

THE  
**Monthly Repository**

No. CCXL.]

DECEMBER, 1825.

[Vol. XX.

*Original Letter of Mr. Emlyn's to Mr. Manning, with Mr. Manning's Notes.*

Yarmouth,

Sir, Nov. 7, 1825.

SOME manuscripts were a few weeks since committed to my care which belonged to the late Mr. Manning, of Ormesby, (see p. 497,) amongst which I found a letter directed to his ancestor, the Rev. Mr. William Manning, of Peasenhall, who was one of the Ejected Ministers. [Mon. Repos. XII. 377 and 478.] The letter is without signature, and has no other date than the day of the month, but from the circumstances mentioned in the first paragraph, I concluded that it must have been written by T. Emlyn during his imprisonment in Dublin, and on referring to Emlyn's narrative, p. xxxiv. (Tracts, Vol. I, 2nd edit. 1731,) I found the same facts which are stated in the letter. I afterwards found another letter in the same hand-writing with the signature T. E. So that there can be no doubt that the enclosed was written by that amiable and persecuted minister. Thinking that a letter written by such a man and at such a moment of suffering, when he could not suppose that what he was writing would ever come before the world, would be interesting to your readers, I have carefully transcribed it, preserving the few peculiarities of orthography, and send it you enclosed. The original is written in a very small character, but perfectly clear and legible. On every part of the paper left blank by Emlyn, his venerable friend had noted down such reflections and observations as occurred to him on reading the letter. These remarks, which are written in the old secretary hand and in a very small character, I have also copied. If you think them worth attention, I have two or three others which, by their date, must have been written by Emlyn during his confinement, each of which is also accompanied by many remarks and observations of the Rev. W. Manning. I will send you copies

of them on the first opportunity. It must be both delightful and improving to contemplate that calm, philosophic and truly Christian spirit which could detail with such simple and unaffected meekness his cruel and unmerited sufferings, give himself up with such quiet resignation to a life of imprisonment and solitude, without expressing any other regret than that he could not improve his confinement as he wished for want of his books, and then turn with perfect composure to the consideration of the same speculative opinions for which he was unjustly imprisoned. Nor can the remarks of Mr. Manning be considered less interesting, who though not fully satisfied that the Scriptures *were clear in the point* between the Arian and Socinian hypotheses, had no hesitation in deciding positively against the commonly received doctrines which subvert the unity of God and envelope the object of our religious adoration in impenetrable obscurity.

H. R. BOWLES.

SIR,

Decem. 23.

I have yours of Oct. 27th: since my last to you I have been under some new hardships: on the 6th of Oct. our Lord Chief Justice ordered the Sherif to remove me from my private confinement (which I had been at expence to procure) into the common gaol, where for five weeks I was greatly incommoded in a strait place crowded with prisoners, there being six beds where I lay, and about seventeen persons lying in the room next to us; but upon a petition to the Court I was by Habeas Corpus removed to the Marshalsea, where I have better accommodation. I learn that I am in execution for the £1000\*

\* The sentence against Emlyn was, "to suffer a year's imprisonment, to pay £1000 fine to the Queen, and to lie in prison till paid, and to find security for good behaviour during life."

and that it is not in the power of my judges to reduce it, but absolutely in the hands of the government, nor do there want several petitioners who have tryed to beg it for some publick uses and some for private, so that I suppose it either is or will be granted, though I know not to whom. The way you mention of getting some friend to beg it is what I long since suggested to our friend Mr. H. at London, (for I cannot pretend to any such here who have interest enough,) but I perceive there is none will use their interest at Court that way, or care to appear in so despised a cause. I hear 'tis said by some of the great ones, that if I were released I should be but further troublesome; indeed I know not what way to attempt any thing more to any purpose, and therefore intend to sit down in silence, being determined to spend my few days in a prison, rather than to pay any thing considerable to the impoverishing myself and the prejudice of my child. I hope I can be content with my confinement and solitude, though having sold my books I cannot improve it as else I might.

Notwithstanding the difference between my sentiments and Dr. Cudis,\* Fowl,† &c., which you mention, yet I conceive they have in effect said the same with me, though they wou'd fain bring themselves off with a few healing expressions. But as they directly deny the essence of Father and Son to be numerically one and the same, so I think they deny it to be of the same sort, or to have the same or like propertys, for what can make a difference in species if not this, *viz.* that one is self-originated, independent and supreme, and the other a derivative depending Being? These are very different, nay even contrary propertys. As for a likeness in power and knowledge, *ab extrâ*, commensurate to the world, I have not denied it more than they (I take the Father's secret purposes to be *ab intrâ*, Acts i. 7). I avoided assertions that Christ was created, not knowing what other ways of production there may be, nor do I see any difference between creation and emanation, only I fear to assert with them a necessary emana-

tion from the Father, lest it imply imperfection in the Father, for since nothing more than all perfection can be necessary, if the Father have all perfection in himself, what necessity is there on him to produce more, any more than there can be that he should create other beings? In short, I am not concerned about his origination as to the *modus*, (supposing his pre-existence,) 'tis enough that he is begotten or produced from the first original Being.

I grant indeed that many controversys have perplexed the church when the preexistence was granted by the Arians, but as there will be more difficult controversys (I judge) if it be denied, so I do not think those ancient controversys about the unity of the two natures to be any way depending upon the preexistence, which needs suppose no more of two natures in one person than is in every man: all will grant Christ consists of soul and body, whether the former pre-existed or not, and there may be the same questions also put as to his origination, either way.—The question is only whether his preexistence be proved from Scripture: you think no proof but *a priori* is sufficient: you require it to be proved that any part of Christ's nature or person did pre-exist to the union to flesh; to this I think it may be replied, that most of what we know even by revelation itself, is known *a posteriori* by consequences. Perhaps I could not know from Scripture that man has a soul distinct from the body but by implication and consequences, but in this case I think the Scripture asserts Christ's preexistence to his descent on earth in express terms, particularly John xvi. 28, ch. i. 17, Col. i. 15, 17. I conceive his coming from the Father was in a literal sense, else there was no antithesis between the two parts, and nothing could be more violent than a metaphorical sense of such places; but as to any other ascension than one to his Father, I think there is no pretence for it either *a priori* or *a posteriori*, except John iii. 13, which is far from asserting it, only it says, he had been or was there; *no man else had been there (which must be by ascending) but he who (not ascended, but) was there.* I do not think that the bare predications of the propertys

\* Qu. Cudworth? ED.

† Qu. Fowler? ED.

of two diverse natures of the same subject, will prove an union of those two natures into one person, because those predications, may one of them be metonymicall (else it were a good proof) as in the case of angels, called Jehovah in the Old Testament; but in the case of the preexistence of Christ's spirit to his incarnation or flesh there is much more to be said, because what is attributed to Christ in relation to his preexistence, or is said to be done of old by him, can never be interpreted of another person in him or represented by him: it cannot be meant of the Father in him, because he is therein distinguished from the Father, as John xvii. 5, and other places; and as to any other figurative sense of such places, I cannot see, as I have said, but that they are too forced. I wonder not if you find none before Justin Martyr among the fathers who speaks of his preexistence, he being one of the first that has left us any writings of bulk not dubious, though the writings which we have under the name of earlier authors, even Clemens himself in his second epistle, (which, for ought I find, some think of as good authority as the other,) do clearly intimate it, and I can scarcely think that Tertullian, Irenæus, Origen, Lactantius, &c., should so soon forsake Christianity in such a point; how came they all to conspire to be the disciples of Plato and none to contradict them? I find it difficult to interpret first chapter of John of the new creation, (as also Col. i. 16,) for whatever different senses the Jewish writers had for the *Logos*, sometimes taking it for a principle of Divine Wisdom, otherwhiles for an inferior person, yet I think there is no doubt but they all agree in attributing to the *Logos* the old creation, as appears in Philo's writings contemporary with St. John, and 'tis hard to conceive he wou'd have spoken in their usual dialect, if he would not be understood in their known sense, while he no way expresses any caution against it. Let me further add, that I find such invincible objections against the two ways according to which the original of our souls is usually accounted for, viz. by traduction or immediate creation, that the preexistence of human spirits (if they be immaterial) is a

disputable problem with me. If you have ever read Glanvil's *Lux Orientalis*, you see what fair pretences there be for this opinion, and yet I doubt not, but what was done to, or by, a preexistent soul (supposing that notion), may most properly be said of the whole present person incarnate; 'tis still the same man, as much as one of us is the same in childhood and in our grown age: 'tis peculiar to the personal union that it be a foundation for such predications in the most proper sense. I mean, that things be attributed to the person that did primarily belong to any one part.—The Scripture you say reveals no nature of Christ but what was derived from the loyns of Abram and David, but then it must be considered that it only speaks of his flesh, still there is nothing said of the origination of his spirit, how that came into being or when.

I grant indeed, after all, that there is nothing absurd to reason, that Christ should be caught up into heaven, but only 'tis unproved, and 'tis more unaccountable that the history of his life and mission shou'd be silent of such an important matter that wou'd have established his authority beyond any thing mentioned, (when yet his carrying about by the tempter and the voice from heaven are so particularly spoken of,) than that no more shou'd be said of his preexistent state, which is not the subject of that history. And yet if that ascent to heaven were allowed, it wou'd not solve those places that speak of his being before Abram, before the foundation of the world, and of his creating it. So that all these controversies will yet remain, after such a concession, so that I shou'd think the Arian scheme will greatly narrow the controversy we have with our adversaries, and doubtless it appears *prima facie*, the most plausible, and according to the most obvious letter of Scripture.

I have read Mr. N.'s late book, turning the Trinity into an allegory, of three facultys or principles, as tho' Arius or Sabellius or any others had ever denyd God to have life and intellect and will. I suppose it will be thought trifling to insist on a Trinity which none deny, and which he cannot suppose to be the Scripture

Trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit. May he that gives liberally give us the wisdom we lack!—and at least afford us so much of his counsell as may guide to his service here, and his glory for ever hereafter.

I am in all sincerity,

Yours.

For

The Rev. Mr. Willm. Manning, at his house in Peasenhall, near Yoxford, Suffolk.

Per London.

The Notes are as follows :

Here is nothing stuck\* at of the common doctrines but only the co-eternity and co-equality of the Father and Son, and the necessary existence of the Son (indeed not answering to the term begotten). His creation out of nothing is not asserted, and of such as hold him to be very God of God, consubstantial with the Father, many deny the equality, all of them own his subordination economical by dispensation and voluntary submission. The dispute then is only of his formal nature and substance. Why not begotten of the Father's substance then, with Dr. Fowler? But for Philo he disowned of the Logos (or Messiah) that to him was to be attributed the creation. And why not attribute it as well to the Holy Spirit distinct? as well to make three Creators as two. And how came the world so soon to outstrip Justin and to conspire with Athanasius, (as still do our most noted divines,) not only to affirm the consubstantiality, but generally the co-equality, to this day the common belief? The former led the way.

Grant but the Nestorian hypothesis about the incarnation of God the Son, and that the holy child Jesus, begotten of the Virgin Mary, was a person, (called her Son and the Son of Man so often by himself,) an human person distinct, and that will avoid the force of all the arguments of the Inquiry.† And no wonder it is that the pre-existent Logos, begotten Son, and *sub-omnipotent* Creator and Sustainer of all things, visible and invisible, should

\* Qu. *struck!* ED.

† The publication for which Emlyn was imprisoned was called "An Humble Enquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ." This was printed in 1702.

obtain to be owned for *very God by nature*, as it has eventually proved.

The hypostatical unity with God (at least the Father) must be let go as greater than he distinct, *viz.* than the man Christ Jesus, if not in some respects than God the Son too. Admitting the personal union with the Son only, of the same substance but subordinate in office to his progenitor, (as others speak that are for the substantial unity of person,) and disowning the equality against Nestorius, but believing Christ to have the style of God by nature given him, what a confusion are we in!

As for the equality and personal unity (both commonly held), the Scriptures confute it a hundred times, but granting the inequality or refusing the personal union especially, the confutation of the Godhead of the Son is more difficult, admitting the hypothesis of Arius for true.

However the contrary may be my opinion, I am not so certain about it (the Scriptures being dark in the point between the Arian and Socinian) as I am to myself about the falseness of the common doctrine, which subverts the unity of God most high and the simplicity of his Being, void of *componency*, such as of a *God-man*, one subsistent with a communication of properties in the concrete person between Creator and creature in true and very speech, as consisting of the two natures as to God the Son.

Justin and Tertullian too with Eusebius were for the *consubstantiality* of the Son. As one luminary alights another without diminution of itself (as one soul begets another), so the Son is proceeding from or begotten of the Father. While yet Tertullian, as Irenæus before him, owns the pre-existence not to be contained in the ancient creed or rule of Christian faith invariable (from the beginning extending all the world over) recited by them.

Again, how came it to obtain in the world so universally, that the child so called the holy thing, begotten miraculously of Mary, should be believed to be not an inanimate mass of flesh or corpse only, but a *man* child? When began it? Who was the first asserter of it? The history of his begetting, Matt. i. 18, Luke i. 31, 32, Gal. iv. 4, nothing like to the infusion

of a spirit into it by the Holy Ghost in the conception, much less of the same Spirit that made the Holy Ghost, if Creator of all.

A creative power if ascribed to the preexistent Son, an inquiry may arise whether or no it was inherent to his person from his nature, (with the Father's concurrence suitable to his capacity still,) as in such instances as Gen. i. 1, 7, 10, &c., or it was miraculous absolutely or not effected by a power connate or intrinsic to him, but such as 2 Kings viii. 5, 1 Kings xvii. 16, Acts iii. 12, &c., viz. supernatural, Acts ii. 22, Judges xvi. 28. However in either way dependent and ministerial and subservient to God's beck in acting.

Others wrought miracles, and 'tis ascribed to them as the efficient, Deut. xxxiv. 11, Acts viii. 6, 1 Cor. xii. 10, such as restoring life, &c., but not creation. Elisha and Peter could receive no such power to be given or subjected in them, tho' at the will of another, because creatures of a limited nature nor capable recipients.

Necessary emanation corresponds most to the *autotheos* (as light, heat, and motion from the sun or the faculties from the soul of man, as of the formal essence, else no sun nor soul), and to make out the coeternity and coequality in strict conception. But the very term begotten confronts that notion, 'tis a voluntary production, and the contrary assertion was condemned of all the east, even the Homoiousians also (or Homousians in kind meaning it) as well as Arians. The substratum to the efficiency or powers (that something) they would have the Father to be, but not God *without*, but *with* the other.

After all my arguing, I can't be so confident against the Arian as against the tritheistical Trinitarian. I have little against the former who retain the unity of God and defend it, and think that what they give to Christ don't clash with the rights of God, only of which is my doubt.

Newport, Isle of Wight,  
Nov. 10, 1825.

SIR,  
THE last Number of the Quarterly Review contains a specimen of disingenuousness or ignorance, not to use stronger terms, that appears to me deserving of notice and reprehension.

The offensive passage is in the article on Mechanics' Institutions and Infant Schools, No. LXIV. p. 410. It is worthy of notice that this infallible organ of opinions hostile to the cause of general education, confesses that it cannot discover any solid objections to these excellent institutions; its exceptions are taken to some minor points only in their constitution. But if it cannot seriously attack the institutions themselves, it does not fail to asperse the strenuous supporter of them, Mr. Brougham. That gentleman would, I imagine, be much more surprised if he were to receive the commendation rather than the censure of the Quarterly Review.

The objectionable matter in question is a garbled quotation from a pamphlet published by Mr. Brougham. The object in thus misstating the passage of Mr. Brougham's is to make an attack on the excellent Dr. Lindsay, the writer at the same time imagining that he is levelling a blow at the venerable Theophilus Lindsey. The quotation given in the Review as if taken verbatim from Mr. Brougham's "Practical Observations," p. 21, is as follows, "That temporary accommodation for the London Institution was provided at the Chapel in Monkwell Street, formerly Dr. LINDSEY'S; and if upon such a subject we might make any account of omens, surely a scheme for the improvement of mankind could not be commenced under *more unhappy auspices than in the place once occupied by that rash and inconsistent misinterpreter of Scripture.*" See Quar. Rev. p. 421, note. The words of Mr. Brougham really are, "Surely a scheme for the improvement of mankind could not be commenced under happier auspices than in the place which so virtuous and enlightened a friend of his country had once filled with the spirit of genuine philanthropy and universal toleration." (Practical Observations, p. 21.) Mr. Brougham has misspelt Dr. Lindsay's name, Lindsey, instead of Lindsay. And the Reviewer, misled by this error or by his ignorance of the characters of the two excellent individuals, fancying that they were one and the same, has evidently confounded them, or he would not have styled the amiable Dr. Lindsay, who was not distinguished for his scriptural

criticisms, but for his moderation and caution in stating matters of faith, "a rash and inconsistent misinterpreter of Scripture," which in the usual style of this liberal Review would be an appropriate definition of a learned Unitarian biblical critic. This the venerable Theophilus Lindsey undoubtedly was, and the Quarterly Reviewer having a faint recollection of a Lindsey resigning church preferment for conscience' sake, and afterwards boldly defending his conduct by the publication of his scriptural researches under the title of an Apology, has confused the whole together, and fancied he was attacking one man, while he was ignorantly censuring another.

ABRAHAM CLARKE.

On Milton's New Work.

Thus lovely Halcyons dive into the main,  
Then shew far off their shining plumes  
again!

COWPER.

Islington,

Dec. 4, 1825.

SIR,  
I HAVE been much amused with certain critiques of Milton's newly-recovered theological work entitled, "A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, compiled from the Holy Scriptures, translated from the original Latin by order of his Majesty." The remarks of the Reviewers of the *Congregational* and of the *Evangelical Magazine* are characterized by similar lamentations of its extreme heterodoxy. There is, however, one wide difference between them. The former pronounces it the imbecile ebullition of dotage, and of course unworthy of attention. The latter makes no such insinuation, but, speaking highly of the literary merit of the work, means to institute a series of essays for the refutation of its contents. This is fair and entitled to commendation. "The cause of truth (says Dr. Priestley) may be compared to an engine constructed so as to be put in motion by the tide, and which is kept in its proper movement whether the water flows in or flows out! Nothing here is wanting but motion, it being impossible for that motion from whatever quarter it arise to operate unfavourably." With unimpeded career, overwhelming all opposition, Truth will have her victory.

But the *Evangelical* critic has a paragraph which must not pass unnoticed. "To some of our Baptist brethren it will not be a little gratifying to find that Milton was on their side. The triumph is, however, in some degree moderated by the circumstance that his extreme heterodoxy in other particulars must forever annihilate him as a theological authority. If, however, they will boast of him, let them not forget that he was an *Arian*, a *Polygamist*, a *Materialist*, a *Humanitarian*, and in fact an abettor of almost every error which has infested the Church of God!" Now here is a strange jumble of hard names flung together with the view of branding the character of the illustrious author of *Paradise Lost* with obloquy. The writer is doubtless acquainted with the efficacy of abuse instead of argument, and is well aware of the due effect it will have on the readers of the *Evangelical Magazine*. Be it so. I envy not his satisfaction. Milton was certainly, as it appears from this work, an *Arian* and a *Polygamist* and a *Materialist*, but not a *Humanitarian*. *Arianism* and *Humanitarianism* are in direct opposition to each other, and this sagacious critic ought to have known it. The Particular Baptists indeed are confessedly moderated in their triumph on finding Milton a Baptist, by his alleged heterodoxy. But it should be known that a large and respectable portion of the General Baptists exult without reserve in discovering this great man among their ranks. That he was a *Baptist* and an *Arian Baptist* I rejoice to find, and more especially that he became so by the diligent study of the Old and New Testament. Upon his richly impregnated and capacious mind truth shone not through the murky atmosphere of creeds and confessions, but from the broad and unsullied mirror of the word of God!

Milton's undisguised avowal of the despised doctrine of *Adult Baptism* must be particularly offensive to the *Pædobaptists*,—it is proclaimed in these memorable words: "Under the gospel the first of the sacraments, commonly so called, is Baptism, wherein the bodies of believers who engage themselves to pureness of life, are immersed in running water, to signify

their regeneration by the Holy Spirit and their union with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection." His able and impartial translator, Dr. Sumner, says in a note, "In *profluentem* aquam,—by the admission of this word into the definition, it is evident that Milton attributed some importance to this circumstance, probably considering that the superior purity of running water was peculiarly typical of the thing signified! Hence it appears that the same epithet employed in *Paradise Lost* in a passage very similar to the present, is not merely a poetical ornament—

— Them who shall believe,  
Baptizing in the profluent stream, the  
sign  
Of washing them from guilt of sin to life,  
Pure and in mind prepared, if so be-  
fall,  
For death like that which the Redeemer  
died!" B. xii. 441.

Milton expresses himself decisively on *the Perpetuity* of Baptism, so strangely questioned in the present day. Indeed the writer of this article cannot refrain from saying, that Milton, were he still living in the metropolis, could join himself to the General Baptist Churches at Worship Street alone, in perfect consistency with his leading religious sentiments. There he would be admitted into free and full communion, indulging the most unreserved love and charity towards all the other professors of Christianity. Pardon my honest enthusiasm. Methinks I behold this venerable man, this distinguished friend of civil and religious liberty, sitting down along with us around *the Lord's table*, and though bereft of bodily sight, yet "inly irradiate," ruminating on the blessed truths of the Christian revelation, whose beams light him onward in his darkling path to the regions of eternal day! In this his immortal work he says, "Although it is the duty of believers to join themselves if possible to a church duly constituted, Heb. xi. 25, *not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another; yet such as cannot do this conveniently or with full satisfaction of conscience, are not to be considered as excluded from the blessing bestowed*

by God on the churches." The fact is, that Milton in his latter days attended no place of worship; probably there was in his time no church in the metropolis to which he could be conscientiously united. Nothing except rigid Puritanism or loose Church-of-Englandism at that period predominated! Hence Bishop Newton remarks of the poet, that "in the latter part of his life he was not a professed member of any particular sect of Christians; he frequented no public worship, nor used any religious rite in his family. Whether so many different forms of worship as he had seen had made him indifferent to all forms, or whether he thought that all Christians had in some things corrupted the purity and simplicity of the gospel, or whether he disliked their endless and uncharitable disputes, and that love of dominion and inclination to persecution which he said was a piece of Popery inseparable from all churches, or whether he believed that a man might be a good Christian without joining in any communion, or whether he did not look upon himself as inspired, as wrapt up in God, and above all forms and ceremonies, it is not easy to determine; *to his own Master he standeth or falleth*: but if he was of any denomination he was a sort of *Quietist*, and was, though he so little regarded the exterior, full of the interior of religion." Another editor of *Milton's Works*, Mr. Hawkins, justly observes, "The reproach that has been thrown upon him of frequenting no place of public worship in his latter days, should be received, as Dr. Symmons observes, with some caution. His blindness and other infirmities might be in part his excuse, and it is certain that his daily employments were always ushered in by devout meditation and study of the Scriptures." Such, with all his peculiarities, was the author of *Paradise Lost*—most pious, most conscientious, altogether unlike the general herd of professors—a sincere believer of scriptural Christianity. This he fearlessly avows in his work. I glory in the fact; it is indeed most honourable to his memory.

But beside the heresies of Milton concerning *Arianism* and *Adult Baptism*, the Evangelical critic charges

him with being a *Polygamist* and a *Materialist*. As to *Polygamy* he should have remembered that in these latter times it has had for its chief and most zealous advocate an evangelical clergyman, the Rev. Martin Madan, of the Lock Hospital, who, however, unwisely proposed it as a remedy for what he deemed the worse evil of prostitution. Materialism has been maintained with ability by the father of the late Lord Ellenborough, Dr. Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, and by Archdeacon Blackburne, the brightest ornaments of the Church of England. Apart from revelation, *Materialism* is the cheerless tenet of infidelity. But eminent writers, including even *Luther*, have contended for it with the sole view of giving its full value to *the resurrection*, which is the great doctrine of the New Testament, and thus enhancing our obligations to *Jesus Christ* who *hath brought life and immortality to light!*

It is, however, a grievous thing that a Christian brother cannot differ from another without having disparaging motives imputed to him. On reviewing the work of Milton, the *Congregational* critic intimates a defect of nature, averring, that he was fallen into his dotage; whilst the *Evangelical* animadverter, acknowledging that the work fell from his pen at a period when "his judgment must have reached its utmost maturity," will have it that it is a defect of grace, the want of humility. Coupled with a laudatory concluding paragraph, the whole shall be transcribed: it is a theological curiosity:

"We conclude our present remarks by informing our readers, that although there is a *host of errors* in the volume before us, it has nevertheless some claims on the lovers of biblical knowledge. It is marked throughout, and where the reasoning is perverse, by a very decided appeal to the Sacred Oracles. If the proofs selected from the Holy Scriptures are not always pertinent, they are at least exceedingly numerous, and shew that the distinguished author had not relinquished in the progress of his speculation a profound deference for the word of God! In some parts of the work, too, we have discovered passages of transcendent energy and pathos which would

bear comparison with the very richest of his compositions. In closing the volume, however, our prevailing impressions are those of bitter sorrow and regret. Would that Milton had felt *more humbly*, and then doubtless would he have thought and written more correctly." The commendatory parts of this paragraph respecting the scriptural completion of the work, have been wrung from the writer in spite of his own narrow system of faith, which, dictating the last sentence, shews how awfully it has blinded his understanding, and indurated his heart with bigotry! The best reply to the truly antichristian insinuation of the Reviewer, is the closing paragraph of the incomparable *Prefatory Address* of his work, entitled, "John Milton, to all the churches of Christ, and to all who profess the Christian faith throughout the world, peace and the recognition of the truth, and eternal salvation in God the Father and in our Lord Jesus Christ." His words are these: "For my own part I adhere to the Holy Scriptures alone. I follow no other heresy or sect. I had not even read any of the works of heretics, so called, when the mistakes of those who are reckoned orthodox and their incautious handling of Scripture first taught me to agree with their opponents whenever those opponents agreed with Scripture. If this be *heresy*, I confess with St. Paul, Acts xxiv. 14, *that after the way which they call heresy so worship I the God of my fathers*, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets, to which I add, whatever is written in the New Testament. Any other judges or chief interpreters of the Christian belief, together with all implicit faith as it is called, I in common with the whole Protestant Church refuse to recognize. For the rest, brethren, cultivate truth with brotherly love. Judge of my present undertaking according to the admonishing of the Spirit of God, and neither adopt my sentiments nor reject them unless every doubt has been removed from your belief by the clear testimony of revelation. Finally, live in the faith of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Farewell."

A few words more respecting this work of the author of *Paradise Lost*,

and I have done. I have perused it with intense interest, with undivided attention. It is a human production and has its errors. But its prime excellence is, and an excellence which attaches itself to no other body of divinity that I have ever seen, that the *personal unity* of God constitutes the central point—beaming refulgently throughout its pages like the sun in the firmament, whilst the other minor doctrines, resembling so many satellites, revolve around in their several orbits with an attractive but subordinate glory! Be it ever remembered, that ONE VOLUME alone merits the well-known encomium of Locke, "It has God for its author, *salvation* for its end, and *truth* without any mixture of error for its subject-matter." Infallibility is the sole prerogative of Deity.

I conclude my notice of this work just resuscitated from its long entombment, with the mention of a curious fact respecting its author, not generally known. He died November, 1674, and was interred in *Cripplegate Church*, where, in 1793, the late Samuel Whitbread, Sen., placed a marble tablet to his memory. About the year 1800, the spot where the poet lay buried was opened, and an *imperfect skeleton*, supposed to be his, was subjected to public inspection. Great doubt, however, has been entertained respecting the identity of these remains, nor can the contemplation of them be denominated a laudable curiosity. "But whether," said the late ingenious though eccentric *Capel Loft*, "the remains of that body which once was Milton's, or those of any other person, were thus exposed and set to sale, *death* and *dissolution* have had their empire over these. The spirit of his *immortal works* survives invulnerable and must survive! These are his best image, these the *reliques* which a rational admiration may cherish and revere. The memory of the perfections which we esteem effaces the humiliation and horrors of the tomb, and instead of ransacking the sepulchre with idolatrous superstition for the mouldering and undistinguished fragments which it decently conceals, such a resemblance operates no weak spell with bones and dust; its holier and diviner magic invests its object with antici-

pated immortality and loses every frail and perishable idea in those contemplations which pursue the future progress of renovated and exalted existence through the ages of eternity!"

J. EVANS.

---

A "Long-Lost Truth."

LETTER II.

SIR,

IT now only remains, as it was proposed, to offer a few remarks on this important subject, in a more direct and positive point of view.

And let it be observed, I, that all essence is of God, and has its foundation in him; or, according to the Apostle, "All things are of God, of whom are all things;" and as they all existed in his eternal idea, so he could have no immediate regard to himself in producing them. *Goodness*, therefore, or benevolence, must have been the chief spring of action in the Deity, in the work of creation, and especially that of his rational offspring.\*

*Secondly*. If we should entertain any doubt of the infinity of the Divine Goodness, from the present prevalence of natural and moral evil, revelation expressly assures us that "God is love." This is abundantly sufficient to calm the mind of every truly religious and reflecting person, and to abolish at once every idea and every doctrine inconsistent with this sublime principle, when he meditates upon it in all its glorious and infallible consequences and effects; for we are to consider that "God is love"—"not only as he is said to be *light*, or denominated from any other *single* property or attribute, but as to his *nature*, or the divine form of his substance or essence; the *result* of all his other perfections, that to which they tend, and in which they *concentre*, as their end and crown; all conspiring to exalt and *eternize* the sublime joy and glory of his one divine, natural and vital act of triumphant and consummate love." †

Hence it follows, that all the other attributes of the Deity are to be regarded as exercised in strict *unison* with this transcendant perfection, of

---

\* See Spect. Vol. VIII.

† Roach.

which they are, as it were, parts and modifications, and in which they are all comprehended. "In a relative view they are all the *effluxes* of his eternal goodness, distinguished by several names, according to the objects about which it is exercised. When it supplies the indigent, it is *bounty*; when it relieves the miserable, it is *mercy*; when it confers blessings on the unworthy, it is *grace*; when it bears with rebellious sinners, it is *long-suffering*; when it bestows blessings on them to whom he hath obliged himself by promise, it is *truth*; and when it succours the innocent, and by just punishment restrains those evils that are destructive to men, it is *justice and righteousness*. It is the great *inviting attribute* which inclines his wisdom to contrive and his power to act for us, and veils his *holiness* from alarming and terrifying us. We admire God for his other perfections, but this *allures us*; this is the ground of all our converse with him, that he is a *good God*. All creatures have a natural goodness in them, a goodness of being; but God is sovereignly and infinitely good—the first *Being*, and therefore, as Plato says, the first *Good*. Moses having desired to see his glory, is answered, 'I will make all my *goodness* pass before thee:' and the Apostle, Rom. i., calls his goodness his *Godhead*; so that goodness is *inseparable* from the notion of God."\*

*Thirdly.* As "God is love," and as true religion consists in the imitation of the Being whom we worship, so especially in this sublime perfection of his nature, which constitutes both our highest duty and supreme felicity. Hence *charity*, in its scriptural sense, as including our duty to God and man, is said to be "the fulfilling of the law, the end of the commandment, and the bond of perfectness," the standard of our present character, and the criterion of our future judgment. And this divine principle is to be exercised with the greatest intensesness, "with all the heart and soul and mind and strength;" and in those that are duly possessed with it, it is said to "cast out fear," that "against such there is no law," seeing that "they

are taught of God," and are "a law unto themselves."

"Who shall prescribe a law to those that love?"

Love's a more powerful law which doth them move."

Now, from those two fundamental principles taken together, namely, that "God is love," and that benevolence is an indispensable qualification in his rational offspring, we are enabled to form a judgment of two arguments sometimes made use of in defence of the popular scheme, arising from the supposition that the contemplation of future punishments may tend to preserve *new beings* in their allegiance, or to confirm and enhance the happiness of the righteous in heaven.

As to the first of these suppositions, it being only a *conjecture*, we shall leave it to itself. "Conjectures are endless, and the most dangerous of all auxiliaries;"\* and where we have no grounds to proceed upon, we had better confess our ignorance at once. Doubtless, "the unfathomed space is ever teeming with new births;" and in the immensity of the universe, the All-wise Creator may have a variety of methods whereby to govern, to punish, or to restore his rational offspring. But we have no example or knowledge of this kind, and can derive but an imperfect acquaintance from revelation with the history of those (commonly supposed) *prior* apostate spirits, whose fall and punishment, if alluded to at all, are marked out only in dark and distant adumbrations. Neither do we know any thing of the inhabitants of Mars or Venus, Saturn or Jupiter, whether they are in states of trial, of punishment or of reward; and certainly nothing of those countless myriads of suns and worlds, revolving in the unfathomable depths of æther, invisible to mortal eyes, and beyond the stretch of human imagination. "We walk by faith, not by sight." Let us then withdraw nearer home.

Now, as to the *knowledge* which glorified saints may acquire of future punishment, it is observed (XIX. 721), that there can be no doubt of the fact,

\* Wisheart. 1716.

\* Melampus. 1781.

and that upon the supposition of limited and adequate punishment, this knowledge will be attended with suitable emotions. It is a puerile and unwarranted idea of the Christian heaven to regard its inhabitants as always elevated to a high pitch of seraphic ecstasy, a state for which created natures, such as man, seem to be utterly unqualified. Much of our present enjoyments arises from *contrast*; and though the blessed will have nothing to oppose their proper felicity, yet there may be gradations of happiness, pensive seasons when, retiring from the bright effulgence of surrounding glories, they may delight to enjoy the pleasures of *reminiscence*, to retrace the scenes of their earthly pilgrimage, and perhaps to drop a silent tear, "such as angels weep," over the lot of those whom once they loved, whom now they behold not, and whom they know to be the victims of a just but awful sentence in the state of distant separation!

But if you pursue this idea farther, and suppose glorified spirits contemplating *eternal* punishments without painful emotions, you entirely change the question, and make a supposition utterly irreconcilable with all analogy. It is one reason for bearing patiently our present sufferings, that they do not last *always*; and in proportion to the probable duration of our own or those of others, are our hopes or our fears. Now, for the celestial inhabitants to contemplate the eternal misery of others without uneasiness, and yet at the same time to retain in the highest perfection the essential characteristics of true goodness, sympathy and benevolence, is, as we must conceive, an utter impossibility; for this would be not to strengthen, enlarge and improve their faculties, but to take them away, and transform them, partially at least, into stocks and stones. But as *Stoicism* forms no part of the Christian character on earth, so we may be assured that it will constitute no part of it in heaven, "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." This is the supreme excellency of men or angels, and must so remain throughout eternal ages. If the angels now "rejoice over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine

just persons who (comparatively) need no repentance," we cannot for a moment be persuaded to think that "the children of the resurrection," who shall hereafter be "like unto the angels," will ever be able to contemplate the (supposed) everlasting sufferings of others without the deepest and most indelible sorrow. The bare possibility, the most distant idea of such a termination of the Divine plans, with regard to any of their fellow-creatures, would prove a never-dying worm in their breasts, an eternal bar to the full possession of their sublime felicity, and transform heaven itself into a state of comparative punishment. The *knowledge*, therefore, of future sufferings, which angels and perfected spirits will possess, is an unanswerable argument against their proper eternity.

And this will be further evident when we consider, *fourthly*, that revelation gives us the strongest assurances of the full and complete gratification of the benevolent affections in a future state. "Faith, hope and charity" are described as meeting there with their proper objects. Faith and hope will, indeed, in some measure cease, one being changed into vision, and the other perfected in enjoyment. Not that the righteous will have nothing more to expect or to desire, for desire and expectation seem necessary to the happiness of all created natures; but *here* is the distinction—in this world these affections are often at variance; we frequently expect what we by no means desire, and desire that which we have no reason to expect: but *there* desire and expectation shall go hand in hand—we shall wish for nothing but what is proper for us, and our desires shall be abundantly gratified. Our felicity shall keep pace with our capacities, and, though fully satisfying at present, shall be for ever increasing.

But though hereafter faith and hope, as far as they imply defect and imperfection, shall be done away, "*Charity never faileth*"—it "hopeth all things, and believeth all things"—it never despairs, even in the present state, of the human race, of the commonwealth, or of the individual; it believeth all things to be in a progressive state of improvement, though it may be mistaken in particular instances;

the prospects of its possessor are not bounded by the narrow limits of time and sense; he regards this world in its necessary connexion with another, and when disappointed in his expectations from sublunary objects, anticipates with joyful hope the important realities of futurity. His "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled!" This beatitude evidently points out something astonishingly great and glorious in the future condition of the righteous. These restless appetites of the animal frame are frequently satisfied for the present, but they as frequently return; but the "hunger and thirst after righteousness," the spiritual desires of the truly good, shall hereafter be filled in a far more complete and emphatic manner; they shall be abundantly gratified in those "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness—when the work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever."

To expatiate on all the passages in the Bible which appear, not only by fair inference, as above stated, but also by direct application, to designate this glorious termination of the Divine plans with respect to *mankind*, (which the reader will recollect is all that immediately concerns us, or that is within our reach,) in terms sufficiently explicit, consistently with the general tenor of holy writ concerning remote events, and with the language of prophecy, would require a volume; but some of the most striking cannot be overlooked; they appear as bright orbs in the celestial hemisphere, "having no part dark," and guiding our feet into the way of peace.

We have seen that whatever God is, he is *infinitely* so. Now, to say that he is infinitely good, but *partially* long-suffering, is to deny in reality what we profess in words. The branches must partake of the excellency of the root; the streams of the fountain. When it is asked, "Will he draw out his anger *unto all generations?*" This implies the strongest negation that he will *not*; and this he hath also himself assured us of in the most positive terms—"I will not con-

tend *for ever*, neither will I be always wrath; lest the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made!" To confine the import of these passages to the narrow limits of time and sense, is the most egregious trifling—it is to degrade and limit the attributes of the Deity, and to represent him as, in this view, "such a one as ourselves:" the decrees and dispensations of the Almighty are never to be opposed to *his nature*: no length of time, no degree of perverseness in the creature, (speaking with reverence,) can literally, though they may *figuratively*, weary out his patience, or extinguish his long-suffering. If the daring transgress or abuse this essential property of the Divine nature, either here or hereafter, the fault is in himself alone, and not in the doctrine, as we may have occasion more fully to observe in the sequel.

"God sent not his Son into the world to condemn it, but that the world through him might be saved." Christ is said "to give his flesh for the life of the world;" and he is emphatically styled "the Saviour of the world." These and other similar texts, which the reader's judgment will supply, may be properly considered together, and the lowest possible sense we can assign to them, either separately or in their respective connexions, is plainly this—that the Deity had an original intention of saving all mankind, and that, in this view, the benefits resulting from the meritorious instrumentality of our Lord, in his labours and sufferings towards the accomplishment of this glorious end, as they were designed for all, so they are *sufficient* for all. But are we to *restrain* these wonderful expressions to the lowest possible sense, and to suppose that they will ultimately fail of their complete accomplishment? Ancient and venerable divines tell us, that "the mercy of God, apprehended by an act of true faith, can pluck a sinner from the very confines of hell"! and that "one drop of the blood of Christ is sufficient to purify the guilt of ten thousand worlds"! And shall the mercies of God, and the merits of Christ, which in this life are represented as so gloriously and transcendently operative, prove in the next totally inert and inefficacious? Is it

conceivable, when our Lord assures us that he "came to seek and to save that which was lost, to taste death for every man, and to destroy the works of the Devil," that these sentiments are to be regarded only as *allegories of mercy*; simply possible, indeed, but by no means probable; that he should be a partial, but not an universal Saviour; and that "the works of the Devil," the prevalence and effects of sin, shall be so far from being in reality *destroyed*, that on the contrary they will continue to flourish with increasing magnitude and vigour throughout the countless ages of eternity?

We are enjoined to forgive an offending brother "seventy times seven;" that is, an indefinite number: and here, as in all cases relating to the excellencies and perfections of moral agents, we should reason from the lesser to the greater.

A passage from 1 Tim. ii. has been considered, XIX. 719. In ch. iv. 10, the Apostle observes, "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all men*, especially of those that believe." Timothy did not require to be informed that God's providence was over all, for this he knew from Moses; nor yet that the gospel was eminently calculated for universal reception; but the writer seems to be here inculcating an important truth, by way of parenthesis, not sufficiently attended to by many Jewish converts, who were still too apt to confine and limit the Divine bounty: as if he had said, "God is the Saviour of all men *ultimately*, but of true believers *especially*." It is fit that they who have readily submitted to the Divine authority, and thankfully accepted the blessings of the gospel, in faith and obedience, should be graciously and eminently distinguished from others, who at present neglect or oppose them; but the Author of all beings hath unknown methods in store to accomplish his benevolent purposes; in him are all the springs of life, both natural and moral—"He can work upon the heart without wronging the natural faculties, and *suit the key to all the wards of the lock*, so that none of them shall be disordered" \*—"He will magnify his law, and make it honourable."

In the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Colossians and the Philippians, there is a variety of passages which appear to bear a similar import, namely, that in the "dispensation" (or economy) "of the fulness of times," God hath determined "to gather together in one" (or *re-head*) "all things in Christ" But what kind of *re-heading* in Christ can that be, if a great part of mankind are to suffer everlasting banishment from him, and millions go out of life without having ever heard of his name, at least to any salutary or practical purpose? And how shall "the Father by him reconcile all things to himself—and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God," if millions of souls shall remain for ever unreconciled and unreconcilable, and eternally rebellious and incorrigible? These topics require our serious consideration.

Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, hath thrown considerable light upon a remarkable passage, Rom. v., to which the reader is referred. The contrast or opposition here is plainly between the consequences of Adam's sin, by which all men became liable to natural death or condemnation, which are here used as synonymous terms, and the consequences of "the free gift," by which all who suffer the former are to partake of the benefits of the latter, not only by being raised to life again simply, but "to *justification of life*." Now, we cannot call a mere resurrection, succeeded by eternal punishment, "justification of life," literally or figuratively; nor, on the other hand, can we suppose this applicable to the impenitent, in a strictly *imputative* sense, since that would be to do away all distinction of character, and to vacate our obligation to obedience. For God will never grant to rebels the inheritance of sons, till by a change of character they shall be fitted for the manifestation of his grace. Perhaps this important passage may be best explained by the Apostle's language in another place: "God hath concluded all under sin, that he may have mercy upon all!" These are transcendently glorious and transporting parts of the scheme of the gospel, which "the angels desire to look into," and which should be the objects of our frequent and delightful contemplation and praise.

\* Roach.

In the Epistle to the Romans, viii. 19—22, there appears to be a sublime, distinct and specific prophecy concerning final restitution. It strikes upon our view like lightning from heaven, or rather like a fixed constellation, which, though undiscerned by the careless eye, is yet easily distinguished by the attentive observer, who, "in the glass of the word," often descries objects which escape common observation :

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because (*ὄτι*, or that) the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God: for we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

By the "creature" here, as Mr. Burkitt observes, "some understand the whole universe of rational, sensitive and inanimate beings." It is no less strange than true, that Calvin himself alludes to this interpretation without censuring it (*Inst.* Book iii. Ch. ix. Sect. 5): "Shall brute beasts, yea, and lifeless creatures, stocks and stones, according to Paul, knowing their present vanity, be earnestly looking for the great day of the resurrection, that *they may, with the children of God*, be delivered from this state; and shall we, that are endowed with the light of reason, and, above all, illuminated by the Spirit of God, not raise our minds above this scene of vanity and corruption?" But this appears to be too general a sense of the passage. It is true, the inferior creatures suffer by the sin of man, and their sufferings frequently exceed their enjoyments, and as they are innocent, and possessing faculties, sensations and voluntary powers, which we justly admire but cannot explain, this may seem to require some remuneration: and, no doubt, if it be fit and proper, it will be so; but these are matters which do not immediately concern us, and which we may safely leave in the hands of the God of nature.

But by "the creature" here, (*κτίσις*) is generally understood the whole race of mankind, besides Chris-

tians, who, in the next verse, are opposed to the former class. Now "no creature but man in this world can be said to be subject to vanity *willingly* or *not willingly*."\* Mankind is therefore here divided into *two great classes*, professing Christians, and the rational world at large; and the apostle is evidently making a *digression* and inviting the attention of those to whom he wrote to an important subject, which they either did not sufficiently attend to or duly apprehend. As if he had said, "We Christians should not wonder at the peculiar sufferings to which we are exposed, which are for the most beneficial purposes, and will terminate in a manner unspeakably glorious; since we see in the present constitution of things, that this is the case in some measure of all the world, as well as of ourselves. 'For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth, and the whole creation groaneth:' the good and the bad, for reasons partly different and partly similar. Good men groan under peculiar afflictions, under persecution, on account of their own imperfections and the general infelicity of man. Bad men groan in their lucid intervals from the unsatisfying nature of present enjoyments, from the torment of ungoverned appetites and passions, and the shortness of human life. And sometimes they unite in the general aspirations of the just, after a spiritual deliverance, though they have but confused ideas of its nature, and will not attend to the means by which it is to be accomplished. Thus every individual may be considered as 'travailing in pain,' and in a state of 'earnest expectation' for something better: 'Like a *poor prisoner*, who often puts his head out of the window of his gaol and looks for relief, and longs to be enlarged into liberty and enjoyment.'"<sup>\*</sup> Now the creature was thus originally subjected, "not willingly," for it could not act or choose *before it was*, but by the appointment of Providence, who in his inscrutable wisdom did not think it fit that the offspring of an apostate head should be favoured in *the first instance* with equal advantages to their progenitor. But this state of things is not *irre-*

\* Taylor in loco. † Ibid.

versible; for I now assure you, by the spirit of prophecy, that the Almighty hath thus subjected his rational offspring "in hope" of a better state and condition, of which he hath already afforded all mankind some considerable intimation in the frame and constitution of their own minds; and as he never can deceive his creatures, nor does any thing in vain, this hope will ultimately be realized "and the creature itself;" all mankind universally "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." This appears to the writer to be in the main a summary of Mr. Taylor's paraphrase upon this important passage. The reader must determine this question for himself. It is true, impenitent transgressors cannot be received into "the liberty of God's children" while they remain such, but this being a leading principle of the gospel, needs not to be here insisted upon.

The last passage of Scripture which we shall mention in an argumentative way, is the close of our Lord's parable, recorded *Luke* xii., which undoubtedly relates to the judgments of futurity. It will be allowed, that we are to have a more especial regard to those parts of holy writ which treat of particular doctrines, in which the sacred penmen expressly *reason* upon them, than to those where they are only alluded to in a general and cursory way. The apostles did not immediately, as in other cases, comprehend the full scope of this parable, and Peter desired an explanation, which was immediately granted; and the sum and substance of the whole discourse is presented to us by the Evangelist, vers. 47, 48: "He who knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he who knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes:" and then the argument follows, founded upon the purest principles of eternal justice—"for to whom much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him will they ask the more." In this memorable language our Lord lays down the true criterion of future judgment, and furnishes us with *the key*, as it were, to unlock the prison doors of *Hades*, and to afford us a

glimpse of those awful sufferings which await the hitherto incorrigible in a future state. But instead of a paraphrase upon it, let us try a *sylogism*, and see how far the reasoning applies to the doctrine which we have been endeavouring to illustrate and defend.

Jesus Christ, the appointed judge of the whole earth, when treating of his future advent, hath assured us, that *some* of the victims of future sufferings shall be "beaten with few stripes," or in comparatively lenient degrees; but the phrase "a *few stripes*," is absolutely inconsistent with the idea of *an eternal duration*: therefore some of the victims of future condemnation shall not remain in a state of punishment throughout an *absolute eternity*.

If there be no defect in the *second* limb of this argument, then, unless our faculties deceive us, and we have no means of distinguishing truth from error, *the conclusion* must necessarily follow; and a similar train of reasoning will justify us in extending the rule to the case of the delinquent who is to be "beaten with many stripes," unless we suppose (*horrendum dictu*) that the creature is stronger than his Maker, or that the Almighty (to repeat the tremendous language of the poet) hath "pushed into being a reverse of himself!"

Thus hath our great Master, in this place, as in many of his divine discourses, set before us *the paternal character* of the Deity in the most striking and alluring light, inducing us to adopt the belief or *moral suasion* that the punishments of futurity, being directed by infinite wisdom, power and goodness, holiness and justice, in eternal harmony and union, will be *sanatory and medicinal*, and not final and vindictive: only let us never forget that his infinite goodness is designed to attract us more and more to his service; to increase, not to abate, our dread of offending him; that aggravated transgression will meet with aggravated punishment; and that it is *eternally true*, and throughout every period of our existence, that if we refuse to submit to the sceptre of his grace, we must bow down before the rod of his indignation!

By the way, we may observe, that "*the restitution of all things*," is a Scripture phrase. *Acts* iii. 21:

"Whom the heavens must receive, till the times of *the restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

"Thus the eye of prophecy looks through and beyond the general judgment at the end of this world and the execution of its sentence on the impenitent, and represents another judgment-seat, whereon *love divine* shall sit triumphant and supreme, with which *justice*, now fully satisfied, shall coalesce and combine, pronouncing the general sentence of release and amnesty, and absorbing all into itself as into a boundless and unfathomable ocean; when *all rational natures* shall have passed through their several states of purification that were before 'found wanting,' and the long-lost spirit shall return to its great Original; then will this general redemption be accomplished, and the mediating office of our great High Priest be at an end, for he will then deliver up the kingdom thus completed to his Father, that 'God may be all in all!'"\*

\* The pharisaical professor walks the streets of a crowded metropolis by night or by day; he sees vice in its most odious and disgusting forms, and where he sees none he suspects it, and regards the multitude as ignorant and brutish, and standing every moment upon the brink of destruction: and he says in his heart, Shall such as *these* ever be partakers of the heavenly felicity? Impossible! "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" They are sealed unto suffering and a curse. "Reprobate silver shall men call them," and heaven itself shall re-echo the sound, "because the Lord hath rejected them!"

Very different is the conclusion which many wise and reflecting men have drawn from these considerations.

"As all men," says a profound but comparatively unknown author—"As all men stand in a near relation to God, so they have still so much of his image stamped upon them as may oblige and excite us to love them. In some this image is more eminent and conspicuous, and we may discern the lovely traces of wisdom and goodness; and though in others it be mi-

serably sullied and defaced, yet it is not altogether razed, some lineaments do still remain. All men are endowed with rational and immortal souls, with understandings and wills capable of the highest and most excellent things; and if they be at present disordered and put out of tune by wickedness and folly, this may indeed move our compassion, but ought not in reason to extinguish our love."

"When we see a person of a rugged humour and perverse disposition, full of malice and dissimulation, very foolish and very proud, it is hard to fall in love with an object that presents itself to us under an idea so little grateful and lovely; but when we consider these evil qualities as *the diseases and distempers* of a soul, which *in itself* is capable of all that wisdom and goodness wherewith the best of saints have ever been adorned, and which may *one day* come to be raised to such heights of perfection as shall render it *a fit companion for the holy angels*; this will turn our aversion into pity, and make us behold him with such resentment as we should have in contemplating a beautiful body mangled with wounds or disfigured by some loathsome disease; and however we hate the vices, we should not cease to love the man."\*

"Thus, heaven-ward all things tend, for all were once  
Perfect, and all must be at length *restor'd*:  
So God has greatly purpos'd, who would else,  
In his dishonour'd works, *himself* endure  
Dishonour, and be wrong'd without redress!  
Haste, then! and wheel away a shatter'd world,  
Ye slow revolving seasons!"†

"And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever!" Rev. v. 13.

"Amen! even so! come Lord Jesus."

AN OCCASIONAL READER.

\* Scougal's "Life of God in the Soul."  
† Cowper.

SIR,  
**T**HE discussion which appeared in your last and some preceding Numbers, (pp. 536—538 and 648—651,) strikes me as likely to be attended with important results. In order to throw some light on the subject, I have thought that it would not be unuseful to present to your readers the translation of some of the first verses of John's Gospel, as it stood in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. I shall give it according to the reading of the two Churches, the old Church of England (by some called, though improperly, Popish) and the new Church of England, or the Church of England as it was then established by law. And I may just observe here, that not a small number of persons imagine that the Church of England, as now established by law, is the same as the Church of England as it was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, an error naturally arising from the little attention paid to the origin and variations of the Church of England.

*The Translation by the old Church of England.*

1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.
2. This was in the beginning with God.
3. All things were made by him, and without him was made nothing. That which was made
4. In him was life, and the life was the light of men.
5. And the light shineth in darknesse, and the darknesse did not comprehend it.

*The Translation of the new Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.*

1. In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was that word.
2. The same was in the beginning with God.
3. All things were made by it, and without it was made nothing that was made.
4. In it was life, and the life was the light of men.
5. And the light shineth in the darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not.

I have also before me my Bible printed in the reign of Edward the Sixth; and also the form of prayer ordered to be read in churches by Henry the Eighth; in which the version of the above verses stands as follows:

*Edward's Bible.*

In the begynnynge was the worde, and the worde was with God, and the worde was God. The same was in the begynnynge with God. All thynges were made by it, and withoute it was made nothyng that was made. In it was lyfe, and the lyfe was the lyght of men, and the lyght shineth in the darknes, but the darknes comprehended it not.

*Henry the Eighth's Form of Prayer.*

In the begynnynge was the worde. And the worde was with god. And the word was god. The same was in the begynnynge with god. Al thynges were made by it, and withoute it was made nothyng. That was made in it was lyfe, and the lyfe was the light of men. And the lyght shineth in the darkenes, but the darkenes comprehendyd it not.

The reader may compare these versions with that in the present Bible in common use, and the comparing of them together brings back to my mind the situation in which I was placed some years ago in a large company, the majority of which were ministers. Something or another brought the above verses under discussion, and in rendering them from the Greek I used the word *it* instead of *him*. 'All things were through *it*.' A general exclamation followed that I had no authority for saying *it* for *him*. I believe I said that I had no authority but what was obvious to any one who had the slightest knowledge of the Greek language. This did not satisfy the company; they preferred the modern mumpsimus to the old sumpsimus. It appears, however, from the above, that I might have quoted the authority of the Church of England from the time of the revolt of Henry the Eighth from the see of Rome, to the establishment of the present version—that is, about a hundred years.

The reader will probably have noticed a difference between the two earlier and the two later readings, the former not being divided like the latter into verses. Our present barbarous division into verses is the fruit of a later invention, which, notwithstanding its utility in some cases, has been attended with

very great disadvantages; so much so, that from what I have frequently heard from the pulpit and out of the pulpit, I am almost inclined to oppose an old adage, and to say, Bonus Textuarius malus Theologus. I am sure of this, that if preachers would have the goodness now and then to see in what sense the writer uses the texts they quote, there would result a very great change in their discourses.

I shall beg leave to conclude this letter with a translation of the third verse of John, in which I appeal to the authority of the Established Version for my rendering of *εγενετο*, as it is taken from repeated instances of the use of that verb in the sense in which I have taken it.

Third verse: All did come to pass through it, and without it did come to pass nothing that has come to pass.

I do not give this as an elegant, but a literal version of the passage, conveying, as it appears to me, the true meaning of the writer. I shall be glad if it is sanctioned by the authority of Ben David, and, if otherwise, shall be much obliged to him to shew us in what it is incorrect.

W. FRENCH.

N. B. I have used in my translation above, of the third verse, "did come to pass," for *εγενετο*, merely to shew the distinction of tenses in *εγενετο* and *γενουεν*. To make it still more conformable to the reading of *εγενετο*, in the Established Version, the verse may be read, All came to pass through it, and without it came to pass nothing that has come to pass.

SIR,

I RESUME my remarks on the proem of John's Gospel. Having stated in a recent number of the Repository, (pp. 536—538,) the objections to which the interpretation adopted in the Improved Version is liable, I shall now proceed to an analysis of the passage, with a view to exhibit what I conceive to be its genuine meaning. In doing this, however, let me not be thought to claim the merit of originality, as I aim at nothing more than recalling the wandering attention of persons too fond of novelty, to opinions known and advocated long ago. No reproach of temerity belongs to me who fight under the banners of Lardner and Priestley, "par nobile fratrum;" the one of whom by laborious research in the neglected mines of Christian antiquity, and the other by the bold flight of reason, which pinions exercised in modern science alone could take, cleared away the accumulated rubbish which encumbered the Christian's path, and set, as it were, a new polish on the ancient gem of the gospel.

In connexion with John's Gospel, there is another book of the New Testament which we ought to consider, because it is evidently from the same pen, and very similar in style and sentiments: I mean his general Epistle. The proem or opening of this last appears to be a perfectly parallel pas-

sage to that of the gospel, and we must see that they be so explained as to harmonize with one another. Let us then suppose that both the passages, in the original as well as in the English, are before the reader. In this way I shall make the Apostle his own interpreter.

*In the beginning was the Word.* What beginning? Of the world or of the Gospel? Compare the Epistle. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life.* As all the succeeding circumstances here mentioned refer evidently to the evangelic history, and not to the natural world, I think we are obliged to understand the first clause of the sentence in the same connexion. If we say, *that which was from the beginning of Christianity*, it makes good and coherent sense in this passage; but if we substitute, *that which was from the beginning of creation*, the sense is injured, for though the idea be great, yet it is foreign to the matter in hand. This leads me to conclude that the Apostle refers, in both passages, to the beginning of the Gospel, or of Christianity; of that series of great events with which he had long been conversant as the great concern of his life. There is good confirmation of this decision in other passages of the

same writer. 1 John ii. 7: "I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning." Again, in ver. 11th, "I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning." Again, in ver. 24, "Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning." These citations, which might be multiplied, may suffice to shew that the phrase, *in the beginning*, or, *from the beginning*, was rather a favourite one with our Apostle, when he wished to refer to the commencement of the Gospel. I shall mention one further consideration in favour of the opinion for which we contend, which appears to me of great weight. In the 4th and 5th verses of the Gospel we read thus: "In it (i. e. the Word) was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it." Now this indisputably refers to the light of the gospel, because John the Baptist is said immediately afterwards to have been sent to bear witness to this light. But if we refer the three first verses to the origin of creation, the transition in the 4th verse to the Gospel history, appears to me very awkward and abrupt. Of this every reader must judge for himself, but the arguments I have adduced certainly prevail with me to understand the passage as referring to the beginning, not of creation, but of the evangelic history. Well, then; εἰς ταῦτα, let us proceed.

*In the beginning* of the gospel was the Word. Antecedently, that is, to all those events of which the writer is about to give the narrative, existed the Word. He is about to recount a train of surprising occurrences, but he sets himself, in the first place, to declare to us the principle or agency from which they flowed. This principle was the Word. But what was the Word, and how did it exist? These inquiries the Apostle proceeds to satisfy in the verses which immediately follow. First, he says, *the Word was with God*. He is about to declare afterwards in what manner the Word was manifested among men, but previously to this manifestation, he wishes us to understand that the Word was with God, which he repeats again in the second verse. The full im-

port of this expression cannot be determined till we are further made acquainted with the nature of the Word, what sort of existence it is; then only can we know in what precise sense it is said to be with God. All that seems to be intended here is to inform us, that previous to the manifestation of the Word among men, it existed in the Divine Nature, hidden from the world, but known to the Almighty. In the parallel passage of the Epistle the same is said of life: "That eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." There is a cast of mystical obscurity about these expressions as well as many others of this author, which ought to deter us from attempting too great precision of interpretation, lest we should overshoot our mark, and determine the sense more nicely than the writer himself conceived it.

We have arrived thus far. "In the beginning of the gospel was the Word, and the Word was with God; it was a principle or existence inherent in the Divine Nature. The sacred writer then proceeds to another assertion: *and the Word was God*. The nature of the Word is thus more fully discovered; it is not only present with God, and inherent in his nature, but it is, in fact, no other than a part or form of himself, inseparable from his being, and essentially one with him. So the various faculties of our own minds are with them and in them, and not to be distinguished from them. It has been objected to this view, that it makes the Word to be the same being with whom it was; but we have explained how this is to be understood, and, if I judge rightly, it has not much real difficulty, not nearly so much as there is in supposing that the Apostle should apply the name of God to two different beings in the same verse. The name of God in Scripture may justly be regarded as a proper name, belonging to one Being and no other; the exceptions are too rare to deserve consideration, and when they take place, the context is such as to leave no ambiguity. To doubt that God means God, seems as strange as to doubt that Abraham means Abraham. I conclude, then, that when we are told that *the Word was God*, we are to understand it as said of that Being to whom this name as exclu-

sively belongs, and whom, when thus absolutely used, it as unequivocally designates, as that of Abraham does the father of the faithful.

The original words that follow, *παντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο*, &c., referring to the operation or agency of the word, may be understood either with respect to the creation of the natural world, or to the dispensation of the gospel. And in either sense they may be said in truth, according to that view of the nature of the Divine *Word* or *Λογος* for which I am contending: for *the Word* which dwelt in Christ, the source of his divine powers and life-giving energy, was the very same to which the world itself owed its being. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made." We need not, therefore, contend with much eagerness about this point; but the coherence of the whole passage, and its harmony with the corresponding passage in the Epistle, may seem to be better preserved if this third verse be referred entirely to the Gospel. In that case the English must run thus: "By or through it (i. e. the Word) were all things done, and without it was nothing done that has been done." But let me leave this question for others to decide.

That the nature and operation of this *Word* may be better understood, the Apostle proceeds to say that *in it was life, and the life was the light of men*: it was a principle of life and spiritual illumination. This evidently refers to the Gospel, and needs no comment. In the Epistle *the Word* is called *the word of life*. Indeed, we have, on the whole, three names given as of the same thing, *the word, life, and the word of life*. Let me ask, by the way, of those who prefer the Socinian interpretation, whether these titles do not most naturally convey the idea of an impersonal principle? Had the Apostle's design been to name his Master, there were surely appellations at hand much more proper for his purpose than these abstract terms. Is it not more reasonable to conclude, since the writer falls upon three abstract impersonal terms to designate the thing of which he speaks, that the thing itself was indeed of an abstract and impersonal nature?

The discourse concerning *the Word* or *Λογος*, does not appear to be re-

sumed until the 14th verse; for that which is said in the 10th verse, "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not," appears to be spoken immediately of God. In the 14th verse *the Word* is again mentioned: "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld its glory." *The Word*, before spoken of as a life-giving and enlightening energy inherent in, and emanating from, the Divine Being, is now to assume a new form; it is embodied in a mysterious manner in the person of a man; according to the conceptions of the writer of this Gospel, which are in a manner peculiar to himself, a sort of unity and identity is effected between the divine *λογος* and the human person: and this mystical and undefined idea runs through his works. It is from this source that the current doctrines of the deity and pre-existence of Jesus Christ have been derived, because theologians have not known how to distinguish mystical expressions from plain and literal ones; a similar error to that by which the Papists will have it that we actually feed, like cannibals, on the flesh and blood of our own Master. And thus the majority, confounding the person of Jesus with the divine *Word*, interpret literally his declaration that he was come down from heaven, not discerning the mystical allusions of the writer. But to understand a mystical writer literally, is doing as much violence as to understand a plain writer mystically. It might, perhaps, be shewn that Unitarians also fall into some error in this Gospel, by trying to make the writer speak too much in their own plain way. But this may be a vain attempt. The fundamental idea of this author, that the *λογος* had become flesh in the person of Jesus, leads naturally to an identification of Jesus with God in a certain sense, though not in a literal and proper one. It is our duty, indeed, to give to mystical passages a rational interpretation, but to make them convey plain and simple ideas is a thing impossible, because contrary to their nature.

I observe some remarks by your intelligent correspondent, Mr. Cogan, (pp. 605 and 646,) on the signification of the word *γενεσθαι*. I have not room at present to say more in reply, than

that I have turned to the places from which he cites, and think that if they are attentively considered, it will be perceived that the word in question is not in any of them confined to the simple sense εἶναι, but carries with it, in all, its proper sense of *acquiring or coming into a new state of being*. Thus the phrase μαρτυρῶ γινεσθαι, from Herodotus, does not, to me, convey simply the idea "you *are* a witness," as if it were μαρτυρῶ εἶ, but rather that of, "you *become* a witness," which thing a person does every time that he is called on to bear his testimony.

T. F. B.

—

*A Brief View of the different Schemes of Interpreting the Proem of John's Gospel.*

AS the facts, on which the explanation of the Logos, given in my last paper, (pp. 648—651,) are very remote from common apprehension, its propriety, I fear, will be little felt by the readers of the Repository. Lest this be their feeling, I beg further attention, while I contrast it with some of the leading schemes which learned men have adopted for interpreting the proem of John. It seems to have been the general opinion in the second century and afterwards, that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel against *Cerinthus*; and the narrative of Irenæus implies that the language of John is drawn up in direct opposition to the Gnostic heresy. Michaëlis, it is well known, adopts the same supposition; and it is remarkable that Dr. Priestley, who at first embraced the sentiments of Lardner, felt reason to change his opinion; and in his Notes on the Bible, he explains the words of the Evangelist as levelled against the Gnostics.

The notion of Lardner is, that *the Logos means God himself*. When the Evangelist, therefore, says that "This was with God," he asserts that God was with himself, an assertion which, though not, as Dr. Clarke would have us believe, a contradiction in terms, is yet strange and unnecessary, as calculated neither to confirm the truth nor remove the errors of those to whom the Gospel was addressed. Logos (λογος) signifies a *word or speech*: and as speech is

founded on the rational faculties of man, it hence came to signify *reason or intelligence* itself. This is the common acceptation of *logos*, and taken here in this sense it denotes not God, but an attribute of God, holds him forth as a *rational principle, as a designing cause*, as the source of all the order, beauty and happiness which abound in the universe, in opposition to certain impostors who, to establish a system of Atheism and by that means erase the very foundations of revelation, stripped the universal Father of his natural perfections. When the Evangelist, therefore, declares that reason was in the beginning, was with God and was God, he declares that HE who at first brought all things into being was himself possessed of life and reason, and the source of life and reason to all created things, and not what the Gnostics represented the Supreme God, destitute of life and reason, and existing from eternity, like what Moses says of the deep, in solitude and darkness.

If the Logos meant God himself, then when "he became flesh" in the person of Christ, God, even the Father, the Creator and Governor of the universe, became flesh, and this was the doctrine of *Sabellius*, who supposed the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost to be three different names of the same Being, expressive only of three different relations. See Lardner, III. 78. Aware of this conclusion, Lardner thus paraphrases the verse: "'And the Word was made man, or took upon him the human nature, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth'—that is, 'And we beheld in Jesus such power and wisdom that we could not doubt his being the Messiah.'" Here the Doctor shifts his ground, making the Logos, which in the first verse he represents as God himself, to mean *the power and wisdom of God* uniting with the man Jesus, and thus proving him to be the Messiah. This paraphrase is very nearly the true one: and it is remarkable that this learned and amiable man should expound the drift of the Evangelist's meaning without being aware of the great truth that the historian wished to establish. The impostors who denied

that Christ is flesh and blood, denied also that he derived his authority from the Creator of the universe. This sentiment, of which Lardner does not appear to have been aware, was, if adopted, completely destructive of the gospel, and John briefly sets it aside by representing the power, wisdom and goodness which Jesus displayed to be no other than the Logos, the moral perfections displayed by God himself in the creation and government of the world.

In this proem the Logos, as expressive of reason in God, or, more generally, of all those natural and moral attributes implied in reason when infinite, is *personified*. The object of this personification was to render the sense of the term more prominent and impressive, and at the same time more conformable to the glowing imagination of eastern writers: and it is to be observed, that a similar personification characterizes the writings and preaching of the apostles. I will here content myself with two instances. Thus in Acts x. 36, "The Logos, whom God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace through Jesus Christ: this Logos is Lord of all." Again, in Heb. iv. 12, "The Logos of God is alive and energetic, surpassing in keenness a two-edged sword, penetrating so far as to separate between life and breath, joints and marrow, and is a judge of the meditations and thoughts of the heart." These are striking instances, and they demonstrate the erroneousness of the notion adopted by Lardner, Priestley and others, namely, that the personification of the Logos and its application to Christ originated with the Platonic philosophers converted to Christianity in the second century, this having already been done by the apostles themselves.

The next scheme for interpreting this much-disputed introduction is that of *Socinus*. This is adopted by the late N. Cappe, and, embellished by his eloquence, it found its way into the *Improved Version*. According to this scheme, the Logos means Jesus. "In the beginning," means "In the beginning of the gospel dispensation." "All things were made by him," means "All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ." As the Logos was Jesus, the clause

"He became flesh," is rendered, "He was flesh."

On this interpretation I remark—and I make these remarks not without reverence and affection for the high character and talents of the Editor—that it is founded in the absence of the circumstances in which John wrote his Gospel, and which give full force and propriety to every word that he has penned. The irrelevance of this scheme to the momentous errors which pressed on the attention of the sacred writer, renders it at once impertinent and nugatory, the construction withal being in some of the clauses forced, and at variance both with common sense and the genius of the Greek language.

"The Word was in the beginning, or from the commencement of the gospel dispensation." Was it necessary to say that the Word was in the beginning of the gospel, more than in the middle or the end of the gospel? Who ever doubted that Jesus was in the beginning of his ministry? Who could question that every thing made during his ministry was made by him? But it is said that "*γινωμαι* occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of *create*." This may be true, for the obvious reason that the writers of the Christian Scriptures had in no other place occasion to speak of the creation, or to allude to Moses as the historian of it. I am free to assert that the perfect middle *γεγονε*, is the most appropriate verb which the Evangelist could have used to express *creation*; the Pagan philosophers before Christ, and the Christian fathers afterwards, having continually employed it in that sense.

John wrote his Gospel as well as his Epistle against certain impostors who maintained the divinity of Christ with no other view than as a specious pretext to overturn Christianity. Is it then probable that he should in the commencement assert the very doctrine which it is the principal object of his writings to set aside as false and pernicious? "The Word was a God," and this God was Jesus. If the Evangelist was capable of saying this, or even favouring this conclusion, instead of the profound wisdom, the correct judgment and dignified simplicity which he displays as the

historian of Jesus Christ, he would forfeit every claim to consistency and even to common sense.

As to the difference between  $\eta\nu$  and  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , which Mr. Frend has taken so much pains to ascertain, I feel no difficulty, in answer to his question, to point it out. A competent writer in Greek, having occasion to say of another that never had a child, would write  $\alpha\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma \eta\nu$ , *he was childless*; but if the same person, having a child, lost it, he would say  $\alpha\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , *he became childless*. Mr. Cogan says that "the verb  $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is used of a state commencing, and  $\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  of a state which exists." This is very near the truth, but not exactly so.  $\Gamma\iota\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  implies a *change* from one state to another. This is its primary meaning, and thence it often signifies a continuance in that state to which the change is made. The primary signification then is *to become, come to pass, take place, happen*; the secondary, *to continue, abide, to be*; and thus it is synonymous with  $\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ ; and though the places are frequent where these verbs may be substituted one for the other, there are also many where the substitution would be solecistical; and such appears to me is  $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi} \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , if rendered *he was flesh*, instead of *he became flesh*, because the Evangelist had already stated the Logos to be the reason or the attributes of God, while in this clause he expresses a transition of it from God to a being with flesh and blood.  $\Sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi} \eta\nu$  would imply that the Logos always was a man— $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi} \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , in connexion with what precedes, marks its emanation from God and its union with Jesus Christ. I would moreover observe, for the sake of the learner in Greek, that this verb has different senses in different branches of it. Thus the first aorist middle  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$ , has always a *transitive* sense, namely, *to produce*; and Homer in a few places uses the second aorist in the same signification. Thus  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , without the augment  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , and by syncope  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron$ , *he produced for himself, he took, laid hold of*. Lexicographers have absurdly supposed  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron$  to be a corruption of  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ , and in the number of these is Damm, the most admirable of all lexicographers. A pretty full account of this verb with its several ramifications will be found

under the common root  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omega$ , in my Greek and English Lexicon, col. 265, 2nd ed.

It remains now briefly to notice the interpretation which the orthodox divines have put upon this proem. And here justice and candour force me to allow, that this interpretation is what the Evangelist seems at first glance to suggest, it being for the most part conformable to the primary acceptation of the words, and to the rules of construction in Greek. The Logos is said to be from the beginning of time, to be God, to be with God, and, as it must appear to common sense, to be different from that God whom he is said to be with. This same Logos made all things, and afterwards became a human being in the person of Jesus Christ. No competent person would reject this view of the subject, were it not for the perplexing consequences which follow, were it not for the contradictions which it involves, were it not for the dogmas which it brings in its train—dogmas that are at variance with reason, with the tenor of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures—dogmas that prostrate and even stultify the human understanding, and at the same time throw the whole orb of revelation into shade.

It is a providential thing, that while the orthodox interpretation is so imposing, is thus supported by the first view of the proem, we shall find it, if we trace the passage to its origin, to be at variance with sound criticism, to be set aside by the direct object of the Evangelist and the strictest sense of the terms used by him. And the following observations, whenever they shall be duly weighed by the advocates of this scheme, will set the question to rest.

1. The orthodox scheme, then, supposes the Logos to be Jesus Christ, the second person in the Trinity. But Logos means *word, speech, reason*; it expresses not God, but an attribute of God; and though the sacred historian says that Reason is God, he means to say that God, as the Creator of all things, is a rational, intelligent and spiritual Being, distinct from the works of his hands, in opposition to certain impostors who, in order to supplant the gospel, stripped the universal Father of his perfections. The phrase that the Logos

is God, is a figure of speech, the converse of that, where Christ is said to be *the way, the truth, and the life*, and equally natural with it.

2. The Logos in this proem is a *personification*, but the advocates of the orthodox faith, overlooking the figure, take the personified being to be a real person. This mistake was natural, though consequences flowed from it which not only divided the Christian church into hostile sects and parties in all ages, but threatened to overwhelm Christianity itself by furnishing the sceptic with arguments against its divine origin.

3. The Logos is said to "become flesh," that is, to become a being with flesh and blood, or a real human being. The Gnostics denied that Christ was a real being; they denied also that he received his authority and power from the Almighty. If these artful and pernicious tenets were admitted, the gospel which proclaimed the placability of God and eternal life to the penitent, sunk like the sun behind the thickest clouds of heathenism, and it became imperiously necessary in the Evangelist to set them aside; and how could he have done this more effectually than by representing Christ as having real flesh, and endued with those attributes from the Author of nature which that Author himself employed in the creation and government of the universe?

4. As the Logos of God united with the man Jesus, it was reasonable that this name should occasionally be given him. But the term holds him forth as the delegate of God, to be the Saviour of the world: it is a title of his *office*, not of his *nature*. As the Logos meant an attribute and not a real being, its union with Christ is not the union of two natures in one person, but the union of his ministry, as the promised Messiah, with the moral government of God, for the salvation of mankind. The Evangelist in attesting the incorporation of the Logos, solely attests the divinity of our Lord's mission, and that, as I have just said, in opposition to wicked and artful men who denied his commission from the Creator and Governor of the world.

5. If the Logos be really a divine being, its union with the man Jesus

constitutes him *God and man*. If, on the other hand the Logos, be an attribute of God, its incorporation with Jesus constitutes him *the Son of God*, that is, a highly-favoured servant of God, authorized to announce to mankind the glad tidings of salvation on the terms of repentance and reformation, and enabled to work miracles and to appear again alive after death, in attestation of his divine mission. If the former conclusion be just, it is reasonable to expect that he should appear in the execution of his office under the character and title *of God*; if the latter, his highest title during his ministry would be that of *the Son of God*. This is a sure criterion whereby we may ascertain which of these two conclusions is the true one. Which then on examining the gospel shall we find to have been the fact? The very Evangelist who asserts that the Logos became flesh, asserts also, "These things were written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, *the Son of God*."

There are two occasions in the ministry of Jesus when, in an especial manner, the Logos of God appears to have been united with him. These are his baptism and his transfiguration. When he was baptized, the Logos, or, as it is there called, the Holy Spirit, descended upon him in the form of a dove; and how is he then pointed out by the voice from heaven? "This is my beloved *Son* in whom I am well pleased." The Evangelist on saying that the Logos united with the man Jesus, refers, in illustration of this union, to the scene of his transfiguration. "And the Logos became flesh, and he formed his tent among us, full of loveliness and reality. And we beheld his brightness as the brightness of an only-begotten Son from the Father."

6. The Gnostics, though disguised, were the most malignant and depraved enemies of the gospel, and they had recourse to the divinity of the Founder merely as a specious pretext to sink it in Heathenism. The drift of their whole system was briefly this: Christ did not derive his authority from the Creator, because being himself a God he did his miracles by virtue of his own power. He appeared after death by virtue of his own nature, and there is, therefore, no resurrection of the

dead. These inferences turn upon the doctrine of Christ's divinity as upon a pivot. And nothing is more certain than that John in all his writings directly levels his language against them and their base authors. The Pagan philosophers imitated the Gnostics in attempting to destroy Christianity, by having recourse to the same principle. One example of this kind I shall here produce, and it goes to the full extent of my assertion. They are the words of *Amelius*, a disciple of Porphyry, and one of the bitterest enemies of the gospel. "This truly is the Word, by whom, as being eternal, all things were made, as Heraclitus would have acknowledged: and, indeed, the barbarian (meaning John), assigning to him the rank and dignity of being in the beginning, asserts that he existed with God and was God, that by him were all things made, and in him every thing that is made has its life and being; that having descended into a body, and clothed himself, he appeared a man, and that after he had even then shewn the greatness of his nature, he disengaged himself from the flesh, again resumed his Godhead, and is still a God, as he was before he became a man." See Lardner, VII. 160, or Euseb. Præp. Evan. Lib. xi. c. p. 540. Now I maintain that this writer, whom Eusebius represents as one of the supporters of the new philosophy in the school of Alexandria, not only alludes to the proem of John, but interprets it in the way in which it is interpreted by modern orthodox divines. Taking it for granted that the Evangelist teaches the Godhead of the Logos, Amelius asserts on his authority, that it descended to a body, and, clothing itself with flesh, appeared as a man. In this state he *shews the greatness of his nature*. Here the philosopher alludes to the stupendous miracles recorded by John which Jesus performed, *and is a broad acknowledgment of their truth*. Yet he was no believer in the gospel, and clearly because he was able to account for the miracles of Christ by referring them to the Godhead within him. Had he considered Jesus simply as a human being, teaching and acting with authority from the Almighty, the only true God, the God and Father of all mankind, this assent of

Amelius to his divine mission, and consequently to the truth of his religion, would have been inevitable. This interpretation of the Gospel of John was borrowed by the Alexandrian philosophers from the Gnostics, and it serves in a remarkable manner to illustrate the nature and object of their system. At the same time it proves to a demonstration that the divinity of Christ, so far from being essential to Christianity, was made use of by his enemies as the most effectual means of destroying it.

JOHN JONES.

SIR,  
HAVING, since I wrote my last, (p. 646,) received two friendly letters from a respectable contributor to the Repository, on the verb *γεγενεσθαι*, I have been led to think upon the subject more than I had ever done before. The result of my thoughts I will now communicate in as few words as I can.

I had said that *γεγενεσθαι* was used as the aorist to *ειναι*, and upon looking into Buttman's Greek Grammar, I find that this able grammarian has stated that *γεγονα* and *εγενομην* are used as the preterites of this verb. That this is true with respect to the *infinitive mood* is certain, there being no possible way of expressing the sense of *fuisse* in Greek but by *γεγενεσθαι* and *γεγονεναι*. But I will confine myself chiefly to *γεγενεσθαι*. If *γεγενεσθαι*, then, is often equivalent to *fuisse*, would it not be strange if *εγενομην* could never signify *fui*? But of this use there are many and unquestionable examples. I will only add two to those which have been already produced. Philostrati Heroica, p. 32, in the edition of Boissonade: *Εἰ μὲν τερατωδεις εγεγοντο εκεινοι και ευμβεβλημενοι θηριοις, εκ οιδα. An immensi illi (Gigantes) fuerint, et serpenticibus cincti, non novi.* Theocriti Scholiastes ad Id. vii. ver. 8: *ΒΡΑΣΙΛΑ· οἱ γραφοντες δια τῆς δ', αμαρτανθσι. Εγενετο γαρ Βρασιδας Λακων το γενοσ, ο δε Βρασιδας Κρος.* But, it may be said, how came it to pass that the primary meaning of *γεγενεσθαι* should be obscured or lost in the aorist? I ask in reply, how came it to pass that the Greek *φω* should lose its primary signification in the Latin *fui*? But is it

not common for words by a certain inflexion of meaning to be applied to cases to which in their primitive sense they were inapplicable? And do not the preterites of certain verbs differ materially in signification from the present tenses of these verbs? Every scholar knows that *κτᾶσθαι* is to *acquire*, and that *κετῆσθαι* is to *possess*. This is not extraordinary. But *κετῆσθαι* is sometimes so used as to exclude the sense of *acquisition*. Vide Euripidis Orest., v. 1202. Analogy, then, would lead us to conclude that if *εγενόμενῃ* was once used for *fui*, its original meaning would in some instances be *lost sight of altogether*. I will now endeavour to point out the *ratio* of the fact for which I have been contending. When we speak of that which *was* or *has been*, we evidently do not speak of a permanent and necessary existence, but of something which must *have begun* to be, of something, which in some way or other must *have become* what it *has been* or *was*. The verb *εἶναι*, therefore, may not improperly borrow its preterites from a word which comprehends the significations of *nasci*, *oriri*, *fieri*. Certain it is that neither *εἶναι* nor *esse* have preterites of their own. And the reason of this, *perhaps*, may be, that they denote existence *simply*; and hence they are applicable to that which exists necessarily and permanently. But even though my metaphysics should be false, the fact will remain the same.

While writing this last sentence, I was struck with the use of the term *existence* in our language. *To exist*, if we consult the derivation of the word, is to *come into being*, and yet who hesitates to speak of the *existence* of God? This may teach us not to reason too confidently from the primary meaning of a word as to what may be its ultimate use. But here a wide field of inquiry opens itself, into which I will not enter. I will only add, that some critics have said, that *existo* in Latin is sometimes equivalent to *sum*.

E. COGAN.

Homerton.  
Dec. 3, 1825.

SIR,

WITH extreme reluctance I again request a place in your

pages. It is no pleasant task to encounter an opponent so regardless of argumentative fairness as Mr. Bakewell shews himself. I would take no notice of contempt and reproach thrown at myself personally. But his deplorable prejudices have led him to assail a cause which is dearer to me than life, and doctrines which, notwithstanding his gross misapprehensions of them, I believe and know to be "doctrines according to godliness."

Had Mr. B. been governed by the spirit of candour and equity, he might have stated that it was in consequence of injurious reports and newspaper paragraphs, that Mr. Malan deemed it right to publish what he assures us is a faithful narrative of the conversations and exhortations in which he bore the chief part, at the house of a respectable family at Rolle. I have to-day read the pamphlet through again, and I do not find that air of vanity with which Mr. B. charges it; nor any thing to justify the tauntings, "how condescendingly he spoke to one, how graciously he smiled upon a second." I should be happy to put the pamphlet into your hands, or into those of any gentleman who may ask me, and submit the question whether it is at all deserving of the offensive character which he has drawn of it.

If the brief remarks which I before was allowed to insert in the Repository on the doctrine of the *Perseverance of Real Christians in the ways of Holiness*, be not sufficient to protect that doctrine from the horrid imputations that have been cast upon it, nothing in my power to say or to protest can avail to that effect.

To you, Sir, I need not say that if we do not, in controversy, take the honest pains to understand those whom we animadvert upon, we are disqualified for our undertaking. This rule of candour is never more wanted than in our judging of the phraseology of religious writers. All ages and countries, as well as different sects, have their peculiarities: and if we condemn, without fairly estimating the *evident design* of the expressions which we disapprove, we are likely to be guilty of no little injustice. Mr. Malan has some modes of expression and perhaps of thinking which I cannot accord with him in approving.

His imagination is ardent. He makes much use of elucidation by comparisons and the supposition of cases, and he often runs his metaphors into allegories.\* But his *meaning* is not difficult to be perceived. One of his most remarkable peculiarities is the use of the term *the saved*, as an appellation of all sincere Christians. This is alien from our habits: but it is clear as noon-day that he means only that such persons are, by the grace of God in Christ, *delivered* from the curse and condemnation, and from the power and dominion, of sin. He can, however, plead the authority of the New Testament. "The Lord daily added to the church [*τους σωζομενους*] *the saved*;" not, as it is in the common version, "such as should be saved." (Acts ii. 47; and see the Unitarian Improved Version.)

Mr. B. has dealt with Mr. M.'s pamphlet in the way which he would heavily and justly complain of, if it were practised upon any of his own productions. He has picked out passages, omitting words and clauses, bringing together such as are not connected in the original, and separating them from their proper connexion; so that the impression of the whole is *exceedingly different* from the genuine meaning and design.

To prove this it would be necessary to translate large extracts from the pamphlet, for which I have not time, nor could I expect you to fill your pages with them. Yet I trust a very moderate indulgence in such citations will be admitted, as due to a virtuous and calumniated individual.

Mr. Bakewell has, in his ungenerous and unjust way, adduced garbled passages with the object of making it appear that the doctrine of Perseverance, as held by Mr. M., implies a licentious tendency. Let me quote a few other passages, and let the equitable reader put them by the side of Mr. B.'s. I cannot ask the insertion of the original, as well as my translations: but the book is at your service, and the extracts may be copied in French, if desired. The words put

in Italics are not put so by me, but are faithfully taken from the French.

"It is the objection which the world has at all times made against the ministers of God, and which in the present day is the outcry from all quarters, 'that the gospellers preach that we need not do good works; that theirs is a very convenient religion for the wicked, who have only to say, I believe, I have faith, I am saved; and then quietly yield to their lusts.' As this calumny is no stranger to us, it will be right to repel it; and at the same time to guard you against a carnal security, a fatal indolence, by shewing you, my dear friends, that, though works are not wanted to obtain salvation, *there is no salvation without works.*" (Conventicule de Rolle, p. 30.)

"To say that true faith,—the faith of the heart,—Christian faith, is in the believer a support to sin, a counteraction to remorse, and thus a source of immorality; is as much as to say, that the life which Jesus had just restored to Lazarus was a support to the infection of his corpse, a means of remaining in the grave. It is surprising that such an assertion could ever be made by any person of sound sense. Yet, how many books and pamphlets are published to maintain it! To hear their authors complain as they do, of the preachers of the gospel and the doctrine of faith, one would suppose that those preachers were sellers of indulgences, and Christ a minister of sin; and that to attract a soul to the cross of Jesus were enough to make it ten times more attached to Satan and his abominations. According to those persons, the assurance of having been saved by the love of our faithful Saviour, of being thus reconciled to God, of being sealed with the gift of the spirit of holiness, and animated by a lively hope of the heavenly glory, are, in a believer, the same as hatred to his Redeemer, contempt of his heavenly Father, a bargain with sin, and the hope of being with the devil and his angels.—Yes, my friends, the Christian does good works, and much better ones than before he became a Christian.—As a child of Abraham, he is animated by the spirit and walks in the steps of his spiritual father: and the first use that he makes of the liberty which grace gives him,

\* The observation of your American critic might be applied sometimes to Mr. M.'s style: "It possesses that strained aim after merely rhetorical effect, so common among the French divines." (Mon. Repos. XX. 655.)

is to go to the feet of his King and Saviour and bind himself to obedience by the offer of his heart and the oath of his love." (Pp. 30, 31, 33.)

"Let no man flatter himself that it can be otherwise.—To pretend to belong to Christ, and yet to preserve his old notions, his old habits, his old inclinations, his old hopes, in one word, his old heart—is to give the lie to the word of God; it is to pretend to possess a secret which God himself does not know, the secret of uniting light with darkness, sin with grace.—The fruits of the Spirit are all Christian virtues, that is to say, all good works. The union which the Most Holy One has established between his Spirit and holiness" [in the true Christian] "is indissoluble as well as necessary; so that the faith which is produced by this Spirit, the faith which justifies, is as inseparable from good works, as the restored life of Lazarus was from his resurrection. It was his resurrection itself. So also faith is the resurrection of the soul: it is in the soul the life of works, good works." (P. 34.)

"Make all who see you learn from you, that the commandment of God is dearer to the children of promise than all the allurements, all the hopes, all the fears of earth; that the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness is the only, the continual object of your dearest desires; and that thus, while you have received your salvation from grace, and works were not wanted to obtain it, now that you have received it, your life consists in performing those works to the glory of your Saviour God; so that whoever will may gain assured evidence in you, *that there is no salvation without works.*" (P. 43.)

These, and many like these, are the paragraphs, and this is the strain of thought and feeling, which Mr. Bakewell has passed over; while he was exercising his industry to cull and mutilate other sentences, in order to fix upon them a meaning which the widest stretch of charity will hardly help us to imagine that he could believe to be that which their author intended.

Mr. B. urges, with great force, an Allegory by which, he says, M. Malan has delivered "the doctrine that no crimes can separate the elect from God." It would be impossible fully

to refute this part of Mr. B.'s statement without translating the whole passage from Mr. M., which would be long, and could not reasonably be presented for admission into your pages. This allegory may not be in the best taste, nor all its parts in exact keeping, and Mr. B. has furnished a proof that it is liable to be misunderstood and abused: but, to any one who will read it in a fair and upright spirit, it will be abundantly apparent that the author's intention was to administer encouragement to persons whose minds are overwhelmed with fear and distress on account of their sins, and that nothing was farther from his thoughts than to afford any license or tolerance to wilful sin. On this doctrine itself, the Perseverance of the Saints, I cannot but repeat my request that Mr. B. would, *with seriousness and candour*, consider the remarks offered in October, 1824. (Mon. Repos. XIX. 673.) Unless he can prove those statements to be incorrect, unless he can shew the Calvinistic doctrine to be a continuance in happiness *without a persevering in universal obedience*, all his declamation falls to the ground. He may amuse himself with forming suppositions and putting dreadful cases of impiety and crime; but I beg to inform him that he is supposing moral impossibilities. Were any to argue and act as he describes (and I fear many have done so), they would furnish indeed melancholy reason to believe that they were total strangers to genuine religion; but no reason at all for discrediting the Calvinistic doctrine, that the *sincere* Christian will, by the aid of divine grace, persevere to the end in opposing sin and cultivating holiness. Your American correspondent affirms my holding "that the very word Salvation means *deliverance from sin*," to be "coming round sweepingly to Arminianism." (P. 656.) I assure him that he also greatly errs: and I cannot help believing that he has never attentively, or perhaps at all, read any Calvinistic author of estimation on this subject. May I hope to be endured, if I quote a sentence or two from the Acts of the Synod of Dort? I am no admirer of Synods, nor believer in their authority: but I receive with reverence truth and argument, wherever I find them. "It is their [true believers]

duty perpetually to watch and pray, that they be not drawn into temptations: which if they neglect to do, they may not only be hurried away by the flesh, the world, and Satan, into even great and dreadful sins, but even may sometimes, by the just permission of God, be thus drawn aside. But, by such dreadful sins, they greatly offend God, incur the guilt of death, grieve the Holy Spirit, interrupt the exercise of faith, and often for a time lose all sense of the divine favour; until, having by *deep repentance returned into the right way*, the fatherly mercy of God again visits them.—With the *utmost sincerity* and in a godly manner, they are distressed for the sins which they have committed; by faith and with a contrite heart they seek and obtain forgiveness through the blood of the Mediator; being reconciled they again enjoy the favour of God, they adore his tender mercies in which they trust, and they thenceforward the more diligently work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. This doctrine of the **PERSEVERANCE** of those who are *really believers* and *holy persons*, and the assurance of it, though God hath, in his word, most abundantly revealed it to the glory of his name and the comfort of pious souls, and hath impressed it upon the hearts of the faithful; yet the carnal principle does not receive it, Satan hates it, the world scoffs at it, *ignorant men and hypocrites abuse it*, and false teachers oppose it. But the church of Christ has always most affectionately loved and constantly maintained it." (*Acta Syn. Dordr.* Pars i. p. 271, ed. 1623.)

Whatever faults of structure and conduct may attach to Mr. Malan's Allegory, I trust that your candid readers will free it from the charge of an Antinomian tendency upon the evidence of its concluding sentence. I must observe that the awful sword, which afterwards becomes a friendly lamp, is intended to represent the law of God. The very image shews that the writer holds in honour the holy law, as the guide of the believer's life. "Rely then on God, with your whole soul. Keep yourselves close to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of your faith. Mount up on high, O believers, led by the law, your kind and gracious guide. Lay fast hold on the cross of

your Saviour; and let no one take your crown!" (P. 51.)

Mr. Bakewell affords a remarkable proof how little qualified he is to report fairly the sentiments of one whom he dislikes, be they right or wrong, when he writes, "What Christian preacher—ever laid claim to the power of crushing his enemies to dust with the breath of his nostrils? Yet this dangerous power M. Malan appears, from his own testimony, to possess, though he good-naturedly declines calling it forth." Mr. B. cites a passage which he regards as decisively confirming his accusation. Now, permit me to bring forwards *the whole* of the passage. One of the parties in the conversation says—

"Yes indeed, this is what distresses us; to see persons irritating themselves against the gospel, and against pious Christians and their religious meetings, as if they took up their time in playing at charades, or met together to make grimaces at each other. Yet those very persons, far from offering any thing in their own lives more wise, more useful, or more holy, satisfy themselves with raising the outcry, 'See, see these simpletons, these proud people, who meet in evenings to read the Bible and pray; as if that were a proper time for such doings!' Yet at these very hours, both on Sunday and other evenings, they are sitting down to cards and playing off their sarcasms at those who are probably at the very moment praying for them. Really this vexes one."

"*The Genevese minister.* Let us allow no such feeling. The Lord who reigns in heaven and whose name is the Lord of hosts, sees and hears them: and, since he sustains, above these poor deluded persons, the vault of heaven which covers their heads, let us not crush them with our censure, with our indignation. There is a way, quite easy and which will succeed, to make the cards fall from their hands, and to put a Bible in their place. This way is to shew them plainly all the happiness, all the delight, all the peace and patience, which this Bible makes to abound in the hearts and throughout the whole life of those who love it. Let them but once compare that holy and sweet effect with the empty restlessness, the

secret shame, the dissatisfaction which they get from their useless speculations; and they will feel the need of exchanging their nothing for at least something, though that something should be happiness." (P. 65.)

If Mr. M. had not thought himself bound to tell all that he could recollect of his conversations at Rolle, I should have said that all this had better have been confined to his friend's parlour. But, at all events, Mr. Bakewell's interpretation is evidently erroneous. The expression, *ne les écrasons pas*, &c., was required to be strong from the nature of the antithesis; but the meaning is manifest: an emphasis is evidently laid upon "*notre censure, notre indignation*," and thus the object clearly is to repress the feelings of impatience and to inculcate moderation and submission. Pope's well-known stanza ("Let not this weak, unknowing hand," &c.) expresses the very same sentiment, and by the same kind of figure. If Mr. B. be consistent with his imputations on Malan, he ought to say that the poet "laid claim" to the power of hurling the thunderbolts of heaven and dealing damnation upon men.

I would suggest to Mr. B. that "glorify yourselves" (p. 642) is not the proper translation of the French verb, which, though reflective, means no more than *to glory, boast or exult*. If I had time or room to introduce the whole passage that refers to Mr. Robert Haldane, it would shew how greatly misplaced are Mr. B.'s attempted witticisms upon that gentleman and his mode of scriptural instruction. One of the kindest wishes that I could form for Mr. B. would be, that he might imitate Mr. Haldane in the seriousness and impartiality of his researches, the comprehensiveness of his scriptural studies, and the justness of his principles of interpretation.

Mr. B. further displays how little he is acquainted with the subjects on which he writes so confidently, when he intimates that the Calvinist denies "that men shall be judged by their works." The only sense in which this proposition can be rationally understood is, that in the future judgment all the real indications of moral state and character will be placed in full view, as evidences of the equity of

the sentence. This is what every Calvinist and every Christian holds. I could adduce quotations to this effect, almost without end, from Calvin and the most accredited Calvinistic authors: but I must forbear.

Mr. B.'s concluding paragraph states that "an attempt is making to deceive the people of this country, and to confound both the governments [that of Geneva and that of the Canton of Vaud] together in a general charge of intolerance." I wish he had told us who are guilty of this misrepresentation. In the discussions which took place in the Body of the London Dissenting Ministers upon the Persecutions in the Vaud, the most distinct exception and honourable testimony were made in favour of the Genevese Government: nor has the calumny mentioned by Mr. B. met me in any other way.—Having touched upon this subject, I hope that your readers will forgive me if I say, in reply to a remarker on the Resolutions of the Dissenting Ministers, in the Repository for July last, (p. 405,) that, on the facts alleged, he has perhaps ceased to be sceptical, if he has read the last number of the *Edinburgh Review*; that private efforts were first made through the medium of His Majesty's Foreign Secretary, to effect a favourable change in the measures of the Lausanne government, but without success; that the circumstance of a certain individual having been the Chairman on that occasion arose from no design or preconcerted plan, but was solely occasioned by the ordinary routine of proceedings; and that a subscription for the relief of the sufferers was publicly begun before the publication of his remarks.

J. PYE SMITH.

SIR,  
**I**N offering my concluding remarks on *Ordination Services*, I will endeavour to be as brief as possible, and confine myself strictly to what has been urged in their favour, on the score of utility and scriptural authority.

Let it not be supposed by any one that I wish to detract from the utility of public religious services and acts of devotion in general. I am willing to acknowledge, that whether stated, occasional or extraordinary, (as in the

case of associations,) provided the object proposed to be answered be not in itself objectionable, they are not only often very gratifying to those who attend them, not only instructive and beneficial in their general tendency; but often become the channels of communication highly interesting and encouraging to the friends of religious truth and liberty, and stimulating their zeal and perseverance to more vigorous and successful efforts. But of this kind of utility I do not perceive that *ordination services* contain any thing peculiar or extraordinary, either deserving the high-strained encomiums which have been bestowed upon them, or justifying the importance which has been ascribed to their observance. Is it therefore right and proper to revive this practice, which our denomination has for powerful reasons discontinued, the observance of which is of no ascertainable value more than ordinary, and its celebration connected with superstitious notions in the minds of the generality of Christians, especially in regard to the validity and sacredness of the clerical character? On what other or better grounds than these can we attack superstitious notions and observances?

Two objects of utility are mentioned by Mr. Baker; *first*, that the candidates may be "recommended to the favour of God by a public act of devotion; and, *secondly*, that they may "receive from their reverend fathers in the ministry lessons of experience and wisdom:" and, in connexion with this, we are assured that "no *general* advice already on record respecting the objects of the ministry, can be so forcible as a charge drawn up for every particular occasion."

In regard to the first of these, I hesitate not to prefer the scriptural mode, which we learn from a passage, to which Mr. Baker refers, Acts xiv. 23: "And when they—the apostles—had ordained" (i. e. appointed) "them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." Surely, the appointing, praying and fasting took place in every particular church—within each society, without a concurrence of persons from distant places. Now, except it can be shewn with some appearance of truth and reason,

that this mode of soliciting the blessing of the Almighty is less efficacious than the parade of an inaugural or ordination service, I shall certainly prefer it, not only because it is scriptural, but also because it is fully adequate to every purpose of utility that can be contemplated by the united prayers of the reverend brethren.

In regard to the *second* object of utility, no one, I presume, can suppose that I maintain that good advice, judiciously and affectionately given, is not calculated, in a greater or less degree, to do good; but I am ready to acknowledge, that no advice which it is practical and possible to introduce into an ordination service, can be, under the actual circumstances of the case, of the importance and consequence contended for. I have, however, a better opinion of good advice than Mr. Baker seems to have. I think the good advice and general instructions already on record for qualifying a person for the ministry, are much more comprehensive and valuable than any short address can be, however "forcibly" drawn up, on a particular occasion. I also wish Mr. Baker to explain how it is that general advice cannot be suitable to "every particular occasion," when every particular occasion is so much alike. I certainly have never observed that ministers, in framing their inaugural address, (if they must be so called,) suit them so scrupulously to the particular occasion; and as gentlemen from a distance are mostly chosen to officiate, who are ignorant of most of the particular circumstances of the parties, the thing is impossible.

In order to qualify a minister for the proper discharge of his duties, much, very much, more is necessary than a short address, containing a few topics of common-place advice, with which, too, one of the parties, at least, is already very well acquainted. The qualifications for the ministry should be acquired, previously, by lectures on systematic theology, on scriptural criticism, on the pastoral office, &c., by suitable exercises in the composition and delivery of public discourses, by advice, when needed, derived from judicious friends and from a variety of valuable publications, by cultivating and cherishing the moral temper and a devout frame and disposition of

mind, without which his labours cannot be effective with regard to others, nor pleasant and satisfactory to himself, and by viewing (not previously, indeed, but ever) the improvement of that knowledge and those qualifications which contribute to the more efficient performance of ministerial duties, as objects of continual and progressive attainment. These things are requisite, indispensable. But what can be the difference in the practical result, in the real merits and usefulness of a minister's labours, whether or not he has listened for half an hour to common-place advice at an ordination?

Advice is of use just in proportion as it is needed. If it is not wanted, what loss is incurred by dispensing with it? If it be really wanted by a young minister, is it not a plain proof that he is not duly qualified for his office? For, I will ask any man of common sense, whether, if a man be indeed in want and need of the common-place advice given in the course of an ordination service, he be fit to be a Christian minister; and in what definite degree can such advice diminish his disqualification?

Good and judicious advice is very valuable; but chiefly so in particular cases and emergencies, when it is really needed. But here, if any public advice can be of avail, it is not to be expected from an ordination service, but rather from the meetings of district associations, whose members are best acquainted with the nature of the case, and likewise (especially when a "young minister" needs advice) from the "reverend fathers." But, as far as I have observed, this is a course, I am sorry to say, which is not often taken. If, however, any favourable change in this respect should be produced by inaugural services—if they should dispose any "young minister" to lend a more favourable ear to good advice, I hope I shall have self-denial enough to rejoice at my opponents' accession of argument. Good advice is useful, not because it is given, but because it is taken; and though the latter has no necessary connexion with the former, that connexion is assumed by my opponents in estimating its value.

In the tone and manner of a warm advocate, a reporter of one of the or-

dnation services expressed his firm conviction, that "no one can disapprove of any sentiment uttered, or of any circumstance that took place in the course" of the services of the day; that "they were eminently successful in promoting a spirit of Christian love in the minds of many who attended;" and that ordination "may be considered as a means of multiplying opportunities of friendly acquaintance with each other—a thing of great benefit and advantage."

I should be sorry to be thought to depreciate or disparage such advantages; nor do I see how I can be justly charged with doing this, except it can be proved that these advantages are exclusively peculiar to ordination services. With every disposition to give full credit to the reporter, on the score of fact, his remarks contain no reasoning applicable to the present subject. For is it not most obvious to remark, that the benefits enumerated may be derived from this service, only because they are essentially and necessarily connected with every religious exercise properly conducted? I wonder, indeed, that any one should consider such advantages as peculiar to these services—and a peculiar recommendation of them. Besides, are we not at perfect liberty to form as many religious associations as we think proper, provided we do not connect them with an unauthorized practice? And have we not actually many such in every district of the country? At the meetings of these associations, do we not implore the blessing of the Almighty on both ministers and congregations, as the different occasions require? Are these not considered as very suitable occasions by the "reverend fathers" to give advice to the inexperienced young ministers, and to all? What just apology can it be deemed of a meeting for a particular object, that the general sentiments and circumstances exhibited on the occasion are unobjectionable? Is the service *eminently* successful in "promoting a spirit of Christian love," &c, because it is an ordination? Will any one inform me what can raise this service to such pre-eminence over every other? If we wish to "multiply opportunities" of friendly acquaintance, have we no other resource but the unfrequent and

uncertain recurrence of ordinations? Can we not induce our congregations and brethren in the ministry to meet for great and good purposes, except we avail ourselves of their prepossessions and prejudices?

I am aware that ingenuity, on one hand, and a disposition, on the other hand, to view a thing in a favourable light, will often give a *striking* degree of speciousness to arguments grounded on the plea of utility, however inconclusive they may be; but I wonder that any person who is qualified for being a scriptural critic should have the hardihood to say, that any one of the passages to which Mr. Baker referred, in your number for June, (pp. 345—348,) affords any ground for concluding that an ordination or inaugural service, of the kind advocated, “is *eminently* scriptural in its practice,” or, indeed, scriptural at all.

Mr. Baker observes, that “it is in the manner in which these officers (i. e. elders or bishops and deacons) were appointed or ordained, that the force of the scriptural argument consists;” and he adds, that “it was generally, if not always, distinguished by a special act of devotion.” How far *especial* I do not understand; but granted, “by an act of devotion,” or prayer to God for his blessing on the person appointed and his ministrations. But how can there be any force in this argument, except the similarity between the primitive “act of devotion,” and of modern ordination services, be shewn to our satisfaction? So far are we from being authorized, by the passages cited by Mr. Baker, to infer any similarity between them, (*prayer being made alone excepted*,) that we infer the direct contrary. The practice, therefore, contended for, instead of being *eminently* scriptural, is mainly and radically deficient in scriptural proof and authority.

I am not a little surprised that this *strikingly* unavailing appeal to scriptural authority should be resorted to at this time, when it is well known (see number for April, p. 217), that those who retained the practice of ordination, nearly a century ago, acknowledged that it had no foundation in Scripture. And, indeed, with their manifest disinclination to give it up, it would have been truly wonderful

that they should ever have been induced to discontinue it, if it were strikingly and eminently grounded on scriptural practice.

From Tit. i. 5, it is most evident that the ordination, i. e. choice or appointment to an office, which took place in the churches, was very different from any thing now in use among us: “For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain elders in every city.” Elders were preachers or teachers of the Christian doctrine, who were ordained or appointed by Titus, according to the Apostle’s direction, without any thing like an ordination service—without any “celebration of their connexion” with the church.

I hope now that even the zealous supporters of ordination are convinced that there is a striking difference between the primitive *ordination*, or appointment of officers in the church, and the modern *ordination service*, or celebration of a minister’s appointment. The former was a private affair, within the limits of the particular society, which was conducted without the advice or assistance of brethren or friends from distant places, and which consisted, so far as our information goes, of nothing besides prayer and fasting; the latter no ordination or appointment at all, but only the celebration of it, which owes its main interest and attraction to the services and attendance of distant ministers, and where fasting certainly is not observed.

We have every reason to suppose that all the officers in the primitive church were ordained alike, i. e. with prayer and fasting; will any one of my opponents in this question inform us why *fasting* is now omitted; and why the ordination service is only performed when the *minister’s* appointment is to be celebrated, but is an honour not conferred upon any other officer in our societies?

By some, scriptural authority is deemed unnecessary in support of various forms and practices which different persons or societies may think proper to observe; and they, therefore, presume that the putting on of a gown or sacred vestment is a thing as indifferent as the putting on of a coat. And so I grant it is, when not considered as a religious act, and not

connected with any religious function as a necessary or constant appendage; but when it is constantly done in such connexion, it is as much a superstitious mummery, however different it may be in degree, as any observance in the Romish or any other church. Are we then to believe that there is no harm in a little bit of superstition, if it harmonizes with the taste of the age and the state of men's prejudices? *I think*, notwithstanding, that the necessity of wearing a gown in the performance of a religious exercise, either directly required of any one, or implied by certain persons scrupulously never omitting *to put it on*, is an unchristian imposition upon others, as well as in itself a silly superstition.

Thus, Sir, I have concluded the remarks which I undertook to make on the subject of *ordination services*. It has been my wish and object to discuss the subject with dispassionateness, to exclude all irrelevant matter, and to determine the question by its own merits; and I am not conscious that I have indulged an angry feeling, or endeavoured to excite one. But this, as well as the merits of the question in general, is submitted to the judgment of your readers—by me most cheerfully. WILLIAM JOHNS.

*Gray's Inn,*

December 14, 1825.

SIR,  
THAT the sacramental test has ever been required as a qualification for the English bar, may not, perhaps, be generally known to your readers. Such, however, has till very recently been the case, and it is with peculiar satisfaction I have now to communicate the abolition of the last remaining regulation of the kind.

Having occasion some years since to become a member of one of the four Inns of Court, as preparatory to being called to the bar, I unwarily entered myself of Gray's Inn, of which I had not been long a member before I learned that, by an order or by-law of the Society, candidates for the degree of barrister were required to produce a certificate of having taken the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. Upon this discovery I was induced to inquire into the existence of any similar requisition in the other Inns, and I col-

lected the following information, which may be depended on as correct.

The Inner Temple has not for the last twenty years, nor, as far as I am aware, at any previous period, had any such rule or order.

In the Middle Temple the test existed for about thirty or forty years previous to the year 1748, when it was discontinued, and has not been since revived. I further learned, that although in the bond required by that Society upon a student's entry for the bar, the ancient form is retained, in which mention is made of attendance at Church and the taking of the Sacrament as by law required, yet it is not the present practice to inquire into or notice the compliance or noncompliance with the bond in these particulars.

At Lincoln's Inn the test was introduced in 1670, and a few years afterwards dispensed with, and no such regulation has since existed in that Society.

Such was the result of my inquiry as to the three last-mentioned Inns of Court. In Gray's Inn, however, the test has existed and been in force for many years past, but at what precise period it was introduced I am unacquainted. So far as the regulation may have been intended to exclude Dissenters from the bar, its operation, confined as it was to one single Inn, was of course nugatory. Had it prevailed at all the Inns at one and the same time, its operation would have been complete in effectually shutting out Dissenters from the bar, which is now considered as open to all, without distinction of sect or party. Existing in Gray's Inn alone, it served merely as a beacon to warn Dissenters against a membership with that particular Society: and though cases, like my own, may have occasionally occurred, in which a Dissenter entering for the bar in ignorance of the test may have inadvertently exposed himself to its direct operation, yet the rareness of such instances, in conjunction with the fact that Catholics were, as I understand, relieved from its operation by some special provision in their favour, may perhaps explain why the prolonged continuance of the test in this Inn has excited so little attention.

The Benchers of Gray's Inn have, I believe, for a length of time contemplated the abrogation of the test, and have in the course of the recent Michaelmas Term carried that object into full effect by a resolution, passed on the 16th November last, whereby it is "Ordered that receiving the Sacrament by students, as a qualification for the English bar, be in future dispensed with." This instance of liberality will not be the less highly appreciated, when I state that it has emanated from the Benchers themselves, as their own spontaneous act, founded upon general considerations, and without reference to any individual application that may have been made to them for relief.

The regulations for keeping terms at Gray's Inn present certain peculiar conveniences, especially for students residing at a distance from the metropolis, and of which the knowledge of the existence of the late test has alone, I am persuaded, prevented many Dissenters, having the bar in view, from availing themselves. I consider, however, that the recent repeal of that test derives its chief importance, not so much from the intrinsic value of the actual benefit conferred, as from the liberal and enlightened spirit of which it is the fruit and pledge: and I trust, Mr. Editor, you will concur with me in recognizing the propriety, I may even add the justice and duty, of giving every publicity to a measure that confers honour on the Society from which it has proceeded.

JOHN EVANS, Jun.

*Bristol,*

*December 16, 1825.*

SIR,  
THE letter of H. W. in your last number, (p. 681,) respecting the intended Second Part of my Reply to Archbishop Magee, appears to require from me some notice; and this is rendered the more expedient, by various private inquiries which have, at different times, been put to me.

It was always my intention that the publication of the Second Part should not be prevented, though it should be discouraged, by an inadequate sale of the First. I thought that what was to come would be more generally acceptable, and more permanently useful. If, therefore, I had enjoyed, since

I wrote my Preface, the "two or three months of tolerable leisure," I think the loss attending the First Part would not have operated to prevent my proceeding. But though I have very often renewed my attention to the subject, I have not had the power of completing the work. Nor do I regret this. My opinions have acquired greater stability and precision: and though I have not seen reason to change them materially in (I think) any instance, yet my sentiments have increasingly become what I may be allowed to call evangelical; and the work, if executed, will therefore, I think, be more calculated to render service to a cause, which, whether to be promoted by direct or by indirect, but often equally effective, exertion, is never out of my heart.—If life and health are preserved to me, I shall make the completion of the work a leading employment of the time I can devote to such objects, as soon as others more immediately pressing are accomplished.

While I thank H. W. for his suggestion, I must decline the plan he proposes: I would prefer leaving myself unrestrained in the time and manner of completing the Second Part.—The simplest way of preventing loss on the whole, would be by promoting the sale of the First Part. I have still one-third of the impression on my hands, and the proceeds from sale have not yet amounted to the direct expenses by above £50.\* Remuneration for the work I knew was out of the question; and from the first I had not looked for any pecuniary advantage from the time and labour I gave to it: indeed, the marketable value of these would have been several hundred pounds. Finding, after about two or three years' trial, that the sale did not go on, I reduced the price from fourteen shillings to half-a-guinea: but I am not aware that this answered any purpose. The volume is large, and

\* I may be allowed to suggest that our friends who approve of the work, and are disposed and able thus to encourage the completion of it, might get copies from me, (or even through the ordinary channels,) at the present price, 10s. 6d., for the purpose of giving them to public libraries or orthodox divines, &c., known to possess Archbishop Magee's work.

several parts of it can be of no interest to the ordinary reader; and though I believe that various portions would be of general interest and utility, yet, as a whole, it is not calculated to be popular. From the catalogues of most of our Tract Societies, it is still excluded by the price; and it has this year been left out of that of the London Unitarian Society.

I should the more regret that the First Part has not been much purchased by the opponents of Unitarianism, if I had not reason to believe that it has greatly contributed to lessen the resort to the Archbishop's armoury, and to make it felt among them that he has forged unsafe and even unholy weapons. Some indications of this effect I have stated in the Preface to the third edition of Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, p. xv.; and it is not, I still think, too much to hope that "those who before employed his calumnious charges without hesitation, and sometimes without suspicion, will be constrained to caution, lest they also should incur the heavy guilt of bearing false witness." That such has not been the case with Archdeacon Wrangham is a matter of regret only in respect to his character for intelligence and liberality. He has rendered Unitarianism a great service by bringing into the field of controversy, one, who will always "strive lawfully," and for truth alone.

Let me be pardoned in taking this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Well-beloved, and, still more, those among us who value scriptural knowledge, and have at heart the interests of religion and virtue, that he has accomplished one important portion of his Family Bible, by completing his Translation and Exposition of the Pentateuch. If, as I trust, he print a separate title for that portion, perhaps he will give such a one as shall make the volume regarded, as it really is, complete in itself, and equally valuable whether or not he go through the whole of the Scriptures in a similar manner. The volume already completed should be in the hands of every family among us who have the means of purchasing it, and should be accessible to all. Liberal scripturalists, of every denomination, would find in it abundance to inform and benefit them;

and by such it will be valued the more it is known. If the estimable author had done nothing more for the interests of piety and virtue, he would be entitled to our gratitude.—It has been reported, and I hope correctly, that he will next proceed with the poetical books, Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs: perhaps he will give his readers information as to his intentions, through the channel of the Repository.

I must join H. W. in hoping for information respecting the completion of Mr. Rutt's edition of Dr. Priestley's Works. I am well aware that the intelligent Editor has not only given very much unrequited labour to the publication, (which I doubt not he did expect,) but also that he is left to bear pecuniary burdens from it which never should have been upon him. If, as appears, too many subscribers have been negligent in claiming their copies and paying their arrears, (I am happy in saying that such is not the case with the eleven which come into my hands,) they should consider that it is a great evil not only to Mr. Rutt, but to those who have been punctual, and that it contributes to throw increased difficulties in the way of similar undertakings, even if less extensive. In one respect, (I trust Mr. Rutt will bear with me in saying it, and, what is more, act upon it,) he is in debt to those who have done what they could to promote the sale,—I mean in reference to the *first* volume, promised in 1817, but still unpublished, intended to contain the Life and Letters of the Author. If he would execute this, (which need not be nearly as expensive to him as those already published,) our sets would be complete as far as they go: without it, we have always a feeling of defectiveness. It could not cost *him* great labour; and if not made too large, it seems not improbable that many, who, from having most of Dr. Priestley's separate works, have not subscribed to Mr. Rutt's edition, would be glad to avail themselves of such a volume, and lessen his loss in executing what was surely a very desirable object, and even due to the memory and labours of our eminent divine and philosopher.—Besides, however, the portion for general circulation, the first volume should contain a list of the works in

each succeeding one (including of course those yet to come, which Mr. Rutt can now have no difficulty in arranging and specifying); and in behalf of the subscribers I would solicit from him, when he next publishes, a series of second labels, bearing the contents of each volume: the want of this often occasions difficulty in consultation, and consequently a loss of time and labour.

L. CARPENTER.

Birmingham,

December 9, 1825.

SIR,

**M**AY I be permitted to offer a little advice to those of your correspondents who occasionally furnish matter for the "Obituary" in your valuable Repository, viz. to observe, strictly, the following rule,— "Not to let the value of character and its influence on society be lost, by putting upon a par with *those* whose exemplary virtues, *tried* and *manifested* in their journey through life, and whose high and striking qualities of mind and heart are subjects of interest with the public—*such* as walk not out of the ordinary course, who, however their memories may deserve the respect of private friendship, are not entitled to any higher praise."

I have been led to obtrude myself on your notice from, now and then, witnessing in "Obituaries," sketches of character of individuals with whom I have been personally and sometimes intimately acquainted, where I could not but perceive a sad departure from truth in the delineation, and so over-rated an estimate of conduct and character, as to prove to me how little are such *partial* sketches to be relied on.

Upon you, Sir, as an Editor, I could not charge the want of discretion or judgment in the selection of objects, because to you it does not belong to know the merit of the different characters that may be transmitted to you for insertion; but I would certainly wish to recommend to such as may lose friends, whom they esteemed and loved, to cherish the feelings which friendship inspires, and *privately* to cultivate love for the memory of departed worth, without being drawn aside by an *overweening* partiality, and led, thereby, to expose (through the press) to remark and animadver-

sion, those, of whom others may have formed an opinion in some respects different, and frequently more correct than their own.

My view of the subject is, decidedly, to let ordinary characters alone, to leave the unobtrusiveness of modest worth to influence such as may be the silent observers of its loveliness, and to eulogize those only who have been *highly distinguished* by their *talents, integrity* and *patient endurance of privation* and *suffering*, and who may be fairly held up as models of imitation to all the world.

P. T.

Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq.

(Concluded from p. 678.)

**T**HE carelessness of Charles II. left his household in great disorder and put him to great shifts.

"Sept. 2, 1667. I dined with Sir G. Carteret, with whom dined Mr. Jack Ashburnham and Dr. Creton, who I observe to be a most good man and a scholar. In discourse at dinner concerning the change of men's humours and fashions touching meats, Mr. Ashburnham told us that he remembers since the only fruit in request, and eaten by the King and Queen at table as the best fruit, was the Katharine Payre, though they knew at the time other fruits of France and our own country. After dinner comes in Mr. Townsend; and there I was witness of a horrid rateing which Mr. Ashburnham, as one of the Grooms of the King's Bed Chamber, did give him for want of linen for the King's person; which he swore was not to be endured, and that the King would not endure it, and that the King his father would have hanged his wardrobe man should he have been served so; the King having at this day no handkerchers, and but three bands to his neck, he swore. Mr. Townsend pleaded want of money and the owing of the linen draper £5000, and that he hath of late got many rich things made, beds and sheets and saddles, without money, and that he can go no further; but still this old man (indeed like an old loving servant) did cry out for the King's person to be neglected. But when he was gone, Townsend told me that it is the Grooms' taking away

the King's linen at the quarter's end as their fees, which makes this great want, for whether the King can get it or no, they will run away at the quarter's end with what he hath had, let the King get more as he can." II. 121.

The Lord Chancellor Clarendon is no favourite character of ours, but we read with indignation the account of the insults put upon him by the abandoned creatures of the Court.

"Sept. 8, 1667. And here it comes into my head to set down what Mr. Rawlinson (whom I met in Fenchurch Street on Friday last looking over his ruins there) told me that he was told by one of my Lord Chancellor's gentlemen lately, that a grant coming to him to be sealed wherein the King hath given my Lady Castlemaine, or somebody by her means, a place which he did not like well of, he did stop the grant, saying that he thought this woman would sell every thing shortly, which she hearing of, she sent to let him know that she had disposed of this place, and did not doubt in a little time to dispose of his." II. 124.

Pepys relates (II. 149) a quarrel between Nell Glynn and another woman-player of the name of Marshall, from which we learn that two daughters of Stephen Marshall, "the great Presbyterian," were in this condition of life, and bore the degraded character then common to females who trod the stage. Nell's reproach was bitter enough—"you are," &c.—"though a Presbyterian's praying daughter!"

Pepys had a cousin, Roger Pepys, who was in Parliament; but this, according to his own confession, was no very enviable place.—"He tells me that he thanks God he never knew what it was to be tempted to be a knave in his life, till he did come into the House of Commons, where there is nothing done but by passion and faction and private interest." II. 150.

He records (II. 160) a saying of Mr. Evelyn's, "that he did believe we should soon see ourselves fall into a Commonwealth again;" and remarks (II. 168), that the high language of Parliament was of the same sound as that in the year 1640.

The Nonconformists were yet regarded with awe, on account of their numbers, character and zeal. In an

intriguing Court, they were sometimes played off by one faction against another.

"Dec. 21, 1667. The Nonconformists are mighty high, and their meetings frequented and connived at, and they do expect to have their day now soon, for my Lord of Buckingham is a declared friend to them, and even to the Quakers, who had very good words the other day from the King himself; and what is more, the Archbishop of Canterbury [Gilbert Sheldon] is called no more to the Caball, nor, by the way, Sir W. Coventry, which I am sorry for, the Caball at present, being, as he says, the King and Duke of Buckingham, and Lord Keeper, the Duke of Albe-marle, and Privy Seale. The Bishops differing from the King in the late business in the House of Lords, have caused this and what is like to follow, for every body is encouraged now-a-days to speak, and even to preach (as I have heard one of them) as bad things against them as ever in the year 1640, which is a strange change." II. 169, 170.

We have (II. 172) under the date of Dec. 29, 1667, some notice of the Quaker Founder, with no very honourable mention of his father, the Royalist admiral. "At night comes Mrs. Turner to see us; and there, among other talk, she tells me that Mr. *Wm. Pen*, who is lately come over from Ireland, is a Quaker again, or some very melancholy thing; that he cares for no company, nor comes into any; which is a pleasant thing after his being abroad so long, and his father such a hypocritical rogue, and at this time an Atheist."

Amongst other matters, we find in the following extracts sufficient proof that the Established Church was at this time established by law more than in public opinion.

"1667,8. Jan. 20. My Lord told a good story of Mr. Newman, the minister in New England, who wrote the Concordance, of his foretelling his death, preaching a funeral sermon, and did at last bid the angels do their office, and died. It seems there is great presumption that there will be a Toleration granted, so that the Presbyterians do hold up their heads; but they will hardly trust the King or the Parliament what to yield them—"

though most of the sober party be for some kind of allowance to be given them."

"Jan. 23, 1667, 8. The Bishop tells me that he thinks that the great business of Toleration will not, notwithstanding this talk, be carried this Parliament; nor for the King's taking away the Deans' and Chapters' lands to supply his wants, they signifying little to him if he had them for his present service." II. 184.

"January 31, 1667, 8. They (the Commissioners) have Mr. Jessop their Secretary, and it is pretty to see that they are fain to find out an old-fashioned man of Cromwell's to do their business for them, as well as the Parliament to pitch upon such, for the most part on the lowest of people, that were brought into the House for commissioners. I went away, giving and receiving great satisfaction; and so to White-Hall to the Commissioners of the Treasury; where waiting some time I there met with Colonell Birch, and he and I fell into discourse; and I did give him thanks for his kindness to me in the Parliament House, both before my face and behind my back. He told me that he knew me to be a man of the old way of taking pains, and did always endeavour to do me right, and prevent any thing that was moved that might tend to my injury; which I was obliged to him for, and thanked him. Thence to talk of other things, and the want of money; and he told me of the general want of money in the countrey; that land sold for nothing, and the many pennyworths he knows of lands and houses upon them, with good titles in his country, at 16 years' purchase: 'And,' says he, 'though I am in debt, yet I have a mind to one thing—and that is a Bishop's lease;' but said, 'I will yet choose such a lease before any other, because I know they cannot stand, and then it will fall into the King's hands, and I in possession shall have an advantage by it.' Says he, 'I know they must fall, and they are now near it, taking all the ways they can to undo themselves, and shewing us the way;' and thereupon told me a story of the present quarrel between the Bishop and Dean of Coventry and Lichfield; the former of whom did excommunicate the latter, and caused his excommunication to

be read in the Church while he was there; and after it was read the Dean made the service be gone through with, though himself, an excommunicate was present, (which is contrary to the canon,) and said he would justify the quire therein against the Bishop: and so they are at law in the Arches about it; which is a very pretty story. He tells me that the King is for Toleration, though the Bishops be against it; and that he do not doubt but it will be carried in Parliament, but that he fears some will stand for the tolerating of Papists with the rest; and that he knows not what to say, but rather thinks that the sober party will be without it rather than have it upon those terms; and I do believe so. It is observed, and is true, in the late fire of London, that the fire burned just as many parish churches as there were hours from the beginning to the end of the fire; and next, that there were just as many churches left standing as there were taverns left standing in the rest of the city that was not burned, being, I think, thirteen in all of each; which is pretty to observe." II. 186, 187.

"February 10, 1667, 8. Mr. Hollier (a surgeon) dined with my wife and me. Much discourse about the bad state of the church, and how the clergy are come to be men of no worth in the world; and, as the world do now generally discourse, they must be reformed; and I believe the hierarchy will in a little time be shaken, whether they will or no; the King being offended with them, and set upon it, as I hear." II. 194.

In 1668, April 28, we have a memorandum (II. 223) shewing that the fear of the Parliament with regard to Nonconformists was greater than with regard to Papists. "This law against Conventicles is very severe; but Creed, whom I meet here, do tell me that it being moved that Papists' meetings might be included, the House was divided upon it, and it was carried in the negative, which will give great disgust to the people, I doubt."

Our play-going Diarist relates (II. 260), that 1668, Sept. 4, he went to Bartholomew Fair to see the play of that title; he praises its wit, but adds, "only the business of abusing the Puritans begins to grow stale and of

no use, they being the people that at last will be found the wisest."

Pepys's patriotism was none of the best.

1668, Oct. 12, (II. 268,) Sir H. Cholmley tells him he do think Parliament will never meet again, which, says he, "is a great many men's thoughts and *I shall not be sorry for it.*" Under this date, he thus takes notice of the Quaker Founder as an author: "Read a ridiculous, nonsensical book set out by *Will. Pen* for the Quakers; but so full of nothing but nonsense that I was ashamed to read in it." An after entry in the Journal shews that he did not regard Penn with invariable contempt, if it does not shew also that Pepys was not a sound believer:

"1668, 9, Feb. 12. Home, and there Pelling hath got *W. Pen's* book against the Trinity. I got my wife to read it to me; and I find it so well writ as, I think, it is too good for him ever to have writ it; and it is a serious sort of a book and not fit for every body to read." II. 303.

We have (II. 291) further particulars of mismanagement and corruption in the Government, and of the wretched tricks that political functionaries put in practice.

"1668, Lord's-day. Saw the King at chapel; but staid not to hear any thing, but went to walk in the Park with *W. Hewer*; and there, among others, met with *Sir G. Downing*, and walked with him an hour, talking of business, and how the late war was managed, there being nobody to take care of it: and he telling, when he was in Holland, what he offered the King to do if he might have power, and then upon the least word, perhaps of a woman, to the King, he was contradicted again, and particularly to the loss of all that we lost in Guinny. He told me that he had so good spies, that he hath had the keys taken out of *De Witt's* pocket when he was a-bed, and his closet opened, and papers brought to him and left in his hands for an hour, and carried back and laid in the place again, and the keys put into his pocket again. He says he hath always had their most private debates, that have been but between two or three of the chief of them, brought to him in an hour after, and an hour after that hath sent word thereof to

the King; but nobody here regarded them. But he tells me the said news that he is out of all expectations that ever the debts of the navy will be paid, if the Parliament do not enable the King to do it by money; all they can hope for to do out of the King's revenue being but to keep our wheels a-going on present services, and, if they can, to cut off the growing interest: which is a sad story, and grieves me to the heart."

Courtier as Pepys was, he could not speak without indignation of Charles's personal conduct.

"1668, 9, February 17. The King dining yesterday at the Dutch Ambassador's, after dinner they drank and were pretty merry; and among the rest of the King's company there was that worthy fellow my Lord of Rochester, and *Tom Killigrew*, whose mirth and raillery offended the former so much, that he did give *Tom Killigrew* a box on the ear in the King's presence; which do give much offence to the people here at Court to see how cheap the King makes himself, and the more, for that the King hath not only passed by the thing and pardoned it to Rochester already, but this very morning the King did publicly walk up and down, and Rochester I saw with him as free as ever, to the King's everlasting shame to have so idle a rogue his companion." II. 305.

The *Cabal* was a mischievous faction, but the Duke of Buckingham, its head, deserves praise for his well-known enmity to intolerance. He was the patron of the Divines called Latitudinarians.

"1669, March 16. We fell to other talk; and I find by him that the Bishops must certainly fall, and their hierarchy; these people have got so much ground upon the king and kingdom as is not to be got again from them; and the Bishops do well deserve it. But it is all the talk, I find, that *Dr. Wilkins*, my friend, Bishop of Chester, shall be removed to Winchester and be Lord Treasurer. Though this be foolish talk, yet I do gather that he is a mighty rising man, as being a Latitudinarian, and the Duke of Buckingham his great friend." II. 316.

It was the custom of these days for the pious to take notes at church, of

which the biographies of the period afford numerous examples. Many a good woman was praised in her funeral sermon for her observation of this little piece of church industry, which was sometimes regarded as a set-off against feminine failings. Pepys says (II. 330) under date of 1669, April 14, "They do here talk mightily of my Lady Paulina's making a very good end and being very religious in her life-time; and she hath left many good notes of sermons and religion wrote with her own hand, which nobody ever knew of; which I am glad of; but she was always a peevish lady."

He himself had a book given him which he seemed to resolve he would use for taking notes of sermons at church.

Further symptoms (II. 339) of the restoration of the religion, at least, of the Commonwealth: 1669, May 3. "Thence to White-Hall and met with Creed and discoursed of matters; and I perceive by him that he makes no doubt but that all will turn to the old religion, for these people cannot hold things in their hands nor prevent its coming to that; and by his discourse he fits himself for it, and would have my Lord Sandwich do so too and me."

We cannot wonder at the profligacy of the Court when we read the following account (II. 342) of buffoonery and profaneness in the archiepiscopal palace. The Puritans must be ever denounced, forsooth, as hypocrites; let their revilers look henceforth to Lambeth.

"1669, May 14. At noon to dinner with Mr. Wren to Lambeth, with the Archbishop of Canterbury; the first time I was ever there, and I have long longed for it. Where a noble house and well furnished, with good pictures and furniture, and noble attendance in good order, and a great deal of company though in an ordinary day; and exceeding great cheer, no where better, or so much, that ever I think I saw for an ordinary table; and the Bishop mighty kind to me particularly, desiring my company another time when less company there. Most of the company gone, and I going, I heard by a gentleman of a sermon that was to be there; and so I staid to hear it, thinking it serious, till by

and by the gentleman told me it was a mockery by one Count Bolton, a very gentleman-like man, that behind a chair did pray and preach like a Presbyter Scot, with all the possible imitation in grimaces and voice. And his text about the hanging up their harps upon the willows: and a serious good sermon too, exclaiming against Bishops, and crying up of my good Lord Eglington, till it made us all burst; but I did wonder to have the Bishop at this time to make himself sport with things of this kind, but I perceive it was shewn him as a rarity. And he took care to have the room-door shut, but there were about twenty gentlemen there: and myself infinitely pleased with the novelty."

We are now arrived at the end of the Memoirs and have only one more extract, the last passage in this interesting and instructive book, to lay before our readers. The passage (II. 347) is somewhat mournful, though, like Pepys's character, it is not all of a piece. Comedy and tragedy were strangely jumbled together in his mind, as they are in his Journal. He has, however, left us a picture of the interior of the Restoration-Court, and we sincerely thank the Honourable Master of Magdalene College and the noble proprietor of Audley End for publishing to the world a practical refutation of the slanders of a century and a half against the brave and pious men that risked every thing that was dear to them in the noble attempt to overthrow the base tyranny of the Stuarts.

"1669, May 31. Up very betimes, and continued all the morning with W. Hewer, upon examining and stating my accounts, in order to the fitting myself to go abroad beyond sea, which the ill condition of my eyes, and my neglect for a year or two hath kept me behind-hand in, and so as to render it very difficult now and troublesome to my mind to do it; but I this day made a satisfactory entrance therein. Had another meeting with the Duke of York at White-Hall, on yesterday's work, and made a good advance: and so being called by my wife, we to the Park, Mary Batchier and a Dutch gentleman, a friend of hers, being with us. Thence to 'The World's End,' a drinking house by the Park; and there merry, and so home late. And

thus ends all that I doubt I shall ever be able to do with my own eyes in the keeping of my Journall, I being not able to do it any longer, having done now so long as to undo my eyes almost every time that I take a pen in my hand: and, therefore, whatever comes of it, I must forbear; and, therefore, resolve from this time forward to have it kept by my people in long-hand, and must be contented to set down no more than is fit for them and all the world to know, or if there be any thing, I must endeavour to keep a margin in my book open, to add here and there a note in short-hand with my own hand. And so I betake myself to that course, which is almost as much as to see myself go into my grave; for which and all the discomforts that will accompany my being blind, the good God prepare me."

*Framlingham,*

*December 14, 1825.*

SIR,

IT is matter of congratulation to the Unitarian public that the *Evangelical Magazine* for this month, (pp. 506, 507,) has lent its aid to give publicity to the lately-discovered theological work of the great John Milton, amongst its numerous orthodox readers, many of whom probably would never have heard of its being brought to light, but for the notice there taken of it. In the critique are the following expressions: "We profess our belief that this long-lost system of theology is indeed the actual production of the immortal Milton. That it fell from his pen, and that too at a period of life when his judgment must have reached its utmost maturity, cannot for a moment be doubted.—In the case of the great poet was found an avowed contempt for human authority, and a profound deference for the word of God. It has (i. e. the work) some decided claims on the lovers of biblical knowledge. It is marked throughout by a very decided appeal to the sacred oracles. If the proofs selected from the Holy Scriptures are not always pertinent, they are at least exceedingly numerous, and shew that the distinguished author had not relinquished, in the progress of his speculations, a profound deference for the word of God. In some parts of the work, too, we

have discovered passages of transcendent energy and pathos, which would bear comparison with the very richest of his other compositions."

Yet, strange to tell, notwithstanding these high encomiums, the writer says, "It is not without a pang of regret that we profess our belief that this long-lost system of theology is indeed the actual production of the immortal Milton. It is but too lamentably evident from this volume, that towards the close of his earthly pilgrimage, his opinions were in many essential particulars erroneous and unscriptural. It is, indeed, harrowing to the feelings to learn from Milton's own shewing that he believed the Son of God to be nothing more than an exalted creature, &c. With these cardinal errors are mixed up a variety of minor ones, equally characteristic of that spirit of unhallowed speculation, which in the case of the great poet was found to associate itself with an avowed contempt for human authority and a profound deference for the word of God. When first we perused the objectionable parts of Milton's theology, we were ready to say, What a pity it is that the work at large ever escaped from its ancient hiding-place!—We conclude, &c. [See the remainder of the passage in Dr. Evans's letter, p. 712.]

It must be left to the writer and his approvers to reconcile "a spirit of unhallowed speculation—with an avowed contempt for human authority, and a profound deference for the word of God," and a want of humility with "a decided appeal to the sacred oracles:" also, the opinions of Milton "towards the close of his earthly pilgrimage being wretchedly erroneous and unscriptural," when, according to the writer, "it cannot for a moment be doubted but that his judgment must have reached its utmost maturity."

Although great names are not to be alleged as proofs of any doctrines, yet it may well afford Unitarians a considerable degree of satisfaction, that they can now without the least hesitation rank Milton with Locke, Newton, Whitby, and other eminent persons of olden times as decided abettors of the Divine Unity.

W. C.

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Milner, occasioned by some Passages contained in his Book, entitled, “ The End of Religious Controversy.”* By the late Rev. S. Parr, LL.D. London: printed for Mawman. 1825. 8vo. pp. 60.

ART. II.—*Dr. Milner’s Parting Word to Dr. Grier. With a Brief Notice of Dr. S. Parr’s Posthumous Letter to Dr. Milner.* London: printed, &c., by Keating and Brown. 1825. 8vo. pp. 49.

THE former of these pamphlets is edited by the late Dr. Parr’s grandson, the Rev. John Lynes, of Elmley Lovett, near Worcester. It was originally written for the Gentleman’s Magazine; but “after-thoughts enlarged its dimensions, and other reasons, unnecessary to detail, prevented its publication in that form. The design of publishing it, however, was never abandoned, and three different copies, each left more finished than the other,\* demonstrate the author’s zeal and his intentions.”

Many of our readers may be aware that Dr. Milner, in his “End of Religious Controversy,” had, more than once, taken occasion to intimate, and even allege, that Bishop Hallifax died a Catholic. The statement naturally excited wonder among those who knew and valued the departed prelate. Accordingly, the main object of Dr. Parr’s Letter is to refute the charge: this design he has executed firmly and courteously; and if there are any individuals whom the reasoning in his tract fails to convince, we can refer them, without anxiety or hesitation, to the documents in the Appendix.

Of Dr. Parr’s pamphlet nearly the first twenty-seven pages are little relative to the matter in dispute. In those pages he extracts from “the End of Religious Controversy,” a number of propositions, some of which

are wild and monstrous, others misplaced, and most untenable. Occasionally, however, he stops to animadvert upon his quotations: and we shall produce one stricture of this kind, which is eminently marked by pertinency and acuteness. Pp. 16, 17.

The Vicar Apostolic having, with much triumph, declared, that “it is an absurdity to talk of the Church or Society of Protestants, because the term Protestant expresses nothing positive, much less any union or association among them,” Dr. Parr submits to him the following questions:

“Where, perhaps you will be asked by some of my brethren, lies the absurdity of talking of a church, or society of Protestants? Where, permit me to ask you, is the contradiction either in the ideas or the terms? If one term Protestant distinctly and unequivocally expresses one idea, the protestation of those who protest against the Catholic Church,\* how does it follow that another term, be it church or society, does not as unequivocally and as distinctly express another idea, namely, the union or association of those who thus protest among themselves? When you, Sir, have the goodness to assist my dullness, I shall be ready to forgive your positiveness, and to applaud your sagacity.”

In three several pages of “the End of Religious Controversy,” Dr. Milner has spoken of Bishop Hallifax as dying a Catholic. At first, indeed, (Part i. p. 77,) he qualifies this statement by the word *probably*. Nevertheless, he repeats it afterwards without any modification, a practice not uncommon with some polemics, and deserving of severe reproof. With a moderation of temper and a correctness of judgment which are extremely admirable, Dr. Parr contents himself with pointing out the utter improbability of the allegation. From Bi-

\* It is, after all, not such as Dr. Parr himself would have laid before the world.

† See Mosheim’s account of the term, Eccl. Hist., [Maclaine,] IV. 73, 74 (ed. 1782).

shop Hallifax's \* personal and public character, from the prelate's writings, from the circumstance of Dr. Milner's informant being anonymous, from the silence of near relations and official attendants, he argues effectually and satisfactorily to the conclusion, that the statement is unfounded.

But the Appendix is by far the most valuable and important part of this pamphlet; inasmuch as we find *the question of fact* here disposed of in a manner perfectly decisive. On Feb. 9, of the present year, the Rev. B. F. Hallifax, son of the former Bishop of that name, and resident at Batchcott, near Ludlow, addressed to Dr. Milner a letter, in which it is asked, with due respect, on what grounds the probability of the above-cited statement rests; and in which it is declared, on the authority of those who attended the prelate during his illness and at his death, that "no expression escaped his lips, from which it could be inferred or supposed any change had taken place in his mind with respect to the Church of England." By Dr. Milner this letter was acknowledged and this inquiry was answered. The Vicar Apostolic speaks of "a certain Catholic" who had access to the Bishop in his illness, and who, it seems, was made the depositary of his avowal of a change of faith. Unfortunately, nevertheless, "both the parties alluded to having long since quitted this world, it is not possible to bring the matter to any thing like evidence; but," adds Dr. Milner, "as I spoke of the fact barely as probable, I may be allowed to retain my opinion on the known credibility of my informants." With such a reply Mr. Hallifax, as we might well suppose, was not satisfied: he wrote therefore a second letter to the Vicar Apostolic, and requested to receive from him such names and dates and other circumstantial intelligence as might serve either to verify or to disprove his former allegation. Here the correspondence of these two gentlemen ended.

\* It is remarkable enough that in Dr. Parr's Letter the names *Houdly* and *Hallifax* are misspelled [Hoadley and Hallifax].

In a postscript to "a Parting Word to the Rev. Richard Grier, D.D.," &c., Dr. Milner resumes the subject: he now employs four pages in a notice of Dr. Parr's posthumous tract and of Mr. Hallifax's second letter; that letter he most unjustifiably designates as "a fishing letter," and contents himself with again expressing what he calls his *probable* opinion, while he studiously withholds from us any further means of estimating the measure of its probability.

Under these circumstances, we must pronounce Dr. Parr's and Mr. Hallifax's victory complete, and must treat the statement in respect of the late Bishop of St. Asaph's change of religious belief as a wanton calumny. Let our readers judge for themselves, of Dr. Milner's conduct as a disputant, a logician and an ecclesiastic.

But we confound not the communion to which he belongs with individual members and ministers of it: we distinguish, too, between doctrines that we deem unscriptural and civil rights, that ought, in wisdom and in equity, to be without delay and without reserve extended. Cordially do we adopt the words of the late venerable author of the posthumous Letter, and avow ourselves (p. 35) unfeigned "well-wishers to the petitions which English and Irish Roman Catholics have presented to Parliament, in order to obtain relief from certain galling restraints and insulting exclusions."

N.

ART. III.—*A Treatise of Christian Doctrine, compiled from the Holy Scriptures alone.* By John Milton.

(Continued from p. 692.)

OUR object in resuming this work of Milton's is to lay before our readers his thoughts upon some other important subjects; not that we adopt all his opinions, but that, being *his*, they are worthy of being known.

Discarding the doctrine of the Trinity, Milton gave up of course the popular notion concerning the Holy Spirit. Like some of the elder Unitarians, he believed in the personality of the Spirit, and attributed to him an exalted nature. "— inasmuch as he is a minister of God, and therefore a

creature, was created or produced of the substance of God, not by a natural necessity, but by the free-will of the agent, probably before the foundations of the world were laid, but later than the Son, and far inferior to him." P. 171. He anticipates (p. 167) Dr. Samuel Clarke's interpretation of the Baptismal form, Matt. xxviii. 19: "Our eternal salvation is owing to the Father, our redemption to the Son, and our sanctification to the Spirit. The power of the Father is inherent in himself, that of the Son and Spirit is received from the Father," &c.

The work of creation, properly so called, is assigned by Milton to Christ. He had no prepossession for the scheme of Socinus. "— he by whom all things were made both in heaven and earth, even the angels themselves, he who in the beginning was the Word, and God with God, and although not supreme, yet the first-born of every creature, must necessarily have existed previous to his incarnation, *whatever subtilties may have been invented to evade this conclusion by those who contend for the merely human nature of Christ.*" Pp. 298, 299.

Milton held the doctrine of Atonement, nearly as it is now held by Calvinists. He thus defines the humiliation of the Redeemer: "The Humiliation of Christ is that State in which under his character of God-man he voluntarily submitted himself to the Divine Justice, as well in Life as in Death, for the purpose of undergoing all things requisite to accomplish our redemption." P. 316. He considers Christ to have been a proper sacrifice "both in his divine and human nature," and "slain in the whole of his nature." The following definition is orthodox enough on this point to satisfy a synod of "Westminster Divines:" "The satisfaction of Christ is the Complete Reparation made by him in his two-fold capacity of God and Man, by the fulfilment of the Law and payment of the required price for all mankind." P. 322. The heresy of general redemption appears in the last clause of the quotation; but with this doctrine, Milton united that of the special operations of the Holy Spirit on the minds of individuals, which he regarded as necessary to the

production of saving faith. See Chap. XVIII. and XX.

On the economy of redemption, Milton is of the same mind as the Remonstrants of Holland. He denies, as we have seen, absolute personal election and, of consequence, final perseverance.

He was a believer in the existence of a race of beings called angels, with a gradation of ranks, dignities and offices; and also in the apostacy of a part of them who since their revolt have been known as devils.

He held the bold doctrine of the homogeneity of man, and of the extinction of the whole man at death.

He received the fall of man in a literal sense, and though he scrupled the phrase "Original Sin," admitted the universal hereditary depravity of the human race.

His opinion on the liberty of divorce for other causes than adultery was well known in his life-time, when also he was suspected of inclining to the lawfulness of polygamy, which he defends in this posthumous Treatise.

A favourite point with Milton is the abolition under the Gospel of the whole Mosaic law: but the Antinomians cannot boast that if now alive he would be a member of the church (late W. Huntington's) in Gray's Inn Lane, for in the ethical part of the Treatise he asserts the merit of good works.

He abandons the Sabbath as a Christian institution, and pronounces the observation of the First Day of the week to be matter of expediency only, and not to be enforced by the civil power.

He rejects the baptism of infants, and maintains the immersion of adult believers: but he does not allot to baptism the first place in the scale of Christian duties (see p. 463); on the contrary, he seems to justify its disuse in certain cases (see pp. 439 and 444), and as far as we know his religious history, his own example was conformable not to the rule but to the exception of baptism.

His view of the Lord's Supper will be generally esteemed a low one: he regarded the ordinance as a rite of memorial and hospitality, and, glancing at the orthodox churches of his day, writes with indignation of the

“ numberless absurd speculations which have well nigh converted the Supper of the Lord into a banquet of cannibals.” P. 442.

He describes marriage as a purely civil compact, requiring neither priest nor altar.

In church-government he agrees with the Independents; holding that religion is to be protected by the civil magistrate, not forced upon the people, that bishops and elders are the same character in the New Testament, that the right of election to all offices is in the people, and that any believer endowed with the necessary gifts is competent to act as a minister.

Finally, the Milton Creed embraces the resurrection of the same body, the Millenium or Thousand Years' personal reign of Christ upon the earth, the locality of hell and the eternity of punishment.

The form of the Treatise is too scholastic to allow it to be popular, even if the singularity of some of its doctrines would not turn away the people from it. There is a profusion of Scripture, but the succession of a number of texts without comment is tedious. Throughout the whole work Milton appears the grave and even severe divine: he does not once as-

sume the politician, nor, unless the description of the angelic hierarchies be an exception, betray the poet. The Treatise is a curiosity that posterity will value: it will be a lasting memorial of the independence and integrity of the author's mind, and its influence will, we calculate, be seen in taking off the edge of the *odium ecclesiasticum* from what is called *heresy*.

Mr. Sumner, the Translator, is entitled to high praise. His version is perspicuous and easy, and his notes are chiefly illustrations, and those taken from Milton's acknowledged works. A few, indeed, are of a different description, and are open to criticism. We smile when we find the Prebendary of Canterbury making the apology for Milton's Antitrinitarianism, that he lived before Waterland. But, upon the whole, we admire his forbearance as a Churchman, and heartily thank him for so faithful a fulfilment of the liberal wish of the King, so truly honourable to His Majesty, that this undoubted relic of the great Milton's should be given pure and entire to the world, and also placed by means of a translation in the hands of the British Public.

## OBITUARY.

1825, July 9, SAMUEL BROADLEY, Esq., of *The Lodge, Bradford, Yorkshire*, for many years President of the Northern Education Society, a Dissenting Academical Institution for Students for the Ministry. The liberality and generosity of Mr. Broadley are testified by the following noble legacies:

To the Northern Education Society; six young men to be supported by the proceeds . . . . .	£5000
To Superannuated Ministers and their Widows, the proceeds to be devoted to their relief under the direction of the President and Committee of the above-named Society . . . . .	5000
To the Yorkshire Itinerant Society . . . . .	2000
To the Baptist Mission . . . . .	1000
To the Baptist Irish Society . . . . .	1000
To the first Baptist Church at Bradford; proceeds to be ap-	

plied for the relief of poor members . . . . .	1000
To Sion Chapel, ditto, for the same purpose . . . . .	500

Oct. 25, in his 77th year, after a few days' illness at *Brighton*, whither he had gone to attend a religious meeting, the Rev. DAVID BOGUE, D. D., of *Gosport*. He had been about 50 years pastor of a church of Protestant Dissenters at *Gosport*, was one of the first promoters of the London Missionary Society and was Tutor of the Missionary Seminary. He was highly respected in his denomination, as the list of Funeral Sermons for him will sufficiently testify. He published several theological works and many single sermons.

Nov. 21, at *Tooting*, in the 77th year of his age, Mr. WILLIAM BICKNELL.

[Biographical particulars of this excellent man will be given in the next Number.]

Dec. 3, at *Bridport*, aged 51, CHARLOTTE GUNDRY, eldest daughter of the late Joseph Gundry, Esq., Banker, in that place. It would afford a pensive pleasure to review in detail the life of one so estimable, to trace minutely that course, which like the dawning light, shone more and more unto the perfect day. But a brief and very imperfect sketch must suffice. Miss Gundry enjoyed in early life the advantage of judicious maternal instruction and care, and was in early life deprived of this advantage. Educated among Unitarian Dissenters, she happily imbibed along with the opinions which characterize our body, a deep sense of religious obligation, a spirit of fervent, well-regulated piety, and a fixed habit of religious self-controul. The circumstances in which she was placed on attaining to maturity, led her to a free investigation of the most interesting and important topics connected with the Christian faith, and in this way her understanding gained strength by exercise, whilst the system which she had been taught by others, obtained the sanction of her deliberate judgment. Nor did her subsequent life afford any countenance to the notion that speculative inquiries are necessarily injurious to the best and loftiest affections of the heart. Let the friend who had the privilege of claiming that title during the last and best half of her days be heard in testimony of what she was under *the domestic roof*: "I have been intimate with Miss Gundry," says that friend in a letter written since her death, "for more than a quarter of a century, and about one-fifth of that time she has passed under my roof, either in attending the sick bed of her earliest friend during many periods of great anxiety, or in administering to the comforts of the family by a mild but uniform flow of spirits, and the most rational and useful conversation. Though she disliked levity, she was always cheerful, and occasionally playful. Her temper was of uncommon sweetness, and I do not recollect for one moment to have seen it ruffled. In all her actions she was guided by a principle of duty, and she has frequently said to me, she hoped she should never live a single day longer than she could be useful." As to her *religious profession* and *social virtues* there is little need to appeal to individual testimony. The members of a numerous Christian society who witnessed week after week

her deportment in the house of prayer and her zeal in promoting its best interests in every possible way, and especially in the instruction of the young—the inhabitants of this town who could not but notice and admire her persevering activity in every appropriate work of benevolence, the poor, the sick, the aged, those whom she sought out in their abodes of want and suffering, and to whom she delighted in administering instruction, sympathy and relief,—all these are ready to rise up and call her blessed. The pure satisfaction arising from the performance of these labours of piety and love, was for years the principal enjoyment which supported our friend under a deeply-rooted malady productive of frequent and intense suffering. It was the will of Heaven that this course of agonizing trial and extraordinary usefulness should at length terminate. The strength of the frame was gradually worn down by the ravages of disease, and it was appointed that the principles which had impelled to duty, should exhibit their power to support and to cheer on the couch of debility and in the chamber of death. To the very last there was extreme bodily suffering, but there were "blessed consolations in distress." Besides "the memory sweet of mercies done," the affectionate attentions of near relatives, and the invaluable society of that *earliest friend* whom a merciful Providence permitted to assume her own station in the solemn hour which severs earthly ties, there was the realized presence of a heavenly Parent and the humble hope of eternal life, founded on a sure trust in his unpurchased mercy as manifested to the penitent and faithful by his well-beloved Son. Seldom is it the privilege of surviving friends to contemplate a character of so much excellence. Seldom do we behold, as in this instance, in united operation, vigorous understanding with deep sensibility and feminine grace, ardent private affection with comprehensive active benevolence, zeal for a peculiar religious system with complete liberality towards the supporters of opposing systems, a generous readiness to enter into the schemes of the benevolent with a judicious appreciation of their merits and their means, the habit of exercising reason with the culture of devout affection in all its modifications of gratitude, humility, resignation and hope. Those who know what it is to have possessed and to have lost such a friend will not require in this place a minute scrutiny as to the shades which the censorious may detect in the brightest excellence. Human virtue is progressive, and those who are progres-

sive must look back on imperfection, and will readily acknowledge that they have not yet attained, nor are as yet perfect. This our much-lamented friend well knew and deeply felt. Indeed those who witnessed the spotless character of her life, would have heard with surprise her unaffected acknowledgment of deficiencies and her modest renunciation of reliance on her own meritorious deeds. In outward conduct malignity itself could find no ground for accusation. For years past, at least, *her warfare was within*. She shared in the conflict with him who, perfect as he was, *was tempted in all points like as we are*, and, supported by his spirit, she, like him, obtained victory here, and is gone to share in his eternal joy. It is possible that those who knew not Miss Gundry, if they read these lines, may suspect that this is an exag-

gerated statement of Christian excellence. It is more than probable that those who did know her will find in this outline a very inadequate representation of what she was. The writer cannot suppose that he has done justice to their estimate, for he has been little able to express his own. The recollection of past intercourse with one so excellent is invaluable, the hope of a renewal of intercourse in a better world is most soothing and consolatory to the sorrowing friend.

G. B. W.

*Bridport, Dec. 19th, 1825.*

Dec. 23, at his house in *Mecklenburg Square*, after a long and painful illness, aged 65, Mr. SAMUEL PARKES, author of the "Chemical Catechism," &c.

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

---

### DOMESTIC. RELIGIOUS.

#### *Re-opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Newport, Isle of Wight.*

THE Unitarian Chapel at *Newport*, in the *Isle of Wight*, having been closed for several weeks for the purpose of being repaired and enlarged, was re-opened for divine worship on Wednesday, Oct. 12th. The religious service in the morning was introduced by the Rev. J. B. Bristowe, of Ringwood. The Rev. Russell Scott, of Portsmouth, dedicated this temple anew in a most solemn and devotional prayer to the worship and service of the one true and living God. An excellent sermon was delivered by the Rev. Michael Maurice, of Southampton, on the duty and advantages of social worship, by whom were also conducted the devotional services of the evening. The Rev. Russell Scott afterwards preached from the words of our Saviour, "Ye worship ye know not what, but we know what we worship," and gave a rapid but comprehensive sketch of the corruptions of the pure doctrines of Christ and his apostles by their admixture with the Platonic notions so prevalent in the first ages of the Christian Church. The preacher pointed out the gradual methods by which the mysterious visions and sublime theories of the Heathen Philosophers were engrafted on the simple truths of the gospel, thus shewing the source from whence have sprung the popular corruptions of Christianity. An interesting

comparison was drawn in the conclusion of the discourse between the Christianity of the New Testament and the opinions which pass under that title in the present day. The candid, argumentative and dignified style of the preacher made a strong impression on the hearers. The congregation present at the religious service in the morning was numerous. In the evening the chapel was crowded. In the afternoon the members of the congregation and the different ministers of other churches who were with them, met together at a friendly tea party at the Assembly Room in the town. This meeting was exceedingly gratifying.

A considerable enlargement has been effected in the Chapel at Newport: by lengthening the building, a great addition has been made to the sittings in the body and gallery—a new stair-case, school-rooms for boys and girls and library have been added; the whole on the plan and under the superintendence of Mr. William Mortimer, of Newport, a member of the congregation. The alterations have been rendered absolutely necessary by a great increase having lately taken place in the number of the attendants at the chapel. The new sittings are now all nearly or quite occupied.

A. C.

*Memory of Dr. Priestley.*—At the Low Bailiff's dinner lately given at Birmingham, a remarkable degree of liberality was shewn by the clergy and gen-

men of different religious denominations. The health of the Dissenting ministers of the town was proposed by a clergyman of the Established Church; a Dissenting minister proposed the health of the Catholic priest; and the latter adopted all the liberal sentiments that had been previously suggested. But the most extraordinary occurrence of the day was the generous retraction by Mr. Burn, an aged clergyman, of the hard things which he had written against Dr. Priestley thirty-five years ago: this disavowal of unkindness towards the illustrious dead is so honourable to the living speaker that we feel it to be a duty as well as a pleasure to put it upon record.—“In the school of Christianity,” said Mr. Burn, “they were taught that the man who was acting in accordance with the spirit of the gospel, was deserving the friendship of his Christian brethren, however different their sentiments might be. That church to which he belonged inculcated feelings of charity to all mankind, and though there might be things in which they differed, they had no prerogative to assume the right of directing the consciences of others.

“He could only say, that whatever might have been the defects of his own conduct in the early periods of his life, he now felt himself better established in the principles of his religion than at any former period; yet had he to live his past life over again, he should have to correct the asperity of feelings and expressions which it was his misfortune to use in his controversies with a late respectable and highly talented individual (Dr. Priestley).

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

##### *Receipts of Religious Charities in 1824,5.*

###### *Bible Societies.*

British and Foreign . . . . .	£93,285	5	0
Naval and Military . . . . .	2,615	2	0
Merchant Seamen's . . . . .	911	4	7

###### *Missionary Societies.*

Church . . . . .	45,383	19	10
London . . . . .	40,719	1	6
Wesleyan . . . . .	38,046	9	7
Baptist . . . . .	15,995	11	2
London Moravian Association . . . . .	3,568	17	3
Scottish . . . . .	8,257	4	3
Home . . . . .	5,092	15	10

###### *School Societies.*

British and Foreign . . . . .	2,114	19	3
Sunday-School Union . . . . .	4,253	12	2
Newfoundland . . . . .	701	0	6

###### *Societies of a mixed nature.*

Christian Knowledge . . . . .	62,387	3	4
-------------------------------	--------	---	---

Propagating the Gospel . . . . .	32,016	14	5
Jews . . . . .	13,715	2	1
London Hibernian . . . . .	8,143	3	11
Continental . . . . .	2,133	15	10

###### *Book Societies.*

Prayer-Book and Homily . . . . .	1,781	12	10
Church Tract Society . . . . .	737	19	9
Religious Tract . . . . .	12,568	17	0

###### *In Ireland.*

Hibernian Bible Society . . . . .	6,728	10	4
Sunday-School Society . . . . .	2,653	7	2
Tract and Book Society . . . . .	3,647	6	3
Irish Society . . . . .	1,060	3	8

#### *Apocryphal Question.*

It will be seen by the following resolution, adopted on Monday, the 28th ult., by the General Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, to whom a Special Committee appointed for considering the question of circulating the Apocrypha with the Bible had made a report expressive of strong disapprobation of such circulation, that the Apocrypha is to be henceforward absolutely excluded from all the Society's Bibles:

“That the funds of the Society be applied to the printing and circulation of the canonical books of Scripture, to the exclusion of those books and parts of books which are usually termed Apocryphal, and that all copies printed either entirely or in part at the expense of the Society, and whether such copies consist of the whole, or of any one or more of such books, be invariably issued bound, no other books whatever being bound with them; and further, that all money-grants to societies or individuals be made only in conformity with the principle of this regulation.”

What effect this resolution will have upon the harmony of this extensive Society remains to be seen. In some minds it may possibly give birth to other questions which the most zealous Biblists would be slow to entertain; as for example, whether it be consistent with reverence of the sacred volume, with a love of truth or with honesty, to continue in the New Testament the Three Witnesses' Text, 1 John v. 7, which we believe nine scholars out of ten regard as decidedly spurious.

*The Catholic Question.*—A deputation from the Roman Catholics of Clonmel lately waited on the Earl of Donoughmore (late Lord Hutchinson) to present an address of condolence upon the decease of his brother, the late Earl, who had for nearly half a century been the steady and consistent advocate of their claim of eligibility to civil rights. The

answer of the present Earl to this address conveys very wholesome and necessary advice to the Irish Catholics, for the future management of their cause. It comes, too, from a nobleman who mixes little in the politics of the hour, and whose advice must be considered as disinterested as it is sagacious. The Earl of Donoughmore, in that part of his answer to which we allude, says, "Your call for the repeal of the restrictions which still affect you, may be loud, unanimous and unceasing; but allow me to express a hope that it will be made with that moderation which becomes the justice of your cause, which will deprive misrepresentation of its most formidable weapons, and reconcile many just and upright men to you, who, from the effects of early habit and education, now look upon all your proceedings with jealousy and suspicion. Convince such men that they have nothing to apprehend, and that their fears are imaginary—the contest is over—the battle is won—your triumph is certain. You have been destined to live in most enlightened times, when it is impossible for any alliance, holy or unholy, to prevent the spread of knowledge, and the amelioration of the condition of man, or to prevent the progress of human affairs towards rational liberty, civil, political and religious. It is your good fortune to be united, I trust with indissoluble ties, with a great, a just, and a reasoning people, amongst whom liberal principles of every kind continue hourly and daily to gain strength. Convince their reason, cultivate their good opinion and affections, and you will not have long to complain that you are not placed on the footing of other subjects. In my opinion your cause is in your own keeping—nobody can ultimately defeat it but yourselves."

*Long arm of a Scotch Presbytery.*—Another instance of Scottish Ecclesiastical interference in England has come before the public. Mr. THOM was licensed and ordained by the Presbytery of Glasgow to a Scotch Church in Rodney Street, Liverpool. Complaints have been lately lodged against him for preaching false doctrine, that is, as far as we understand the complaints, high Calvinism. The Presbytery having examined the matter, have declared the charges found, and have accordingly deprived Mr. Thom of his ministry in the above church: they tell him, however, for his comfort, that their finding does not affect his character as a man, nor hinder him from being a minister of the Church of Scotland. In other words, he has only to repent of preaching what he believes to be the true

doctrine of the Church of Scotland, to which he and the Presbytery are equally bound, and to preach what he considers to be error, and then he may be reinstated. This priestly meddling with opinions is ridiculous; but Mr. Thom has no reason to complain, for as a member of the Church of Scotland he is supposed to hold such meddling to be right. Our opinions are probably nearer to those of the Presbytery than to those preached by the deprived minister; we cannot, however, help pitying his case, and hoping that in the next religious connexion he may form, he will not give his assent to a system of rule under which a preacher may be punished for his Christian integrity. The moral of the story is, that Church Establishments are radically evil: it is still a hopeful sign of the times that Church Power cannot now be exercised to the hurt of an individual without exciting public indignation and leading many to scrutinize the grounds of ecclesiastical claims and to flee spiritual tyranny and to embrace the principle of universal and equal religious liberty.—We had written thus far when we read in the newspapers that the friends of Mr. Thom have had a meeting and resolved to erect a chapel for him. In this way, the intolerance of Established Churches multiplies Dissenters; a good effect, we should say, from an evil cause.

### *Lord Byron's Monument.*

AN elegant Grecian Tablet of white marble has lately been placed in the Chancel of Hucknall Church, Nottinghamshire. We subjoin a copy of the inscription:—

In the vault beneath,  
Where many of the Ancestors of his  
Mother are buried,  
Lie the remains of  
George Gordon Noel Byron, Lord Byron,  
Of Rochdale, in the county of Lancaster,  
The author of "Childe Harold's Pilgrimage."  
He was born in London, on the 22d  
January, 1788;  
He died at Missolonghi, in Western  
Greece,  
On the 19th April, 1824,  
Engaged in the glorious attempt to re-  
store that country to her ancient  
freedom and renown.

His Sister,  
The Honourable Augusta Maria Leigh,  
Placed this tablet to his memory.

*A List of Joint-Stock Companies, the Proposals for which are now, or have been lately, before the Public.*

Amount of ascertained Capital, from p. 637, £274,507,240			
60	Monkland and Merkentilloch Rail Road	32,000	
71	Manchester Ship Canal, 1,000,000, read 1,500,000	500,000	
274	Atlantic Steam Navigation Company	600,000	
591	Norwich New Corn Exchange	7,000	
666	Monmouth Cap to Hereford, Rail Road	25,000	
676	New Passage Ferry, 21,000, read 30,000	9,000	
685	Egis Fire and Dilapidation and English and Cambrian Life Insurance Company	1,000,000	
687	Aberdeen Fire and Life Assurance Company, 500,000, read 750,000	250,000	
705	Lambeth Bridge from the Church to the Horse Ferry	200,000	
708	Fire Proof Paint Association	50,000	
714	Society for Building Lincoln's-Inn Place, 100,000, read 210,000	110,000	
			<b>277,292,240</b>
			<i>Solicitors, Bankers or other Persons appointed to receive Applications for Shares.</i>
717	United Foreign Stock and Share Company	.. Burrell ..	100,000
718	Equitable Building Society	.. Ashley ..	
719	Nottingham Water Works Company	.. Perry ..	
720	Preston and Fishwick's ditto ditto	.. ..	
721	St. James' Foreign Wine ditto	.. Mover ..	100,000
722	National Genuine Porter ditto	.. Secretary at Mr. Goodair's	1,000,000
723	London Tallow and Melting ditto	.. Bousfield ..	200,000
724	Forth and Deep Fishing ditto	.. Trotter ..	250,000
725	Connaught Joint Stock Banking ditto	.. ..	
726	New Edinburgh Bank	.. ..	1,000,000
727	Joint Stock Company for Building a Market-place at Belfast	.. ..	
728	Patent Mosaic Gold Works Association	.. Lyon ..	200,000
729	British Commercial Trading Company, Liverpool to Mexico and Peru	.. Piercey ..	175,000
730	National Company for the Colonization of Columbia, 400,000 Dollars	.. Arthur ..	90,000
731	Company for making an Embankment at, and building a Bridge over Sutton Wash	.. ..	
732	Alford Canal and Anderby Harbour (Lincolnshire)	.. Wilson ..	40,000
733	Canal, Goole to Leeds and Wakefield	.. ..	
734	Ditto, Cork to Brandon	.. ..	28,000
735	Ditto, Glastonbury to Highbridge	.. ..	10,000
736	Ditto, Lough Foyle at Londonderry to Lough Erne at Ballansidy	.. ..	
737	Rail Road, Dundee to the Valley of Strathmore	.. ..	
738	Ditto Aberdulais to Cwm Dylais (Glamorgan)	.. Bicknell ..	
739	Ditto Bedley on the Monkland and Merkentilloch Rail Way to Glasgow	.. ..	
740	Ditto from the Land of Kippy, on the Monkland and Merkentilloch, to Ballockney, Arbuckle and Arden	.. ..	
741	Ditto Johnstone to Androssan, County of Ayr.	.. Campbell ..	110,000
742	Ditto from the Mouth of the River Lea to the Tunnel on the Regent's Canal	.. Brown ..	
743	Ditto Selby to York and Newcastle, with a Branch to Sunderland	.. ..	
744	Ditto Manchester to Audley	.. ..	
			<b>£280,595,240</b>

- 745 Rail Road, Manchester to Oldham  
 746 Ditto from Bolton, to join the Manchester and Liverpool at Eccles.  
 747 Ditto Extension of the Bolton and Leigh to join the Manchester and Liverpool at Kenyon, near Winwick  
 748 Ditto Limerick to Carrick (County of Tipperary)

*Floating Churches.*—The zeal of the Methodists and the Calvinistic Dissenters forces the *Church of England* to do strange things. The *Floating Chapels* were at first laughed at; they have however answered; and to prevent the seamen from being sectarianized, it is found necessary to have *Floating Churches*. His Majesty's Government has agreed to give ships and fit them out for such parts as may require them on the Episcopalian plan, and, where it is necessary, to appoint and pay a clergyman. The two Archbishops and some of the principal Bishops are said to have come into the plan; and the Archbishop of Dublin has licensed a clergyman for a *Church Ship* and consecrated the said ship. It may be added amongst the other *ship-news*, that the "Continental Society" entertain maritime projects, and propose to have a *Missionary Ship* or ships to carry *Evangelical* preachers from country to country and from harbour to harbour.

THE REV. JAMES GRAY, M. A., has been unanimously chosen by the *United Associate Congregation at Albion Chapel, Moorfields*, to be their minister, that place being vacant by the retirement of the Rev. *Alexander Fletcher*.

#### LITERARY.

THE Board of the University of Dublin have determined on collecting and publishing, under the superintendence of the Provost, a uniform edition of the Works of Archbishop USHER, many of whose MSS. are in their library. A new Life will be prepared.

THE *Seatonian Prize* for the present year has been adjudged to the Rev. J. OVERTON, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, for his Poem on "The Building and Dedication of the Second Temple."

MR. HYMAN HURWITZ, author of *Vindiciæ Hebraicæ, &c.*, has just published a volume of Moral Hebrew Tales, translated from ancient Hebrew works; to which is prefixed a popular Essay on the still existing Remains of the uninspired Writings of the ancient Hebrew Sages.

A MANUSCRIPT of the great HOOKER'S, the author of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, has been discovered in Trinity College Library, Dublin.

#### FOREIGN.

##### FRANCE.

FRANCE has just lost by death her first parliamentary orator and one of the most undaunted of her patriots, General FOY. The event has produced a great sensation in France. The funeral was a public procession of thousands of the friends of freedom, chiefly young men. The General died poor, leaving several children unprovided for; and a public subscription has been set on foot for raising a monument to his memory and for portioning his children, which amounted by the last advices to not less than 25,000*l.* This fact proves that there is a stronger feeling in favour of freedom in France than we have been accustomed for the last few years to give our neighbours credit for. And besides this, there have been two decisions lately of the Judges, in favour of persons prosecuted by the Government for libels—so that the French may still boast in some measure of the liberty of the press. In proof of their having this great blessing we may observe that the *Revue Encyclopédique*, the principal magazine and review of Paris, has been recently very bold in its political and religious strictures. Its writers are we know some of the ablest, and if they pursue their present course they will shew themselves some of the best, men in France.

##### ITALY.

THE Pope has established a Philological College for the encouragement of literature in general. Its members are some of the most distinguished literati of Italy, viz. Prince Augustine Chigi, the Abbé Mai, the Chevalier J. G. de Rossi, the Abbé Santucci, the Baron Gilus van de Vivere, the Avocat Guadagni, &c. This establishment is to rank with the other colleges of Rome and Bologna.

Monsignore ANGELO MAYO, (says a letter from Rome,) already celebrated for his discoveries in the "Palimpsestes,"

has just discovered more important treasures than all those already found by him. Very voluminous fragments of the best books of Polybius and Diodorus have been found among more recent manuscripts of ecclesiastical works. They mention an entire book of Diodorus, containing precious details of the Phœnicians. M. Mayo has also discovered numerous fragments of Menander.

---

RUSSIA.

THE recent death of the Emperor ALEXANDER has given rise to much political speculation. There can be no doubt that the event will alter the aspect, in no inconsiderable degree, of all Europe. As the head of the Holy Alliance, the late Autocrat will not be regretted by the people of the several European nations; but we believe he was at least a politic if not a beneficent ruler of his own subjects. Under him, for the last twenty-five years, Russia has been making advances in civilization, science and the arts, and of course in power. Lately, he seemed to think that he had pushed liberal institutions too far, and withdrew his patronage from Schools for all, and positively discountenanced the Bible Society. His brother CONSTANTINE succeeds him. The name of the new Emperor, given him by Catherine, of odious memory, is ominous for Turkey. He is, we understand, no great favourite in Russia, although he affects great zeal for religion. This change in the Empire will, it is thought and hoped, prove favourable to the Greeks, in their long and lately almost hopeless contest with the Barbarians. A short time will confirm their hopes, or dash them to the ground apparently for ever.

---

AMERICA.

*Bunker Hill Celebration.*

ON the 17th of June last, the Half Century Celebration of the Battle of Bunker Hill, near Boston, was observed with great eclat. The number of people present is estimated in one newspaper at One Hundred and Fifty Thousand. In the procession were General (so he was called, rather than Marquis, on his late visit to the United States) La Fayette, who was accompanied by General Lallemand; and the veteran survivors who fought at Bunker Hill, about forty in number. The oldest among them is Col. Clarke, of Lebanon, a veteran of 95, who commanded a company in the hottest of the battle. He was quite infirm and was attended to Boston by Mr. Wottles, a

descendant of John Alden who first landed on Plymouth rock. The object of the day was to lay the foundation of a monument to celebrate the Battle. This was done with Masonic ceremonies, nearly 2000 masons being in the procession. The performances on the ground consisted of a prayer offered by the Rev. Mr. Thaxter, who was Chaplain of Prescott's regiment, and the first Chaplain of the Revolutionary Army. The voice and manner of the Reverend speaker, who is 85 years of age, combined with a glow of patriotic feeling in the composition of the prayer, rendered it a highly interesting performance. He was heard distinctly by nearly the whole assembly on the ground, which must have consisted of 20,000 persons.

The following Hymn was then sung by a select choir:

*Hymn.*

BY THE REV. JOHN PIERPONT.

Tune—"Old Hundred."

- 1 O, is not this a holy spot!  
'Tis the high place of Freedom's birth:—  
God of our fathers! is it not  
The holiest spot of all the earth?
- 2 Quenched is thy flame on Horeb's side:  
The robber roams o'er Sinai now;  
And those old men, thy seers, abide  
No more on Zion's mournful brow.
- 3 But on *this* hill thou, Lord, hast dwelt,  
Since round its head the war-cloud curled,  
And wrapped our fathers, where they knelt  
In prayer and battle for a world.
- 4 Here sleeps their dust: 'tis holy ground:  
And we, the children of the brave,  
From the four winds are gathered round,  
To lay our offering on their grave.
5. Free as the winds around us blow,  
Free as yon waves below us spread,  
We rear a pile, that long shall throw  
Its shadow on their sacred bed.
6. But on their deeds no shade shall fall,  
While o'er their couch thy sun shall flame:  
Thine ear was bowed to hear their call,  
And thy right hand shall guard their fame.

The Address, by Mr. Webster, came next; his whole person was exposed to the view of the assembled multitude, and the higher swells of his voice must have extended to the remotest parts of the

height. It was a production worthy of his reputation as a patriot and politician. It was full of manly thought, patriotic sentiments, beauty and force of illustration, and political wisdom. Parts of it were declamatory, and others pathetic in the highest degree. His apostrophe to *Warren*, to the manes of those who were buried in the sepulchre over which he spoke—his affecting addresses to the survivors of the battle—and to the officers of the revolutionary army, partook of this character of eloquence—and especially the distinct and forcible picture which he drew of the disinterested services and chivalric character of *La Fayette*, deeply affected every person present. In dwelling upon the future prospects of the country his views were statesman-like and profound; and in his description of the dark scenes of difficulty in which the country was involved in 1775, and of which the battle of Bunker Hill was the most prominent, contrasted with the animating circumstances of the present times, we admired the facility of his language and the clearness of his ideas.

After the oration was concluded, another hymn was sung, and a concluding prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Walker, of Charlestown.

*Hymn.*

BY REV. JAMES FLINT.

Tune—"St. Martin's."

1. O glorious day! that saw th' array  
Of freemen in their might,  
When here they stood, unused to  
blood,  
Yet dared th' unequal fight.
2. The sons are met to own the debt  
Due to their fathers' fame;  
And here they place the column's base  
To bear their deathless name.
3. 'Tis not that here the victor's cheer  
Rung o'er the falling foe,—  
That earth here drank of many rank  
Th' life-blood's gushing flow:
4. The pledge here given to earth and  
heaven,  
Freemen to live or die—  
This gives their fame its sacred claim  
To immortality.
5. To God, who willed a state to build,  
Based on the rights of man,  
Glory we give, who this day live  
To hail the accomplished plan.

The subscribers to the dinner and the invited guests were then escorted by the

military under General Lyman, to the dinner on the high part of Bunker Hill. A tent had been erected 400 feet long and 100 feet in width—under which twelve tables were laid lengthwise, with plates for 3000 persons. A platform, in the centre, elevated the tables intended for General La Fayette, the distinguished guests, and the revolutionary officers, and the survivors of the battle. The first toast was,—*The 17th June, 1775*: The marble may moulder; but while a heart beats in an American's bosom, there will be a *tablet* from which the record of that day's glory shall never be effaced.

The regular toasts having been given, the President of the Association observed, that he rose to propose a toast in behalf of the Directors of the Association. Probably he was already anticipated in the name which he should mention. It was well known, that the distinguished personage near him, from the time when he first became acquainted with the object of the Association, had taken much interest in it, and had expressed an intention to be present at the ceremony of laying the Corner Stone. This purpose he had kindly remembered, through the long course of his visits to the several States. It was not at all necessary to say—indeed it could not be said—how much his presence had added to the interest and pleasure of the occasion. He should proceed at once to the grateful duty which the Directors had enjoined on him, and propose to the company,

"Health and long life to General LA FAYETTE."

On which General La Fayette rose, and thus expressed himself:

Gentlemen,—I will not longer trespass on your time than to thank you in the name of my revolutionary companions in arms and myself for the testimonies of esteem and affection, I may say of filial affection, which have been bestowed upon us on the memorable celebration of this anniversary day; and to offer our fervent prayers for the preservation of that Republican freedom, equality and self-government, that blessed union between the States of the confederacy, for which we have fought and bled, and on which rest the hopes of mankind. Permit me to propose the following sentiment—

Bunker Hill, and the holy resistance to oppression which has already enfranchised the American hemisphere,—the next half century Jubilee's toast shall be—to the whole of enfranchised Europe.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

A Legacy for Young Ladies, consisting of Miscellaneous Pieces in Prose and Verse. By the late Mrs. Barbauld. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Observations on the Causes and Evils of War; its Unlawfulness; and the Means and Certainty of its Extinction; in a Series of Letters addressed to a Friend. By Thomas Thrush, late Captain in the Royal Navy. Intended as an Apology for withdrawing himself from the Naval Service. Part I. 8vo.

A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke. By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher. With an Introduction by the Translator, containing an Account of the Controversy respecting the Origin of the Three First Gospels, since Bishop Marsh's Dissertation. 8vo. 13s.

The Life of Erasmus: with Historical Remarks on the State of Literature between the Tenth and Sixteenth Centuries. By Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Jewish, Oriental and Classical Antiquities, containing Illustrations of the Scriptures and Classical Records, from Oriental Sources. By D. G. Wait, D.D., Rector of Blagdon, Somersetshire. 8vo. 9s.

A History of the Christian Church, from its Erection at Jerusalem to the present Time; on the Plan of Milner's Church History: designed for Families and Schools. By John Fry, B. A., Rector of Desford, Leicestershire. 8vo. 12s.

A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's, on a Passage of the Second Symbolum Antiochenum of the 4th Century. By Thomas Burgess, D.D. (Bishop of Sarum.) 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A Literal Translation of the Book of Psalms, solely upon the Authority of Parkhurst. 8vo.

Remarks on the Legality and Expediency of Prosecutions for Religious Opinion. To which is annexed an Apology for the Vices of the Lower Orders. By Jonathan Duncan, Esq. 8vo. 8s.

The Principles of Political Economy: with a Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Science. By J. R. McCulloch, Esq. 8vo. 12s.

The Opinion of the Catholic Church for the first Three Centuries, on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God. Translated from the Latin of Bishop Bull. To which is prefixed a Memoir of his Life. By the Rev. T. Rankin. 8vo. 8s.

A Short Paraphrase upon the New Testament. By the late William Dodwell, M. A., Rector of Welby and Stoke, Lincolnshire. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Universal Historical Dictionary; or, Explanation of the Names of Persons and Places in the Departments of Biblical, Political and Ecclesiastical History, Mythology, Heraldry, &c. &c. By Geo. Crabb, A.M. (40 Plates containing 800 Portraits and an Immense Number of Cuts, from Coins, &c.) 2 Vols. 4to. 5l. 8s.

Analogiæ Latinæ; or, a Developement of those Analogies by which the Parts of Speech in Latin are derived from each other. By John Jones, LL.D. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Original Experiments and Practical Observations on Hydrophobia and Canine Madness. By R. White, Esq., Surgeon, Brighton. [N. B. Mr. White is the gentleman who, as a test of his principles, suffered himself, during the past summer, to be severely bitten by a mad dog, which afterwards died under undoubted symptoms of hydrophobia. His work is dedicated, by permission, to Lord Egremont; the King, the Dukes of York, Richmond, Norfolk, Bedford, &c., being also among its special patrons.]

The Annual Biography and Obituary for the Year 1826. 8vo. 15s.

A Voyage towards the South Pole, performed in the years 1822—24; containing an Examination of the Antarctic Sea, to the 74th degree of Latitude; and a Visit to Terra del Fuego, with a Particular Account of the Inhabitants, &c. By James Weddell, Esq., Master in the Royal Navy. 8vo. 16 Charts and Plates. 18s.

### *Apocrypha.*

Remarks on the Controversy respecting the Apocrypha, reprinted from the Eclectic Review of September 1.

Reasons for not circulating the Apocrypha in Churches which regard it as inspired; an Inquiry into the Propriety of occasionally reading Portions of the Apocrypha in the Week-Day Services of the Church of England; and an Examination of the Purity of the English Canon of Holy Scripture, suggested by "Remarks," reprinted from the Eclectic Review. By Francis Russell Hall, B. D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Review of the Conduct of the Directors of the Bible Society relative to the Apocrypha and to their Administration on the Continent; with an Answer to the

Rev. Charles Simeon, and Observations on the Cambridge Remarks. By Robert Haldane, Esq. 2s. 6d.

A Plea for the Protestant Canon of Scripture, in opposition to the Popish Canon, of which the Apocrypha makes an Integral Part. Or, a Succinct Account of the Bible Society Controversy, respecting the Circulation of the Apocryphal Writings, &c. (Portrait of William Tyndal.) 4s.

*Sermons.*

Two, preached in the Chapel in Lewin's Mead, Bristol, on the Morning and Evening of Sunday, Oct. 16, 1825: I. On the Future State of the Righteous, occasioned by the lamented Death of Mrs. Mary Rowe, the Wife of the Rev. John Rowe, one of the Ministers of the Lewin's Mead Chapel. II. On Numbering our Days, suggested by a recent unusual Mortality in the Congregation. By Robert Aspland. 8vo. 2s.

On various Subjects. By Philip Doddridge, D. D., now first published. 4 vols. 8vo. 17. 16s.

Occasional. By Robert Moorehead, A. M., Junior Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, York Place, Edinburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Twelve, illustrative of the Leading Doctrines of the Gospel, in Connexion with Christian Temper and Experience. By George Hodson, M. A., Minister of Christ Church, Birmingham, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. 8vo. 7s.

Man Responsible for his Belief: Two Sermons, occasioned by a Passage in the Inaugural Discourse of Henry Brougham, Esq., M. P., on his Installation as Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, April 6, 1825. By Ralph Wardlaw, D. D. 24mo. 2s.

*Single.*

The Causes of the Slow Progress of

Christian Truth: delivered at the Congregational Meeting-house, Trowbridge, Wilts, on Wednesday, July 13, before the Western Unitarian Society. By Robert Aspland. 12mo. 1s.

The Service at the Settlement of the Rev. Edward Tagart, as Minister of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, August 10, 1825. 8vo. 2s.

Occasioned by the Death of the Rev. John Ryland, D. D. Preached at Bristol, June 6, 1825. By Robert Hall, M. A., of Leicester. 2s.

The Necessity of Philosophy to the Divine: preached at Bridgwater, at the Primary Visitation of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, August 31, 1825. By John Matthew, M. A., Rector of Kilve and Stringston, Somersetshire. 8vo.

Review of Nonconformity; delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. J. Kennedy, of Bury, Lancashire. By John Ely, Minister of Providence Chapel, Rochdale. 1s. 6d.

A Charge to the Clergy of Chester at the Primary Visitation, in August and September, 1825. By Charles James Blomfield, D. D., Bishop. 2s.

*Funeral Sermons for Dr. Bogue.* (See p. 750.)

The Faithful Christian Minister finishing his Course with Joy: preached at Gosport, Nov. 2, 1825. By Robert Winter. D. D. 2s.

At Portsea. By John Griffin.

The Death of Eminent Ministers, a Public Loss: preached in Carr's Lane Meeting, Nov. 25. By T. A. James, Birmingham. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

At Brighton. By J. N. Goulty. 1s. 6d.

Before the London Missionary Society, at the Poultry Chapel. By J. Bennett.

At Holland Chapel, Kennington. By J. Styles, D. D.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Rev. T. Belsham; Mr. W. Matthews; Clericus Cantabrigiensis; Spectator; A York Student; A Constant Reader; Clara; Not almost but altogether a Protestant; A Constant Reader (Royston); and C.

Several of the above signatures are affixed to communications on the subject of *Ordination Services*, which we are not able to bring into the present Number; and we deem it inexpedient to carry the subject into the ensuing Volume.

Another packet is arrived from our American Correspondent.

An "Original Subscriber's" letter is put into the hands of the gentleman whom it principally concerns.

The Editor has received for the Chapel at Sheerness, from

H. E. Howse, Jun., Esq., Bath	:	£1	0	0
A Friend to Zealous Exertions (by H. E. Howse, Jun., Esq.)	:	5	0	0

The Publishers have a set of the MONTHLY REPOSITORY complete in Twenty Volumes. Such of the former Volumes and Numbers as are not out of print, may also be obtained, on application to them, personally, or through the Booksellers in town or country.