



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

WISDOM BETTER THAN WEAPONS OF WAR.

---

A

S E R M O N

PREACHED IN THE  
EPISCOPAL CHAPEL OF FORFAR, ON THURSDAY.  
THE 21ST OF FEBRUARY, 1805.

BEING THE DAY APPOINTED BY HIS MAJESTY FOR  
A GENERAL FAST IN NORTH BRITAIN.

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

A DISSERTATION ON THE HEBREW, GREEK, AND  
LATIN TERMS FOR *WISDOM*;

A LETTER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW ;

AND SOME

STRICTURES ON THE REVIEW.

OF BISHOP SKINNER'S CONVOCATION SERMON, GIVEN  
IN THE *ANTI-JACOBIN* AND *BRITISH CRITIC*,  
FOR FEBRUARY LAST.

---

BY THE REVEREND JOHN SKINNER, A. M.

EPISCOPAL CLERGYMAN AT FORFAR.

---

*" Sapientia divina—non pendens ex hominum judiciis, animos Deo ad-  
movet ; ob quem pati contumelias honestum est dehonestamentum, et  
" opprobrium splendidius omni humana gloria."*

MOLINÆUS, *De Laud. Theolog.*

---

ABERDEEN:

Printed by J. Chalmers and Co.

AND SOLD BY MESSRS CHEYNE, AND CONSTABLE AND CO. EDINBURGH ;  
DONALDSON, DUNDEE ; FENTON, FORFAR ; ANGUS, BROWN,  
AND BURNETT, ABERDEEN ; IMLACH, BANFF ; AND  
BY F. AND C. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1805.



---

## INTRODUCTION.

---

*IN giving the following Discourse to the Public, the author feels himself actuated by motives, which he is not ashamed to own. He hopes, by the blessing of God, the perusal of it may serve, in some degree, the interests of religion in the populous district where he resides : or, at any rate, evince the anxiety, natural to the breast of every conscientious pastor, to comply with the apostolical precept—"As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially to them that are of the household of faith." But, becoming as this object may appear, it is not all, that the author has in view. He hopes to be pardoned by a generous public, for avowing, that another urgent motive with him, for claiming their notice as an author, is, that he may be enabled to contribute to the necessities of a Brother Clergyman, who has, for several years, been bereaved*



---

*bereaved of his reason, and been an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum of this county. The case of this worthy man, without money, and without friends, is such as must interest every feeling heart! Hitherto his maintenance in the hospital, has chiefly depended on the exertions of his brethren of the clergy, aided by the liberality of other benevolent persons. But precarious as this dependance must be, it is wished that some small fund could be raised for his permanent support. By the profits arising from the sale of this discourse, the author has not the presumption to suppose that such a fund can be much benefited. But to the generosity of his readers, and their friends, he thinks he may confidently look for something in aid of one, who was and is a "brother beloved." The smallest donation will be thankfully received by any Scotch Episcopal Clergyman, and transmitted by him to the author at Forfar, or to Bishop Skinner at Aberdeen: and be assured, "God is not unrighteous to forget the work and labour of love which they shew to his name, who have ministered to the saints, and do minister."*

FORFAR, }  
MARCH 22. 1805. }

---

---

S E R M O N.

---

ECCLES. IX. 18.—*Wisdom is better than weapons of war : but one sinner destroyeth much good.*

---

THAT annual *appeal* to the supreme and all-directing Majesty of heaven, which, in behalf of the British Empire, He, who sways the sceptre of these realms, has ever piously enjoined, during the period of existing warfare, it is no uncommon thing to *hear* derided by some, but more common still to *see* it heedlessly disregarded by many ; and the day, set apart for the pious solemnity, spent in wantonness and dissipation, rather than, as directed, in humiliation and prayer ! \* What

B

an

\* I am aware, that to argue with men of this description, is to argue with the deaf, or, at best, with such as are unwilling to hear. Yet, "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear," the pious Christian will not, I trust, be displeased with the following reasoning from analogy. As the body politic, and body natural, are equally liable to distemper, ought not a similar regimen, when the distemper is similar, to be resorted to ? To the individual, whose humours are vitiated, and whose general habit betrays nought but a rooted tendency to disease, the first of duties is *abstinence*, and *self-restraint*.

To

an aggravation this of the offences of a sinful people! Is it “the Lord who ruleth in the kingdoms of men;” is it “He who putteth down one, and setteth up another;” is it “He who stilleth the raging of the sea, the noise of its waves, and the madness of the people?” Must Christians either acknowledge all this, or, (I tremble to utter it!) make **GOD** a liar, and yet fail to conduct themselves as their pious Sovereign enjoins; fail to “come and worship, and fall down, and kneel before the Lord, their maker;” “sending up their prayers and supplications to the divine Majesty, for averting those heavy judgments which our manifold provocations have most justly deserved, and for imploring his blessing and assistance to the arms of our country, for the restoration of peace and prosperity.” \*

“A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour? If I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts!” † Can language more forcibly express the divine disapprobation, or mark more strongly the criminality of man, in withholding the honour due unto **GOD’S**

To the nation afflicted with the same malady, the same regimen is necessary; and is, when prescribed, prescribed judiciously. We know, from scripture, that there are certain evil spirits, who go not out but by “*prayer and fasting*.” And equally true it is, that evil thoughts and practices creep into public communities, which can only be got rid of by the same salutary expedients. Hence the wisdom of appointing days of national “fasting and humiliation,” which, were they regarded as they deserve to be, would not fail to produce the salutary effects above described.

\* Royal Proclamation.

† Malachi i. 6.

God's holy name, than this? Or can words more accurately pourtray the principles of not a few among ourselves, than the following: "Ye have said, It is vain  
 "to serve God, and what profit is it, that we have kept  
 "his ordinance, and walked mournfully before the  
 "Lord of hosts?" \*

True it is, that the interposition of the Almighty is no object of sight, either in the private or national concerns of the human race. We cannot, with our bodily eyes, behold him, dealing his bread to the hungry, or his clothing to the naked; neither do we see him giving "victory to kings," and delivering his servants "from the peril of the sword!" But what saith the scripture? "We walk by *faith*, and not by *sight*." † And again, "The invisible things of God, from the  
 "creation of the world, are clearly seen, being under-  
 "stood by the *things that are made*, even his eternal  
 "power and godhead." ‖ In the instances, therefore, just adduced, we see the *elements*, things confessedly *made* by the all-creating finger of Deity, contributing, we know not how, to "bring forth first the blade,  
 "then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear;" by means of which, the hungry have their needful food; while "they who go down to the sea in ships,"—under God, the only guard of the British empire,—"these see  
 "the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the  
 "deep." § Are not they, therefore, as the apostle  
 B 2 speaks,

\* Mal. iii. 14.

† 2 Cor. v. 7.

‖ Rom. i. 20.

§ See the whole of this sublime description in Psalm cvii.

speaks, “without excuse,” who understand not these things, but “become vain in their imaginations, until “their foolish hearts be darkened;” † who, because the immediate and visible operations of almighty power have ceased, say, within themselves, “How doth God know? Is there knowledge in the most high?” \* Or who, gainsaying both history and experience, are of opinion, that he views, with unconcern, the things which are passing on the earth, and that the “Lord hath indeed forgotten to be gracious!” It is on account of the prevalence of such antichristian sentiments as these, and of the visible effects which experience demonstrates such sentiments to have on the practice of Christians of every rank, age, sex, and condition, that I have selected, as a fit subject of discourse, on this occasion, the very interesting words of King Solomon, “Wisdom is better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth much good.”

Although expressed in the form of an aphorism, the form generally adopted by their inspired author, yet are the words of the text intimately connected with the verses preceding them; and may, nay ought to be regarded as the moral of the parable, which the preacher delivers in the following affecting terms: “There was “a little city, and few men within it, and there came a “great king against it, and besieged it, and built great “bulwarks against it. Now there was found in it a “poor wise man, and he, by his *wisdom*, delivered the “city;

† Rom. i. 20.

\* Ps. lxxiii. 11.



“ city ; yet no man remembered that same poor man.  
 “ Then said I, *wisdom* is better than strength ; never-  
 “ theless, the poor man’s *wisdom* is despised, and his  
 “ words are not heard. The words of wise men are  
 “ heard in quiet, more than the cry of him who ruleth  
 “ among fools. *Wisdom* is better than weapons of  
 “ war : but one sinner destroyeth much good.”

How indisputable is the truth here inculcated !—  
 When, between contending states, there is an inequality  
 of physical strength, the state or party least populous,\*  
 and, therefore, humanly speaking, least powerful,  
 ought, every man must allow, to have recourse to some  
 other means of self-protection, than “ mere weapons of  
 “ war ;” and, in the judgment of the wisest of men, it  
 is only on *wisdom*, truly and properly so called, that  
 such state or party can build a reasonable hope of suc-  
 cess. When I say “ *wisdom* truly and properly so cal-  
 “ led,” it is obvious that I would have the term restric-  
 ted

\* “ The following,” says Mr Kett, in his Elements of General Knowledge,  
 published in 1803, “ is the actual Population of Great Britain, &c. &c. as  
 “ stated by well informed writers:—

“ England and Wales, - - - - -	8,500,000
“ Scotland, - - - - -	2,000,000
“ Ireland, - - - - -	5,000,000
“ Total, British Empire, ———	15,500,000
“ France formerly computed - - - - -	26,000,000
“ Her recent acquisitions in the Austrian Ne- “ therlands, &c. - - - - -	8,000,000
“ Total, French Empire, ———	34,000,000
“ Spain, - - - - -	10,500,000
“ Batavian Republic, - - - - -	2,360,000
“ Physical strength of the Enemy, ———	46,860,000
“ Thrice the population of Great Britain and Ireland.”	

ted to the sense imposed upon it by King Solomon, and the other sacred writers, who we, as Christians, are taught to believe, “spake as they were inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost.” For the “*wisdom* of this world,” † the art, the policy, the cunning, and device of man, the offspring only of his own finite and erring intellect, is, and ever has been, “*foolishness* with God.”

Should I, therefore, be happy enough to make myself understood, I trust, that, when I shall have given the words of Solomon their proper scriptural interpretation, and made a suitable application of them to the present state of things in this country, your edification shall be promoted; your future steady adherence to the principles of “true and undefiled religion” secured; and all to your own unspeakable comfort, and to the heartfelt satisfaction of him, who, being appointed to “watch for your souls,” is now called upon to “exhort you with all long-suffering and doctrine.”

The term *wisdom*, in the original language of Solomon, seems to be derived from the word which denotes the *palate*, or organ of taste, in the animal frame; and it is applied figuratively to the discernment of the soul. Thus it generally means, when referred to human beings, that intelligence and faculty of the mind, by which truth is distinguished from error, and by which men know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good set before them. But *wisdom*, in scripture, has, also,

a

† 1 Cor. iii. 19.

a peculiar application to the blessed God himself:— and as there is “none good but one, that is God,” so is there none, strictly speaking, *wise*, but God only. Yet we find this attribute applied essentially to the Redeemer of mankind. “Christ, the power of God and “the *wisdom* of God,”\* is the language of St. Paul, who asserts in another place, “in whom (Christ) are “hid all the treasures of *wisdom* and knowledge.”§ What an irrefragable evidence this of his true and essential divinity! For if Christ be the wisdom of God, as he is here declared to be, he is *God truly* and *essentially*; “unless,” says a learned writer, || “we can separate God from his wisdom, and set his perfections “and attributes at a distance from his being.” But hath not our Redeemer clearly evinced himself to be the “wisdom of God,” not only in the formation of the visible world, but, likewise, in the whole œconomy of grace and salvation, since the world began?† “The  
“ heavens

\* 1 Cor. i. 24.

§ Col. ii. 3.

|| In mentioning the name of Searle, I am fully aware of the stigma of Calvinism, which is justly attached to the theological pursuits of this indefatigable writer. But it will not, I hope, be asserted, that, in the field of biblical research, there is no separating of the tares from the wheat. The reasoning of Mr Searle on the subject of the Trinity, and of the divine nature of Christ and the Holy Spirit, is most conclusive. (See his *Hore Solitariae*.) His comments, not his criticisms, are objectionable. Therefore, though the enemy of his system, I am a friend to his learning; and admire his application of the term *Wisdom* to our blessed Saviour.

† All things were made by the *word*, which, in the beginning, was with God, and who, himself, was God; and without him was not any thing made that was made. (John i. 3.) Yet, according to Solomon, (Prov. iii. 19.) the Lord, by *wisdom*, hath founded the earth, &c. (See, also, 2 Tim. i. 9.)



“ heavens declare his glory, and the firmament sheweth  
 “ his handywork.” “ Every thing which is made  
 “ displays his eternal power and godhead,” and points  
 out his wise arrangement, and continued superintend-  
 dence, of the whole natural world ; while, in the spi-  
 ritual world, the “ Father hath, also, given all things  
 “ into the hands of the Son ; \* who, of God, is made  
 “ unto us *wisdom*, and righteousness, and sanctifica-  
 “ tion, and redemption.” || “ Doubtless,” therefore ex-  
 claims St. Paul, “ do I count all things but loss for the  
 “ *excellency* of the *knowledge* of Christ Jesus my  
 “ Lord.” § And well might he and every Christian do  
 so, since these are the words of him, to whom is given  
 power over all flesh. “ This is life eternal, that they  
 “ might *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ  
 “ whom thou hast sent.” † Without this *knowledge*,  
 every other species of science is worthless and delusive !  
 For nothing but “ the *wisdom* of God in a mystery,  
 “ even the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before  
 “ the world, unto our glory,” ‡ can make Christians  
 either holy or happy.

Impressed with this interesting truth, can we fail to  
 commiserate the self-denominated *wise* men of this  
 world,

\* St. John iii. 35. || I Cor. i. 30. § Phil. iii. 8. † St. John xvii. 3.

‡ I Cor. ii. 7. “ Our *redemption*,” says the venerable Bishop Wilson, in one  
 of his invaluable discourses, (Sermon xv.) “ being at least, to us, a work of as  
 “ great mercy as was that of our *creation*, we could not but love our Redeem-  
 “ er as much as God who made us. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary  
 “ that *God* should redeem us ; otherwise we should have been obliged to have  
 “ loved a *Creature*, equal with *God*, our *Creator* !”

world, whose aim is rather to augment human misery, than to alleviate the ills of life! For them, every other discovery has its attractions; every other topic merits their regard! While the most important topic of all, the end and purpose of their being, including, as it does, "God, in Christ, reconciling the world to himself," is either cavilled at, or disbelieved, or held to be unworthy of investigation! Carnal reason may, and does, promote the temporal interest of man, as a mere sensual animal—but there it ends. It is to the *written*, the *revealed word of God*, that we are indebted for our admission into the intellectual world; where the soul may commune with its *creator*, its *redeemer*, and *sanctifier*; and, amid the changes and chances of this mortal life, "cast all its care upon him, who careth for it."‡

*Wisdom*, therefore, in its scriptural sense, the sense alone worthy of our acceptance, is from above, and leads the mind, on all occasions, to where "Christ sitteth at the right hand of God; angels, authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him!" "Happy, then, thrice happy, is the man who findeth *wisdom*."§ It delivers the soul from feeling the vicissitudes

c

tudes

‡ Such is, at times, the force of conviction, that neither prejudice nor vice can resist its influence. Rousseau (see his *Pensées*) affords a striking example: "The majesty of the Scripture," says he, "fills me with astonishment; the holiness of the gospel speaks to my very heart! Behold the books of Philosophers, with all their pomp, how little are they in comparison? Is it possible that a book, at once so wise and so sublime, should have been the production of mere men!"

§ Sec Prov. iii. 13.—20.

tudes of time. In prosperity, it teacheth us to “use  
 “this world without abusing it.” In adversity, it in-  
 structs us “to hear the rod, and him who hath ap-  
 pointed it.” “I have learned,” said St. Paul, and  
 surely it was of *him* who said, “Learn of me;” “I  
 “have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to  
 “be content. I know both how to be abased, and I  
 “know how to abound. Every where, and in all  
 “things, I am instructed both to be full and to be hun-  
 gry; both to abound, and to suffer need.” †

Such, therefore, being “the manifold wisdom of  
 “God,” how appropriate is the quality ascribed to it  
 by King Solomon, in the text? “Wisdom is better than  
 “weapons of war:” than the spear and sword, than  
 the bow and quiver, or the horse himself, prepared for  
 the battle! “Thou comest to me,” exclaimed the  
 youthful son of Jesse to the uncircumcised Philistine,  
 “thou comest to me with a sword, a spear, and a  
 “shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord  
 “of Hosts! and all this assembly shall know that the  
 “Lord saveth not with sword and spear; for the bat-  
 tle is the Lord’s, and he will give you into our  
 “hands.” || Would to God that the British warrior  
 were entitled to use language of equal confidence; that  
 he could say to his enemies round about, “With you  
 “is the arm of flesh, but with us is the Lord our God,  
 “to help us, and to fight our battles!” \* But why, I  
 will ask, is he not so entitled? “Is it that the arm of  
 “the

† Phil. iv. 11, and 12.

|| 1 Sam. xvii. 45—47.

\* 2 Chr. xxxii. 8.

“ the Lord is shortened, that he cannot save? Or is  
 “ his ear become heavy, that he will not hear?” No,  
 indeed! But “ our iniquities have separated between  
 “ us and our God; and our sins have hid his face from  
 “ us, that he will not hear.”

Behold the picture which the prophet Isaiah, at one  
 time, drew of his countrymen, and say whether, in most  
 respects, it be not a portrait of the nation to which we  
 ourselves belong? “ Your hands are defiled with  
 “ blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips  
 “ have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered per-  
 “ verseness. None calleth for justice, nor any plead-  
 “ eth for truth: they trust in vanity, and speak lies;  
 “ they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity;  
 “ wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way  
 “ of peace they know not, and there is no judgment in  
 “ their goings: for truth is fallen in the street, and  
 “ equity cannot enter. Yea, *truth faileth*; and he  
 “ *that departeth from evil, maketh himself a prey.*” \*

c 2

To

\* Isaiah lix. 3—15. Should it be said, that the language of the prophet  
 is of that *particular* nature, that, without adducing instances, to apply it to the  
 people of this nation, is rash and presumptuous. I have only to answer, that  
 though instances did occur to me, to have adduced them would have been un-  
 suitable to the pulpit. Yet, to prove the justice of the application, have not  
 interest, ambition, and voluptuousness, every where set up their idols? And  
 is not the temple of the living God the only temple in which the boasted  
 wisdom of the present day refuses to bend the knee? “ Surely, then, we are  
 “ called upon, as if a voice from heaven had warned us, to arm ourselves  
 “ against these abominations! They are, evidently, the provocations and pre-  
 “ parations of those last heavy judgments, with which the wrath of God visits  
 “ abandoned

To know our real state is, as we have seen, an essential part of that *wisdom* recommended to us in the text: but to *know* the *means* whereby we may amend it, this is the one thing needful: and *this* it has been my object, in the arguments already adduced, to inculcate. The *will* only is wanting to put the *means* in practice; and to stimulate the *will*, shall now be my endeavour, in what remains to be said.

We are told that “when a man’s ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him;” † and what is thus said of individuals, is indisputably true of nations and public communities. If, then, we, of this nation, find its enemies aggrandized both by numbers and resources, and if we see no abatement of their violent and vindictive dispositions, it is no doubt by reason of *our ways*, which do *not please* the Lord of heaven and earth, and which, therefore, require to be corrected.

Were I, however, (sensible, as I am, of wanting both talent and opportunity for discrimination) to decide on the religious and moral state of this kingdom, I might justly be charged with arrogance and self-conceit: altho’ experience, in our own little society, would justify me, in adopting language not very expressive of the influence of  
truth,

“abandoned and reprobate nations; and these are the very characters, whereby those countries, which have been swept with the besom of desolation, have been ruinously distinguished, in the period immediately preceding their extinction.” (See Mr Magee’s Sermon before the Association, &c. in Dublin.)

† Prov. xvi. 7.



truth, but very indicative of the prevalence of error, lukewarmness, and indifference. I, therefore, eagerly look around me, for the assistance of some one, who, to the best opportunities for discriminating between national virtues and national vices, adds talents proper for the task ; and who, I trust, possesses such an inflexible regard to truth and candour, as prevents him from being the dupe of a party, as well as from “ setting down aught in malice.”

In a discourse preached some years ago in London, before the honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, Mr. Nares, § now Archdeacon of Stafford, gives the following, I apprehend accurate, statement of the leading evils characteristic of the age in which we live : “ It is, I think, but too undeniable, that in this age, the spirit of religion has become extremely weak. Far from being the exalted creatures which real Christians should be, the present Christians bear the name, with very few of the distinctive marks.— Many, indeed, have renounced even the name ; but among those who retain it, and make a general profession of the faith, to consider the negligence which there is with respect to some duties ; the total contempt of others ; the general *indifference about Christian knowledge* ; the forgetfulness of Christian hopes ; and the violence of desire and contention with which all temporal advantages are sought, may lead our imaginations to picture rather creatures with-

“ out

§ See his printed Discourses.

“ out religion altogether, and devoid of future hopes,  
“ than to any thing that properly displays the charac-  
“ ter of Christians.

“ From vices, however, and even from the vice of  
“ worldly-mindedness, no times of christianity have yet  
“ been wholly exempt : but this peculiar *crime* of indif-  
“ ference, rising frequently into a total alienation from  
“ religion, and a fear of even *seeming* to profess it, has  
“ never, surely, been so prevalent, as within the pre-  
“ sent century. The general cause of this has been  
“ the increase of fancied knowledge, and the pride of  
“ *imaginary wisdom*. The fact is not that real know-  
“ ledge has not also increased, and that great and  
“ solid wisdom has not also appeared ; but these  
“ good things, like every other earthly advantage,  
“ have had some counterbalance of attendant evil. Va-  
“ nity and presumption have always made a stride be-  
“ yond the progress of real knowledge and *true wis-*  
“ *dom* ; and while these have struck out discoveries of  
“ some importance in the system of nature, and im-  
“ provements in many arts, and gained a few steps in  
“ science, both moral and divine ; those have hurried  
“ themselves, with blind precipitation, into the abyss of  
“ metaphysics ; and there, immersed in central dark-  
“ ness, have imagined that they discovered, and could  
“ demonstrate, whatever pernicious fancies the *ruler of*  
“ *the darkness of this world* thought it most expedient  
“ for his purposes to suggest.

“ The novelty, or, at least, the apparent novelty of  
“ these excursions, with a certain brilliancy of genius,  
“ by

“ by which the results were artfully set forth, together  
“ with the dissolute manners of some corrupt courts,  
“ prevailed unhappily so far, as to give them currency,  
“ and to render irreligion fashionable. If we look  
“ back a very little farther into history, we shall find it  
“ otherwise ; but thus it has been for some time, and  
“ the evil, I hope, has past its height.

“ A favourable period seems, at length, to have ar-  
“ rived, for shaking off this torpid malady. Those writ-  
“ ings which, for a time, seduced so many, have lost  
“ the grace of novelty, and have had their futility ex-  
“ posed. They are sinking rapidly into oblivion ; and  
“ religion, never silenced by reason, but, for a time, ap-  
“ parently overborne by clamour, may now again be  
“ heard. In the conflict, she has manifested a strength  
“ which, to the end of time, will be her glory ; and her  
“ friends have only now to improve the good position,  
“ in which she has established their force.”

Such is the statement given by this most acute dis-  
cerner of the “ signs of the times.” How worthy of  
the attention of all who feel an interest in the duty  
which they owe either to God, or their neighbour, or  
themselves ! “ Weapons of war” may dazzle the eye  
of the superficial observer ; and thousands upon thou-  
sands wielding those weapons, in defence of their coun-  
try, may be thought, and no doubt is, matter of inward  
exultation to every British bosom ! But without *wisdom*,  
heaven-born *wisdom*, to guide us to him, who has both  
external nature, and the hearts of men, at his com-  
mand, what is the sword, or he who wields it ! The  
wind



wind and the sea, the storm and tempest, the raging pestilence and wasting famine, these are enemies to which even British courage must yield; and either of these enemies may, in one season, bring more ruin and devastation on us and our country, than the united forces of Europe would do, in a series of years. Yet they are the "evil arrows" which dart from the hand of Omnipotence; and no power, less than divine, can keep them within the quiver, and say unto them, "Peace, be still."

Whither, therefore, should Britons look for an ally, at such a time as the present? Whither should they turn for aid and assistance superior to the force by which they are, or may be assailed? Not, surely, to the Princes of this world, equally accessible to the arm of the Almighty as themselves; but to *Him*, who is "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords;" who "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will;" and who saveth not by many, or by few; but "who, with his own right hand and holy arm, getteth himself the victory!"

This is what the wisest of men urges in the text, and what every man, *calling himself a Christian*, is bound in duty to receive as the truth; and to conform to, as the only unerring rule for human belief, and human practice: for "wisdom is better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth much good."

The truth of this conclusion is equally undeniable, as are the truths which we have now been discussing, and to which it is opposed: for one artful sinner, be his

his condition what it may, *destroys* much *good* among the mass of society, who judge chiefly by appearances, and who are ever ready to become the dupes of evil example. “A little leaven,” saith an apostle, “leaveneth the whole lump.” And, were instances wanting, thousands of living instances could be brought forward where, by *one* artful *companion*, the *good* principles of a parent have been effaced from the bosoms of his family—his sons and daughters; where one infidel writer, or infidel declaimer, has corrupted a whole community; and where *one sinner*, one aspiring usurper, has, by his ambitious plots, *destroyed* the *good* of the most refined state in Europe! †

D

Nay,

† In this striking instance, we may see the difference between *power* and *authority*; and, in all our enquiries into the nature of *lawful government*, we ought to keep this difference ever in our view. The highwayman has *power* over the helpless traveller, when demanding his property, as the only exchange for his life! But has the highwayman *authority* to take either the *one* or the *other*? No! It is brutal force on which he rests his claim; and by the law of terror only, that he prevails. Now it is the very same with the *mighty robber*, who has seized the *property* of a *whole kingdom*; and who, having the *lives* of *its inhabitants* also in his *power*, keeps them in the most slavish subjection, by some hundred thousands of armed plunderers, perpetually holding the dagger to their throats. The sanguinary despot, who thus tyrannizes over a vanquished people, may call himself EMPEROR, or any thing he pleases; but, in the sight of God, he is none other than a base usurper of the rights of others. His imperial purple serves only to conceal the bloody assassin that lurks under it; and the solemn mockery of a *coronation*, nay, blasphemous as it is, of a *consecration*, can but blacken his guilt the deeper—the more horribly! For of all the wicked devices which this wonderful contriver of mischief has yet been able to practise, none has exceeded, in impious effrontery, that farce which was lately acted in prostituting a most solemn religious rite to the worst, the vilest of purposes! It is, indeed, difficult to determine, of the two parties, which has evinced the greatest contempt of the sovereignty of Heaven; the

one,

Nay, only mark the conduct of the political innovator, such as the recent annals of this country exhibit him, and you will have ample proof of the *good destroyed* by *one* crafty and intriguing son of Belial! He tells his quiet unsuspecting neighbour, alike industrious in discharging, heretofore, his duty both to God and man, that, in this enlightened age, every man should be particularly well informed on the subject of governors, and the governed. For this purpose, he entreats him to peruse such an essay, such a pamphlet, and such

a

*one*, commanding the profanation of a holy and venerable service; or the *other*, degrading himself so far as to yield obedience to the base command! Where, may we ask, is now the *dignity*, the *holiness*, the *infallibility* of the pretended Head of the Catholic Church? Has not the person supposed to be invested with that high and holy character, debased it to the lowest pitch of infamy, by bestowing his solemn benediction on one of the most consummate works of wickedness, through all its various stages, which the christian or heathen world has ever witnessed? Let it not be said, that the poor unfortunate Roman Pontiff, holding all the dignities of his office, his freedom and his life, at the will of this stern tyrant of France, was obliged to comply with the arbitrary dictates which he had not the power to resist. *He had the power* to resign his dignity, his freedom and his life, if he could not retain them without the loss of credit, of character, and of a pure conscience! And had he been possessed of any regard for *these*, and known what it was to tread in the steps of a *once suffering*, but *now highly exalted Saviour*, he would have readily surrendered all that he had in the world; he would have "died the death," rather than have been guilty of an action which must entail disgrace upon him while he exists, and be to his memory an everlasting reproach! Many are the motives which might be thought to influence serious and well disposed persons against the errors of popery; but none, I should think, could *now* have greater weight with such persons, than the conduct so lately exhibited by the Pope himself; a conduct of itself sufficient to open the eyes of the most bigoted adherent to the See of Rome; and, therefore, more than enough to make every wise and good man, of the Romish communion, exclaim—

"To popery henceforth I bid adieu!"

a newspaper ; in which are carefully detailed *grievances* which never existed, and *rights* which, though ingeniously advocated, never were, and never could be, recognized. In a twinkling the whole household is enlightened—man, wife and child, con over the pages of sedition and discontent—friends and neighbours procure them in loan—meetings are held—clubs instituted—and oaths administered !

Convinced that his poison has operated, the political quack himself retires to a distant quarter, that he may imbrue his hands in the blood of others, and initiate strangers into his mysterious system ! Meanwhile his former converts proceed with the work of darkness ! Midnight revelling admits neither of morning nor noontide labour. The shopman deserts his counter ; the mechanic his axe or anvil ; and the labourer his shovel and spade ! At length, become desperate, the day of general insurrection is fixed ! But the *eye* of *Heave* can no longer look with unconcern upon the hitherto smothered flame !

On the eve of its bursting forth with a violence, as the incendiaries conceive not to be overpowered, a “still small voice” whispers to the conscience of some one the awakening word, *forbear* ! Roused, as from a dream of horror, the panic-struck man goes and reveals the whole ! The arm of justice is extended ; and, on the day, perhaps, when the deluded wretches expected to see success crowning their plans of murder and misrule, a gibbet is prepared, on which they are themselves suspended, victims to the injured laws of

their country, and a terror to evil doers of every description!

Even those who, being less implicated, escape the awful sentence of death, escape not the temporal wrath of Him “who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.” Like Cain, they become “fugitives and vagabonds in the earth.” Estranged from God, and the renewing grace of his Holy Spirit, shunned by the loyal and virtuous, and beggared in their fortunes, they drag on a miserable existence while on earth; and when they die, have nought to expect, but the doom announced by an inspired apostle, “Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.”† “If we look to the highest place in society,” says the writer before quoted, † “the chief magistrate, by whatever title distinguished, the effects of having a *sinner* so situated will be the more extensive and alarming. When the power of such a ruler is absolute, there is no evil, physically possible, which he may not readily produce; no *good* which he may not, by a mere act  
“ of

‡ Rom. xiii. 2. Have not a Paine and a Godwin, not to mention others, thus *slain*, by means of their writings, and the emissaries of discontent, “their thousands and ten thousands?” The public executioners, or the records of suicide and of emigration from our country, can tell! Would to God that *experience* may, at length, open the eyes of those who are yet in danger of *destruction* from such *pens* and such *principles*, “that they may know the things which belong unto their peace, before they are hid from their eyes!”

† Archdeacon Nares. (See a single Sermon, entitled, The Benefits of Wisdom, and the Evils of Sin, preached before the Society of Lincoln’s Inn, and published at the request of the Bench.)



“ of authority, *destroy*. In our own country, we have  
“ happily, at present, a double security from these evils.  
“ We have a Monarch limited by law ; and we have  
“ one, (I mean not to flatter, which in this holy place  
“ were most unworthy, but I believe, in conscience, we  
“ have one,) who, if any man could deserve confidence,  
“ might be trusted even without restraints. The *evil*  
“ which a ruler so situated might do, if a sinner, may,  
“ providentially for us, be calculated best by contrast ;  
“ and we have to consider only what would be the ef-  
“ fect of a disposition, in that high place, diametrically  
“ opposite to the character which we in reality con-  
“ template.”

Having now considered the subject in the several dif-  
ferent lights which the words of the text seem to fa-  
vour, let me not be disappointed in my hope of having  
made, in some respects, the impression which I had in  
view. To the clergyman who feels the awful responsi-  
bility of his office, there cannot be a matter of more  
heartfelt regret, than to see his best exertions, in the  
way of duty, regarded in no other light, than that of  
empty declamation : nor, on the other hand, a matter  
of greater exultation and joy in the Holy Ghost, than  
to see his exertions have the effect intended, of turning  
men “ from heathen vanities, and from the power of  
“ Satan unto God.” Should my ministerial labours,  
hitherto, have failed to produce that regard for the su-  
blime doctrines of the gospel ; that conviction of the  
salutary influence of its precepts ; that regular and de-  
vout attendance on the worship and service of our God  
and

and Saviour, which, strictly speaking, entitle a man to the name of Christian, and which alone can benefit a man at the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, may this prove the “accepted time of remedy!” may this be the *day* of other resolutions, and, therefore, the “day of salvation!”

In human arts and sciences the instructions of their teacher are held in due estimation by learners of every description. Does one attend a lecturer in philosophy, in medicine, or in law? he does it with a wish, nay more, with a resolution to acquire information, and to apply that information to some useful purpose. Experience, however, tells me, that the case is otherwise in the school of christianity. The man, commissioned “to pray the people in Christ’s stead to be reconciled unto God,” may preach the “word of reconciliation;” may be “instant in season and out of season;” may “reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine:” yet shall his words all fall to the ground, or “seem as idle tales,” unless, for the sake of popularity, he betray the cause of truth, make light of the commission assigned him, and, “speaking to the people smooth things, prophesy deceits.”

To what cause can this lamentable state of lukewarmness and indifference be ascribed, if not to this: that on every other subject, whether philosophy, law, physic, agriculture or commerce, men can enter into sober and serious discussion, thus stimulating each other to study and application? Whereas the subject of religion is as carefully shunned and evaded, as that of “treason, stratagem

stratagem and spoil!" And to talk of what one hears at church, unless it may be for the purpose of ridiculing either the manner or matter of the preacher, is considered, not in promiscuous company only, but in the bosom of one's family, as the height of enthusiasm, and, therefore, folly. † Is the rising generation to be blamed when parents or guardians, by their neglect of admonition, and religious instruction, and by their ruinous example, destroy the germ of piety in its embryo state? Yet religion is the last, and, therefore, least regarded branch of education, at this moment, among the majority of high and low, rich and poor. In proof of which, young people are, for the most part, left to themselves to go to church or not as they incline; and, out of church, to learn their christian duty or not, as best suits their different dispositions, or rather different fancies. For *infidelity* makes a man no less acceptable to the society of modern christians, than if his *creed* were *sound* and *apostolical*!

“ Woe

† The author must not be understood to insinuate that he considers the subject of religion as, *at all times*, proper for social discussion. He knows that there exists such a precept as the following: “ Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine.” (Matt. vii. 6.) But he feels that, on the part of Christians, some respect is due to another command; “ Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but *bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*” (Ephes vi. 4.) For thus *it was promised and vowed* for them! And if words have a meaning, the words of the apostle, now quoted, do clearly assert, that without the *nurture* and *admonition* of the Lord, the children of men will be exasperated, will be provoked to wrath: the consequences of which will be felt immediately by the parents; mediately by the particular community to which they belong; and ultimately by the country at large.



“ Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil ;  
 “ that put darkness for light, and light for darkness ;  
 “ that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.” † Yet  
 how could the highly extolled modern *virtue of liberality* be better defined, than by those very practices  
 which the prophet here denounces ? Is he not, at this  
 moment, esteemed the most *liberal*, and, therefore,  
 praiseworthy character, who fritters away the bound-  
 aries of right and wrong ; who sweeps away all dis-  
 tinctions, and mixes all extremes ; and by whom the  
 creed of “ *saint, of savage, and of sage,*” is held to be  
 alike “ worthy of all acceptance ;” being alike pleasing  
 in the eyes of Him of whom cometh man’s salvation ?

Do the scriptures of truth, however, countenance the  
 latitudinarian in this vile confounding system ? Every  
 page almost asserts the contrary ; though the follow-  
 ing brief declarations are so much to our purpose, that  
 to multiply quotations is unnecessary : “ There is none  
 “ *other name* under heaven given among men, whereby  
 “ we must be saved, but the name of *Jesus Christ* of  
 “ Nazareth.” \* And again, “ Whosoever shall call  
 “ upon the *name* of the Lord (from the context neces-  
 sarily the Lord Jesus Christ) *shall be saved*. How then  
 “ shall they call upon him in whom they have not be-  
 “ lieved ? And how shall they believe in him of whom  
 “ they have not heard ? And how shall they hear with-  
 “ out a *preacher* ? And how shall they *preach*, except  
 “ they be sent ?” † † One would think that declarations

so

† Isaiah v. 20.

\* Acts iv. 12.

‡ Rom. x. 13, 14, 15.

so express, would, at least, be admitted as decisive, by those who still call themselves Christians; yet is it the prevailing fashion of these latter days, to believe and act as if no such declarations existed.—A fashion, however, which, if not quickly exchanged for the noble and becoming system of former years, when parents and heads of families, attended by their children and domestics, were seen regularly at church, calling on the name of the Lord, and listening to the instructions of their duly commissioned pastor; and as regularly instilling into them the principles and duties of christianity at home, all *must* and *will be wrong*; and no “weapons of war” can long protect this country from ruin and devastation. Whoso is *wise* will *ponder these things*.

And may the good Spirit of God influence all who now hear me, to *ponder* them, as they deserve; that having amended what is amiss in their own principles and practices, the “Lord may direct their hearts,” yet more and more, “into the love of God, and into the “patient waiting for Christ;” for we know, that *all things* work together for “good to them that love “God;” and therefore, “though an host should encamp against them,” their heart need not fear; “tho’ war should rise against them,” *in this they may be confident*.

Wherefore, unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only *wise* God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. *Amen.*





tasting and distinguishing the various sorts of nutriment. Thus, “doth not the ear try words, וַיִּדָּבֵר אֹכֵל, “and the mouth or palate, *taste his meat* \*?” But Job could, and did, apply the term *figuratively* to the *mind*: “Is there iniquity in my tongue? cannot my “taste, חָכְנִי, discern perverse things †?” that is, things opposed to real knowledge, judgment, and discretion: In strict conformity with which figurative application, is the following language of the Psalmist, “how sweet are thy words to my *taste*, לְחֵנִי, yea, “sweeter than honey to my mouth ‡?” Hence, therefore, in my humble conception, did the terms חָכְמָה *wise*, and חִכְמָה *wisdom*, derive their origin; an origin which, if the following text is duly considered, cannot be disputed: “There are four things little upon earth, “(viz. the ant, the conies, the locust, and the spider); “but they are, חֲכָמִים מִחֲכָמִים, *skilful*, being *made* “skilful, or taught skill ||;” and how? plainly by him who formed them, says the very learned Mr Parkhurst; and who, I would add, gave them their חָכְמָה, palate, sagacity, or instinct.

In Greek, the term for *wisdom* is Σοφία, evidently from Σοφός *wise*. It is almost unnecessary to say, that the appellation of Σοφοί, or *wise men*, was held in universal repute throughout the whole of the Grecian empire. It was, however, in the judgment of the real scholar, so often misapplied, that, according to Cicero and Diogenes Laertius, the celebrated Pythagoras, would

Job, xii. 11. and xxxiv. 3.

† Job, vi. 30.

‡ Ps. cxix. 103.

|| Prov. xxx. 24.

would not permit himself to be called  $\Sigma\omicron\Phi\omicron\varsigma$ , a wise man, but modestly assumed the title of  $\Phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\omicron\Phi\omicron\varsigma$ , that is, philosopher, or lover of wisdom. Happy were it for the cause of truth, if, in these latter days, those who assume the title of Pythagoras, would attend to the real definition of the term, and conduct themselves with equal diffidence and modesty.

“ Sapienciam qui expetunt *philosophi* nominantur,” says Cicero, “ nec quidquam aliud est *philosophia*, si interpretare velis, quam *studium sapientie* \* ;” that is, “ those who desire, or who endeavour to attain wisdom, are called philosophers, nor is philosophy any thing else, if you will expound the term, but the study of wisdom.

That the word  $\Sigma\omicron\Phi\omicron\varsigma$  is, however, itself of Hebrew origin, will appear, I doubt not, from the following brief enquiry. In the book of Numbers, we read, xxiii. 14. “ and he brought him (*i. e.* Balak brought Balaam) into the field of *Zophim*, or *Sophim*, to the top of *Pisgah*.” Here the Hebrew terms *Sophim* and *Pisgah*, are given us untranslated. When rendered into our language, the words are, “ He brought him into the field of the watchmen to the top of the place of observation.” But the learned Gale, in his Court of the Gentiles, has the following conclusive remark, “ That the Greeks derived their  $\Sigma\omicron\Phi\omicron\iota$ , or wise men, from this *Sophim* (of Scripture) Heinsius affirms, without a peradventure, because the  
“ Greek,

\* Cic de Officiis, lib. ii. cap. 2.



“ Greek, *Σοφοί*, were wont, on such high hills, (as  
 “ Num. xxiii. 14.), to *observe* the course and motion  
 “ of the heavens.” The question, however, comes  
 to be, Who were the צפִיִּים, or *sophim*, of Scripture?  
 Who, but the prophets of God, I am ready to answer.  
 “ Also, saith the Lord, I set צפִיִּים (translated in our  
 “ version), *watchmen* over you \*.”

It would seem, therefore, to have been the tradi-  
 tional belief of the *inspiration* of those *sophim*, watch-  
 men, which made the Greeks adopt the title. And if  
 so, it is undeniable, that they originally considered  
*wisdom* to be unattainable without divine aid ; and that  
 a revelation from heaven could alone direct man to the  
 knowledge of divine things. To me it appears doubt-  
 ful, whether the Latins did not derive their verb *sapere*,  
 to be wise, the root of *sapientia*, wisdom, from  
 the Greek, *Σοφός*. If they did so derive it, it is evi-  
 dent, that they had discerned in the Hebrew origi-  
 nal, an allusion to the instinctive faculty of *taste*.  
 May not the Psalmist be said to discover some such  
 allusion, when he asserts, “ more to be desired are  
 “ they (the judgements of the Lord) than gold, yea  
 “ than much fine gold ; sweeter also than honey, and  
 “ וְנִפְתַּח צִוְּפִים, the honeycomb †.” Be this as it may,  
 the import and derivation, which the Latin lexicogra-  
 phers ascribe to ‘ *sapere* ’ and ‘ *sapientia*, ’ confirm the  
 idea of an *instinctive* allusion, as well as an allusion to  
 the yet more unerring *gift of inspiration*. For the im-  
 port

\* Jerem. vi. 17.

† Ps. xix. 10.

*port* of *sapere* is confessedly to *taste*; and its generally acknowledged *derivation* from the Hebrew term שפּה, the ‘*lip*,’ accords naturally enough with this import. While the figurative sense of שפּה, if extended to its derivatives, ‘*sapere*,’ ‘*sapientia*,’ ‘*wisdom*,’ conveys at once the idea of ‘*religious wisdom* ;’ and that, too, the *gift* of God: since, according to biblical critics of no mean repute, שפּה, figuratively taken, means not only *language*, or *speech*, as usually rendered, but *religious confession*. Thus, St. Paul saying, “ By him, (Jesus), therefore, let us offer the *sacrifice* of *praise* “ to God continually; that is, the *fruit* of our *lips*, “ giving thanks to his name \*,” is supposed to refer to that sublime passage in Isaiah, “ Thus saith the “ high and lofty one, that inhabiteth eternity, whose “ name is holy,” &c. “ I create the *fruit* of the *lips*, “ peace, peace,” &c. ; that is, *I give the blessings* of “ religion, and establish your good designs and counsels. †”

I have done, however, with what may be termed by such as ‘ search not the Scriptures,’ in the original language, a mere waste of words. My only apology is an ardent desire to undeceive the modern admirers of heathen vanity, “ of science falsely so called.” And should this well meant attempt to shew, that even the misguided Gentiles, in the very *terms* which they employed to express their ideas of *wisdom*, had an eye to

\* Heb. xiii. 15.

† Isaiah, lvii. 15—19. See Julius Bate, and Mr. Parkhurst, on the word שפּה.



to God, as its only source, have this effect on one solitary individual, my labour will not have been in vain : for my object is to prove, in the language of Scripture, “ that if any man *lack wisdom,*” (and all men do), he should *ask it of God* ; for there is no *wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel, against the Lord.*

BISHOP

---

BISHOP SKINNER of Aberdeen, having, in the Autumn of 1803, published his "Vindication of Primitive Truth and Order," &c. this work was reviewed, in December following, by a writer in the *Anti-Jacobin Magazine and Review*. The readers of this very useful periodical publication are not to be informed, that a department of this work is assigned to the communications of such correspondents as are disposed to engage in the laudable task of "reviewing the reviewers." Conscious, therefore, that the critic, who animadverted most inconsistently on the manner and matter of Bishop Skinner's work, exposed alike the author and his own employers, I submitted, in a Letter to the very respectable editor, some observations on his criticisms. This letter, although transmitted twelve months ago, has never been inserted. Had the attack in question appeared in any other periodical work, than one established purposely for the defence of 'primitive truth and order,' I, though in duty bound to protect as well the literary, as the moral character of a father, would have passed it over. As the case stands, however, silence would be undutiful; while but to attempt Bishop Skinner's defence, and the defence of the principles which he has so becomingly espoused, seems praise-worthy, be the issue what it may.

I hope to be forgiven, therefore, for seizing the present opportunity of publishing my letter to the editor of the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, even should it fail to interest the public in general: and should it, in this form, meet the eye of the critic, and of his patriotic employer, I feel that they will do me the justice of believing me to be actuated by motives completely foreign to resentment. For, having *pledged myself* to endeavour to refute the errors in doctrine, laid to my father's charge, the present offers itself as a very fit opportunity for redeeming my pledge.

---

MR. EDITOR,

ALTHOUGH aware of the impropriety of calling on you to listen to the querulous remarks of such correspondents as have no allowance to make for the imperfections of periodical criticism; yet, as I feel that the credit of the *Anti-Jacobin Review* cannot be maintained, but by a strict regard, on the part of its conductors, to the noble maxim of Phædrus,

“*Exploranda est veritas multum prius,*

“*Quam stulta prave judicet sententia.*”

I take leave, as the constant reader of your work, and the warm friend of ‘primitive truth and order’ to send you a few observations on the critique of Bishop Skinner’s ‘*Vindication*,’ &c. inserted in Nos. 66. 67. and 68. of your valuable publication.

That

That ‘*usefulness*,’ and not the display of ‘genius,’ was Bishop Skinner’s aim, in undertaking to plead the sacred cause of primitive truth and order, the reviewer “is rightly persuaded.” But how, Mr Editor, can an author be *useful*, if, on his first introduction to public notice, “the very first sentence of his book” be quoted, as an instance that “his general manner is somewhat “diffuse, his construction sometimes ungrammatical, “and his meaning so unhappily expressed, as to be (without any restrictive particle, therefore *at all times*) ‘hardly intelligible!’” Yet this is the language in which the critic ushers Bishop Skinner into public notice, as an author! and it is followed up by a long dissertation on our national taste, the conclusion of which is but little suited to the *original design* of the *Anti-Jacobin Review*.—“The strong, the whole-  
 “some, but homely fare of our ancestors, which de-  
 “lighted their literary palates, will not now go down.  
 “No richness of matter, or solidity of sense, will now  
 “atone for the harshness of a clumsy and unpolished  
 “stile: and the writer who will not accommodate  
 “himself to this disposition of the public mind, has  
 “evidently no just right to complain, that his produc-  
 “tions are treated with what he may think unmerited  
 “severity, or supercilious neglect!” Is this language to pass unnoticed by the readers of a work, the very next number of which has the following admirable motto from Seneca?

“*Nunquam volui populo placere; nam quæ ego scio, non probat populus; quæ probat populus ego nescio.*”——

I have heard it remarked by a critic of your acquaintance, Mr Editor, “ most studious moreover of harmony,” and of adjusting the proportion of clauses and sentences, “ *that verbal criticism on works of seriousness, is never of much importance, while it is often impertinent.*” Yet, although the reviewer must agree to the truth of this remark, “ his squeamish and sickly fastidiousness ” *strains* through half a page at a mere *gnat* of a pronoun ; “ which,” says he, “ contrary to every known principle of grammar, is made to point forward, instead of pointing back !” ‘ Ego, si risi, lividus et mordax videar :’ be it so : for in such hands, “ I swear not Addison himself is safe.” Nay, to satisfy such a *palate*, no fare, I apprehend, will suffice, unless the famous John of Salisbury revisit our land, and bring with him “ Doctor sanctissimus ille Gregorius, qui, *melleo predicationis imbri,* “ totam rigavit, et inebriavit ecclesiam !” But with your permission, Mr Editor,

“ I’ll take a word with this same learned Theban.”

How, Sir, in the name of consistency, could you, after holding up Bishop Skinner’s work, “ as void of originality of thought, as somewhat diffuse, as sometimes ungrammatical, and his meaning, as hardly intelligible,” how could you say, “ that the object of the Mosaic law, and its reference to the œconomy of grace, are stated by the learned and respectable prelate with (mark your words) *perspicuity* and *force* !” How could you say of another paragraph, “ that ” (with an exception to be noticed by  
and



and bye) “ it is *highly excellent* ;” and conclude your criticism, by acquainting the readers of the *Anti-Jacobin*, “ that in Bishop Skinner’s third chapter, by far “ the best written part of the book, the author’s manner assumes a high, but by no means an unbecoming “ *tone of impressive earnestness.*” I leave you to reconcile this mode of reviewing a work, with what may, ‘ in the language of the *school authors,*’ be literally termed the *grace of congruity* ; and, from your *verbal*, pass on to your *doctrinal* criticisms.

“ Where Bishop Skinner” (to use your own words) “ contrasts the presumption of men in attempting to “ new model the œconomy of *grace*, with their modesty and wisdom, in never intermeddling with the “ established order of *nature*,” you say, “ the cases “ are in truth *entirely dissimilar*, and therefore all “ *reasoning* from the *one* to the *other*, is, to every “ *practical* purpose, at least, *altogether inconclusive.*” Now, Sir, I would ask you what constitutes a *parable*, “ without” which, an evangelist informs us, our blessed Saviour himself “ spake not unto the people?” You will not, I trust, object to Mr. Parkhurst’s definition. “ *Παραβολη*, a *parable*,” according to this justly esteemed critic, “ is a comparison, similitude, or simile, in which one thing is compared with another, “ and *particularly spiritual things with natural* ; by “ which means, such *spiritual things* are better understood, and make the *deeper impression* on the *honest* “ and *attentive hearer*, at the same time that they are “ *concealed* from the *gross, carnal, and inattentive.*”

Again,

Again, you say, “ by no stretch of fancy can the  
 “ church, at one and the same instant, be conceived  
 “ as a *wal*, a *pillar*, a *ground*, and a *city set on a hill* ?  
 Yet by giving these metaphors the epithet “ *incongru-*  
 “ *ous*,” were you aware, that, in some respect, the  
 ‘ word of God is made of none effect !’ For these  
 metaphors are not of Bishop Skinner’s creation, they  
 are all strictly scriptural : and, you might, on turning  
 to the 13th chapter of St. Matthew, as well criticise it,  
 as exhibiting “ a mixture, and confusion of incongru-  
 “ *ous* metaphors,” because there, in one and the same  
 discourse, and at one and the same instant, the saviour  
 of the world likens the ‘ kingdom of heaven, to a man  
 ‘ sowing good seed in his field,’ ‘ to a grain of mus-  
 ‘ tard seed,’ ‘ to leaven,’ ‘ to treasure hid in a field,’  
 ‘ to a merchant man,’ and ‘ to a net cast into the sea.’

Having thus, Sir, skirmished with *pronouns* and  
*metaphors*, and come off less than conqueror in the es-  
 timation of the real friends of primitive truth and order,  
 you now commence your grand attack on a “ few of  
 “ the buttresses” of Bishop Skinner’s work, which,  
 I hope, I shall be able to convince an impartial public,  
 are impregnable to every such rude assault.

“ Bishop Skinner’s *exposition* of the cherubim”  
 placed at the east of the garden of Eden, to keep  
 the way of the tree of life, you “ cannot implicitly a-  
 “ dopt, because it is *involved* in such difficulties, and  
 “ *exposed* (mark the accuracy with which these phrases  
 “ are balanced) to such objections, *as no sagacity or*  
 “ *strength of intellect can remove.*” Again, “ *it is*  
 “ *founded*

“founded on gratuitous assumption, and therefore incapable of satisfactory proof\*.” These, I must observe, are the very arguments of the Socinian, when the divinity of Christ is affirmed; they are the arguments of the deist, when “the faith once delivered to the saints” is contended for: nay, Sir, they are the arguments of the atheist, when the existence of God himself is pressed upon him. Every thing is, and may be got rid of, by the absurd exclamation, ‘*gratuitous assumption!*’ and therefore incapable of satisfactory proof! But to come to the point: Has not St. Paul expressly affirmed, that the ‘holy of holies,’ in the tabernacle, and in the temple, was ‘a figure of that heaven,’ where is the presence of God? But the ‘cherubim of glory,’ (as this apostle terms them), were the most conspicuous part of the furniture of ‘this figure of heaven,’ this holy of holies. What else could the intention, therefore, of displaying them be, but to represent something in heaven? And what that something was, I conceive, (call me Hutchinsonian, or what you will) that we have more than *gratuitous assumption*; we have such *satisfactory proof*, as must convince every man

\* By the way—Bishop Skinner’s exposition of the cherubim is the exposition of that pre-eminently learned theologian, the late reverend William Jones of Nayland.—(See his Works.)—Of course, the critic, and the work for which he wrote, are *completely at variance*; for, in a dedication to Lord Kenyon, inserted in the Appendix to Vol. XIX. we are informed by the editor, that the Anti-Jacobin “was established for the purpose of *maintaining and upholding* those *religious* and political principles, which were deeply implanted in his Lordship’s mind, by his venerable preceptor, the *reverend William Jones of Nayland!*”

man, who has a mind not yet ‘spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit.’ The command of God himself, was this, “of the *mercy-seat*” (called by St. Paul, ἰλαστήριον) “shall ye make the cherubim.” Yet Jesus Christ, “who took not on him the *nature of angels*,” but who had all the *fullness of God dwelling in him bodily*, “he is set forth by God to be our “ἰλαστήριον,” Rom. iii. 25. to be to us, under the gospel, what the *mercy-seat and the cherubim* were to the church of God under the patriarchal, and Mosaic dispensations. Dare we call this ‘*gratuitous assumption?*’ nay, does it not amount to something near akin to *satisfactory proof?* especially when we are further assured, that the high priest, by carrying “the blood, which he offered for himself and for the “errors of the people,” into the holy of holies, where were the cherubim (“the sound of whose wings “was as the *voice of the Almighty God*, when he “speaketh,” Ezek. x. 5.) represented Christ’s entering with his own blood into heaven, *to appear in the presence of God for us*. When all this is impartially weighed and considered, Bishop Skinner’s exposition must appear far from ‘*gratuitously assumed;*’ and he must be a bold man, who, believing in the divine authority of scripture, has strength of intellect to resist conviction. “Though Bishop Skinner,” you say, reasons convincingly “and clearly” on the interesting subjects contained in the Old Testament, “yet you are sorry” (I hope that I have administered some consoling arguments) “to observe him relapsing into  
“ that

“ that mystical manner, of which, in his explanation  
 “ of the cherubim, we have already complained.”  
 For, while you give the Bishop credit for his account  
 of the difference between the offerings of Cain and  
 Abel ; yet, when with equal proof he supposes, that  
 “ the clothing of skins was a most comfortable em-  
 “ blem of that covering and protection from divine  
 “ wrath, that garment of salvation provided for man  
 “ by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who was to  
 “ take away the sin of the world,” you exclaim, “ it  
 “ is so like the *flight* of a *warm imagination*, that we  
 “ are not inclined to allow it much weight.” A bi-  
 blical critic of some note, however, the author of *Ho-  
 ræ Solitariae*, gives it due weight ; and thinks that  
 scripture language warrants the *supposition*. “ It may  
 “ be observed,” says he, “ concerning the coats of  
 “ skins, with which the Lord is said to have clothed  
 “ our first parents, that it was an emblematic fact,  
 “ preaching the doctrine of salvation through sacrifice.  
 “ As the body of man received raiment taken from  
 “ slain creatures, to defend it from warring elements,  
 “ so his soul, stripped of original righteousness, needs  
 “ to be covered from divine wrath, by a garment of  
 “ salvation taken from one, who was to be sacri-  
 “ ficed to its bestowment. This, in the language of  
 “ scripture, is *putting on Christ*.”

In commenting on God’s transaction with Noah,  
 you again charge the “ learned prelate” with “ resign-  
 “ ing himself to his *propensity* for *mystical interpreta-  
 “ tion* !” Surely, Sir, in your estimation, ‘ much



‘*learning* hath made him mad.’ But, “most noble” critic, only bear with me a little farther; and I shall make it appear, that the “*learned prelate*,” as you choose to term him, is not *mystically* mad, but “speak-  
eth the words of *truth* and *soberness*.”

The Bishop writes—“God, we are told, was pleased to set his bow in the cloud, as a token of his covenant—a pledge of his mercy to man, through the merits and mediation of that mighty One, whom St. John saw in heaven, and there was a rainbow round about the throne.” “This interpretation” you say, we cannot approve. The covenant mentioned in the 9th chapter of Genesis, as established with Noah and his seed, *could not possibly mean* (but why not possibly) “the *covenant of redemption*, because (mark the reason) “*at the very same instant, it is said to be equally established with the whole animal crea-  
tion!*” To think before one speaks is necessary; but to think before one writes, indispensibly necessary. Had the *ark*, the outward visible sign of God’s establishing his covenant with Noah, *no relation to spiritual*, but only to *temporal* mercies; *because, at the very same instant*, Noah is commanded “to take of all flesh, of every living creature, and of fowls after their kind, two of every sort, into the ark, to keep them alive?” or, are the Apostles St. Paul and St. Peter to be charged with a “propensity to mystical interpretation,” when the former asserts, “that Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an *ark* to the saving of  
“ his

“ his house, by the which he condemned the world,  
 “ and became *heir* of the *righteousness*, which is by  
 “ *faith!*” And when the latter is equally, nay more  
 explicit, in declaring, “ that the like figure to the *ark*  
 “ of *Noah*, is *baptism*, which doth also now *save us*,  
 “ by the *resurrection* of *Jesus Christ!*” Again, in  
 passing through the red sea, we are assured that “ *flocks*  
 “ and *herds*, nay *very much cattle*, accompanied the  
 “ children of *Israel*, and partook of the *salvation* there  
 “ wrought for them.” Yet how earnest is St. Paul to  
 prevent our being ignorant of the *spiritual* mercy here-  
 by intended! “ Brethren,” says he, “ I would not that  
 “ ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were  
 “ under the *cloud*, and all passed through the *sea*, and  
 “ were all *baptized*,” &c. “ and did all drink the same  
 “ *spiritual drink*; for they drank of that *spiritual*  
 “ *rock* that followed them, and that *rock was Christ.*”  
 We have only to compare this single text, with Numb.  
 xx. 11. “ And Moses lifted up his hand, and, with  
 “ his rod, he smote the *rock* twice, and the water came  
 “ out abundantly; and the congregation drank, and  
 “ *their beasts* also;” when we shall learn how unsafe  
 it is to contradict St. Paul, by asserting that there can be  
 no *spiritual relation*, ‘ because at the very same instant’  
 the animal creation are admitted, as partakers of the  
 mercy vouchsafed! For, in addition to the satisfac-  
 tory evidence of the contrary already produced, it is  
 worthy of remark, that the ‘ whole animal creation’  
 then existing, had been saved in the *ark*; the figure of  
*Christian baptism!!* It was, therefore, as a pledge of

this *common* salvation ; ‘ it was as a token’ (says God himself ) ‘ of the covenant, which I make between me ‘ and you,’ (Noah) ‘ and every living creature, that is ‘ with you,’ (that is, between God, and all who went out of the ark), ‘ that I do set my *bow in the cloud !*’ If, then, there be truth and consistency in the word of God, which I should be *sorry to see* an Anti-Jacobin reviewer gainsaying, the *bow must relate to the same spiritual mercies with the ark ; it being set in the cloud as a token or memorial of the same deliverance.*

“ Great,” therefore, as *your* “ astonishment” was, when you found Bishop Skinner affirming, “ that the “ natural rainbow was intended as a pledge of God’s “ mercy to man, through the merits and mediation of “ Christ,” &c. *greater will be my* astonishment, if, after reflecting on the facts now produced, you do not candidly acknowledge, that the interpretation given in “ Primitive Truth and Order,” is the true and scriptural interpretation. The prophet Ezekiel has positively asserted, that the “ appearance of the *bow* that “ is in the cloud,” was the “ appearance of the likeness of the *glory of the Lord ;*” while St. Paul affirms of Christ, that “ *He is the brightness of his Father’s “ glory !*” Nay, Sir, in no other way, but from a faint traditionary belief of this sort, can we account for the misguided heathen making *Iris*, the rainbow, a goddess, the *messenger* of Jupiter and Juno. Thus Homer (Iliad XI.) declares :

“ Τρεῖς, ἐκάλειθ’ ἰρίσιν ἑοικότες ἄς τε Κρονίων,  
 “ Ἐν νεφελῇ στήριξε, τερασ μεροπῶν Ἀνθρώπων.

You

You acknowledge, with all your abhorrence of *mystical interpretation*, that Melchizedec was “ evidently  
 “ a *type* of Christ; but that he was actually the se-  
 “ cond person of the Trinity in a human form, is a  
 “ notion which, by whatever great names it has been  
 “ embraced, we cannot implicitly admit: nor do we  
 “ perceive, either in the books of the Old or New Tes-  
 “ taments, any ground for supposing, as the Bishop  
 “ seems to do, that the time of Abraham’s interview  
 “ with Melchizedec, was likewise the time at which he  
 “ received the most distinct communications of the na-  
 “ ture of the Christian dispensation, and rejoiced to  
 “ see our Saviour’s day.” Is it possible, I would ask,  
 for any one to read ‘ without partiality, and without  
 ‘ prejudice,’ the seventh chapter to the Hebrews, and  
 doubt of whom the Apostle speaketh? Nay, there is  
 one circumstance, which affords to my mind such *scrip-  
 tural evidence*, that Abraham’s interview with Melchi-  
 zedec, was the *time* at which he received a most dis-  
 tinct communication of the ‘ *nature of the Christian  
 ‘ dispensation,*’ that at the risk of the critic’s repre-  
 hension, I must state it to him.

If, Sir, I understand the matter rightly, the diffe-  
 rence between the ‘ orders of Aaron and Melchizedec,’  
 will be found to lie in this; that the priest of the or-  
 der of Aaron “ ought, as for the people, so also *for*  
 “ *himself*, to offer for sins;” while the priest of the  
 order of Melchizedec “ pertaineth to that other tribe, of  
 “ which *no man* gave attendance at the altar.” Ac-  
 cording to the Aaronic order, “ the blood of bulls  
 “ and goats, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh,  
 “ and

“ and was to be offered *daily* :” whereas, according to the order of Melchizedec, “ *one offering* perfected for “ ever them that are sanctified.” But of this *one offering*, ‘ bread and wine’ have, by the appointment of the offerer, ever been denominated the *representative* symbols, the *similitudes*, whereby, according to an apostle, “ the bread which we break, is the *communion* “ of the *body of Christ* ; the *cup* which we bless, is “ the *communion of the blood of Christ*.”

When, therefore, Melchizedec met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and it is said, that *he*, “ the priest of *the most high God*, “ brought forth” (unquestionably for the purpose of Abraham’s partaking) “ *bread and wine*,” the patriarch, by this act of receiving the symbols ‘ of his body ‘ broken, and blood shed,’ ‘ *rejoiced* to see our Saviour’s day ;’ just as the disciples travelling to Emmaus, rejoiced to see the day of his victory over death and the grave ; declaring, ‘ that he was *known unto* ‘ *them in breaking of bread*.’

I come now, Sir, to the last charge of any consequence against Bishop Skinner, viz. “ his misconception” of the meaning of our Saviour’s prayer for his disciples, St. John, xvii. 21. With regard to Dr. Campbell’s interpretation of the celebrated words of Ignatius, “ ‘εν θυσιασθηριον ‘ως ‘εις επισκοπος,” though I confess the cogency of your reasoning, and admit the language of St. Cyprian, “ *episcopatus unus* “ *est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur,*” to be the best reply to the Doctor’s objections : yet, I cannot but regret, that an Anti-Jacobin reviewer,  
in



in other words an *orthodox* christian, should have given this decision: "We are therefore, decidedly of opinion, that this text has *no relation to the essential unity of the persons in the Godhead!*" How will the 'Socinian controvertists' rejoice to hear, that the declaration of our Saviour, 'I and my Father are one,' means nothing more than simply a *figurative unity!* Yet you will have it, that when this divine person prays to his father for his disciples, "that they all may be one, καθως ἡμεῖς ἐν εἰσμεν, as "we are one," if by the *latter unity*, be meant the *unity of essence in the divine nature*, the object of the prayer is (bold language indeed) "a *physical impossibility!*" What, Sir, has 'science falsely so called;' what have the "*disparates of logic*" to do with the immutable 'Logos,' or 'word of truth;' whose ways "are equal, while our ways are *unequal!*" Did not the high priest prophesy, that Jesus "συναγαγεῖ εἰς ἓν, should gather together in *one* the children of God, "who were scattered abroad?" And does not St. Paul tell the Ephesians, that this same Jesus did fulfil this prophecy, and did make (Jew and Gentile) ἀμφότερα ἓν, both *one?* That he might accomplish *this*, was therefore, the object of his prayer (John, xvii. 21); and critics are not at liberty to interpret scriptural language, as may best suit their own preconceived opinions. As God is a *spirit*, "the *essential unity of the Godhead is a spiritual unity.*" But, "by *no power*," you say, "could the disciples be made *one*, "as the Father and the Son, in the essence of the *divine nature, are one.*" 'Yet, ἐν πνεύμα, μία ψυχή  
' are

‘ are enjoined to all who embrace the gospel of Christ,’ (Philip. i. 27.) Nay St. Paul assures us, in terms direct to my purpose, “ He that is joined to the Lord, “ *ἓν πνεῦμα ἐστὶ*, is *one spirit*, (1 Cor. vi. 17.) where an *essential*, though to us a *mystical* unity, stands confessed. I conclude, therefore, that “ what our “ Saviour asks in behalf of his disciples is” *not* “ precisely what St Paul recommends to his Christian brethren at Rome, the “ *ἵνα αὐτοὶ φρονεῖν ὁμοθυμαδὸν* ;” and would earnestly beg of you, Sir, as a proof of your being ‘ removed from the tenets of Socinian contro- ‘ vertists,’ to reverse the decision which has appeared so unexpectedly in the pages of that truly valuable miscellany, the *Anti-Jacobin Magazine and Review*.

I hope, Mr Editor, that I have now shewn to your satisfaction, and the satisfaction of your numerous readers, that my petition to be heard at the bar of the public, in vindication of the *Vindicator of ‘ Primitive ‘ Truth and Order,* is neither ‘ *frivolous* nor *vexati- ‘ ous* !’ ‘ *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit.*’ To see the critic, in the latter part of his review, displaying so happily the force of this adage, I acknowledge gave me pleasure, heartfelt pleasure. And, it now, in taking leave, gives me similar pleasure to hold out to him the ‘ right hand of fellowship,’ and say, that he concluded his criticisms in a manner,

“ *Dignum et optimo viro, et opere sanctissimo !*”

I have only, Sir, to assure you of my good wishes for the encreasing success of your labours; and to acquaint you, that if the reviewer wishes to address me,  
 “ *Christianus mihi nomen, Catholicus cognomen.*”

WHEN

---

WHEN occupied in preparing for the press the matter here submitted to the public, the ‘Anti-Jacobin Review,’ and ‘British Critic,’ for February 1805, came to hand. By both critics is Bishop Skinner’s ‘Sermon, preached at the Convocation of the Bishops and Clergy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland,’ &c. reviewed; and to both, I readily admit, is the Scotch Episcopal Church largely indebted, for the very honourable mention which they make of her, and for the interest which they individually take, and have taken, in her prosperity. Not so her senior Bishop; who, tho’ zealous in the extreme, to ‘approve himself unto God,’ by ‘rightly dividing the word of truth,’ ‘studies,’ according to the Anti-Jacobin critic, ‘to shew himself a workman that needeth to be ashamed!’ For these are this critic’s words: “Of the discourse, “in general, we think, that will not be said, which “is said by Ovid, of the palace of the sun: *Materiem superabat opus*. To say the truth, the learned “prelate’s stile still continues to be, in numerous instances, disfigured by the same *inaccuracy* and *slowness* of manner, of which, on a former occasion, we complained.” What hypercritical trifling would this appear, were it worth while to mention the few instances adduced by the critic in support of this silly censure? In every theological discussion, Bishop

Skinner's object is to declare, to the best of his ability, "the testimony of God;" though it may happen in his case, as it did in the apostles', that when he cometh before the public, "he cometh not with *excellency of speech, or of wisdom.*"

The British Critic, indeed, seems duly aware of the impropriety of thus carping at the unavoidable inaccuracies to which the style of every Scotch writer is occasionally subjected. "The language of these discourses," says he, "is, in general, simple and perspicuous; and we have high authority (Johnson's) for saying, that when something is to be told, that was not known before, such language is the most proper." It is, however, chiefly for the purpose of self-vindication, that I am induced to draw the attention of my readers to the Reviews in question. And sure I am, that when I have stated the matter, *first, as represented by the critics, and then as it consists with fact*, I shall stand acquitted, they themselves being judges, of the charges brought against me; and be forgiven by the candid reader, for speaking of myself, as regard to character alone constrains me to do. The Anti-Jacobin critic writes thus:

"The second part of the publication consists of an Appendix, containing the substance of an address to the meeting, by another prelate, Bishop Jolly of Moray, and also the address of a Mr Skinner of Forfar; both recommending subscription to the Articles; and both declaring that the Articles ought to be understood in an Anti-Calvinistic sense. The  
Bishop's

“ Bishop’s address is interesting, being modest, learn-  
 “ ed, argumentative and plain,” &c. “ With regard  
 “ to Mr Skinner of Forfar, we see not, we confess,  
 “ the reason why so conspicuous a place has been here  
 “ assigned him, in preference to the rest of his bre-  
 “ thren. Many of them, it is to be supposed, deli-  
 “ vered their sentiments in the meeting. Their  
 “ speeches however, have, in our opinion, been judi-  
 “ ciously suppressed, if that which is here ascribed to  
 “ Mr Skinner was considered as of such eminent excel-  
 “ lence, as to entitle it to so marked and prominent a  
 “ pre-eminence. The gentleman, however, is un-  
 “ doubtedly desirous, that what he said, on this oc-  
 “ casion, should be, as generally as possible, known ;  
 “ we shall, therefore, we question not, do him a gra-  
 “ tification by inserting it !”

How to account for the *sneering, sarcastic insinua-  
 tions*, to Mr Skinner’s prejudice, here detailed, he is  
 utterly at a loss. If *penned* by an eye-witness of the  
 proceedings of the Convocation at Laurencekirk, the  
 thing speaks for itself, and is unworthy of animadver-  
 sion. If *penned* by a stranger, and evidently meant  
 to injure Mr Skinner in the eyes of strangers, the libel-  
 lous charge requires animadversion ; or rather, as  
 conscious innocence suggests, the *correcting hand of  
 truth*.

The fact is—Bishop Jolly of Moray had a *written  
 address*, which the critic does the author no more than  
 justice, in commending as “ interesting, modest, learn-  
 “ ed, argumentative, and plain,” &c. Mr Skinner of



Forfar had also a *written address*, or rather some select extracts, on the subject of the 39 Articles. But the antithesis, to be complete, makes the reviewer say, that Mr Skinner's address was completely the reverse of Bishop Jolly's, being ' *uninteresting, immodest, unlearned, unargumentative, and unintelligible!*' From this address, however, on the motion for printing his sermon, being unanimously approved of, Bishop Skinner was desirous to select those notes, which, according to the British Critic, "serve as an index to *all the information* which the *learned reader* can desire on "the Calvinism, or Anti-Calvinism, of the church of "England!" For this purpose it was given him by the author.

No other member of the convocation, though many of them did deliver their sentiments in the meeting, had their thoughts committed to writing; and this seems to be the "reason, why so conspicuous a place "was assigned to Mr Skinner, in preference to the rest "of his brethren." Or, if there be any *other reason*, it rests entirely with his ecclesiastical superior; for, neither *directly*, nor *indirectly*, was Mr Skinner "desirous, that what he said on that occasion should be, "as generally as possible, known." Nay, he has real "gratification," in assuring this *friendly* reviewer, that it was the general assent given, by the meeting, to the "declaration," with which Mr Skinner concluded, that procured its insertion, in the manner objected to.

But having thus taken responsibility on himself for the

the Notes appended to Bishop Skinner's Sermon, Mr Skinner has to repel another charge, which both critics agree in preferring against him, although in different terms of opprobrium.

“ We were,” says the Anti-Jacobin, “ we confess, “ exceedingly surprised, at the affirmation, in one of “ the notes to Bishop Jolly's Address, that *Heylin* was “ *contemporary* with Calvin and Cranmer. *Whoever* “ *was the writer* of this note, we are fully convinced “ that it was not Bishop Jolly. He is evidently too “ well informed a man to be capable of *such consum-* “ *mate ignorance*, as is here displayed : for *every body* “ *knows*,” the critic should have added, except Mr Skinner, “ that Heylin's *Historia Quinquarticularis*, “ was published considerably after the middle of the “ 17th century.” “ In a note,” says the British Critic, “ on Bishop Jolly's discourse, we meet with a “ mistake, for which we cannot account. It is said, “ that Dr Heylin was contemporary with Calvin and “ Cranmer ; but Bishop Jolly knows well, that Cran- “ mer and Calvin flourished a hundred years before “ Heylin ; and yet it is not easy to conceive this ana- “ chronism a mere error of the press.”

But let the *note* in question *now* speak for itself ; and if the vindication, to follow it, evince not Mr Skinner's accuracy in adjusting “ clauses and sentences,” he hopes that it may have the effect of removing the accusation of “ *consummate ignorance*,” he thinks rather rashly and unwarrantably brought against him.

The concluding clause of the quotation from Mr Daubeny,

Daubeny, with which the supposed anachronism is connected, is as follows: "Therefore, it is most obvious, " that the *plain, literal, and grammatical* sense of the " Articles of the Church of England, did not, in the " opinion of the *Calvinists* of that period," (the period of the Royal declaration) " contain the saving doc- " trines of free-grace in election and *predestination*, " according to the Calvinistic interpretation." " Very " justly, then," adds Bishop Skinner, " was it observed " by one of the clergy present at our meeting, that, " if the disciple of Calvin holds to the *literal and gram- " matical* sense of the Articles, as the anchor of his " soul, he has been clearly convicted of leaning only " to a broken reed, instead of an anchor sure and " stedfast; for prejudice itself must yield to facts, as " facts are stubborn things: and, in addition to *those " now produced*, we are informed by a *contemporary* " writer, that Calvin's offer of assistance, in conduct- " ing the Reformation in England, was rejected by " Cranmer, for," says Heylin, " the Archbishop " knew the man!"

Here Mr Skinner meant to say, (and he must be forgiven, if still of opinion that his meaning stands expressed), " that *in addition to the facts now produced*," (the *facts* regarding the royal declaration, as stated by Mr Daubeny), " we are informed by a *contemporary* " *writer*," (a *writer contemporary*, not with Calvin and Cranmer, whose names had not been mentioned, but *contemporary with the facts produced*), " that Calvin's " offer of assistance in conducting the Reformation, " was

“ was rejected by Cranmer ; for,” says Heylin, “ the  
 “ Archbishop knew the man !” Mr Skinner may be  
 ignorant of the art of writing, so as to preclude cavil,  
 though not ignorant that Heylin lived, as “ *every body*  
 “ *knows,*” in the 17th century !

Injurious, however, as Mr Skinner, in as far as he  
 is concerned, feels the language of the Anti-Jacobin to  
 be ; the following observation of the British Critic  
 gave him more uneasiness ; inasmuch as self-vindica-  
 tion compels him to leave the two critical gentlemen,  
 the “ one to *shout for mastery,*” the other, “ to cry  
 “ *for being overcome !*”

After some invidious comparisons, as to the literary  
 merits of the episcopal clergymen of Scotland, the British  
 Critic goes on to state : “ One priest, and but one,  
 “ appears to have spoken in the Convocation ; and,  
 “ perhaps, it might have been as well for the cause of  
 “ truth and consistency, that he too had been silent.  
 “ Mr Faber is no Anti-Calvinist ; and of the tract  
 “ which is here quoted as authority,” (*never was Mr*  
*Faber’s tract so quoted*), “ *neither Calvinist nor Armi-*  
*nian will speak with approbation. We have else-*  
 “ *where detected the fallacy of its reasonings ; and*  
 “ *have shewn, that, if those reasonings were not fal-*  
 “ *lacious, they would tend greatly to destroy the autho-*  
 “ *rity of the scriptures.*”

The truth is this :—When Mr Skinner was engaged  
 in preparing the extracts, which he carried with him  
 to the Convocation at Laurencekirk, the Anti-Jacobin  
 for August 1804, reached him ; in which Mr Faber’s

“ Thoughts

“ Thoughts on the Calvinistic and Arminian contro-  
 “ versy,” hold a conspicuous place. The critic calls  
 this “ *little work judicious and satisfactory ;*” and con-  
 cludes his account of it in the following words of  
*decided commendation* : “ Having thus presented our  
 “ readers with an analysis of this *judicious and convinc-*  
 “ *ing work*, we shall conclude with *recommending*  
 “ it to their perusal ; and giving it the *stamp* of our  
 “ *hearty approbation !*”

Never having perused any of Mr Faber’s writings ;  
 but being disposed to confide in the judgment of Anti-  
 Jacobin reviewers, Mr Skinner *quoted*, from a *quota-*  
*tion of theirs*, what was, he conceived, completely per-  
 tinent to his subject ; and said ne’er a word about the  
 work, or the orthodoxy of its author. Nay, he is still  
 of opinion, that language more expressive of his own  
 sentiments, or of the sentiments of the church to which  
 he has the honour to belong, could not be framed.  
 “ *Truth and consistency*,” therefore, have suffered no-  
 thing in his hands : in the hands of the critics, the  
 case is *evidently* otherwise. But, aware of the jus-  
 tice of the old adage,

“ Who can decide when Doctors disagree ?”

Mr Skinner leaves it to the gentlemen themselves—

“ *Tantum componere litem !*”

F I N I S.