

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. XIV.

FEBRUARY, 1828.

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH MARRIAGE LAW.*

IN tracing the history of the Marriage Law in this country, it is difficult to assign the exact period at which the institution of marriage was first considered to be a matter of ecclesiastical cognizance. There seems, however, to be very little doubt that from the earliest times the church endeavoured to draw to itself the solemnization of this contract, and accordingly, by the decrees of various councils, the performance of the ceremony was prohibited unless *in facie ecclesiæ*.† Whether the effect of these ordinances was to render marriages solemnized in contravention of them invalid, for temporal purposes, or merely to subject the parties to spiritual censures, is a question of great obscurity; but it certainly appears that, from the earliest periods of our history, it was the practice to solemnize the marriage in *facie ecclesiæ*, or to receive the nuptial benediction from the lips of the priest. As marriages celebrated without any religious solemnity were clearly *irregular*, and subjected the parties to the animadversion of the spiritual courts, which in those days exercised a most formidable jurisdiction, it is not surprising that a due regard was paid to the observance of the prescribed forms; and it by no means follows, as a necessary consequence from thence, that such an observance was essential to establish the *temporal* rights of the parties. In all probability, however, some confusion existed as to these distinctions, and in the apprehension of the people an *irregular* marriage might be considered an *invalid* one. Thus, in the Consideration, Election and Petition of Parliament, addressed to Richard III., it is said, that the marriage of Edward IV. and Elizabeth Grey “was made privily and secretly, without edition of banns, in a private chamber, a profane place, and not openly in the face of the church, after the law of God’s church, but contrary thereunto, and the laudable custom of the Church of England.”‡ It is worthy of observation, that this marriage is said to be contrary to the law of *God’s church* and the

[* We make no apology to our readers for laying before them a valuable communication on a legal subject, considering its connexion with the important endeavour to enlarge the civil privileges of Unitarians, which has so long engaged their attention. Our correspondent does not seem aware that Dissenters’ marriages in Ireland are, by a *Declaratory Act*, valid to all intents and purposes. Ed.]

† See Selden’s *Ux. Heb.* l. ii. c. xxix.

‡ *Rolls of Parl.* Vol. VI. p. 241.

custom of the *Church of England*, but is not stated to be contrary to the *law of England*.

Though the churchmen held the celebration of marriages without the intervention of a person in orders to be void, yet they treated marriages celebrated by such a person, not in *facie ecclesiæ*, and with publication of banns, &c., as valid, though irregular; in which light the Gretna-Green marriages are still regarded by the law of Scotland. The consequence was, that clandestine marriages soon became frequent; and clergymen of bad character were easily found to perform them for the emolument which they produced. When the Committee for Scandalous Ministers was sitting in 1640, a petition was presented against the Vicar of Kidderminster and his Curate, as unlearned tipplers, who preached but once a quarter; and the curate's trade in the week days was said to be unlawful marriages.* In the course of the following century these irregular practices greatly increased, until abolished in 1756 by the passing of the Marriage Act.

In the year 1644, the Book of Common Prayer having been abolished, and the Directory substituted by Parliament in its place, the solemnization of marriage was regulated by that ordinance, which directs that "though marriage be no sacrament, yet it be expedient that it be solemnized by a lawful minister of the word;" and banns are directed to be published, and the ceremony to be performed, in a place appointed for public worship. It may be observed, that the prayer and exhortation given in the Directory are free from the objections which have been sometimes urged against the present service.† In 1653, the ceremony was again altered, and after a publication of banns at the church or market-place, the ceremony was directed to be performed before a Justice of the Peace.‡ This ordinance was confirmed in 1656, except as to a clause of nullity, which was repealed.§ It appears by the ordinance of 1653, that the consent of parents or guardians was required if either of the parties were under the age of twenty-one years.||

It is probable that the frequency of clandestine marriages originally led to the passing of the statute 26 Geo. II. c. 33; though, according to Horace Walpole,¶ it owed its introduction to Lord Bath, who happening to attend a Scotch appeal was struck with the hardship of a matrimonial case, in which a man after a marriage of thirty years was claimed by another woman on a precontract. The history which Walpole has given of this statute is both curious and amusing.

"The Judges were ordered to frame a bill which should remedy so cruel a retrospect. They did, but drew it so ill, and it was three times printed so inaccurately, that the Chancellor (Lord Hardwicke) was obliged to give it ample correction. Whether from mere partiality to an ordinance thus become his own, or whether in shaping a law new views of power opened to a mind fond of power, and fond of dictating; so it was, that the Chancellor gave all his attention to a statute into which he had breathed the very spirit of aristocracy and insolent nobility. It was amazing, in a country where liberty gives choice, where trade and money confer equality, and where

* Godwin's Commonwealth, Vol. I. p. 52.

† See Scobell, p. 87.

‡ Scobell, p. 236.

§ Id. p. 394.

|| There is a laughable proviso at the end of this ordinance—that the Justice, in case of dumb persons, may dispense with their pronouncing the words, and with joining hands in case of persons who have not hands.

¶ Memoirs, Vol. I.

facility of marriage had always been supposed to produce populousness,—it was amazing to see a law promulgated that cramped inclination, that discountenanced matrimony, and that seemed to annex as sacred privileges to birth as could be devised in the proudest, poorest, little Italian principality. * * * The abuse of precontracts had occasioned the demand of a remedy. The physician immediately prescribed medicines for every ailment to which the ceremony of marriage was or could be supposed liable. Publication of banns was already an established ordinance, but totally in disuse, except amongst the inferior people, who did not blush to obey the law. Persons of quality, who proclaimed every other step of their conjugation by the most public parade, were ashamed to have the intention of it notified, and were constantly married by special license. Unsuitable matches, in a country where the passions are not impetuous, and where it is neither easy nor customary to tyrannize over the inclinations of children, were by no means frequent. The most disproportioned alliances, those contracted by age, by dowagers, were without the scope of this bill. Yet the new act set out with a falsehood, declaiming against clandestine marriages, as if it had been a frequent evil. The abuse was the temporary weddings clapped up in the Fleet, and by one Keith,* who had constructed a very bishoprick for revenue in May Fair, by performing that charitable function for a trifling sum, which the *poor* successors of the apostles are seldom humble enough to perform out of duty.”

It appears, from the debates on the bill, that Horace Walpole is not correct in his statements as to the number and cheapness of the clandestine marriages. One of the speakers on that debate asserted, that at Keith's chapel there were 6000 married in a year, whereas at St. Anne's Church, in a very populous parish, there were seldom above fifty marriages in a year, though the difference in the expense was not above eight or ten shillings.†

The debates on the bill were long and violent. “The Speaker,” says Horace Walpole, in a letter to the Hon. H. S. Conway,‡ “who had spoken well against the clause, (of nullity,) was so misrepresented by the Attorney-General, that there was danger of a *skimmington* between the great wig and the coif, the former having given a flat lie to the latter.” For the bill, spoke Pelham, Wilbraham, C. Yorke, &c.; against it, Fox, Charles Townsend, Fazakerley, and others. “Captain Saunders, who had said he would go and vote against the bill for the sake of his sailors, (having once given forty of his crew leave to go on shore for an hour, and all returned married,) was compelled by Lord Anson, the Chancellor's son-in-law and his patron, to vote for it.”§

The clause of *nullity*, as it was termed in the statute of George II., (whereby marriages, however honestly contracted, yet wanting the consent of the proper parties, were declared void, and the children consequently illegitimate,) has been considered a very harsh and unjust enactment. Not only were the children of such marriage illegitimate, but if such children were married under age, with the consent of their supposed parents, the grand-children likewise were illegitimate. An instance of the grievous operation of this law, occurring a few years since in a noble family, led to the revision of the statute of George II., and accordingly a new Marriage

* When Keith was deprived of this revenue he swore he would be revenged upon the bishops; that he would buy a piece of ground and outbury them.

† Hansard, Parl. Deb. Vol. XV. p. 19.

‡ Walpole's Works, Vol. V. p. 35.

§ Walpole's Mem., Vol. I. p. 300.

Act was passed, (3 Geo. IV. c. 75,) whereby marriages solemnized by license, obtained without the proper consent, were rendered valid, where the parties continued to cohabit until the death of one of them. Some of the provisions of this statute, however, being found of an inconvenient nature, the statute 4 Geo. IV. c. 76, which contains the present marriage law of England, was passed. The chief distinction between this act and that of George II. will be found in the clause, declaring what marriages shall be void; with regard to which the law now is, that in order to render the marriage void, it must be *knowingly and wilfully* entered into by both parties, contrary to the provisions of the act.

Before concluding this slight sketch of the history of the law of marriage in England, it will, perhaps, not be considered improper to state the arguments relative to the validity of marriages by Dissenting ministers, before the statute of George the Second.

Before the statute 26 Geo. II. c. 33, marriages were of two kinds; such as were celebrated *in facie ecclesiæ*, or by a person in holy orders, and such as, though contracted *per verba de presenti*, yet wanted that solemnity. The legal effect of the latter marriages has been a subject of much dispute, and is still considered by many as an unsettled question. On the one hand, it is contended that, by the English law, a solemnization by a person in holy orders was always requisite to form a legal marriage, though it is admitted that the parties are bound by the contract; on the other hand, it is said, that before the Marriage Act, the contract itself was a sufficient marriage for all civil purposes which do not require the intervention of the ecclesiastical courts, by which such a marriage is regarded as imperfect. The following is a succinct statement of the arguments and authorities on both sides of the question.

It is said by those who contend for the necessity of a religious ceremony, that the *practice* of such a solemnization, in very early times, appears from the law of dower *ad ostium ecclesiæ*;* from which we learn that it was customary for the husband on his marriage to endow his wife at the church door. The rule is said to have been so strict at one time, that a marriage privately performed in a chamber by the bishop, being without any celebration of mass, was held invalid;† but in a much later case, a marriage in an ale-house, solemnized by a person in orders, was adjudged to be good.‡ It appears in the argument of counsel, in the case of *Bunting v. Leapingwell*,§ that children born after a contract *per verba de presenti*, are illegitimate, unless the marriage ceremony afterwards takes place, which will have relation to the contract. So in the case of *Heydon v. Gould*,|| where, on an appeal to the delegates, it appeared that the parties married were Sabbatarians, and had been married by one of their own ministers, (not in orders,) who had used the form of Common Prayer, except the ring, it was held an insufficient marriage. Many *dicta* of the Judges may also be cited to shew that a religious solemnization was considered by them to be essential.¶ The common law recognizes and follows the ecclesiastical law in this respect. Thus, when issue is joined on the fact of marriage in a writ of dower, the trial is by the bishop's certificate, who, of course, is guided by the rules of the ecclesiastical law, and will not certify a marriage unless a religious ceremony has taken place; yet the courts of common law regard such a

* Lit. Ten. sec. xli.

† 10 Ed. I. 4 Vin. Ab. 218.

‡ Tarry v. Browne, 13 Car. II. 1 Sid. 64.

§ Moor, 169.

|| 1 Sack., 119.

¶ Co. Litt., 33, a, note 10. 1 Sid. 13.

certificate as conclusive. In cases of disputed marriages, before the Marriage Act, the question always appears to have been, "Was the marriage ceremony performed by a person in orders?" Thus, in the *King v. Luffington*,* the question was, whether a marriage by a person erroneously supposed to be in orders was valid; a question which could never have arisen unless it had been essential to prove that the ceremony was performed by such a person. In addition to these authorities, many *dicta* of the ecclesiastical Judges might be cited to prove the position above advanced.

On the other hand, it is said by those who argue in favour of the legality of marriages contracted without any religious sanction, and without the intervention of a person in holy orders, that it is admitted by the civilians themselves that originally marriage was only a civil contract.† The celebration in a church, or before a person in orders, being a matter of ecclesiastical ordinance only, was not before the Marriage Act, 26 Geo. II., considered to be essential at common law, to the validity of a marriage. It may be admitted that the *practice* of celebration *in facie ecclesiæ*, or before a priest, was almost universal, but it was a consequence of the ecclesiastical censures and disabilities to which the parties would otherwise have subjected themselves. All the authorities which can be collected on the other side of the question, setting aside certain loose *dicta* of the Judges, are cases either determined in the spiritual courts, or argued by civilians, and only prove the existence of the rule in the ecclesiastical law. Thus, in *Bunting v. Leapingwell*, the court acted upon the opinion of the civilians; while, in *Heydon v. Gould*, which was decided before the delegates, it was said that perhaps the wife or the issue of the marriage might entitle themselves by such a marriage to a *temporal* right. This case can only, therefore, be considered as an authority in the spiritual courts, which appears to have been the opinion of Chief Baron Comyn, who abstracts it thus:‡ "If the marriage be not conformable to the ecclesiastical law, the husband shall have no right by the ecclesiastical law, as if the marriage be in a separate congregation by their preacher, who is a layman, the husband will not be entitled to administration." With regard to the admission of the bishop's certificate in cases of dower, which is allowed to be conclusive in the common-law courts, it by no means proves that those courts would be guided by the rules of the ecclesiastical law if the case came directly before them. Numberless instances exist in which the courts of common law recognize the authority of judgments and sentences, though founded upon rules and obtained upon evidence wholly unknown to the common law, as in the instance of decrees in chancery. Had the question arisen in a court of common law, it would have adjudicated upon it in a manner wholly different, and yet, finding it determined by a competent tribunal, such determination is regarded as conclusive. The authorities to shew that before the Marriage Act the intervention of a priest was unnecessary, are numerous. It appears to have been the opinion of Sir Matthew Hale, as we learn from the following passage in his life by Burnet: "A Quaker being sued for his wife's debts while sole, insisted that his marriage was not legal, not being according to the rules of the Church of England; but Hale declared that he was not willing on his own opinion to make their children bastards, and gave directions to the jury to find it special, as he had undoubtedly a right to do.—He thought all marriages made according to the

* Burr. sett. ca. 232.

† See *Bunting v. Leapingwell*, Moor, 169; Blackstone's Com. Vol. I. p. 439.

‡ Digest, Baron and Feme (b. i.).

several persuasions of men ought to have their effects in law." * This opinion has excited the spleen of Roger North, who tells us, that "it was gross in favour of those worst of sectaries." † So, in the year 1661, in an action of ejectment, tried at Nisi Prius, a Quaker marriage was held to be valid; ‡ and, in an action for criminal conversation, Mr. Justice Denison held a Quaker marriage to be sufficient to support the action. § Upon the same principle, in a case at the Old Bailey, before Sir John Silvester, it was held that a marriage in Ireland, (to which country our marriage acts do not extend,) by a Dissenting minister, in a private room, was good. || To these authorities may be added that of the present Chief Justice of the King's Bench, who, in his charge to the jury in the case of *Beer v. Ward*, stated, that a marriage without religious solemnization or the presence of a priest, and merely with consent of parties admitted before sufficient witnesses, and followed by cohabitation, was, before the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Act, a valid marriage for all purposes whatsoever, according to the then known law of the land, as was the case with the law of Scotland at this day. ¶ It appears, however, that Lord Eldon (whose prejudices do not run in favour of the Dissenters) did not altogether coincide in this opinion.

An argument in favour of the validity of Dissenters' marriages is also to be drawn from the exception in Lord Hardwicke's Act of the marriages of Quakers and Jews. The Legislature in passing this act could not have regarded such marriages as invalid, as the exception would then have been merely nugatory. It must have been perfectly immaterial to the Quakers whether their marriages were invalid by the common law or by the express words of the statute. Unless such marriages were good, the Quakers would indeed be placed in a most singular situation. The act says, that all marriages not celebrated according to its provisions shall be void, except the marriages of Quakers, which are not within the operation of the act. Quakers, therefore, as long as they continue such, cannot be married according to the provisions of the act. But it is said, that by the common law the marriages of Quakers, according to their own ceremonies, are invalid. Therefore, in consequence of this exception in the act, it is impossible that Quakers can be legally married at all. To avoid this absurdity it is absolutely necessary to hold that the marriage acts have recognized the common-law validity of marriages celebrated by Dissenters according to their own particular ceremonies.

The validity of marriages by Dissenting ministers before the Marriage Act does not entirely rest upon the position that such marriages were valid as *contracts*, without the intervention of a priest; for it may be contended upon very arguable grounds, that subsequent to the Toleration Act Dissenting ministers are recognized by the law as public teachers of religion, and that, therefore, marriages celebrated by them were equally good with marriages celebrated by Roman Catholic priests, which are admitted to have been valid. This appears to have been the opinion of Sir John Nicholl, who, in the case of *Kemp v. Wickes*, ** thought that Dissenting ministers, being now legalized, it could not be said that rites and ceremonies performed by them were not such as the law could recognize in any court of justice. This opinion is countenanced by the decision of the Court of King's Bench in *R. v.*

* Life of Hale, p. 70.

† Life of Lord Keeper North, Vol. I. p. 134.

‡ Haggard's Rep., Vol. I. Appendix, p. 9.

§ Buller's Nisi Prius, p. 28.

|| Russell's Crown Law, Vol. I. p. 205.

¶ See the Times of Nov. 18, 1823.

** London, 1810, Butterworth; Roper's Baron and Feme, Vol. II. p. 478.

Barker,* where it was held that a *mandamus* lay to trustees to admit a Dissenting teacher. In that case Lord Mansfield says, "Since the Act of Toleration, Dissenters are entitled to all manner of legal protection; charities to their mode of worship have been established since the Revolution, though held to be superstitious before."† In opposition to this argument it may doubtless be urged, that the law required a celebration by a person *in holy orders*, in which light a Roman Catholic priest is regarded, and that a Dissenting minister is not a person in holy orders. But to this it may be replied, that before the Toleration Act the law recognized no religious teacher who was not in holy orders, but that since that act the minister of a Dissenting congregation is regarded as a minister of religion, and that the requisition of the law (if indeed it ever existed) merely was, that marriage should be a religious ceremony.

R. H

ADDRESS

TO THE AVOWED ARIANS OF THE SYNOD OF ULSTER.

HAIL ! faithful few, who love the light of truth
More than the praise of men !—Your choice is made ;
And may that choice repay you ! If ye lose
Much that the heart of man has learned to prize,
Stir not your noble spirits when ye think
What ye have gain'd ? What honour from good men,
What peace within, what favour from your God !
Reason is on your side, and Nature too :—
Nature, who bade the human soul be free,
Active and independent, gave it power
To seek the truth and energy to hold.

The mind of man must keep its onward course,
And conquer prejudice and combat error,
Till truth prevail, clear, gentle, and serene.
Thus springs, within the bosom of a mount,
Work on their silent way, till, stronger grown,
They burst their barriers, and gush freely forth
To meet the eye of heav'n : and if, convulsed,
The hills are rent, and falling rocks impede
The torrent's course, the proud wave higher swells,
And overflows them ; till opposed no more,
It spreads afar its silent, blue expanse,
Where flowers behold their image, and the moon
Gazes upon herself.—

Then struggle on,
And hope for future peace :—but if in vain
Ye seek it among men ;—if malice, scorn,
And tyranny should track your steps, and chafe

* See W. Blackstone's Rep. Vol. I. p. 353.

† See also R. v. Jotham, 3 Term Rep., 575.

Th' immortal mind they never can subdue,—
 O! still be thankful for your destiny.
 Hold fast your glorious privilege, and impart
 Where'er ye may, the liberty wherewith
 The Gospel makes you free. What though for this
 Bigots alarm, and superstition scowl,
 And friends desert, and calumny prepare
 Her scorpion whip,—yet tremble not, nor shrink,
 Nor deem the contest doubtful. Ye have heard
 The holy call which none may disobey,
 Receiv'd the badge which none may disavow.
 Say,—if the spirit of Truth, descending, place
 His fiery symbol on your honour'd heads,
 Can ye, with ev'ry energy awake,
 Each power exulting, glowing ev'ry sense,
 Under his influence,—can ye forget
 The language he has taught? Can ye despise
 His holy revelations, or desert
 The little band of friends who bear his mark?
 Can ye forswear the gifts of heav'n, because
 Earth's tyrants frown, earth's children mock, and griefs,
 Perils, and snares, are thickly strewn around?
 O, no! Ye cannot choose but speak the things
 Your mental eye hath seen, your favour'd ear
 Intently heard.—And if for this, the storms
 Of life should gather round you on your way,
 Ye shall not shrink defenceless or afraid.
 Conscience is nigh to shield, to soothe, to cheer.
 Should poverty impend, and natural tears
 Be shed, when the fond partner of your cares
 Grieves for her children's lot and fears for you,
 Conscience shall dry those tears, dispel that grief,
 Sweeten the bread of virtuous poverty,
 Beam consolation from your children's eyes,
 And echo sounds of gladness from their tongues.
 Around your heads, if Conscience still attend,
 The lightnings of the world innocuous play,
 And form a crown of splendour for your brows.
 Conscience can bid the muttering storm be still;
 And make from jarring discords of the earth
 Celestial music;—strains which shall expire
 Only in death;—strains which your waking souls
 Shall recognize, when from the tomb ye rise,
 And see heaven's portals open to the sound.

JOURNAL OF A TOUR IN THE SOUTH OF FRANCE, BY THE REV.
S. WOOD.

(Concluded from p. 11.)

To the Editor.

Marseilles, Dec. 28th, 1827.

OCTOBER 29th. I came from Montauban to Toulouse, which is a shabby, old-fashioned town, with high houses and narrow, ill-paved streets. I was glad to escape from it the next morning, by the passage-boat on the canal of Languedoc, which landed me at Beziers in six-and-thirty hours. This canal, which was begun and finished in the reign of Louis XIV., is a magnificent work indeed—wide, and with trees planted on each side; the country through which it passes not particularly interesting, though it is but fair to take into the account, that the best season for seeing it was past.

Nov. 1st. Arrived at Montpellier by the diligence at six in the morning, after one of the most jolting rides that I ever remember to have had. I asked a man, why the roads were not kept in better order (*mieux arrangées*)? He replied, “*Monsieur, le Gouvernement pourquoi n'est-il pas mieux arrangé?*” and this was accompanied by one of those shrugs of the shoulders which none but a Frenchman can give, and which expressed, better than all the words in the dictionary could have done, “So it is, and so it must be.” In truth, the state of this and of many other roads which I have travelled in France, is a disgrace to the government, which ought either to see that its agents do their duty, or to place these things on a totally different footing.—The climate of Montpellier, as far as I could judge from the stay of three or four hours which I made there, deserves the bad character which it has *lately* acquired. I felt it to be peculiarly dry and cold; nor can it be otherwise, for the town is situated on an eminence, with a wide tract of open country to the north, bounded by a ridge of hills in the distance. The town itself, though the streets are narrow, is in other respects well built; it has a delightful public walk, and an aqueduct with a double row of one hundred and eighty arches, surpassing even that of Lisbon. Between Montpellier and Nîmes I crossed a most singular district of country, the plain of Lunel—a wide expanse of barren-looking land, planted, as far as the eye could reach, with stunted vines, interspersed with olive-trees, the former producing an excellent wine. Across this plain was blowing that keen north wind, the *mistral*, which prevails so much in this part of France. As I entered Nîmes, I was much struck with the *Arena* or *Amphitheatre*. This splendid monument of Roman grandeur, and of Roman cruelty, has suffered but little from the hand of time, most of the steps or seats for the spectators remaining entire, as well as the galleries and archways by which they were approached. There are four doors to the ring or *arena*,—two by which the wild beasts were introduced, a third for the gladiators, and a fourth for the criminals condemned to die. It was enough to make one's blood run cold to contemplate a spot which had formerly been the scene of so much wanton and deliberate cruelty. What are we to think of the morality, or of the refinement, of a people who could take delight in such exhibitions as these, and erect buildings in which they could be seen by the greatest number of persons? Christianity would have done much to deserve our gratitude, had it only abolished such practices as these. Yet, can we say that it has completely abolished them, while cock-fighting still remains the disgrace of our nation?

Nov. 2d. This morning I visited the *Maison Carrée*, a beautiful Roman temple in excellent preservation, scarcely any part of it being imperfect; also the remains of the Temple of Diana, the public walk, and fountain, and an ancient tower, which is placed on the top of a high hill, overlooking the town, and to which various uses have been assigned—some supposing that it was a treasury, others a light-house, &c. Accustomed as we are in England to regard with wonder every morsel of real Roman that we can find, though it be but a broken arch, or a few square feet of wall, how much does it astonish us to have such perfect buildings as the *Maison Carrée* or the Amphitheatre presented to our view, with not merely the general outline or skeleton preserved, but even the minute ornaments! When I first saw the former of these edifices, (and I saw it too, as it ought to be seen, “by the pale moon-light,”) I could scarcely believe that it *was* a Roman temple on which I was gazing. The interior has been repaired, and fitted up as a hall for the reception of relics of the antique and works of modern art. It contains some good pictures and statues, and is a most delightful lounge.

3d. On this and the two preceding days, there was a dry, parching coldness in the air, like some of our worst weather in the month of March. This day it was the *vent de bise*, or north-east wind, which blew; on the preceding it was the *magestral*, or *mistral*, i. e. the north-west.

Sunday, 4th. Attended the morning service at the principal Protestant church. The pew-opener* placed me on a semi-circular bench immediately opposite the pulpit, appropriated to the members of the Consistory. I soon found myself surrounded by a number of elderly and most highly respectable looking men. When I considered their calm and sensible countenances, and recollected the troubles and persecutions which this church had suffered in the years 1815 and 1816, I could not help regarding them with feelings of love and veneration; I looked upon them as “a noble army of martyrs,” as men “of whom the world is not worthy,” and who possess a reward, such as the world cannot give, in the high consciousness of having stood firm to their principles, notwithstanding the ill-disguised enmity of a bigoted court and the excesses of an infuriated populace. M. Fontanès was the preacher. He had a good congregation of five or six hundred persons, who were very attentive to his discourse; and it would have been strange had it been otherwise, for I have seldom, if ever, heard preaching with which I was better pleased. The text was taken from 1 Cor. xi. 17, “Now in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye come together, not for the better, but for the worse;” and the object of the preacher was to shew what a discourse is, or ought to be, and how the hearers may best profit by it. “A discourse,” he observed, “is, in fact, a conversation or familiar address (*entretien*); for, as the pastor has not time to talk on religious subjects, as much as he could wish, to the members of his flock at their own houses, he says to them all, when assembled together, what he would desire to say to each individual in private.” The discourse of M. Fontanès corresponded exactly to this definition. It had all the best points of the French style and manner, and none of their defects. There were no overwrought appeals to the feelings—no tinsel decorations or oratorical de-

* I use this word for the want of a better, for there can be no such officer as a pew-opener where there are no pews to open. The body of the French Protestant churches is filled with chairs, arranged in pretty close rows, those in the same line being fastened together and kept in their places by long slips of wood nailed at the top and the bottom.

vices; but all was plain, and simple, and natural—familiar without being coarse, and persuasive without affectation. It was delivered entirely without notes, and without the slightest hesitation; the action free and graceful, precisely that which a man would naturally adopt if called upon to address a number of people in a room on an interesting and important topic. As I sat listening with edification and delight, I said to myself, “This is real eloquence! this is the kind of preaching to do good!” I was affected even to tears, and as I walked back to my hotel, felt myself a better man than I was when I went. And why cannot we have something like this in England? Why cannot we stand up in our pulpits like men, and address our congregations without a note before us, as if we really meant to do them good? Is there, in the style and manner of this preaching, any thing so difficult to acquire, that it is hopeless to make the attempt? I am convinced that there is not; and I am convinced of another thing too, that if we do not try to acquire some such style as this, our preaching will be little better than a dead letter. But it is useless to bring forward an evil without pointing out the remedy. If, then, we would improve our preaching, we must do three things. In the first place, we must banish cushions from our pulpits. With such a piece of furniture as this before him, a man’s action can never be easy and natural. Should we not think it very ridiculous to see Mr. Brougham addressing the House of Commons, or Mr. Denman appealing to the feelings of a jury, with such a thing as one of our pulpit cushions before him? These articles were surely invented to put both the minister and his people asleep, as the form and the name seem indeed to imply. If we must needs have something to rest the Bible upon, in the devotional part of the service, let this be removed when the sermon is to be spoken. In the second place, congregations must demand less of their ministers in the way of pulpit duty; they must be content with fifty sermons in the course of the year, instead of a hundred, or with twenty-five instead of fifty. And, in the third place, ministers must have the means of travelling abroad; they must have the opportunity of hearing with their own ears, and of seeing with their own eyes, specimens of the style which they ought to adopt; they must hear Fontanès at Nîmes, and Mûnier at Geneva, and Monod at Paris; and if, after listening to these noblest of sacred orators, they do not return home with a deep and a full conviction that our English preaching is not what it ought to be, and with a high resolution to attempt something better and more profitable to themselves, they will be unworthy of the profession which they have thought fit to assume. But on this subject I shall not enlarge at present, as I hope to give my thoughts more at length at some future time.

Before the afternoon service, I went with M. Fontanès to the *Bibliothèque Populaire*, or Library for the Common People, and was much gratified to see the number of persons who came for books, though it is only two months since it was established. There is here also a Lancasterian School, in which there are from 260 to 280 boys and 220 girls.

Nov. 5th. Left Nîmes at noon, and travelled all night in the diligence to Marseilles, where I arrived the next morning at eight o’clock; the country through which I passed during the day-light, a dead flat, bounded on each side by ridges of picturesque hills; the most striking object in the whole ride, the Castle of Beaucaire, which is perched on an almost inaccessible rock, overlooking the rapid stream of the Rhone, opposite the village of Tarascon.

7th. M. Sautter, one of the Protestant pastors, to whom I had an intro-

duction, took me to see the new church, which has lately been built for the members of his communion. So far as mere architecture is concerned, it is a fine building, but it is ill adapted for preaching; the pillars are much too thick, and from the height of the ceiling, or some other cause, it is not free from echo. It cost 80,000 francs; and it is pleasing to record, as a proof of the liberality of the times, that towards this sum the Government contributed 15,000, and the Commune 30,000. There is here, as at Nîmes, a long semicircular seat, opposite the pulpit, for the members of the Consistory; and M. Sautter informed me, with pride and pleasure, that the consuls of many different countries, and many different communions, have all their places either on that or on an adjoining bench; viz. those of England, America, Sweden, Holland, Russia,* Prussia, and Switzerland. There is a Lancasterian school for the poor boys, and another for the girls; and a collection of religious books in the vestry, to lend or sell to those who want them. The congregation is rich, and comprises some of the most considerable people in the town; the number of Protestants is about 1300. There are two pastors who preach in turn, and one of them goes on the first Sunday of every month to Aix, where there is a small congregation. There are also two other country churches, at the distance of fifteen or twenty miles, attached to this Consistory, and supplied by a pastor who preaches at each alternately.

17th. Went to the Public Library, the door of which I found kept by some gendarmes, who told me that I could not be admitted, as the election of a Deputy was then taking place in the hall. There were a number of the electors standing talking in knots in the street, but the general tranquillity of the town presented a striking contrast to the scenes which I had witnessed on similar occasions in England; so much so, that a man who was not distinctly informed of it, would not be aware that any thing extraordinary was going on. The taking of the votes occupied two days, and on the morning of the third it was announced that the Ministerial Deputy was re-elected, though not by a very large majority, for out of 800 more than 300 had voted for his opponent. At the election preceding this, the Opposition candidate had only eighty votes, so that liberal sentiments have made considerable progress in the last three or four years. It is worth recording, that among the 800 voters there was only one priest, which proves that the French Catholic clergy are by no means rich.

Dec. 17th. I have now been here six weeks, and I find that, what with news-rooms, libraries, the society of a few friends, and the bustle and variety of a large town, I have many resources for passing the winter agreeably. The weather, when I first arrived, was extremely cold, as it always is whenever the *mistral* blows. Three weeks ago we had a cruel blast of it, which lasted three days; since that it has been mild, and we have had heavy rain. No person affected with a pulmonary complaint ought to come hither, unless he has resolution enough to keep himself in the house when the cold wind prevails; at other times the climate is delightful.

The new part of the town of Marseilles is well built and handsome; the streets regular, and the houses all of stone. It possesses a most commodious natural dock, near half a mile in length; and it is very interesting to see the variety of costume displayed by the natives of different countries on its quay.

* The established religion of Russia is that of the Greek Church; but the Consul of this power, resident at Marseilles, is a German, and of the Lutheran persuasion.

The progress which this town has made in real, substantial prosperity, and in intellectual and moral improvement, in the last forty years, is truly gratifying. Since 1812, even, its population has increased from 80,000 to 123,000, without reckoning a floating population of 22,000. Among its public institutions, almost all of recent origin, may be enumerated a Botanic Garden, a Public Library, a Secondary School for Medicine, and gratuitous Schools for Drawing, Music, Geometry, and Mechanics; a Female Penitentiary; a Savings' Bank; an Institution for the Deaf and Dumb; and a variety of others, the object of which is to give assistance to the sick and to the poor, and to relieve misfortune in whatever shape it may present itself. Within the last year and a half there has been formed here a *Société de la Morale Chrétienne*, on the same plan as that at Paris. *Société de la Bienfaisance Chrétienne*, would better express the object which it has in view, which is to promote the happiness and improvement of man, in whatever way its efforts may be most needed. Hitherto its attention has been chiefly directed to the establishment of a *circle*, or reading-room for young people, to the improvement of the prisons, to the abolishing of gaming, and to the bettering the condition of the young Greeks, many of whom it has rescued from slavery, brought to this port, and forwarded on their arrival to other towns on the Continent, where committees exist which take charge of their education. The country around Marseilles is not beautiful, and least of all so to an Englishman; for there are no green fields for the eye to repose upon. Yet it is extremely striking; the canes, and vines, and olives, with which the gardens are planted; the pines, which the axe has still spared, on the higher grounds; the bold rocks, which shoot up their craggy summits on every side; and the blue waters of the bay, which reflect the hues of a cloudless sky, combine to form a scene which might feed the imagination of a poet.

18th to 21st. Made an excursion to Toulon and Hyères. The arsenal at the former place is extensive and well arranged; and its bay large enough for three hundred vessels to ride securely at anchor. Great preparations are making to bring the Dey of Algiers and the Grand Turk to their senses. Hyères is the most miserable town that I ever saw; but placed in the midst of a country which is the very garden of France, spread out into pastures, and orange-groves, and vineyards, and gently sloping towards the sea, which presents itself at the distance of a couple of miles. This place is warmer than Marseilles, but it is not altogether secure from the *mistral*; lodgings are dear, and a man would be very likely to die for want of society.

Having now attempted to give your readers some idea of what struck me as being most worthy of notice in the course of my journey, I shall here set down, in a condensed form, the information which I obtained respecting the religious opinions, the present state, and the future prospects of the French Protestants. I have refrained from giving the particulars of conversations which I had with various individuals in the places through which I passed, for this would have been taking an unwarrantable liberty; but I endeavoured, wherever I went, to become acquainted with the Protestant pastors,* and the statements which I shall make are founded on their testimony, as well as on that of other intelligent persons whom I met with.

The result of my inquiries is, that the majority of the French Protestants

* I use this word as corresponding more exactly to the French *pasteur*, than our word minister does. In contradistinction to *pasteur*, *minister* denotes one who is admitted to holy orders, but has not yet the charge of a flock.

are Arians ; not, indeed, that they would profess themselves such, if asked what their opinions are, but, if questioned more closely, they would be found to be so in point of fact. The French know little or nothing of doctrinal distinctions. Ask a man in this country what he is in religion, he will tell you, that he is a Christian, or a Christian of the Reformed Church, or even that he is a Calvinist, though, after a little cross-questioning, you soon discover that there is not one of the dogmas peculiar to the Genevese Reformer which enters into his creed. It is not therefore the less true, that the majority are Arians, though they may not even know it themselves. With respect to the Atonement, I have been assured by a very sensible man, that they are, to use his expression, "Arminians in a large sense." Those of the pastors who entertain these sentiments, are a very numerous and an increasing body, comprising nearly all the younger clergy. They make no secret of their opinions, and are even frank in the profession of them in private, but they seldom, if ever, introduce doctrine into their sermons, being decidedly opposed, on principle, to this kind of preaching ; thinking it infinitely more profitable to instruct their flocks in the great duties prescribed in the gospel, and to open to them its rich treasures of consolation, than to exercise their acumen on points of doubtful disputation, which have been a subject of much discussion for 1800 years. This part of the clergy are, as might be expected, exceedingly liberal towards those who are of other communions ; they are not disposed to look with coldness on a professed Unitarian, but ready to hold out the right hand of Christian fellowship to every one who admits in any sense the divinity of Christ. It is their object to keep together, and, if possible, to unite more firmly the body to which they belong, endeavouring to prevent those from splitting into parties who all receive the same gospel, and recognize the same great principles of Protestant dissent. The organ of this party is the *Revue Protestante*, a periodical which appears at Paris on the fifteenth of every month. It is well written, and is filled with the most interesting matter ; but it is to be regretted, that forty-eight rather widely printed pages are the whole extent of each number. Of the minority, the greater number may be described as Orthodox, i. e. Trinitarians, without being Calvinists. Those of the clergy who belong to this class are, for the most part, the senior pastors, men who received their education some fifty or sixty years ago, before Griesbach had enlightened the biblical world by his researches, or Michaelis and Kuinoel had left but little for future critics to accomplish. These are fast dying off, and are daily replaced by others who have profited by the progress of the age in all that is interesting and important. The rest are Calvinists, or as they are here often, but improperly, called, Methodists. These are an active, perhaps an increasing, body. They have been fostered and supported by the Wesleyan Methodists and the Continental Society of England, and, like their patrons, they insist perpetually on the corruption of man's nature, and the necessity of an atonement, and would exclude from the name of Christian all those who cannot admit the same doctrines which they do. It is not to be expected that they can be very well content to act with the more liberal part of their brethren ; but I have only heard of one place where they have as yet established a separate worship. The English evangelical party, by which this is supported, is looked upon with no good will by the majority of the French Protestants, the latter affirming, that they have introduced dissensions and uncomfortable feelings into their congregations, and that the divisions which they have occasioned are operating as no inconsiderable bar to the conversion of the Catholics, who say, when they see the Protes-

tants so much divided, "We had better remain as we are." At an annual meeting of the Paris Missionary Society, a year or two ago, when a vote of thanks was proposed to the English societies which had lent their co-operation, a distinct exception was made to the prejudice of that for continental missions, just offence having been taken at the unmeasured terms in which it had stigmatized the sentiments of the French Protestants. The organ of the Calvinistic party in this country is the *Archives du Christianisme*, a work which is interesting from its information, but deeply imbued with the peculiar spirit of its conductors; and the style in which many of its articles are written is as *médiocre* as its engravings.

The southern provinces of this country are, as is well known, those in which the Protestants are in the greatest force. Though few, compared to their more orthodox brethren, they are yet a very considerable body, and their wealth and standing in society are much more than proportioned to their numbers. In Bourdeaux, especially, the richest of the merchants are of this persuasion, and a liberal spirit prevails between the members of the two communions, which indeed is the case, I believe, in most of the towns through which I passed, excepting Nîmes, where there is a religious, or rather an *irreligious*, mob of the worst description. The prospects of an increase of numbers among the Protestants are exceedingly cheering. There is a very strong disposition among the Catholics to change their religion. Seventeen hundred came over at Lyons very lately, in consequence, probably, of the measures which had been taken by the authorities to prevent the celebration of Protestant worship in the village of Consorce, (see *Mon. Repos.*, N. S., p. 601,) in that neighbourhood; and I was both surprised and gratified the other day to hear a Catholic declare, that if there were to be a persecution of the Protestants in France, two-thirds of the Catholics would turn Protestant immediately.* The little success which has followed the labours of the Jesuitical missionaries who have lately been traversing the country, and the disgust which their extravagant doctrines and unblushing assumption have, in many instances, excited, are proofs that the French are not, at this moment, very submissively disposed towards the See of Rome. The noble spirit, too, which has been displayed in the late elections, furnishes some kind of pledge that other impositions besides those of the political world will be resisted, and other sophisms exposed; and when to this we add, that the people of this country are daily becoming more serious and philosophical,†

* I heard lately an anecdote, which is so very characteristic of the spirit of the times, that I cannot forbear relating it.

The curé of the parish of — in Gascony, had given it as his opinion that it was very wrong in the women to come to church with nosegays. In spite of this prohibition, his fair auditors thought proper to make their appearance with the offensive ornaments in their bosoms. The enraged curé descended from his pulpit, and snatched away from them all the flowers which he could find. The following Sunday the offence was repeated, and the same summary notice was taken of it; upon which their ladyships, not choosing to be dictated to in this arbitrary manner, seceded in a body, and determined to have a pastor more to their own liking. They first, however, procured a number of Bibles, that they might form a more accurate judgment of the pretensions of the rival churches; and the result has been, that they have hired a room as the first step to the establishment of a Protestant service.

Let the priests look to it! their influence hangs on a very thread! Should any more Protestants be hindered in the celebration of their worship, or any more nosegays be plucked from the glowing bosoms of the high dames of Gascony, we shall soon see the Catholic churches left to the quiet possession of the bats and the curés.

† In support of this remark, I have great pleasure in translating a passage from

more usefully active, and more desirous of information, we can have no hesitation in concluding that the cause of Protestantism in France has every thing to hope from the progress of time, and but little to fear from the secret arts, or the more open attacks, of its enemies. They who from long habit, and the unwillingness to change, cannot bring themselves to renounce the religion of their fathers, while they yet exclaim, "How happy you English are to be born of Protestant parents!" will be succeeded by another generation, who will not be restrained by the same scruples—by a generation who will not only be excited by the light and knowledge and improvement, which are beaming around them, to read and think for themselves on the most important of all subjects, but who will proclaim the result of their inquiries by throwing off the yoke of superstition, and betaking themselves to the bosom of a free and rational church. Nor is it of small importance to add, that one of the chief barriers which opposes the profession and consequently the progress of liberal opinions in England, has here but little influence, or rather scarcely exists; for the Established Church (if indeed any church can be called established, where the ministers of the Dissenting body are paid by the Government) has no golden prebends in its gift to tempt men away from the ranks of truth and freedom, or to retain within its pale enlightened but interested individuals who "cannot afford to keep a conscience." It was only the other day, that the Government salaries of the second class of Curés was *raised* to the same sum as the *lowest* which is given to a Protestant pastor; and those of the Bishops are only from 12,000 to 15,000 francs, i. e. from £480 to £600 a year. What the *casuel*, i. e. the fees or perquisites, may amount to, it is difficult to say; but, if I am rightly informed, in the case of the Bishop of this town, it is not sufficient to defray the outgoings which are attached to the possession of his office, so that his salary of 12,000 francs is not, in fact, a clear income.

I cannot conclude this letter without observing, that if the Protestants are sincerely desirous of increasing their numbers, they will introduce some very necessary reforms into their public service. In the first place, the reading of the Scriptures ought not to be intrusted (as it has been in every instance, except one, which has come under my notice) to the clerk, or to a young minister, whose manner is any thing else than just and impressive. It is really degrading the word of God to let it be read, as it always is, precisely as a man would read a list of things at an auction, without emphasis, without intonation, without meaning; and there is the less excuse for this, as there are generally two pastors attached to each church. In the second

the *Revue Protestante* for July, 1825, p. 11. The writer has been speaking of a book written by a Catholic, and goes on to observe,

"Our readers cannot fail to be gratified by the progress of free inquiry, a progress which nothing can stop. After a whole age of incredulity and levity, we see the most distinguished writers of our day, of all parties, making a slow but perceptible approach towards the gospel. A new light beams upon their opened eyes. It is pleasing to be able to point out this change; nor less so, to add, that the reprinting of so many books, in which false views are given of Christianity, no longer makes men either unbelievers or impious. People are tired of that wretched wit of Voltaire, which, however brilliant it might be in the gilded drawing-rooms of Fernel, is a bitter draught in the comfortless cottage of the widow and the orphan. It serves to amuse, and that is all. Graver subjects occupy men's thoughts; they acquire more and more the habit of going to church; and the spirit with which they are filled is in unison with the simplicity of the worship and the sanctity of the place. Philosophy, becoming religious, extends, if we may so express it, her wings over the human race, and the fulfilment of the times is at hand."

place, the singing is universally bad. I have heard some scores of Psalms sung in the last two months, and I have only heard one tune the whole time. It is one uniform drone, without either life, or soul, or interest, or variety. Why cannot the French import some of our best collections of Psalm tunes, and adapt words to them, just as Moore did with the Irish Melodies? In the third place, the devotional part of the service is not sufficiently varied, the Commandments, and the Confession of Sin, as well as the General Supplication, being read every Sunday. And what is the consequence of all this? It is, that the congregation, finding the first part of the service uninteresting, acquire the slovenly habit of straggling in after it is begun, there sometimes not being above a dozen persons present at the commencement. If there must be a printed liturgy, it would surely be a very easy thing to extend and vary it, so as to have three or four services to be used in turn, instead of the same every Sunday. Should these observations meet the eye of any of those whom they chiefly concern, I hope they will not bring upon the writer the charge of censoriousness, but that they will be taken in the same spirit of friendship in which they are given. I have made them, because I think that they are such as must suggest themselves to every one who has been accustomed to the admirable manner in which the devotional part of the service is generally conducted in the Dissenting chapels in England, and because I am persuaded, that if these things were reformed, the Protestant churches of France would be still better filled than they are, and they who resort to them would be more interested and more improved. Hoping that your readers may derive from what I have written half the gratification which I have derived from what I have seen and heard, I remain,
 &c. SAMUEL WOOD.

A DREAM OF HEAVEN.

Lo, the seal of Death is breaking,
 Those who slept its sleep are waking, —

Eden opes her portals fair!
 Hark, the harps of God are ringing,
 Hark, the seraphs' hymn is singing,
 And the living rills are flinging
 Music on immortal air!

There, no more at eve declining,
 Suns without a cloud are shining
 O'er the land of life and love;
 Heaven's own harvests woo the reaper,
 Heaven's own dreams entrance the sleeper,
 Not a tear is left the weeper
 To profane one flower above.

No frail lilies there are breathing,
 There no thorny rose is wreathing
 In the bowers of paradise; —
 Where the founts of life are flowing,
 Flowers unknown to time are blowing,
 Mid superber verdure glowing
 Than is sunn'd by mortal skies.

There the groves of God, that never
 Fade or fall, are green for ever,
 Mirror'd in the radiant tide ;
 There, along the sacred waters
 Unprofaned by tears or slaughters,
 Wander Earth's immortal daughters,
 Each a pure Immortal's bride.

There no sigh of memory swelleth,
 There no tear of misery wellet,
 Hearts will bleed or break no more :
 Past is all the cold world's scorning,
 Gone the night, and broke the morning,
 With seraphic day adorning
 Life's glad waves and golden shore.

Oh, on that bright shore to wander,
 Trace those radiant waves' mæander,
 All we loved and lost to see,—
 Is this hope, so pure, so splendid,
 Vainly with our being blended ?
 No ! with Time ye are not ended,
 Visions of Eternity !

Crediton.

OPINIONS OF THE EARLY FATHERS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

To the Editor.

SIR,

IN the last number of the Quarterly Theological Review, there is an article on Burton's work respecting the Ante-nicene Fathers, which not only betrays the usual violent and virulent spirit against Unitarians and those who have most distinguished themselves in defence of their cause, but evinces at the same time so much ignorance of the real question at issue in the controversy between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsley, and the evidence on which Dr. Priestley asserted the great prevalence of Unitarianism in the earliest ages of the Christian church, that I am tempted to offer, in the first place, a few observations on several accusations contained therein ; and I may, hereafter, with your approbation, give a short account of the several points in dispute between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsley ; stating what the one asserted and the other denied, the evidence on which this affirmation and denial respectively rested, and the result to which a fair and candid examination of it necessarily leads.

The tone and style of the Reviewer in the article upon which I am animadverting, are throughout of the most acrimonious and scurrilous nature. Any error, however trivial, any oversight, however unimportant, the slightest mistranslation or misconstruction of a passage committed by an Unitarian, is made the ground and occasion of the foulest accusations. The most vituperative epithets are lavishly bestowed on Dr. Priestley, Mr. Lindsey, and Mr. Belsham. They are charged not only with ignorance and presumption, but with dishonesty and falsehood. And does the Reviewer think that, except by bigots like himself, such abuse will be received with any other feel-

ings than those of reprobation or disgust? To say nothing of the pure and unsullied character of these celebrated defenders of the primitive faith, what motives, what inducements, had they or could they have had, to be dishonest and unfaithful? What temptation had they to become Unitarians and to witness before the world their good confession, in spite of the prejudices of early education and the influence of many dear and cherished associations, except that which flowed from the disinterested love of truth, and the desire of obeying the voice of God, as that voice was heard speaking in their hearts and consciences? The Reviewer could not but know, as all must know, that Unitarians have no outward attraction to draw men over to their profession. With them there are no seducing temptations; temptations which appeal to vanity or sense; neither the lure of wealth, nor the pomp of pride, nor the baubles of ambition, nor the splendour of fashion. "The world has no love for them, for the world loveth her own." And is it to be imagined that men, who, for the sake of principle, were so ready to renounce the world and the world's laws, should afterwards become unprincipled, not only for no earthly purpose that can be conceived, but to their own manifest injury and disadvantage? Human nature must, indeed, be very differently constituted from what it now is, to render this supposition possible.

Let the Reviewer, then, and men like-minded with himself, be told, (for it would seem as if they had forgotten it,) that Unitarians are, naturally, as sensible as others to the good and the evil which this world has to distribute; that their bodies and minds are as susceptible of pleasure and pain as those of the most orthodox believer; that they have no more fondness than he for slander and reproach; and that, if they could do so with a safe conscience, they would be as glad probably as he to enjoy the honours and emoluments of the patronized and endowed sect. Unhappily there are too many, holding Unitarian opinions, who are taken captive by these feelings; and, for the sake of the fashion of this world, of its privileges and advantages, of its glitter and its gold, fetter their consciences and restrain the going forth of their convictions. They love the praise of men more than the praise of God, and verily they have their reward. But when we see men, like those just mentioned, with high-principled courage turning a deaf ear to every other call but the call of duty, and casting a look of disdain upon the good things of this world when set before them as lures, as the price of their soul, the purchase-money of their sincerity and integrity; when we have before us such instances of the paramount influence and ascendancy of moral and religious principle, it is the weakest kind of railing to construe, under these circumstances, involuntary errors into wilful falsehoods, to confound the unconscious mistakes of the understanding with the dishonest purposes of the will. Of the attacks which are made upon us, incessant as they are, both from the pulpit and the press, it does not become us to complain; it being the right and the duty of every man to endeavour to put down what he believes to be serious error; but we *have* reason to complain when our motives are arraigned, and our object is misrepresented. We *have* reason to complain that ignorance and calumny are constantly employed as instruments of personal annoyance, and that no method of attack is rejected, however unmanly and unchristian.

The article upon which I am remarking furnishes a good specimen of the kind of hostility to which we are exposed. Of such a mode of procedure, however, it is impossible to speak with too severe a spirit of reprehension. Does the Reviewer think that Unitarians could not, if they so pleased, retaliate? Is he so ignorant of the writings of his own orthodox party as not to

be aware, that scarcely one is to be found of any eminence among them who has not committed blunders, which, following his example, we might call gross and stupid,—errors which we might denounce as wilful and perverse? But where would be the use of this species of warfare, this crimination and recrimination, this interchange of calumnious language, this bandying to and fro of harsh and reproachful epithets? Could it tend to any other purpose than that of exciting and inflaming the bad passions of our nature, and so be the means of throwing additional hindrances in the way of arriving at truth, or of escaping from error? That party alone will be guilty of such conduct, whose object it is to blind the judgment, to weaken and impair the powers of spiritual discernment. The man of honest purpose, of real singleness of intention, of pure and ingenuous mind, will disdain the use of such aids. He has too much confidence in the power of truth, to desire any other weapons than those which can be furnished from her own armoury. With these he contends, and upon these he relies.

I have made these observations because there is no doubt that Dr. Priestley, in his controversy with Dr. Horsley, and in other parts of his numerous publications, has been proved to have committed some errors and mistakes. Would he not have been more than human if he had not? Of these errors and mistakes, ungenerous, unjust advantage has been frequently taken, not only to cast aspersions upon the character and fame of this illustrious man, but to perplex and mislead the understandings of inquirers, as to the true *nature* and real merits of the proofs and reasonings adduced by him. It is on this latter account chiefly that Dr. P.'s mistakes are to be lamented. It is because, in connexion with some of the arts of controversy in which his opponents were far better skilled than himself, they have served to hoodwink the judgment of many, who would otherwise have seen clearly enough that his assertions respecting the general prevalence of Unitarianism in the first periods of the Christian church were completely and solidly established, and that there was scarcely a single argument, of any force or weight, advanced against it by his able and learned antagonist, that was not entirely overthrown and utterly demolished. I do not stand up the assertor of Dr. Priestley's infallibility, but of his honour and integrity. I do not say that his references are always exact, or that his translations and constructions of passages are uniformly correct, or that his inferences are in every case unexceptionable and just; but I say that few men could have written so much, upon such a subject, and with the commission of so few errors as he has done. In his main position he was impregnable. Whatever trifling defeats he may have suffered on the less important and inferior stations that he occupied, here, on this capital point, his victory was decisive and triumphant.*

The Reviewer observes, (p. 288,) “that in every dispute concerning the

* “With great tranquillity and satisfaction, therefore,” says Dr. P., in the preface to his *History of Early Opinions*, “I now commit this History to my friends, and to my enemies; sufficiently aware that it is not without its defects to exercise the candour of the former, and the captiousness of the latter. But no work of this extent, and of this nature, can be expected to be perfect. I have myself discovered great mistakes and oversights in those who have gone before me; and notwithstanding all my care, I shall not be surprised if those who come after me, should find some things to correct in me. To make this as easy as possible, I have printed my authorities at full length. But I am confident that all my oversights will not invalidate any position of consequence in the whole work, and this is all that *the real* inquirer after truth will be solicitous about.”

apostolicity of any point of Christian discipline or doctrine, it is obviously of the highest importance to ascertain what was the belief or practice of those Christians who lived in the first ages of the church." So thought Dr. Priestley; and it was this view of the subject, and the conviction that the great majority of the primitive Christians were Unitarians, believers in the strict unity of God and the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, that led to the composition of some of the most interesting and important of his theological works. And it is the use which may be made of this fact, if sufficiently well established, that renders the orthodox writers of the present day so exceedingly anxious to shew that the antiquity which we claim for our opinions is unjustly claimed; that it is, in fact, with them and not with us. In their zeal to establish this point, they are apt to confound two questions perfectly distinct, viz. the opinions held by the early philosophizing fathers, and the opinions held by the great mass of Christian believers. With the exception of those termed *apostolic*, it is not denied by Dr. Priestley, nor by Unitarian writers generally, that the fathers, as they are called, were most of them believers in the divinity of Christ.* Whether that divinity which they professed was, or was not, of a subordinate nature, has, at different times, been a matter greatly disputed; but it has not been disputed by them that the ancient fathers generally admitted the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ. That which they dispute and deny is the Trinitarianism of the *great body of the early Christians*. On the contrary, they maintain that, for upwards of a century after Christ, the *generality* of Christian believers were properly Unitarians, and that the evidence for this fact is to be gathered from the incidental remarks and concessions of the *orthodox writers* themselves. The evidence to which they appeal, and on which they chiefly rely, is that which is derived not from the direct and positive testimony of partial and biassed friends, but that which is drawn from the indirect and incidental testimony of acknowledged, and, for the most part, bitter opponents. The Reviewer says, "he wonders that any man can have the face to say that all the fathers of the church and all Christian people, till the Council of Nice, were Unitarians." Dr. Priestley has not said so, nor has even Mr. Lindsey said so, to whom he refers, and from whom he quotes a part of a sentence instead of the whole.† Dr. Priestley

* "So far," says Mr. Wellbeloved in his admirable Letters to Archdeacon Wrangham, "so far from considering these Fathers as Unitarians, we charge them (with the exception of those denominated apostolic) with being the corruptors of the Unitarian doctrine. All that we contend for, (that is, with respect to these Ante-nicene Fathers,) is, that they did not hold the doctrine of the Trinity as now professed; that they had no notion of three co-eternal and co-equal persons forming one God; but that, although they spoke of the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, they spoke of it uniformly as an inferior and subordinate divinity, derived from the Father, who was the Supreme and only true God, and to whom alone the highest degree of worship was to be paid." This, however, is a question distinct from that which was mainly discussed by Dr. Priestley, and which concerned only the opinions of the great mass of Christian believers in the period immediately succeeding that of the apostles. That the opinions of the Ante-nicene Fathers, however, were such as Mr. Wellbeloved has mentioned above, has been maintained not only by Dr. Priestley but by Dr. Samuel Clarke, Whitby, in his *Disquisitiones Modestæ*, and Semler. Whether, however, this be so or not, it is, I again repeat, a different and independent question from that which it was the principal object of Dr. Priestley, in his Controversy with Dr. Horsley and his Early Opinions, to establish.

† Mr. Lindsey's language is, that they were "Unitarians," (so far the Reviewer quotes, omitting the remainder of the sentence,) "or ARIANS," meaning by this latter

(History of Corruptions, Vol. I. p. 32) says, "we find nothing like divinity ascribed to Christ before Justin Martyr." While, therefore, he admits that divinity *was* ascribed to Christ by Justin Martyr and others of the fathers, he does, in the foregoing sentence and in other places, exclude from this admission the fathers termed apostolic. Here the Reviewer and himself are really and properly at issue. While the one contends, that from the writings of the apostolic fathers, in consequence of the very doubtful authenticity of some, and the interpolated state of others, no inference can be fairly drawn in proof of their acknowledgment of the proper divinity of Jesus Christ; the other contends that such an inference may and must be drawn. This dispute, it is clear, resolves itself into the question, What, of the existing writings of the apostolic fathers, are genuine, and what are not? The Reviewer discourses about Hermas and Barnabas as if no serious and weighty objections to the genuineness of their writings existed; or as if, from writings so suspected, it were fair to draw any argument involving their authenticity; a conduct which (if we were to use his own language) we should say, is at once a proof either of his extraordinary ignorance, or most unaccountable perverseness. Of the writings of Ignatius, Dr. Priestley may have spoken too loosely and unguardedly when he said "that their genuineness was generally given up by the learned." But to found upon this vague and inaccurate mode of expression the charge of "presumptuous falsehood," is a piece of daring, the like to which was scarcely ever before exhibited. It is a monstrous accusation, and the man who preferred it must have known that, in doing so, he was "the bearer of false witness." When it is notorious that many of the learned have given up the writings of Ignatius altogether, the shorter* as well as the longer epistles; when it is remembered that that opinion is constantly gaining strength, and when we reflect that serious doubts concerning them have been expressed by Michaelis and Marsh, the error committed by Dr. Priestley is simply that of an exaggerated form of expression, the employment of too general and extensive a term. This is an error of frequent recurrence in the writings of the best and honestest of men—and one which it is extremely difficult entirely to avoid. And if for every such inadvertence writers are to be branded with the odious epithets of "presumptuous liars," it would not be easy to name any one who could escape the disgraceful imputation.

It is not worth while to enter now upon the question of the authenticity of the works of the apostolic fathers. Many of them are almost univer-

word, what, though not strictly correct, it is yet most frequently understood to mean, those who hold the doctrine of the inferiority and subordination of the Son to the Father. And in this sense of the word, notwithstanding all that the Reviewer has said to the contrary, I believe that Mr. Lindsey was right. For the general reader, who may wish for information upon this subject, a reference to Dr. Clarke's "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity" may perhaps be sufficient.

* On which side the majority of the learned incline it is not easy to say. A great many, no doubt, have advocated the genuineness of the shorter epistles. But if great names are to be cited in their favour, names equally great may be produced against them. If not altogether spurious, however, they have been altered and interpolated, so as to be deprived of all authority. Lardner considered them to have been tampered with and corrupted. So thought Mosheim, and also Michaelis and Marsh. Semler entirely rejects them, and in this is powerfully supported by Dr. Campbell in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Jortin declares, that in no writings are there more evident marks of interpolation than in the genuine epistles, as they are called, of Ignatius. "What need have we of further witnesses" to shew the want of authority belonging to these writings?

sally given up. Of some, stronger doubts are entertained than of others. In the least disputed of them, viz. Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians, the only expression that has been quoted as clearly implying a belief in the divinity of Christ, is the phrase, "sufferings of God;" but, even here, the true reading is suspected by many learned critics to have been, *μαθηματα*, instead of *παθηματα*, "the precepts, and not the sufferings of God," as the context manifestly shews. Of this the Reviewer takes no notice, but cites the passage as if the present reading were altogether unquestioned. Upon this or any other passage, however, extracted from the writings of the apostolic fathers, whether making for or against our opinions, I would not lay the smallest stress. It would not, as it seems to me, be fair to do so, when it is recollected what suspicions are attached to them by men of undoubted erudition, and when a theological scholar, in every way so accomplished as Bishop Marsh, speaks of them generally in the following manner: "Not only the adversaries, but also the friends, of Christianity have suspected the authenticity of the writings ascribed to the apostolic fathers, notwithstanding the immense erudition bestowed on them by Cotelier, Usher, Pearson, Le Clerc, and others, at the end of the last and beginning of the present century. Lardner has clearly shewn that all the works of Clement are spurious, except his first Epistle to the Corinthians; but even that is suspected by one author, (i. e. Michaelis); and Dr. Semler, who has made a more particular study of ecclesiastical history perhaps than any man that ever lived, doubts the authenticity of all the writings ascribed to the apostolic fathers. This, at least," continues Bishop Marsh, "*is certain*, that passages are found in these writings which, from the nature of the subjects, could not have existed in the first century; and if they prove not the whole to be spurious, they prove at least that these writings have been so interpolated as to make it difficult to distinguish what is genuine from what is false." * Surely of writings, so many of which are acknowledged to be spurious, and the whole of which are believed to have been interpolated, and where it is so difficult to distinguish what is genuine from what is false, it behoves all parties, whether orthodox or heterodox, to be particularly cautious in the use which they make, and not to rest any thing of weight upon so uncertain an authority. In spite, therefore, of the air of confidence assumed by the Reviewer, I have no hesitation in saying that, as evidences of the real sentiments of the apostolic fathers, the writings now bearing their name afford no satisfactory ground of decision, and that Dr. Priestley has not been proved to have been incorrect in his assertion, that before Justin Martyr nothing like divinity was ascribed to Jesus Christ.

The Reviewer finds great fault with Dr. Priestley for appealing to a passage in Eusebius, in proof of the assertion that the Unitarians in the time of Victor, about the end of the second century, contended, as the Unitarians of the present day contend, that theirs was the faith of the first Christians. The passage, as quoted by the Reviewer, proves the correctness of Dr. Priestley's statement. It is this: "They" (says the author to whom Eusebius refers) "maintain that all the first Christians, and the apostles themselves, received and taught those things which they (the followers of Artemon) now hold; and that the true doctrine, which was preserved till the time of Victor, the thirteenth bishop of Rome in succession from St. Peter, was first corrupted by his successor Zephyrinus. Their assertion might have

* See Marsh's Michaelis, note to Vol. I. C. ii. S. vi.

some show of probability, but that, in the first place, the Holy Scriptures are decidedly opposed to them ; and there are extant many writings of the brethren, more ancient than the times of Victor, which they wrote to the Gentiles in defence of the truth, and against the then existing heresies. I speak of Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement, and many others, in all of which the divinity of Christ is maintained. And who is ignorant of the books of Irenæus, Melito, and the rest which proclaim that Christ is both God and man ? And whatsoever psalms and songs were written from the first by the faithful brethren, they all ascribe divinity to Christ, and celebrate him as the word of God. How, then," he asks, "can it be pretended that the doctrines which they (the Artemonites) inculcate were received till the time of Victor ? And how is it that they are not ashamed to throw out this calumny against him, since they perfectly well know that Victor excommunicated Theodotus, the inventor and father of their God-denying apostacy, the first who asserted the mere humanity of Christ."

"In this passage," says the Reviewer, "Dr. Priestley could perceive nothing but a plain acknowledgment that the ancient Unitarians themselves constantly asserted that their doctrine was the universal opinion of the primitive church." Certainly, in this passage Dr. Priestley saw, what every one *must* see, that the Unitarians of the time of Victor contended that theirs was, generally, the faith of the primitive church. That in the above passage of Eusebius Dr. Priestley saw *nothing but this*, is what the Reviewer had no right to say. For Dr. Priestley* has taken particular notice of all the statements contained in this said passage, and has attempted distinctly to answer every one of them. He was fully aware that Eusebius and others set up the claim of antiquity for their opinions, as the Unitarians did for theirs. He mentions and combats it. He notices expressly what is said about Theodotus and the novelty of his doctrine, and observes that a direct contradiction to it may be found in the writings of Eusebius himself, and cites a passage from Bishop Pearson in corroboration of the same opinion. As to the hymns used by Christians, and said to have been from the beginning, Dr. Priestley argues,† that no inference can be safely drawn from them, because divinity may be ascribed to persons in very different senses ; and as to their antiquity, the historian not having particularly mentioned their age, it is very possible, for any thing that appears to the contrary, that they might have been those very hymns which were rejected by Paulus Samosatensis on account of their novelty. This very nearly agrees with what Dr. Lardner‡ says of them. "Possibly," observes he, "those hymns were partly ancient, partly modern, having been altered and interpolated since their first original, and some of them might be entirely modern." It appears, then, that Dr. Priestley saw in this passage every thing that was to be seen, and has noticed every thing that it became him to notice. The question, however, with which we are now most concerned is, did the Unitarians of the time of Victor, or did they not, contend that theirs was the faith of the general body of primitive Christians ? And was Dr. Priestley

* Early Opin. Vol. III. pp. 295—302.

† And in my opinion justly. These hymns are no longer in existence ; if they were, it might, perhaps, be found that their language admitted of a different interpretation from that put upon it by the anonymous author referred to in Eusebius. Many persons argue the divinity of Christ, for instance, from words and phrases which, in the estimation of others, justify no such doctrine.

‡ Works, Vol. III. p. 94.

wrong in saying that they did, and in the authority to which, for that purpose, he appealed? He does not attempt to deny or conceal that this claim of the Unitarians was not admitted by Eusebius, for he replies to Eusebius's objections. All that he asserts is, that it was a claim every where advanced by the Unitarians, and, as Dr. Priestley considers, justly advanced. This is the head and front of his offending, and for which he is courteously charged by the Reviewer with "extreme dishonesty,—a just specimen," it is added, "of the conduct of Unitarian commentators."

Why the testimony of an anonymous author, cited by Eusebius, (for Dr. Lardner will not allow, as the Reviewer asserts, that it is *Caius*,) should be preferred to the testimony of Artemon, or Paul of Samosata, or of the Unitarians of that period generally, I know not, except that the one was orthodox and the other heterodox, a circumstance, I am well aware, quite sufficient, in the estimation of some people, and probably of the Reviewer himself, to determine the judgment,—though, no doubt, there are others who will not hesitate to prefer the positive assertions of heretics, of fair and respectable character, to the anonymous statements of an orthodox writer recorded, in a subsequent period, in the writings of another.

For the same purpose, as that last mentioned, the Reviewer cites again a passage in the *Philopatris*, "a satirical dialogue," says he, "ascribed to Lucian, but *probably the work* of some contemporary writer." Triephon, a Christian, in reply to the question of his Heathen catechumen, "By whom shall I swear," answers, (I give, instead of the Greek, the English of the passage,) "By the most high God, great, immortal, celestial, Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one of three and three of one. These account Jupiter, reckon this your God." "This passage," says the Reviewer, "almost persuaded Socinus that the doctrine of the Trinity was the received belief of the Christians of the second century." Whether this was the case or not, whether Socinus was so easily persuaded as we are told he was, I have not at this moment the means of ascertaining; but if he were, he must have been in a singularly credulous state of mind, and strangely wanting in his accustomed judgment. The whole force and pertinency of the Reviewer's observation depend *entirely* upon the age of this anonymous work. It is clear that when the dialogue was composed something like the doctrine of the Trinity was entertained by the writer; but before we can regard it as furnishing any testimony in favour even of the partial reception of this doctrine in the middle of the second century, we must first be satisfied that it was written at about this period; but for this there is not only no sufficient evidence, but the greatest weight of learned opinion inclines the other way. Dr. Lardner,* after mentioning the opinions of Bishop Bull, (who placed it as early as the reign of Marcus Antoninus,) and the sentiments of Moyle, Dodwell, and Gesner,† who ascribe it to the third and fourth, century, decides in favour of the later date, viz. the fourth century. In this case any argument derived from it as to the state of opinions in the second century is perfectly nugatory.

It may seem strange that a writer, thus betraying carelessness or prejudice at every step, should have ventured upon occupying ground which he has shewn himself to be altogether incapable of maintaining. It would not have

* Works, Vol. VIII. pp. 77 and 81.

† Gesner composed a dissertation expressly on its age and author, and supposes it to have been written in the time of Julian, after the middle of the fourth century.

been worth the trouble which I have taken to notice his charges, were it not that such confident assertions, affecting the character and credit of the professors of Unitarianism, and of its most illustrious advocates, are too often received with a readiness exactly proportioned to the degree in which they seem to detract from their principles and their honour.

THOMAS MADGE.

MEMOIR OF ANTONIO VIEYRA, THE PORTUGUESE PREACHER AND MISSIONARY.

OUR readers are probably aware that the censorship imposed upon the French press expired with the close of the last session of the French chambers, and cannot be again imposed until these bodies reassemble after the new election. During this interval, the periodicals of France are using their liberty with great zeal, and giving to the public many curious papers, which had been condemned to oblivion by the jealous caution of their official literary inquisitors. One of these prohibited productions is the memoir of which we here subjoin a translation, which is inserted in the French "Globe" of the 22nd of December. The subject of it was an extraordinary man, and his history cannot, we think, be now perused without interest.

"When, during the controul of the censorship, we gave a sketch of the literature of Portugal, we were not permitted to pay that tribute of respect which we ought to have done to one of its first prose writers, and the greatest man perhaps of that country, Camoens himself not excepted. Antonio Vieyra was not merely the first preacher of his nation, the Massillon of Portugal; the universality of his genius recalls to us that of Bossuet. A great theologian, an expert linguist, a profound historian and chronologist, a political writer distinguished by his force and courage;—speaking and writing the principal languages of Europe, together with six at least of the primitive dialects of Brasil, he was not solely a man of the closet and of study; he was in Europe a statesman, and in America an apostle. Several diplomatic missions to England,* France and Holland, (in 1646 and 1647,) two journeys to Rome,† four voyages to Brasil, eleven visits to all the missionary stations on the Maranhaô, twenty-two voyages along rivers exceeding in their extent the Mediterranean Sea, fourteen thousand leagues traversed on foot over the deserts of the new world, would seem to have scarcely left him leisure to be a writer. Nevertheless, Vieyra is justly ranked among the literary ornaments of Portugal; and we hardly know which ought most to excite our admiration, the immortal productions of his eloquence, or the six hundred leagues of territory which he civilized.

"This illustrious man was born at Lisbon on the 6th of February, 1608. His father conveyed him, when only seven years of age, to Bahia, where, in opposition to the wishes of his family, he joined the Jesuits on the 16th of May, 1623. He was for some time professor of the learned languages at the College of Bahia. In 1641, after the restoration of the house of Braganza, he accompanied, as his adviser, D. Ferd. Mascarenhas, son of the Viceroy of

* "Barbosa notices only one voyage of Vieyra to England. We state the fact from Oudiner. See Nicéron, Tome XXXIV. pp. 270—275."

† "Ib. 1650, 1669."

Brasil, who was sent to Portugal to compliment the king, John IV. This monarch, captivated by the eloquence of Vieyra, appointed him his preacher, and having found him possessed of talents for public business, entrusted him with many negociations. It was in vain that the king endeavoured to attach him to his person, and to reward his services by a bishopric. His truly apostolic soul sought a career of activity and of dangers. Vieyra determined to devote himself altogether to the instruction of the American savages. In 1652, he arrived at the Captainship of Maranhã, accompanied by twelve missionaries. In the following year he was compelled to return to Lisbon to carry a complaint to the king against the Colonists, and to demand the freedom of the Indians as necessary to their conversion. Having succeeded in this honourable undertaking, he again set out for his deserts. It was then that, devoting himself to his proselyting zeal, he brought over to Christianity the greater part of the tribes who wandered in the Seara, Maranhã, Para, and on the banks of the Amazons. He erected sixteen churches, and composed a catechism in six languages for the use of the converts. He subjected the Nhemgaybas to the Gospel and to Portugal, which received them in triumph on the 5th of August, 1659. In 1661, the Colonists, more and more irritated by the impediments which the missionaries opposed to their criminal avarice, shipped off Vieyra and his associates in a vessel bound for Lisbon, on the pretence that they were conspiring with the Dutch to deprive Portugal of Brasil. This absurd accusation fell of itself: the voyage occasioned Vieyra, however, many misfortunes. Alphonso VI. had now succeeded to John IV. The young nobility had rendered themselves masters of the king's will. Vieyra, being consulted by the regent, advised that the favourites should be banished. A remonstrance, attributed to his pen, was forwarded to the young monarch. This piece appeared in French in a work entitled, *Relation des troubles arrivés à la Cour de Portugal*, by Fremont d'Ablancourt. The following year, however, the favourites again became the masters, and Vieyra was banished first to Oporto, and afterwards to Coimbra. Old enmities were now awakened. From the year 1652, the Jesuits of Portugal, enraged by a measure which they believed to have originated in his advice, were desirous of expelling him from their society as an innovator. On this occasion they charged him with having delivered from the pulpit doctrines contrary to the true faith. Will it be believed that neither the genius of this great man, nor the eminent services he had rendered to the cause of Christianity, could prevent their persecuting him through the Inquisition? He was imprisoned, by order of the Holy Office, on the 2nd of October, 1665; and it was considered that they did him a favour when they released him on the 24th of December, 1667, after a confinement of twenty-six months, by sending him to assist at an *auto-da-fé*, and restricting themselves to prohibiting him to preach. This injury was too odious to pass unnoticed. The Pope interposed, and the honour of Vieyra received a striking satisfaction and a singular distinction. By a brief of Clement X., he was removed from the jurisdiction of the Portuguese Inquisitors, and placed under the charge of the Roman congregation of Cardinals. We owe to this dispute of Vieyra with the Holy Office a very curious little work, which was not printed till 1821. It is entitled, 'A Secret Note addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff, Clement X., on the manner in which the Inquisition of Portugal proceeds towards its Prisoners.'* It is to be

* "Barbosa has not mentioned this piece among the manuscript productions of Vieyra; the reason of his silence may be easily understood."

added, that it was after the developement of facts made by this letter that the Inquisition was suspended in Portugal from 1674 to 1681.

“At the request of Queen Christina, Vieira, in 1669, received from the general of his order, an invitation to visit Rome. The queen, delighted by his eloquence,* was desirous of engaging him as her confessor; but Vieira’s wishes were absorbed in his missionary labours. After having re-established his health at Lisbon, and, in 1678, declined new offers from the Queen of Sweden, he re-embarked for Brasil, where he arrived in 1681. He was appointed, on the first of January, 1688, by the general of the Jesuits, Visitor of the Provinces, and the Superior of all the Missions. He passed the remainder of his life at Bahia, where he occupied a small house with a garden, in one of the suburbs. In this retirement he employed himself in the correction and printing of his works. He afterwards received a brief from Clement X., authorizing him to publish his works without submitting them to the approbation of any censors—a circumstance not the least remarkable of his life. Vieira rigidly observed his vow of poverty. He possessed no property, and wore the same cloak for fourteen years. He died in a state of nearly total blindness, in 1697, at the age of 89.

“In the writings, as well as in the adventurous life of Vieira, we perceive a poetic character, which is a predominant characteristic of the Portuguese prose writers. We shall quote, in proof of this, the extract of a sermon which this zealous missionary delivered at the church of our Lady of Ajuda, at Bahia, during the obstinate and glorious struggle which Portugal had to maintain against Holland. This piece is marked by all the pious courage and all the zealous singularity of so energetic a character. It is pronounced by the Abbé Raynal,† to be the most extraordinary discourse that ever was delivered from a Christian pulpit. Vieira, having taken for his text the xliv. Psalm and 23 verse, where the Psalmist, addressing God, says, *Awake. Why sleepest thou, O Lord?* thus proceeds:

“‘It is thus remonstrating rather than supplicating that the prophet-king speaks to God. The [present] times and circumstances are the same.—It is not, therefore, to the people that I shall preach this day; my voice and my words shall ascend higher. I aspire at this moment to penetrate the bosom of the Deity. This is the last day of Easter, (*le dernier jour de la quinzaine,*) which in all the churches of the mother country is devoted to prayers before the sacred altars; and since this day is the last, it is proper to resort to the only and the last remedy. The Christian orators have in vain laboured to lead you to repentance: since then ye have been deaf, since they have not converted you, it is thou, Lord, whom I would convert.—Knowest thou not that the heretic, elated by the successes which thou hast granted him, has already said that it is to the falsehood of our worship he owes his protection and his victories? And what wouldst thou that the heathens who surround us should think of this?—The Talapoin, who does not yet know thee, the unsteady Indian, scarcely wet with the water of baptism? Hast thou then given us these countries only that they may be wrested from us? If thou hast destined them for the Dutch, why didst thou not call them while the land was uncultivated? Has the heretic rendered thee such signal services, and are we so contemptible in thine eyes, that thou

* “He preached before her in Italian.”

† “*Histoire Philosophique*. Paris, Amable Coste, 1820, T. v. p. 37; and *Recueil des Sermons* du P. Vieira, Lisbon, 1679, 1696, 12 Vols. 4to., terceira parte, p. 467. The Sermon is entitled, *Pelo bom Successo das Armas de Portugal contra as de Hollande.*”

hast drawn us from our country merely to be to him the clearers of the soil, to build him cities, and enrich him by our labours? Job, crushed by misfortunes, contended with thee: thou wouldst not that we should be more insensible than he. He said, Since thou hast determined my destruction, accomplish thy purpose; kill me, annihilate me. Let me be buried, and reduced to dust; to this I consent. But to-morrow thou shalt seek me, but shalt not find me. Thou shalt have the Sabeans, the Chaldeans, the blasphemers of thy name; but Job, the faithful servant who adores thee, thou shalt have no more. Dost thou think that Holland will furnish thee with apostolical conquerors, who, at the hazard of their lives, will carry through the whole country the standard of the cross? Will Holland raise temples that shall please thee? Will she build altars upon which thou wilt descend?—Yes! yes! the worship which thou shalt there receive will be that which is daily offered at Amsterdam, at Middleburgh, and at Flushing, and in other parts of this cold and humid hell!

“ ‘ Lord! I well know that the propagation of thy faith, and the interests of thy glory, depend not upon us,—and that were there no human beings in existence, thy power would give life to the stones, and from them raise up children to Abraham. But I also know that since the time of Adam thou hast not created a new race of men; that thou employest those which are, and that thou dost not admit to thy plans the less good, but from the want of better. If the misfortune befall us, that Holland shall become the mistress of Brasil, what I would with humility, but most seriously recommend, is, that thou do well consider before thy decree be executed; carefully weigh what might in that case befall thee; deliberate, while yet there is time.—Before the deluge thou wert highly incensed against the human race. It was in vain that Noah supplicated for an age; thou persistedst in thine anger. The cataracts of heaven at length burst; the waters rise above the summits of the mountains; the whole earth is inundated—and thy justice is satisfied! But three days afterwards, when the bodies floated, when thy eyes beheld the multitude of livid carcases, when the surface of the seas presented to thee a spectacle the most melancholy, the most terrific which ever angels gazed upon with sorrow, what didst thou? Struck with this scene, as if thou hadst not foreseen it, thy bowels were moved with grief. It repented thee that thou hadst made the world. Thou didst lament the past—didst form resolutions for the future. Behold what thou art; and since this is thy character, why dost thou not interpose to save us? When thy temples shall be spoiled, thy altars destroyed, thy religion be extinguished in Brasil, thy worship be suspended and the grass shall grow before the portals of thy churches, then shall Christmas arrive, and there shall be none to commemorate thy natal day. Lent, the holy week, shall come, and the mysteries of thy passion shall not be celebrated! The stones of our streets shall groan, like those of the desolate streets of Jerusalem. There will be no more priests, no more sacrifices, no more sacraments. Heresy will seat herself in the chair of truth. False doctrine will infect the children of Portugal. At some future day the question will be asked the descendants of those who surround me, *Boys, of what religion are you?*—And they will answer, *We are Calvinists.* *Girls, of what religion are you?*—And their answer will be, *We are Lutherans.* Thou wilt then pity, and wilt repent; but since sorrow affects thee, why not prevent its occurrence?—

“ Surely, neither Bossuet nor Bridaine furnishes any thing more splendid than this bold address. Besides his sermons, which form thirteen volumes, 4to, and extend to 190 in number, Vieira wrote many other pieces, which

are specified by Barbosa. His other biographers have enumerated only a small portion of his publications. We cannot better complete the idea we had proposed to give of this extraordinary man, than by transcribing the titles of some of his works. They are, 1. A Letter addressed to the King on the Missions of Seara, &c., 4to. 2. Account of the Mission of the Serra of Ibiapaba. 3. Report to the Ultra Marine Council on the Affairs of Maranhão. 4. Advice on the Difficulties experienced by the Inhabitants of St. Paul in the Government of the Indians. 5. Letter of Vieyra to the Provincial of Brasil on the Motives of his quitting Lisbon in 1652. 6. Apology for the Tears of Heraclitus. 7. The Art of Flying, a curious work, composed on the Invasion of Portugal by Spain. 8. A Discourse on the Comet which appeared at Bahia on the 27th of October, 1694. 9. History of the Future. 10. Criticism on the History of the Dominicans of Portugal.

“Vieyra left many manuscripts, of which Barbosa has given a correct catalogue. The principal are, 1. Description of Lisbon. 2. Politics of the Devil. (We are not informed whether this work treats of the Inquisition.) 3. Method of Governing the Indians of the Great Para. 4. Instruction and Reply on the Affair of Naples. 5. Description of Maranhão. 6. A work on the War of the Dutch at Pernambuco. 7. The Manner in which the Indians were taken and condemned to Slavery in 1655. 8. Memoir on the State of the Jews and of the New Converts in Spain and Portugal. 9. A Key to the Prophets.—But we must stop. Perhaps more than one of our readers will, like ourselves, blush on their own account at the neglect we have so long shewn towards a literature of this kind. They would also probably feel surprised if we were to omit to avail ourselves of an interval of the liberty of the press, to give insertion to the praise of a man who has in such a degree done honour to Christianity and to human nature.”—*Le Globe*, Tome VI. No. 13.

SECRET WORSHIP.

WOULDST thou in thy lonely hour
 Praises to th' Eternal pour?
 I will teach thy Soul to be
 Temple, Hymn, and Harmony.
 Sweeter songs than poets sing
 Thou shalt for thy offering bring;
 The unuttered hymn that dwells
 In devotion's deepest cells.
 Know that music's holiest strain
 Loves to linger, loves to reign,
 In that calm of quiet thought,
 Which the passions trouble not.
 And that living temple where
 Peace and Hope and silence are,
 Is the sacred citadel,
 Where the Father loves to dwell.
 Wouldst thou in thy lonely hour
 Praises to th' Eternal pour?
 Thus thy Soul may learn to be
 Temple, Hymn, and Harmony.

A.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—*History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy in the Sixteenth Century ; including a Sketch of the History of the Reformation in the Grisons.* By Thomas M'Crie, D. D. Edinburgh, Blackwood. 1827.

(Concluded from p. 34.)

IN 1269, died at Ferrara, Armano Pungilupò. His conduct had been so exemplary and christian-like, that the Bishop of Ferrara, who was and is considered a saint, endeavoured immediately to prove in an authentic manner that Pungilupò had gone straight to Paradise, had worked many miracles, and deserved to be canonized. But whilst the good bishop was administering oaths to witnesses and collecting evidence to this purpose, not more than a year after Pungilupò's death, the Court of Rome set to work to prove that Pungilupò, so far from being a saint, was a heretic, and had gone quite in the other direction : and at Rome also witnesses were sworn and evidence collected to prove that such was the fact. The contest between the advocate of the saint and that of the devil (who is considered to be defendant *jure officii* in these cases) was a long and sharp one; but at length the latter prevailed. Although so late as the year 1295, Ricobaldo called Pungilupò a *friend of God*, yet, on the 22d of March, 1301, Pope Boniface VIII. (for whom Dante was mistaken in hell by Pope Nicolas III., who occupied a place which he was anxious to leave to Boniface, who he knew was to succeed him in it) condemned the memory of Pungilupò as that of a heretic; his bones, which had been buried thirty-two years, were dug up and burned, and his ashes thrown to the wind. A diligent historian of Ferrara, on whom we may rely, since Muratori has praised him, has preserved the acts of this condemnation, and from him we learn, that Armano was declared guilty of partaking the opinions of the Albigenses, Bagnolesi, and Concorrezesi. He has further taken the trouble, on that occasion, of giving a list of propositions in which these sectarians agreed, as well as of some in which they did not. It may not be uninteresting to our readers to see some of the propositions in which they agreed.

The Albigenses, Bagnolesi, and Concorrezesi, in Italy, then agreed, it appears, in the following propositions : “ That Christ is not God ; that there is no resurrection of the body ; that baptism with water is of no service ; that a material church is of no use to pray in ; that the church cannot make constitutions ; that the anointment with holy oil is nothing ; that the sacrament of the altar is nothing ; that there is no original sin ; that there is no purgatory ; that faith alone is not enough for our salvation ; that we ought not to confess ; that it is not lawful to swear, or to put any one to death, or to give any one up to justice (if a heretic), because he may be converted.” *

The sect of the Apostolics, resembling this in many points, was flourishing at the time when Pope Boniface was condemning the memory of Pungilupò. John of Parma, General of the Franciscans, is said to have prophesied that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was to terminate in the year 1260, when

* Priscianus, apud Muratori Antiq. Ital. Med. Ævi. Diss. 60.

the Gospel of the Holy Spirit was to succeed it, being as much superior to the existing one as the sun is to the moon, and by this the church was to be changed. The tenets of this man being condemned, another friar of Parma, Gerard Secarelli, began to spread the opinions of the Apostolics, and being taken and condemned as a heretic, he was burnt on the 18th of July, 1300. His sect was not, however, extinguished with him, for he was succeeded in the direction of it by Fra. Dolcino, whose capture and death are made by Dante matter of prophecy to him by Mahomet, in the 28th canto of his *Inferno*. Dolcino was burned after the most cruel torture, which he bore with the greatest fortitude, and without renouncing his opinions, in July 1305.

Secarelli and Dolcino taught that they were sent to REFORM the church, which was perishing, on account of the pride, avarice, luxury, and many other vices of the clergy. Dolcino said that Secarelli had already begun this *reformation*, and that he (Dolcino) was to finish it: that the church of Rome was not the church of God, but a reprobated one, and that she was that bad woman who renounced the faith of Christ, of whom John speaks in the Apocalypse: that no pope has the power of absolving from sins, if he be not "as poor, holy, and humble as St. Peter, not exciting war, not persecuting any one, and permitting every one to live in perfect liberty:" that Frederic of Aragon should be made Emperor, and should make nine or ten kings in Italy, who would destroy the pope and priests and friars, more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, "and take from them their riches and temporal dominions, and bring all the world under the law of the New Testament." These sectarians called themselves *apostolics*, because they professed to live according to the manner of the apostles, and their opinions on many points were very heterodox.

This sect was certainly in many particulars the same as the others which appeared at different times. It is recorded at least that they agreed in their praises of celibacy, in their opinions respecting the inutility of churches, in disapproving of oaths, &c. It was said by the Albigenses, "that it was not permitted to shave;" so also the Apostolics, who affected the same ignorance and simplicity of manners as the apostles, were "*intonsi et barbati*," as St. Bernard says. Long after this monk, some of the followers of Dolcino being burnt at Padua, one who saw them burn says they were rustics.* Dolcino had many followers in Dalmatia and the Alps of Trent, as well as in Tuscany and the neighbourhood.† The name was well known in the twelfth century, and was even familiar in Germany, as we find from St. Bernard. Evervin, a parish priest of Steinfeld, near Cologne, wrote to St. Bernard to acquaint him that some of the *Apostolics* had been discovered to have arrived there, and the discovery originated in a quarrel these newcomers had with some heretics of that place. Two of them, *quoting always the words of Christ and of the Apostles*, had a dispute in public before the Archbishop of Cologne and many of the nobility, and then asked time to send for some of their *learned elders*. The people, against the will of the clergy, (if we must believe Evervin,) seeing that these heretics would not be converted, seized them, submitted them to the watery ordeal, (which St. Bernard approves of as an excellent mode of discovering truth,) and, as they were found obstinate, they were burned. They died so cheerfully, that poor Evervin could not understand how those sons of Belial appeared to have a

* Foscolo's Dante, sect. lxxx.

† Additamenta ad Hist. Dolcini Hæres. apud Muratori.—Rer. Ital. script. Vol. IX. col. 450.—Sassi not. in Dolcini Hist. col. 429.

greater strength of resolution than true Christians. St. Bernard answered this letter from Evervin, saying, that the courage they appeared to possess did not come from God, but from the devil; he called them all sorts of names, foxes, hypocrites, dogs; but after all is compelled to say that they behaved very well, did not deceive any one, had very good morals, did not commit violence, &c.: good qualities which he charitably attributes to hypocrisy. Muratori observes that none of the contemporary historians found fault with the behaviour of Dolcino and his followers in a moral point of view.

Dr. M'Crie would pass over the exertions of many excellent men by telling us, that many Italians had discovered the corruptions of the Roman Church, who entertained no thought of renouncing her communion, and he quotes three or four passages from the *Divina Commedia* to prove his opinion. Now this, in its strict sense, would apply to almost all men who see abuses in their country's institutions. Their first thought is, not to destroy, but to reform; not being always sure that if they overthrow they shall set up something better. The Nonconformists of England laboured long to avoid what they called the sin of schism, and so did many very honest reformers, who, for one reason or another, saw no necessity to destroy in all respects the system of ecclesiastical government of those from whom they differed in some particulars. That Dante "entertained no thought of renouncing the communion of the Roman Church," if opportunity served and redress could be had no other way, is a very easy assertion, but one which has little to support it. A man who, as Dante did, cried out loudly against the mass, the indulgences, the decretals, the temporal power of the popes, and their avarice; the hypocrisy and riches and idleness and ignorance of the friars of all denominations; who scorned their interpretation of the Bible, charging them with distorting its sense, and advising his fellow-creatures to read it and follow its precepts; who boldly puts into hell Pope Celestin, though canonized as a saint; who declared the Roman see vacant, in the sight of God, when filled by an unworthy pope (Boniface VIII.)—this man certainly looks like one who would not have been very averse to renouncing the communion of the Roman Church. After what Foscolo and Rosetti have written on Dante's inclination and intentions on the subject of reform, (particularly the former in his preliminary volume,) Dr. M'Crie would perhaps alter his opinion. To understand Dante, it is necessary to have a somewhat more intimate acquaintance with him than that which Dr. M'Crie appears to possess. His quotations remind us of the inquisitors of Spain, who put the poem in the *Index expurgatorius*, until three passages were expunged from it. Those learned divines did not see any other part to be dangerous. The Italian divines were wiser—they wrote very learned books and notes to prove his orthodoxy; not daring to proscribe his poem, and seeing that it would be necessary to destroy it altogether to do any good to their cause, unless they could make the world put an entirely different construction upon its meaning.

The poem of Dante cannot be understood without a full acquaintance with the religious history of his time, nor is that religious history intelligible without a thorough knowledge of his poem. Many of his opinions are those professed by the Italian sectarians in matters of morals, reformation of ceremonies, &c. In doctrinal speculations he placed Aristotle above Plato; but still, in his system of the heavens, in his metaphysics, and in his theological disputations, he follows in preference the school of Plato and Pythagoras. Nevertheless, many of his poetical fancies are to be traced to the opinions of the heretics of his days, and sometimes to those of some of the heathen

philosophers whom he could reconcile with Christianity; in doing which he displayed great ingenuity.

Dante's time, however, was not the fit season for heading any open plan of reformation in Italy. The abuses of spiritual power to obtain temporal ends and to advance the ambitious views of that "old, cursed, insatiable she-wolf," (as Dante calls the Court of Rome,) were then brought to their highest pitch, and political heresy to her interests was as dangerous as religious. The Venetians having seized Ferrara in 1309, Clement V. excommunicated them, declared them infamous to the fourth generation, ordered their merchandise to be confiscated in all the ports of the world, deprived them of the right of inheriting or of making a will, either in a foreign or in their own country, authorized any one to seize them and make them slaves, and excited all Christian nations to the lawful, nay, meritorious, act of making war upon them, and of destroying them by means even of treachery. And this bull found executors amongst all the Christian powers. A year before Dante's death, in 1320, and exactly one hundred years after the first constitution of Frederic against the heretics, the Inquisition was most mercilessly and infamously exercised against the partizans of the empire, in Milan and other cities in any wise disaffected, and continued to be so for several years.

Yet, in 1369, an insult was offered in Milan to the ambassadors or legates of the pope, which perhaps would have been spared when that city was full of heretics. In that year the pope excommunicated Visconti, Duke of Milan, and sent a cardinal and an abbot to deliver to him the bull of excommunication. The legates found Visconti in his capital, delivered him the bull, and were apparently well received. When they were about to depart he offered to accompany them a little way, attended by many of his followers. On reaching the bridge of the *Naviglio*, the duke stopped and asked them sternly, whether they felt more inclined to eat or to drink; they answered, that they wanted neither: but being pressed, they added, that where there was so much drink to be got, they felt more inclined to eat. "Well, then," said the duke, "here is the bull of excommunication; you shall eat it before you leave this bridge." It was in vain the cardinal remonstrated and threatened him with the vengeance of God. The ambassadors were obliged to eat immediately on the spot the parchment, ribbons, leaden seals and all. When they had finished their hard repast they were allowed to depart.

Petrarch and Boccaccio contributed greatly to the revival of Platonic philosophy. Neither of them was ever a profound scholar in Greek, yet from their days Aristotle began in his turn to loose ground before his rival.

In the next century Platonism was every where in vogue throughout Italy, and philosophy, in various ways, became the source of discussions and opinions which agitated the minds of the Italians, and prepared them for the state in which the German reformation found them. The Aristotelians became comparatively insignificant, but they still adhered to their principles. Pomponazzo, the most famous of them all, having denied the immortality of the soul in his treatise *de Immortalitate Animæ*, had no better defence to offer, than that he meant it as Aristotle's opinion, not his own; a very evasive plea, as may easily be seen. Had it not been for Cardinal Bembo's protection, perhaps the inquisitors would not have so easily admitted it, coming from a man who was already obnoxious for having held up Christianity to ridicule.

There was a moment when it appeared probable that the superstitions of Rome would be done away with altogether in Italy. The spirit of the times

was such, that popes and cardinals laughed at the vices of friars, and denounced both them and their miracles; but these men were many of them politicians, and the greater part of those even, who were honest, shrunk from violence and from many of the opinions and proceedings of the *root-and-branch reformers*.

Many of the Italians began to join the Court of Rome at the Council of Constance, and did so altogether at that of Trent, not from religious, but political reasons; to prevent the destruction of a power which they considered necessary to the political importance of their country. The literati, equally with the politicians, betrayed the cause of reform, or left both sides to the management of the rude and violent. "Sadoletto, Bembo, and the rest of the Italian scholars," as Mr. Roscoe observes, "kept aloof from the contest, unwilling to betray the interest of literature by defending the dogmas of religion, and left the vindication of the most important interests of the church to scholastic disputants, exasperated bigots, and illiterate monks, whose writings for the most part injured the cause they were intended to defend." This same Sadoletto, we learn from Dr. M'Crie, "in the name of his friends, set before Paleario the danger of giving way to innovations, and advised him, in consideration of the times, to confine himself to the safer task of clothing the peripatetic ideas in elegant language." Sadoletto, like Erasmus, had not the courage of a martyr.

Dr. M'Crie might very well have bestowed a little more pains in analysing the causes which led (more directly than the "disturbance" of the free inquirers) to so complete a desertion and overthrow of those bodies of reformers, who (though no doubt on various principles and views) were working, it might have been supposed somewhat surely, towards much the same end in Italy. The effects of the ferment upon political and religious opinion in Italy, are equally susceptible of much interesting inquiry. Whatever was the reason why the cause, though triumphant elsewhere, so totally miscarried in Italy, the injury resulting to that country from the collision was fatal and permanent. That measure of liberty and practical toleration which had existed, perhaps, to a greater degree there than in any country of Europe, was totally destroyed. Thankful for the blessings of the Reformation, however disfigured, it is hardly for *us* to speculate what might have been the result if the Italians had not been so crushed. Some of their descendants are fond of thinking that those principles which had found their way into the minds of so many of all classes of society, and even of the dignitaries of the church, would have produced a less violent and dogmatic, but perhaps a more effective, reformation, commencing in the country which was best prepared for it by its civilization and by the authority which its example would have enforced. As it was, if some part of Europe gained, Italy lost irretrievably all she had both in possession and prospect. After the Council of Trent, the power of the Inquisition was amazingly increased. Even the bishops were deprived of their canonical power, the monastic orders were rendered independent of them, the pope became a despot, and the whole nation was prostrated both in a civil and religious sense.

Dr. M'Crie's religious views obviously govern his plan, and furnish the reason why some of the most remarkable seceders from the Roman faith among the Italians are very briefly disposed of. Even the names of several of them are not mentioned, as is the case, for instance, with Gribaldi; of others it is only incidentally done. Alciati and Blandrata are only mentioned as "the noted Anti-trinitarians." Gentili is spoken of but once, to

deny that he met with other Unitarians at Venice in 1546. The Socini are very slightly noticed. In Dr. M'Crie's view, these men had nothing to do with "the Reformation" but to *disturb* it; and to dwell upon their names would excite feelings unpleasant to an admirer of Calvin, who would willingly shut his eyes to that great man's infirmities. To have mentioned Gribaldi, might have rendered it necessary to say that he died of the plague just in time to escape dying (thanks to the mercy of the Calvinists) by the hand of the executioner, a fate which could not be escaped by the more unfortunate Gentili, who was put to death among the Lutherans at Bern. We know that Dr. M'Crie is really an enemy to cruelty and intolerance, but we cannot help remarking that his dislike of any doctrines but his own has led him to approve of acts *in principle* as bad as those just now alluded to, which he wisely passes over in silence. Speaking of Alciati and Blandrata, (who visited the Grisons a second time in 1579, and were ordered to depart immediately,) he adds, "After this the country does not appear to have been **DISTURBED** with these controversies" about the Trinity. To be sure it was not *disturbed*, because if, instead of discussing with your opponents, you drive them away, you are not likely to be *disturbed* by their controversies. In other times a zealot would say of these good people, on the same principle, "They are carrying their opinions to some place, where perhaps they will find ignorant persons to delude; therefore, instead of banishing, the effectual remedy is to burn them, that they may not *disturb* ANY country with their controversies." Thus did the holy Inquisition, and in defence of it urged the very same reason, namely, that where there was the blessing of a holy office, the country was *not disturbed by controversies* on religion. But it is said, "They were strangers—they fomented discord and endangered the existence of the whole colony, by propagating sentiments equally shocking to the ears of Papist and Protestant." Were not the Englishmen and Germans who were burned at Rome and elsewhere in Italy foreigners? Did not they foment discord, and endanger not a mere colony, but what was considered the true and universal church of God? And as for their propagating sentiments shocking both to Protestants and Catholics, does not a Jew or a Mahometan do the same? Consequently, the kings of Spain were right in driving all the Jews and Mahometans from their dominions, and in burning those who did not depart. Besides, we would wish to understand how far this is to go. Carlostadt was a *Protestant*, we suppose; but merely because he promulgated tenets shocking both to Papists and Lutherans about the real presence, he too was banished by the kind intervention of Luther, and driven both by him and Zwingli to live miserably by hard daily labour. Is this within the justification pleaded?

We do not intend to enter here into the details of Dr. M'Crie's History. It contains a good deal of matter which it is not easy to find elsewhere; and, whatever we may think of the deficiency and exclusiveness of his plan, and the partiality of his execution, his book is certainly, upon the whole, interesting and useful. We might, perhaps, remark, that he appears to us to repose rather too indiscriminate a confidence in his authorities. Whatever may be thought of their high characters, the reformers, and in general the Protestant writers, particularly those who were nearer the times of the Reformation, are not to be blindly trusted when they speak of Papists, of the Inquisition, of heretics, and so on. We cannot help, for instance, observing, that Calvin is a suspicious authority for an affirmation on which stress is to be laid, that Servetus "was known to be as zealous of propa-

gating his notions by private letters, as by the press." So we incline to think, that if the assertions on the persecutions at Venice be not altogether false, they are greatly exaggerated. Some of the writers on whom Dr. M'Crie relies, may be easily convicted of telling untruths—for instance, Vergerio. This man says, according to the translation of Dr. M'Crie, in a letter of April 24, 1551, "The news from Italy are, that the Senate of Venice have made a decree that no papal legate, nor bishop, nor inquisitor, shall proceed against any subject, except in the presence of a civil magistrate; and that the pope, enraged at this, has fulminated a bull interdicting, under the heaviest pains, any secular prince from interposing the least hindrance to trials for heresy. It remains to be seen whether the Venetians will obey." Now, it is a fact ascertained beyond the shadow of doubt, that from the very first moment when the Inquisition was introduced into Venice, it was *always* under the controul of the civil magistrates. After this we hear that "ample authority is given to the inquisitors, on the smallest information, to seize any person at their pleasure, to put him to the torture, and (what is worse than death) to send him to Rome." When we see all this said on the faith of an historian who talks about a bold speech, made at a *public audience*, by an ambassador of the Grisons, who was thanked by several of the senators for his boldness, whilst we know that no public audience, no thanks of senators, could take place in reference to any ambassador, we are very much inclined to doubt all these tales and the circumstantial histories about the boats, the planks, &c., &c.

What we positively know is, that the republic of Venice *never* yielded to the Court of Rome; that when the Pope proposed a crusade against the Lutherans, the Venetians not only refused to join in it, but would not send ambassadors to a congress held at Bologna for that purpose; and that Carraccioli, Marquess of Vico, well known as an illustrious Protestant, often mentioned even by Dr. M'Crie, whenever he wanted to see his family, always did it in the Venetian territories, and under a safe-conduct from the government, which was respected by every one in the territories of the republic. Add to this, that we do not find a word about these persecutions and these martyrs in any historian of the republic of Venice, and particularly not in the last, best, and most impartial of them all, Count Daru, who had access to the private archives of the republic, and who would have exposed most willingly any villanies of the Court of Rome or of the Inquisition. The fact adverted to by Dr. M'Crie, that there continued to be Protestants at Venice in the seventeenth century, is also in our favour. We should have wished that to all other authorities Dr. M'Crie had added those mentioned by Daru, as from them it appears that among those Protestants, who exceeded one thousand, there were three hundred patricians, and that they were under the direction of the illustrious Fra. Paolo Sarpi, and of his companion and friend Fra. Fulgenzio.

To conclude this rambling excursion: we have heard that chronology and geography are the two eyes of history. We cannot assert that Dr. M'Crie's history is blind, because we cannot well make out whether or not it has the eye of chronology; a thing very difficult to be verified in his confused and embarrassed method of writing, the same persons and places appearing and disappearing many times, without clearly distinguishing any dates. We doubted the soundness of the other eye, that of geography, when we saw Bologna, Modena, &c., separately spoken of, and the Pisano, (which we suppose means the territory of Pisa,) and the duchy of Mantua, (separated

as they are by many other states and by the Apennines,) united in one place, as if they were contiguous to one another. (P. 130.) But when we saw Piedmont and the very city of Turin spoken of as out of Italy, (pp. 281—283,) and read, “LUCCA—SITUATED ON THE LAKE OF GENOA,” (p. 123,) we felt satisfied that, if not blind, Dr. M'Crie's History was at least somewhat one-eyed.

P.

ART. II.—*Conybeare's Bampton Lectures and Chevallier's Hulsean Lectures.*

(Concluded from p. 43.)

MR. CONYBEARE begins, in his second lecture, the history of the spiritual and secondary interpretation of Scripture. We have already examined the evidence on which the existence of such a sense has been supposed to be known to the writers of the Old Testament, or any of those who lived before this part of Scripture was completed, and having found no trace of such knowledge, we cannot, of course, agree with him, that those who, in the interval between the close of the Old Testament and the times of our Saviour, employed themselves in tracing such a sense, “borrowed this principle of interpretation from the authority of revelation itself.” P. 40. Of the marks of this practice in the apocryphal books he thus speaks :

“The earliest instances of this practice are to be found (assuming, that is, the correctness of the dates usually assigned for the composition of those works) in the apocryphal books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.—In both these works, but more especially perhaps in the book of Wisdom, traces of mystical interpretation are occasionally discoverable, though these are scarcely of that which can in strictness be termed a spiritual character. They are altogether in the tone of that Hellenistic philosophy, if we may so term it, which distinguishes the whole of the works in question, and of which it will soon be necessary to speak somewhat more at large. The most singular example, perhaps, of this mode of exposition to be found in either of the books, is the assertion, that the sacerdotal vestments of Aaron were symbolical of the material, or perhaps of the archetypal, universe; a notion held also by Josephus and others in later times.—In one passage of the book of Wisdom, there is (if I be not mistaken) somewhat which implies that its author regarded the history of the fall of our first parents as allegorical; and the same tendency to mystical exposition shews itself more than once in the highly amplified and ornamented detail which the same writer presents of the plagues inflicted on the monarch and people of Egypt. Of an era not perhaps very remote from that of these extraordinary works, is a remarkable, though suspicious, document, preserved by Eusebius, and attributed, on the authority of the Pseudo-Aristæas, to Eleazar the high priest. In this an allegorical explanation is authoritatively given to the different species of animals permitted or forbidden by the Mosaic law to be used for the food of man. The chief ground for proposing this explanation appears to have been a dread lest the Scripture should be supposed to have prescribed any thing as of divine ordinance, without reason or truth (*εἰκὴ ἢ μυθώδως*); a pretext, which (with, perhaps, a yet greater latitude of application) is common to all the earlier advocates of allegorical exposition. Whatever degree of credit we attach to the writings which pass under the name of Aristæas, the extracts preserved by Eusebius prove at least, that the habit of mystical exposition had already obtained among the Alexandrian Jews in the age of their author. The like inference may be drawn also from the extracts given by the same

historian from the treatise, whether genuine or supposititious, attributed to Aristobulus, a Jewish philosopher of the peripatetic school, said to have flourished under the Ptolemies.”—Pp. 41—45.

It is evident, from Mr. Conybeare's own statements, that these books afford no traces of that kind of secondary interpretation of the Jewish history and law which, he contends, was familiar to the ancient Israelites, though imperfectly practised by them, namely, their typical and prophetic reference to the Messiah; but, we think, we may go further, and say that the passages referred to are not even examples of secondary interpretation at all, as they attribute no more than *one* meaning to the words. When the author of the Book of Wisdom says, “that God made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living: for he created all things, that they might have their being; and the generations of the world were healthful;” he seems to mean nothing more than that the world was originally calculated for the immortality of man, till his own disobedience brought death into it; and this, surely, is much more like a literal than an allegorical interpretation of the fall. The amplification of the plagues of Egypt displays the usual tendency of the apocryphal writers to exaggerate and feign, but we can see in it no marks of mystical exposition. The passage of this book, (xviii. 24,) in which the author, speaking of Aaron's staying the plague, ascribes virtue to his garments and insignia, (“for in the long garment was the whole world, and in the four rows of stones the glory of the fathers graven, and thy majesty was the diadem upon his head,”) is a curious instance of that propensity of the Jews to seek for a recondite and fanciful *reason* for their own usages and rites, of which other examples may be seen in Josephus. That the pectoral of the high-priest represented the glory of the fathers, and the diadem, the majesty of Jehovah, was perfectly true; that the colours of his garments represented the elements, his girdle the ocean, and his turban the heavens, (Jos. Ant. III. C. vii.,) is rather a fanciful theory respecting the motive of the legislator in prescribing this dress, than a mystical interpretation of his words, which are taken only in one, and that their obvious, sense. Indeed, throughout his observations, Mr. Conybeare makes no distinction between the *emblematic* or *commemorative* import of a ceremony or usage, and the double meaning of words, applying to both the terms secondary, spiritual, mystical, allegorical, &c. Thus we are told, that an allegorical explanation is given in the epistle of Eleazar to the clean and unclean animals of the Mosaic law. Now, though Eusebius, in introducing the extract in question, (Pr. Ev. VIII. 9,) does use the word *ἀλληγορεῖσθαι*, this only shews, what we had occasion to observe in speaking of a passage in the epistle to the Galatians, (iv. 24,) that the ancients used the verb very differently from ourselves. The commands and prohibitions are taken in a literal sense, but are supposed to convey some moral instruction, derived from the habits of the animals in question. Thus the birds and beasts allowed for food are chiefly granivorous and herbivorous, while those forbidden are carnivorous, a distinction designed to teach us, that violence and bloodshed are unlawful. Ruminating animals are clean, to shew us the importance of *meditation*; those with a divided hoof are so, to shew us the importance of *discrimination*, &c. All this is absurd and fanciful it is true, and may be called a spiritual or mystical explanation of the Mosaic precept; but it is no secondary or allegorical interpretation of the words. The extracts from Aristobulus are yet further from affording any example of allegorical explanation. In the longest passage (Eus. Pr. Ev. VIII. 9, 10) he is supposed to be explaining to the king, Ptolemy,

the passages of the law in which hands, eyes, a face, &c., are attributed to God, and this he does by shewing that hands are an emblem of power, and that when it was said of himself, *μεγάλην χεῖρα ἔχει ὁ βασιλεύς*, what was meant was, that he had great power, and that the same principle of interpretation was to be applied, when God is said in the law to have brought up Israel out of Egypt "with a strong hand." Eusebius, it is true, calls this *ἀλληγορικὴ θεωρία*, but it is evidently nothing more than a *figurative* explanation of the anthropomorphic language of Scripture. In another passage (vii. 13) he applies to wisdom what is said of the creation of light; but the very phrase *μεταφέρατο δ' αὖ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας*, points to an *application* rather than an *interpretation*. Should any one, however, think that from the manner in which Origen, *con. Cels.* IV. 51, joins his name with Philo's, as an author of allegories of the law, he must have written in the same strain with Philo, we see no objection to the inference; but the fragments which have been preserved do not supply any positive evidence.

Many circumstances conspired to dispose the Jewish Platonists of Alexandria to the allegorical interpretation of the law. Surrounded by monuments, in which a literal and symbolical meaning are blended in the most extraordinary manner, it was not wonderful that they should acquire a propensity to discover allegories even in literal narratives, and to search for a hidden meaning where a simple one was obvious. As Platonists, the example of their master not only inclined them to whatever was mystical, but accustomed them to clothe their own thoughts in this imaginative dress, and to seek for allegories in the religious legends of antiquity. Ashamed of the grossness and immorality of their own mythology, and yet unable or unwilling to renounce them openly, the Heathens themselves had endeavoured to bring religion and philosophy into harmony, by the allegorical interpretation of their poetical fables, and especially those of Homer,* whose name stood the highest, and whose influence on the popular mind was the greatest. What Homer was in point of antiquity to the Greeks, Moses was to the Jews; and the more they venerated him as the founder of their nation, the more anxious they felt that his writings and his institutions should impress the Heathens, if not with a belief in his divine mission, at least with reverence and admiration. They possessed not the knowledge of their own language and antiquities, which would have been required to explain justly and truly many things by which a heathen would be revolted, nor did they understand the scope of the Mosaic legislation sufficiently to vindicate it on the true ground, as a wise and beneficent plan for promoting the welfare of the people who lived under it, and making them the instruments of the most important future blessings to mankind at large; they adopted a course better suited to their powers, and better calculated to obtain their object with their heathen contemporaries, and by an allegorical interpretation contrived at once to explain away that which in a literal sense they could not justify, and also to engraft upon their sacred books the dogmas of that philosophy which they had learnt from the Heathens to admire. The writer whose works remain as an ample specimen of this mode of interpretation, Philo of Alexandria, lived a little before and during the age of the promulgation of the gospel, but the manner in which he speaks of his system shews that it was then no recent invention. It should be observed that, though he sometimes appears to uphold the allegorical as exclusive of the literal sense, he else-

* See the seventeenth Lecture of Bishop Marsh, who closely follows a writer in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibl.* V. 222, seq.

where considers them both as existing, one for the unrefined multitude, the other for those whose minds had been purified and exalted by philosophy. The spirit of his interpretation of the Mosaic history will be best understood by an extract from this part of Mr. Conybeare's work.

“ While he allows that the history of Abraham exhibits in its literal acceptation the example of a man wise and dear to his Creator, he sees in the outward circumstances of that history the progress of the human mind from a state of darkness and error to one of intellectual and spiritual illumination. Chaldea is the region of vain and earthly imaginations, of astrology, idolatry, and false philosophy. Haran is the type of the sensible and material universe, of the creature with whose elements alone the unenlightened man is conversant. The handmaid Agar shadows out that discipline of the mind in the study of the liberal arts and sciences which is a prerequisite for the attainment of the highest and only true wisdom. She is termed an Egyptian, because the body (of which Egypt is the symbol) is needful for the acquisition of this elementary knowledge; and, lastly, she is subordinate to, and in time to be supplanted by, the real and legitimate partner of such a mind, the perception of things purely intellectual, and of their eternal author, figured in the person of Sarah, whose name he interprets to signify, my superior or ruling principle (*ἀρχή μου*). In Isaac, Philo discerns the type of a mind ranking yet more highly in the scale of spiritual and intellectual excellence; a mind possessing intuitively, as it were, and by the immediate gift of its author, the supreme wisdom; not a denizen of the fleshly Egypt, not seeking for previous instruction from the handmaid and the slave, from human erudition and accomplishments, but choosing one virgin partner, the heavenly and spiritual Rebecca, a patient continuance in the truth (*ὑπομονήν*). In like manner the wives of the other patriarchs are declared to be severally typical of some good quality of the heart or understanding. The life of the patriarch Jacob, like that of Abraham, is regarded as symbolical of the progress of human intellect from the earthly and visible things to the heavenly and invisible. The well of Haran is the fountain of science. To the vision of the ascending and descending angels a yet more remarkable interpretation is affixed. The ladder is the region of the air interposed between our own globe and the lunar sphere; a region peopled through all its extent by intellectual and incorporeal essences, some of whom are continually descending for the purpose of animating the bodies of men; others, having quitted those bodies, are returning to their aerial mansion, destined either to make this their sole and endless dwelling-place, or to return to the prison of the body, according to their respective degrees of purity and advancement in the love and knowledge of spiritual things. It is needless to add, that this is precisely the doctrine of the Platonic school as to the pre-existence and descent of the human soul.”—Pp. 56—59.

Mr. Conybeare very candidly admits that the passages of Philo's writings, to which some (especially the late Jacob Bryant) have appealed, to prove that he had attained to some notion of the mediatorial office of Christ, are too obscure to warrant such a conclusion, and that Philo's notion of a Messiah was like that of his countrymen generally, the notion of an earthly and temporal deliverer. We have, therefore, reached the æra of the gospel, without having found, either in the Scriptures of the Old Testament themselves, or in the Apocryphal books, or in the writings of the Alexandrian Jews, a single example of a typical or secondary application, in the sense in which those phrases are commonly used; that is, any example of words understood as primarily referring to subordinate events and persons, and at the same time to the Messiah and the events of his kingdom, and only among the Platonizing philosophers have we found a double sense of any kind attributed to the words of Scripture.

In the commencement of his third Lecture Mr. Conybeare touches very briefly on the use of secondary interpretation by our Lord and his apostles. As the whole authority of the practice must be derived from the use of it, we should have been glad to have found something more satisfactory than an assertion, that only the "most determined prejudice can doubt that they do affix a secondary and spiritual meaning to the Scriptures of the Old Testament." P. 78. The truth is, that the phrases *secondary interpretation*, *double sense*, &c., are wholly unknown to the writers of the New Testament, and though the spirit and the letter are opposed to one another, it is not necessary for us to shew that these expressions have no reference to what theologians call the spiritual sense of the Old Testament. The writers of the New Testament, when they quote passages from the Old, applying them in a manner very remote from the sense which their original connexion indicates to belong to them, never intimate that they supposed them to have a double, a primary, and a secondary meaning; they allege them as if the meaning which they attribute to them were the only one which they bore; and it is only an hypothesis of theologians that they knew of the existence of any other. Our Lord himself makes a very rare use of the argument from prophecy in support of his own claims, resting the proofs of his mission on the works which the power of the Father enabled him to do; he refers in general terms to the testimony which Moses, David, and the prophets bore to the Messiah (Luke xxiv. 27, 44); but we do not recollect a single passage in which he appeals, *in proof of his divine authority*, to a prophecy of the Old Testament, which, when examined with its context, appears to have no reference, or only a supposed secondary one, to the Messiah. In regard to the Evangelists the case is different, and the wide diversity of the sense in which they apply passages in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms and Prophets, to Christ, from that which they evidently bear, in their original connexion, has long since led critics to suppose either a double meaning in the original, or an accommodation, resembling that of modern quotations of the classics, and not implying the belief of any real prophecy in the words. The bolder criticism of a still later period has suggested, that the Evangelists themselves understood and applied the Old Testament, like their contemporaries, according to the sound of detached passages, rather than the real meaning, and were equally remote from the knowledge of a double sense, and an intention to accommodate Scripture to any purpose to which they did not believe it originally applicable. Mr. Conybeare is unable to dispense entirely with the system of accommodation, but he admits it reluctantly, and even thinks it the part of Christian humility and sober criticism rather to suspend the judgment, as to the passages which present difficulties, than to attempt to reconcile or account for them by this hypothesis. P. 80.

Passing to the apostolical fathers, Mr. Conybeare observes, that in the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, there is little of mystical application of Scripture, while the Epistle of Barnabas abounds in them, and the author of the Clementine homilies adopts the principle of Philo, that many things in the Old Testament are derogatory to the power of God if literally understood, and therefore must receive an allegorical interpretation. Justin is both careless in his quotations and fanciful in his expositions, but does not indulge in that bold denial of the literal meaning which characterized the Alexandrian school. Irenæus, too, luxuriates in typical expositions, in which an instructed Christian of the present day will hardly follow him, and in one passage, where he applies the spoiling of the Egyptians as an analo-

gical argument that the church may possess itself of the goods of Heathens, Mr. Conybeare remarks the first instance of the misapplication of a scriptural type leading to a moral error of judgment, if not of practice. Tertullian closes the list of those who are enumerated in the third Lecture, and from him the reader will hardly expect more sobriety than from his predecessors in typical exposition, a practice so seductive to a lively imagination.

The fourth Lecture brings us to the school of Alexandria, distinguished, according to Mr. Conybeare, by not confining its allegorical interpretations to the illustration of those doctrines which are derived from the undoubted evidence of Scripture, as the apostolic fathers did, but endeavouring by means of it to give the appearance of scriptural authority to the doctrines of their Platonic or Eclectic philosophy. Of this school the two most illustrious names are Clemens and Origen. Clemens believed that the heathen philosophers had either acquired from the Mosaic writings a knowledge of the truths which they contain, or that they had enjoyed a portion of the same inspiration from which the Jewish legislator had derived them; and while with the most multifarious erudition he endeavours to shew the conformity of the heathen theology with the Jewish and the Christian, he labours, on the other hand, by the aid of allegorical interpretation, to deduce the doctrines of philosophy from the Scriptures. He regarded nearly the whole of them as bearing an enigmatical character, and the Mosaic law as having a fourfold meaning, literal, moral, mystical, and prophetic. Like Philo, who was evidently his model, he applies the commencement of the book of Genesis to the Platonic theory of an archetypal universe, allegorizing the history of our first parents, and occasionally grafting Christian ideas on the fancies of his Jewish predecessor. The simplest portions of the history do not escape his ingenuity; thus, in the three days' journey of Abraham, previous to the offering of Isaac, he discerns the progressive advancement of the human mind towards the comprehension of the ideal universe; and the same event he conceives to afford an adumbration of the three persons of the Trinity, and the third of them to prefigure that on which our Lord rose from the dead. The same course is pursued with the narratives of the Gospel. The five loaves miraculously blessed by our Lord, are interpreted to be the five senses of man, and the feet of the Redeemer, bedewed, as he expresses it, by the ointment of repentance, to typify either the doctrines of truth, or the apostles who preached those doctrines. Origen, the most eminent of all the philosophizing theologians whom Alexandria produced, is still more celebrated than Clemens in the history of allegorical interpretation, partly from the reputation which other circumstances attached to his name, partly from his real merit and services to the cause of biblical criticism, and from his opinions on this subject being conveyed in the more accessible form of commentaries and homilies on Scripture. Hence, he has even obtained the unfounded reputation of being the inventor of the allegorical system. Like Clemens, he turned the history of the New Testament into type and allegory, as well as that of the Old. Having given some specimens of the extravagant length to which he carried this practice, Mr. Conybeare observes,

“It is indeed calculated to excite both wonder and regret, that one so distinguished for learning, genius, and, it may fairly be added, for piety, should have attached so little of value to the plain, literal, and practical exposition of the text; should have spoken at times as though doubtful, not only of the worth, but even the truth of the simplest narratives, unless viewed through the medium of allegory. Not only in the parables and the actions

or institutions expressly recorded as having a symbolical and spiritual meaning, but in every miracle, every speech, (I had almost said,) and every movement of our blessed Lord, in every mention of time, place, or outward circumstance, he finds a mystical designation of somewhat more closely and highly connected with the progress of the gospel, and the reception of Christ into the hearts of his faithful people.”—Pp. 140, 141.

“Thus, before the termination of the third century, such a body of spiritual and allegorical interpretations had been accumulated, as to leave to subsequent expositors the power and opportunity of little more than actual repetition, or direct and obvious imitation. The principle was generally recognised as applicable to the Scriptures of the New as well as the Old Testament; and the chief alteration perhaps observable, as we advance, appears to be this, that the philosophical expositions are gradually either omitted, or so modified, as to harmonize more readily with the established faith of the church. As the *παράδοσεις* too became more copious, and more technically defined, the subjects, believed to lie concealed under the mysterious veil of the letter, naturally became somewhat more numerous.”—P. 143.

It will, therefore, be unnecessary for us to pursue the history of allegorical interpretation in the hands of later writers, who only repeated what their more eminent predecessors had said. Theodore of Mopsuestia (who died A. D. 428) appears to have set himself against the prevailing taste of the age, and to have endeavoured to bring back the interpreters of Scripture to the literal sense, but with little success; and the rapid decline of learning, secular and sacred, which ensued after the fifth century, forbade the hope of any revival of the true principles of sacred criticism. The fathers of the Latin church who succeeded to Tertullian, though they abound in mystical interpretation, yet indulged their fancy less than those of the Alexandrian school, and in greater subjection to the *regula fidei*. They do not in general deny the literal sense, but only treat it as in itself unworthy of the author of Scripture. Jerome and Augustine are the most eminent expositors among the Latin fathers of this age. To the former, as to Origen, biblical criticism owes the highest obligations; yet, in his expositions, he adopted the vague and uncritical canon, that every thing improbable or unworthy in the literal sense was to be explained allegorically; and he not only uses this method to illustrate or enforce doctrines which he supposed to be clearly taught in other parts of Scripture, but attaches an argumentative and doctrinal value to the allegorical sense. Augustine, inferior to Jerome in erudition, but superior to him in imagination and eloquence, found mystical interpretation in an especial degree conformable to his mental habits, and in proportion to the imperfection of his philological knowledge and his contempt for the letter of Scripture, was his success in discovering meanings most remote from the intention of the writers. The following is a specimen :

“The whole of the Psalms, as well as the greater part of the historical books of the Old Testament, Augustin appears to regard as having been understood by the Israelites themselves in their primary and literal sense alone, ‘*ad tempus temporaliter intellecta sunt*,’ but to have involved universally a second sense, of a prophetic as well as spiritual nature. He grounds this assertion, erroneous perhaps in the extent only of its application, upon a text which evidently bears no such meaning as that which he would affix to it, ‘*Cantate Domino canticum novum—Vetus homo cantat vetus canticum, novus, novum.*’ The applicability of each Psalm to the person, the history, or the spiritual kingdom of our blessed Redeemer, he gathers usually from the mystical import of the titles prefixed to each; titles, the age and origin of which are, in the opinion of the best biblical scholars, by no

means free from suspicion. Thus the title of the fourth Psalm, 'In finem, Psalmus Cantici David,' is explained with reference to our Saviour as the fulfilment of the law, 'Finis legis Christus—Hic aut verba Dominici hominis post resurrectionem expectamus, aut hominis in ecclesia credentis, et sperantis in eo.'—Pp. 180, 181.

During the dark ages the method of allegorical interpretation prevailed universally among the commentators, who indeed drew their materials from the fathers already mentioned. The state of sacred literature among the Jews was such, that had Hebrew been more known than it was, no remedy of the evil could have been derived from this source: for the Rabbis were as blindly devoted to their Cabbala, as the Christians to their spiritual and secondary sense. But in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the grammatical study of Hebrew and the historical interpretation of Scripture were revived by Aben Ezra, Jarchi, and Kimchi; and the Christian theologians, being engaged in eager controversy with the Jews, were obliged to pay more attention to the literal sense. Nicolas de Lyra, who flourished towards the beginning of the fourteenth century, is reckoned by Mr. Conybeare one of the first whose method of exposition was improved by this means. But his innovations were unpopular, and the weight of authority against which he had to contend did not allow of his succeeding to any great extent. Nothing less than the revived study of the Greek and Roman classics was sufficient to expose the absurdity of the mode of interpretation to which the Scriptures had so long been subjected, nor till the appearance of the paraphrases of Erasmus was any effectual impression made upon the ancient system. That while he bore his testimony against the excesses of Origen, Hilary and Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine, he still admitted a limited use of the same method, may have been the result of the prudence which he infused into every act of opposition to the opinions of his age, or of habit, not admitting him at once to see the full extent to which his own principles should consistently be carried: in the passage which Mr. Conybeare quotes from him, (p. 224,) we do not, however, see a recognition of the fact that Scripture was designed to have more than one meaning, but only to produce in different minds different feelings and emotions. "Non absurdum est voluisse Spiritum S. ut sacra Scriptura nonnunquam *varios gignat sensus*, pro cuiusque affectu. Neque hæc est Scripturarum incertitudo sed fœcunditas." In fact, in his Annotations on the New Testament, he seldom notices the spiritual expositions, so popular in his day, except for the purpose of refuting them. Melancthon imitated his example, and the writings of Luther, although affording some instances of a very fanciful application of Scripture, tended on the whole to re-establish the literal sense. By encouraging their readers to throw off this servile devotion to authority and tradition, all these eminent men contributed indirectly to the same end, though their own practice may not always have been uniform and consistent.

It is to Calvin, however, above all the other Reformers, that we are indebted for the first promulgation, at least in modern times, of a principle, without which the interpretation of the Old Testament can never be freely and independently carried on, namely, that we are not to suppose that the passages quoted from it in the New Testament, really had that meaning which those who quote them assign to them, because the New-Testament writers are in the habit of *deflecting or accommodating* what they cite, to the purpose which they have in view. "Non tam interpretatus," says he of Ps. lxiii. 19, quoted Ephes. iv. 3, "*quam pia deflexione ad Christi personam accommodat.*" So in the passages which have been supposed

to bear a double relation to the Jewish and the Christian church, he appears disposed rather to ground such an application on the similarity of the subjects and their condition, than on any typical and prophetic character. The recollection of these facts may teach a seasonable lesson to some of his modern followers, many of whom, we doubt not, regard these doctrines as an invention of the Socinians to weaken the interest of Scripture and degrade the character of the Redeemer.

Mr. Conybeare's seventh Lecture is devoted to the history of secondary interpretation since the days of the Reformers. The Romish Church, as might be expected, continued to adhere to the system which was sanctioned by so many of the most eminent fathers; among the Protestants great diversity of practice prevailed, a few adopting the principle of Calvin, the majority, according to their knowledge and taste, and the predominance of fancy or judgment in their minds, adopting, to a greater or less degree, the spiritual interpretation. Grotius, (of whom Mr. Conybeare rather strangely remarks, "that he betrayed an attachment, perhaps somewhat excessive, to the more learned and temperate of the Jewish expositors,") in his commentaries on the Old Testament, very generally restricted to the history of the Jews those passages which had been hitherto considered as prophetic of the Messiah, admitting, however, a secondary reference to the Christian dispensation. Though he by no means denies the existence of a mystical sense or typical prefiguration, the tendency of his commentaries to produce a disbelief in them is visible enough in those who adopted him for their guide, and especially in subsequent critics of the Remonstrant Church. Among these Le Clerc, as might be expected, is mentioned by Mr. Conybeare with strong reprobation, as carrying his notions of accommodation to such an excess, as nearly to invalidate the prophetic character of the Old Testament, and indirectly at least to depreciate the divine authority of the New. We will, nevertheless, venture to predict, that the name of Le Clerc will be preserved by distant generations with gratitude, as of a man who, by unwearied activity and fearless independence of thought, gave a powerful impulse to the minds of his contemporaries. While Grotius and his followers thus contracted the secondary interpretation within the very narrowest limits, the learned Cocceius extended them beyond the wildest flights of the ancient allegorists, by maintaining, that "Scripture signifies whatever it can signify," in other words, whatever it can be made to signify. That the Cocceian school is not wholly extinct may be inferred from the work of the Rev. Mr. Noble, reviewed in the last volume of the Repository [p. 523].

Until about the middle of the last century the Lutheran divines of Germany had held a kind of middle course in regard to typical and secondary interpretation, of which an idea may be derived from the well-known work of Glassius. Since the days of Semler, however, the ancient opinions on this subject, even in the modified degree in which they were still held by Ernesti, have been gradually abandoned; there are probably very few who maintain the double sense by which Grotius explained the application of the prophecies in the New Testament, and while some still contend for an accommodation, others regard the Evangelists as applying Scripture according to the custom of their age, in which the true sense and connexion of the obscurer parts of it had already been lost. The writings of Sykes and Benson in our own country, on types and the double sense, cannot be unknown to the theological reader.

The last Lecture of the volume, which should have been first, treats of the principles by which spiritual interpretation should be guided, and

of its several species. The maxim of the text, "Turn not unto the right hand nor to the left," is an excellent rule for keeping in the right way when it has once been found, but affords no instruction how to find it. We look in vain for any thing like a clear and definite rule, founded on a well-established principle. Mr. Conybeare is laudably anxious to check the abuse of this mode of interpretation, but every thing is in fact referred to the commentator's own discretion, and it would be very difficult to say why he himself receives Joshua as a type of Jesus, and yet hesitates to consider the downfall of the walls of Jericho as a type of the pulling down of the strongholds of sin by the gospel; or why he should see a striking adumbration of the great ransom in the cities of refuge and the offender's liberation by the death of the high-priest, yet doubt whether the harp of David, expelling the evil spirit of Saul, prefigured our Lord commanding the evil spirits to go out of the man whom they tormented. (Pp. 308, 314). On the subject of the deflexion and accommodation of prophecy he writes with equal indecision, not venturing wholly to deny its existence, yet laying down no rule by which to ascertain what is or is not accommodated or deflected. This deficiency is not to be imputed as a fault to Mr. Conybeare, who could not find an intelligible criterion where none existed, which, in regard to types, we have already endeavoured to shew. The general tendency of his remarks, however, is certainly to discourage the spirit of mysticism, and they may thus prove a useful warning to those who would have rejected similar advice from one who abandoned typical interpretation altogether. His history of this practice in the Jewish and Christian church is learned, candid, and instructive, and shews him to have been a man whose pious feelings and amiable dispositions deserved the eulogies and the regret of his surviving friends.

We have given no extracts from that part of Mr. Chevallier's Lectures in which he unfolds the types of the Old Testament. Those who delight in this species of theology will be edified by the minute detail of resemblances into which he enters. We have already, however, observed how completely destitute of Scriptural authority these details are, and the matter, which is to be found in other treatises of a similar kind, is not recommended by any particular ingenuity or eloquence in the manner in which it is treated.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. III.—*The Case between the Church and the Dissenters impartially and practically considered.* By the Rev. Francis Merewether, M.A., Rector of Cole Orton, Vicar of Whitwick, &c., &c. Rivington, London. pp. 166.

THERE are some books that claim a passing notice amongst the publications of the day, not so much from any intrinsic merit or interest, as from the indication which they furnish of the state of opinion and feeling in certain classes of the community. If the work of Mr. Merewether be entitled to any attention,

it must be on this ground; though we much question whether his own party would be very willing to acknowledge it as a fair specimen of the learning and ability to which the church must look for her defence in these days of lukewarmness and heterodoxy; for a feebleness of reasoning, conveyed in a worse style, it has rarely fallen to our lot to encounter.

The design of the book must, however, be admitted to be charitable, and reminds us of those schemes of comprehension, which a century ago were subjects of such eager discussion between the Church and the Dissenters; as it is nei-

ther more nor less than an attempt to bring back the various classes of Seceders into the bosom of the National Church, by detailing the mischiefs of Dissent, and enlarging on the benefits of Conformity. This end he proposes to accomplish, without changing any of the creeds of his church; for the catholicism of his spirit extends only to those who subscribe to the truth of her doctrines. (P. 9.) "The safe exercise of their religion," he informs us, (p. 17,) "is the utmost which they can reasonably expect," who dissent from the Church, which "enjoys the honours, stations, and emoluments disposable by the State."

The writer sets out with observing, that "the Established National Church must be admitted to be the *rule*; the Dissenting communities the *exception*:" hence "it will be the most logical, as well as the most orderly and impartial proceeding, to examine the circumstances of the exception, before the value of the rule, as a rule, is inquired into." The very reverse of this appears to us to be the case; since the nature and necessity of the exception can only be estimated in reference to the character of the rule. In this order of inquiry, he proceeds to shew that Dissent, in itself considered, is an evil; a position in which we are very well disposed to agree with Mr. Merewether, though the admission of it would lead us to a widely different conclusion. These evils he arrays under eight formidable heads:—Dissent is, 1st, Anarchical; 2dly, Anti-social; 3dly, Unpeaceable; 4thly, Unpatriotic; 5thly, Uneconomical; 6thly, Unseemly; 7thly, Unlearned; 8thly, Unscriptural.

The guilt of Dissent being thus satisfactorily proved, another important question occurs:—"At whose door does the guilt of Dissent lie? At the Dissenters', who separate because they cannot comply with the prescribed terms, or be involved in the offendant consequences of communion? Or at the Church's, who impose these terms, and give occasion to these consequences?" This point is next resolved by inquiring into the nature of the consequences complained of: these are enumerated under the following heads:—1st, Worship; 2dly, Discipline (including Government); 3dly, Character of Clergy; 4thly, Imposition of Ceremonies; 5thly, Subscription to Articles; 6thly, Doctrine (including Catechism and Creeds). It is not a little singular that from this enumeration is excluded the article of alliance between Church and State—a consideration, of all others, the most important in the eyes of a thorough

Dissenter, as pointing to the radical evil from which all the great errors and corruptions of established religions arise.

With what success and ability these several objections to conformity are repelled by Mr. Merewether, some notion may be gathered from what is said under the head of "Subscription to Articles." The sum of the argument is, that without a prescribed creed there can be no uniformity of faith; that the chief sects of Dissenters require from their candidates for ordination some declaration of faith; and that the church has the advantage of prescribing a general form, "framed by collective wisdom and competent authority" for universal signature, instead of allowing each individual, as among the Dissenters, to make a confession of faith in his own words; and that this plan presents a clear, unequivocal, and intelligible test to the clergy and others; and, above all, to those whom the clergy are to teach. (Pp. 88, 89.)

With this "short *defence* of subscription" our author contents himself; and with arguments equally conclusive against the other objections alleged, it is not surprising if he turns the scale against Dissenters, and proves the whole enormity of schism to be with them.

The best part of the book is that in which the writer considers the evil tendencies and the advantages either of established religions generally, or of the Church of England particularly; though we must frankly confess, we have seldom met with a book written so little in the spirit of the present day, or so little calculated to accomplish the end which it proposes. It is evidently called forth by a strong feeling that the interests of the church are on the decline, and discovers a willingness to make concessions for the sake of peace and comprehension, which shews how deeply the inroads of Dissent, in its various forms, upon the integrity of the church are acknowledged and deplored. The grave proposal to the governors of the church for "*shaping*" the Methodist meeting houses "into *decent* ecclesiastical structures," cannot be read without a smile. (P. 152.)

Amidst a somewhat ostentatious display of candour and good feeling towards Dissenters, the author still maintains that tone of conscious superiority, that confident assumption of the learning of his own church, and of the transcendent excellence of her institutions, which so naturally results from possessing a monopoly of the national honours and endowments. Of those high classical and mathematical attainments, and of the general

literary accomplishments, by which many of our established clergy are distinguished, we always wish to speak in terms of respect and commendation. But neither the learning, nor the logic, nor the style of Mr. Merewether entitles him to such consideration. We shall conclude this notice with the following specimen of perspicuous gracefulness of expression: "The balance remains to be struck. Can candour hesitate to pronounce on which side the scale turns? The Church of England, as whilst she is such, that is national, she ought to do, preponderates: the Dissenting cause kicks the beam." (P. 146.) We question whether the most illiterate Dissenting teacher could produce any thing much worse than this; and we are certain that "the general character both of their labours in the pulpit and of their productions from the press," at least among that class which enjoys a regular education, exhibits a style very greatly superior to it.

ART. IV.—*The Silent and Unmarked Progress of Truth: a Sermon, preached, October 16, 1827, at Wolverhampton, before a Meeting of Ministers.* By John Kentish. 8vo. pp. 26. Birmingham, Belchers; London, R. Hunter.

MR. KENTISH'S text is the question of the Pharisees and the answer of our Lord, concerning the coming of the kingdom of God, recorded Luke xvii. 20, 21. He adopts, in his interpretation of the passage, Schleiermacher's paraphrase: "In the way in which thou seemest to watch for the kingdom of God, expecting its appearance to be marked by outwardly striking events, it will never come to thee; thou needest not look abroad, for it forms itself in the same circle in which thou art living, in that of teaching and instruction, and is in fact already come." The object of his Sermon is to guard this statement from being misapprehended; to illustrate the justness of it; and to point out the influence which it ought to have on the sentiments, temper, language and behaviour of Christians and Christian ministers. The discourse is the work of a learned and critical student of the Holy Scriptures. Clearness of sense and precision of style are its prominent character. In the following passage, the truly respectable preacher gives a perspicuous and animated illustration of his subject:

VOL. II.

K

"This quiet and usually imperceptible progress of truth and holiness, distinguishes Christianity from false systems of belief and rules of life, and gives it one feature of pre-eminence above less complete and more partial revelations of the Divine Will. The march of the Impostor of Arabia, was, alas! but too conspicuous in traces of blood and devastation. On the other hand, the empire of 'the Prince of Peace' has for its captives willing and renewed minds; for it is the kingdom of God within us. So far is it from employing in its own behalf the sword either of the magistrate or of the military leader, so far from loving scenes of parade and state, that its triumphs, altogether moral, have been, perhaps, the greatest amidst those who have suffered persecution for righteousness' sake, and those, too, who have been scantily provided with this world's blessings, yet who have been rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom. While some men, knowing scarcely any thing more of the Christian dispensation than the name, have exclaimed, 'Lo, here, or Lo, there,' while they have looked for its approach, and even for its victories, in the patronage which forms of it have received either from the learned, the mighty, the wealthy, the great, or from numbers of the people, the humble, enlightened follower of our Lord has been sensible that his kingdom does not so come with observation: such an individual seeks for the Gospel and its ascendancy, where the multitude, whether in lowly or in fashionable life, behold it not; he views it, wherever it forms within the soul the moral image of Jesus Christ, wherever it exalts the child of ignorance and frailty and death, to the hope of pardon and immortal life, and to the glorious dignity of the sons of God."—Pp. 13, 14.

We know not whether there be a particular reference in the application of the discourse to any local occurrences: the concluding paragraph would lead us so to think.

"Many around us are, in their religious profession, ostentatious and obtrusive: I arraign not their motives; while I take leave to protest against their judgment and demeanour. There is a parade, a secularity, in their manners, their language, and some of their measures, when they associate for avowedly Christian objects, which I cannot witness without extreme disgust, and the recital of instances of which would ill suit the services of this hour. Alas!

frail man seldom knows how to steer a safe and even course between the opposite shoals of lukewarmness and spiritual display."—Pp. 18, 19.

We respect the preacher's sense of decorum in keeping the pulpit free from allusions to individuals and parties and passing events; but we remark, with deference, that there is a vagueness in his complaint and remonstrance which may allow some readers to suppose that he glances at certain public religious associations which the habits of his useful life sufficiently prove that he would be the first to encourage. We ought to add, that in a well-written "Appendix," Mr. Kentish particularizes as the objects of his disapprobation, "the placards which so often meet the eye, in the crowded street, and on the public road, the singular matter and phraseology of advertisements inserted in diurnal, weekly and monthly papers, the theatrical semblance and appendages of not a few edifices dedicated to Christian worship and instruction, the theatrical tokens of applause, or its reverse, exhibited at meetings convened for the most important of purposes," and also "those public and oral discussions of theological or ecclesiastical topics, to which a miscellaneous audience is invited and admitted by the sale of tickets."

ART. V.—*The Duty and Benefits of Co-operation among the Friends of Scriptural Christianity: a Sermon preached in the Meeting-House of the Second Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, on Sunday, the 26th of August, 1827, and published at the Request of several of those who heard it.* By Hugh Hutton, M. A., Minister of the Old Meeting-House, Birmingham. 8vo. pp. 46. Hunter and Eaton, London.

THIS discourse, bearing reference to the late unhappy revival of bigotry amongst the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, is dedicated to that portion of them "who disclaim the authority of the 'Westminster Confession of Faith,' and of all other human creeds, either as a test of Christian truth, or as a bond of Christian communion, and who practically maintain the sufficiency of the Scriptures to make men wise unto salvation." It is a faithful, bold, and energetic plea for union and mutual exertion amongst the Irish Liberals. Having, in

his exordium, very happily illustrated a somewhat curious text, (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18,) the preacher thus proceeds:

"As the passage which I have read in connexion with these remarks, fixes our view on the assistance rendered by some of these workers of righteousness, to the labours of Paul, and on the happy influence of their conduct on the spirit and exertions of this venerable servant of Christ; I shall, on the present occasion, pursue the train of thought to which it naturally leads, in some plain considerations respecting the duty, necessity, and advantage, of united and zealous co-operation among the friends of simple, scriptural truth; among those, I mean, who, like you, *acknowledge no master in religion, but Christ; no creed-book, but the Bible; no test of sound doctrine, but the unambiguous declarations of Jesus and his apostles.*"—Pp. 4, 5.

Mr. Hutton addresses his audience as Unitarians, in the comprehensive sense of the appellation, and calls upon them, under this character, to take public active measures for the defence and promotion of pure Christianity: an unusual style of address, we fear, in Ireland, where bigots and fanatics have proclaimed their follies and fulminations from the house-top, but where the advocates of reason, peace, and charity, have too often been contented to whisper in the ear.

We have not space to epitomize the various persuasives of the discourse; we will, however, extract a *Note*, in which the author states his views of the means which the friends of truth and liberty amongst the Irish Presbyterians ought to adopt for the promotion of their common cause. Happy shall we be to learn that the preacher's sensible suggestions have been duly weighed by that valuable class of persons for whose use and benefit they are designed. This is a critical moment in the moral, as well as political, history of Ireland; and much may depend for generations on the conduct now pursued in that interesting, painfully interesting, country, by those persons, whether ministers or laymen, to whom Providence has committed the talent, which carries with it so much responsibility, of influence over the public mind.

"The scope of this discourse, which was hastily composed on the occasion of his receiving an unexpected invitation to preach before a liberal and enlightened congregation of Presbyterians in his native town, and without the most distant idea of publication, prevented the author

from entering on the consideration of the *manner* in which the co-operation here recommended might be effected, and of the specific *objects* to which it might be most successfully directed. He cannot, however, send his discourse from the press in compliance with the request of his friends, without a brief allusion to these subjects. *Associations should be formed* of all who renounce the authority of human creeds and adopt the *Scriptures only* for their religious guide; originating in small independent *district* societies, and uniting in one extensive body. These associations should be *voluntary—always in action—regularly corresponding* with each other—supported by *small* contributions from men of the same spirit *in all ranks* of life; the *objects* to which their attention and their efforts might be turned, are such as the following, viz.: the *dissemination* of the great principles of Christian faith and practice, which they profess;—the *erection* of new congregations on these principles,—the formation of *tract* societies—the establishment of occasional *district* and *general* meetings of ministers and people, for religious worship and edification, at which discourses on doctrinal subjects might be delivered—the sending forth of *missionaries* to the various towns and villages, to bear testimony against the corruptions and inventions of men, and to vindicate the authority and teachings of Scripture, both by the preaching of the word and by the circulation of tracts—the assistance of *poor*, or *rising* congregations—the establishment of *Sunday-Schools*, in connexion with their places of worship—the *protection* of ministers and others, who may be brought into difficult circumstances by their manly avowal and defence of the truth—and the maintenance of a system of correspondence and co-operation, with societies founded on similar principles in other countries.

“All these objects have been attempted in England; experience amply attests their practicability and usefulness. *Some* of them might be tried with success in Ireland. From the North to the South, men are to be found there in abundance, of talents, courage, and zeal, equal to the work. Let the *people* take an interest in their labours, and support them with their characters, their substance, and their exertions; and not many years shall pass away, before such associations will be in vigorous and successful operation throughout the land.”—Pp. 39, 40.

CONTEMPORARY PERIODICALS.

UNDER this head we propose to give variety to the Repository by inserting occasionally extracts from different periodical works, illustrative of their opinions and literary merits, or containing any interesting or instructive facts or observations.

ART. VI.—*Foreign Quarterly Review*. No. II.

The Catholic Church.—“The third cause to which we would allude, as having operated far and wide in favour of liberty in the middle ages, is the influence of the Catholic church. Its modern enemies, not content with insisting on the true ground of Protestantism, the intolerable assertion of spiritual despotism by that church, have endeavoured to represent it as the constant enemy of civil freedom. We cannot but think that the history of ancient times speaks almost uniformly in favour of the contrary position. Selected indiscriminately from the very lowest ranks of society, it could not be expected that the priesthood, however tenacious of their own inalienable rights, should have felt much sympathy with the assertors of temporal dominion, whether barons or emperors. The son of a herdsman, whom Fortune had raised to the cardinal’s hat or papal tiara, if his elevation had left within him the least spark of human feeling, could not but view with some degree of pity the sufferings of that class from which he had himself been raised, and to which, in the eye of the proud descendant of a hundred nobles, he still belonged. And his views of policy generally coincided with his natural feelings. It is impossible to read the history of the Guelfs and Ghibellines of Italy, without perceiving that it was at least as much through the intrigues of the church as through the firmness of the people, that the republican spirit triumphed at once over the tyranny of domestic signori and the pretensions of the imperial court. And, even in darker ages, we ought never to forget, that the liberation of serfs was placed by the church among those good deeds which were exacted as the tokens of a death-bed repentance.”—Pp. 328, 329.

Christening Bells.—“If we turn to the *Pontificale Romanum*, we find a ceremony for the baptism of bells, which is to the full as absurd as any of the preceding ones, nay, seems to combine in itself all possible absurdities as to benedictions.

The bell is so placed that it can be easily got at, and then water, a whisk for sprinkling, salt, white linen cloths, holy oil, chrism, an incensoir with hot coals, &c., and a seat for the bishop, are put by it. The bishop comes in state, sits on his faldistorium, and goes through various evolutions of putting on and off his head gear, while he exercises the salt and the water, and the salt and water together, &c., as before. He washes the bell with the salt and water, and after it has been dried he dips his thumb in holy oil and makes the sign of the cross on the outside of the bell, and says, 'We beseech thee, Oh Lord! who hast commanded Moses to make silver trumpets, that this machine may be consecrated by the Holy Ghost, so that all the snares of the evil one, hail and tempest, may be driven away,' &c.! Next he washes away the cross made with oil, and says, 'The voice of the Lord is over the waters,' which is repeated by the choir. Then after certain psalms he makes seven crosses outside with holy oil, and four inside with chrism, consecrates the bell to the honour of some Saint, in the name of, &c. Then comes another prayer to the same purpose as before, then an incensing of the bell, and sundry evolutions with the head gear, psalms, antiphony, a gospel, &c., and the whole is concluded with the bishop's kissing the gospel and returning as he came. This ceremony is called baptizing the bell, and formerly, says the author, there were sponsors, who held the rope in their hands, answered any questions put to them, and were asked the name of the bell as in the baptism of children, to which the whole ceremony was analogous.

"There are, we presume, different forms in different rituals; for in another that we have seen, the bishop, while anointing and crossing the bell, prays God will send his Holy Spirit, that the bell may become sanctified for the repelling of all the power, snares, and illusions of the devil, for the souls of the dead, and especially for the averruncation of storms, thunder, and tempests! This, as an old writer says, is precisely the same notion as the ancients had with respect to their trumpets, as we see from Ovid:—

"Temesæaque concrepat æra
Et rogat ut tectis exeat umbra suis.

"And again, in Tibullus, I. 8:

"Cantus et e curru Lunam deducere
tentat,
Et faceret si non Æra repulsa sonent.

"We should be sorry to calumniate any person, more especially any Royal person, but we have strange misgivings that their Royal Highnesses the Duchesses of Angouleme and Berri have been god-mothers to sundry bells since the return of the Bourbons to France; most assuredly in 1782 the King and Queen of France were so. The book before us shews that the ceremony is still practised, for it appears that the chaplain of a Bavarian bishop, who has lately gone through the ceremony, has written in the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung*, to shew that his master did not really mean to *christen* the bell! Charlemagne forbade the christening of bells in 789. See *Capitular. Aquisgran. III. C. xviii.*; or *Durantis de Rit. Eccl. I. 22, 2.* Cardinal Boza endeavoured to shew that the ceremony was not intended as a real christening; nor can any one suppose that they who invented this impious formulary, could either be blasphemous or absurd enough to entertain such a thought; but in this, as in a thousand other cases, the Church of Rome cannot excuse itself for doing what is likely to mislead, and then taking no pains to prevent the people from being misled, nay, rather encouraging (by her functionaries) the most absurd errors."—Pp. 544, 545.

ART. VII.—*British Critic or Quarterly Theological Review.* No. V.

The New Irish Reformation.—From a long and rather absurd article on this subject, we shall make a few extracts for the benefit of those who might not otherwise be aware what prodigies are now in progress through the converting energies of the possessors of the tithes (we know no other equally appropriate description of the handful of persons who call themselves the Protestant Church) of Ireland.

"On the whole, from a statement of conversions recently published, it appears that the total number at the end of last September, was 2,357. It is known that many have silently conformed to the Protestant church, whose cases have not been included in that statement. It is also notorious, that conversions have not since been anywhere discontinued; and, when it shall have been considered, that only adult persons have been comprehended in the enumeration, it must be manifest that no inconsiderable inroad has been already made upon the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, by the number of those who have actually withdrawn

themselves and their families from its communion. The review which we have taken of the state of the Roman Catholic Church in every part of Ireland, must satisfy reflecting persons, that the real impression is beyond comparison greater; a spirit of religious inquiry appearing to have been generally excited among Roman Catholics, and the authority of the sacred Scriptures superseding everywhere the dictation of their priests."—P. 53.

" 'The conversions that have taken place are but, as it were, the first shaking of the tree; a few of the ripest have been severed. These recantations have had the most beneficial results. One immediate effect they had, of confirming all Protestants in the truth of Protestantism, which was a point of much importance in this part of the kingdom,—which was the better religion was a subject of doubt in the minds of most ignorant Protestants. Now the Reformed Religion is completely victorious, having Reason and Scripture on its side.'.... 'Never,' the writer urges in his conclusion, 'was there a time when English aid was more necessary than now, because the overwhelming power possessed for so many centuries by the priests, is all brought to bear in every parish against the infant Reformation. Its battle must be fought inch by inch. The Woman that fled into the Wilderness is returning out of it, and the monster stands with open jaws to devour her, if he can, before she has attained strength from on High.' "—P. 41.

"Two observations have been added, which should not be omitted. 'Hitherto,' says our informant, 'the Roman Catholics have had too much reason for an opinion which is very commonly entertained among them, namely, that to be a Protestant and to have no religion are synonymous expressions.' The evil is indeed rapidly disappearing, and Roman Catholics are now forced to make a distinction between nominal and real Protestants. The other observation is, 'that nothing seems so fitted to produce extensive good in Ireland as the influence of the landed proprietor, who should prove to his tenantry that he values them at something more than the revenue which they produce to him. The influence of such a man, who would feel and act as a servant largely entrusted by God, would,' it is said, 'be incalculably great.' The power of this influence has, however, been little tried in Kerry."—P. 47.

Our readers shall see in the next extract what this genial "influence" is.

"A gentleman possessing an estate in a part of Ireland, in which the Roman Catholics form a considerable part of the population, established on it a school for the education of his tenantry, and appointed a committee of five persons, three of whom were Roman Catholics, to arrange a system of education. Having thus taken sufficient care that the peculiar opinions of Roman Catholics should not be offended, he announced to the tenants, that he would insist upon their children receiving the education which he offered, and that he would accordingly exercise all the power of a landlord against those tenants whose children should be absent a single day without permission. The clergy interfered in this, as in other instances; the landlord distrained the cattle of the parents of the children whom they had caused to be withdrawn; and the tenants frequently sent private messages, requesting that these coercive measures might be employed against them, to furnish them with an apology for sending their children again to the school."—P. 24.

But the Protestant church finds some difficulty in agreeing what doctrine it seeks conversion to.

"The prevailing argument urged on the other side by the Roman Catholic clergy, is the dissension existing not only between distinct churches of Protestants, but even within the Established Church of these countries itself, between Calvinists and Arminians. It may indeed easily be admitted, that a question concerning the manner in which the Atonement of the death of Jesus Christ is applied to the salvation of believers, cannot properly have place in a church in which the doctrine of the Atonement is overlaid and stifled by the superstition of a sacrificial sacrament, and by the various contrivances of priestcraft, which have corrupted the scriptural doctrine of salvation with the most unchristian notion of meritorious performances. The very dissension prevailing among Protestants is, on the other hand, at least a proof that the notion of human merit is rejected, since the question is concerning the manner in which the salvation of Jesus Christ is granted by the free mercy of God, whether it is appointed only for a chosen number, or offered generally and without restriction to every individual. It is, however, notorious to every person acquainted with the state of religious opinion within the Established Church, that much of this dissension has been mitigated, and that the two parties, in-

sisting little on their peculiar opinions, are now generally contented to meet upon the common ground of a rejection of the pretensions of human merit. It may be hoped, that what may still remain of the disagreement will be wholly forgotten in the opposition to a common adversary."—Pp. 49, 50.

The following is a curious inducement to conviction.

"Already in the neighbourhood of Sligo, as has been remarked, an opinion has begun to prevail among Roman Catholics, that the religion of the Protestants was soon to have the superiority. How rapidly would the Reformation be extended, if such an opinion were to be generally entertained!"—P. 54.

There is something of the sublime in the following.

"Whoever looks into the history of the three centuries which have elapsed since the commencement of the Reformation, must be convinced that the Church of England has been, and is at this day, the grand and powerful support of the Protestant churches of Europe, and consequently must necessarily have been, and continue to be, the main object of the jealousy and hostility of the Papacy, as it has struggled, and is still struggling, to regain its lost ascendancy over the governments of the west. From England, indeed, and even from Britain, the efforts of the Papacy were, after some struggle, wholly excluded, though not without a change of the reigning dynasty. Ireland, however, specially subjected to the Papacy in the very introduction of the English power, still very extensively acknowledges the Papal supremacy. Here then is the hold which the Papal dominion still possesses of the United Kingdom. That it attaches importance to the hold is manifest from this fact, that the concerns of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland are subjected to a special congregation of cardinals, though a regular hierarchy has always existed in the country. That the object of the grasp is not limited to the local interests of Ireland, the establishment at Stonyhurst, and its active interposition, must demon-

strate, if demonstration be required. It is the deadly gripe of an antagonist, who will never relinquish the struggle, until he shall have been wholly overcome. Either England must subdue the Papacy by reforming Ireland, or the Papacy will overthrow the Church and Constitution of England. The Protestant religion of England, indeed, cannot altogether perish, though, possibly, in the awful dispensations of the Divine judgments, it may yet require to experience a renewed ascendancy of the Pope, as in the bloody, though brief, reign of Mary, the Reformation of England was originally purified. But, while we are confident of the permanence of our religion, we should struggle to maintain also the permanence of our religious and of our civil institutions. If the spirit of those institutions has become languid in undisturbed tranquillity, let us endeavour to restore it to its original vividness; let us act, as if the struggle in which we are now engaged were the appointed means of the Divine Providence for reanimating the friends of a Protestant Church and Constitution, and we may avert a calamitous visitation by rendering it unnecessary."—Pp. 54, 55.

ART. VIII.—*The Test-Act Reporter*.
No. I. January, 1828. To be continued Monthly. London. 6d.

THIS is the first number of a little publication under the auspices of the United Committee for conducting the Application to Parliament for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. We hail it not only as a symptom of activity and of increasing interest on the part of the Dissenters, but as intended to furnish an accurate and complete historical record of what takes place on so important a question. If the Dissenters of the present day have any energies to awaken, they will hail a publication of this sort, which merges all minor differences in the grand design of asserting and extending the most generous principles of Religious Liberty.

OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENCE.

*On the Necessity of Discrimination in Opposing the Doctrines of the Established Church.**To the Editor.*

SIR, Dec. 13, 1827.

As it is not my design to occupy your pages with any controversy respecting points of theology on which we shall in vain expect coincidence of sentiment, I shall be brief in the remarks which I have to offer in reply to your correspondent R. A. M. I will merely premise that he is evidently not aware that if his observation with respect to the harmlessness of advancing arguments against doctrines in their *exaggerated form* be just, calumnies and libels might be vindicated on the same ground. Supposing the latter to be destitute of foundation, then since *shadows* only have created alarm, they can give rise to no injury, and consequently ought to excite no indignation!

The purport of the paper inserted in your number for September, which your correspondent has honoured with his notice, amounts to this; that it is extremely unfair to represent all members of the Established Church as believing what only a part of them do, and to make the whole body responsible for the extent to which many, and it may be the majority, carry its leading doctrines. In my apprehension, it is the duty of our opponents to specify the precise opinions to which their accusations are intended to be applied, and therefore the use of *general terms* is not sufficient where they are known to comprehend different significations. Though it is true, with very rare exceptions, that every member of the Anglican Church professes to be a Trinitarian, it is not true that every one of them embraces; for example, the opinions of Sherlock. Those only, therefore, who adopt the interpretation of the inflexible dean are bound to answer the objections alleged against it. Thus also in the case of the Atonement, a certain number may believe in the explanation given of that tenet by the disciples of Calvin, but it would be palpably unjust to place those churchmen who entertained different sentiments in the

same class with these evangelical divines, as they term themselves, though both parties may be equally strenuous in maintaining the truth of the Atonement. Again, several eminent writers of the Church of England have maintained, what in the present day has been advocated by Mr. Wilberforce, that the human heart was rendered so radically depraved by the transgression of our first parents, as to be utterly incapable of any virtuous inclination and of making the slightest effort towards actual improvement. A larger portion of the clergy have contended that this corruption, though universal in its extent, has not destroyed the moral powers of man, nor prevented his attainment of excellence by the proper exertion of his faculties: while others, like Archbishop King and Bishop Bull, make original sin consist in the evils resulting to mankind from God's withdrawing his extraordinary favour, as well as the gift of immortality which he had conferred upon Adam in his state of innocence, though these privileges did not in reality belong to his nature.*

From this statement it is evident that the charges adduced against the preceding doctrines may be true of some of their advocates, and false with respect to others; and hence the necessity of particularizing the precise explanation which is meant to be opposed in all controversies respecting these points. Your correspondent R. A. M., however, observes that there can be no need of this specification, when he can at once, without any trouble, appeal to the Athanasian Creed, the Articles, the Litany, and the Catechism, for the truth of his assertions. To this I have only to reply, that these articles and formularies of the church are received by many whose sentiments materially differ from each other, and are adopted by the followers of Wallis, South, Burnet, Jortin, and Powell, not less than by those of Bull, Sherlock, Waterland, and Horsley. "Tous

* See Archbishop King's Sermon on the Fall of Man at the end of his Origin of Evil, and Bishop Bull's Discourse on the First Covenant, &c.

ceux (says Pascal) qui disent les mêmes choses ne les possèdent pas de la même sorte."

But, let me ask, is there no variety of doctrine among those who claim the common appellation of *Unitarians*? We have not to learn that though a certain portion of them contend that our Saviour was nothing more than one of the ordinary race of men, subject to all the bodily and mental weaknesses incident to human nature, and that even in his moral character he did not exhibit a model of absolute perfection, another class are not less firmly persuaded of his pre-existence; believing that he dwelt in the bosom of the Father long anterior to the formation of the mundane system, and that by him was created the present material universe with all its inhabitants. Some again of the same denomination maintain, that by the Logos of St. John is signified a being perfectly distinct from the Father, and who was in due time sent into the world to announce the certainty of an existence hereafter. Others consider the term as denoting nothing more than the divine wisdom which at a certain period emanated from the Deity, and became personified in the son of Joseph and Mary. One party discards the remotest idea of an atonement; another regards the death of the Saviour as possessing a mediatorial efficacy in the redemption of mankind, though they attempt not to explain their precise notions. Some contend that every semblance of worship paid to our Saviour shares in the guilt of blasphemy; others think with Socinus that the adoration of Christ is fully authorized by the power and glory with which he was invested after his ascension; while a third class assert that from the language of Scripture the Son is entitled to every degree of homage and veneration, short of the actual worship due to the Father.*

Now, in my apprehension, whoever undertakes to refute the creed of the Unitarians is bound to state with precision against which of these parties, all claiming the same title, his arguments are intended to be directed; nor could any thing be more unfair than to involve in one indiscriminate accusation

* If I mistake not, this appears to be the opinion of your correspondent, Mr. T. T. Clarke. I admire the conciliating disposition of this gentleman, but I cannot by any means concur with his sentiments respecting the character of our liturgy.

Whiston and Lardner, Priestley and Price, Mr. Frend and the Editor of the *Improved Version*. It is the constant neglect of this discrimination which I am sorry to be obliged to condemn in the opponents of the Church of England. Your correspondent will probably say, that since the Unitarians are not tied down to any fixed creed, the cases I have compared are not similar; but as long as some of our articles continue to receive different explanations, the complaint I have urged is, in my conception, fully justified. That the language of these articles and formularies has, in some instances, been thus variously interpreted by learned and orthodox divines, it would be in vain to deny; and while some have regarded this latitude as a subject of lamentation, others have with more justice viewed it as advantageous to the interests of religion, by admitting a greater number of able and excellent men into our communion, and by leaving room for future improvement, without compromising the great ends proposed by the Reformation. There can be no doubt that the original framers of our articles were desirous of retaining as many of the best Papists and Puritans within the pale of the church as it was possible to effect consistently with the object in view, and hence we may account for some of those modes of expression which may be construed as favourable to the respective tenets of different subscribers. The truth is, as Dr. Powell has well observed, these articles "have been interpreted too rigidly by zealots on both sides, with different designs: by some among our friends, lest they should be thought lukewarm in defence of the church: by many among our enemies, that the compliance required of them might appear the less reasonable."*

After this explanatory statement, the questions which your correspondent R. A. M. has proposed, with an apparent air of triumph, scarcely require any serious notice. He asks whether it may not be said without exaggerating the truth, that the Athanasian Creed teaches *tritheism*, that the Litany supposes an expiring God; and that the Catechism speaks distinctly of three independent Gods. He will excuse me if I adopt on the present occasion the monosyllabic answer

* See an excellent Discourse on *Subscription*, by Archdeacon Powell, formerly Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, preached before the University.

of that illustrious and lamented statesman, Mr. Canning, to a series of questions forced upon the attention of the House of Commons, by Sir Thomas Lethbridge, during the last session: *No.* The exposition which R. A. M. has given in each of the three instances adduced is most assuredly a gross exaggeration. Neither Sherlock, nor Bull, nor Waterland, nor Horsley, nor any other polemic of the high school of orthodoxy, professed to believe any thing of the kind; nor did they admit that the supplication in the Litany which he appears to think decisive, is to be understood as implying more than the passion of the Son of God in his *human nature*. Neither is the interpretation which R. A. M. has given of some of the expressions in our second Article, that which is received by the majority of our best divines. Like Dr. Channing's* terrific description of the Atonement, (which he most unfairly represents as applicable to all Trinitarians,) it may possibly be adopted by some, but it is utterly rejected by others. Let the former answer for themselves.

Does your correspondent really mean to affirm that because many of the clergy do not subscribe the articles in the sense which in his conception is the most obvious, they must therefore disbelieve them? Then most unquestionably

* Dr. Channing's Discourse on the Beneficial Tendency of Unitarianism is well entitled to the praise of eloquence, but I have seldom seen less substance comprised in the same bulk. Besides the misrepresentation of which I have complained, many of his observations are, to say the least, vague and unsatisfactory. Thus, "Nature," he informs us, "is no Trinitarian. It gives not a hint, not a glimpse, of a tri-personal author." I will merely ask, Has nature given any hint of a resurrection of the body, or of a general judgment hereafter? Does it say any thing of sanctifying a Sabbath for the Jews so sacred that every violation of it was punished with certain death? Does nature give any glimpse of Christian Baptism and the Lord's Supper? Or, what is still more important, does it suggest the necessity of limiting the light of the gospel to a small portion only of the human race, and of extending the sentence of future condemnation to the great majority? But though "neither nature nor the soul bears one trace" of these truths, are they on that account thought to be the less worthy of reception?

we have a right to conclude that those Unitarians who affix to the words of John vi. 62, of Coloss. ii. 9, and of numerous other texts, a meaning totally different from their usual acceptation, and from what the construction naturally suggests, do in fact, as far as those passages are concerned, refuse to believe the declarations of the sacred writers.

Your correspondent pointedly inquires, what I imagine the great mass of professed Christians do in truth believe. The reply is obvious. As the great mass of the population in every country of Christendom is necessarily composed of the unlearned, they naturally rely upon the authority of the public teachers of the denomination to which they belong for the explication of the doctrines revealed in Scripture, and of the formularies (if any) of their respective churches. But, after all, the private opinion of uneducated persons can be no criterion in judging of the truth of the one, or of the correctness of the other. Nothing, however, can be more unreasonable than the expectations of our opponents, and we might almost suppose that they required in human compositions a degree of perfection not to be found even in the pages of inspiration. We should entertain but a mean opinion of that man's understanding who, because he had met with considerable difficulty in the interpretation of the English laws, as well as some obscurity and error in the language in which they are recited, should immediately relinquish the benefits of our unrivalled constitution, and repair to some other country in quest of Utopian excellence. Little less irrational are those who insinuate that because some doctrinal errors may in their apprehension be discovered in the National Church, and some expressions are retained in its ritual which it might be better either to amend or expunge, its communion ought to be quitted without hesitation, and its tenets and form of worship for ever renounced.

Speaking of our ecclesiastical constitution, your correspondent observes that "every departure from an absolute unity of opinion is a flaw in the operation of the system." Beyond all question such was not the opinion of the temperate Reformers who compiled our Articles. "It is usually of more importance," says Dr. Powell, "to the peace and happiness of a community, that its members should speak, than think, alike." That man, indeed, must be nearly infatuated who can imagine that *absolute* uniformity of sentiment can ever be attained on sub-

subjects of high interest, like the present; but still such a degree of uniformity may exist, and is greatly to be desired, as will comprehend the majority of a nation in the same profession of faith, unite them under the same form of worship, and thus check that separation into an infinity of clashing sects so inimical to all the practical purposes of genuine religion. I will only add, that it is truly preposterous to suppose that either the English clergy or the laity are required to believe that the church to which they belong is altogether faultless, and that it may not in some particulars admit of improvement. It is sufficient that they regard it as better adapted to the circumstances and events of the people at large than any other existing communion, and that, taken as a whole, they acknowledge it to be justly entitled to their cordial approbation.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Welsh and Sanscrit Languages.

To the Editor.

SIR,

IN your September and October numbers you inserted two articles relating to a passage in Taliesin's Poems, and Mr. Edward Williams's opinion concerning it. I said in the course of the last letter, I had fully ascertained that the passage in question was not Sanscrit; and I gave my reasons for thinking there were some words in it, at least, a little like Welsh, adding, however, that I had got together a few facts, and conjured up a few fancies, to account for the phenomenon, though, as the matter turned out, there was no room left either for fancies or facts. After finishing the letter, I saw the Welsh *Archæologia*, when I subjoined, "that as a few foreign ideas had obtruded themselves on my mind, I would endeavour, with your permission, to relieve myself of them by forwarding them to you on some future occasion."

I am desirous, therefore, of fulfilling my promise by saying two or three words more.

I. Mr. Williams's words, contained in his poems, and alluded to in my last letter, are as follow (Note in p. 7, of the second volume): "The Welsh have always called themselves Cymri: the strictly literal meaning of the word is *Aborigines*: they are the Cimbri or Cimmericians of the ancients, and have been distinguished by this appellation in all ages, and in all countries, wherever they have at different times appeared, as if they

considered themselves the Aborigines of the world; they call their language Cymraig, that is, *aboriginal* or *primitive* language, for the word cannot possibly admit any other meaning. Some derive Cymri, or Cimbri, from the patriarch Gomer, a wild conjecture, a groundless etymology. Let them study the Welsh." Dr. Davies, in his preface to his Welsh Grammar, speaks more guardedly: "Si non a Gomer, ut quidam volunt, as some will have it." He adds, however, (he is alluding to those who have spoken of the originality of the Welsh language,) "not that they believed that the nation, and with the nation the language, sprang out of the earth like mushrooms, but because the beginning of the nation and of the language is more ancient than all the memory of man."

In a former letter, the grounds on which the eastern origin of the Welsh has been maintained were hinted at, and, at the same time, a passage in Taliesin's Poems was alluded to, which is of sufficient consequence to be quoted in this place:

"A numerous race, fierce they are said to have been,
Were thy originals, Britain, first of isles,
Natives of a country in Asia, and the
country of Gafis,
Said to have been a skilful people; but
the district is unknown
Which was mother to these warlike ad-
venturers on the sea.
Clad in their long dress, who could equal
them?
Their skill is celebrated; they were the
dread of Europe."

The original and the translation are in Mr. Higgins's *CELTIC DRUIDS*, (p. 101,) lately published.

In this ingenious and learned work, the author, amidst many other curious and interesting particulars, aims to shew, that as the Welsh and Irish were colonies from the east, there will of necessity be an affinity in their alphabets, and often a similarity in their language; that the Welsh, the Cornish, the Irish, the Manks, and the Erse, have one common mother language, and that other European and Eastern languages, though subject to intermixtures and changes which the lapse of time and other circumstances would introduce, still find their origin in one parent language; and he particularly shews correspondences of some of them with the Sanscrit, which he also thinks has the same common parent.

Without stating how far I may in all

things agree with the theory of this ingenious writer, I must acknowledge, (though I had not seen this book at the time,) it clearly shews not only the *possibility*, but the probability, and, indeed, the *certainly*, that there are at least Sanscrit *words* in the Welsh language. Mr. Higgins produces a passage of pure Sanscrit from the Greek, and the British must have had an affinity with the Greek as being of the same Celtic origin. And as (to borrow the words of Mr. Higgins) it “retained some of the ancient pronunciation longer than any other nation, so might it retain some of its language.”

The learned Dr. Davies,* who was so well acquainted with the genius of his own language, and had compared it with the oriental forms, speaks thus of it generally: Ausim affirmare, Linguam Britannicam tam *vocibus*, quam *phrasibus*, et *orationis contextu*, tam literarum pronunciatione, manifestam cum orientalibus habere congruentiam et affinitatem.

As to a whole passage from the Sanscrit, I was obliged, I own, to call in the assistance of a little fancy: thus,

I recollected that Abaris and Anacharsis, two Scythian princes and philosophers, found their way to Athens in quest of knowledge; that Bladud, an ancient Welsh king, with others, journeyed also to Athens for the same purpose, according to Herodotus and Diogenes Laertius; and that prince Madoc, in the twelfth century, is said to have led out a colony to America. Might not Taliesin, or any other Welsh bard, (the ancient bards were proverbially a roving race,) have been conveyed by some means to the land of the Brahmins, and come back to Britain, the happy white isle, accompanied by a few Brahmins? Thus I got possessed of a few fragments of Sanscrit poetry. For though the ancient Sanscrit was, in some sense, a *sacred*, it was not so much a *secret*, language as some have thought. But I was thinking of a *poet's* expedition, and I was not to be put out of my course by improbabilities and impossibilities. It might at least be shewn from ancient authors, that Britain was visited from the east at very remote periods, and that the British Druids visited ancient Greece.

These facts and fancies, however, with a few others, proceeding on the supposed testimony of two learned Sanscrit scholars, that the lines in our first letter were

really Sanscrit, on a more clear testimony that they really are not, are now all put to flight, “velut ægri somnia vana.”

II. So I proceed to the second point under consideration, viz. the portion of Welsh which may be supposed to be in the above-said passage.

As to *corrupt* Welsh, I think it has already appeared, that there is a little of something like Welsh in the lines said to be Taliesin's: and I use the word *corrupt* in preference to *obsolete*, aware that certain Welsh critics are backward to admit that the Welsh language has undergone any material change, *it being an original, primitive language*: but,

Mortalia facta peribunt,
Nedum sermonum stet honos, et gratia
vivax.

HORAT.

With respect to languages they must *all* of necessity change, increase, or diminish: thus the Greek was derived from the Phœnicians, and, like the Eastern languages, was read from right to left (as now from left to right), in what is called the Βασιλοφῶν way: then there was the most ancient, called the Pelasgic, and the Ionic Greek. Again, the latter divides into three principal dialects, of which one (the Doric) is often so different from the others, that Theocritus frequently seems to be written in a different language from Homer and Xenophon, to say nothing of the poetical dialects and of the accentual marks of modern invention. The Latin is a dialect of the Greek, or, more properly, both are derived from the same stock; in Cicero's time it had advanced to its most perfect state; yet Latin inscriptions might be produced, written only three hundred years before, which would be hardly read as Latin. In like manner all the modern languages derived from the Latin—the Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, have undergone similar changes. The French language has been characterized by the different kings' reigns about whose times its different changes were introduced; and from what was hinted in a former letter, the English language might be distributed in nearly a similar manner.

But it is said by some, and among others, by Camden, that the Welsh language was exempted by its locality from this common liability to change. Dr. Davies finds in it a stronger resemblance to the *Hebrew*, no less in its simplicity, purity, and originality, than in the forms of its grammatical construction and the

* Prefat. ad Linguæ Britannicæ Rudimenta.

constancy of its roots. And this may be admitted.

But the original, primæval character of even the Hebrew is probably lost. The Samaritan is prior to the present square character, which was not introduced till the time of Ezra, after the Babylonish Captivity; and though the Jews may say, that *all the Synagogue* copies of the Old Testament are uniformly the same, yet certain parts of it are Chaldee; not to mention the *Masoretic* inventions and the *Rabbinical* Hebrew. And all this supposes some variety or change.

As to the Welsh, besides that, as our honest Welsh bard admits, it was corrupted by the Irish, it might have received into it something also from its other cognate dialects, and probably had its *provincialisms*, (for the British *had* been the language of the whole *island*,) as also from commerce or other accidental interventions. Now such circumstances would imply some local varieties, some occasional introductions, without, however, supposing any essential radical change in the language, such as would affect the simplicity of its syntax, the purity of its idioms, its claims to antiquity, and many of its roots or its general resemblance in phraseology and forms to the Hebrew tongue; for all which the Welsh, with so much zeal, and probably with so much reason, contend.

Of the Britons themselves we know little, that is certain, till the time of Julius Cæsar. Mr. Williams says somewhere, that he has seen Welsh manuscripts of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries; and there are in its cognate dialect, the Irish, and in our Anglo-saxon, writings two or three centuries older, in our public libraries, at least. But Taliesin lived at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, and might have had the writings of Druid bards, (for, as we learn from Cæsar, they had writing among them,) or some traditionary poems and songs of their roving minstrels, which ran back through very remote periods. Such writings too, and such traditionary poems, might have been affected by different provincialisms, (for at the time here supposed, as observed before, the British language was spoken through *all* England,) or by the mistakes of copyists, or some peculiarities in the pronunciation of the reciters; all these things might have happened when stops were not made use of in writings, when words ran on in continuation without regular division; or some con-

fusion might have arisen in the sounds of vowels and a frequent similarity of letters: of all which sources of mistakes, in old writings, endless examples might easily be produced, if necessary.

Now, Sir, as observed before, it appears that the lines referred to in my first letter are not Sanscrit, and contain in them, probably, something of Welsh. I submit to those who are curious in these matters, whether the hints thus cursorily dropped in this and the preceding letter tend any way to solve the difficulty which seems to have perplexed our honest and ingenious Welsh bard, Edward Williams.

In conclusion, your readers will please to notice, that I say nothing of the *place* and character of the said passage in the poems; for whether it is introduced as a quotation, or whether it is part of a poem in continuation, I must be understood to know nothing, and to have made no inquiry. I beg leave further to add, that though Mr. Williams speaks of it as a passage among Taliesin's Poems, and I have therefore spoken of it as his, I see nothing whence I should conclude that it was really written by him. All that appears from the Welsh Archæologia is, that it occurs in a poem placed chronologically among Taliesin's poems, though without his name. But this, with other matters, I leave to the consideration of such as are better acquainted with the subject, and who may think it deserving their more critical examination.

GEORGE DYER*

On the Mode of Choosing Dissenting Pastors.

To the Editor.

"At the same time (1733) they appear to have laid down for themselves a rule of conduct which, if it were universally adopted, would save much unchristian feeling, and many a division in Dissenting churches; viz. never to have more than one candidate at a time, and, after a competent period allowed for hearing and inquiry, to come to a decisive vote; if unfavourable, by previous agreement to be final."—Pp. 10, 11.

SIR,

Though I felt much interest in the judicious and able review, in your De-

* [It is proper to state that this letter reached us before the appearance of the translation of Taliesin's Poem, Vol. I. p. 885. EDIT.]

ember Repository, of Mr. Turner's Sermon on the Century from the opening of his Chapel, it strikes me that the above extract might have been enlarged upon with great advantage in the present state of several of our leading congregations, who seem to have been pursuing a directly opposite principle, viz. to call upon as many preachers to come and display their talents before them, as the fancy of any individual shall prompt him to propose, before the congregation at large should assemble for the choice of its future pastor. The natural consequence of such a proceeding must obviously be, to divide it into parties, perhaps as many as it may have heard preachers, and to excite in the respective partizans the passions, and give occasion to many of the manœuvres, of a common borough election; passions that will probably maintain their influence and shew their bad effects in the subsequent proceedings of the congregation; and manœuvres that will afterwards be recollected with resentment, and perhaps played off against those who have had recourse to them on the next practical occasion. At any rate, both the passions and the manœuvres are inconsistent with that brotherly love and simplicity of spirit which ought to influence a Christian assembly.

In the mean time the minister elected comes, if he choose to come, to take the charge of a divided flock; he knows who in it are his friends, and who have been his opponents; and it will require great self-government and a spirit well schooled in Christian principles to behave towards all without partiality, and without, on the other hand, yielding, on his side, to a manœuvring, perhaps a truckling spirit, unworthy of a Christian minister.

Does it not, besides, betray somewhat of an overweening consciousness of superiority for any congregation to imagine that it has a right to expect that ministers should come from the most distant parts of the kingdom, leaving their respective flocks to exhibit themselves before them? And may it not also be the means of loosening the bonds of Christian affection between a minister and his flock? of rendering the one unsettled and discontented with his present station in the church, while a higher one is within his reach; and the other jealous and distrustful, as of one who seems ready to make them only a stepping-stone to this higher station?

I mean not to say that ministers

should in no case remove from one charge to another, or that our smaller congregations may not be useful nurseries for training up ministers for more extended services elsewhere; still less that our larger societies may not justifiably invite such ministers as they know to have conducted themselves with credit and usefulness in a more confined sphere: but it does appear to me, that great danger is to be apprehended from the indulgence of an unlimited curiosity on the one side, and from exciting an ill-founded spirit of ambitious restlessness on the other.

These observations have appeared to me of considerable importance to the peace, good order, and Christian edification of our larger societies, and I have endeavoured to offer them in the spirit of peace and love. If I have failed of doing this, I shall indeed be very sorry.

V. F.

Test and Corporation Acts.

SIR, *To the Editor.*

I SEE, with the sincerest pleasure, that my brethren are early in the field, and preparing for a renewed and hearty struggle for the demolition of those two decayed and hateful props of the Establishment, the Corporation and Test Acts. The Address of the Dissenting Ministers, printed in the last Repository, will have been read with pleasure and profit by all true Nonconformists. Thank God! the spirit of their fathers in the church still lives and reigns among them. Their activity, their union, their firm and uncompromising perseverance, will have its due weight throughout the kingdom. It will rouse us to a sense of our rights and of our wrongs, and it will enkindle a spirit too mighty to resist, and too determined to be turned from its purpose. It would be wise in the bigots to submit with a good grace, and not suffer the Dissenters to feel and know their own strength. If a determined resistance to their just claims should lead to an organized system of co-operation, should make them feel how mighty they are, the Church may rue the day when such a disclosure shall be made. "*Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath, for they shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy, and he shall make of them a speedy riddance.*" (Zeph. i. 18.) Of one good consequence we may be certain. Our brethren of all persuasions, and especially those who are young, will be led to examine the

grounds and reasons of their opposition to all Church Establishments, and without this knowledge there can be no zeal but of a spurious and improper kind. That steady and consistent zeal which never loses sight of its object, and which alone is to be depended on, exists only in the minds of such as understand their principles.

The following document will shew the light in which the exclusion laws were considered nearly a century and half ago by some of the members of the House of Lords.

“ *Die Jovis, 21^o Martii, 1688.*

“ The House having been in consideration of the bill for abrogating the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and establishing others in their place,

“ A clause for repealing so much of the Test Act as concerns the receiving the sacrament was read.

“ And the question being put, whether to agree to the said clause ;

“ It was resolved in the negative.

“ Leave was given by the House to such Lords as will, to enter their dissents, and accordingly these Lords following, do enter their dissents, for the reasons following :

“ 1st. Because a hearty union amongst Protestants is a greater security to the church and state than any test that can be invented.

“ 2dly. Because this obligation to receive the sacrament is a test on Protestants rather than on the Papists.

“ 3dly. Because so long as it is continued, there cannot be that hearty and thorough union amongst Protestants as has always been wished, and is at this time indispensably necessary.

“ 4thly. Because a greater caution ought not to be required from such as are admitted into offices, than from the members of the two houses of Parliament, who are not obliged to receive the sacrament to enable them to sit in either house.

“ NORTH AND GREY,	GREY,
CHESTERFIELD,	VAUGHAN,
J. LOVELACE,	STAMFORD,
DELAMER,	P. WHARTON.”

“ *Die Sabbati, 23^o Martii, 1688.*

“ *Hodie 3a vice lecta est billa,* An act for the abrogating of the oaths of supremacy allegiance, and appointing other oaths.

“ A rider (in parchment) providing, that no officer shall incur the penalties of the Test Act, in case he shall receive the sacrament in any Protestant congrega-

tion within a year before or after his admission, was offered and read.

“ And the question being put, whether this rider shall be made part of the bill ;

“ It was resolved in the negative.

“ Leave was given to such Lords as will, to enter their dissents, and these Lords do enter their dissents in the reasons following :

“ 1st. Because it gives great part of the Protestant freemen of England reason to complain of inequality and hard usage, when they are excluded from public employments by a law, and also because it deprives the king and kingdom of divers men fit and capable to serve the public in several stations, and that for a mere scruple of conscience, which can by no means render them suspected, much less disaffected to the government.

“ 2dly. Because His Majesty, as the common and indulgent father of his people, having expressed an earnest desire of liberty for tender consciences to his Protestant subjects ; and my lords the bishops having, divers of them, on several occasions professed an inclination, and owned the reasonableness of such a Christian temper ; we apprehend, it will raise suspicions in men’s minds of something different from the case of religion or the public, or a design to heal our breaches, when they find, that by confining secular employments to ecclesiastical conformity, those are shut out from civil affairs, whose doctrine and worship may be tolerated by authority of Parliament, there being a bill before us, by order of the House, to that purpose ; especially when, without this exclusive rigour, the Church is secured in all her privileges and preferments, nobody being hereby let into them who is not strictly conformable.

“ 3dly. Because to set marks of distinction and humiliation on any sort of men who have not rendered themselves justly suspected to the government, as it is at all times to be avoided by the makers of just and equitable laws, so may it be particularly of ill effect to the reformed interest at home and abroad, in this present conjuncture, which stands in need of the united hands and hearts of all Protestants, against the open attempts and secret endeavours of a restless party, and a potent neighbour, who is more zealous than Rome itself to plant popery in these kingdoms, and labours, with the utmost force, to settle his tyranny upon the ruins of the Reformation all through Europe.

“ 4thly. Because it turns the edge of

a law (we know not by what fate) upon Protestants and friends to the government, which was intended against Papists, to exclude them from places of trust, as men avowedly dangerous to our religion and government; and thus the taking the sacrament, which was enjoined only as a means to discover Papists, is now made a distinguishing duty amongst Protestant Dissenters, to weaken the whole, by casting off a part of them.

“ 5thly. Because mysteries of religion and divine worship are of divine original, and of a nature so wholly distant from the secular affairs of public society, that they cannot be applied to those ends; and therefore the Church, by the law of the gospel, as well as common prudence, ought to take care not to offend either tender consciences within itself, or give offence to those without, by mixing their sacred mysteries with secular interests.

“ 6thly. Because we cannot see how it can consist with the law of God, common equity, or the right of any free-born subject, that any one should be punished without a crime: if it be a crime not to take the sacrament according to the

usage of the Church of England, every one ought to be punished for it, which nobody affirms: if it be no crime, those who are capable, and judged fit for employments by the king, ought not to be punished with a law of exclusion, for not doing that which is no crime to forbear: if it be urged still, as an effectual test to discover and keep out Papists, the taking the sacrament in those Protestant congregations, where they are members and known, will be at least as effectual to that purpose.

“ OXFORD,	P. WHARTON,
R. MONTAGUE,	J. LOVELACE,
MORDAUNT,	W. PAGET.”

In the defence of their religious rights the present has certainly been a sleepy and idle generation. Of those who were our champions in 1789, few, very few, remain. “ It is high time for us to awake out of sleep.” Let it not be imagined that we have an easy task to perform. The struggle will probably be long and hard, but the result is certain; the reign of intolerance must have an end. “ *Babylon shall be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all.*”

A NONCONFORMIST.

OBITUARY.

J. G. EICHORN.

1827. June 29, the University of Göttingen lost one of its oldest and most celebrated Professors, JOHANN GOTTFRIED EICHORN, Knight of the Guelphic Order, &c. He was in his 75th year, and had been a Professor for thirty-nine years. His important labours not only with regard to the Holy Scriptures, but in every department of historical and literary inquiry, require no eulogium from us, but we shall probably take an early opportunity of giving some account of his various works.

MRS. ALICE AINSWORTH.

Dec. 1, at Preston, aged 52, ALICE, daughter of the late Mr. Hutton, of Parbold, in Lancashire, and relict of the late David AINSWORTH, Esq., of Preston, in the same county. In this lady was united great sincerity, with the most amiable and affectionate dispositions. Her generous heart made her averse to every thing selfish and mean, and invariably prompted her to study the happiness of those about her. While health permitted, she was a regular attendant

on public worship, towards the support of which, as well as of other things connected with the cause of Unitarian Christianity, she was, like her late husband, a liberal contributor. During the space of two years previous to her decease, she bore the pains and the confinement arising from a distressing and gradually wasting illness with Christian patience and resignation. Her cheerfulness remained with her to the last; and as long as she retained the faculty of speech, she continued to counsel, bless, and console her sorrowing children. She has descended to the grave regretted and mourned by all who enjoyed her friendship.

R. C.

THOMAS CONEYS, Esq.

Dec. 28, at his residence at Brixton, in the county of Surrey, THOMAS CONEYS, Esq., Barrister at Law. He was born at Clifden, in the county of Galway, in Ireland, of an ancient and respectable family, who were originally from the county of Salop. His father was Thomas Coneys, Esq., of Streamstown,

county of Galway, who died on the 23rd of October, 1784, at the age of 54. Mr. Coneys received his collegiate education at the University of Cambridge. Being destined for the legal profession, he afterwards entered a student at Lincoln's-Inn, where he finished his terms in 1789. He now returned to Ireland, and for a short time practised as a Solicitor at Dublin; but this branch of the profession not being congenial with his taste, he quitted it, and was called to the Irish Bar. Though he here acquired considerable reputation as a lawyer, yet his attendance upon the courts was not sufficiently constant to command for him very general practice. Subsequently to the Union, he was frequently employed in appeal causes before the House of Lords, and in Parliamentary business before Committees of the House of Commons. In 1819, he took up his permanent residence in the neighbourhood of London, but still occasionally engaging in professional business before Parliament. In 1824, he was honoured with the appointment of being one of His Majesty's Commissioners of Legal Inquiry into the Administration of Civil and Commercial Justice in the West Indies, an office for which he was singularly well qualified, no less by his learning and talents than by the high independence of his spirit and his inflexible integrity. In consequence of this appointment, he spent almost two years in the West Indies, and his last months were principally devoted to the preparation, in conjunction with his only surviving colleague, Jabez Henry, Esq., of the important report of the result of their inquiries, to be submitted to the Government and to Parliament. During the time Mr. Coneys was a student at Cambridge, a spirit of religious inquiry was at work among the members of that University, which had then led to the secession of some eminent individuals, and subsequently caused the secession of others, from the doctrine and communion of the Church of England. Among this honourable band may be named Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Disney, Dr. Jebb, Mr. Wakefield, and others, not to mention some individuals of high character still living. Mr. Coneys felt the influence of this spirit, and whilst he did not neglect a proper attention to the ordinary pursuits of the University, he applied himself with diligence and earnestness to the study of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, and rose from the consideration of them "with the entire conviction," so he has himself recorded, "of the strict

unity and unrivalled supremacy of the One God the Father, and of the mere and proper humanity, as regards the nature, and the divine mission, as respects the authority, of his Son and servant, our Lord Jesus Christ:" and in this persuasion he remained unshaken to his death. His convictions on these important points were to him sources of great satisfaction on his dying bed, and he caused them to be distinctly recorded in his will, which was made a short time before his death. It is to be mentioned to his honour, that he was never solicitous to conceal his religious sentiments, however they might, by their unpopularity in the circles in which he generally moved, operate to his disadvantage as a professional man. Whilst he resided at Dublin, he was an attendant on Unitarian worship at the chapel of the excellent Dr. Drummond, and on his settlement in London he became a worshiper at Essex Street, and occasionally, as suited his convenience, at other Unitarian chapels. A desire to do good was his ruling passion. Under the influence of this feeling, and considering that his example and instruction might, in consequence of his early and hereditary connexion with Ireland, and also because of the peculiar circumstances of that country, be more effective there than elsewhere, he had projected the formation of an establishment in his native neighbourhood, where he intended to pass some months in every year, with the view of promoting by every means in his power the intellectual, moral and physical improvement of the surrounding country. Death, however, rendered this scheme abortive, and terminated all his philanthropic plans and benevolent anticipations.

HELEN MARIA WILLIAMS,

Whose death we announced in our last number, (p. 60,) began her literary career under the friendly patronage of Dr. Kippis. Her first publication was a legendary tale, entitled *Edwin and Elfida*, to which Dr. Kippis wrote a preface. She afterwards printed, in 1783, an *Ode on the Peace*, which was followed, in 1784, by *Pern*, a Poem. In 1786, she published by subscription a *Collection of Miscellaneous Poems*, in 2 Vols., 12mo, including the two poems just named. Her next work was a poem on the *Slave Trade*, which appeared in 1788. And, in 1790, she published a novel in two volumes, under the title of *Julia*. In 1788, Miss Williams, having

become attached to the principles of the Revolution then in its infancy in France, was led to visit that country. In consequence of the interest she took in the events then passing, she published, in 1790, *Letters written in France to a Friend in England*, in the Summer of 1790. A second edition appeared in 4 Vols., 12mo., in 1792. She went to France a second time in 1791, on which occasion she published a poem, entitled *A Farewell for Two Years to England*. From this time, however, she became a permanent resident at Paris. Her principal publications, subsequently to this period, were, *Letters, containing a Sketch of the Politics of France*, 4 Vols., 12mo., 1796. *Paul and Virginia*, translated from St. Pierre. This was the amusement of her hours of confinement while imprisoned in the temple during the sanguinary ascendancy of Robespierre. *A Tour in Switzerland*, 2 Vols., 8vo., 1796. *Sketches of the State of Manners and Opinions in the French Republic*, in a Series of Letters, 2 Vols., 8vo., 1800. *Poems selected from Various Authors*, 12mo., 1796. In 1803, she edited the *Political and Confidential Correspondence of Louis XVI.*, in 3 Vols., 8vo., adding her observations to the letters. And, in 1815, she published a *Narrative of the Events which took place in France from the Landing of Napoleon Bonaparte on the First of March, 1815, to the Restoration of Louis XVIII.*, with an *Account of the Present State of Society and Public Opinions*. Her last literary employment was the translation of Humboldt's *Personal Narrative*. Of this valuable work she had completed six octavo volumes, and at the time of her death had made considerable progress in the seventh. During the eventful period of the French Revolution, Miss Williams enjoyed the friendship of some of the most eminent persons who bore a part in the public transactions; and, during the short peace of 1802, her house was the resort of most of the English travellers of respectability who visited the French metropolis. As a writer she acquired considerable reputation. But none of her works, some of her smaller poems, perhaps, excepted, are of a character likely to transmit her name to posterity.

MR. FREDERICK BOARDMAN.

Dec. 6, at his residence, *Mount Pleasant*, near *Manchester*, Mr. FREDERICK BOARDMAN, Solicitor. In his profession he was remarkable for the conscientiousness with which he gave his opinions; and, though opposed to his interest, yet he generally advised his clients to act upon the Scripture maxim, "Agree with thine adversary quickly," as he felt it to be his duty to prevent them from needlessly incurring the expense and unpleasantness which too frequently attend litigation. In all his actions he was characterized by an unbending regard to principle, and his memory is embalmed in the affectionate remembrance of those who knew his worth.

He was, from personal investigation, a firm believer in the doctrines of Unitarianism, and during the latter period of his life cherished a hope that he should be able at a future period to devote the whole of his time to the office of a Christian teacher. During the greater part of the time that the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society has been established, he was a preacher at its different stations. It was his general practice to preach extempore, and there were always a fervour and an earnestness in his ministrations which caused him to be listened to with great attention.

The Unitarian Society recently established in Salford, Manchester, has lost in him a valuable friend. He was connected with it from its infancy, and may be justly called one of its founders. He engaged with zeal and laboured with diligence to promote the success of its different institutions, and he was greatly respected by its members for his talents and integrity. To the Sunday-school he was a most efficient support, and, indeed, every scheme that had for its object the improvement of his fellow-creatures, found in him a ready and a sincere friend. He was naturally formed for domestic life, and many are the sacrifices of ease and enjoyment which he has made to fulfil his duty. About seven months since, he was married, when he entered his solemn protest against the marriage service, because it required from him an implied assent to the truth of doctrines which he believed to be fundamentally erroneous.

INTELLIGENCE.

Corporation and Test Acts.

THE United Committee have held frequent meetings, and their circulars and forms of petitions are now, we trust, widely extended over the kingdom. Deputations from the Committee have had interviews with Lord Holland and Mr. John Smith, and a correspondence has also taken place with Lord John Russell, who is absent from town. It is intended to give the earliest notice of a motion in the House of Commons, which will probably be made towards the end of February, so that no time should be lost in sending up petitions.

Marriage Act.

THE Association Committee has settled the form of a bill, which it is proposed to introduce in the House of Lords immediately. It is founded on the former basis, to which it has been found best to revert, of marrying at Unitarian places of worship.

Beverley Meeting of the Clergy.

A NUMEROUS meeting of the Clergy of that Archdeaconry was held at the Tiger Inn, Beverley, on Wednesday, to take into consideration the propriety of petitioning Parliament against certain provisions in the Unitarian Marriage Bill. The Rev. J. Gilby was called to the Chair. A series of resolutions, of which the following is the substance, were passed, and petitions to Parliament founded thereon were adopted:

“That this meeting have viewed with alarm certain provisions contained in a Bill intended to be submitted to Parliament, entitled, ‘A Bill for granting Relief to certain Persons Dissenting from the Church of England, in respect to the Mode of celebrating Marriage.’

“That those provisions of the said Bill which degrade marriage from a religious to a civil contract, are, in the opinion of this meeting, at direct variance with the doctrines of the Church of England; and, if passed into a law, will establish a precedent highly dangerous to the stability of the institution of marriage, and, in its consequences, to the best interests of society.

“That we consider those provisions which require us to publish the banns and register the celebration of the marriages contracted under the powers of the said Bill, as offensive to our consciences and degrading to our characters; offensive to our consciences, as compelling us to assist in an act at variance with the doctrines of our church; and degrading to our characters, as requiring us to become the clerks and criers of those who reject our ministry, and the beautiful service of the Liturgy as idolatrous.”

London University.

A RUMOUR is very prevalent among the clergy, that it is intended to make application to the Legislature for the endowment of a college in the metropolis, which, like the other great universities, shall be under the controul, and dedicated only to the purposes, of the Established Church. Several private individuals, it is rumoured, have expressed their intentions, should the Legislature adopt this idea, to found professorships and scholarships, and to devote sums for annual prizes. This establishment, the heads for the proposed arrangement for which have been already submitted to the hierarchy of the church, is thought necessary, in consequence of the determination of the planners and promoters of the “Dissenters’ University,” to persevere in the prosecution of this undertaking. The London University, it is *falsely* said, was not only conceived in Dissenterism, but all its appointments of professors and assistants are, with one or two exceptions, Dissenters. It is hence inferred, that the interests of the state religion require some security against the influence of the new University. The fact, however, is not so. Had it originated in Dissenterism, it would not be matter of wonder, when Dissenters are excluded from Oxford and Cambridge. It happens, however, that *not one* of the professors elected is a *Dissenter*!* Nine in ten are Church-of-

* [Is our respectable correspondent, who may be supposed to have had access to the best information, prepared to

England-men, and one or two are of the Established Church of Scotland. But granting the assertion to be true, if the professors were bound to inculcate the tenets of the Dissenters, or any doctrines averse to, or dissonant from, those of the State Church, the argument would hold good; but the fact is, it professes to inculcate no religious tenets whatever, religion being entirely excluded from its course. Now, how a student's religious principles can be affected by listening to a lecture upon medicine, surgery, or any other science, delivered by a Dissenter, it is difficult to conceive. This point, however, should be established by those who-maintain that the State Church requires protection against the London University. *New Monthly Mag.*, Jan. 1828.

Trials for Blasphemy.

CONTRARY to all expectation, the City of London, (perhaps its Solicitor, who may not like to see bright prospects clouded,) though it does not choose, or is ashamed, to bring up the offenders it convicts for judgment, goes on to outrage public opinion by fresh prosecutions, which, after one successful trial, would naturally seem wholly useless except for the purpose of more widely diffusing the blasphemy. Perhaps it is thought wise to try a legal experiment as to the multiplication of offences, by thus (after getting a man found guilty of *blasphemy*) trying to get him also convicted of *conspiring to blaspheme*. A full special jury not having attended, the Attorney-General (glad, it would appear, to withdraw on any terms) availed himself of his option not to proceed, by which the matter goes over to March.

On the same day, the 17th of January, a petition was presented on the subject to the Common Council. Almost all the speakers concurred in reprobating the

prove this assertion? In the official printed list of elected professors there are at least *two* learned gentlemen who, if we mistake not, are English Protestant Dissenters, and would not scruple to avow their "Dissenterism," if called upon. And may we not ask, what are all the members of the Scotch Established Church, and the numerous seceders from it, when they have crossed the Tweed, but *Dissenters*, Dissenters from the Established Church of England and Ireland; and are they not as subject to the laws affecting Dissenters as any English Nonconformist? EDIT.]

folly and impolicy of the proceedings. Alderman Atkins, the prosecutor, was received as he deserved; and the lesson will probably produce its effect.

Salford Chapel Anniversary.

THE friends and supporters of the Unitarian Chapel, Green-gate, Salford, dined together on the 4th of January, at the School-room connected with the Chapel. The Rev. W. Shepherd was in the Chair, and about one hundred and twenty persons sat down to table. After dinner the meeting was ably addressed by the Chairman, by Ottiwell Wood, Esq., of Liverpool; the Rev. Messrs. Robberds, J. J. Tayler, Beard, Brettell, &c., &c., and the afternoon passed with much enjoyment, affording a high intellectual treat to those who were enabled to be present.

FOREIGN.

RUSSIA.

Persecution of the Jews in Russia.

IN our last number we inserted at length the Ukase lately issued by the Emperor of Russia against the Jews in his dominions. The Jews in London had held a meeting on the subject, to consider what relief might be afforded to their suffering brethren. On the first of January, a meeting of *Christians* was convened by public advertisement for a similar purpose, at the King's Head Tavern in the Poultry, at which Apsley Pellatt, Esq., presided. Several gentlemen addressed the meeting, expressing their abhorrence of persecution, and their anxiety to do something to avert or mitigate the evils which menaced the Russian Jews. The following Resolutions were then agreed to:

I. That the persecutions to which the Jews are subjected by the late Russian Ukase, are as unjust towards that ill-treated people, as they are repugnant to the spirit of generous Christianity, which forbids its professors to persecute or prosecute any class of their fellow-creatures.

II. That this meeting commends the spirit which has led the Jews in this country to meet together, for the purpose of expressing their sympathy with their afflicted brethren, and approves their determination to protest against those oppressions, of which they have for so long a time been made the victims in all countries.

III. That this meeting is desirous of

assisting the Jews in any rational efforts which they may themselves be disposed to make to obtain a recognition of their rights to the protection of all governments, so long as they prove themselves good subjects, and peaceful members of society.

IV. That a copy of these Resolutions be forwarded to Mr. Levi, the Chairman of the meeting of Jews lately held at the London Tavern, and also to the various congregations of Jews in the British dominions, and that they be published in some of the public newspapers.

INDIA.

Suppression of Mr. Adam's Newspaper.

OUR readers will see from the following documents, which we copy from the last number of the Oriental Herald, that the Indian Government are determined, in the exercise of their sovereignty, and in the genuine spirit of Eastern despotism, to put down every journal which dares to give utterance, even in the most guarded language, to liberal sentiments. We hope the ruling authorities will not act over again the tyranny that was exercised towards Mr. Buckingham and Mr. Arnot, and after destroying his property, compel Mr. Adam to quit the present scene of his useful labours.

"The late Calcutta Chronicle."

"The proprietor of the late Calcutta Chronicle yesterday informed the subscribers to that paper, that a respectable [respectful?] application had been addressed to the Government, praying for a renewal of the license on grounds that, it was hoped, would be successful. He has now to add, that the application has been unsuccessful, and for the information of his friends and the public, he subjoins the correspondence that has passed on the occasion, republishing the first letter of Mr. Secretary Lushington, that the whole may be presented to the reader at one view.

"To Mr. William Adam, and Mr. Villiers Holcroft, Proprietors of the Calcutta Journal."

"General Department."

"GENTLEMEN,

"THE general tenour of the contents of the Calcutta Chronicle having been for some time past highly disrespectful to the Government, and to the Honourable the Court of Directors, and that paper of the 29th instant, in particular, comprising several paragraphs in direct violation

of the Regulations regarding the press; I am directed to inform you, that the Right Honourable the Vice-President in Council has resolved, that the license granted to you on the 25th January last, for the printing and publishing of the Calcutta Chronicle, be cancelled, and it is hereby cancelled accordingly from the present date.

"I am, Gentlemen,

"Your obedient servant,

"C. LUSHINGTON.

"Chief Secretary to the Government.

"Council Chamber, 31st May, 1827."

"To Charles Lushington, Esq., Chief Secretary to the Government."

"SIR,

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, informing me that the license of the Calcutta Chronicle is cancelled by the Right Honourable the Vice President in Council.

"As his Lordship in Council has not seen fit to indicate the particular articles or paragraphs that have brought upon me this heavy expression of his displeasure, I am at a loss to know wherein my offence consists, what are the violations of the Press Regulations to which his Lordship refers, or in what respects the general tenour of the paper has been considered as highly disrespectful to the Government and to the Honourable the Court of Directors.

"I beg to recall to the recollection of his Lordship in Council, that the rules attached to the Press Regulations are expressly declared to 'impose no irksome restraints on the publication and discussion of any matters of general interest relating to European and Indian affairs, provided they are conducted with the temper and decorum which the Government has a right to expect from those living under its protection; neither do they preclude individuals from offering, in a temperate and decorous manner, through the channels of the public newspapers, or other periodical works, their own views and sentiments relative to matters affecting the interests of the community.' With profound deference to his Lordship in Council, I beg to state, that in offering my sentiments relative to matters affecting the interests of the community, I am not conscious of having transgressed the bounds here presented.

"I beg respectfully to submit, for the consideration of his Lordship in Council,

that in every former case of suppression, several previous admonitions have been given; whereas, in the present case, although I am informed that the general tenour of the articles of the Calcutta Chronicle has been considered, for some time past, highly disrespectful, yet the withdrawal of the license is sudden and unexpected, and has not been preceded by any authoritative warning, to which it would have been my duty, my interest, and my inclination, to attend.

"Knowing the difficulties and dangers that beset the path of an Indian Editor, I was originally induced to allow my name to be sent into Government, in that character, with extreme unwillingness, which was vanquished chiefly by the hope of being instrumental in saving from destruction the property of a poor man, vested in a paper that had incurred the displeasure of Government; and the leniency shewn by Government in that case, subsequently, encouraged me to embark property, on my own account, in a similar concern. I venture to hope, that an engagement thus commenced, for the benefit of another, will not be terminated, by the fiat of his Lordship in Council, to my great loss, without any premonition for my guard and guidance. I have only to add, that should his Lordship in Council be pleased to extend to me the same consideration which has been bestowed upon others in similar circumstances, it will be my earnest endeavour to avoid whatever may appear likely to be deemed a violation of the Press Regulations.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. ADAM,

"Sole Proprietor of the Calcutta Chronicle.

"Calcutta, 31st May, 1827."

"To Mr. William Adam.

"SIR,

"Your letter of yesterday's date having been laid before Government, I am desired to inform you that the Right Honourable the Vice-President in Council *does not think it necessary to make any more specific reference to the objectionable passages contained in the Calcutta Chronicle of the 29th ultimo, than was done in my communication of yesterday.*

"2nd. I am desired to add, that the remainder of your letter requires no other reply, than that *the warnings publicly given to other editors WERE SUFFICIENT FOR YOUR INFORMATION*, and that Government does not see fit to accede to your

application for permission to continue the publication of the Calcutta Chronicle.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"C. LUSHINGTON,

"Chief Secretary to the Government.

"Council Chamber, 1st June, 1827."

"The suppression of a paper in Calcutta, by the mandate of Government, is not a new thing; but the suppression of the 'Calcutta Chronicle' is attended by circumstances of a peculiar nature, which furnish some novel illustration of the state of law and government in this country. It is not, however, the intention of the proprietor to offer those reflections which suggest themselves to his mind on this occasion, because, from higher considerations than a regard to his own personal convenience or safety, he is desirous of avoiding a course that might subject him to the penalty of transmission, to which, as a British-born subject, he is liable.

"He must, however, be permitted to express his regret, that 'the Right Honourable the Vice-President in Council does not think it necessary to make any more specific reference to the objectionable passages contained in the Calcutta Chronicle,' than a bare mention of the paper of the 29th ult., as it has generally been considered *necessary* to let a culprit know why and wherefore, on what specific grounds and evidence, he is convicted, condemned, and punished. There cannot be a stronger or clearer proof of the uncertainty of the law regarding the press, and the difficulty, if not impossibility, of escaping from its penalties, than the fact, that of different individuals of great judgment and experience, who have attempted to specify the offensive paragraphs, each has differed from all the rest, and no one, as far as the proprietor can learn, has fixed upon the paragraph which he happens to know, on good authority, was the *ostensible* reason for suppressing the paper.

"Arrangements are in progress for the purchase of the stock and printing materials of the late Calcutta Chronicle, by an individual who may probably possess sufficient penetration to understand, and prudence to observe, the Press Regulations. Should this individual succeed in obtaining a license for a newspaper, it will be forwarded to the subscribers of the late Calcutta Chronicle, with the strongest recommendation of its Editor, who is satisfied that it will be found to merit their support.

"The proprietor takes his leave of his readers with the gratifying consciousness, confirmed by the suffrages of a numerous and constantly increasing list of subscribers, that the Calcutta Chronicle, in its brief day, has done the public some good service.

"Calcutta, June 2, 1827."

LITERARY NOTICES.

THE Rev. G. Oliver has issued proposals for publishing by subscription a History of Initiation, comprising a detailed account of the Rites and Ceremonies, Doctrines and Discipline, of all the Secret and Mysterious Institutions of the Ancient World.

A new work has been announced as from the pen of the late Rev. Dr. Gerard, on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion.

The Rev. Francis Wrangham will shortly publish a new edition of the Prolegomena to the London Polyglott Bible, by Bishop Walton, accompanied by a variety of Notes illustrative of the Text, and noticing such Original Criticisms as have been made on the subjects therein discussed since his time; with Tables of Oriental Alphabets.

The Rev. C. Williams is about to publish the Missionary Cabinet, comprising a Gazetteer of all the Places occupied by Christian Missionaries, with a brief Geographical Description.

Among the *Novelties* of the season it is announced that there will shortly issue from the press *Three Sermons* by the Author of *Waverley*!

Mr. Rose is printing a Second Series of Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge.

The Ordination Services at the Settlement of the Rev. Peter Thomas Davies, with the Congregation assembling at the Upper or Presbyterian Meeting-House, Newbury, are in the Press, and will be published in the course of the ensuing month.

Mr. Johns, of Crediton, is preparing for the Press a volume of Poetry.

The Narrative of the Second Expedition to explore the Shores of the Polar Sea under the command of Captain Franklin, will shortly be given to the public by that able and enterprising officer.

The Papers and Collections of Sir Robert Wilmot, Bart., some time Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, are announced for publication; as are also the Conway Papers, from the Collection of the Marquis of Hertford.

Dr. Robert Southey has announced a work, under the title of *Sir Thomas More*; a series of Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society.

Dr. Nathaniel Drake is printing *Mornings in Spring, or Retrospections*, Biographical, Critical, and Historical.

The Rev. Mr. Le Bas, M. A., is about to publish *Considerations on Miracles*.

Mr. John Bowring has announced his intention of publishing, by subscription, *Hungarian Popular Songs*, with Critical and Historical Notices of the Magyar Literature and Language, as spoken in Hungary and Transylvania.

Lady Charlotte Bury is preparing for the press, *Historical Memoirs of the House of Argyle*, from the earliest period down to the time of the late John Duke of Argyle.

Mr. Washington Irving is engaged in a *History of the Life and Voyages of Columbus*.

Mr. J. P. Thomas is preparing for publication a *Compendium of the Laws of Nature and Nations*.

A work has been announced under the title of *Bibliographica Cantabrigiensiæ*, or *Remarks upon the most valuable and curious Book rarities in the University of Cambridge*.

Mr. Joseph Parkes is about to publish a *History of the Court of Chancery*; with Practical Remarks on the recent Commission, Report and Evidence, &c.

A Poem in the Servian Language has been announced as about to be published at Leipsic, by Simeon Milutinovitsch.

Mr. Thomas Bellamy is about to publish *Thirty Designs for Monumental Stones and Tombs*, with practical details.

The Rev. W. Orme is printing some Discourses on Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and the Doctrine of Spiritual Influence, with Notes and Illustrations.

There is now in the press, the *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D.*, illustrated principally from his unpublished Manuscripts, with a preliminary view of the Papal System, and of the State of the Protestant Doctrine in Europe to the commencement of the Fourteenth Century. By Robert Vaughan. With a finely engraved portrait by E. H. Finden, from the original picture by Sir Antonio More, now an Heirloom to the Rectory of Wycliffe, Richmondshire. 2 Vols. 8vo.

The Rev. C. Moase is about to publish a work on Religious Liberty, in answer to Bishop Burgess's Catechism.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Treatise on the Steam Engine, Historical, Practical, and Descriptive. By John Farey. 4to. 5*l.* 5*s.*

Compendium of Gas-Lighting, &c. By William Matthews. 12mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Conversations on Animal Economy. By a Physician. 2 Vols. 12mo. 16*s.*

The Chart of Health and Domestic Medical Guide, on a large sheet.

Essays on the Human Intellect as constructed by God, and on our Saviour, considered in his Character of Man. By Paul Ferrol. 12mo. 5*s.*

Rights of Christians: a Vindication of the Rights of the Members of Christian Congregations to Choose their own Ministers. By the late Rev. J. Yates, of Liverpool. 1*s.*

Test-Act Reporter. No. I. Published by the United Committee for Conducting the Application to Parliament for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Act. 6*d.* (To be continued Monthly.)

The Perpetuity of Christian Baptism Vindicated, in Reply to An Essay on the Perpetuity of Baptism, by the Rev. R. Wright. By John Marsom. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions of Dr. Parr. By the Rev. W. Field. 8vo. 14*s.*

Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ,

according to the Four Evangelists; from the German of J. D. Michaelis. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Sunday Evening Discourses, or a Compendious System of Scriptural Divinity for the Use of Households. By the Rev. R. Warner. 2 Vols. 12*s.*

Sermons.

Chiefly Practical. By the Rev. Edward Bather, M.A. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Chiefly Practical. By the Rev. W. Dealtry, B.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

By the Rev. G. T. Noel. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* boards.

On the Truth of the Christian Religion, &c. By the Rev. W. Malkin, A.B. 8vo. 12*s.*

Seventeen. By the Rev. H. M'Niel, A.M. 8vo. 12*s.*

Single Sermons.

Christ One with God: a Sermon, preached at Exeter, July 18, 1827, before the Western Unitarian Society. By J. G. Robberds. 12mo. 6*d.*

The Character and Office of Melchizedek, as a Type of Christ, considered in a Discourse delivered at Brighton, before the Unitarian Association. By Russell Scott. 12mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

On the Duty of Redeeming the Time: a Sermon preached at Newport, Isle of Wight, &c. By Edmund Kell. 1*s.*

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE past month has been productive of important events, and the hopes and fears of all who feel an interest in the policy and prospects of the country have been excited by the dissolution of Lord Goderich's administration, and the delays which have occurred in the formation of that which has succeeded it. That the reins of government would fall from the feeble and inefficient hands of the late Premier, might have been anticipated, even if dissension had not arisen among his colleagues, and his resignation would probably have occasioned little regret if a bolder and more vigorous successor to the plans of Mr. Canning had been selected, and the members of the late ministry had thus been kept together. In the arrangement of the present administration, there is, it will be confessed, just cause for apprehension. The country has beheld with surprise

and jealousy the union of the highest civil and military offices in one person, the Duke of Wellington, intrusted by the King with the task of remodelling the government, having taken upon himself the post of first Lord of the Treasury, retaining at the same time the command of the army. Most of those who seceded from Mr. Canning have returned to power, and it cannot be supposed that their influence will be beneficially exerted on some of the great questions which must occupy the attention of Parliament. They will probably be, as heretofore, the decided and unyielding opponents of any relaxation of the civil disabilities which affect the Roman Catholics and the Dissenters, and even if they continue the present line of foreign policy, we cannot expect from them that unsparing and effectual economy in the public expenditure which is demanded

by the present state of the country. In their ranks, however, we find Mr. Huskisson and one or two others who are separated by a wide interval from the principles or prejudices of their colleagues. We will not believe that they will desert the opinions or relinquish the measures which they have recently and powerfully advocated. They will be opposed to their associates in power on some subjects of the first importance, and it is obvious, therefore, that the government, as at present formed, contains many elements of dissension, if not of dissolution. The change, which has damped the hopes of the Roman Catholics, has increased and invigorated their resolution to press their claims upon the attention of the Legislature. Simultaneous meetings have been held throughout Ireland, and petitions to Parliament are in preparation from all parts of that country. A meeting of the British Roman Catholics has been held in London, and rendered remarkable by an interesting speech from Lord Rossmore, a Protestant Peer, in which the fact that Mr. Pitt, through Lord Cornwallis, promised emancipation to the Irish Catholics, as the price of their consent to the Union, was established beyond further controversy. A petition to both Houses of Parliament, in favour of a repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, was unanimously passed at this meeting, and we are happy to record it in our pages as an evidence of the liberal views of our Roman Catholic brethren, and an important recognition by a large and influential body of the great principle of universal religious liberty. The petition to which we refer is as follows :

“ The humble petition of the undersigned Roman Catholics,

“ Sheweth, That a numerous class of their fellow-subjects, Dissenters from the Established Church, are deprived of liberty of conscience by the operation of the Test and Corporation Acts.

“ That while your petitioners are ex-

erting themselves to procure their own emancipation from the operation of the unjust laws of which they are the victims, they entertain an anxious desire that all classes of their fellow-subjects may enjoy the same rights of which they themselves are in pursuit.

“ That, accordingly, your petitioners respectfully but earnestly entreat your Honourable House that the said Acts may be forthwith repealed.”

In France we have to notice the expulsion from office of an able minister who has found himself incompetent to encounter the opposition which he has justly excited by his compliances with the will of the court, and by his efforts to restore, as far as possible, some of the worst privileges of the old regime. He has been succeeded by ministers who, probably, will not have sufficient influence or energy to confer any important benefits on France ; but the noble example of disinterestedness and patriotism which has been recently given by the electors, and the growing influence of public opinion in that country, are the best and most satisfactory pledges of future improvement.

Official accounts have reached us of the departure of the European ambassadors from Constantinople. The Sultan is making every preparation for war, but as it will be merely defensive on the part of Turkey, and all the objects of our intervention in the affairs of Greece can be accomplished without aggressive hostilities, we may hope that the contest will be soon and quietly terminated.

The message of the President of the United States to the congress has been received. It contains, as usual, a clear statement of the resources and expenditure of the Republic, and it preserves a friendly tone towards England, while it notices the disagreements which have occurred on the subject of the New Brunswick territory, and on the question of trade with our colonies.

CORRESPONDENCE.

An old and respected Correspondent must not consider that he is “ sent to Coventry,” because there has been a delay in inserting some of his communications.

The account of the Salford Meeting did not arrive till that now inserted had gone to press.

The Conductors wish to mention in the commencement of their articles on political events, that they do not purpose to continue them uniformly, but to resume the subject only as suitable topics or particular events may render it desirable.

Several communications have been received as to which, from particular circumstances, the Conductors ask the indulgence of correspondents in delaying for a short time their acknowledgment.