



Wordsworth

PR

4480

M3

1853

CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



THE  
WORDSWORTH COLLECTION  
FOUNDED BY  
CYNTHIA MORGAN ST. JOHN

THE GIFT OF  
VICTOR EMANUEL  
OF THE CLASS OF 1919

12-216  
157

NOTES,

THEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND  
MISCELLANEOUS.



NOTES,  
THEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND  
MISCELLANEOUS.

BY

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

EDITED BY

THE REV. DERWENT COLERIDGE, M.A.

LONDON :  
EDWARD MOXON, DOVER STREET.

1853.

Words  
18/xii/51

Word

Pt 4430

V 9

1822

LONDON:

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

## PREFACE.



THE present volume completes the publication of Coleridge's Marginalia. The Notes on Luther, with some other articles of less extent, and the larger portion of the Omniana, have already appeared in the four volumes of literary Remains edited by the late H. N. Coleridge. The remainder, constituting about two-thirds of the whole, is now published for the first time.\*

This portion of the Author's writings is now contained in five volumes, of which the two first, entitled "Notes on Shakspeare and other Dramatists," are exclusively critical. The two which followed, entitled "Notes on English Divines," are exclusively theological. The contents of the present volume are of a varied character, and present

\* The new matter is distinguished in the Table of Contents by an asterisk.

specimens of the Author's way of thinking, not only on religion and politics, but on questions of natural philosophy, philology, and other topics, bearing in this respect some relation to his "Table Talk."

The motives which have led to the publication of the Theological Notes have been sufficiently set forth by the first Editor, in the Preface to the third and fourth volumes of the "Literary Remains," to which reference has already been made in the preface to the "Notes on English Divines."

The Historical and Political Notes will be read with interest, as exhibiting the sentiments of the Author during the latter period of his life. They make it evident that his political principles, however adapted to the varying phase of circumstance, suffered no real change, and that he remained to the last, what he had been from the first, a genuine English Publicola. Warmly attached to the institutions of his country, and especially anxious for the permanency and well-being of the National Church, he sought to enlighten, and in this way to support, the Conservative party in the State: but the whole bearing of his mind was toward liberty—that freedom alike of thought and action which he believed



to be essential to the dearest interests of man. Hence his stern opposition to the doctrines, and to the policy, by which it was sought to uphold the dynasty of the Stuarts, of whose motives and personal character he takes the least favourable view. His opinions on these points are expressed in these notes with an unreserved vehemency of language, which bears witness to the depth and earnestness of his feeling.

Of the miscellaneous notes several refer to points of physical science on which the Editor is not qualified to pronounce an opinion. They refer in some cases to obsolete theories, and may perhaps contain statements at variance with modern discovery: yet, being few in number, they appear worthy of preservation, if only as showing into what devious paths the Author's researches led him, and the spirit of divination which followed him as a lamp into the darkest places. If, here and there, the light which it casts constitutes a portion of the forms which it reveals, yet the method displayed in the examination, and the singular mastery of expression with which the results are communicated, will, it is believed, sufficiently repay perusal.

The arrangement of these volumes has been adopted with a view to the convenience of purchasers, and has been followed as closely as circumstances permitted. The "Notes on Burnet," might have been added to those on "English Divines," but were overlooked by the Editor to whose hands the papers had only just been transferred.

ST. MARK'S COLLEGE, CHELSEA,  
*September 7th, 1853.*

# CONTENTS.

## THEOLOGICAL NOTES.

	Page
NOTES ON LUTHER'S TABLE TALK . . . . .	3
* NOTES ON BURNET'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION . . . . .	62
* NOTES ON CHILLINGWORTH . . . . .	73
NOTES ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER . . . . .	81
NOTES ON THE LIFE OF ST. TERESA. 1812 . . . . .	91
* NOTES ON A TRIPLE RECONCILED BY THOMAS FULLER, B.D. . . . .	97
* NOTES ON LIFE OUT OF DEATH, A SERMON BY THOMAS FULLER, B.D. . . . .	99
* NOTES ON WORTHIES OF ENGLAND, BY THOMAS FULLER, B.D. . . . .	101
* NOTES ON HOBBS'S LEVIATHAN . . . . .	102
NOTES ON ASGILL'S TREATISES . . . . .	103
* NOTE ON THE TREATISE "DE CULTU ET AMORE DEI" OF EMMANUEL SWEDENBORG . . . . .	110
* NOTES ON A DISCOURSE OF LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE BY THOMAS WHITFIELD, MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL . . . . .	111

	Page
NOTES ON THE WORKS OF ROBERT ROBINSON . . . . .	112
NOTE ON FÉNÉLON ON CHARITY . . . . .	127
NOTE ON A SERMON ON THE PREVALENCE OF INFIDELITY AND ENTHUSIASM, BY WALTER BIRCH, B.D. . . . .	128
NOTES ON LETTERS FROM SPAIN BY DON LEUCADIO DOBLADO	131
* JAHN. APPENDIX HERMENEUTICÆ . . . . .	135
NOTE ON SOUTHEY'S OMNIANA . . . . .	139
NOTE ON THEOLOGICAL LECTURES OF BENJAMIN WHEELER, D.D. . . . .	140
* NOTES ON THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, OCTOBER, 1813 . . . . .	142
* NOTES ON BIOGRAPHIA SCOTIANA . . . . .	157

---

### POLITICAL NOTES.

* NOTES ON MEMOIRS OF COL. HUTCHINSON . . . . .	169
* NOTES ON PEPYS'S DIARY . . . . .	178
* NOTES ON ALGERNON SYDNEY'S WORKS . . . . .	189
* NOTES WRITTEN IN A VOLUME OF TRACTS RELATING TO THE TIMES OF CROMWELL . . . . .	194
* NOTES WRITTEN IN A VOLUME OF TRACTS RELATING TO THE CIVIL WARS . . . . .	201
* NOTE ON HAYLEY'S LIFE OF MILTON . . . . .	202
* NOTES ON THE ROYALIST'S DEFENCE, VINDICATING THE KING'S PROCEEDINGS IN THE LATE WAR MADE AGAINST HIM . . . . .	203
* NOTES ON LIVES OF BRITISH STATESMEN . . . . .	207

	Page
* NOTES WRITTEN IN THE "LAW MAGAZINE," FOR JANUARY AND APRIL, 1830. VOL. III. . . . .	216
* NOTES WRITTEN IN THE ENCYCLOPEDIA LONDINENSIS . . . . .	218
* NOTE ON THE "VOCATION OF OUR AGE FOR LEGISLATION AND JURISPRUDENCE" . . . . .	220
* NOTE ON A LETTER TO VISCOUNT GODERICH, BY VINDEK, ON THE CONDUCT OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARDS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES . . . . .	221
* NOTES ON PARK'S DOGMAS OF THE CONSTITUTION . . . . .	223

---

### MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

* NOTES ON A NEW METHOD OF CHEMISTRY . . . . .	231
* NOTES WRITTEN IN A JOURNAL OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, CHEMISTRY, AND THE ARTS . . . . .	237
* NOTE ON OBSERVATIONS ON THE DISEASES OF THE ARMY	246
* NOTE WRITTEN IN THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF FOREIGN MEDICINE AND SURGERY . . . . .	248
* NOTES ON DONNE'S POEMS . . . . .	249
* NOTES ON LETTERS CONCERNING MIND . . . . .	262
* NOTES WRITTEN ON THE FLY-LEAVES AND MARGINS OF A COPY OF JOHN REYNOLDS'S "GOD'S REVENGE AGAINST MURDER." . . . .	265
NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S "RELIGIO MEDICI." 1802	267

	Page
NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S "RELIGIO MEDICI," MADE DURING A SECOND PERUSAL. 1808 . . . . .	274
NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S GARDEN OF CYRUS . . . . .	281
NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S VULGAR ERRORS . . . . .	283
OMNIANA * . . . . .	295
NOTE ON MR. COLERIDGE'S OBSERVATION UPON THE GIFT OF TONGUES. BY SARA COLERIDGE . . . . .	409

\* The five last articles in the Omniana are now published for the first time.—ED.

THEOLOGICAL NOTES.





## THEOLOGICAL NOTES.

---

---

### NOTES ON LUTHER'S TABLE TALK.\*

I CANNOT meditate too often, too deeply, or too devotionally on the personicity of God, and his personality in the Word, Ὑπὸ τῷ μονογενεῖ, and thence on the individuity of the responsible creature;—that it is a perfection which, not indeed in my intellect, but yet in my habit of feeling, I have too much confounded with that *complexus* of visual images, cycles or customs of sensations, and fellow-travelling circumstances (as the ship to the mariner), which make up our empirical self: thence to bring myself to apprehend lively the exceeding mercifulness and love of the act of the Son of God, in descending to seek after the prodigal children, and to house with them in the sty. Likewise by the relation of my own understanding to the light of reason, and (the most important of all the truths that have been vouchsafed to me!) to the will which is the reason,—will in the form of reason—I can

\* *Doctoris Martini Lutheri Colloquia Mensalia* : or Dr. Martin Luther's Divine Discourses at his Table, &c. Collected first together by Dr. Antonius Lauterbach, and afterwards disposed into certain common-places by John Aurifaber, Doctor in Divinity. Translated by Capt. Henry Bell. *Folio*, London, 1652.

form a sufficient gleam of the possibility of the subsistence of the human soul in Jesus to the Eternal Word, and how it might perfect itself so as to merit glorification and abiding union with the Divinity; and how this gave a humanity to our Lord's righteousness no less than to his sufferings. Doubtless, as God, as the absolute Alterity of the Absolute, he could not suffer; but that he could not lay aside the absolute, and by union with the creaturely become affectible, and a second, but spiritual Adam, and so as afterwards to be partaker of the absolute in the Absolute, even as the Absolute had partaken of passion (*τοῦ πάσχειν*) and infirmity in it, that is, the finite and fallen creature;—this can be asserted only by one who (unconsciously perhaps), has accustomed himself to think of God as a thing,—having a necessity of constitution, that wills, or rather tends and inclines to this or that, because it is this or that, not as being that, which is that which it wills to be. Such a necessity is truly compulsion; nor is it in the least altered in its nature by being assumed to be eternal, in virtue of an endless remotion or retrusion of the constituent cause, which being manifested by the understanding becomes a foreseen despair of a cause.—Sunday, 11th February, 1826.

One argument strikes me in favour of the tenet of Apostolic succession, in the ordination of bishops and presbyters, as taught by the Church of Rome, and by the larger part of the earlier divines of the Church of England, which I have not seen in any of the books on this subject; namely, that in strict analogy with other parts of Christian history, the miracle itself contained a check upon the inconvenient consequences necessarily attached to all miracles, as miracles, narrowing the possible claims to any rights not proveable at the bar of universal reason

and experience. Every man among the sectaries, however ignorant, may justify himself in scattering stones and fire-squibs by an alleged unction of the Spirit. The miracle becomes perpetual, still beginning, never ending. Now on the Church doctrine, the original miracle provides for the future recurrence to the ordinary and calculable laws of the human understanding and moral sense; instead of leaving every man a judge of his own gifts, and of his right to act publicly on that judgment. The initiative alone is supernatural; but all beginning is necessarily miraculous, that is, hath either no antecedent, or one *ἐτέρου γενοῦς*, which therefore is not its, but merely an, antecedent,—or an incausative alien co-incident in time; as if, for instance, Jack's shout were followed by a flash of lightning, which should strike and precipitate the ball on St. Paul's cathedral. This would be a miracle as long as no causative *nexus* was conceivable between the antecedent, the noise of the shout, and the consequent, the atmospheric discharge.

#### The Epistle Dedicatory.

But this will be your glory and inexpugnable, if you cleave in truth and practice to God's holy service, worship and religion: that religion and faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is pure and undefiled before God even the Father, which is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep yourselves unspotted from the world.  
—*James* i. 27.

Few mistranslations (unless indeed the word used by the translator of St. James meant differently from its present meaning), have led astray more than this rendering of *θρησκεία* (outward or ceremonial worship, *cultus*, divine service,) by the English *religion*.

St. James sublimely says : What the *ceremonies* of the law were to morality, *that* morality itself is to the faith in Christ, that is, its outward symbol, not the substance itself.

Chap. i. pp. 1, 2.

That the Bible is the word of God (said Luther) the same I prove as followeth : All things that have been and now are in the world ; also how it now goeth and standeth in the world, the same was written altogether particularly at the beginning, in the first book of Moses concerning the creation. And even as God made and created it, even so it was, even so it is, and even so doth it stand to this present day. And although King Alexander the Great, the kingdom of Egypt, the Empire of Babel, the Persian, Grecian and Roman monarchs ; the Emperors Julius and Augustus most fiercely did rage and swell against this Book, utterly to suppress and destroy the same ; yet notwithstanding they could prevail nothing, they are all gone and vanished ; but this Book from time to time hath remained, and will remain unremoved in full and ample manner as it was written at the first.

A proof worthy of the manly mind of Luther, and compared with which the Grotian pretended demonstrations, from Grotius himself to Paley, are mischievous underminings of the faith, pleadings fitter for an Old Bailey thieves' counsellor than for a Christian divine. The true evidence of the Bible is the Bible,—of Christianity the living fact of Christianity itself, as the manifest *archeus* or predominant of the life of the planet.

*Ibid.* p. 4.

The art of the School divines (said Luther) with their speculations in the Holy Scriptures, are merely vain and human cogitations, spun out of their own natural wit and under-

standing. They talk much of the union of the will and understanding, but all is mere fantasy and fondness. The right and true speculation (said Luther) is this, Believe in Christ; do what thou oughtest to do in thy vocation, &c. This is the only practice in divinity. Also, *Mystica Theologia Dionysii* is a mere fable, and a lie, like to Plato's fables. *Omnia sunt non ens, et omnia sunt ens*; all is something, and all is nothing, and so he leaveth all hanging in frivolous and idle sort.

Still, however, *du theurer Mann Gottes, mein verehrter Luther!* reason, will, understanding, are words, to which real entities correspond; and we may in a sound and good sense say that reason is the ray, the projected disk or image, from the Sun of Righteousness, an echo from the Eternal Word — *the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world*; and that when the will placeth itself in a right line with the reason, there ariseth the spirit, through which the will of God floweth into and actuates the will of man, so that it willeth the things of God, and the understanding is enlivened, and thenceforward useth the materials supplied to it by the senses symbolically; that is, with an insight into the true substance thereof.

*Ibid.* p. 9.

The Pope usurpeth and taketh to himself the power to expound and to construe the Scriptures according to his pleasure. What he saith, must stand and be spoken as from heaven. Therefore let us love and preciously value the divine word, that thereby we may be able to resist the Devil and his swarm.

As often as I use in prayer the 16th verse of the 71st Psalm (in our Prayer-book version), my thoughts

especially revert to the subject of the right appreciation of the Scriptures, and in what sense the Bible may be called the word of God, and how and under what conditions the unity of the Spirit is translucent through the letter, which, read as the letter merely, is the word of this and that pious but fallible and imperfect man. Alas! for the superstition, where the words themselves are made to be the Spirit! Oh might I live but to utter all my meditations on this most concerning point!

*Ibid.* p. 12.

Bullinger said once in my hearing (said Luther) that he was earnest against the Anabaptists, as contemners of God's word, and also against those which attributed too much to the literal word, for (said he) such do sin against God and his almighty power; as the Jews did in naming the ark, God. But, (said he) whoso holdeth a mean between both, the same is taught what is the right use of the word and sacraments.

Whereupon (said Luther) I answered him and said; Bullinger, you err, you know neither yourself, nor what you hold; I mark well your tricks and fallacies: Zuinglius and Ecolampadius likewise proceeded too far in the ungodly meaning: but when Brentius withstood them, they then lessened their opinions, alleging, they did not reject the literal word, but only condemned certain gross abuses. By this your error you cut in sunder and separate the word and the spirit, &c.

In my present state of mind, and with what light I now enjoy,—(may God increase it, and cleanse it from the dark mist into the *lumen siccum* of sincere knowledge!)—I cannot persuade myself that this vehemence of our dear man of God against Bullinger, Zuinglius and Ecolampadius on this point

could have had other origin, than his misconception of what they intended. But Luther spoke often (I like him and love him all the better therefor,) in his moods and according to the mood. Was not that a different mood, in which he called St. James's Epistle a "Jack-Straw poppet;" and even in this work selects one verse as the best in the whole letter, —evidently meaning, the only verse of any great value? Besides he accustomed himself to use the term, "the word," in a very wide sense when the narrower would have cramped him. When he was on the point of rejecting the Apocalypse, then "the word" meant the spirit of the Scriptures collectively.

*Ibid.* p. 21.

I (said Luther) do not hold that children are without faith when they are baptized; for inasmuch as they are brought to Christ by his command, and that the Church prayeth for them; therefore, without all doubt, faith is given unto them, although with our natural sense and reason we neither see nor understand it.

Nay, but dear honoured Luther! is this fair? If Christ or Scripture had said in one place, *Believe, and thou mayest be baptized*; and in another place, *Baptise infants*; then we might perhaps be allowed to reconcile the two seemingly jarring texts, by such words as "faith is given to them, although, &c." But when no such text, as the latter, is to be found, nor any one instance as a substitute, then your conclusion seems arbitrary.

*Ibid.* p. 25.

This argument (said Luther), concludeth so much as nothing; for, although they had been angels from heaven,

yet that troubleth me nothing at all ; we are now dealing about God's word, and with the truth of the Gospel, that is a matter of far greater weight to have the same kept and preserved pure and clear ; therefore we (said Luther), neither care nor trouble ourselves for, and about, the greatness of Saint Peter and the other Apostles, or how many and great miracles they wrought : the thing which we strive for is, that the truth of the Holy Gospel may stand ; for God regardeth not men's reputations nor persons.

Oh that the dear man Luther had but told us here what he meant by the term, Gospel ! That St. Paul had seen even St. Luke's, is but a conjecture grounded on a conjectural interpretation of a single text, doubly equivocal ; namely, that the Luke mentioned was the same with the evangelist Luke ; and that the *evangelium* signified a book ; the latter, of itself improbable, derives its probability from the undoubtedly very strong probability of the former. If then not any book, much less the four books, now called the four Gospels, were meant by Paul, but the contents of those books, as far as they are veracious, and whatever else was known on equal authority at that time, though not contained in those books ; if, in short, the whole sum of Christ's acts and discourses be what Paul meant by the Gospel ; then the argument is circuitous, and returns to the first point,—What *is* the Gospel ? Shall we believe you, and not rather the companions of Christ, the eye and ear witnesses of his doings and sayings ? Now I should require strong inducements to make me believe that St. Paul had been guilty of such palpably false logic ; and I therefore feel myself compelled to infer, that by the Gospel Paul intended the eternal truths known ideally from the beginning, and historically realised in the manifestation of the Word in Christ



Jesus ; and that he used the ideal immutable truth as the canon and criterion of the oral traditions. For example, a Greek mathematician, standing in the same relation of time and country to Euclid as that in which St. Paul stood to Jesus Christ, might have exclaimed in the same spirit : “ What do you talk to me of this, that, and the other intimate acquaintance of Euclid's ? My object is to convey the sublime system of geometry which he realised, and by that must I decide.” “ I,” says St. Paul, “ have been taught by the spirit of Christ, a teaching susceptible of no addition, and for which no personal anecdotes, however reverently attested, can be a substitute.” But dearest Luther was a translator ; he could not, must not, see this.

*Ibid.* p. 32.

That God's word, and the Christian Church is preserved against the raging of the world.

The Papists have lost the cause ; with God's word they are not able to resist or withstand us. \* \* \* *The kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers take counsel together, &c.* God will deal well enough with these angry gentlemen, and will give them but small thanks for their labour, in going about to suppress his word and servants ; he hath sat in counsel above these five thousand five hundred years, hath ruled and made laws. Good Sirs ! be not so choleric ; go further from the wall, lest you knock your pates against it. *Kiss the Son lest he be angry, &c.* That is, take hold on Christ, or the Devil will take hold on you, &c.

The second Psalm (said Luther) is a proud Psalm against those fellows. It begins mild and simply, but it endeth stately and rattling. \* \* \* I have now angered the Pope about his images of idolatry. O ! how the sow raiseth her bristles ! \* \* \* The Lord saith : *Ego suscitabo vos in novissimo die* : and then he will call and say : ho ! Martin

Luther, Philip Melancthon, Justus Jonas, John Calvin, &c. Arise, come up, \* \* \* Well on, (said Luther), let us be of good comfort.

A delicious paragraph. How our fine preachers would turn up their Tom-tit beaks and flirt with their tails at it! But this is the way in which the man of life, the man of power, sets the dry bones in motion.

Chap. ii. p. 37.

This is the thanks that God hath for his grace, for creating, for redeeming, sanctifying, nourishing, and for preserving us: such a seed, fruit, and godly child is the world. Oh, woe be to it!

Too true.

*Ibid.* p. 54.

That out of the best comes the worst.

Out of the Patriarchs and holy Fathers came the Jews that crucified Christ; out of the Apostles came Judas the traitor; out of the city Alexandria (where a fair illustrious and famous school was, and from whence proceeded many upright and godly learned men), came Arius and Origenes.

Poor Origen! Surely Luther was put to it for an instance, and had never read the works of that very best of the old Fathers, and eminently upright and godly learned man.

*Ibid.*

The sparrows are the least birds, and yet they are very hurtful, and have the best nourishment.

*Ergo digni sunt omni persecutione.* Poor little Philip Sparrows! Luther did not know that they more

than earn their good wages by destroying grubs and other small vermin.

*Ibid.* p. 61.

He that without danger will know God, and will speculate of him, let him look first into the manger, that is, let him begin below, and let him first learn to know the Son of the Virgin Mary, born at Bethlehem, that lies and sucks in his mother's bosom ; or let one look upon him hanging on the Cross. \* \* But take good heed in any case of high climbing cogitations, to clamber up to heaven without this ladder, namely, the Lord Christ in his humanity.

To know God as God (*τὸν Ζῆνα*, the living God) we must assume his personality: otherwise what were it but an ether, a gravitation?—but to assume his personality, we must begin with his humanity, and this is impossible but in history ; for man is an historical—not an eternal being. *Ergo*, Christianity is of necessity historical and not philosophical only.

*Ibid.* p. 62.

*What is that to thee?* said Christ to Peter. *Follow thou me*—me, follow me, and not thy questions, or cogitations.

Lord ! keep us looking to, and humbly following, thee !

Chap. vi. p. 103.

The philosophers and learned heathen (said Luther) have described God, that he is as a circle, the point whereof in the midst is every where ; but the circumference, which on the outside goeth round about, is no where : herewith they would show that God is all, and yet is nothing

What a huge difference the absence of a blank space, which is nothing, or next to nothing, may make! The words here should have been printed, "God is all, and yet is no thing."\* For what does 'thing' mean? Itself, that is, the *ing*, or inclosure that which is contained within an outline, or circumscribed. So likewise to *think* is to inclose, to determine, confine and define. To think an infinite is a contradiction in terms equal to a boundless bound. So in German *Ding, denken*; in Latin *res, reor*.

Chap. vii. p. 113.

Helvidius alleged the mother of Christ was not a virgin; so that according to his wicked allegation, Christ was born in original sin.

Oh what a tangle of impure whimsies has this notion of an immaculate conception, an Ebionite tradition, as I think, brought into the Christian Church! I have sometimes suspected that the Apostle John had a particular view to this point, in the first half of the first chapter of his gospel. Not that I suppose our present Matthew then in existence, or that, if John had seen the gospel according to Luke, the *Christopædia* had been already prefixed to it. But the rumour might have been whispered about, and as the purport was to give a psilanthropic explanation and solution of the phrases, Son of God and Son of Man,—so St. John met it by the true solution, namely, the eternal Filiation of the Word.

\* The error, if error it be, is found in the German original (*damit sie haben wollen anzeigen Gott sei alles und nichts*), and must be charged to the reporter, not to the translator or printer. But here, as elsewhere, the annotator may have brought the deeper and truer meaning which he found, and unconsciously substituted a correction for an interpretation.—D. C.

*Ibid.* p. 120. *Of Christ's riding into Jerusalem.*

But I hold (said Luther) that Christ himself did not mention that prophecy of Zechariah, but rather, that the Apostles and Evangelists did use it for a witness.

Worth remembering for the purpose of applying it to the text in which our Lord is represented in the first (or Matthew's) gospel, and by that alone, as citing Daniel by name. It was this text that so sorely, but I think very unnecessarily, perplexed and gravelled Bentley, who was too profound a scholar and too acute a critic to admit the genuineness of the whole of that book.

*Ibid.*

The Prophets (said Luther) did set, speak, and preach of the second coming of Christ in manner as we now do.

I regret that Mr. Irving should have blended such extravagancies and presumptuous prophesyings with his support and vindication of the millennium, and the return of Jesus in his corporeal individuality,—because these have furnished divines in general, both Churchmen and Dissenting, with a pretext for treating his doctrine with silent contempt. Had he followed the example of his own Ben Ezra, and argued temperately and learnedly, the controversy must have forced the momentous question on our clergy:—Are Christians bound to believe whatever an apostle believed,—and in the same way and sense? I think St. Paul himself lived to doubt the solidity of his own literal interpretation of our Lord's words.

The whole passage in which our Lord describes his coming is so evidently, and so intentionally

expressed in the diction and images of the prophets, that nothing but the carnal literality common to the Jews at that time, and most strongly marked in the disciples, who were among the least educated of their countrymen, could have prevented the symbolic import and character of the words from being seen. The whole gospel and the epistles of John, are a virtual confutation of this reigning error—and no less is the Apocalypse, whether written by, or under the authority of, the evangelist.

The unhappy effect which St. Paul's (may I not say) incautious language respecting Christ's return produced on the Thessalonians, led him to reflect on the subject, and he instantly in the second epistle to them qualified the doctrine, and never afterwards resumed it; but on the contrary, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, c. 15, substitutes the doctrine of immortality in a celestial state and a spiritual body. On the nature of our Lord's future epiphany or phenomenal person, I am not ashamed to acknowledge, that my views approach very nearly to those of Emanuel Swedenborg.

*Ibid.* p. 121.

Doctor Jacob Schenck never preacheth out of his book, but I do (said Luther), though not of necessity, but I do it for example's sake to others.

As many notes, *memoranda*, cues of connection and transition as the preacher may find expedient or serviceable to him; well and good. But to read in a manuscript book, as our clergy now do, is not to preach at all. Preach out of a book, if you must; but do not read in it, or even from it. A read sermon of twenty minutes will seem longer to the hearers than a free discourse of an hour.

*Ibid.*

My simple opinion is (said Luther), and I do believe that Christ for us descended into hell, to the end he might break and destroy the same, as in Psalm xvi. and Acts ii. is showed and proved.

Could Luther have been ignorant, that this clause was not inserted into the Apostles' Creed till the sixth century after Christ? I believe the original intention of the clause was no more than *vere mortuus est*—in contradiction to the hypothesis of a trance or state of suspended animation.

## Chap. vii. p. 122.

When Christ (said Luther) forbiddeth to spread abroad or to make known his works of wonder; there he speaketh as being sent from the Father, and doth well and right therein in forbidding them, to the end that thereby he might leave us an example, not to seek our own praise and honour in that wherein we do good; but we ought to seek only and alone the honour of God.

Not satisfactory. Doubtless, the command was in connection with the silence enjoined respecting his Messiahship.

## Chap. viii. p. 147.

Doctor Hennage said to Luther, Sir, where you say that the Holy Spirit is the certainty in the word towards God, that is, that a man is certain of his own mind and opinion; then it must needs follow that all sects have the Holy Ghost, for they will needs be most certain of their doctrine and religion.

Luther might have answered, "positive, you mean, not certain."

Chap. ix. p. 160.

But who hath power to forgive or to detain sins? Answer; the Apostles and all Church servants, and (in case of necessity) every Christian. Christ giveth them not power over money, wealth, kingdoms, &c. ; but over sins and the consciences of human creatures, over the power of the Devil, and the throat of Hell.

Few passages in the sacred writings have occasioned so much mischief, abject slavishness, bloated pride, tyrannous usurpation, bloody persecution, with kings even against their will the drudges, false soul-destroying quiet of conscience, as this text (John xx. 23) misinterpreted. It is really a tremendous proof of what the misunderstanding of a few words can do. That even Luther partook of the delusion, this paragraph gives proof. But that a delusion it is; that the commission given to the Seventy whom Christ sent out to proclaim and offer the kingdom of God, and afterwards to the apostles, refers either to the power of making rules and ordinances in the Church, or otherwise to the gifts of miraculous healing, which our Lord at that time conferred on them; and that *per figuram causæ pro effecto*, 'sins' here mean diseases, seems to me more than probable. At all events, the text surely does not mean that the salvation of a repentant and believing Christian depends upon the will of a priest in absolution.

*Ibid.* p. 161.

And again, they are able to absolve and make a human creature free and loose from all his sins, if in case he repenteth and believeth in Christ; and on the contrary, they are able to detain all his sins, if he doth not repent and believeth not in Christ.

In like manner if he sincerely repent and believe,



his sins are forgiven, whether the minister absolve him or not. Now if  $M \times 5 = 5$ , and  $5 - M = 5$ ,  $M = 0$ . If he be impenitent, and unbelieving, his sins are detained, no doubt, whether the minister do or do not detain them.

*Ibid.* p. 163.

Adam was created of God in such sort righteous, as that he became of a righteous an unrighteous person; as Paul himself argueth, and withal instructeth himself, where he saith, The law is not given for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.

This follows from the very definition or idea of righteousness;—it is itself the law;—*πᾶς γὰρ δίκαιος αὐτονόμος*.

*Ibid.*

The Scripture saith, God maketh the ungodly righteous; there he calleth us all, one with another, despairing and wicked wretches: for what will an ungodly creature not dare to accomplish, if he may but have occasion, place, and opportunity?

That is with a lust within correspondent to the temptation from without.

A Christian's conscience, methinks, ought to be a *Janus bifrons*, a gospel-face retrospective, and smiling through penitent tears on the sins of the past, and a Moses-face looking forward in frown and menace, frightening the harlot will into a holy abortion of sins conceived but not yet born, perchance not yet quickened. The fanatic Antinomian reverses this; for the past he requires all the horrors of remorse and despair, till the moment of assurance; thenceforward, he may do what he likes, for he cannot sin.

*Ibid.* p. 165.

All natural inclinations (said Luther) are either against or without God; therefore none are good. We see that no man is so honest as to marry a wife, only thereby to have children, to love and to bring them up in the fear of God.

This is a very weak instance. If a man had been commanded to marry by God, being so formed as that no sensual delight accompanied, and refused to do so, unless this appetite and gratification were added,—then indeed!

Chap. x. pp. 168-9.

Ah Lord God (said Luther), why should we any way boast of our free-will, as if it were able to do anything in divine and spiritual matters were they never so small? \* \* \* I confess that mankind hath a free-will, but it is to milk kine, to build houses, &c., and no further: for so long as a man sitteth well and in safety, and sticketh in no want, so long he thinketh he hath a free-will which is able to do something; but, when want and need appeareth, that there is neither to eat nor to drink, neither money nor provision, where is then the free-will? It is utterly lost, and cannot stand when it cometh to the pinch. But faith only standeth fast and sure, and seeketh Christ.

Luther confounds free-will with efficient power, which neither does nor can exist save where the finite will is one with the absolute Will. That Luther was practically on the right side in this famous controversy, and that he was driving at the truth, I see abundant reason to believe. But it is no less evident that he saw it in a mist, or rather as a mist with dissolving outline; and as he saw the thing as a mist, so he ever and anon mistakes a mist for the thing. But Erasmus and Saavedra were equally indistinct; and shallow and unsubstantial

to boot. In fact, till the appearance of Kant's *Kritiques* of the pure and of the practical reason, the problem had never been accurately or adequately stated, much less solved.—26 June, 1826.

*Ibid.* p. 174.

Loving friends (said Luther), our doctrine that free-will is dead and nothing at all is grounded powerfully in Holy Scripture.

It is of vital importance for a theological student to understand clearly the utter diversity of the Lutheran, which is likewise the Calvinistic, denial of free-will in the unregenerate, and the doctrine of the modern Necessitarians and (*proh pudor!*) of the later Calvinists, which denies the proper existence of will altogether. The former is sound, scriptural, compatible with the divine justice, a new, yea, a mighty motive to morality; and, finally, the dictate of common sense grounded on common experience. The latter the very contrary of all these.

Chap. xii. p. 187.

This is now (said Luther), the first instruction concerning the law; namely, that the same must be used to hinder the ungodly from their wicked and mischievous intentions. For the Devil, who is an Abbot and a Prince of this world, driveth and allureth people to work all manner of sin and wickedness; for which cause God hath ordained magistrates, elders, schoolmasters, laws, and statutes, to the end, if they cannot do more, yet at least that they may bind the claws of the Devil, and to hinder him from raging and swelling so powerfully (in those which are his) according to his will and pleasure.

And (said Luther), although thou hadst not committed this or that sin, yet nevertheless, thou art an ungodly

creature, &c. ; but what is done cannot be undone, he that hath stolen, let him henceforward steal no more.

Secondly, we use the law spiritually, which is done in this manner ; that it maketh the transgressions greater, as Saint Paul saith ; that is, that it may reveal and discover to people their sins, blindness, misery, and ungodly doings wherein they were conceived and born ; namely, that they are ignorant of God, and are his enemies, and therefore have justly deserved death, hell, God's judgments, his everlasting wrath and indignation. Saint Paul (said Luther), expoundeth such spiritual offices and works of the law with many words.—*Rom. vii.*

Nothing can be more sound or more philosophic than the contents of these two paragraphs. They afford a sufficient answer to the pretence of the Romanists and Arminians, that by the law St. Paul meant only the ceremonial law.

*Ibid.* p. 189.

And if Moses had not cashiered and put himself out of his office, and had not taken it away with these words, (where he saith, *The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee another prophet out of thy brethren ; Him shalt thou hear.* (Deut. xviii.), who then at any time would or could have believed the Gospel, and forsaken Moses ?

If I could be persuaded that this passage (Deut. xviii. 15—19) primarily referred to Christ, and that Christ, not Joshua and his successors, was the prophet here promised ; I must either become a Unitarian psilanthropist, and join Priestley and Belsham,—or abandon to the Jews their own Messiah as yet to come, and cling to the religion of John and Paul, without further reference to Moses than to Lycurgus, Solon, and Numa ; all of whom in their different spheres no less prepared the way for the coming of the Lord, *the desire of the nations.*

*Ibid.* p. 190.

It is therefore most evident (said Luther), that the law can but only help us to know our sins, and to make us afraid of death. Now sins and death are such things as belong to the world, and which are therein.

Both in Paul and Luther, (names which I can never separate,)—not indeed peculiar to these, for it is the same in the Psalms, Ezekiel, and throughout the Scriptures, but which I feel most in Paul and Luther,—there is one fearful blank, the wisdom or necessity of which I do not doubt, yet cannot help groping and straining after like one that stares in the dark; and this is death. The law makes us afraid of death. What is death?—an unhappy life? Who does not feel the insufficiency of this answer? What analogy does immortal suffering bear to the only death which is known to us?

Since I wrote the above, God has, I humbly trust, given me a clearer light as to the true nature of the *death* so often mentioned in the Scriptures.

*Ibid.*

It is (said Luther), a very hard matter: yea, an impossible thing for thy human strength, whosoever thou art (without God's assistance) that (at such a time when Moses setteth upon thee with his law, and fearfully affrighteth thee, accuseth and condemneth thee, threateneth thee with God's wrath and death) thou shouldest as then be of such a mind; namely, as if no law nor sin had ever been at any time:—I say, it is in a manner a thing impossible, that a human creature should carry himself in such a sort, when he is and feeleth himself assaulted with trials and temptations, and when the conscience hath to do with God, as then to think no otherwise, than that from everlasting nothing hath been, but only and alone Christ, altogether grace and deliverance.

Yea, verily, Amen and Amen! For this short heroic paragraph contains the sum and substance, the height and the depth of all true philosophy. Most assuredly right difficult it is for us, while we are yet in the narrow chamber of death, with our faces to the dusky falsifying looking-glass that covers the scant end-side of the blind passage from floor to ceiling,—right difficult for us, so wedged between its walls that we cannot turn round, nor have other escape possible but by walking backward, to understand that all we behold or have any memory of having ever beholden, yea, our very selves as seen by us, are but shadows, and when the forms that we loved vanish, impossible not to feel as if they were real.

*Ibid.* p. 197.

Nothing that is good proceedeth out of the works of the law, except grace be present; for what we are forced to do, the same goeth not from the heart, neither is acceptable.

A law supposes a law-giver, and implies an actuator and executor, and consequently rewards and punishments publicly announced, and distinctly assigned to the deeds enjoined or forbidden; and correlatively in the subjects of the law, there are supposed, first, assurance of the being, the power, the veracity and seeingness of the law-giver, in whom I here comprise the legislative, judicial and executive functions; and secondly, self-interest, desire, hope and fear. Now from this view, it is evident that the deeds or works of the law are themselves null and dead, deriving their whole significance from their attachment or alligation to the rewards and punishments, even as this diversely shaped and ink coloured paper has its value wholly from the

words or meanings, which have been arbitrarily connected therewith ; or as a ladder, or flight of stairs, of a provision-loft, or treasury. If the architect or master of the house had chosen to place the store-room or treasury on the ground-floor, the ladder or steps would have been useless. The life is divided between the rewards and punishments on the one hand, and the hope and fear on the other ; namely, the active life or excitancy belongs to the former, the passive life or excitability to the latter. Call the former the afficients, the latter the affections, the deeds being merely the signs or impresses of the former, as the seal, on the latter as the wax. Equally evident is it, that the affections are wholly formed by the deeds, which are themselves but the lifeless unsubstantial shapes of the actual forms (*formæ formantes*), namely, the rewards and punishments. Now contrast with this the process of the Gospel. There the affections are formed in the first instance, not by any reference to works or deeds, but by an unmerited rescue from death, liberation from slavish task-work ; by faith, gratitude, love, and affectionate contemplation of the exceeding goodness and loveliness of the Saviour, Redeemer, Benefactor : from the affections flow the deeds, or rather the affections overflow in the deeds, and the rewards are but a continuance and continued increase of the free grace in the state of the soul and in the growth and gradual perfecting of that state, which are themselves gifts of the same free grace, and one with the rewards ; for in the kingdom of Christ which is the realm of love and inter-community, the joy and grace of each regenerated spirit becomes double, and thereby augments the joys and the graces of the others, and the joys and graces of all unite in each ; — Christ, the head, and by his Spirit the bond, or

unitive *copula* of all, being the spiritual sun whose entire image is reflected in every individual of the myriads of dew-drops. While under the law, the all was but an aggregate of subjects, each striving after a reward for himself,—not as included in and resulting from the state,—but as the stipulated wages of the task-work, as a loaf of bread may be the pay or bounty promised for the hewing of wood or the breaking of stones!

*Ibid.*

He (said Luther), that will dispute with the Devil, &c.

Queries.

I. Abstractedly from, and independently of, all sensible substances, and the bodies, wills, faculties, and affections of men, has the Devil, or would the Devil have, a personal self-subsistence? Does he, or can he, exist as a conscious individual agent or person? Should the answer to this query be in the negative: then—

II. Do there exist finite and personal beings, whether with composite and decomposable bodies, that is, embodied, or with simple and indecomposable bodies (which is all that can be meant by disembodied as applied to finite creatures), so eminently wicked, or wicked and mischievous in so peculiar a kind, as to constitute a distinct *genus* of beings under the name of devils?

III. Is this second *hypothesis* compatible with the acts and functions attributed to the Devil in Scripture? O! to have had these three questions put by Melancthon to Luther, and to have heard his reply!

*Ibid.* p. 200.

If (said Luther) God should give unto us a strong and an unwavering faith, then we should be proud, yea also, we



should at last contemn Him. Again, if he should give us the right knowledge of the law, then we should be dismayed and faint-hearted, we should not know which way to wind ourselves.

The main reason is, because in this instance, the change in the relation constitutes the difference of the things. A. considered as acting *ab extra* on the selfish fears and desires of men is the law: the same A. acting *ab intra* as a new nature infused by grace, as the mind of Christ prompting to all obedience, is the gospel. Yet what Luther says is likewise very true. Could we reduce the great spiritual truths or ideas of our faith to comprehensible conceptions, or (for the thing itself is impossible) fancy we had done so, we should inevitably be 'proud vain asses.'

*Ibid.* p. 203.

And as to know his works and actions, is not yet rightly to know the Gospel (for thereby we know not as yet that he hath overcome sin, death, and the Devil); even so likewise, it is not as yet to know the Gospel, when we know such doctrine and commandments, but when the voice soundeth, which saith, Christ is thine own with life, with doctrine, with works, death, resurrection, and with all that he hath, doth and may do.

Most true.

*Ibid.* p. 205.

The ancient Fathers said: *Distingue tempora, et concordabis Scripturas*; distinguish the times; then may we easily reconcile the Scriptures together.

Yea! and not only so, but we shall reconcile truths, that seem to repeal this or that passage of Scripture, with the Scriptures. For Christ is with his Church even to the end.

*Ibid.*

I verily believe (said Luther) it (the abolition of the Law) vexed to the heart the beloved St. Paul himself before his conversion.

How dearly Martin Luther loved St. Paul! How dearly would St. Paul have loved Martin Luther! And how impossible, that either should not have done so!

*Ibid.*

In this case, touching the distinguishing the Law from the Gospel, we must utterly expel all human and natural wisdom, reason, and understanding.

All reason is above nature. Therefore by reason in Luther, or rather in his translator, you must understand the reasoning faculty:—that is, the logical intellect, or the intellectual understanding. For the understanding is in all respects a medial and mediate faculty, and has therefore two extremities or poles, the sensual, in which form it is St. Paul's *φρόνημα σαρκός*; and the intellectual pole, or the hemisphere (as it were) turned towards the reason. Now the reason (*lux idealis seu spiritualis*) shines down into the understanding, which recognises the light, *id est, lumen à luce spirituali quasi alienigenum aliquid*, which it can only comprehend or describe to itself by attributes opposite to its own essential properties. Now these latter being contingency, and (for though the immediate objects of the understanding are *genera et species*, still they are particular *genera et species*) particularity, it distinguishes the formal light (*lumen*)—not the substantial light, *lux*—of reason by the attributes of the necessary and the universal; and by irradiation of this *lumen* or *shine* the under-

standing becomes a conclusive or logical faculty. As such it is *Λόγος ἀνθρώπινος*.

*Ibid.* p. 206.

When Satan saith in thy heart, God will not pardon thy sins, nor be gracious unto thee, I pray (said Luther) how wilt thou then, as a poor sinner, raise up and comfort thyself, especially when other signs of God's wrath besides do beat upon thee, as sickness, poverty, &c. And that thy heart beginneth to preach and say, Behold here, thou livest in sickness, thou art poor and forsaken of every one, &c.

Oh! how true, how affectingly true is this! And when too Satan the tempter, becomes Satan the accuser, saying in thy heart:—"This sickness is the consequence of sin, or sinful infirmity, and thou hast brought thyself into a fearful dilemma; thou canst not hope for salvation as long as thou continuest in any sinful practice, and yet thou canst not abandon thy daily dose of this or that poison without suicide. For the sin of thy soul has become the necessity of thy body, daily tormenting thee, without yielding thee any the least pleasurable sensation, but goading thee on by terror without hope. Under such evidence of God's wrath how canst thou expect to be saved?" Well may the heart cry out, "Who shall deliver me from the *body of this death*,—from this death that lives and tyrannises in my body?" But the Gospel answers—"There is a redemption from the body promised; only cling to Christ. Call on him continually with all thy heart and all thy soul, to give thee strength, and be strong in thy weakness; and what Christ doth not see good to relieve thee from, suffer in hope. It may be better for thee to be kept humble and in self-abasement. The thorn in the flesh may remain and yet the grace of God

through Christ prove sufficient for thee. Only cling to Christ, and do thy best. In all love and well-doing gird thyself up to improve and use aright what remains free in thee, and if thou doest aught aright, say and thankfully believe that Christ hath done it for thee." O what a miserable despairing wretch should I become, if I believed the doctrines of Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his Treatise on Repentance, or those I heard preached by Dr.—; if I gave up the faith, that the life of Christ would precipitate the remaining dregs of sin in the crisis of death, and that I shall rise in purer capacity of Christ; blind to be irradiated by his light, empty to be possessed by his fullness, naked of merit to be clothed with his righteousness!

*Ibid.* p. 267.

The nobility, the gentry, citizens, and farmers, &c. are now become so haughty and ungodly, that they regard no ministers nor preachers; and (said Luther) if we were not holpen somewhat by great princes and persons, we could not long subsist: therefore Isaiah saith well, *And kings shall be their nurses, &c.*

Corpulent nurses too often, that overlay the babe; distempered nurses, that convey poison in their milk!

Chap. xiii. p. 208.

Philip Melancthon said to Luther, The opinion of St. Austin of justification (as it seemeth) was more pertinent, fit and convenient when he disputed not, than it was when he used to speak and dispute; for thus he saith, We ought to censure and hold that we are justified by faith, that is by our regeneration, or by being made new creatures. Now if it be so, then we are not justified only by faith, but by all the gifts and virtues of God given unto us. Now what is

your opinion, Sir? Do you hold that a man is justified by this regeneration, as is St. Austin's opinion?

Luther answered and said, I hold this, and am certain, that the true meaning of the Gospel and of the Apostle is, that we are justified before God *gratis*, for nothing, only by God's mere mercy, wherewith and by reason whereof, he imputeth righteousness unto us in Christ.

True; but is it more than a dispute about words? Is not the regeneration likewise *gratis*, only by God's mere mercy? We, according to the necessity of our imperfect understandings, must divide and distinguish. But surely justification and sanctification are one act of God, and only different perspectives of redemption by and through and for Christ. They are one and the same plant, justification the root, sanctification the flower; and (may I not venture to add?) transubstantiation into Christ the celestial fruit.

*Ibid.* pp. 210-11. *Melancthon's sixth reply.*

Sir! you say Paul was justified, that is, was received to everlasting life, only for mercy's sake. Against which, I say, if the piece-meal or partial cause, namely, our obedience, followeth not, then we are not saved, according to these words, *Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel.* 1 Cor. ix.

*Luther's answer.*

No piecing or partial cause (said Luther) approacheth thereunto: for faith is powerful continually without ceasing; otherwise, it is no faith. Therefore what the works are, or of what value, the same they are through the honour and power of faith, which undeniably is the sun or sun-beam of this shining.

This is indeed a difficult question; and one, I am disposed to think, which can receive its solution only by the idea, or the act and fact of justification by faith self-reflected. But humanly considered, this position of Luther's provokes the mind to ask, is

there no receptivity of faith, considered as a free gift of God, prerequisite in the individual? Does faith commence by generating the receptivity of itself? If so, there is no difference either in kind or in degree between the receivers and the rejectors of the word, at the moment preceding this reception or rejection; and a stone is a subject as capable of faith as a man. How can obedience exist, where disobedience was not possible? Surely two or three texts from St. Paul, detached from the total *organismus* of his reasoning, ought not to out-weigh the plain fact, that the contrary position is implied in, or is an immediate consequent of, our Lord's own invitations and assurances. Every where a something is attributed to the will.

N.B. I should not have written the above note in my present state of light;—not that I find it false, but that it may have the effect of falsehood by not going deep enough. July, 1829.

Chap. xiii. p. 211.

To conclude, a faithful person is a new creature, a new tree. Therefore all these speeches, which in the law are usual, belong not to this case; as to say *A faithful person must do good works*. Neither were it rightly spoken, to say the sun shall shine: a good tree shall bring forth good fruit, &c. For the sun *shall* not shine, but it doth shine by nature unbidden, it is thereunto created. [*Die Sonne sol scheinen, ein guter Baum sol gute Früchte bringen, drei und sieben sollen zehen seyn. Denn die Sonne sol nicht scheinen, sondern sie thuts ungeheissen von Natur, denn sie ist dazu geschaffen.*]

This important paragraph is obscure by the translator's ignorance of the true import of the German *soll*, which does not answer to our *shall*; but rather to our *ought*, that is, *should* do this or that,—is under an obligation to do it.

*Ibid.* p. 213.

And I, my loving Brentius, to the end I may better understand this case, do use to think in this manner, namely, as if in my heart were no quality or virtue at all, which is called faith and love (as the Sophists do speak and dream thereof), but I set all on Christ, and say, my *formalis justitia*, that is, my sure, my constant and complete righteousness (in which is no want nor failing, but is, as before God it ought to be) is Christ my Lord and Saviour.

Ay! this, this is indeed to the purpose. In this doctrine my soul can find rest. I hope to be saved by faith, not by my faith, but by the faith of Christ in me.

*Ibid.* p. 214.

The Scripture nameth the faithful a people of God's saints. But here one may say; the sins which daily we commit, do offend and anger God; how then can we be holy? *Answer.* A mother's love to her child is much stronger than are the excrements and scurf thereof. Even so God's love towards us is far stronger than our filthiness and uncleanness.

Yea, one may say again, we sin without ceasing, and where sin is, there the holy Spirit is not: therefore we are not holy, because the holy Spirit is not in us, who maketh holy. *Answer.* (John xvi. 14.) Now where Christ is, there is the holy Spirit. The text saith plainly, *The holy Ghost shall glorify me, &c.* Now Christ is in the faithful (although they have and feel sins, do confess the same, and with sorrow of heart do complain thereover); therefore sins do not separate Christ from those that believe.

All in this page is true, and necessary to be preached. But O! what need is there of holy prudence to preach it aright, that is, at right times to the right ears! Now this is when the doctrine is necessary and thence comfortable; but where it is

not necessary, but only very comfortable, in such cases it would be a narcotic poison, killing the soul by infusing a stupor or counterfeit peace of conscience. Where there are no sinkings of self-abasement, no griping sense of sin and worthlessness, but perhaps the contrary, reckless confidence and self-valuing for good qualities supposed an overbalance for the sins,—there it is not necessary. In short, these are not the truths, that can be preached *ευκαιρως ἀκαίρως*, *in season and out of season*.

In declining life, or at any time in the hour of sincere humiliation, these truths may be applied in reference to past sins collectively; but a Christian must not, a true however infirm Christian will not, cannot, administer them to himself immediately after sinning; least of all immediately before. We ought fervently to pray thus:—"Most holy and most merciful God! by the grace of thy holy Spirit make these promises profitable to me, to preserve me from despairing of thy forgiveness through Christ my Saviour! But O! save me from presumptuously perverting them into a pillow for a stupified conscience! Give me grace so to contrast my sin with thy transcendent goodness and long-suffering love, as to hate it with an unfeigned hatred for its own exceeding sinfulness."

*Ibid.* pp. 219-20.

Faith is, and consisteth in, a person's understanding, but hope consisteth in the will. \* \* Faith inditeth, distinguisheth and teacheth, and it is the knowledge and acknowledgement. \* \* Faith fighteth against error and heresies, it proveth, censureth, and judgeth the spirits and doctrines. \* \* Faith in divinity is the wisdom and providence, and belongeth to the doctrine. \* \* Faith is the *dialectica*, for it is altogether wit and wisdom.



Luther in his Postills discourseth far better and more genially of faith than in these paragraphs. Unfortunately, the Germans have but one word for faith and belief—*Glaube*; and what Luther here says, is spoken of belief. Of faith he speaks in the next article but one.

*Ibid.* p. 226.

That regeneration only maketh God's children.

The article of our justification before God (said Luther) is, as it useth to be with a son which is born an heir of all his father's goods, and cometh not thereunto by deserts.

I will here record my experience. Ever when I meet with the doctrine of regeneration and faith and free grace simply announced—"So it is!"—then I believe; my heart leaps forth to welcome it. But as soon as an explanation or reason is added, such explanations, namely, and reasonings as I have any where met with, then my heart leaps back again, recoils, and I exclaim, Nay! Nay! but not so. 25th of September, 1819.

*Ibid.* p. 227.

Doctor Carlestad (said Luther) argueth thus: True it is that faith justifieth, but faith is a work of the first commandment; therefore it justifieth as a work. Moreover all that the Law commandeth, the same is a work of the Law. Now faith is commanded, therefore faith is a work of the Law. Again, what God will have, the same is commanded: God will have faith, therefore faith is commanded.

St. Paul (said Luther) speaketh in such sort of the law, that he separateth it from the promise, which is far another thing than the law. The law is terrestrial, but the promise is celestial. God giveth the law to the end we may thereby be roused up and made pliant; for the commandments do go and proceed against the proud and haughty, which

contemn God's gifts; now a gift or present cannot be a commandment.

Therefore we must answer according to this rule, *Verba sunt accipienda secundum subjectam materiam*. \* \* St. Paul calleth that the work of the law, which is done and acted through the knowledge of the law by a constrained will without the holy Spirit; so that the same is a work of the law, which the law earnestly requireth and strictly will have done; it is not a voluntary work, but a forced work of the rod.

And wherein did Carlestad and Luther differ? Not at all, or essentially and irreconcilably, according as the feeling of Carlestad was. If he meant the particular deed, the latter; if the total act, the agent included, then the former.

Chap. xiv. p. 230.

The love towards the neighbour (said Luther) must be like a pure chaste love between bride and bridegroom, where all faults are connived at, covered and borne with, and only the virtues regarded.

In how many little escapes and corner-holes does the sensibility, the fineness (that of which refinement is but a counterfeit, at best but a reflex), the geniality of nature appear in this *son of thunder!* O for a Luther in the present age! Why, Charles!\* with the very handcuffs of his prejudices he would knock out the brains (nay, that is impossible, but), he would split the skulls of our *Cristo-galli*, translate the word as you like: — French Christians, or coxcombs!

*Ibid.* pp. 231-2.

Let Witzell know, (said Luther) that David's wars and

\* Charles Lamb.—Ed.

battles, which he fought, were more pleasing to God than the fastings and prayings of the best, of the honestest, and of the holiest monks and friars: much more than the works of our new ridiculous and superstitious friars.

A cordial, rich and juicy speech, such as shaped itself into, and lived anew in, the Gustavus Adolphuses.

Chap. xv. pp. 293-4.

God most certainly heareth them that pray in faith, and granteth when and how he pleaseth, and knoweth most profitable for them. We must also know, that when our prayers tend to the sanctifying of his name, and to the increase and honour of his kingdom (also that we pray according to his will) then most certainly he heareth. But when we pray contrary to these points, then we are not heard; for God doth nothing against his Name, his kingdom, and his will.

Then (saith the understanding, τὸ φρόνημα σαρκὸς) what doth prayer effect? If  $A = B$ , and  $A + \text{prayer} = B$ ,  $\text{prayer} = 0$ . The attempt to answer this argument by admitting its invalidity relatively to God, but asserting the efficacy of prayer relatively to the pray-er or precant himself, is merely staving off the objection a single step. For this effect on the devout soul is produced by an act of God. The true answer is, prayer is an idea, and *ens spirituale*, out of the cognisance of the understanding.

The spiritual mind receives the answer in the contemplation of the idea, life as *deitas diffusa*. We can set the life in efficient motion, but not contrary to the form or type. The errors and false theories of great men sometimes, perhaps most often, arise

out of true ideas falsified by degenerating into conceptions; or the mind excited to action by an inworking idea, the understanding works in the same direction according to its kind, and produces a counterfeit, in which the mind rests.

This I believe to be the case with the scheme of emanation in Plotinus. God is made a first and consequently a comparative intensity, and matter the last; the whole thence finite; and thence its conceivability. But we must admit a gradation of intensities in reality.

Chap. xvi. p. 247.

When governors and rulers are enemies to God's word, then our duty is to depart, to sell and forsake all we have, to fly from one place to another, as Christ commandeth; we must make and prepare no uproars nor tumults by reason of the Gospel, but we must suffer all things.

Right. But then it must be the lawful rulers; those in whom the sovereign or supreme power is lodged by the known laws and constitution of the country. Where the laws and constitutional liberties of the nation are trampled on, the subjects do not lose, and are not in conscience bound to forego, their right of resistance, because they are Christians, or because it happens to be a matter of religion, in which their rights are violated. And this was Luther's opinion. Whether, if a popish Czar shall act as our James II. acted, the Russian Greekists would be justified in doing with him what the English Protestants justifiably did with regard to James, is a knot which I shall not attempt to cut; though I guess the Russiaus would, by cutting their Czar's throat.

*Ibid.*

But no man will do this, except he be so sure of his doctrine and religion, as that, although I myself should play the fool, and should recant and deny this my doctrine and religion (which God forbid), he notwithstanding therefore would not yield, but say, "If Luther, or an angel from heaven, should teach otherwise, *Let him be accursed.*"

Well and nobly said, thou rare black swan ! This, this is the Church. Where this is found, there is the Church of Christ, though but twenty in the whole of the congregation ; and were twenty such in two hundred different places, the Church would be entire in each. Without this no Church.

*Ibid.* p. 248.

And he sent for one of his chiefest privy councillors, named Lord John *Von Minkwitz*, and said unto him ; " You have heard my father say (running with him at tilt), that to sit upright on horseback maketh a good tilter. If therefore it be good and laudable in temporal tilting to sit upright ; how much more is it now praiseworthy in God's cause to sit, to stand, and to go uprightly and just ! "

Princely. So Shakspeare would have made a Prince Elector talk. The metaphor is so grandly in character.

Chap. xvii. p. 249.

*Signa sunt subinde facta minora ; res autem et facta subinde creverunt.*

A valuable remark. As the substance waxed, that is, became more evident, the ceremonial sign waned, till at length in the Eucharist the *signum* united itself with the *significatum*, and became consubstantial. The ceremonial sign, namely, the eating

the bread and drinking the wine, became a symbol, that is, a solemn instance and exemplification of the class of mysterious acts, which we are, or as Christians should be, performing daily and hourly in every social duty and recreation. This is indeed to recreate the man in and by Christ. Sublimely did the fathers call the Eucharist the extension of the Incarnation: only I should have preferred the perpetuation and application of the Incarnation.

*Ibid.*

A bare writing without a seal is of no force.

Metaphors are sorry logic, especially metaphors from human and those too conventional usages to the ordinances of eternal wisdom.

*Ibid.* p. 250.

Luther said, No. "A Christian is wholly and altogether sanctified. \* \* We must take sure hold on Baptism by faith, as then we shall be, yea, already are, sanctified. In this sort David nameth himself holy."

A deep thought. Strong meat for men. It must not be offered for milk.

Chap. xxi. p. 276.

Then I will declare him openly to the Church, and in this manner I will say: "Loving friends, I declare unto you how that N. N. hath been admonished: first, by myself in private, afterwards also by two chaplains, thirdly, by two aldermen and churchwardens, and those of the assembly: yet notwithstanding he will not desist from his sinful kind of life. Wherefore I earnestly desire you to assist and aid me, to kneel down with me, and let us pray against him, and deliver him over to the Devil."

Luther did not mean that this should be done all at once; but that a day should be appointed for the congregation to meet for joint consultation, and according to the resolutions passed to choose and commission such and such persons to wait on the offender, and to exhort, persuade and threaten him in the name of the congregation: then, if after due time allowed, this proved fruitless, to kneel down with the minister, &c. Surely, were it only feasible, nothing could be more desirable. But alas! it is not compatible with a Church national, the congregations of which are therefore not gathered nor elected, or with a Church established by law; for law and discipline are mutually destructive of each other, being the same as involuntary and voluntary penance.

Chap. xxii. p. 290.

Wicliffe and Huss opposed and assaulted the manner of life and conversation in Popedom. But I chiefly do oppose and resist their doctrine; I affirm roundly and plainly that they teach not aright. Thereto am I called. I take the goose by the neck, and set the knife to the throat. When I can maintain that the Pope's doctrine is false, (which I have proved and maintained), then I will easily prove and maintain that their manner of life is evil.

This is a remark of deep insight: *verum vere Lutheranium.*

*Ibid.* p. 291.

Ambition and pride (said Luther) are the rankest poison in the Church when they are possessed by preachers. Zuinglius thereby was misled, who did what pleased himself. \* \* \* He wrote, "Ye honorable and good princes must pardon me, in that I give you not your titles; for the glass windows are as well illustrious as ye."

One might fancy, in the Vision-of-Mirza style, that all the angry, contemptuous, haughty expressions of good and zealous men, gallant staff-officers in the army of Christ, formed a rick of straw and stubble, which at the last day is to be divided into more or fewer haycocks, according to the number of kind and unfeignedly humble and charitable thoughts and speeches that had intervened, and that these were placed in a pile, leap-frog fashion, in the narrow road to the gate of paradise; and burst into flame as the zeal of the individual approached,—so that he must leap over and through them. Now I cannot help thinking, that this dear man of God, heroic Luther, will find more opportunities of showing his agility, and reach the gate in a greater sweat and with more blisters *a parte post* than his brother hero, Zuinglius. I guess that the comments of the latter on the prophets will be found almost sterile in these tiger-lilies and brimstone flowers of polemic rhetoric, compared with the controversy of the former with our Henry VIII., his replies to the Pope's Bulls, and the like.

By the by, the joke of the "glass windows" is lost in the translation. The German for illustrious is *durchlauchtig*, that is, transparent or translucent.

*Ibid.*

When we leave to God his name, his kingdom, and will, then will he also give unto us our daily bread, and will remit our sins, and deliver us from the devil and all evil. Only his honour he will have to himself.

A brief but most excellent comment on the Lord's Prayer.



*Ibid.* p. 297.

There was never any that understood the Old Testament so well as St. Paul, except only John the Baptist.

I cannot conjecture what Luther had in his mind when he made this exception.\*

Chap. xxvii. p. 335.

I could wish (said Luther) that the Princes and States of the Empire would make an assembly, and hold a council and a union both in doctrine and ceremonies, so that every one might not break in and run on with such insolency and presumption according to his own brains, as already is begun, whereby many good hearts are offended.

Strange heart of man ! Would Luther have given up the doctrine of justification by faith alone, had the majority of the Council decided in favour of the Arminian scheme ? If not, by what right could he expect Oecolampadius or Zuinglius to recant their convictions respecting the Eucharist, or the Baptists theirs on infant Baptism, to the same authority ? In fact, the wish expressed in this passage must be considered as a mere flying thought shot out by the mood and feeling of the moment, a sort of conversational flying-fish that dropped as soon as the moisture of the fins had evaporated. The paragraph in p. 336, of what Councils ought to order, should be considered Luther's genuine opinion.

*Ibid.* p. 337.

The Council of Nice, held after the Apostles' time (said Luther) was the very best and purest ; but soon after in

\* Probably the text (John i. 29) : "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world !" — the sum and substance of the Old Testament dispensation, gathered from the Old Testament itself, previous to the publication of the Gospel.—ED.

the time of the Emperor Constantine, it was weakened by the Arians.

What Arius himself meant, I do not know : what the modern Arians teach, I utterly condemn ; but that the great Council of Ariminum was either Arian or heretical I could never discover, or descry any essential difference between its decisions and the Nicene ; though I seem to find a serious difference of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed from both. If there be a difference between the councils of Nicea and Ariminum, it perhaps consists in this ;—that the Nicene was the more anxious to assert the equal Divinity in the Filial subordination ; the Ariminian to maintain the Filial subordination in the equal Divinity. In both there are three self-subsistent and only one self-originated :—which is the substance of the idea of the Trinity, as faithfully worded as is compatible with the necessary inadequacy of words to the expression of ideas, that is, “spiritual truths that can only be spiritually discerned.”\* 18th August, 1826.

Chap. xxviii. p. 347.

God's word a Lord of all Lords.

Luther every where identifies the living Word of God with the written word, and rages against Bullinger, who contended that the latter is the word of God only as far as and for whom it is the vehicle of the former. To this Luther replies : “My voice, the vehicle of my words, does not cease to be my voice, because it is ignorantly or maliciously mis-

\* “Out of the number of 400, there were but 80 Arians at the utmost. The other 320 and more were really orthodox men, induced by artifices to subscribe a Creed which they understood in a good sense, but which, being worded in general terms, was capable of being perverted to a bad one.” *Waterland, Vindication, &c.*, c. vi.—ED.

understood." Yea! (might Bullinger have rejoined) the instance were applicable and the argument valid, if we were previously assured that all and every part of the Old and New Testament is the voice of the divine Word. But, except by the Spirit, whence are we to ascertain this? Not from the books themselves; for not one of them makes the pretension for itself, and the two or three texts, which seem to assert it, refer only to the Law and the Prophets, and no where enumerate the books that were given by inspiration: and how obscure the history of the formation of the Canon, and how great the difference of opinion respecting its different parts, what scholar is ignorant?

Chap. xxix. p. 349.

*Patres, quamquam sæpe errant, tamen venerandi propter testimonium fidei.*

Although I learn from all this chapter, that Luther was no great Patrician (indeed he was better employed), yet I am nearly, if not wholly of his mind respecting the works of the Fathers. Those which appear to me of any great value are valuable chiefly for those articles of Christian Faith which are, as it were, *ante Christum* JESUM, namely, the Trinity, and the primal Incarnation spoken of by John, i. 10. But in the main I should perhaps go even farther than Luther; for I cannot conceive any thing more likely than that a young man of strong and active intellect, who has no fears, or suffers no fears of worldly prudence to cry, Halt! to him in his career of consequential logic, and who has been *innutritus et juratus* in the Grotio-Paleyian scheme of Christian evidence, and who has been taught by the men and books, which he has been bred up to regard as authority, to consider all inward experiences as

fanatical delusions;—I say, I can scarcely conceive such a young man to make a serious study of the Fathers of the first four or five centuries without becoming either a Romanist or a Deist. Let him only read Petavius and the different Patristic and Ecclesiastico-historical tracts of Semler, and have no better philosophy than that of Locke, no better theology than that of Arminius and Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and I should tremble for his belief. Yet why tremble for a belief which is the very antipode of faith? Better for such a man to precipitate himself on to the utmost goal: for then perhaps he may in the repose of intellectual activity feel the nothingness of his prize, or the wretchedness of it; and then perhaps the inward yearning after a religion may make him ask;—“Have I not mistaken the road at the outset? Am I sure that the Reformers, Luther and the rest collectively, were fanatics?”

*Ibid.* p. 351.

*Take no care what ye shall eat.* As though that commandment did not hinder the carping and caring for the daily bread.

For ‘caring,’ read ‘anxiety!’ *Sit tibi curæ, non autem sollicitudini, panis quotidianus.*

*Ibid.* p. 351.

Even so it was with Ambrose: he wrote indeed well and purely, was more serious in writing than Austin, who was amiable and mild. \* \* \* Fulgentius is the best poet, and far above Horace, both with sentences, fair speeches and good actions; he is well worthy to be ranked and numbered with and among the poets.

*Der Teufel!* Surely the epithets should be

reversed. Austin's mildness—the *durus pater infantum!* And the *super*-Horatian effulgence of Master Foolgentius! O Swan! thy critical cygnets are but goslings.

N.B. I have, however, since I wrote the above, heard Mr. J. Hookham Frere speak highly of Fulgentius.

*Ibid.* p. 352.

For the Fathers were but men, and to speak the truth, their reputes and authorities did undervalue and suppress the books and writings of the sacred Apostles of Christ.

We doubtless find in the writings of the Fathers of the second century, and still more strongly in those of the third, passages concerning the Scriptures that seem to say the same as we Protestants now do. But then we find the very same phrases used of writings not Apostolic, or with no other difference than what the greater name of the authors would naturally produce; just as a Platonist would speak of Speusippus's books, were they extant, compared with those of later teachers of Platonism;—'He was Plato's nephew—had seen Plato—was his appointed successor, &c.' But in inspiration the early Christians, as far as I can judge, made no generic difference, let Lardner say what he will. Can he disprove that it was declared heretical by the Church in the second century to believe the written words of a dead Apostle in opposition to the words of a living Bishop, seeing that the same spirit which guided the Apostles dwells in and guides the Bishops of the Church? This at least is certain, that the later the age of the writer, the stronger the expression of comparative superiority of the Scriptures; the earlier, on the other hand, the more we hear of the *Symbolum*, the *Regula Fidei*, the Creed.

Chap. xxxii. p. 362.

The history of the Prophet Jonas is so great that it is almost incredible: yea, it soundeth more strange than any of the poets' fables and (said Luther) if it stood not in the Bible, I should take it for a lie.

It is quite wonderful that Luther, who could see so plainly that the book of Judith was an allegoric poem, should have been blind to the book of Jonas being an apologue, in which Jonah means the Israelitish nation.

*Ibid.* p. 364.

For they entered into the garden about the hour at noon-day, and having appetites to eat, she took delight in the apple; then about two of the clock, according to our account, was the fall.

Milton has adopted this notion in the Paradise Lost—not improbably from this book.

*Ibid.* p. 365.

David made a Psalm of two and twenty parts, in each of which are eight verses, and yet in all is but one kind of meaning, namely, he will only say, Thy law or word is good.

I have conjectured that the 119th Psalm might have been a form of ordination, in which a series of candidates made their prayers and profession in the open Temple before they went to the several synagogues in the country.

*Ibid.*

But (said Luther) I say, he did well and right thereon: for the office of a magistrate is to punish the guilty and wicked malefactors. He made a vow, indeed, not to punish him, but that is to be understood, so long as David lived.

O Luther! Luther! ask your own heart if this is not Jesuit morality.

Chap. xxxiii. v. 367.

I believe (said Luther) the words of our Christian belief were in such sort ordained by the Apostles, who were together, and made this sweet *Symbolum* so briefly and comfortable.

It is difficult not to regret that Luther had so superficial a knowledge of Ecclesiastical antiquities: for example, his belief in this fable of the Creed having been a *picnic* contribution of the twelve Apostles, each giving a sentence. Whereas nothing is more certain than that it was the gradual product of three or four centuries.

Chap. xxxiv. p. 369.

An angel (said Luther) is a spiritual creature created by God without a body for the service of Christendom, especially in the office of the Church.

What did Luther mean by a body? For to me the word seemeth capable of two senses, universal and special:—first, a form indicating to A. B. C. &c., the existence and finiteness of some one other being *demonstrative* as *hic*, and *disjunctive* as *hic et non ille*; and in this sense God alone can be without body: secondly, that which is not merely *hic distinctive*, but *divisive*; yea, a product divisible from the producent as a snake from its skin, a precipitate and death of living power; and in this sense the body is proper to mortality, and to be denied of spirits made perfect as well as of the spirits that never fell from perfection, and perhaps of those who fell below mortality, namely, the devils.

But I am inclined to hold that the Devil has no one body, nay, no body of his own; but ceaselessly usurps or counterfeits bodies; for he is an everlasting liar, yea, the lie which is the coloured shadow of the substance that intercepts the truth.

*Ibid.* p. 370.

The devils are in woods, in waters, in wildernesses, and in dark pooly places, ready to hurt and prejudice people, &c.

“The angel's like a flea,  
The devil is a bore;—”

No matter for that! quoth S. T. C.

I love him the better therefore.

Yes! heroic Swan, I love thee even when thou gabblest like a goose; for thy geese helped to save the Capitol.

*Ibid.* p. 371.

I do verily believe (said Luther) that the day of judgment draweth near, and that the angels prepare themselves for the fight and combat, and that within the space of a few hundred years they will strike down both Turk and Pope into the bottomless pit of hell.

Yea! two or three more such angels as thyself, Martin Luther, and thy prediction would be, or perhaps would now have been, accomplished.

Chap. xxxv. p. 388.

Cogitations of the understanding do produce no melancholy, but the cogitations of the will cause sadness; as, when one is grieved at a thing, or when one doth sigh and complain, there are melancholy and sad cogitations, but the understanding is not melancholy.



Even in Luther's lowest imbecilities what gleams of vigorous good sense ! Had he understood the nature and symptoms of indigestion together with the detail of subjective seeing and hearing, and the existence of mid-states of the brain between sleeping and waking, Luther would have been a greater philosopher ; but would he have been so great a hero ? I doubt it. Praised be God whose mercy is over all his works ; who bringeth good out of evil, and manifesteth his wisdom even in the follies of his servants, his strength in their weakness !

*Ibid.* p. 389.

Whoso prayeth a Psalm shall be made thoroughly warm.

*Expertus credo.* 19th August, 1826.

I have learnt to interpret for myself the imprecating verses of the Psalms of my inward and spiritual enemies, the old Adam and all his corrupt menials ; and thus I am no longer, as I used to be, stopped or scandalised by such passages as vindictive and anti-Christian.

*Ibid.*

The Devil (said Luther) oftentimes objected and argued against me the whole cause which, through God's grace, I lead. He objecteth also against Christ. But better it were that the Temple brake in pieces than that Christ should therein remain obscure and hid.

Sublime !

*Ibid.*

In Job are two chapters concerning *Behemoth* the whale, that by reason of him no man is in safety. \* \* These are colored words and figures whereby the Devil is signified and showed.

A slight mistake of brother Martin's. The *Behemoth* of Job is, beyond a doubt, neither whale nor devil, but, I think, the hippopotamus; who is indeed as ugly as the devil, and will occasionally play the devil among the rice-grounds; but though in this respect a devil of a fellow, yet on the whole he is too honest a monster to be a fellow of devils. *Vindiciæ Behemoticæ.*

Chap. xxxvi. p. 390.

*Of Witchcraft.*

It often presses on my mind as a weighty argument in proof of at least a negative inspiration, an especial restraining grace, in the composition of the Canonical books, that though the writers individually did (the greater number at least) most probably believe in the objective reality of witchcraft, yet no such direct assertions as these of Luther's, which would with the vast majority of Christians have raised it into an article of faith, are to be found in either Testament. That the *Ob* and *Oboth* of Moses are no authorities for this absurd superstition, has been unanswerably shown by Webster.\*

Chap. xxxvii. p. 398.

To conclude (said Luther), I never yet knew a troubled and perplexed man, that was right in his own wits.

A sound observation of great practical utility. Edward Irving should be aware of this in dealing with conscience-troubled (but in fact fancy-vexed) women.

\* The Displaying of supposed Witchcraft, &c. London, folio, 1677.—ED.

*Ibid.*

It was not a thorn in the flesh touching the unchaste love he bore towards Tecla, as the Papists dream.

I should like to know how high this strange legend can be traced. The other tradition that St. Paul was subject to epileptic fits, has a less legendary character. The phrase *thorn in the flesh* is scarcely reconcilable with Luther's hypothesis, otherwise than as doubts of the objectivity of his vision, and of his after revelations may have been consequences of the disease, whatever that might be.

*Ibid.* p. 399.

Our Lord God doth like a printer, who setteth the letters backwards; we see and feel well his setting, but we shall see the print yonder in the life to come.

A beautiful simile. Add that even in this world the lives, especially the autobiographies, of eminent servants of Christ, are like the looking-glass or mirror, which reversing the types, renders them legible to us.

*Ibid.* p. 403.

*Indignus sum, sed dignus fui—creari a Deo, &c.* Although I am unworthy, yet nevertheless *I have been* worthy, *in that I am* created of God, &c.

The translation does not give the true sense of the Latin. It should be *was* and *to be*. The *dignus fui* has here the sense of *dignum me habuit Deus*. See Herbert's little poem in the Temple,—

Sweetest Saviour, if my soul  
Were but worth the having,  
Quickly should I then control  
Any thought of waving;

But when all my care and pains  
 Cannot give the name of gains  
 To thy wretch so full of stains,  
 What delight or hope remains?

*Ibid.* p. 404.

The chiefest physic for that disease (but very hard and difficult it is to be done) is, that they firmly hold such cogitations not to be theirs, but that most sure and certain they come of the Devil.

More and more I understand the immense difference between the Faith-article of *the Devil* (τοῦ Πονηροῦ) and the superstitious fancy of devils: *inimicus objectivus dominationem in τὸν Εὐμὴ affectans; ὅστις τὸ μέγα ὄργανον Διαβόλου ὑπάρχει.*

Chap. xliv. p. 431.

I truly advise all those (said Luther) who earnestly do affect the honor of Christ and the Gospel, that they would be enemies to Erasmus Roterodamus, for he is a devaster of religion. Do but read only his dialogue *De Peregrinatione*, where you will see how he derideth and flouteth the whole religion, and at last concludeth out of single abominations, that he rejecteth religion, &c.

Religion here means the vows and habits of the religious or those bound to a particular life;—the monks, friars, nuns, in short the regulars in contradistinction from the laity and the secular clergy.

*Ibid.* p. 432.

Erasmus can do nothing but cavil and flout, he cannot confute. If (said Luther) I were a Papist, so could I easily overcome and beat him. For although he flouteth the Pope

with his ceremonies, yet he neither hath confuted nor overcome him; no enemy is beaten nor overcome with mocking, jeering, and flouting.

Most true; but it is an excellent pioneer and an excellent *corps de reserve*, cavalry for pursuit, and for clearing the field of battle, and in the first use Luther was greatly obliged to Erasmus. But such utter unlikes cannot but end in dislikes, and so it proved between Erasmus and Luther. Erasmus, might the Protestants say, wished no good to the Church of Rome, and still less to our party: it was with him *Rot her and Dam us!*

Chap. xlvi. p. 442.

David's example is full of offences, that so holy a man, chosen of God, should fall into such great abominable sins and blasphemies; whenas before he was very fortunate and happy, of whom all the bordering kingdoms were afraid, for God was with him.

If any part of the Old Testament be typical, the whole life and character of David, from his birth to his death, are eminently so. And accordingly the history of David and his Psalms, which form a most interesting part of his history, occupies as large a portion of the Old Testament as all the others. The type is two-fold—now of the Messiah, now of the Church, and of the Church in all its relations, persecuted, victorious, backsliding, penitent. N.B. I do not find David charged with any vices, though with heavy crimes. So it is with the Church. Vices destroy its essence.

*Ibid.*

The same was a strange kind of offence (said Luther) that the world was offended at him who raised the dead, who made the blind to see, and the deaf to hear, &c.

Our Lord alluded to the verse that immediately follows and completes his quotations from Isaiah.\* I, Jehovah, will come and do this. That he implicitly declared himself the Jehovah, the Word, this was the offence.

## Chap. xlix. p. 443.

God wills, may one say, that we should serve him freely, but he that serveth God out of fear of punishment of hell, or out of a hope and love of recompense, the same serveth and honoreth God not freely; therefore such a one serveth God not uprightly nor truly. *Answer.* This argument (said Luther) is Stoical, &c.

A truly wise paragraph. Pity it was not expounded. God will accept our imperfections, where the face is turned toward him, on the road to the glorious liberty of the Gospel.

## Chap. l. p. 446.

It is the highest grace and gift of God to have an honest, a God-fearing, housewifely consort, &c. But God thrusteth many into the state of matrimony before they be aware and rightly bethink themselves.

The state of matrimony (said Luther) is the chiefest state in the world after religion, &c.

Alas! alas! this is the misery of it, that so many wed and so few are Christianly married! But even in this the analogy of matrimony to the religion of

\* Isaiah xxxv. 4; lxi. 1. Luke iv. 18, 19.—ED.

Christ holds good: for even such is the proportion of nominal to actual Christians;—all *christened*, how few baptised! But in true matrimony it is beautiful to consider, how peculiarly the marriage state harmonises with the doctrine of justification by free grace through faith alone. The little quarrels, the imperfections on both sides, the occasional frailties, yield to the one thought,—there is love at the bottom. If sickness or other sorer calamity visit me, how would the love then blaze forth! The faults are there, but they are not imprinted. The prickles, the acrid rind, the bitterness or sourness, are transformed into the ripe fruit, and the foreknowledge of this gives the name and virtue of the ripe fruit to the fruit yet green on the bough.

*Ibid.* p. 447.

The causers and founders of matrimony are chiefly God's commandments, &c. It is a state instituted by God himself, visited by Christ in person, and presented with a glorious present; for God said, *It is not good that the man should be alone*: therefore the wife should be a help to the husband, to the end that human generations may be increased, and children nurtured to God's honour, and to the profit of people and countries; also to keep our bodies in sanctification.

(Add) and in mutual reverence, our spirits in a state of love and tenderness; and our imaginations pure and tranquil.

In a word, matrimony not only preserveth human generations so that the same remain continually, but it preserveth the generations human.

*Ibid.* p. 450.

In the synod at Leipzig the lawyers concluded that secret contractors should be punished with banishment, and be

disinherited. Whereupon (said Luther) I sent them word that I would not allow thereof, it were too gross a proceeding, &c. But nevertheless I hold it fitting, that those which in such sort do secretly contract themselves, ought sharply to be reprov'd, yea, also in some measure severely punished.

What a sweet union of prudence and kind nature ! Scold them sharply, and perhaps let them smart a while for their indiscretion and disobedience ; and then kiss and make it up, remembering that young folks will be young folks, and that love has its own law and logic.

Chap. lix. p. 481.

The presumption and boldness of the sophists and School-divines is a very ungodly thing, which some of the Fathers also approved of and extolled ; namely, of spiritual significations in the Holy Scripture, whereby she is pitifully tattered and torn in pieces. It is an apish work in such sort to juggle with Holy Scripture: it is no otherwise than if I should discourse of physic in this manner: the fever is a sickness, rhubarb is the physic. The fever signifieth the sins—rhubarb is Jesus Christ, &c.

Who seeth not here (said Luther) that such significations are mere juggling tricks? *Even so* and after the same manner are they deceived that say, Children ought to be baptized again, because they had not faith.

For the life of me, I cannot find the 'even so' in this sentence. The watchman cries, 'half-past three o'clock.' *Even so*, and after the same manner, the great Cham of Tartary has a carbuncle on his nose.



## Chap. lx. p. 483.

George in the Greek tongue is called a *builder*, that buildeth countries and people with justice and righteousness, &c.

A mistake for a tiller or boor, from *Bauer*, *bauen*. The latter hath two senses, to build and to bring into cultivation.

## Chap. lxx. p. 503.

I am now advertised (said Luther) that a new astrologer is risen, who presumeth to prove that the earth moveth and goeth about, not the firmament, the sun and moon, nor the stars; like as when one who sitteth in a coach or in a ship and is moved, thinketh he sitteth still and resteth, but the earth and the trees go, run, and move themselves. Therefore thus it goeth, when we give up ourselves to our own foolish fancies and conceits. This fool will turn the whole art of astronomy upside-down, but the Scripture sheweth and teacheth him another lesson, when Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth.

There is a similar, but still more intolerant and contemptuous anathema of the Copernican system in Sir Thomas Brown, almost two centuries later than Luther.

Though the problem is of no difficult solution for reflecting minds, yet for the reading many it would be a serviceable work, to bring together and exemplify the causes of the extreme and universal credulity that characterises sundry periods of history (for example, from A.D. 1400 to A.D. 1650): and credulity involves lying and delusion—for by a seeming paradox liars are always credulous, though credulous persons are not always liars; although they most often are.

It would be worth while to make a collection of

the judgments of eminent men in their generation respecting the Copernican or Pythagorean scheme. One writer (I forget the name) inveighs against it as Popery, and a Popish stratagem to reconcile the minds of men to Transubstantiation and the Mass. For if we may contradict the evidence of our senses in a matter of natural philosophy, *a fortiori*, or much more, may we be expected to do so in a matter of faith.

In my Noetic, or Doctrine and Discipline of Ideas = *logice, Organon*—I purpose to select some four, five or more instances of the sad effects of the absence of ideas in the use of words and in the understanding of truths, in the different departments of life; for example, the word *body*, in connection with resurrection-men, &c. — and the last instances, will (please God!) be the sad effects on the whole system of Christian divinity. I must remember Asgill's book.\*

Religion necessarily, as to its main and proper doctrines, consists of ideas, that is, spiritual truths that can only be spiritually discerned, and to the expression of which words are necessarily inadequate, and must be used by accommodation. Hence the absolute indispensability of a Christian life, with its conflicts and inward experiences, which alone can make a man to answer to an opponent, who charges one doctrine as contradictory to another,—“ Yes! it is a contradiction in terms; but nevertheless so it is, and both are true, nay, parts of the same truth.”— But alas! besides other evils there is this,—that the Gospel is preached in fragments, and what the hearer

\*. “ An argument proving that, according to the covenant of eternal life, revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence, without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated till he had passed through death.” See *Table Talk*. 2nd Edition, p. 127.—Ed.

can recollect of the sum total of these is to be his Christian knowledge and belief. This is a grievous error. First, labour to enlighten the hearer as to the essence of the Christian dispensation, the grounding and pervading idea, and then set it forth in its manifold perspective, its various stages and modes of manifestation. In this as in almost all other qualities of a preacher of Christ, Luther after Paul and John is the great master. None saw more clearly than he, that the same proposition, which addressed to a Christian in his first awakening out of the death of sin was a most wholesome, nay a necessary, truth, would be a most condemnable Antinomian falsehood, if addressed to a secure Christian boasting and trusting in *his* faith—yes, in *his* own faith, instead of the faith of Christ communicated to him.

I cannot utter how dear and precious to me are the contents of pages 197—199, to line 17, of this work, more particularly the section headed—

How we ought to carry ourselves towards the Law's accusations.

Add to these the last two sections of p. 201,\* the last touching St. Austin's opinion † especially. Likewise, the first half of p. 202. ‡ But indeed the whole of the twelfth chapter 'Of the Law and the Gospel' is of inestimable value to a serious and earnest minister of the Gospel. Here he may learn both the orthodox faith, and a holy prudence in the time and manner of preaching the same. July, 1829.

\* We must preach the Law (said Luther) for the sakes of the evil and wicked, &c.

† The opinion of St. Austin is (said Luther) that the Law which through human strength, natural understanding and wisdom is fulfilled, justifieth not, &c.

‡ Whether we should preach only of God's grace and mercy or not. From "Philip Melancthon demanded of Luther"—to "yet we must press through, and not suffer ourselves to recoil."

## NOTES ON BURNET'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.\*

### —◆— THE FIRST PART.

#### *The Preface.*

And if a lewd and wicked Pope may yet have the Holy Ghost dwelling in him, and directing him infallibly, why may not an ill king do so good a work as set a Reformation forward; and if it were proper to enter into a dissection of four of those Popes that sat at Rome during his reign, Pope Julius will be found beyond him in a vast ambition, whose bloody reign did not only embroil Italy, but a great part of Christendom. Pope Leo X. was as extravagant and prodigal in his expense, which put him on baser shifts than ever this king used to raise money; not by embasing the coin or raising new and heavy taxes, but by embasing the Christian Religion, and prostituting the pardon of sin in that foul trade of indulgences. Clement VII. was false to the highest degree—a vice which cannot be charged on this king; and Paul III. was a vile and lewd priest, &c. And, except the short reign of Hadrian VI., there was no Pope at Rome all this while whose example might make any other prince blush for his faults; so that Guicciardini, when he calls Pope Clement a good Pope, adds, I mean not goodness Apostolical; for in those days he was esteemed a good Pope that did not exceed the wickedness of the worst of men.

Perhaps a Romish wit might retort—It must fare badly with your cause when four wicked Popes go to the making of one Protestant king; or when you must extract and unite the vices of the four worst

\* The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. By Gilbert Burnet, 2 vols. folio. Dublin, 1730.

Popes to make up the wickedness of one reforming king!

*Ibid.*

But the other prejudice touches the Reformation in a more vital and tender part; and it is,—that Cranmer and the other bishops, who promoted the Reformation in the succeeding reign, did in this comply too servilely with King Henry's humours, both in carrying on his frequent divorces, and in retaining those corruptions in the worship which by their throwing them off in the beginning of King Edward's reign, we may conclude were then condemned by them, &c. They did not at once attain the full knowledge of divine truth, &c. &c.

As for other things, such as the giving the cup to the laity, the worshipping God in a known tongue, and several reformations about the Mass, though they judged them necessary to be done as soon as was possible; yet they had not so full a persuasion of the necessity of these, as to think it a sin not to do them. The Prophet's words to Naaman the Syrian might give them some colour for that mistake, and the practice of the Apostles, who continued not only to worship at the Temple, but to circumcise and to offer sacrifices (which must have been done by St. Paul when he purified himself in the Temple) even after *the Law was dead*, by the appearing of the Gospel, seemed to excuse their compliance.

Here lurks a mistake. Dead it was in spiritual efficacy, and as a way to truth. The law, therefore, dared not be imposed on, or even permitted to, the Gentile converts.

But on Paul and the Apostles, and the Jewish converts generally, it remained in force till the destruction of the Temple, the abolition of the ruling priesthood, and the dispersion of the people; in short, the absolute extinction of the Jewish *State*,

in all its constituent parts, by Vespasian and Titus. Then when the Heaven (the government and hierarchy), and the Earth (the people) had passed away, and the object no longer existing, the law ceased of necessity.

The horrors of the Jewish War, and the siege of Jerusalem, with all its portentous and unparalleled incidents, were the Lightnings and Thunders of Mount Sinai for its abrogation. But till this time the law was binding, I say, on the Apostles and Jewish Christians, both as a civil obligation, a duty incumbent on them as citizens of a particular State, and by the express command of Christ; forbidding them to make their new character as Christians a pretext for not performing their duties as subjects.

Book III., p. 265.

Thus did Sir Thomas More end his days, in the fifty-third year of his age. He was a man of rare virtues and excellent parts. In his youth he had freer thoughts of things, as appears by his Utopia, and his letters to Erasmus; but afterwards he became superstitiously devoted to the interests and passions of the Popish clergy; and as he served them when he was in authority, even to assist them in all their cruelties; so he employed his pen in the same cause, &c.

I cannot satisfy my judgment on this point, one way or the other. For the negative—there is the great improbability of the statement, from the whole cast of More's mind and character; for the affirmative—his latter writings, and some apparently well-authenticated facts, together with the admitted superstition of Pascal. But still I am inclined to believe that the statesman and the patriot were uppermost, and that, not foreseeing the rise and power of the

Third Estate, he saw in the power of the clergy, and even in the Papal influence, the sole remaining counter-weights to the royal prerogative, which the ravages of the Civil Wars, and the consequent prostration of the nobility, had left. It is possible, likewise, that Henry's own overbearing and capricious character might have indisposed him to any unsettling of ancient, though not *the* ancient landmarks.

---

## THE SECOND PART.

### *The Preface.*

The second prejudice is, that the Reformation was begun and carried on, not by the major part of the bishops and clergy, but by a few selected bishops and divines, who being supported by the name of the king's authority, did frame things as they pleased; and by their interest at Court got them to be enacted in Parliament; and after they had removed such bishops as opposed them, then they procured the Convocation to consent to what was done: so that upon the matter, the Reformation was the work of Cranmer, with a few more of his party, and not of this Church, which never agreed wholly to it, till the bishops were so modelled as to be compliant to the designs of the Court. In short, the resolution of this is to be taken from a common case; when the major part of a Church is, according to the conscience of the supreme Civil Magistrate, in an error, and the lesser part is in the right. The case is not hard, if well understood, for in the whole Scripture there is no promise made to the major part of the Pastors of the Church; and there being no divine promise made about it, it is certain that the nature of man is such, that truth separated from interest hath few votaries; but when it is opposite to it, it must have a very small party. So that most of those things which needed Reformation,

being such as added much to the wealth and power of the clergy, it had been a wonder indeed, if the greater part had not opposed it. In that case, as the smaller part were not to depart from their sentiments, because opposed in them by a more numerous party that was too deeply concerned in the matter ; so it was both natural for them, and very reasonable, to take sanctuary in the authority and protection of the Prince and the Law.

That Princes have an authority in things sacred, was so universally agreed to in King Henry's reign, and was made out upon such clear evidence of reason and precedents, both in the Jewish state, and in the Roman Empire when it turned Christian, that this ground was already gained. It is the first law in Justinian's code, made by Theodosius when he came to the Empire,—that all should, everywhere, under severe pains, follow that faith which was received by Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria. And why not the King and laws of England give the like authority to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York ?

I find it difficult to account for so very thin and languid a defence of our Reformation on this objection from the minor number of the Reformers from so sensible and powerful a reasoner as Burnet generally appears.

P.S. The objection is not only weakly answered, but most dangerously : for, first, the Parliament is almost sneakingly *insinuated*, rather than asserted, as a joint-authority ; and, secondly, what even Parliaments were during the period from Henry VII. to James I., who does not know to whom English history is not unknown ? The proper answer would have been, that if the rites and doctrines abolished are false and superstitious, and those retained were, together with the interpretations of them, true, edifying, and scriptural, the excellence of the result cannot be affected by accidental coincidences of



the actions of individuals, the Church representing Truth, as its own evidence. But if the contrary be the case, if the Reformation was an heretical deprivation, then it should be acknowledged that the enforcement of the same on the majority of the clergy and the kingdom by the minority, is an aggravation of the crime. Therefore till this point be decided, the objection is premature; and, when it is decided, superfluous. For the crime needs no aggravation, and the merit no addition.

Book i. 80.

The belief of Christ's corporal presence was yet under consideration. And they observing wisely how the Germans had broken, by their running too soon into contests about that, resolved to keep up still the old general expressions, of the Sacraments being the whole and true Body of Christ, without coming to a more particular explanation of it.

Wisely? Keep up? This may have been very *prudent*, but it looks very like 'YMBYT', alias, No, sir! Yes, sir! y-y-y-yes, sir! N-n-n-no, sir!—*pretty*, when prettily minced and stammered by a young lady with downcast eye, askance; but not quite so becoming in the mouth of a grave theological Reformer. Eh! Master Burnet?

*Ibid.* p. 113.

The Germans soon saw the ill effects of this doctrine. [of Predestination] Luther changed his mind about it, and Melancthon openly writ against it; and since that time the whole stream of the Lutheran Churches has run the other way. But both Calvin and Bucer were still for maintaining the doctrine of these Decrees; only they warned the people not

to think much of them, since they were secrets which men could not penetrate into; but they did not so clearly show how these consequences did not flow from such opinions.

Pity that Burnet did not inform us, how the doctrine is to be put down! or on what principles it is to be convicted of falsehood! And if not, how (Calvin) and Bucer could do better, than to declare it a truth above the human faculties, and unfit for frequent meditation, it being so likely that we should err, and the errors being so perilous!

Book ii. p. 327.

But above all, that design of his [Cardinal Pole's] to have seminaries in every cathedral for the planting of the diocese, shows what a wise prospect he had of the right methods of recovering a Church which was overrun, as he judged, with heresy. It was the same that Cranmer had formerly designed, but never took effect. Certainly, persons formed from their childhood with other notions and another method of living, must be much better fitted for a holy character than those that have lived in the pleasures and follies of the world; who, unless a very extraordinary change is wrought in them, still keep some of their old customs about them, and so fall short of that gravity and decency that becomes so spiritual a function.

Strange ignorance of human nature! And this from a Whig bishop! To sever a body of men from all living sympathy with mankind at large, was an excellent trick for the keeping up of superstition.

*Ibid.* p. 345.

I.

First, that there is but one living and true God, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, &c.

Amen.

II.

I believe also whatsoever is contained in the Holy Canonical Scriptures.

Ἐπεὶ λέγω. *Lege*, I believe that in the holy Canonical Scriptures are contained, &c. &c.

Then I answer, Amen.

In the which Scriptures all things necessary to salvation; by the which also all errors and heresies may sufficiently be reproved and convicted; and all doctrine and articles necessary to salvation established.

Amen.

*Ibid.* p. 366.

I do also most firmly believe and confess all the articles contained in the three Creeds—the Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and our common Creed, called the Apostles' Creed; for these do briefly contain the principal articles of our Faith, which are at large set forth in the Holy Scriptures.

Amen! not taking the damnatory preface as part of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed, or understanding the faith required to be implicit only and not explicit.

I hold the (so-called) Athanasian Creed to be, not false, but imperfect, but yet unfit to be a public Creed because the whole truth in a doctrine setting forth a one idea, is necessary to the perfection of each and every of the truths therein contained, or of the

distinct Verities contemplated in the untroubled unity of the Idea. Now this Creed truly expresses the equality of Attributes and the Identity of the Godhead ; but does not confess the subordination of the Persons.

## III.

I do acknowledge also that Church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the Word of God is truly taught, the Sacraments orderly ministered according to Christ's institution, and the Authority of the Keys duly used ; and that every such particular Church hath authority to institute, to change, clean to put away ceremonies and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous or be abused, and to constitute other making more to seemliness, to order, or edification.

III. does not admit of an answer, it not being here defined, *who* the Church is, as an executive power. The term " Church " is here equivocal, or rather multivocal. In like manner, the term " particular." If the Church of England and that of Ireland be two Churches, why not York and Canterbury ?

## IV.

Moreover, I confess that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him any office or ministry, either ecclesiastical or secular, but such only as are lawfully thereunto called by their high authorities, according to the ordinances of this realm.

Amen : with the same faith and no other, as I confess that nothing is white that is not white.

## V.

Furthermore, I do acknowledge the Queen's Majesty's prerogative and superiority of government of all estates, and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within this realm, &c., to be agreeable to God's Word, and of right to appertain to her Highness, &c.

*Negatively* understood ; *i.e.* that the things of Cæsar to be not cease to be Cæsar's by being in and for a Church,—Amen.

## VI.

Moreover, touching the Bishop of Rome, I do acknowledge and confess that, by the Scriptures and Word of God, he hath no more authority than other bishops have in their provinces and dioceses, &c.

Amen.

## VII.

Furthermore, I do grant and confess, that the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Holy Sacraments set forth by the authority of Parliament, is agreeable to the Scriptures, and that it is Catholic, Apostolic, &c., &c.

Amen ; as far as the knowledge of its fallible origin is not contradicted by this assent.

## IX.

Moreover, I do not only acknowledge, that Private Masses were never used among the Fathers of the Primitive Church, &c. But also that the doctrine that maintaineth the Mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and a mean to deliver souls out of purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon Doctrine Apostolic.

But contrary, &c.

Amen.

## X.

I am of that mind also that the Holy Communion . . . ought to be ministered unto the people under both kinds, &c.

Amen.

Last of all.

As I do utterly disallow the extolling of images, reliques, and feigned miracles, and also all kind of expressing God invisible, &c. &c. ;—so I do exhort all men to the obedience of God's law, and to the works of faith, as charity, mercy, pity, alms, devout and fervent prayer, &c.

Amen. S. T. Coleridge, 28th December, 1823.

Book iii., Appendix, pp. 386-7.

But there was no occasion for Bucer's saying this, since he never declared against the corporeal presence; but was for taking up that controversy in some general expressions.

In the Appendix to Strype's Life of Cranmer is to be found an excellent paper of Bucer's on the Eucharist, in a spirit very superior to the metaphysics of his age. The result is that the Body and Blood are the Corpus *νούμενον* or actual and substantial body, and therefore spiritual; not the Corpus *φαινόμενον*. And that in the former or universal sense the doctrine of the *real* (as opposed to phenomenal) presence is agreeable *with* reason, and *to* Scripture—*οὗτος ἄρτος νοεῖ σῶμα ἐμόν*.

## NOTES ON CHILLINGWORTH.\*

—◆—  
*Answer to the Preface, "Charity maintained by Catholics,"* p. 41.

20 Ad. § 13, p. 41.

To the third—*Whether, seeing there cannot be assigned any visible true Church distinct from the Roman, it follows not that she erred not fundamentally?* I say, in our sense of the word *fundamental*, it does follow; for if it be true, that there was then no Church distinct from the *Roman*, then it must be, either because there was no Church at all, which we deny; or, because the *Roman* Church was the whole Church, which we also deny; or, because she was a part of the whole, which we grant. And if she were a true part of the Church, then she retained those truths which were simply necessary to salvation, and held no errors which were inevitably and unpardonably destructive of it; for this is precisely necessary to constitute any man or any church a member of the Church Catholic. In our sense therefore of the word *fundamental*, I hope she erred not fundamentally; but in your sense of the word, I fear she did; that is, she held something to be Divine Revelation, which was not—something not to be, which was.

If idolatry in both its kinds (*i.e.* worshipping the supreme God under an image, and worshipping subordinate gods); if asserting the merits of creatures so as, though not avowedly, to deny, yet, effectively to make vain the sole redemption by, and mediation

\* The Works of William Chillingworth, M.A., of the University of Oxford, containing his Book, intituled, "The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation." London, 1742.

of, Christ ; if the undermining of the one great purpose of the Gospel, by holding out substitutes for *regeneration* (i.e. the practical hatred of sin for its exceeding sinfulness) by doctrines of attrition, priestly absolution as operant *in se*, and not merely declaratory ; finally, if a general corruption of the moral sense, produced and favoured by the whole compages of its *distinguishing* doctrines and ceremonies, added to a bold alteration and repeal of divine commands, and additions equally bold—as in the Eucharist in one kind only—the dogmas concerning marriage, purgatory, &c. &c., if these be not *fundamental* errors, what can be ? If they be, the Romish Church is *fundamentally* erroneous, therefore *heretical* ; and Chillingworth seems to play at fast and loose. Indeed I cannot but regard it as a proof of the [prevalency of] Low-Church Lockian Faction, that this author is extolled as the Ἄρχασπιστὴς *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, and Stillingfleet's most masterly work (A Rational Account, &c.) forgotten or neglected.

26 Ad. § 18. *Ibid.* p. 43.

To the eighth—*How of disagreeing Protestants, both parts may hope for salvation, seeing some of them must needs err against some truth testified by God?* I answer, the most disagreeing Protestants that are, yet thus far agree: 1st, that those books of Scripture, which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted Word of God, and a perfect rule of faith ; 2nd, that the sense of them, which God intended, whatsoever it is, is certainly true ; so that they believe implicitly even those very truths against which they err ; and why an implicit faith in Christ and his Word should not suffice as well as an implicit faith in your Church, I have desired to be resolved by many of your side, but never could ; 3rd, that they are to use their best endeavours



to believe the Scripture in the true sense, and to live according to it.

The modern Unitarians who follow Dr. Priestley are an exception, for they believe the Scripture erroneous in many things *de facto*, and consequently fallible in any and every thing, except as proved *ab extra*,—*i.e.* by reason and other histories.

*The Answer to the First Chapter.*

Chap. i. p. 55.

Considering, thirdly and lastly, that if they die not with *contrition*, yet it is very probable they may die with *attrition*; and that this pretence of yours, that *contrition will serve without actual confession, but attrition will not*, is but a nicety or fancy, or rather, to give it the true name, a device of your own, to serve ends and purposes; God having no where declared himself, but that wheresoever He will accept of that repentance, which you are pleased to call *contrition*, He will accept of that you call *attrition*; for, though He like best the bright flaming Holocaust of love, yet He rejects not, He quencheth not, the smoking flax of that repentance (if it be true and effectual), which proceeds from hope and fear. These things, I say, considered (unless you will have the charity of your doctrine rise up in judgment against your uncharitable practice), you must not only not be peremptory in damning Protestants, but you must hope well of their salvation.

In the repentance of the living, I grant it; because such *attrition* may be a *mean*, and a natural stage from bad to less bad, in the process to goodness. Enlightened selfishness may be the transit from blind selfishness to love of God, and hatred of sin, even for its exceeding sinfulness. But that a dying penitent can be *saved* without love, without

contrition, first seems to involve a contradiction, for is it not the same as to be regenerate without regeneration? and secondly, not founded on any, and repugnant to very many, *express* passages of the New Testament. This, therefore, I consider as one of Chillingworth's relics of Popery: more will soon appear.

P.S. This error is far less irrational in the Papists, who hold a state of purgatory between death and the final judgment.

*Ibid.* p. 56.

Thus much charity therefore, if you stand to what you have said, is interchangeably granted by each side to the other, that neither religion is so fatally *destructive*, but that *by ignorance or repentance salvation may be had on both sides*; though with a difference that keeps Papists still on the more uncharitable side; for whereas we conceive a lower degree of repentance (that which they call *attrition*), if it be true and effectual, and convert the heart of the penitent, will serve in them,\*—they pretend (even *this author*, which is most charitable towards us) that *without contrition* there is no hope for us.

\* *i. e.* if it end in contrition. If this be true, the notion is self-destructive.

Attrition suffices *without* contrition, if it end *in* contrition,—*i. e.* if finally it be *with*, or become contrition.

*Ibid.* p. 58.

But for my part, whatsoever clamour you have raised against me, I think no otherwise of the nature of faith (I mean *historical faith*) than generally both Protestants and Papists do; for I conceive it *an assent to Divine revelations upon the*

*authority of the revealer*, which, though in many things it differ from opinion (as commonly the word *opinion* is understood), yet in some things, I doubt not, you will confess that it agrees with it. As, first, that as opinion is an assent, so is faith also. Secondly, that as opinion, so faith is always built upon less evidence than that of sense or science; which assertion you not only grant, but mainly contend for in your *sixth chapter*. Thirdly and lastly, that as opinion, so faith admits degrees, and that, as there may be a strong and weak opinion, so there may be a strong and weak faith. These things, if you will grant (as sure, if you be in your right mind, you will not deny any of them), I am well contented that this ill-sounding word *opinion* should be discarded, and that among the intellectual habits you should seek out some other *genus* for *Faith*; for I will never contend with any man about words who grants my meaning.

That Faith is but another word for Opinion, having its very essence in the perception of the preponderance of probabilities, I hold a *second* Popish error—indeed the queen-bee in the hive. The Romanists have decided *Quod fides sit essentialiter in Intellectu*, and Chillingworth is right in making their hostility to Faith = Opinion a mere logomachy. Let Faith be considered, first, as a *moral act*; secondly, as a moral act ripened by habit into a moral *state*—and Opinion, even as elsewhere *Works*, as the natural *consequent* of that state, and one of its diagnostics; and Chillingworth's objections and fears in this and the following page will lose all their force.

*Ibid.* p. 59.

Yet all this I say not as if I doubted that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble prayer and sincere obedience, may and will, by degrees, advance His servants higher, and give them a certainty of adherence

beyond their certainty of evidence. But what God gives as a reward to believers, is one thing; but what He requires of all men as their duty, is another; and what He will accept of out of grace and favour, is yet another.

St. Augustine asserts the *contrary*, viz. that clearness of comprehension is *the* reward of certain adherence—wisely, I think, and evangelically.

*Ibid.* p. 61.

For though your Church were indeed as *infallible a pro-pounder of Divine truths* as it pretends to be, yet, if it appeared not to me to be so, I might very well believe God most true, and your Church most false: as, though the Gospel of *St. Matthew* be the Word of God, yet, if I neither knew it to be so nor believed it, I might believe in God, and yet think that Gospel a fable. Hereafter, therefore, I must entreat you to remember, that our being guilty of this impiety depends not only upon your being, but upon our knowing that *you are* so.

Such knowledge not having been precluded by any wrong moral dispositions, of which God only is the Judge.

Chap. ii. *Ibid.* p. 77.

Since then the visible Church of Christ our Lord is that *infallible means whereby the revealed truths of Almighty God are conveyed to our understanding*, it followeth, that to oppose her definitions is to resist God himself. I conclude therefore with this argument: Whosoever resisteth that means which infallibly proposes to us God's Word or Revelation, commits a sin which, unrepented, excludes salvation; but whosoever resisteth Christ's visible Church doth resist that means which infallibly proposeth to us God's Word or Revelation. Therefore, whosoever resisteth Christ's visible Church commits a sin, which, unrepented, excludes salvation. Now,

what visible Church was extant when *Luther* began his pretended Reformation, whether it were the *Roman* or *Protestant* Church; and whether he and other Protestants do not oppose that visible Church, which was spread over the world before and in *Luther's* time, is easy to be determined, and importeth every one most seriously to ponder, as a thing whereon eternal salvation dependeth.

*Charity maintained, &c.*

If it had been possible, 1st, to define the visible Catholic Church; 2nd, or (that granted) to conceive either how one man can be the Catholic Church, or how millions of men can be a *judge*—nay, at once oracle and questionists; 3rd, how the opinions of this judge, which must be given in *words*, can be less liable to objections than other express *verbal* sentences; 4th, or to conceive the infallibility of fallible men, unattested by miracles or by Scripture from men so attested to be infallible; or, 5th, to clear from a ludicrous *circle* in argument the founding the infallibility of the Church on Scripture, and yet the infallibility of Scripture on the Church; and, 6th, if the whole were not demonstrated false in fact by the obvious and gross discrepancies of the supposed Catholic Church in different ages; and, 7th, idle as well as false, by the actual many and gross divisions of opinion in various branches of the existing Catholic Church;—then it would be difficult to deny the validity of the arguments in this chapter, as it would be unfair, even as it is, not to admit the skill and ability of the arguer as a sturdy and ingenious advocate of an indefensible cause. The Protestant may easily answer the Papist, but it will require more to satisfy the Infidel, who adopts the Papist's difficulties without the *killing* (*ad hominem*) absurdities of the Papist's creed. Neither can this be done logically, I think, unless Faith be defined as a

*moral* state, and not a *mere* intellectual belief; *i. e.* but by admitting that, the Heart being the same, the saving *Faith* is the same in A. and B., though A. should believe and B. disbelieve the possessions in the Gospel to be *demoniacal*, or the like.

*Ibid.* p. 383. Appended to the Concluding Chapter.

April 23, 1809.

I have been disappointed in this work, which, however, has confirmed my convictions concerning Mr. Locke's taste and judgment.—*Similis simili gaudet*. I have stated my opinion of Chillingworth's great inferiority to Stillingfleet's volume on the same plan—it is great indeed. First, this work appears to me prolix, heavy, full of repetitions, and alike deficient in arrangement and that mode of logical acumen which regards the conveyance of arguments. Secondly, I do not deny but that a man of sound unprejudiced mind could scarcely read this book and remain a Catholic, or rather Romanist; but the same must be said of twenty other works before Chillingworth. But I do affirm that it is even more probable that from Popery he would be led by it to Infidelity, Socinianism at least, than to regular Protestantism, Arminian or Calvinistic; that the concessions made to the Romanist, and the doctrines laid down concerning fundamentals, breathe a principle of Latitudinarianism destructive to all principle; while with a tiresome repetition of argument *ad hominem*, and retortions, there is a deficiency of direct and affirmative evidences and of learning, both Scriptural and from the Fathers.

## NOTES ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

---

### PRAYER.

A MAN may pray night and day, and yet deceive himself; but no man can be assured of his sincerity, who does not pray. Prayer is faith passing into act; a union of the will and the intellect realising in an intellectual act. It is the whole man that prays. Less than this is wishing, or lip-work; a charm or a mummery. *Pray always*, says the Apostle; that is, have the habit of prayer, turning your thoughts into acts by connecting them with the idea of the redeeming God, and even so reconverting your actions into thoughts.

### THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.

The best preparation for taking this sacrament, better than any or all of the books or tracts composed for this end, is, to read over and over again, and often on your knees—at all events with a kneeling and praying heart—the Gospel according to St. John, till your mind is familiarised to the contemplation of Christ, the Redeemer and Mediator of mankind, yea, and of every creature, as the living and self-subsisting Word, the very truth of all true being, and the very being of all enduring truth; the reality, which is the substance and unity of all reality; *the light which lighteth every man*, so that what we call reason is itself a light from that light,

*lumen a luce*, as the Latin more distinctly expresses this fact. But it is not merely light, but therein is life; and it is the life of Christ, the co-eternal Son of God, that is the only true life-giving light of men. We are assured, and we believe that Christ is God; God manifested in the flesh. As God, He must be present entire in every creature;—(for how can God, or indeed any spirit, exist in parts?)—but He is said to dwell in the regenerate, to come to them who receive Him by faith in His name, that is, in His power and influence; for this is the meaning of the word “name” in Scripture when applied to God or His Christ. Where true belief exists, Christ is not only present with or among us;—for so He is in every man, even the most wicked;—but to us and for us. *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.* John i. 9—14. Again—*We will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* John xiv. 23. As truly and as really as your soul resides constitutively in your living body, so truly, really, personally, and substantially does Christ dwell in every regenerate man.

After this course of study, you may then take up and peruse sentence by sentence the communion service, the best of all comments on the Scriptures appertaining to this mystery. And this is the preparation which will prove, with God's grace, the surest preventive of, or antidote against, the freezing poison, the lethargising hemlock, of the doctrine of



the Sacramentaries, according to whom the Eucharist is a mere practical metaphor, in which things are employed instead of articulated sounds for the exclusive purpose of recalling to our minds the historical fact of our Lord's crucifixion; in short—(the profaneness is with them, not with me)—just the same as when Protestants drink a glass of wine to the glorious memory of William III. ! True it is, that the remembrance is one end of the sacrament; but it is, *Do this in remembrance of me*,—of all that Christ was and is, hath done and is still doing for fallen mankind, and of course of his crucifixion inclusively, but not of his crucifixion alone. 14 December, 1827.

#### COMPANION TO THE ALTAR.

First, then, that we may come to this heavenly feast holy, and adorned with the wedding garment, *Matt. xxii. 11*, we must search our hearts, and examine our consciences, not only till we see our sins, but until we hate them.

But what if a man, seeing his sin, earnestly desire to hate it? Shall he not at the altar offer up at once his desire, and the yet lingering sin, and seek for strength? Is not this sacrament medicine as well as food? Is it an end only, and not likewise the means? Is it merely the triumphal feast; or is it not even more truly a blessed refreshment for and during the conflict?

This confession of sins must not be in general terms only, that we are sinners with the rest of mankind, but it must be a special declaration to God of all our most heinous sins in thought, word, and deed.

Luther was of a different judgment. He would have us feel and groan under our sinfulness and

utter incapability of redeeming ourselves from the bondage, rather than hazard the pollution of our imaginations by a recapitulation and renewing of sins and their images in detail. Do not, he says, stand picking the flaws out one by one, but plunge into the river, and drown them!—I venture to be of Luther's doctrine.

#### COMMUNION SERVICE.

In the first Exhortation, before the words "meritorious Cross and Passion," I should propose to insert "his assumption of humanity, his incarnation, and." Likewise a little lower down, after the word "sustenance," I would insert "as." For not in that sacrament exclusively, but in all the acts of assimilative faith, of which the Eucharist is a solemn, eminent, and representative instance, an instance and the symbol, Christ is our spiritual food and sustenance.

#### MARRIAGE SERVICE.

Marriage, simply as marriage, is not the means "for the procreation of children," but for the humanisation of the offspring procreated. Therefore in the Declaration at the beginning, after the words "procreation of children," I would insert, "and as the means for securing to the children procreated enduring care, and that they may be," &c.

#### COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

Third rubric at the end.

But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, &c.

I think this rubric, in what I conceive to be its true meaning, a precious document, as fully acquitting our Church of all Romish superstition, respecting the nature of the Eucharist, in relation to the whole scheme of man's redemption. But the latter part of it—"he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth"—seems to me very incautiously expressed, and scarcely to be reconciled with the Church's own definition of a sacrament in general. For in such a case, where is "the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace given?"\*

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

EPISTLE.—1 Cor. xv. 1.

*Brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you.*

Why should the obsolete, though faithful, Saxon translation of *εὐαγγέλιον* be retained? Why not "good tidings?" Why thus change a most appropriate and intelligible designation of the matter into a mere conventional name of a particular book?

\* "Should it occur to any one that the doctrine blamed in the text, is but in accordance with that of the Church of England, in her rubric concerning spiritual communion, annexed to the Office for Communion of the Sick: he may consider, whether that rubric, explained (as if possible it must be) in consistency with the definition of a sacrament in the Catechism, can be meant for any but rare and extraordinary cases: cases as strong in regard of the Eucharist, as that of martyrdom, or the premature death of a well-disposed catechumen, in regard of Baptism."—Keble's Pref. to Hooker, p. 85, n. 70. ED.

*Ibid.*

—*how that Christ died for our sins.*

But the meaning of *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν* is, that Christ died through the sins, and for the sinners. He died through our sins, and we live through his righteousness.

GOSPEL.—*Luke xviii. 14.*

*This man went down to his house justified rather than the other.*

Not simply justified, observe; but justified rather than the other, ἢ ἐκεῖνος,—that is, less remote from salvation.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

COLLECT.

—that they, plenteously bringing forth the fruit of good works, may of thee be plenteously rewarded.

Rather—“that with that enlarged capacity, which without thee we cannot acquire, there may likewise be an increase of the gift, which from thee alone we can wholly receive.”

PSALM VIII.

Ver. 2. *Out of the mouth of very babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies; that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.*

To the dispensations of the twilight dawn, to the first messengers of the redeeming word, the yet lisping utterers of light and life, a strength and

a power were given *because of the enemies*, greater and of more immediate influence, than to the seers and proclaimers of a clearer day:—even as the first re-appearing crescent of the eclipsed moon shines for men with a keener brilliance, than the following larger segments, previously to its total emersion.

*Ibid.*

Ver. 5. *Thou madest him lower than the angels, to crown him with glory and worship.*

Power + idea = angel.

Idea — power = man, or Prometheus.

PSALM LXVIII.

Ver. 34. *Ascribe ye the power to God over Israel; his worship and strength is in the clouds.*

The “clouds” in the symbolical language of the Scriptures mean the events and course of things, seemingly effects of human will or chance, but overruled by Providence.

PSALM LXXII.

This Psalm admits no other interpretation but of Christ, as the Jehovah incarnate. In any other sense, it would be a specimen of more than Persian or Moghul hyperbole and bombast, of which there is no other instance in Scripture, and which no Christian would dare to attribute to an inspired writer. We know, too, that the elder Jewish Church ranked it among the Messianic Psalms.

N.B. The Word in St. John, and the Name of the Most High in the Psalms, are equivalent terms.

Ver. 1. *Give the king thy judgments, O God; and thy righteousness unto the king's son.*

God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, the only begotten, the Son of God and God, King of Kings, and the Son of the King of Kings!

PSALM LXXIV.

Ver. 2. *O think upon thy congregation whom thou hast purchased and redeemed of old.*

The Lamb sacrificed from the beginning of the world, the God-Man, the Judge, the self-promised Redeemer to Adam in the garden!

Ver. 15. *Thou smotest the heads of Leviathan in pieces; and gavest him to be meat for the people in the wilderness.*

Does this allude to any real tradition? \* The Psalm appears to have been composed shortly before the captivity of Judah.

PSALM LXXXII. Ver. 6, 7.

The reference which our Lord made to these mysterious verses, gives them an especial interest. The first apostasy, the fall of the angels, is perhaps intimated.

PSALM LXXXVII.

I would fain understand this Psalm; but first I must collate it word by word with the original Hebrew. It seems clearly Messianic.

\* According to Bishop Horne, the allusion is to the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea.—ED.

## PSALM LXXXVIII.

Ver. 10—12. *Dost thou shew wonders among the dead, or shall the dead rise up again and praise thee? &c.*

Compare Ezekiel xxxvii.

## PSALM CIV.

I think the Bible version might with advantage be substituted for this, which in some parts is scarcely intelligible.

Ver. 6. —*the waters stand in the hills.*

No; *stood above the mountains.* The reference is to the Deluge.

## PSALM CV.

Ver. 3. *Let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord.*

If even to seek the Lord be joy, what will it be to find him? Seek me, O Lord, that I may be found by thee!

## PSALM CX.

Ver. 2. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy power out of Sion; (saying) Rule, &c.*

Ver. 3. Understand—“Thy people shall offer themselves willingly in the day of conflict in holy clothing, in their best array, in their best arms and accoutrements. As the dew from the womb of the morning, in number and brightness like dewdrops; so shall be thy youth, or the youth of thee, the young volunteer warriors.”

Ver. 5. "He shall shake," concuss, *concutiet reges die iræ suæ.*

Ver. 6. For "smite in sunder, or wound, the heads;" some word answering to the Latin *conquassare.*

Ver. 7. For "therefore," translate "then shall he lift up his head again;" that is, as a man, languid and sinking from thirst and fatigue after refreshment.

N.B. I see no poetic discrepancy between vv. 1 and 5.

PSALM CXVIII.

To be interpreted of Christ's Church.

PSALM CXXVI.

Ver. 5. *As the rivers in the south.*

Does this allude to the periodical rains? <sup>\*</sup>\*

As a transparency on some night of public rejoicing, seen by common day, with the lamps from within removed—even such would the Psalms be to me uninterpreted by the Gospel. O honoured Mr. Hurwitz! Could I but make you feel what grandeur, what magnificence, what an everlasting significance and import Christianity gives to every fact of your national history—to every page of your sacred records!

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

XX. It is mournful to think how many recent writers have criminated our Church in consequence of their own ignorance and inadvertence in not knowing, or not noticing, the contra-distinction here

\* See Horne in loc. note.—ED.



meant between power and authority. Rites and ceremonies the Church may ordain *jure proprio*: on matters of faith her judgment is to be received with reverence, and not gainsaid but after repeated inquiries, and on weighty grounds.

XXXVII. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and to serve in the wars.

This is a very good instance of an unseemly matter neatly wrapped up. The good men recoiled from the plain words—"It is lawful for Christian men at the command of a king to slaughter as many Christians as they can!"

Well! I could most sincerely subscribe to all these articles. September, 1831.

## NOTES ON THE LIFE OF ST. TERESA. 1812.\*

Pref. Part i. p. 51. *Letter of Father Avila to Mother Teresa de Jesu.*

Persons ought to beseech our Lord not to conduct them by the way of seeing; but that the happy sight of him and of his saints be reserved for heaven; and that here he would conduct them in the plain, beaten road, &c. \* \* But if, doing all this, the visions continue, and the soul reaps profit thereby, &c.

In what other language could a young woman check while she soothed her espoused lover, in his

\* The works of the Holy Mother St. Teresa of Jesus, Foundress of the Reformation of the Discalced Carmelites. Divided into two parts. Translated into English, MDCLXXV.—Ed.

too eager demonstrations of his passion? And yet the art of the Roman priests,—to keep up the delusion as serviceable, yet keep off those forms of it most liable to detection, by medical commentary!

*Life*, Part i. Chap. iv. p. 15.

But our Lord began to regale me so much by this way, that he vouchsafed me the favour to give me quiet prayer; and sometimes it came so far as to arrive at union; though I understood neither the one nor the other, nor how much they both deserve to be prized. But I believe it would have been a great deal of happiness for me to have understood them. True it is, that this union rested with me for so short a time, that perhaps it might arrive to be but as of an *Ave Maria*; yet I remained with so very great effects thereof, that with not being then so much as twenty years old methought I found the whole world under my feet.

Dreams, the soul herself forsaking;  
 Fearful raptures; childlike mirth.  
 Silent adorations, making  
 A blessed shadow of this earth!

*Ibid.* Chap. v. p. 24.

I received also the blessed Sacrament with many tears; though yet, in my opinion, they were not shed with that sense and grief, for only my having offended God, which might have served to save my soul; if the error into which I was brought by them who told me that some things were not mortal sins (which afterwards I saw plainly that they were) might not somewhat bestead me. \* \* \* Methinks, that without doubt my soul might have run a hazard of not being saved, if I had died then.

Can we wonder that some poor hypochondriasts

and epileptics have believed themselves possessed by, or rather to be the Devil himself, and so spoke in this imagined character, when this poor afflicted spotless innocent could be so pierced through with fanatic pre-conceptions, as to talk in this manner of her mortal sins, and their probable eternal punishment;—and this too, under the most fervent sense of God's love and mercy!

*Ibid.* p. 43.

True it is, that I am both the most weak and the most wicked of any living.

What is the meaning of these words, that occur so often in the works of great saints? Do they believe them literally? Or is it a specific suspension of the comparing power and the memory, vouchsafed them as a gift of grace?—a gift of telling a lie without breach of veracity—a gift of humility indemnifying pride.

*Ibid.* Chap. viii. p. 44.

I have not without cause been considering and reflecting upon this life of mine so long, for I discern well enough that nobody will have gust to look upon a thing so very wicked.

Again! Can this first sentence be other than madness or a lie?—For observe, the question is not, whether Teresa was or was not positively very wicked; but whether according to her own scale of virtue she was most and very wicked comparatively. See post Chap. x., p. 57—8.

That relatively to the command *Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect*, and before the eye of his own pure reason, the best of men may

deem himself mere folly and imperfection, I can easily conceive; but this is not the case in question. It is here a comparison of one man with all others of whom he has known or heard;—*ergo*, a matter of experience; and in this sense it is impossible, without loss of memory and judgment on the one hand, or of veracity and simplicity on the other. Besides, of what use is it? To draw off our conscience from the relation between ourselves and the perfect ideal appointed for our imitation, to the vain comparison of one individual self with other men! Will their sins lessen mine, though they were greater? Does not every man stand or fall to his own Maker according to his own being?

*Ibid.* p. 45.

I see not what one thing there is of so many as are to be found in the whole world, wherein there is need of a greater courage than to treat of committing treason against a king, and to know that he knows it well, and yet never to go out of his presence. For howsoever it be very true that we are always in the presence of God; yet methinks that they who converse with him in prayer are in his presence after a more particular manner; for they are seeing then that he sees them; whereas others may, perhaps, remain some days in his presence, yet without remembering that he looks upon them.

A very pretty and sweet remark: truth in new feminine beauty!

*In fine.*

How incomparably educated was Teresa for a mystic saint, a mother of transports and fusions of spirit! 1. A woman;—2. Of rank, and reared

delicately;—3. A Spanish lady;—4. With very pious parents and sisters;—5. Accustomed in early childhood to read “with most believing heart” all the legends of saints, martyrs, Spanish martyrs, who fought against the Moors;—6. In the habit of privately (without the knowledge of the superstitious Father) reading books of chivalry to her mother, and then all night to herself. 7. Then her Spanish sweet-hearting, doubtless in the true Oroondates style—and with perfect innocence, as far as appears; and this giving of audience to a dying swain through a grated window, on having received a lover’s messages of flames and despair, with her aversion at fifteen or sixteen years of age to shut herself up for ever in a strict nunnery, appear to have been those mortal sins, of which she accuses herself, added, perhaps, to a few warm fancies of earthly love;—8. A frame of exquisite sensibility by nature, rendered more so by a burning fever, which no doubt had some effect upon her brain, as she was from that time subject to frequent fainting fits and *deliquia*;—9. Frightened at her Uncle’s, by reading to him Dante’s books of Hell and Judgment, she confesses that she at length resolved on nunhood because she thought it could not be much worse than Purgatory—and that purgatory here was a cheap expiation for Hell for ever;—10. Combine these (and I have proceeded no further than the eleventh page of her life) and think, how impossible it was, but that such a creature, so innocent, and of an imagination so heated, and so well peopled, should often mistake the first not painful, and in such a frame, often pleasurable approaches to *deliquium* for divine raptures; and join the instincts of nature acting in the body of a mind unconscious of them, in the keenly sensitive body of a mind so loving and so innocent, and

what remains to be solved which the stupidity of most and the roguery of a few would not simply explain? 11. One source it is almost criminal to have forgotten, and which p. 12, of the first Part, brought back to my recollection; I mean, the effects—so super-sensual that they may easily and most venially pass for supernatural, so very glorious to human nature that, though in truth they are humanity itself in the contradistinguishing sense of that awful word, it is yet no wonder that, conscious of the sore weaknesses united in one person with this one nobler nature we attribute them to a divinity out of us, (a mistake of the sensuous imagination in its misapplication of space and place, rather than a misnomer of the thing itself, for it is verily *ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὁ οἰκεῖος θεός,*) the effects, I mean, of the moral force after conquest, the state of the whole being after the victorious struggle, in which the will has preserved its perfect freedom by a vehement energy of perfect obedience to the pure or practical reason, or conscience. Thence flows in upon and fills the soul *that peace which passeth understanding*, a state affronted and degraded by the name of pleasure, injured and mis-represented even by that of happiness, the very corner-stone of that morality which cannot even in thought be distinguished from religion, and which seems to mean religion as long as the instinctive craving, dim and dark though it may be, of the moral sense after this unknown state (known only by the bitterness where it is not) shall remain in human nature! Under all forms of positive or philosophic religion, it has developed itself, too glorious an attribute of man to be confined to any name or sect; but which, it is but truth and historical fact to say, is more especially fostered and favoured by Christianity; and its frequent appearance

even under the most selfish and unchristian forms of Christianity is a stronger evidence of the divinity of that religion, than all the miracles of Brahma and Veeshnou could afford, even though they were supported with tenfold the judicial evidence of the Gospel miracles.\*

---

NOTES ON A TRIPLE RECONCILED BY  
THOMAS FULLER, B.D.

1654.

Page 7.—*Doctrine.*

God's ministers ought without fear or favour to perform their office, neither to be frightened nor flattered. It is observed that Moses first hanelled this law on his sister Miriam, *Numb.* xii. 15.

Secondly, we find it served by subjects on their sovereign in the case of king Uzziah, 2 *Chron.* xxvi. 20.

Five years later this would have cost Fuller a rap on his knuckles from his Bishop.

*Ibid.* p. 8.

*Sad and sorrowful the condition of a sequestered Leper.*  
Indeed some of us have been sequestered; and, blessed be

\* In one of the volumes of this work used by the Editor for ascertaining the references, the following note is written by a former owner:

“October 12, 1788. Begged of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary to take my salvation on herself, and obtain it for Saint Hyacinthe's sake; to whom she has promised to grant any thing, or never to refuse any thing begged for his sake.”

It would be very interesting to know how far the feeling expressed in this artless effusion coexisted with a faith in the atonement and mediation of the one Lord Jesus Christ.—ED.

God, we have borne our yoke in our youth, hoping that more freedom is reserved for our old age.

A hope amounting to an anticipation of the fast approaching Restoration, while Cromwell was yet alive. But there were men who hoped for a restoration of the Established Church under a moderate Episcopacy from Cromwell himself, and had he dared take the name of King, he probably would not have disappointed them.

*Ibid.* pp. 43, 44.

First, for Barnabas his title was, by his extraction, being a Levite, *Acts* xiv. 36, to whom it belonged by their profession to teach the people.

Secondly, he had an *extraordinary call* from God in the second verse of this chapter; besides, at this time, a civil invitation from the *masters* of the *synagogue*. Thus his threefold cable cannot be broken, nor any unlawful invading of the ministerial office be charged upon him.

Thirdly, St. Paul's commission to preach doth appear both by his ability and authority for the same. His ability (*Acts* xxii. 3)—brought up at the feet of Gamaliel.

*Object.* We confess his ability, but deny his authority, &c. &c.

*Ans.* All is confessed, but let the impartial reader consider, first, that Paul was a *Pharisee*, the son of a *Pharisee*, *Acts* xxiii. 6; secondly, let him also weigh the words of our *Saviour*, *Matt.* xxiii. 2, 3. *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not after their works, for they say and do not.*

Fuller is here trying to support a plain truth on a false or very questionable pediment. What wonder that he fails? For those who admitted that miracles had ceased in the Church, convincing arguments might have been brought. For those who



believed immediate calls, no arguments could have been convincing.

---

NOTES ON LIFE OUT OF DEATH, A SERMON  
BY THOMAS FULLER, B.D.

---

Page 4.

Was not Hezekiah assured that the setting of his sun here in a mortal life should be the rising thereof in a blessed immortality?

Noticeable even in the sensible Fuller this disposition to consider the Bible, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, *one* book, so as to antedate the Gospel, and attribute to the good men under the Law, not only the *Faith*, but the clear and distinct belief and assurance of Christians.

Bishop Warburton fell into the contrary extreme.

*Ibid.* p. 6.

Well, the Prophet Isaiah is sent with a welcome counter-message, that Hezekiah's prayer was heard, and a longer lease of life indulged unto him, confirmed with miracles from Heaven of the going back of the sun.

Was not the recovery itself a sufficient sign? The sun of his life had gone backward, if at sixty he was carried back and reimplaced in the strength and health of fifty. Query, a figurative *expression* of a fact, interpreted by the hearers for a distinct fact in itself?

*Ibid.* p. 11.

Sickness is a time to suffer, not to do in : patients are like bees in winter, no flying abroad to find fresh flowers ; either they must starve, or live on that stock of honey which they have provided in the summer time.

A beautiful improvement might be made of this—viz., that God's mercy through Christ does supply to his wisest bees a power of making fresh honey by patience and acknowledgment.

*Ibid.* p. 14.

David therefore allegeth this as an argument to be continued in the land of the living, *Shall the dust praise Thee, O Lord?* that God's service might still be preserved so in him, that his body might not be altogether useless, as in dead folk, but have a portion of praising of God, conjoined with his soul (as the opposite part of the quire) in lauding the Lord.

With an ingenuity worthy of Fuller ; but more ingenious than ingenuous. Better say : it was a question to which sinful man might through God's mercy hope, but could not of his own merits expect, an affirmative answer. Compare with Ezekiel, *Can these dry bones live ?*

NOTES ON WORTHIES OF ENGLAND,  
BY THOMAS FULLER, B.D.

—•—  
*Preface by the Editor, John Nichols, F.A.S.*

Even Bishop Nicolson, fastidious as in this instance he is, admits that the work at least "*pretends* to give an account of native commodities, manufactures, buildings, proverbs, &c., of all the counties of England and Wales, as well as of the great men in Church and State, though the latter looks like the principal design, and makes up the greatest part of the volume." Much might be said, if it were necessary, in vindication of the language of Dr. Fuller.—N.

Fuller's language! Grant me patience, Heaven! A tithe of his beauties would be sold cheap for a whole library of our classical writers, from Addison to Johnson and Junius inclusive. And Bishop Nicolson!—a painstaking old charwoman of the Antiquarian and Rubbish Concern! The venerable rust and dust of the whole firm are not worth an ounce of Fuller's earth!

*Memoirs of the Author.*

Dr. Thomas Fuller, son of the Rev. Thomas Fuller, rector of Aldwinkle St. Peter, in the county of Northampton, was born in 1608.—N.

Shakspeare! Milton! Fuller! De Foe! Hogarth! As to the remaining mighty host of our great men, other countries have produced something like them—but these are uniques. England may challenge the world to show a correspondent name to either of the five. I do not say that, with exception of the first, names of equal glory may not be produced, in a different kind. But these are *genera*, containing each only one individual.

## NOTES ON HOBBS'S LEVIATHAN.



Chap. i. p. 4.—*Of Sense.*

But the philosophy-schools, through all the universities of Christendom, grounded upon certain texts of Aristotle, teach another doctrine, and say, for the cause of *vision*, that the thing seen sendeth forth on every side a *visible species*.

The Schoolmen taught in other words the very same doctrines that are now taught. They gave to the external a power of calling the sense into action, some affirming that they did so *formaliter*, i. e. as a dog impresses reflection on a mirror; others *eminenter*, as the painter's brush impresses the figure of the dog on a canvass, or rather as a magnet will arrange steel filings into a circle.

*Ibid.* Chap. xxxii. p. 197.

For those words, Revolt from the Lord your God, are in this place equivalent to, Revolt from your king.

If by King be meant God only, or such as teach and do the will of the true God, this is not only true, but a mere truism. But if by King be meant any constituted authority, as the Emperor of Japan, or Domitian, it is a *wicked lie*, and all the miracles of the Prophets and Apostles must have been sent by God not to be believed, but merely to try the allegiance of subjects to their Tyrant.

## NOTES ON ASGILL'S TREATISES.

*Asgill's Argument.*

That according to the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life, without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated till he had passed through death. Edit. 1715.

IF I needed an illustrative example of the distinction between the reason and the understanding, between spiritual sense and logic, this treatise of Asgill's would supply it. Excuse the defect of all idea, or spiritual intuition of God, and allow yourself to bring Him as plaintiff or defendant into a common-law court,—and then I cannot conceive a clearer or cleverer piece of special pleading than Asgill has here given. The language is excellent—idiomatic, simple, perspicuous, at once significant and lively, that is, expressive of the thought, and also of a manly proportion of feeling appropriate to it. In short, it is the ablest attempt to exhibit a scheme of religion without ideas, that the inherent contradiction in the thought renders possible.

It is of minor importance how a man represents to himself his redemption by the Word Incarnate,—within what scheme of his understanding he concludes it, or by what supposed analogies (though actually no better than metaphors) he tries to conceive it, provided he has a lively faith in Christ, the Son of the living God, and his Redeemer. The faith may and must be the same in all who are thereby saved; but

every man, more or less, construes it into an intelligible belief through the shaping and colouring optical glass of his own individual understanding. Mr. Asgill has given a very ingenious common-law scheme. *Valeat quantum valere potest!* It would make a figure before the Benchers of the Middle Temple. For myself, I prefer the belief that man was made to know that a finite free agent could not stand but by the coincidence, and independent harmony, of a separate will with the will of God. For only by the will of God can he obey God's will. Man fell as a soul to rise a spirit. The first Adam was a living soul; the last a life-making spirit.

In the Word was life, and that life is the light of men. And as long as the light abides within its own sphere, that is, appears as reason,—so long it is commensurate with the life, and is its adequate representative. But not so, when this light shines downward into the understanding; for there it is always, more or less, refracted, and differently in every different individual; and it must be re-converted into life to rectify itself, and regain its universality, or *all-commonness*, *Allgemeinheit*, as the German more expressively says. Hence, in faith and charity, the Church is catholic: so likewise in the fundamental articles of belief, which constitute the right reason of faith. But in the minor *dogmata*, in modes of exposition, and the vehicles of faith and reason to the understandings, imaginations, and affections of men, the churches may differ, and in this difference supply one object for charity to exercise itself on by mutual forbearance.

O! there is a deep philosophy in the proverbial phrase,—“his heart sets his head right!” In our commerce with heaven, we must cast our local coins and tokens into the melting-pot of love, to pass by

weight and bullion. And where the balance of trade is so immensely in our favour, we have little right to complain, though they should not pass for half the nominal value they go for in our own market.

*Ibid.* p. 46.

And I am so far from thinking this covenant of eternal life to be an allusion to the forms of title amongst men, that I rather adore it as the precedent for them all, from which our imperfect forms are taken: believing with that great Apostle, that *the things on earth are but the patterns of things in the heavens, where the originals are kept.*

Aye! this, this is the pinch of the argument, which Asgill should have proved, not merely asserted. Are these human laws, and these forms of law, absolutely good and wise, or only conditionally so—the limited powers and intellect, and the corrupt will of men being considered?

*Ibid.* p. 64.

And hence, though the dead shall not arise with the same identity of matter with which they died, yet being in the same form, they will not know themselves from themselves, being the same to all uses, intents, and purposes. \* \* \* \*  
But then as God, in the resurrection, is not bound to use the same matter, neither is he obliged to use a different matter.

The great objection to this part of Asgill's scheme, which has had, and still, I am told, has, many advocates among the chief dignitaries of our church, is—that it either takes death as the utter extinction of being,—or it supposes a continuance, or at least a renewal, of consciousness after death. The former

involves all the irrational, and all the immoral, consequences of materialism. But if the latter be granted, the proportionality, adhesion, and symmetry, of the whole scheme are gone, and the infinite quantity,—that is, immortality under the curse of estrangement from God,—is rendered a mere supplement tacked on to the finite, and comparatively insignificant, if not doubtful, evil, namely, the dissolution of the organic body. See what a poor hand Asgill makes of it, p. 26 :—

And therefore to signify the height of this resentment, God raises man from the dead to demand further satisfaction of him.

Death is a commitment to the prison of the grave till the judgment of the great day ; and then the grand *Habeas corpus* will issue *to the earth and to the sea*, to give up their dead ; to remove the bodies, with the cause of their commitment : and as these causes shall appear, they shall either be released, or else sentenced to the common goal of hell, there to remain until satisfaction.

*Ibid.* p. 66.

Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in the grave. \* \* \*

And that it is translated *soul*, is an Anglicism, not understood in other languages, which have no other word for *soul* but the same which is for life.

How so ? *Seele*, the soul, *Leben*, life, in German ;  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  and  $\zeta\omega\eta$ , in Greek, and so on.

*Ibid.* p. 67.

Then to this figure God added *life*, by breathing it into him from himself, whereby this inanimate body became a living one.

And what was this life ? Something, or nothing ?



And had not, first, the Spirit, and next the Word, of God infused life into the earth, of which man as an animal and all other animals were made,—and then, in addition to this, breathed into man a living soul, which he did not breathe into the other animals?

*Ibid.* pp. 75—78—81, *ad finem.*

I have a great deal of business yet in this world, without doing of which heaven itself would be uneasy to me.

And therefore do depend, that I shall not be taken hence in the midst of my days, before I have done all my heart's desire.

But when that is done, I know no business I have with the dead, and therefore do as much depend that I shall not go hence by *returning to the dust*, which is the sentence of that law from which I claim a discharge: but that I shall make my *exit* by way of translation, which I claim as a dignity belonging to that degree in the science of eternal life, of which I profess myself a graduate, according to the true intent and meaning of the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures.

A man so *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* clear-headed, so remarkable for the perspicuity of his sentences, and the luminous orderliness of his arrangement,—in short, so consummate an artist in the statement of his case, and in the inferences from his *data*, as John Asgill must be allowed by all competent judges to have been,—was he in earnest or in jest from p. 75 to the end of this treatise?—My belief is, that he himself did not know. He was a thorough humorist: and so much of will, with a spice of the wilful, goes to the making up of a humorist's creed, that it is no easy matter to determine, how far such a man might not have a pleasure in *humming* his own mind, and

believing, in order to enjoy a dry laugh at himself for the belief.

But let us look at it in another way. That Asgill's belief, professed and maintained in this tract, is unwise and odd, I can more readily grant, than that it is altogether irrational and absurd. I am even strongly inclined to conjecture, that so early as St. Paul's apostolate there were persons (whether sufficiently numerous to form a sect or party, I cannot say), who held the same tenet as Asgill's, and in a more intolerant and exclusive sense; and that it is to such persons that St. Paul refers in the justly-admired fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians; and that the inadvertence to this has led a numerous class of divines to a misconception of the Apostle's reasoning, and a misinterpretation of his words, in behoof of the Socinian notion, that the resurrection of Christ is the only argument of proof for the belief of a future state, and that this was the great end and purpose of this event. Now this assumption is so destitute of support from the other writers of the New Testament, and so discordant with the whole spirit and gist of St. Paul's views and reasoning everywhere else, that it is *à priori* probable, that the apparent exception in this chapter is only apparent. And this the hypothesis I have here advanced would enable one to show, and to exhibit the true bearing of the texts. Asgill contents himself with maintaining that translation without death is one, and the best, mode of passing to the heavenly state. *Hinc itur ad astra*. But his earliest predecessors contended that it was the only mode, and to this St. Paul justly replies:—*If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable.* 1827.

## INTRODUCTION TO ASGILL'S DEFENCE UPON HIS EXPULSION FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS. EDIT. 1712.

---

*Ibid.* p. 28.

For as every faith, or credit, that a man hath attained to, is the result of some knowledge or other; so that whoever hath attained that knowledge, hath that faith (for whatever a man knows, he cannot but believe):

So this *all faith* being the result of all knowledge, 'tis easy to conceive that whoever had once attained to all that knowledge, nothing could be difficult to him.

THIS whole discussion on faith is one of the very few instances in which Asgill has got out of his depth. According to all usage of words, science and faith are incompatible in relation to the same object; while, according to Asgill, faith is merely the power which science confers on the will. Asgill says,—What we know, we must believe. I retort,—What we only believe, we do not know. The *minor* here is excluded by, and not included in, the *major*. Minors by difference of quantity are included in their majors; but minors by difference of quality are excluded by them, or superseded. Apply this to belief and science, or certain knowledge. On the confusion of the second, that is, minors by difference of quality, with the first, or minors by difference of quantity, rests Asgill's erroneous exposition of faith.\*

\* *An argument proving, that according to the covenant of eternal life, revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence, without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated, till he had passed through death.* (Title of Asgill's

NOTE ON THE TREATISE "DE CULTU ET AMORE  
DEI" OF EMMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

THIS would of itself serve to mark Swedenborg as a man of philosophic genius, indicative and involvent. Much of what is most valuable in the philosophic works of Schelling, Schubert, and Eschermayer is to be found anticipated in this supposed Dementato, or madman. Oh! thrice happy should we be if the learned and the teachers of the present age were gifted with a similar madness. A madness indeed celestial, and flowing from a divine mind!—Sept. 22, 1821.

---

pamphlet.) Asgill died in the year 1738, in the King's Bench prison, where he had been a prisoner for debt thirty years.—*Ed.*

Mr. Coleridge speaks thus of Asgill in the *Table Talk* :

July 30, 1831.

"Asgill was an extraordinary man, and his pamphlet is invaluable. He undertook to prove that man is literally immortal; or, rather, that any given living man might probably never die. He complains of the cowardly practice of dying. He was expelled from two Houses of Commons for blasphemy and atheism, as was pretended;—I really suspect because he was a staunch Hanoverian. I expected to find the ravings of an enthusiast, or the sullen suarlings of an infidel; whereas I found the very soul of Swift—an intense half self-deceived humorism. I scarcely remember elsewhere such uncommon skill in logic, such lawyer-like acuteness, and yet such a grasp of common sense. Each of its paragraphs is in itself a whole, and yet a link between the preceding and following; so that the entire series forms one argument, and yet each is a diamond in itself." Vol. i. p. 245, 1st edit. : p. 127, 2nd edit.

April 30, 1832.

"I know no genuine Saxon English superior to Asgill's. I think his and Defoe's irony often finer than Swift's." Vol. ii. p. 48, 1st edit. : p. 164, 2nd edit.—S. C.

NOTES ON A DISCOURSE OF LIBERTY OF  
CONSCIENCE BY THOMAS WHITFIELD,  
MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.



Page 16.

To the first argument, that it belongs to God alone to make laws to bind conscience, &c., the answer is,

That the magistrate doth make no laws to bind conscience, but only enjoins men to do that which the law of God requires, and restrains them from doing that which the law and word of God forbids; and this is his duty to do, namely, to punish sin, all sin and breaches of God's laws, whether it be in matters of doctrine or practice.

To the second, &c.

Answers unanswerable under the condition of an infallible magistrate; but, as magistrates are fallible, and because this is the one case *in which the being actually mistaken is the most likely to happen*, and the mistake is of most pernicious consequences; therefore the unanswerable arguments are not worth answering.

*Ibid.* pp. 16, 17.

This may be further cleared by an instance or two; suppose the magistrate should enjoin a superstitious Papist to take the image which usually he prays before, and break it in pieces or cast it into the fire, this would go against the conscience of the Papist, but it would be no sin in the magistrate; because it is the command of God, that images being instruments of idolatry should be destroyed, &c.

Even this is a sophism. The magistrate might

break the image himself or by his beadles; but to force the Papist himself to do it is gratuitous, inexcusable brutality.

---

NOTES ON THE WORKS OF ROBERT  
ROBINSON.\*

—•—  
Vol. iii. p. 42.

A PLEA for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Let us take a single passage of the Old Testament, and let us see what the application of it to Jesus Christ proves. John the Baptist sends two of his disciples to Jesus Christ to ask him whether he were the expected Messiah, &c.

I scarcely miss any *desiderand* in this fine treatise, but an occasional reply to, or rather anticipation of, natural and unavoidable objections, not from the Socinians but from the sincere searchers after truth. A case is very imperfectly stated by giving the arguments on *one* side. *Audi alteram partem*. Now I confess, that all the arguments *ostensibly* in favour of Socinianism would, if proved and real, be *to me* proofs of Deism or rejection of Revelation. Therefore those not grounded on verbal criticisms and trifles of that sort, but on plain common sense, ought to be met or anticipated. Such is the present instance. John had baptised Christ, his own cousin, of whom such miracles must have been told him both by his aunt Mary and his mother Elizabeth. At the baptism he recognised him as the Messiah from

\* The Miscellaneous Works of Robert Robinson. 4 vols. 8vo. Harlow. 1807.

Heaven; yet *now* he sends to inquire as of one unknown.

*Ibid.* p. 69.

We will illustrate this remark by two passages from the worthy and reverend Mr. Lindsey. These are his words :

*Rev. v. 13. Blessing and honour be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever.* The blessing and honour is tendered to the object PRESENT and VISIBLE. But we have observed in St. Stephen's case, that idolatry doth not consist in worshipping an *invisible* object. The *visibility* and the *invisibility* of the object have nothing to do with the nature of the act.

In this paragraph, as likewise in pages 27, 28, Robinson has fallen into an unintentional sophism; first in making "worship" a specific, whereas it is a general term to be specified by its object. "The people fell on their faces, and worshipped God and the King."—(David). *Chronicles*. Secondly (herein perhaps misled by Lindsey's lax phraseology), in confining the words "seen" and "unseen" to the sight, whereas the word was meant to imply the knowledge of actual, yet contingent, presence, however obtained. Surely a blind man (see p. 27) may discover that such a one is in the room as certainly as one with eyes. Expressed philosophically, Lindsey's argument would run thus: Worship is either of God or of a creature; but the former is distinguished from the latter by always implying the acknowledgment of *necessary* presence (*i.e.* omnipresence;) while in the latter an accidental presence (*ergo* absence elsewhere) only is attributed. The people worshipped, *i.e.* *adored religiously*, the omnipresent Jehovah, and they likewise worshipped, *i.e.* *honoured and did homage to*, King David, who

*happened* then to be present. Now the *essence* of idolatry consists in destroying the essence of all religion, viz.—the sense of necessary presence, by attributing it to a creature, or *vice versâ*, by attributing accidental and creaturely presence to the Creator. I agree therefore with Lindsey, that the *divine* worship of Christ cannot be *certainly* deduced from *this* text, which *may* be explained as *χριστοδουλεία* and not *χριστολατρεία*; though the words “for ever and ever” would incline me to the latter. But that Christ was visually present to St. Stephen at the moment of his death, is a mere presumption of the Unitarians. Besides, are we not commanded to pray to God *through* Jesus Christ, our *Lord* and *Mediator*. Now it is impossible for me to pray to A. through B. without implying that B. hears my prayer either first, or at the same time as A. Whatever presence is attributed to A. is equally applied to B. In the present instance this is omnipresence. Therefore the Unitarian, who obeys the Scripture, adores Christ as God.

*Ibid.* p. 75.

The Lord Jesus encouraged his followers to believe, that the Spirit of truth should abide with them for ever: yet it appears by the event, Jesus Christ did not include in the promise that first great truth of Christianity, on which all the rest are founded, the doctrine of his *person*, &c.

Though there is doubtless a certain degree of weight in this argument, yet, I think, Robinson rests too much upon it, and repeats it too often; for it is a fact not less certain than melancholy, that an immense majority of Christians (*ex. gr.* all the Russians, all the Christians of Asia, and of Africa, and of S. America, the larger and more populous



portions of Poland and of Germany, nine-tenths of France, and all Spain, Portugal, Italy, Sicily, &c. &c.) have been given up to the most despicable and idolatrous superstitions. When Christ comes shall he find faith on the earth? I say unto you, Nay.

*Ibid.* p. 84.

Thus far, my brethren, revelation conducts the plain Christian traveller; here it stops; and, as he who goes forward must travel either without a guide or with one who is ignorant of the road, we ought not to be astonished if he lose his way. Happy for Christians had they rested here without *philosophical explications!* Were this a proper place (but I am not writing on the doctrine of the Trinity), I believe it would be very easy to prove, that the primitive Christians received this simple testimony just as revelation gave it; and that when, about 200 years after Christ, they began to practise the art of explaining what they did not understand, they produced a novel notion called a Trinity, and with it disputes, creeds, subscriptions, proscriptions, persecutions, wars, and other calamitous consequences, which have disgraced Christianity and Christians from that day to this.

A Scripture Trinity undoubtedly there is:—but our present concern is with our Lord's divinity.

Is this not strange? If not writing on the Trinity, how could he justify this harsh *gratis dictum* ("a novel notion called a Trinity") to plain unlearned people? If there be "undoubtedly a Scripture Trinity," there must be a Scripture Triunity: and what other there can be than that of the Nicene Creed, or wherein this differs from Scripture, I am at a loss even to imagine. *All* Scripture from Genesis to the Apocalypse declares, there is but one God. In the New Testament three distinct Agents

are spoken of, the Father, the Son, and the Paraclete or Holy Ghost (My *Father* and *I* will come and *we* will dwell with you.—Sins against the Father and against the Son may be expiated; but not against the Holy Ghost, &c. &c.). To each of these the name, names, and incommunicable attributes of the Supreme Being are given. Ergo, there are three, and these Three are One.—This is the Scripture Trinity; and what other is contained in the Nicene Creed? Of the unauthorised creed of the fierce individual, whom from ignorance of his real name we may call Pseudo-Athanasius, I agree with many learned and orthodox Fathers of the English Church in wishing that *we were well rid.*

*Ibid.* p. 87.

Q. Does not the Christian faith discard reason?

A. God forbid! Reason asks and obtains evidence that God speaks, and Faith believes what He says. Is it irrational to believe him who *cannot lie*? (*Titus* i. 2.) A believer admits the *evidence of things NOT SEEN*. By faith Noah, being warned of God OF THINGS NOT SEEN AS YET, prepared an Ark. By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed, and he went out, NOT KNOWING WHITHER HE WENT. All the Patriarchs *died in the belief* of a proposition, of which they had but obscure and imperfect ideas. (*Heb.* xi.) A philosopher speculates objects with his own eyes; a believer beholds them, as it were, with the eyes of God himself. A Christian neither hides his reason in a napkin, nor drives an illicit trade with it; he puts it into the hands of the best exchanger, and receives his own with usury.

Here is the gap in the evidence: and unless this be filled up, all the rest can but perplex the mind. Reason *cannot* obtain evidence, that it is God who hath spoken, unless what is spoken is compatible with the

co-existence (or, if I dared coin such a phrase, with the *sub-existence* at least) of Reason. As to the ground-work therefore of all positive proof, the negative condition must be pre-monstrated, that the doctrine does not contradict, though it may and must transcend, the Reason; that it is incomprehensible but not absurd.

*Ibid.* p. 89.

Men mistake by not distinguishing objects of *pure* revelation from objects of natural reason, and therefore they confound believing with reasoning. I am not required to believe anything about the moon; it is a sensible object, and I am to look at it, and to reason about it. God requires me to believe the deity of Jesus Christ. Deity is an invisible object. I never saw nor ever conceived an object analogous to it. I cannot reason about it; I believe it.

This is strange! We cannot believe without knowing what it is we believe, and this we cannot know but by distinguishing it from all other notions, at least by *negatives*—and what is this but reasoning? A. cannot be at once one and three, *reasons* the Socinian. Not in the same sense, *reasons* the Trinitarian; but A., which in one sense is *three*, in another sense may be *one*. Both alike *reason*; or they could not believe. Were I to work a miracle, and then say to an illiterate Englishman, εἰς οἰωνὸς ἀριστος, ἀμύνησθαι περὶ πατρῆς, is a divine truth, the man might have good reason to believe my *veracity*, and that *something* (*what, I knew, though he did not*) was true; but *that* truth he could not believe. I dwell the more on this, because I am convinced by experience, that this mode of arguing is, and has been, the main occasion of Socinianism in liberal minds. It is one thing to *apprehend*, and

another to *comprehend*. Reason apprehends the existence of the Supreme Being, though that Being alone can comprehend it.

*Ibid.* p. 98.

There are many passages in the New Testament which express the inferiority of Jesus Christ to the Father. *My Father is GREATER than I,—ALL power is GIVEN unto me,—Of that day knoweth no man, no not the angels, NEITHER THE SON; but the Father.* If I embrace the doctrine of Christ's mere humanity, I meet with no difficulty in two of these texts, and but a few in the middle one.

I believe that the sense of this text, (which, in its ordinary interpretation, seems equally hostile to the Socinian and the Trinitarian, and therefore naturally the pet text of the Arians) is—"no not the Angels—neither the Son in His character, as contra-distinguished from the Father, but as one with the Father or as in the Father." Were the sense what the Arians suppose, the words should be ἀλλὰ μόνος ὁ Πατήρ—but the Father alone. This is confirmed by the corresponding text in St. Mark.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Proofs and Illustrations of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

*Ibid.* p. 120.

There is (if I may express my meaning so) a real and a relative infinity. Real infinity belongs to God alone. Relative infinity may belong to one creature in regard to another.

The real distinction is infinite *improprie*, i. e. *præter numerum*; and infinite *proprie*, i. e. *contra numerum, quicquid numerum excludit*. The one (as

the material Universe for instance) is the excess of number and measure—the other (pure spirit) is the opposite, the contradiction, to number and measure. The immortality of the first created Angel may, or will hereafter, include the excess of time—God's eternity the absence of time.

*Ibid.* p. 124.

Had I been born a Greenlander, I should have said “My kajak did not make itself. More skill is displayed in the structure of the meanest bird than in that of the best kajak, and more still in that of man than in the composition of either.”

Had Robinson been a Greenlander he would have thought thus: My kajak was *made*—the bird *grew*—and never have reasoned from one to the other.

*Ibid.* p. 130.

Plato, who travelled into Egypt to improve his knowledge, learnt the Jewish notion of Memra or Logos, and, affixing ideas to the term, of which the ancient Jews had never thought, returned it to the Jews in his writings, full of dark, pagan, enigmatical ideas. All things were new except the term. It was Moses Atticised indeed!

It became fashionable in time for men of science to speak and think as Plato spoke and thought; and Philo the Jew, and after him many Christian divines, took up the *Platonic* Logos, and thus brought the *Memra* of the old Targumists, and the Logos of St. John, into obscurity and disgrace; although it does not appear that St. John knew anything about Plato's ideas of it.

I suspect that Robinson had not studied Plato or Philo very profoundly. Horsley did not hesitate to pronounce the agreement of the Platonic with the Christian Trinity.

## VOL. IV. SERMON VII.

## THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Page 17.

And on this principle we prize the understandings of those who give sailors Bibles *only*, because the gift implies several just and honourable principles; principles, I mean, which do honour to the understandings and hearts of those who admit them.

First this donation implies that, in the opinion of the donor, the Bible is a *plain*, easy book; either that all the truths of revelation are simple, plain, and clear, or that such truths as are essential to salvation are so.

What if I were to call Newton's *Principia* a plain, easy book because certain detached passages were axiomatic, and because the results were evident to common sense?—What? The Pentateuch? The Solomon's Song? The Prophets in general, and Ezekiel in particular? What? The Ecclesiastes? The praise of Jael? of Ehud? of David? What? St. John's Gospel and his Revelations? The *apparent* discordances of the Evangelists in the most important narrations, as that of the Resurrection? What? St. Paul's Epistles, declared by a contemporary Apostle, dark and hard? are these proofs of a plain and easy book?

The writer of the preceding note reverences the Bible, he trusts, as much, and believes its contents with a far stricter consistency with Protestant orthodoxy (in the common received meaning of the word, orthodoxy) than the amiable author of this discourse, as appears by his own letters.—But never, never can he believe, that the many and various writings of

so many various and distant ages, as brought together form the book; that this book, or *collectaneum*, the interpretation of which *has* occupied, and will occupy, all the highest powers of the noblest and best intellects even to the consummation of all things can be called *in toto*, or even on the average, “a plain and easy book!” That what is necessary for each man’s salvation (in *his* particular state, he making the best use of the means in his power, and walking humbly with his God) is sufficiently plain for that *his* purpose, the writer of this note cheerfully acknowledges, and with thanks to the Author of all inspiration and of all good gifts!

*Ibid.* p. 18.

The nature and perfections of God, the superintendence of Providence, the folly, the guilt, the misery of sin, the purity and perfection of the law, the depravity of human nature, the imperfection of unassisted knowledge and obedience, the nature and offices of Christ, the place and use of Scripture, the influence of the Holy Spirit, the nature and necessity of faith and obedience, the promise of eternal life to the righteous, the threatening of endless punishments to the wicked, the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment, how clear and explicit are the oracles of God on all these important subjects!

And yet on every one of these points have long and obstinate controversies been carried on by learned and by unlearned. And yet scarce one can be mentioned, which some one sect does not interpret in a sense different from, or opposite to, that of another.

*Ibid.*

Some pretended mysteries are not Scripture propositions at all, but mere creatures of the schools. Others called

mysteries are contained in Scripture, but are not mysteries; the Lord's supper never was accounted a mystery till transubstantiation made it so.

Whooh!

*Ibid.* p. 19.

Secondly : the donation of a Bible only, implies, that each reader hath a *right of private judgment*. This is another just notion, truly Scriptural, and entirely Protestant. To give a man a book to read, and to deny him the right of judging of its meaning, seems the summit of absurdity. What pity that such absurdity should not be universally exploded! A right founded in nature, attached inalienably by the God of nature to the very existence of mankind, openly avowed and confirmed by Scripture, constantly exercised by all, even by such as deny it, (for who does not think for himself?) this right, I say, cannot be evaded without the greatest inconsistency.

Doubtless!—but may there not be folly in giving a child (and an ignorant man is a child in knowledge) a book he cannot understand, without any assistance to enable him so to do? To an ignorant man I would not give Newton at all: for not only he cannot understand it, but he may do very well without it. To the same man I *would* give the Bible, though a very large part would be worse than unintelligible, for it would be misintelligible—yet as it does concern him, I would give it, only with “all the means and appliances to boot,” that would preclude a dangerous misinterpretation.



## SERMON XI. ON SACRAMENTAL TESTS.

Page 108.

We suppose our Saviour in the text forbade the exercise of this parental dominion in his favour. It was to his honour that he did so, for had he directed,—impose my name upon all your descendants without their knowledge or consent; introduce the unjust and capricious *patriæ potestas* of the Romans into my kingdom, and let the Christian church be the wise and the ignorant, the profligate and the pure; he would have rendered his Gospel suspected. It would have seemed what it ought not to seem, as if it shrunk from a fair investigation.

This dominion which hath been exercised for many ages, continues to be so. When children first begin to think, Christianity is not proposed to their examination, but they are informed they are Christians already disposed of by a contract made for them by proxies whom they are taught to call godfathers and godmothers, who promised and vowed three things in their name, that they should renounce Satan and the pomps of the world, that they should believe all the articles of the Christian faith, and that they should keep God's holy commandments all the days of their lives; and when they are asked whether they hold themselves bound to perform these engagements of their proxies, each is taught to answer, yes verily, and by God's help so I will.

I hope such of you, my brethren, as practise the baptism of infants, will not imagine I am censuring you. You baptise infants because you sincerely believe infant baptism is agreeable to Scripture, but you do not incorporate them into your churches.

Who dare presume himself secure against prejudice, when the Historian of Baptism could so merge in himself the rational *common-sense* Robert Robinson, as to call from his pen such *Rousseau*

trash as is contained in this paragraph!—What? Do not the Baptists teach their children to pray to and through Christ long before they can understand Christianity? Do they defer teaching them to read and write till the age of discretion has enabled them to have such a conviction of its advantages, as inspires the spontaneous wish, produces a request to be taught? In the English Church does not Confirmation supply the same means as Baptism with the Baptists? When the Baptist says, “I attribute no saving importance to Baptism, no loss of divine power to Infant Baptism; but I think myself obliged to obey Christ scrupulously, and, believing that he did not command Infant Baptism, but on the contrary Baptism under conditions incompatible with infancy (faith and repentance) therefore I cannot with innocence, because I cannot in faith, baptise an infant at all, or an adult, otherwise than by immersion;”—I honour the man, and incline to his doctrine as the more Scriptural. But to declaim about offering Christianity to a child’s *choice* and *judgment*, and to treat the inculcation of it on his docile and believing spirit as a truth and a duty, as being an instance of superstition and *tyrannidos patriæ*—O this should have been in the *Emilius* of the sickly Genevan, not in the sober sermon of Robert Robinson!

*Ibid.* p. 110.

When Constantine entered into the Christian church he brought along with him all his imperial titles and his absolute dominion. Like a true politician, he joined himself to the most numerous and the most powerful party of Christians; and they being at the same time the least enlightened and the most deprived of all other parties of Christians,

taught him to exercise his pagan authority over all his subjects, both Pagan and Christian.

This assertion should have been accompanied with proofs.

*Ibid.* p. 118.

In brief they refused to conform ; and for non-conformity they suffered fines and bonds, exile and death. I own it is not in my power to censure this numerous host of Christians.

But these very non-conformists were, nine out of ten, equally eager and pitiless in imposing their Covenant Oath and the articles of Westminster, and as soon as they possessed the power in North America, began hanging and imprisoning and burning with more than episcopal glee. In short, Intolerance was the vice of the age, not of particular sects, though Toleration was the peculiar virtue and glory of the Quakers and Independents.

*Ibid.* p. 122.

Some complain of a profanation of a sacred institute. Whether we, sinful men, have any religion or not, surely there are some who have given unsuspected proofs of piety ; and they say, we always think of the Supreme Being with the most profound reverence ; we consider the worship of Him with the deepest veneration, as the most serious and important business of life ; we adore the Father of mankind for all his works, and chiefly for sending his Son to enlighten our minds, and to regulate our actions ; and when we behold the holy institutes of a kingdom not of this world, now imposed upon the wicked and now refused to the good, diverted from the original end of their appointment, and prostituted to secular purposes, we blush and tremble at the sight.

I don't know exactly *how* it is, but *so* it is, that the same phrases which in the New Testament I read with awe and delight, yet introduced as they are in this paragraph and a thousand others of like kind in other writings, shock me with the grossness of the *anthropomorphism*. In the new Testament God assumes the Human Nature (*νούμενον*)— In paragraphs like these the author seems to turn God into man (*φαινόμενον*).

*Ibid.* p. 123.

But it is not this sort of men, it is not atheists, deists and profligates, upon whom the test-law is intended to spend its force; but another, a class of virtuous characters, exposed to scorn for imaginary offences called schism and heresy. Yet what have states to do with heresy? They create the crime, and then punish it; but could statesmen be persuaded to let religion alone, there would remain no such crime to be punished. Among the brave and virtuous Goths, there was no such word in all their primitive codes of law; and *opinions the most preposterous do no injury to the state*, as daily experience proves. Where men's lives are innocent their speculations ought to be free.

No! neither do the nits in a child's head bite him; but nits become lice. Adders before birth have no fangs, but we kill the young in the mother's womb.

## NOTE ON FÉNÉLON ON CHARITY.\*

—●—  
Pp. 196, 197.

THIS chapter is plausible, showy, insinuating, and (as indeed is the character of the whole work) “makes the amiable.” To many,—to myself formerly,—it has appeared a mere dispute about words: but it is by no means of so harmless a character, for it tends to give a false direction to our thoughts, by diverting the conscience from the ruined and corrupted state, in which we are without Christ. Sin is the disease. What is the remedy? What is the antidote?—Charity?—Pshaw! Charity in the large apostolic sense of the term is the health, the state to be obtained by the use of the remedy, not the sovereign balm itself,—faith of grace,—faith in the God-manhood, the cross, the mediation, and perfected righteousness, of Jesus, to the utter rejection and abjuration of all righteousness of our own! Faith alone is the restorative. The Romish scheme is preposterous;—it puts the rill before the spring. Faith is the source,—charity, that is, the whole Christian life, is the stream from it. It is quite childish to talk of faith being imperfect without charity. As wisely might you say that a fire, however bright and strong, was imperfect without heat, or that the sun, however cloudless, was imperfect without beams. The true answer would be:—it is not faith,—but utter reprobate faithlessness, which may indeed very possibly co-exist with a mere acquiescence of the under-

standing in certain facts recorded by the Evangelists. But did John, or Paul, or Martin Luther, ever flatter this barren belief with the name of saving faith? No. Little ones! Be not deceived. Wear at your bosoms that precious amulet against all the spells of Antichrist, the 20th verse of the 2nd chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians:—*I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life, which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.*

Thus we see even our faith is not ours in its origin: but is the faith of the Son of God graciously communicated to us. Beware, therefore, that you do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain. If, therefore, we are saved by charity, we are saved by the keeping of the Law, which doctrine St. Paul declared to be an apostacy from Christ, and a bewitching of the soul from the truth. But, you will perhaps say, Can a man be saved without charity?—The answer is, a man without charity cannot be saved: the faith of the Son of God is not in him.

---

#### NOTE ON A SERMON

ON THE PREVALENCE OF INFIDELITY AND ENTHUSIASM,  
BY WALTER BIRCH, B.D.

—◆—

IN the description of enthusiasm, the author has plainly had in view individual characters, and those too in a light in which they appeared to him; not clear and discriminate ideas. Hence a mixture of truth and error, of appropriate and inappropriate

terms, which it is scarcely possible to disentangle. Part applies to fanaticism ; part to enthusiasm ; and no small portion of this latter to enthusiasm not pure, but as it exists in particular men, modified by their imperfections—and bad because not wholly enthusiasm. I regret this, because it is evidently the discourse of a very powerful mind ;—and because I am convinced that the disease of the age is want of enthusiasm, and a tending to fanaticism. You may very naturally object that the senses, in which I use the two terms, fanaticism and enthusiasm, are private interpretations equally as, if not more than, Mr. Birch's. They are so ; but the difference between us is, that without reference to either term, I have attempted to ascertain the existence and diversity of two states of moral being ; and then having found in our language two words of very fluctuating and indeterminate use, indeed, but the one word more frequently bordering on the one state, the other on the other, I try to fix each to that state exclusively. And herein I follow the practice of all scientific men, whether naturalists or metaphysicians, and the dictate of common sense, that one word ought to have but one meaning. Thus by Hobbes and others of the materialists, compulsion and obligation were used indiscriminately ; but the distinction of the two senses is the condition of all moral responsibility. Now the effect of Mr. Birch's use of the words is to continue the confusion. Remember, we could not reason at all, if our conceptions and terms were not more single and definite than the things designated. Enthusiasm is the absorption of the individual in the object contemplated from the vividness or intensity of his conceptions and convictions : fanaticism is heat, or accumulation and direction, of feeling acquired by contagion, and relying on the

sympathy of sect or confederacy; intense sensation with confused or dim conceptions. Hence the fanatic can exist only in a crowd, from inward weakness anxious for outward confirmation; and, therefore, an eager proselyter and intolerant. The enthusiast, on the contrary, is a solitary, who lives in a world of his own peopling, and for that cause is disinclined to outward action. Lastly, enthusiasm is susceptible of many degrees, (according to the proportionateness of the objects contemplated,) from the highest grandeur of moral and intellectual being, even to madness; but fanaticism is one and the same, and appears different only from the manners and original temperament of the individual. There is a white and a red heat; a sullen glow as well as a crackling flame; cold-blooded as well as hot-blooded fanaticism. Enthusiasts, *ἐνθουσιασταὶ* from *ἐνθεός*, *οἷς ὁ θεὸς ἐνεστί*, or possibly from *ἐν θυσίαις*, those who, in sacrifice to, or at, the altar of truth or falsehood, are possessed by a spirit or influence mightier than their own individuality. *Fanatici*—*qui circum fana favorem mutuo contrahunt et afflant*—those who in the same conventicle, or before the same shrine, relique, or image, heat and ferment by co-acervation.

I am fully aware that the words are used by the best writers indifferently, but such must be the case in very many words in a composite language, such as the English, before they are desynonymised. Thus imagination and fancy; chronical and temporal, and many others.



NOTES ON LETTERS FROM SPAIN BY DON  
LEUCADIO DOBLADO.

—♦—  
Pp. 111, 112.

I have often heard the question, how could such men as Bossuet and Fénelon adhere to the Church of Rome and reject the Protestant faith? The answer appears to me obvious. Because, according to their fixed principles on this matter, they must have been either Catholics or infidels. Laying it down as an axiom, that Christianity was chiefly intended to reveal a system of doctrines necessary for salvation, they naturally and constantly inferred the existence of an authorised judge upon questions of faith, otherwise the inevitable doubts arising from private judgment would defeat the object of revelation.

THE most striking, certainly, and most fearful, but far from the only, instance of the practical mischiefs resulting from the confusion of Belief and Faith. In the German, the same word expresses both, viz. *Glaube*. A grievous defect! But even where this is not the case, as in the Latin and in our own language, by how many Divines are they regarded as synonymes! The great Object of Christianity is *Faith*, fealty to the spiritual in our humanity, to that which indeed contradistinguishes us as human, to that Power, in which the Will, the Reason, and the Conscience are three in One, and by which alone spiritual truths, *i. e.* the only living and substantial truths, can be discerned. To this power, under the name of Faith, every thought of the understanding, of the mind of the Flesh, must be

brought into subjection. And belief of particular Dogmata, *i. e.* the perception of the arguments for, over those against, their verity, is then only essential, when such belief is implied in the state of Faith. Hence St. Paul tolerates many, and those not trifling errors of belief, even while he exposes them. Be satisfied, each of you in his own mind, and exercise charity towards such of the Brethren as profess different persuasions; but cling all of you to the bond of love in the unity of Faith. Yet how early the dangerous identification of the two words began, we learn from the Epistle of James, who, arguing *ex absurdo* on the assumption, that Faith means Belief, justly remarks—The Devils believe, and so thoroughly too, that they believe and tremble. Belief, therefore, cannot be the proper and essential ground of Salvation in the soul. But Faith *is*, and by Christ Himself is solemnly declared to be so. Therefore, Belief cannot be the same as Faith! though the Belief of the truths essential to the Faith in Christ is the necessary accompaniment and consequent of the Faith. *Ex. gr.* I cannot sincerely trust in Christ, and entirely love the Lord Jesus, without at the same time believing, first, that He is, and, secondly, that He is most trust- and love-worthy. But I can love Him, trust in Him, and earnestly desire to obey his commands, without having even heard of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, or having troubled my head respecting even her *aei-partheny*.

Pp. 156, 157.

The unresisting nun put the water to her lips, and stopped. The physician was urging her to proceed, when to his great amazement he found the contents of the glass reduced to one lump of ice.

I wonder that I never asked Mr. White what he really meant by the insertion of this *thumper*. Perhaps I had passed over this page and the opposite, the leaves sticking; for I certainly read the volume when first sent to me by the author.

Page 157. Continued from "lump of ice."

We had the account of this wonder from the clergyman who introduced us to the nun. Of his veracity I can entertain no doubt: (!! S. T. C.) while he on the other hand was equally confident of Doctor Carnero's.

Pray, was Dr. Carnero put to his oath whether he had ascertained that it was water and not ice in the glass when the attendant brought it to him? But the more probable solution is, that Dr. Carnero was humming the clergyman.

Page 157.

Our visit to the other convent made me acquainted with one of the most pitiable objects ever produced by superstition—a *reluctant* nun.

Say rather a *diseased*.

A sense of decorum, and the utter hopelessness of relief, keep the bitter regrets of many an imprisoned female a profound secret to all but their confessor. In the present case, however, the vehemence of the sufferer's feelings had laid open to the world the state of her harassed mind. She was a good-looking woman, of little more than thirty; but the contrast between the monastic weeds, and an indescribable air of wantonness which, in spite of all caution, marked her every glance and motion, raised a mixed feeling of

disgust and pity, that made us uncomfortable during the whole visit.

And I should fear that in this climate, cases of nymphomania in the Nunneries are not rare.

Page 167.

In the intervals of the dance we were sometimes treated with dramatic scenes, of which the dialogue is composed on the spot by the actors. This amusement is not uncommon in country towns. It is known by the name of *juegos*—a word literally answering to *plays*.

*Qy. ?* The same as the Venetian Fabas, to which Gozzi's genius has given celebrity.

Page 412.

The dispute on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin began between the Dominicans and Franciscans as early as the thirteenth century.

It may deserve attention from the zealous advocates of the authenticity of the *Evangelium Infantie* prefixed to the Gospel of Luke and concorporated with the canonical revision of Matthew's—whether the immaculate conception of the Virgin is not a legitimate corollary of the miraculous conception of our Lord, so far at least that the same reason, that rendered it impossible for him to have a maculate father, is equally cogent for the necessity of an immaculate mother.

But alas ! in subjects of this sort we can only stave off the difficulty. It is a point in a circle ; on whichever side we remove from it, we are sure to come round to it again. So here. Either the Virgin's ancestors, paternal and maternal, from Adam and Eve downward, were all sinless ; or her immediate

father and mother were not so, but like the rest of mankind, involved in original sin. But if a sin-stained father and mother could produce an immaculate offspring in one instance, why not in the other? That the union of the Divine Word with the seed and nature of man should preclude the contagion of sin in the Holy Child, is as much to be expected on the one supposition of our Lord's birth as on the other. So far from being a greater miracle, it seems so necessarily involved in the miracle of the Incarnation, common to both, as scarcely to be worthy of being called an additional miracle. The accidental circumstance, that the Unitarian party, most palpably to their own\* disadvantage, reject or question the chapter in question, is the chief cause of the horror with which our orthodox divines recoil from every free investigation of the point.

---

JAHN. APPENDIX HERMENEUTICÆ. †

Fasciculus i., p. 62.

Cæterum si quæritur, qualem illi antiqui Hebræi animo conceperint hunc legatum Jehovæ et simul Jehovam : id unum responderi potest certum non credidisse duos Deos ; cætera conjecturis nituntur, &c.

*Translation.*—But if it be inquired what conception those

\* The conception by the over-shadowing of the Holy Spirit being the only plausible explanation, which a Socinian can give to the often repeated antithesis Son of God and Son of Man, of one and the same person. The believer in the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Filial God, and Redemption by the Blood of the divine Mediator, has an interest therefore in the removal, rather than in the up-propment, of this strongest, nay, only, buttress of the *extreme* Heresy.

† Appendix Hermeneuticæ, seu Exercitationes Exegeticæ, auctore Johanne Jahn. Viennæ, 1813.

ancient Hebrews formed of Him who was at once the messenger of Jehovah, and Jehovah himself, this only can be replied with certainty, that they did not believe that there were two Gods: all else rests upon conjecture, &c.

WHY is it *necessary*, on what grounds of psychology is it *rational*, to demand an answer to the question, in what distinct conceptions the more spiritual Israelites under the Law, and of the Prophetic *Æra* presented to themselves the *idea* of the Word of God, that *was* (*i. e.* was not a mere verbal abstraction) and yet was not a creature contradistinguished from God? The great *idea* possessed all the faithful, but before the coming of Jesus, few, perhaps not one, possessed the idea. Our sailors—nay, whole nations—believe with equal liveliness their moral responsibility, and yet their predestination—how many thousands, without having once asked themselves, how the two are to be reconciled? The Jehovah, the Jehovah *Word*, the Name, the Angel of the Presence (*i. e.* inseparably present) was a sacred tradition, a treasured prophecy—a mysterious cypher in which all treasures of all knowledge were contained, but by involution.

This view of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as a *Prophecy*, and like the great Prophecy of the Redemption, proceeding from dim dawn to full noon-tide, is a most important analogy.

Take an acorn—and consider it in its successive growth as the object of watchful attention. It is *one*, but lo! it is becoming many. Nay, it still remains one—*ex. gr.* till at length the full idea of the oak is mastered—the original *Unity* becoming more and more intense as the *Distinctity* becomes apparent.

*Ibid.* p. 63.

Hinc adventum legati divini, Hebræis fæderati, ad templum suum cogitabant talem, qualis locis aliis non paucis memoratur

adventus Jehovæ, quo tamen non amplius significatur quam eminens quædam operatio Jehovæ. . . . Atque in hoc non errabant, sed id quod erat præcipuum, negligebant, de adventu Messiae esse sermonem, et Messiam dici Dominum templi et legatum fæderis, atque venturum, ut alias Jehova venturus dicitur.

*Translation.*—Hence the coming of the divine messenger, covenanted to the Hebrews, to his temple, was thought of as similar to that which in not a few other places is mentioned as the coming of Jehovah, by which, however, no more is meant than some eminent operation of Jehovah. . . . And in this they erred not, but failed to discern what was of most importance, that the discourse was concerning the coming of Messiah, and that Messiah is called the Lord of the Temple, and the Messenger of the Covenant, and that he would come, as elsewhere it is said that Jehovah would come.

They erred in *this*: that the one series of instances could be easily reconciled with, and received their full and legitimate explanation out of the other, viz: the Jehova-ship of the Messiah; but the other not without the most outrageous laxity of interpretation reduced to the former.

*Ibid.* p. 234.

Zach. x. 12.

Maccabæos præ reliquis omnibus in nomine Dei, seu ad tuendam religionem suam bella contra Syro-Macedonas gessisse, monitione non indiget.

*Translation.*—That the Maccabees beyond all others waged their wars against the Syro-Macedonians, in the name of the Lord, or to defend their religion, needs not to be called to mind.

Et passim, imo, *ubique*—the sad squint-eyed application of great absolute truths and assurances to particular (sometimes inappropriate, but when appropriate, yet still *particular*) instances. As if one were

to apply the laws propounded by Alpinus, Franklin, Oersted, Sir H. Davy, Faraday, &c., as of exclusive application to the steeple of St. Boniface's Church destroyed by lightning, in the parish of Mudwork, in the county of Rutland, Nov. 9, 1819.

Doubtless the Maccabean victories and defeats were included in the prophecy, as far as the prophecy included them: and no further. And verily, the petty insurrection of a province against a despot overlord in defence of its own privileges or prejudices, are, when tolerably successful, matters worthy of record: *ex. gr.* those of Biscay, and of Catalonia against the encroachment and faith-breach of the Spanish Crown. But was it necessary that each should have been antedated some three or four hundred years by an especial Gazette in the future sense? Never can I attribute *faith* in the highest sense, viz., the union of the finite individual will with the reason, and the willing subjection of the individual UNDERSTANDING to the Reason, as the representative of the absolute will (as such, therefore, the one UNIVERSAL reason)—never can I attribute Christian FAITH in this, its only legitimate sense, to the man who confounds PROPHECY with PROGNOTICATION, degrades the former into the latter, and places Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, on the same bench with Merlin and Nostradamus! \*

*Fasciculus* ii. pp. 215, 228.

Gen. iii., 9, 15.

Nunc ea in vicinia arboris dormiente; serpens more suo arborem conscendit, atque strepitu et sibilo occasionem somnio præbuit; evigilans mulier conspexit serpentem, &c.  
 . . . . *Kol*, vox vel sonitus Jehovæ, potest quidem

\* See Arnold's two sermons on the interpretation of Prophecy.—ED.



significare strepitum ambulantis, alias tamen denotat tonitrua, quæ etiam h. l. intelligenda esse videntur, imprimis cum mox timor hominum commemoretur.

*Translation.*—Now she sleeping near the tree, the serpent after its manner clomb the tree, and by its noise and hissing gave occasion to a dream; the woman awaking saw the serpent, &c. . . . Kol, the voice or sound of Jehōvah, may indeed signify the noise of one walking, yet elsewhere it denotes thunderings; and this seems to be the meaning in these lines, especially since soon afterwards the *fear* of the man and woman is mentioned.

ὦς ἔμολγε δοκεῖ, it is all over with a literal interpretation, when the interpreter is forced to play the interpolator—*ex. gr.* to choose to assume, that Eve had selected the Forbidden Tree as the shady bower for her afternoon *siesta*—fell asleep, and *dreamt* that she saw this, and heard that!! and then that all the awful catenation of words and thoughts from v. xi. to xx. was suggested to Adam and Eve by a peal of thunder acting on an alarmed conscience. No! if an *historical* interpretation be any way practicable, it must still be as *mythic history*. Adam and Eve must represent, together with their Eden, the *first* race of mankind—and the primeval state, viz., the horticultural or fruit-eaters—and must comprehend an indefinite number of generations.

## NOTE ON SOUTHEY'S OMNIANA.

### GIFT OF TONGUES.

—◆—  
Vol. i. p. 226.

IN no instance is the love of the marvellous more strikingly exhibited than in the ordinary interpreta-

tions of this plain and simple narration of St. Luke's. On the inrush of the Spirit the new converts of Jesus from all parts of the Roman empire then met at Jerusalem, rushed out of the house, and addressed the crowd, each his own countrymen, and, to the scandal of some and surprise of all, in the vernacular dialects instead of the sacred (Syro-Chaldaic) language,—just as if a man should pray aloud in a Catholic Church in any other than Latin prayers. The Apostles sate still the while. At length, observing the workings in the minds of the auditors, the twelve rose at once; and Peter, as the Foreman, made the address recorded, and expressly tells them, that the *miracle* they had witnessed was a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, viz. that laymen should preach in the Spirit in the common tongues.\*

---

## NOTE ON THEOLOGICAL LECTURES

OF

BENJAMIN WHEELER, D.D.

---

Vol. i. p. 77.

A miracle, usually so termed, is the exertion of a supernatural power in some act, and contrary to the regular course of nature, &c.

WHERE is the proof of this as drawn from Scripture, from fact recorded, or from doctrine affirmed? Where the proof of its logical possibility,—that is, that the word has any representable sense? Contrary to  $2 \times 2 = 4$  is  $2 \times 2 = 5$ , or that the same fire acting at the same moment on the same subject should burn it and not burn it.

\* See a note at the end of the volume.—S. C.

The course of nature is either one with, or a reverential synonyme of, the ever-present Divine agency; or it is a self-subsisting derivative from, and dependent on, the Divine will. In either case this author's assertion would amount to a charge of self-contradiction on the Author of all things. Before the spread of Grotianism, or the Old Bailey *volens volens* Christianity, such language was unexampled. A miracle is either *super naturam*, or it is simply *præter experientiam*. If nature be a collective term for the sum total of the mechanic powers,—that is, of the act first manifested to the senses in the conductor A. arriving at Z. by the sensible chain of intermediate conductors, B, C, D, &c.;—then every motion of my arm is *super naturam*. If this be not the sense, then nature is but a wilful synonyme of experience, and then the first noticed aerolithes, Sulzer's first observation of the galvanic arch, &c. must have been miracles.

As erroneus as the author's assertions are logically, so false are they historically, in the effect which the miracles in and by themselves did produce on those who, rejecting the doctrine, were eye-witnesses of the miracles;—and psychologically, in the effect which miracles, as miracles, are calculated to produce on the human mind. Is it possible that the author can have attentively studied the first two or three chapters of St. John's gospel?

There is but one possible tenable definition of a miracle,—namely, an immediate consequent from a heterogeneous antecedent. This is its essence. Add the words, *præter experientiam adhuc*, or *id temporis*, and you have the full and popular or practical sense of the term miracle.\*

\* See the Friend, vol. iii. Essay 2.—Ed.

## NOTES ON THE QUARTERLY REVIEW,\*

OCTOBER, 1813.

—◆—  
Page 92.

Whatever Priestley might have been, this (that Priestley speaks only of sleeping in the grave, and not, like Paul, of sleeping in Jesus) is a wicked misrepresentation of him: these writers know that when he spoke of a long sleep, he alluded to his belief of the sleep of the soul till the resurrection, a notion not peculiar to him; and they know that his belief in the resurrection was as sincere as their own, founded upon the same premises, and producing the same conclusions.

WHICH said Priestley denied the existence of a soul, and whose fable of a Resurrection is neither more nor less than a system of creating B. in such a manner as to force him to believe a Lie, viz. that he was A., in order to torment him with a show of justice! Lie supporting Lie! Injustice barricaded by Injustice! a strange Positive of Right resulting from two negatives!—and these (*horresco referens*) attributed to the Holy One.

Bigotry makes as dismal an effect upon the understanding as upon the heart.

Makes for produces—a Gallo-barbarism not less anti-logical than anti-Anglican.

\* Art. 5.—History of Dissenters, from the Revolution in 1688 to the year 1808. By David Bogue and James Bennett, 4 vols. London, 1812.

## Page 94.

Even Milton has joined in this ill-deserved reproach. "I persuade myself," says he, "if our zeal to true religion, and the brotherly usage of our truest friends were as notorious to the world as our prelatial schism, and captivity to *pocket apothegms*, we had ere this seen our old conquerors, and afterwards liegemen, the Normans, together with the Britains, our proper colony, and all the Gascoins that are the rightful dowry of our ancient kings, come with cap and knee, desiring the shadow of the English sceptre to defend them from the hot persecutions and taxes of the French. But when they come hither and see a tympany of Spaniolised bishops, swaggering in the foretop of the state, and meddling to turn and dandle the royal ball with unskilful and pedantic palms, no marvel though they think it as unsafe to commit religion and liberty to their arbitrating as to a synagogue of Jesuits."

But against the opinion of those who think that we ought to have departed as widely as possible from all the forms and institutions of the Romish church, and that the general cause of Protestantism was injured because the change was not sufficiently broad and striking, there is the weighty testimony of Sully. When that distinguished statesman came over to congratulate James upon his accession, and saw our Church Service, he remarked, that if the French Protestants had retained the same advantages of order and decency, there would at that time have been thousands more Protestants in France.

I will yield to no man in attachment to the Church of England, yet I dare justify this passage of Milton's, as equally wise and accurate as it is forcible. Had the Church adopted Usher's plan of moderate Episcopacy by anticipation, all the Protestant Churches of Europe might have gathered under her wings. There is nothing in the assertion of Sully at all irreconcilable with this.

By the by, what stronger proof can we desire than the known fact, that Laud's and Hammond's tenet concerning the *jus divinum* of Bishops, &c. is obsolete ; at least, *inter inusitatissima—dogma omnimodo insolens?* So that the Church is lumbered with the huge machinery without the power—a steam-engine without the steam.

Page 95.

In the latter years of her reign, when the Pope made use of religion to excite rebellion and conspiracies against her, Elizabeth offered concessions to the Puritans, which, had they been accepted, would have driven many of these men (the clergy, little curious or conversant in disputed points of faith, but attached to the forms in which they had been bred up) out of the church ; but it was then seen that concession which would have materially diminished the number of converts from popery, would have done little towards reclaiming those who had imbibed the temper as well as the doctrines of the Genevan school. For when Walsingham offered, in the queen's name, that if they would conform in other points, the three shocking ceremonies, as they accounted them, of kneeling at the communion, wearing the surplice, and the cross in baptism, should be abolished, they replied in the language of Moses, *ne ungulam esse relinquendam*—they would not leave even a hoof behind.

A powerful mind states, first, all that can be wisely said on the one side of a question ; then the same on the other ; and, lastly, effects the process of comparison, and subtracts the result. Now, there are certain people who catch up and carry off the first and the second part, either as that which they happened to hear, or as that which best suited their predilections, and publish it in their own names as the whole.

Hence arises a sort of perplexity in the mind of a philosophic reader, how being no better it should be so good.

*Ibid.*

A Puritan rampant, who calls himself P. S. Gent, who was evidently a man of learning, and might have been a man of genius if the disease of the times had not made him stark mad, gives, both in prose and verse, the feelings of his party respecting this appellation: Puritan (he says), the invention of hell, the language of profaneness, the blasphemy of God, the evomition of a heart desperately wicked, a glorious defamation, an undermining of, an open thrust at, the very heart, life, and power of religion; an evident preferring of Pharisaical forms and Laodicean neutrality; a *Match-devillian* device to kindle fire in Church and State; a sly practice of the old serpent's maxim, "divide and reign," &c.

In his crazy rhymes he says—

A Puritan ! what's that? an hypocrite.  
 Nay, hold there, man, for so thou dost but fit  
 The noose for thine own neck.—I tell thee, man,  
 Thou art an atheist, or a Puritan ;  
 Thou art a devil or a Puritan, &c. &c.

*Soliloquies Theologicall*, 1641.

The *quotation* at least is neither crazy prose nor crazy rhymes, but sound theology in spirited diction. Are not the Epistles of Peter and John equally decisive? In short, the most important division,—I had almost said, the only important one, inasmuch as all others of importance are implied in this, or deducible from it,—is, whether the essence of Christianity be to make us *better* men only, or to make us *other* men—"create in us a new heart."

Page 96.

By whatever name the Puritans might have been denominated, their history would have been the same; their rise was one of the inevitable consequences of a religious revolution, and the civil war was as inevitable an effect of their progress.

This is an unthinking way of thinking. It is easy to talk of past events as having been inevitable, because we are forced by the forms of the understanding\* to review them by the logical functions of Cause and Effect. The writer did not consider that in the very same way we are obliged to reflect on our own past actions; and that the very same principle, if admitted other than as logical, would do away with free-agency. Endless are the errors, and not a few of them most pernicious, from not distinguishing *Principia Logica* from the *Principia Entitiva*.

Pp. 96, 97.

It is easy to talk of toleration, and say that the Church should have tolerated these schismatics: they would not tolerate the Church. "We intended not," says Baxter, "to dig down the banks or to pull up the hedge and lay all waste and common, when we desired the prelates' tyranny might cease. We must either tolerate all men to do what they will, which they will make a matter of conscience or religion, and then some may offer their children in sacrifice to the devil, and some may think they do God service in killing his servants; or else you must tolerate no error or

\* The *ipse intellectus (per intellectionem sibi ipse revelatus)* of Leibnitz in his admirable reply to the Lockian assertion of the old Peripatetics, "*Nihil in Intellectu quod non prius in sensu:*" an adage which my old master at Christ's Hospital, Bowyer, used to quote when we were under the rod. You must make a lad *feel* before he will *understand*.



fault in religion, and then you must advise what measure of penalty you will inflict. My judgment I have always freely made known : I abhor unlimited liberty or toleration of all."

Southey did not advert to Baxter's use of the word "Religion," which meant with him the *Regula Fidei*, or Apostles' Creed; and this, too, limited to an open opposition to the words of the Creed. Whoever could conscientiously use the words was not to be further questioned.

This is a most unfair quotation from Baxter, who was the nearest to absolute toleration of all theologians. He proposed that all persons admitted as Church members should be ready to declare, that they desired what was prayed for in the Lord's Prayer, believed what was declared in the Apostles' Creed, and held themselves bound to obey what was enjoined by the Ten Commandments, and that all beyond should be free to each.

Pp. 97, 98.

All this is moderate to the language of Edwards in his "Gangræna," where he exhorts ministers to pray to God and call upon Him night and day to give a miscarrying womb to the sectaries, that they may never bring forth that misshapen bastard monster of a toleration. "Toleration," says he, "will make the kingdom a chaos," &c. &c. This was the temper of the Puritans; but to say that toleration would have contented men who laid claim to supremacy, and accounted intolerance in their own hands a Christian's duty of the first magnitude, is as absurd as it would be to attempt to reason a madman into sanity.

The answer to all the foregoing page is, that the reviewer should have made himself precisely acquainted

with the then sense of the word "Toleration;"\* and in this sense he himself seems to fight against it.

Page 98.

Messrs. Bogue and Bennett fail not to notice, with due indignation, the most infamous tragedy acted in the treatment of Burton, Prynne, and Bastwick, &c.; but they pass over the bloodier and deeper tragedy of Laud, by simply

\* In the notes to Baxter, however, it is admitted over and over again, that he, confessedly the most moderate and reasonable of the party, had a "very imperfect theory of religious toleration." See "Notes on English Divines," vol. ii., pp. 22, 23, 25, 26, and, in particular, 98, 99, where the language held is little less strong than that of the article here criticised, only it is better grounded, and better balanced. The question is not what may have been done or thought by this or that party at a particular time, but what is the inevitable tendency of such or such a line of opinion. The first reformers may not have been tolerant, but the movement which they headed tended to toleration, while the reaction which followed inclined towards persecution. Religious toleration, considered as a system having a natural growth and development, can be looked for only from those in whose principles it is ultimately involved, and with whose position it is practically consistent. These conditions were to be found neither in the extreme of the puritanical, nor of the prelatival party; and such was the opinion of S. T. C. Speaking of Field's "Book of the Church," he says—"Here more than in any of the prelatival and Arminian divines, from Laud to the death of Charles II., you will see the strength and beauty of the Church of England; that is, its liturgy, homilies, and articles. By contrasting, too, its present state with that which such excellent men as Baxter, Calamy, and the so-called Presbyterian or Puritan divines would have made it, you will bless it as the bulwark of toleration." Such also, as between the Church of England and its papal adversaries, was the opinion of Mr. Southey. See his admirable "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ," p. 423. Replying to Mr. Charles Butler, he says—"You have adjured me, 'as a Christian and a gentleman, to say on which side the balance of religious persecution lies . . . the Roman Catholic and the Protestant?' There is an Irish act against *making comparisons*, which you cannot but be acquainted with, were it only for its name's sake; for it is called the 'Butler-aboo Statute.' You should have remembered it, Sir, on this occasion, and have enforced it against yourself . . . On which side does the balance of persecution lie!! Put the Inquisition in the scale, Sir, and nothing can be found to counterpoise it, unless Hell be plucked up by the roots!"—D. C.

saying, that he was brought to the block, and repeating the old and oft-confuted calumny, that, under his primacy, it was every day becoming more difficult and less important to distinguish between the Church of England and that of Rome.

. . . . Laud had persecuted them, and persecution, as Warburton says, though it may strengthen or improve our faith, doth not so easily enlarge our charity. But it ought not utterly to extinguish charity; and is it possible that they, being Christians themselves, and serious Christians as they would style themselves, can disbelieve the last solemn declaration of Laud himself? "I was born and baptized," said he, "in the bosom of the Church of England established by law; in that persuasion I have ever since lived, and in that I come now to die," &c. &c.

And what is there in Laud's last confession (to attribute, by the by, to such confessions the weight Southey does, is what Wordsworth would not do)—what is there in it that is incompatible with Bogue's and Bennett's affirmation? Laud was not a believer in those articles of *faith* in which the Romanists differed from the Reformers; nay, he was one of the very ablest of the antagonists of those articles, Transubstantiation, Purgatory. But who ever suspected this? It was the pomp, pride, vanity, and temporal tyranny of the Roman Church that Laud was suspected of being attached to; and these, not mistakes in faith, are the poison-bag on which the Papal fang rests.

Page 99.

Will this convince those persons who still asperse the intentions of Laud? Will they believe him, that in the bosom of the Church of England he lived and died?

But what did Laud mean by "the Church of England?"

*Ibid.*

In Mr. Parsons's new and condensed edition of Neal's "History of the Puritans," Laud's dying declaration, that he had never endeavoured the subversion of the laws of the realm, nor any change of the Protestant religion into popish superstition, is printed in large capital letters, obviously for the purpose of showing that Mr. Neal considered it a falsehood.

Who told Southey that ?

*Ibid.*

This author, whose coarse, bold, self-satisfied countenance at the beginning of this book may teach any one who can read the most legible characters of nature, what kind of feeling he is to expect in it, says, that the Archbishop declared himself upon the scaffold a Protestant according to the Church of England, but with more charity to the Church of Rome than to the foreign Protestants.

Which? Neal or Parsons? Not having the book, I cannot say what was intended; but this is most certain, that Laud did think more charitably of the Church of Rome, while he was in power, than of the foreign non-episcopal congregations, whom he did not allow to be Churches.

Pp. 101, 102.

We are not the apologists of Laud; in some things he was erroneous, in some imprudent, in others culpable. Evil, which upon the great scale is ever made conducive to good, produces evil to those by whom it comes. The bloody sentences of the Star-chamber brought down upon him a more tragic catastrophe than he attempted to avert by them; a milder primate could not have raised the Church

from her enemies, but he would not have perished by their hands. And in return, it cannot be doubted, that when the clergy regained their ascendancy, the severity with which they treated the Dissenters was in no slight degree exasperated by the remembrance of his execution. "For though," as Fuller says, "the beholders on that day were so divided between bemoaners and insulters, it was hard to decide which of them made up the major part of the company;" the feeling of the country was not thus balanced: his love of letters, and the munificence of his bounty, were remembered; and as the drama of life is usually judged of by the catastrophe, so that men are accounted good or ill, fortunate or unhappy, according to their end, it was from his death that the popular and general impression of his character derived its colour.

God knows my heart, how bitterly I abhor *all* Intolerance—how deeply I pity the actors when there is reason to suppose them deluded. But is it not clear that this theatrical scene of Laud's death, who was the victim of almost national indignation, is not to be compared with "bloody sentences" in the coolness of secure power? As well might you palliate the horrible atrocities of the Inquisition; every one of which might be justified on the same grounds that Southey has here defended Laud, by detailing the vengeance taken on some one Inquisitor.

Page 102.

That which has happened may happen again; the passions of men remain the same; progressive as we are, we have often to go through the same lessons as the ages before us; and therefore it especially behoves the historian to inculcate charity, and take part with the oppressed, whoever may have been the oppressors. Of all beasts the many-headed one is the most ferocious; and it is fearful to think how

soon and how surely the taste of blood creates the appetite for it !

When men, after long habits of blind obedience in religion, began to search the Scriptures and to frame articles of belief for themselves, it was impossible that they should not differ; and as they were all agreed that any error upon these points was damnable, they all became in some measure intolerant, and the dominant party persecuted both in duty and self-defence. Here it was that both parties erred, but thus it was that both felt, and thus in justice both ought to be represented. To write history in the true spirit of general good-will no suppression is needed, no falsification, no affectation of candour; it is but to represent men in their actions, as they have appeared to themselves, and, God be praised, there are few characters so unredeemed, that we should then regard their sufferings without compassion, or their errors without excuse.

I know well how imprudent and unworthy these my opinions are! The Dissenters will give me no thanks, because I prefer and extol the *present* Church of England; and the partisans of the Church will calumniate me, because I condemn particular members and regret particular eras of the former Church of England.

Would that Southey had written the whole of this review in the spirit of this beautiful page !

Page 103.

The fanatic who, in this country, would drive the nervous part of his hearers mad by railing at the sins of his neighbours, was taught by the *wise policy* of the Romish Church to expend his fervour upon his own; he was furnished with knotted scourges, hair shirts, and drawers composed of wire and bristles; if this did not content him, he might add a nutmeg-grater waistcoat, and then he had put on the whole papistical armour of righteousness.

!!

Pp. 104, 105.

Three Protestants suffered under the six articles, and three Papists for denying the supremacy, at the same time and place. Insomuch that a certain stranger being there present, and seeing three on one side, and three on the other side to suffer, said in these words, "*Deus bone! quomodo hic vivunt gentes! hic suspendantur Papistæ, illic comburuntur Anti-papistæ.*"

Here again one of the bloody tyrannies of Henry VIII. is adduced as a fact of joint persecution by two parties. The Papists were burnt by the tyrant for treason; the Protestants by the same tyrant, as a doctrinal Romanist, for heresy.

Page 105.

Unquestionably error has had its martyrs as well as truth, but we may well acknowledge that the faith of him who gives his body to be burnt will atone for all the errors of his frail and fallible understanding.

Errors *of* the understanding will never condemn us, but errors *in* the understanding *from* the heart. Faith is not in the Christian sense mere heat of conviction, or why not canonise Ravailac?

Page 106.

George Fox was as confused in his writings as Cromwell in his speeches. Yet there is one passage in his journal which describes the state of his mind in one part of its progress more beautifully than the ablest psychologist could have done. "One morning," says he, "as I was sitting by the fire, a great cloud came over me, and a temptation beset me, and I sate still. And it was said, all things come by

nature; and the elements and stars came over me, so that I was in a manner quite clouded with it; but inasmuch as I sate still and said nothing, the people of the house perceived nothing. And as I sate still under it and let it alone, a living hope arose in me, which cried, There is a living God who made all things. And immediately the cloud and temptation vanished away, and life rose over it all, and my heart was glad, and I praised the living God!"

This passage I myself pointed out to Southey, who did not, it is clear, understand it; for what has it to do here? And the "Psychologist" is one of my words, only used in the very opposite sense that this passage required.

Pp. 106, 107.

Among George Fox's converts were two men conspicuous in their day. Silburne was one; a man (to borrow the expressive phrase of Captain Beaver) fit to draw a lion's tooth, &c. &c.

James Naylor was the other. All our historians relate how this poor fanatic entered Bristol with a set of crazy people before him, singing, Holy, holy, holy, Hosannah in the Highest! Cromwell would have remitted the barbarous punishment to which he was condemned, but the public preachers Caryl, Manson, Nye, Griffith and Reynolds, were as inexorable as so many Dominican friars, and, like all punishments in those days, it was inflicted with the utmost rigour of inhumanity. He recovered both from his madness and his sufferings, and his after-life was a reproach to those who, in the hardness of their hearts, and the blindness of their understandings, had treated insanity like guilt.

No sooner are Puritan Divines concerned than Southey can find "hardness of heart," and "blindness of understanding;" while the Prelatic party,



sweet Lambs! had only some *errors* common to their age! And this is modern impartiality! He does not tell us, which yet is most true, that at any former period poor Naylor would have been burnt alive; and no hint that so saint-like a man as Reynolds might have been conscience-scared from the dread of not resenting blasphemy against the Saviour; for Naylor declared himself God in the flesh.

Page 108.

Cromwell, indeed, was frequently favoured with their admonitions, and the old Quakers were firmly persuaded that the overthrow of his family was a judgment upon him for not interfering more authoritatively to stop the proceedings against them.

There is much truth in this opinion. Cromwell's dynasty fell a sacrifice to indecision and cross-catching.

Pp. 117, 118.

Being on a journey, he (Flavel) set himself to improve the time by meditation, when his mind grew intent, till at length he had such ravishing tastes of heavenly joys, and such full assurance of his interest therein, that he utterly lost the sight of this world and all its concerns, so that for hours he knew not where he was. At last, perceiving himself faint through a great loss of blood from his nose, he alighted from his horse and sat down at a spring, where he washed and refreshed himself, earnestly desiring if it were the will of God, that he might then leave the world. His spirits recovering, he finished his journey in the same delightful frame, &c.

This is one of those facts, common in Romish biography, and not unfrequent in that of our own enthusiasts which clearly belong to nosology. That Flavel himself should not

have perceived how wonderfully he recovered from a fit of apoplexy is not extraordinary; but it is remarkable that Calamy, and his modern editor, should relate the case without suspecting its real nature.

But does any nosologist record an instance of exalted pleasurable tranquillity during the stupor of an apoplectic fit? If any, this of Flavel's must have been *apoplexia sanguinea*, the symptoms of which, as accurately detailed by Dr. W. Sainsbury, jun., in his "Doctrinal Thesis," pp. 7, 8, are scarcely compatible with symptoms of voluptuous tranquillity. I rather incline to conjecture that the hæmorrhages, from intense thought, acted as opium is often known to do on persons new to its influence, when it produces no disorder in its first action on the stomach. The loss of blood would be sedative, and the action of the reproductive secretories would balance the sedative effect in the nature of a stimulant. Now all pleasure rests on the equatorial point of satisfaction—indifference at one, and rapture at the other pole, *i. e.*, is a balance. I doubt not that by this law, applied to the lungs, we must account for the effects of the nitrous oxygen of Davy.

*Written at the end of the Article.*

Southey writes nothing that is not replete with point and amusing facts; but this review is less happily put together than almost any of his longer articles: for, with all his defects and deficiencies, he is the very king of reviewers, *quotque sunt et fuère.*

S. T. COLERIDGE.

CORSHAM, Dec. 1814.

## NOTES ON BIOGRAPHIA SCOTICANA.\*

—♦—

Page 14. *Preface. Note.*

This doctrine of original sin is plainly evinced from Scripture \* \* \* \* \* and by our British poets excellently described. Thus—

Adam, now ope thine eyes, and first behold  
Th' effects which thy original crime hath wrought  
In some, to spring from thee, who never touched  
Th' excepted tree, nor with the snake conspired,  
Nor sinned thy sins ; yet from that sin derive  
Corruption to bring forth more violent deeds.

*Paradise Lost, Lib. ix.*

Conceived in sin (oh wretched state !)  
Before we draw our breath :  
The first young pulse begins to beat  
Iniquity and death.

*Dr. Watts.*

*British Poets.* Capital ! He ought to have meant Taliessin, Hoel, &c. But your true Scot could not bring himself to say “our *English Poets*”—even while he is imagining himself to be writing English. And then the *Dual*. Milton and DOCTOR WATTS !

Life of Mr. David Black. P. 60.

The liberties of the Church, and discipline presently exercised, were confirmed by divers Acts of Parliament,

\* Biographia Scoticana; or, an Historical Account of the Lives, Characters, and Memorable Transactions of the most Eminent Scots Worthies. Leith, 1816.

approved of by the Confession of Faith, and the office-bearers of the Church were now in peaceable possession thereof; that the question of his preaching ought first, according to grounds and practice foresaid to be judged by the Ecclesiastical Senate, as competent judges thereof at the first instance.

This and numerous similar attempts to form an absolute theocracy in Scotland, are pregnant with instruction. It is observable, that all theocracy commences with an assertion, express or implied, of *infallibility* in one or more individuals, without proof. *If A.* be an Ambassador from the King of Kings, *all* Kings must yield obedience to his words, and not pretend to be his Judges. But I, *A.*, am an Ambassador—*ergo, negatur minor*: till proved. The proof was not given, nor could be given, but by some exertion of miraculous power that would have made *A.* a King, and the King *A.*'s Subject; and thus superseded the necessity of a proof. *Facile prescribit, qui proscribere possit.*

Life of Mr. Patrick Simpson. P. 82.

On a Tuesday morning, about day-break, he went into his garden as private as possible, and one Helen Gardiner, wife to one of the bailies of the town, a godly woman, who had sat up that night with Mrs. Simpson, being concerned at the melancholy condition he was in, climbed over the garden wall to observe him in this retirement; but, coming near the place where she was, she was terrified with a noise that she heard, of multitudes of people together, with a most melodious sound intermixed; she fell on her knees, and prayed that the Lord would pardon her rashness, which her regard for his servant had caused. Afterwards she went forward, and found him lying on the ground; she entreated him to tell her what had happened

to him; and after many promises of secrecy, and an obligation, that she should not reveal it in his lifetime, but, if she survived him, she should be at liberty, he then said, "Oh what am I but dust and ashes, that holy ministering spirits should be sent with a message to me!" And then told her that he had a vision of angels, who gave him an audible answer from the Lord respecting his wife's condition; and then returning to the house, he said to the people who attended his wife, "Be of good comfort, for I am sure that ere ten hours of the day that brand shall be plucked from the fire."

God keep me from uncharitable thoughts. It may have been a posthumous fancy, or a prose epic, of Mrs. Helen Gardiner, suggested perhaps by the wind in a Scotch fir at the moment she was peeping at her pious pastor, on his knees in his garden. But it does look horribly like a pio-fraudish confabriculum. If intended only for Mr. Simpson's solace, and as enabling him to predict with confidence, what need of the rushing of a mob of Spirits, or of the melodious voice intermixed? And if intended for a bono-publico miracle to the honour and glory of Misepiscopacy (no worse word than Misanthropy), why the injunction of silence till after the death of the only person who might have contradicted it, and who alone could have confirmed it? At all events, this excuse for posthumous testimony (which is of frequent occurrence in Puritan Biography) is an injudicious, not to say, profane imitation of our Lord's prohibition to his Disciples respecting his Messiahship, his Crucifixion, and Resurrection on the third day. For here the motives for enjoining silence were evident, and the suggestions of mercy no less than of wisdom. For to have proclaimed himself the Messiah—*i. e.*, King of the Jews, would have been high treason to the civil government—*i. e.*, the Roman Magistrates,

and to have declared that the Messiah would be *hung* would have justified his apprehension for blasphemy by the Sanhedrim, in the exertion of the privileges accorded to them by the Roman Emperor and Senate.

S. T. COLERIDGE,

Who intreats and trusts in Allan Cunningham's pardon for thus bescreawling a leaf of his book. A. C. may be assured that S. T. C. is not so devoid either of genial taste, or of gratitude for pleasures enjoyed, as to have treated a book of A. Cunningham's own creation so irreverentially.

Life of Mr. Josias Welch. P. 118.

He had a very notable faculty in searching the Scriptures, and explaining the most obscure mysteries therein; and was a man who had much inward exercise of conscience anent his own personal cases, and was often assaulted anent that grand fundamental truth, the being of a God; in so much that it was almost customary to him to say, as when he first spoke in the pulpit, "I think it a great matter to believe that there is a God;" and by this he was the more likely to deal with others under the like temptations.\*

Martin Luther was of the same mind; and I am persuaded that the notion inculcated from childhood and the after-confirmed habit of considering the existence and attributes of God as a sort of self-evident truth, so little beset with difficulties, that it is a doubt with them whether there ever was such a creature as an Atheist—I am persuaded, I say, that this prepossession among the learned and those educated for the Ministry has been most injurious to

\* Mr. Blair says that he told him, that for three years he durst not say "my God," and that his conscience smote him for the same.—*Blair's Memoirs*, p. 29.

the Faith ; and it is not the least among the causes of the prevailing indisposition to the mysteries of the Gospel—the Trinity, the Personality of the WORD, and his incarnation in the man Jesus, &c. The effects of the opposite error in this instance, viz. the too exclusive direction of the mind to the divine *personality*, the contemplation of the filial Godhead in the *subjective* only, without duly attending to that which he is *objectively*, as the WORD, the LIGHT that lighteth every man, the energetic Reason and Law of the World present over all, are seen in the theology of the Scottish Confessors and Martyrs under the Stuarts, and at once constitute and explain its peculiar characters. Missing the objective in the highest, they cling to it more eagerly and in the same exclusive spirit in the visible *Church* ; and to the outward kingdom and its forms they attached all the moment and indispensability, all the deep interests of faith and conscience, which belong to the *subjective* or Spiritual Church, to the kingdom within ! Hence their Judaizing sabbatarian principles, their predilection for the Old Testament, their equal readiness to suffer or to inflict martyrdom for points of Church Government : hence, lastly, their indecent familiarity in prayer, their anthropomorphic, yea, sarcomorphic notions of the Supreme, and their anile superstitions and devil-combats.

Life of Mr. James Mitchell. P. 142.

One time in conference concerning the sin in the godly, his father said to him, “ I am sure you are not now troubled with corruption, being so near death.” He answered, “ Ye are altogether deceived, for as long as my foot remaineth on this earth, though the other were translated above the clouds, my mind could not be free of sinful motions.”

I have at sundry times been disturbed and assaulted by the question, If it pleased God to restore me to health and strength, have I any sufficient ground of confidence, that the sense of the sinfulness of sin, of the unworthiness and baseness of the sins to which my constitutional softness, sensibility, and craving for sympathy, render me most prone, would either prevent or instantly suppress the workings of sin in my members, or secure me against temptations, and opportunities of indulgence? The inward conviction of my weakness forces me to forego all hope of such a result from the power or strength of any principle or habit of will in myself, and to rest my only hope on the daily, hourly, nay, momentarily assistance of the free grace of the Spirit of Christ. And yet, according to Bp. Jer. Taylor (Tract on Repentance), less than such a Victory over Sin is delusion; and even Archbp. Leighton asserts the necessity of the same Holiness which the Redeemed have in Heaven, as the indispensable condition of our ever getting thither. Of Taylor's book, I have elsewhere avowed my opinion, that it partakes of the worst characters of Romanism, and the salvation by works. But Leighton was a Divine of a better school, and concerning his judgment I would remark—that if he means by Holiness, the Righteousness of Christ, what disciple of John and Paul would hesitate to receive it? But if by Holiness while yet in the perishable body, he means such a strength already united with the “*I*,” with the whole man, as to exclude all danger, so that Temptations no longer act as Temptations—then he seems to me to make the Cross of Christ, his blood shed for us, and the mediatorial efficacy of his perfected Righteousness of no effect—and the Redemption from the Body for which Paul prayed with such fervent groans and taught us



to pray for, no *deliverance* at all, or a deliverance only from a few incommunities which to a soul fearing sin and feeling the root of weakness in himself, must appear nothing. Therefore, though this be not the only instance in which the ascetic power of Thomas à Kempis, joined with a platonising view of the beauty of Virtue, has somewhat tinged and refracted the Rays of the Faith, as it shines through the preaching of St. Paul, I am inclined to interpret this sentence of the Archbishop's by its immediate (the rousing of *loose* living believers from the lethargy of a false conscience) rather than as a universal proposition, to be received without limit or qualification. And doubtless, there is great need of guarding the Believer against turning the grace of God into wantonness—or imagining that we can be saved without such a hatred of sin as will make the Soul deliberately prefer any loss of temporal and bodily pleasure or advantage to a return under its tyranny. I trust that I sincerely and with my whole spirit pray to God through Christ, that he will preserve me in that state, in which the temptations are not greater than my strength—the state, in which the portion of Grace, which he has bestowed, shall be sufficient for me—though it should be a continuance in weakness and languor of body, and an incapacity of all the enjoyments of this world. Yet it would follow from Jer. Taylor's doctrine, that this very prayer, supposing me to die immediately after, would be a presumption, that I had perished! But no! never, never can I receive a doctrine which forbids me to believe, that there is anything to be forgiven and supplied by and through Christ to my Soul, or that I shall leave behind in the deliverance from the *Body of Death* aught that I had not in fact and completion, and not only in firm principle and sincere

desire, already been detached from! Extremes generate each other. The Truth lies between the Judaizing Pelagian and the presumptuous Antinomian—hard to be expressed in *words*, that may not be understood, but easily found by a soul that seeks a Saviour in humility, and prays earnestly for the Spirit which is already given to whoever asks in faith by Christ.

It seems to me as sufficient answer to the scheme of J. Taylor, that Christ has instructed us to pray, Lead us not into *Temptation*; but *deliver* us from the Evil One.

Life of Mr. John M'Clelland. P. 157.

Englishmen shall be made spectacles to all nations for a broken covenant, when the living God swears, *As I live, even the covenant that he hath despised, and the oath that he hath broken, will I recompense upon his own head.*  
 \* \* \* \* His assertion is a ground for faith, his oath a full assurance of faith: if all England were as one man united in judgment and assertion, and if it had a wall round about reaching to the sun, and if it had as many armies as it has men, and every soldier had the strength of Goliah, and if their navies could cover the ocean, and if there were none to peep out or move the tongue against them, yet I dare not doubt their destruction, when the Lord hath sworn by his life that he will avenge the breach of covenant.

It is to be hoped that Mr. M'Clelland did not mean the extirpation of the whole people, and the extinction of the very name of England. If not, this was a safe prophecy, sure to be fulfilled sometime and somehow, if only a M'Clelland should be at hand as an interpreter. The great fire, the great plague, &c. Unless God expressly commanded the

*covenant* itself, in addition to the contents or things covenanted, this is weak reasoning. For God either did and does command the things covenanted, or He did and does not. If He did, the things are binding on the conscience without reference to the covenant. If He does not, then the covenant is a presumptuous will-work, the imposers of which we humbly leave to the mercy of Him who can alone know their motives. But how *their* act should be more obligatory on us, than the covenant of another and far more numerous portion of our ancestors—viz. an Act of Parliament in both kingdoms, speaking the mind of not only all the constituent parts of the state—King, Lords, and Commons—but beyond doubt of a vast majority of the people (in England at all events)—a covenant renouncing and forbidding the former covenant, is perfectly incomprehensible.



POLITICAL NOTES.



## POLITICAL NOTES.

---

---

### NOTES ON MEMOIRS OF COL. HUTCHINSON.\*

---

*Life of Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson*, p. 3.

The people, by the plenty of their country, not being forced to toyle for bread, &c.

Alas! the change (1831)—Query,—Whether the nation, the mechanic and manufacturing class of which is merely adequate to the supply of its learned and landed gentry, and its agriculturists, is not nobler and more prosperous though less powerful, than such as manufactories, stimulated by a widely-extended commerce, now present?

*Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson*, p. 9.

In matters of faith, his reason allways submitted to the Word of God, and what he could not comprehend he would believe because 'twas written, &c.

Well may I *believe* what I do not *comprehend*, when there are so many things which I *know*, yet do not *comprehend*;—my life, for instance, my will, my

\* *Memoirs of the Life of Col. Hutchinson*, by his widow Lucy, daughter of Sir Allen Apsley. Now first published from the original manuscript, by the Rev. Julius Hutchinson. To which is prefixed the *Life of Mrs. Hutchinson*, written by herself, a fragment. 4to. 1806.

rationality, &c. But let us be on our guard not to confound *comprehending* with *apprehending*. I do not, even because I *cannot*, believe what I do not *apprehend*; *i. e.*, I cannot assent to the meaning of words to which I attach no meaning, though I may believe in the wisdom of the utterer. But this is to believe the veracity of the Doctor, not the truth of the Doctrine.

*Ibid.* p. 11.

Nothing grieved him more than to be obliged, where he could not hope to returne itt, &c.

The youthful reader should be made to see that this was a defect, though a defect symptomatic of a noble nature. Besides, except to God, we cannot be obliged without the power of making the right return; for, where no more is in our power, to feel, to acknowledge, and duly to appreciate an obligation, is to return it. Nay, God himself accepts our thankfulness and obedience as a *return* for his free gifts and mercies.

*Ibid.* p. 47.

The gentleman that assisted him he converted to a right believe in that greate poynt of predestination, he having bene before of the Arminian judgment: till, upon the serious examination of both principles, and comparing them with the Scriptures, Mr. H. convinced him of the truth, &c.

A most instructive instance of the delusion consequent on the logic of Dichotomy, or the antithesis of terms, precluding each other, or assumed so to do: *ex. gr.*, Necessity and Freedom; Real and Unreal; Spirit and Body; Cause and Effect, &c. The doctrine of Predestination is built on the assumption, that the distinction of the Terms implies a division of the Things: *ex. gr.*, the Divine Reason and the Divine



Will. The former is arbitrarily taken as the antecedent and the *cause*—the latter as the *effect*, as a passive clay receiving the impression of the former. Deny this, (or, as you safely may do,) affirm the contrary—namely, that the Will is the antecedent, and the Reason the form or Epiphany of the Will; and the whole argument of the Predestinarian is quashed.

*Ibid.* p. 69.

If any one object the fresh example of Queene Elizabeth, let them remember that the felicity of her reigne was the effect of her submission to her masculine and wise counsellors.

But what was the cause of that submission to men chosen?—of that choice of men worthy to be submitted to? This is an old but just answer to an old detraction from Elizabeth's personal character.

*Ibid.* p. 74.

Yet the Parliament showed such a wonderfull respect to the King, that they never mentioned him, as he was, the sole author of all those miscarriages, but imputed them to evill counsellors, &c., which flattery I feare they have to answer for; I am sure they have thereby exposed themselves to much scandall.

*Editor's Note.* This is an oversight of Mrs. H.'s of which she is seldom guilty. Good policy required then, as it does now,\* that the King should be held incapable of wrong, and the criminality fixed on Ministers, who are amenable to the law.

I am yearly more and more inclined to question the expediency of falsehood of any kind; and therefore doubt the wisdom of Julius Hutchinson's censure

\* If the patriots of that day were the inventors of this maxim we are highly obliged to them.—S. C.

of his high-minded ancestress. Had the Parliament, as soon as the King's own principles and passions were known to be prime movers of his Council, declared the same, it might have prevented the Civil War; at all events, the apparent inconsistency of their own proceedings.

*Ibid.* p. 115.

There was one Mr. Widmerpoole, a man of good extraction, but reduced to a small fortune, had declined all the splendor of an old house, and sunke into the way of the middlemen of the country; yet had a perfect, honest heart to God, his country, and his friend; he had a good discretion, and though he were elder then all the rest, yet was so humble to be content to come in the reare of them all, having, through the declining of his famely, the slenderness of his estate, and the parsimony of his nature, lesse interest in the country.

The ellipsis of the pronoun relative after the conjunction is a frequent, and I think, a graceful idiom in our elder authors. "But reduced" for "but who was reduced."

As a portrait-painter, Mrs. H. unites the grace and finish of Vandyke with the Life and substantive Reality of Rembrandt. By the by, among the numerous points that make up that most notice-worthy contrast of the old English Republican, and the modern mongrel-bred Jacobin, one of the most striking is the reverential value of ancient family entertained by the former, with comparative contempt of the court-derived titles, while the latter hates, because he envies, both alike.

*Ibid.*, p. 196. Editor's Note.

But probably Prince Rupert was too strong and too active to let the besiegers escape, &c.

There is something almost fantastic in the thought,

that this Prince Rupert, whose character of Temerity, Brutality, Insolence, Impetuosity, and Unreliableness, (*ex. gr.*, the abandonment of Bristol,) is given almost in the same words by the Royalist and Parliamentary Historians, should have been the inventor of Mezzo Tinto Engraving.

The superstition of Royal Blood, in its most exclusive intensity, acted on Charles's mind in the instance of this his nephew, most ruinously for his affairs. If Charles did not authorise, he passively sanctioned, and perhaps inwardly approved of Rupert's *overly* treatment of the Duke of Newcastle, and thus baffled and disgusted the chivalrous Loyalty and Devotion which nothing could alienate. Prince Rupert was the Evil Genius of Charles's *military* Enterprises.

*Ibid.* p. 197.

Indeed, such a blow was given to the Parliament interest in all these parts, that it might well discourage the ill-affected, when even the most zealous were cast downe, and gave all for lost; but the Governor, who in no occasion ever lett his courage fall, but, when things were at the lowest, recollected all his force, that his owne despondency might not contribute anie thing to his mallicious fortune, at this time animated all the honest men, and expresst such vigor and cheerfullnesse, and such stedfast resolution, as disappointed all the malignants of their hopes.

Beautiful! A Woman only, though certainly a Woman, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, could have so appreciated the true grandeur of masculine virtue.

One great moral benefit results from the study of History, that it tends to free the mind from the uncharitable, the calumniating spirit of party zeal. Take the warmest zealot of Charles the Martyr's Cause, and let him be only an honest man, and

with the feelings of a Christian, and the reflection, "But yet, Col. Hutchinson was a Regicide," could not but attemper his heart, could not but Christianise his antipathies.

*Ibid.* p. 199. Editor's note.

It is proper here to state, that in the outset all those sects which have since taken so many various names, joined their forces to repel the encroachments of the Prelates—it would not be fair to say, of the *Church* of England, whose characteristic is moderation itself—but when they had almost crushed the Episcopalians, the Presbyterian Ministers began to rise pre-eminent in power, and to show that though they had changed the name, they by no means intended to diminish the dominion, of the hierarchy, &c.

It seems (and if it were so, it is much to be regretted,) that the editor had not read "Baxter's own Life," published by Sylvester. The Rev. Julius Hutchinson is an honour to the Church of England. *O si sic omnes!* His kindred soul would have *felt* Baxter's veracity and integrity: his freer judgment would have discovered without difficulty the good old *Church* presbyters' unconscious declinations from verity: and he would not here or elsewhere have used the term Episcopalians as synonymous with the Prelatists. Even the phrase, Presbyterian ministers, and Presbyterian party, Mr. H. would have found reason to place among the vulgar errors of history. The fingers of one hand would suffice to number all the *proper* Presbyterians in the Parliament at this time, or among the London ministers. A large number of those who were afterwards rejected on the twice-infamous St Bartholomew's Day, would have been content even to retain the Prelates under the name of Patriarchs (Canterbury and York) and Archbishops: and as to the main characteristic of

the Genevan, or true Presbyterian discipline, the introduction of laymen as Deacons and Ruling Elders, they were almost to a man against it. Let it not be forgotten, too, that their very intolerancy, to which Mr. H. does not attribute more than may be unanswerably laid to their charge, was the intolerancy of the Established Church, inherited from the Re-founders of the Church-Prelatic and Anti-Parliamentary party of the *same* Church. Remember, that the Reformers in the Church, before the war, approached far more nearly to a majority, than the Protestants in the Western Church : and if the latter were not schismatics, neither were the former.

*Ibid.* p. 203.

To raise this siege, Prince Rupert came with a great armie out of the south ; the besiegers rise to fight with the Prince, and Newcastle drew all his force out of Yorke to joyne with him, when both armies, on a great plaine called Marston Moor, had a bloody encounter.

This appears to have been forced on Newcastle by Prince Rupert.

*Ibid.* p. 253. Editor's note.

The public is in possession of these [letters], they having been printed by the Parliament ; which some have thought a hardship, but surely without reason.

I altogether agree with the editor, and regard the outcry raised by late writers against the indelicacy of publishing the King's correspondence, as sickly sentimental cant.\*

\* See the Life of Thomas Lord Fairfax, by Hartley Coleridge, in the "Northern Worthies," with the note by S. T. C. vol. i. p. 341, of the new edition.—Ed.

*Ibid.* p. 270.

Most answered, to conforme to the generall practise of other Christians, how darke soever it were to themselves; but Mr. Foxcraft, one of the assembly, sayd that except they were convinced of the warrant of that practise from the Word, they sinn'd in doing it, whereupon that infant was not baptised.

*Editor's Note.* Surely this shows an unbecoming propensity to speculate in religion; the story is, however, told with candour.

Surely this is the strangest note that ever came from a man of the editor's sense. Mrs. H. has been speculating in politics from the very commencement, and all to the editor's approbation and admiration. She and Colonel H. speculate on the most unbecomingly speculative part of theology, God's absolute decrees, and the editor finds no fault. Now, as parents about to exercise a duty to their own child, they endeavour to square their conduct with the commands of their Redeemer—examine the Sacred Scripture to learn what they are—and find them in apparent contradiction to the common practice.

*Ibid.* p. 321.

For she was all this while a spy for the King, &c. All which were horrible lies, &c.

These, and of this sort, were the two notorious practices, the disappointment, disgust, and indignation at which, misled Milton for a time into a supporter and apologist of Cromwell's violent ejection of the Parliament, and assumption of the dictatorship under the name of Protector. Good men bore too little, and expected too much: and even wise men, comparatively wise, were eager to have an oak, where

they ought to have been content with planting an acorn. Oh that Colonel Hutchinson and his co-patriots throughout England could at this period have brought themselves to a conviction of the necessity of a king, under that, or some other name, and have joined with Lord Brook and others in offering the throne to Cromwell, under a solemn national contract! So! and so only, might England have become a republican kingdom—a glorious commonwealth—with a king as the symbol of its majesty, and the key-stone of its unity!

*Ibid.* p. 344.

It is believed that Richard himselfe was compounded with, to have resign'd the place that was too greate for him; certaine it is that his poore spiritt was likely enough to doe any such thing. The army perceiving they had sett up a wretch who durst not reigne, &c.

There is something delightful to me in this. The true *woman* in all the contra-distinctive womanhood breaking forth from the high, accomplished, and Christian-minded masculine intellect of Mrs. Hutchinson! But in a woman's soul, no virtues in a man can atone for pusillanimity, for either bodily or mental *cowardice*. Woman cannot look *down* and love. Even her children are *angels* to her, and she clasps her babe to her bosom with a participation of the feeling with which the Catholics describe the Holy Mother to embrace her God-enshrining Child.

## NOTES ON PEPYS'S DIARY.\*



Vol. II. p. 13.

Mrs. Turner do tell me very odde stories how Mrs. Williams do receive the applications of people, and hath presents, and she is the hand that receives all, while my Lord do the business.

Most valuable on many, various, and important accounts, as I hold this Diary to be, I deem it invaluable as a faithful portrait of enlightened (*i.e.* calculating) self-love and self-interest in its perihelion to morality, its nearest possible neighbourhood to, or least possible distance from, honour and honesty.

And yet what a cold and torpid Saturn, with what a sinister and leaden shine, spotty as the moon, does it appear, compared with the principles and actions of the regicide Colonel Hutchinson, or those of the Puritan Richard Baxter (in the autobiography edited by Sylvester), both the contemporaries of Pepys!

*Ibid.* p. 46.

He tells me the King of France hath his mistresses, but laughs at the foolery of our King, that makes his bastards princes, and loses his revenue upon them, and makes his mistresses his masters.

*Mem.*—Earl of Munster. This, with wit and condescension, was all that was wanting to a perfect

\* Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq., F.R.S. Edited by Richard, Lord Braybrook. 2 vols. 4to. 1825.



parallelism in the character of George IV. with that of Charles II. And this he left to be supplied by his worthy brother and successor.

*Ibid.* p. 55.

It is remarkable that this afternoon Mr. Moore came to me, and there among other things did tell me how Mr. Moyer the merchant, having procured an order from the King, and Duke of York, and Council, with the consent of my Lord Chancellor, and by assistance of Lord Arlington, for the releasing out of prison his brother, Samuel Moyer, who was a great man in the late times in Haberdashers' Hall, and was engaged under hand and seal to give the man that obtained it so much in behalf of my Lord Chancellor; but it seems my lady Duchesse of Albemarle had before undertaken it for so much money, but hath not done it.

And this is one of the three idols of our Church—for Clarendon ever follows Charles the Martyr, and the martyr Laud! Alas! what a strange thing the conscience seems to be, when such actions and deliberate falsehoods as have been on strong grounds imputed to Lord Clarendon,—among others, the suborning of assassination—could be made compatible in his own mind with professions of religion and habitual religious meditations and exercises!

*Ibid.* p. 62.

Among others, my good Mr. Evelyn, with whom, after dinner, I stepped aside and talked upon the present posture of our affairs; which is, that the Dutch are known to be abroad with eighty sail of ships of war, and twenty fire-ships, and the French come into the Channell with twenty sail of men-of-war, and five fire-ships, while we have not a ship at sea to do them any hurt with, but are calling in all we can; while our Embassadors are treating at Bredah, and the Dutch look upon them as come to beg peace, and use them accordingly; and

all this through the negligence of our Prince, who had power, if he would, to master all these, with the money and men that he hath had the command of, and may now have, if he would mind his business.

There are good grounds for the belief that more, and yet worse, causes than sensuality and sensual sloth, were working in the King's mind and heart, viz, the readiness to have the French King *his* master, and the disposer of his kingdom's power, as the means of becoming himself the uncontrolled master of its wealth. He would fain be a despot, even at the cost of being another's underling. Charles II. was willing, nay anxious, to reduce his crown and kingdom under the domination of the Grand Monarque, provided he himself might have the power to shear and poll his subjects without leave, and unchecked by the interference of a Parliament. I look on him as one of the moral monsters of history.

*Ibid.* p. 108.

To initiate a young Student into the mystery of appreciating the value of modern History, or the books that have hitherto passed for such, first, let him carefully peruse this Diary; and then, while it is fresh in his mind, take up and read Hume's History of England, Reign of Charles II. Even of Hume's Reign of Elizabeth, generally rated as the best and fullest of the work, I dare assert, that to supply the omissions alone would form an Appendix occupying twice the space allotted by him to the whole reign, and the necessary rectifications of his statements, half as much. What with omissions and what with perversions of the most important incidents, added to the false portraiture of the characters, the

work from the reign of Henry VII. is a mischievous romance.

But alike as Historian and as Philosopher, Hume has, *meo saltem judicio*, been extravagantly overrated. Mercy on the Age and the People, for whom Locke is profound, and Hume subtle.

*Ibid.* p. 110.

1667. 12th. To my bookseller's, and did buy Scott's "Discourse of Witches;" and do hear Mr. Cowley mightily lamented (his death) by Dr. Ward, the Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Bates, who were standing there, as the best poet of our nation, and as good a man.

!!—Yet Cowley *was* a Poet, which, with all my unfeigned admiration of his vigorous sense, his agile logical wit, and his high excellencies of diction and metre, is more than (in the *strict* use of the term, Poet) I can conscientiously say of DRYDEN. Only if Pope was a *Poet*, as Lord Byron swears, then Dryden, I admit, was a very *great* Poet.\*

*Ibid.* p. 125.

1667. 9th. To the Bear-garden, where now the yard was full of people, and those most of them seamen, striving by

\* This appears to be a question of terms. It would not be difficult to extend Mr. Coleridge's own definition of poetry, so as to cover both Pope and Dryden; and surely it would be convenient to do so. The dispute, however, is of long standing, and is connected with a deep-lying instinct. Dryden has not much, except metre, of what is commonly understood to be poetry, as opposed to prose; and if Horace looked upon his own moral essays as *sermoni propria*, the more artificial style of Pope ought not of itself to place him in a different category. Yet Dryden and Pope were obviously "poets sown by nature;" they were both impelled to write verse by the strongest natural impulse, and both wrote it with native power—itsself no doubtful proof of poetic genius.

For a different, and, as the editor presumes to think, a juster estimate of the *relative* merits of Pope and Dryden, see "Essays and Marginalia" by Hartley Coleridge.

force to get in. I got into the common pit; and there, with my cloak about my face, I stood and saw the prize fought, till one of them, a shoemaker, was so cut in both his wrists, that he could not fight any longer, and then they broke off: his enemy was a butcher. The sport very good, and various humours to be seen among the rabble that is there.

Certainly, Pepys was blest with the queerest and most omnivorous taste, that ever fell to the lot of one man!

*Ibid.* p. 151.

To the King's play-house, and there saw a silly play and an old one, "The Taming of a Shrew."

This is, I think, the fifth of Shakespeare's Plays which Pepys found silly, stupid trash, and among them Othello!\* Macbeth indeed he commends for the *shews* and music, but not to be compared with the "Five Hours' Adventures"!! This and the want of *wit* in the Hudibras is very amusing—nay, it is seriously instructive. Thousands of shrewd and intelligent men, in whom, as in S. Pepys, the understanding is *hypertrophied* † to the necrosis or marasmus of the Reason and Imagination, while far-sighted (yet, ah! how short-sighted,) Self-interest fills the place of Conscience, would say the same, if they dared.

\* Vol i., p. 442. "To Deptford by water, reading Othello, Moore of Venice, which I ever heretofore esteemed a mighty good play; but having so lately read the 'Adventures of Five Houres,' it seems a mean thing."

Vol. ii., p. 3. "To the Duke's house, and saw Macbeth, which, though I saw it lately, yet appears a most excellent play in all respects, but especially in divertisement, though it be a deep tragedy; which is a strange perfection in a tragedy, it being most proper here and suitable."

† A new-minted word by the doctors, meaning over-grown or over-nourished.

*Ibid.* p. 254.

1668. 23rd. To church, and heard a good sermon of Mr. Gifford's, at our Church, upon "Seek ye first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and all things shall be added to you." A very excellent and persuasive, good and moral sermon. He shewed, like a wise man, that righteousness is a surer moral way of being rich, than sin and villany.

Highly characteristic. Pepys's only ground of morality was prudence—a shrewd understanding in the service of Self-love, his conscience. He was a *Pollard* man without the *top* (*i. e.*, the Reason as the source—of *Ideas*, or immediate yet not sensuous Truths, having their evidence in themselves; and the Imagination, or idealising Power, of symbols mediating between the Reason and Understanding); but on this account more broadly and luxuriantly branching out from the upper Trunk. For the sobriety and steadfastness of a worldly self-interest substitute inventive Fancy, Will-wantonness (*stat pro ratione voluntas*), and a humourous sense of the emptiness and dream-likeness of human pursuits—and Pepys would have been the *Panurge* of the incomparable Rabelais.

*Mem.* It is incomprehensible to me, that this great and genial philosopher should have been a Frenchman, except on my hypothesis of a continued dilution of the Gothic blood from the reign of Henry IV.; Descartes, Malbranches, Pascal, and Molière being the *ultimi Gothorum*, the last in whom the Gothic predominated over the Celtic.

*Ibid.* p. 260.

1688. 4th. To the fair, to see the play, "Bartholomew Fair," with puppets. And it is an excellent play; the more

I see it, the more I love the wit of it; only the business of abusing the Puritans begins to grow stale, and of no use, they being the people that at last will be found the wisest.

Pepys was always a Commonwealth's man in his heart. N.B.—Not a Democrat; but, even more than the Constitutional Whigs, the very antipode of the modern Jacobins, or *Tail-up-Head-down* Politicians. A Voluptuary, and without a spark of bigotry in his nature, he could not be a Puritan; but of his free choice he would have preferred Presbyterianism to Prelacy, and a mixed Aristocracy of Wealth and Talent to a Monarchy, or even a mixed Government—such at least as the latter was in his time. But many of the more enlightened Jacobites were Republicans who despaired of a Republic. *Si non Brutus, Cæsar.*

*Ibid.* p. 318.

Sir W. Coventry did tell me it as the wisest thing that ever was said to the King by any statesman of his time, and it was by my Lord Treasurer that is dead, whom, I find, he takes for a very great statesman,—that when the King did show himself forward for passing the Act of Indemnity, he did advise the King that he would hold his hand in doing it, till he had got his power restored that had been diminished by the late times, and his revenue settled in such a manner as he might depend on himself without resting upon Parliaments, and then pass it. But my Lord Chancellor, who thought he could have the command of Parliaments for ever, because for the King's sake they were awhile willing to grant all the King desired, did press for its being done; and so it was, and the King from that time able to do nothing with the Parliament almost.

Can a more impressive proof be desired of the truth and wisdom of the E. of Carnarvon's recent remark in the House of Lords—that, before the

reign of Anne, the Constitution had but a sort of uterine life, or but *partially* appeared as in the birth-throes—and that it is unworthy of a British statesman to quote any precedent anterior to the Revolution in 1688. Here an honest, high-principled, and patriotic Senator criminales Lord Clarendon for having prevented Charles II. from making the Crown independent of the Parliament; and this when he knew and groaned under the infamous vices and follies of the king! Sick and weary of the factious and persecuting temper of the House of Commons, many true lovers of their country and its freedom would gladly have dispensed with Parliaments, and have secured for the King a revenue, which, wisely and economically managed, might have sufficed for all ordinary demands,—could they have discovered any other way of subjecting the judges to a periodical rigorous account for their administration of the *Law*. In the Laws, and rights established by Law, these men placed the proper liberty of the subject. Before the Revolution, a Parliament at the commencement of a reign, and of a war, under an economic and decorous Court, would have satisfied the people generally.

*Ibid.* p. 342.

1669. To Whitehall, &c.—Thence walked a little with Creed, who tells me he hears how fine my horses and coach are, and advises me to avoid being noted for it; which I was vexed to hear taken notice of, being what I feared; and Povy told me of my gold lace sleeves in the Park yesterday, which vexed me also, so as to resolve never to appear in Court with them, but presently to have them taken off, as it is fit I should.

This struggle between the prudence of an Atticus, and the Sir Piercy Shafton Tailor-blood, working as

an instinct in his veins, with extreme sensitiveness to the opinions of men as the combining medium, is very amusing.

*Ibid.* p. 347.

1669. And thus ends all that I doubt I shall ever be able to do with my own eyes in the keeping of my journal, I being not able to do it any longer, having done now so long as to undo my eyes almost every time that I take a pen in my hand; and therefore, whatever comes of it, I must forbear; and therefore resolve from this time forward to have it kept by my people in long-hand, and must be contented to set down no more than is fit for them and all the world to know; or if there be anything, I must endeavour to keep a margin in my book open, to add here and there a note in short-hand with my own hand. And so I betake myself to that course, which is almost as much as to see myself go into my grave; for which, and all the discomforts that will accompany my being blind, the good God prepare me!—May 31, 1669.

Truly may it be said, that this was a greater and more grievous loss to the mind's eyes of his posterity, than to the bodily organs of Pepys himself. It makes me restless and discontented to think, what a Diary, equal in minuteness and truth of portraiture to the preceding, from 1669 to 1688 or 90, would have been, for the true causes, process and character of the Revolution.

*Correspondence.*—Vol. ii. p. 65.

WILL. HOWE TO MR. PEPYS.

It is a common position among these factious sectaries, that there is noe medium betweene a true Churchman of England, and a Roman Catholic; soe that those that are for *strict monarchy and arbitrary* government must needs be Roman



Catholics, or well-wishers to them, which is brand enough to prevent elections of such men, and is alsoe a colour for their other disobediencies to their Prince and his lawfull succession.

!!—It is only too probable that James's bigotry alone baffled his despotism, and that he might have succeeded in suppressing the liberties of the country if he would, for a time at least, have kept aloof from its religion. It should be remembered, in excuse for the supporters of James II., that the practicability of conducting the affairs of the state with and by a Parliament, had not been yet demonstrated, nay, seemed incompatible with the theoretic division of the Legislative from the Executive; and indeed, only by blending the two *in fact*, and preserving the division in words and appearances, was this effected. And even now the practicability of governing the empire with and by a perfectly free and freely elected Parliament, remains to be demonstrated.

*Ibid.* p. 71.

MR. EVELYN TO MR. PEPYS.

Were it not possible to discover whither any of those citrine-trees are yet to be found, that of old grew about the foote of Mount Atlas, not far from Tingis; and were heretofore *in deliciis* for their politure and natural maculations, to that degree, as to be sold for their weight in gold? Cicero had a table that cost him ten thousand sesterces, and another which I have read of, that was valued at 14,000 H.S., which, at 3*d.* H.S. amounted to a pretty sum; and one of the Ptolemies had yet another of far greater price, insomuch as when they used to reproach their wives for their luxury and excesse in pearle and paint, they would retort, and *turn the tables* on their husbands.

That lady of masculine intellect, with all the woman's sense of beauty (Mrs. Emerson? was that

the name? but long a botanical correspondent and contributor to "Nicholson's Phil. Magazine—O! Mrs. Ibbetson), believed herself to have discovered the principle of this precious citrine-wood, and the means of producing it;\* and I see no reason for doubting it, though of her physiological anatomy, by help of the solar microscope, I am sceptical.

The engravings instantly call up in my mind the suspicion of some kaleidoscopic delusion, from the singular symmetry of all the forms. But she was an excellent and very remarkable woman, and her contributions in the "Phil. Magazine" worth studying even for the style.

*Ibid.* pp. 72, 73.

MR. EVELYN TO MR. PEPYS.

Sir, with your excellent book,† I return you likewise my most humble thanks for your inducement of me to read it over again; finding in it, as you told me, several things omitted in the Latin (which I had formerly read with great delight), still new, still surprising, and the whole hypothesis so ingenious and so rational, that I both admire and *believe* it at once.

!—Strange!—Burnet's book is a grand Miltonic romance; but the contrast between the Tartarean fury and turbulence of the Burnetian and the almost supernatural tranquillity of the Mosaic Deluge is little less than comic.

*Ibid.* pp. 197, 198.

HENRY, SECOND EARL OF CLARENDON, TO MR. PEPYS.

After dinner, as we were standing and talking together in the room, says my Lord Newborough to the other Scotch gentleman (who was looking very steadfastly upon my wife), "What is the matter that thou hast had thine eyes fixed

\* I could not find this.—S. C.

† Burnet's Theory of the Earth.

upon my Lady Cornbury ever since she came into the room? Is she not a fine woman? Why doest thou not speak?" "She's a handsome lady indeed," (said the gentleman,) "but I see her in blood." Whereupon my Lord Newborough laughed at him; and all the company going out of the room, we parted; and I believe none of us thought more of the matter; I am sure I did not. My wife was at that time perfectly well in health, and looked as well as ever she did in her life. In the beginning of the next month she fell ill of the small-pox: she was always very apprehensive of that disease, and used to say, if she ever had it she should dye of it. Upon the ninth day after the small-pox appeared, in the morning, she bled at the nose, which quickly stopt; but in the afternoon the blood burst out again with great violence at her nose and mouth; and about eleven of the clock that night she dyed, almost weltering in her blood.

It would have been necessary to cross-examine this Scotch Deuteroptes, whether he had not seen the duplicate or spectrum of *other* persons in blood. It might have been the result of an inflammatory condition of his own brains, or a slight pressure on the region of the optic nerves. I have repeatedly seen the phantasm of the page I was reading all spotted with blood, or with the letters all blood.

---

## NOTES ON ALGERNON SYDNEY'S WORKS.\*

Chap. ii. Sect. 5, p. 77.

Ten men may as justly resolve to live together, frame a civil society, and oblige themselves to laws, as the greatest number of men that ever met together in the world.

We must understand this with a pre-supposition

\* The Works of Algernon Sydney. 4to. 1772.

that society has been dissolved, or that those ten men agree after a shipwreck to remain with such women as they can obtain, in a small island, rather than join a larger society in some other place, otherwise the arrangement would be hollow as to its ground, and pernicious as to its consequences; and would justify manifold and contradictory *imperia in imperio*. The great and fundamental axiom of ethics is:—So act that thou mayest be able to *will*, that thy *maxim* should be the *law* of all rational beings. It may be A's maxim, that he will retain whatever has been entrusted to him without evidence, or legal power of being reclaimed; but he cannot *will* this to be the universal *law* of conduct; for this would be to annihilate the very condition of such a law, as then no man would so trust another. Consequently, it would be at once to will a thing and its opposite, the existence and non-existence of a thing at the same moment, which is impossible. So, to form a society, on the maxim that no duties are owing to society, is to will the conditions of connexion and dissolution by the same act.

The fault of Sydney's language (for it is more in expression than in meaning) is, that he dwells too exclusively on the *rights* supposed to result from belief of individual expedience, whereas he should have taken in the *duties* resulting from the greater good of a greater number; though I doubt not, that supposing mankind enlightened as to their true good, the best for the whole world would be the best for the individual. Both roads lead to the same goal, but the latter road is more neighboured by false roads, is a right road through a labyrinth. Still we must suppose them not born in a formed society capable of maintaining them, needing their services, and yielding them due protection, and their rightful share of the fruits of

society, such as education, and the other means and opportunities of developing their bodily, moral, and intellectual faculties, which is the final cause of human society; because human faculties cannot be fully developed but by society and a man *per se* is a contradiction; he is only *potentially* a man, not *actually*. Persecution in religion, and the absolute withholding of all withholdable knowledge, renders society to the injured persons not society, and does not so much dissolve their duties as preclude them; even as absolute frigidity does not give *divorce*, but prove the *non-existence* of the marriage.

*Ibid.* p. 84.

The same author says, that Edward the Confessor “electus est in Regem ab omni populo,” and another, “omnium electione in Edwardum concordatur.”

This is pushing the point too far. The very word *acclamatio*, applied to a country like England, and not to a city, implies that the “ab omnibus” includes only the assembly or populace present; and in this way, even the wickedest tyrant has contrived to be “in magnâ exaltatione à clero et populo susceptus, et ab omnibus Rex acclamatus.” The whole of William’s laws and acts prove that he considered England as a *conquest*, and that he was King by the compelled acquiescence, not the free consent of the Saxon inhabitants. I think that A. Sydney lays too great a stress on these phrases of our old historians. Mock pillars to a Pantheon, when detected, throw a false suspicion on the noble edifice to which they had been idly attached. Sydney himself gives the proper answer, sect. 55, p. 86.

*Ibid.* Sect. 8, p. 99.

Salmasius's story of bees is only fit for old women to prate of in chimney corners.

If it was worth while to reason from such distant analogies, no stronger example in favour of a republic could be adduced than that of bees.

*Ibid.* Sect. 10, p. 108.

Aristotle highly applauds monarchy, when the monarch has more of those virtues that tend to the good of a commonwealth than all they who compose it. This is the king mentioned in his *Ethics*, and extolled in his *Politics*: he is above all nature, and ought not by a municipal law to be made equal to others in power: he ought to govern, because it is better for a people to be governed by him than to enjoy their liberty; or rather do they enjoy their liberty, which is never more safe than when it is defended by one who is a living law to himself and others. Wheresoever such a man appears, he ought to reign.

This is rather more than I would allow; simply because, let the monarch be as wise as he will, he is not omnipresent; and if there exists an adequate number of wise and virtuous ministers, and a people disposed to submit to them on account of their wisdom and virtue; then the people might be allowed to choose both the wisest as supreme, and the others as his helpers; and the same effect would be produced without the bad example, and without that loss of public spirit, which necessarily follows the political passiveness of a people, and prepares a Commodus as successor to an Antonine. The effect produced on the moral character of a nation by the very habit of exerting public rights, is among the most important blessings of a good government; and a people so circumstanced differs from another under a virtuous

despot, as from a well-fed Lazarone differs a man presented by another with soil, seed, and plough, and so enabled to feed and clothe himself and family.

*Ibid.* Sect. 11, Note, p. 110.

Seneca blames Brutus for acting as if he imagined that the state could be instantly reformed at such a crisis: "Qui aut ibi speravit libertatem futuram, ubi tam magnum præmium erat et imperandi, et serviendi; aut existimavit civitatem in priorem formam posse revocari, amissis pristinis moribus, futuramque ibi æqualitatem civilis juris, et staturas suo loco leges, ubi viderat tot millia hominum pugnancia, non an servirent, sed cui. Quanto vero illum aut rerum naturæ, aut urbis suæ tenuit oblivio, qui uno interempto, defuturum credidit alium, qui idem vellet; cum Tarquinius esset inventus post tot reges ferro ac fulminibus occisos?"—Sen. de Benef., lib. ii. c. 20.

This is profoundly conceived and beautifully expressed by Seneca; but the wisdom of Brutus must be denied or admitted, accordingly as we solve the question, whether a number of good and wise men, possessing the political power of a state for a number of years can renovate the spirit, and recall the virtues of a fallen and corrupt people; whether a state may not have more than one zenith and nadir of morals! Surely the experiment was noble. Among the prime desiderata of philosophical literature, is a detailed history of the progress and revolutions of the morals of any given country; Great Britain for instance. I have been induced to believe, though with abundant consciousness of uncertainty, that our morals rose progressively from Edward VI. to the restoration of Charles II., declined till the commencement of the present reign (George III.), and have been, and are on the *whole*, rising (spite of the counterbalance from the epidemic rage of glittering in the public eye).

NOTES WRITTEN IN A VOLUME OF TRACTS  
RELATING TO THE TIMES OF CROMWELL.

—•—  
Mr. Recorder's Speech to the Lord Protector, upon  
Wednesday, the 8th of Feb., 1653.

*Query*—how long it has been since, and how long it is likely to be before, a Mr. Recorder has made, or will make, such another speech, of equal solidity in the substance, and dignity in language?

His Highness the Lord Protector's Speech to the Parliament, in the Painted Chamber, on Monday, the 4th of September.

Page 15.

If, I say, they were but notions, they were to be let alone. Notions will hurt none but them that have them. But when they come to such practices, as to tell us, that liberty and property are not the badges of the kingdom of Christ; and tell us that instead of regulating laws, laws are to be abrogated, indeed subverted; and perhaps would bring in the Judaical law, instead of our known laws settled amongst us; this is worthy of every magistrate's consideration.

*Notions* not punishable however erroneous; but the drawing and publishing of *consequences* from the same, that is, of practical consequences, inconsistent with the social rights and obligations; or with the fundamental laws of the State; and tending to their subversion; is an *overt act*, as rightfully within the sphere of the civil magistrate's office, as theft, forgery, or any other *crime*: though the degree of guilt, of which God alone is the competent Judge, may be very different.



To this dictum of the Lord Protector I know of no sound objection *in genere*. There is, however, a practical difference, the annexment of which would render the principle at once more safe and more complete: namely, that in cases of the first kind (the publication of speculative opinions with unsafe consequences) the magistrate is, or should be, entrusted with a larger discretional power, and in deciding the question, not only respecting the nature and quantum of the punishment, but likewise whether he shall interfere at all, he will in each case be determined by the greater or lesser probability of the consequences being acted on, or the public peace being disturbed by the attempt; still more, perhaps, by the question, whether his interference may not do more harm than good, and aggravate the evil he wishes to remedy, both by spreading the contagion and increasing the susceptibility of the persons exposed to it.

This last caution would apply particularly to the offence of questioning or denying the truth or the Divine authority of the Scriptures, or any main article of the Established Faith. In such cases it is ordinarily wiser to proceed (where the occasion is given) against the *manner*, as indecency, wanton outrage of the feelings of the community, for *incivism*, in short, and nuisance, than against the *matter*, had it been calmly and modestly worded, addressed to the reason and understanding, not to the passions or appetites of the readers—and (as probable by the style, price, and circumstances of publication) intended for competent judges.

His Highness the Lord Protector's Speech to the Parliament, in the Painted Chamber, on Tuesday, the 12th of September, 1654.

Page [ ].

And that there was high cause for their dissolving, is most evident, not only in regard there was a just fear of the Parliament perpetuating themselves, but because it was their design ; \* and had not their heels been trod upon by importunities from abroad, even to threats, *I* believe there would never have been thoughts of rising, or of going out of that room, to the world's end.

After reading this cloudy *Tiberian* Speech, and comparing these impudent assertions with the measures and declared intentions of the Republican Parliament, it should be impossible to doubt the baseness of Cromwell. Even supposing some truth in \*, yet what more can be wished from a Parliament than that they should yield to the desires from abroad?

A Healing Question, Propounded by Harry Vane, Knt.

Page 4.

For the first of these, that is to say, the natural right, which the whole party of honest men adhering to this cause are by success of their arms restored unto, fortified in, and may lay claim as their unmitakeable privilege, that righteously cannot be taken from them, nor they debarred from bringing into exercise, it lies in this.

They are to have and enjoy the freedom (by way of dutiful compliance and condescension from all the parts and members of this society) to set up meet persons in the place of supreme judicature and authority amongst them ; whereby they may have the use and benefit of the choicest light and wisdom of the nation that they are capable to call forth, for

the rule and government under which they live; and through the orderly exercise of such measure of wisdom and counsel as the Lord in this way shall please to give unto them, to shape and form all subordinate actings and administrations of rule and government, so as shall best answer the public welfare and safety of the whole.

N.B. The Right is unquestionable; the question is, in whom is it vested? Sir H. Vane answers: the *Honest Men, i. e.*, my own party. He, at that time, might do so without absurdity—for he grounds *this* Right in part on the prior Right of conquest, and God's decision on an appeal to arms. But this judgment has been reversed, and what shall we substitute? The Nation? Who compose it? The people? Whom do you mean? The majority of *convictions, i. e.*, convinced Understandings? How are these to be collected? Of Wills? What a right of Might?

An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England concerning the Advancement of Learning and Reformation of the Universities, by J. H. London, 1649.

This Tract is a truly admirable memorial, *opusculum verè Baconicum*. J. H. is, I believe, John Hall, a young man of highest promise, who died in the 22nd year of his age. It would be desirable to reprint this "Motion," dedicated to the Founders of the London University. 1828.

*Ibid.* pp. 16, 17.

Nay that those present revenues whereupon they now surfeit, have choked abundance of active industries; nay, been a means to thrust into ecclesiastical or literary offices a *many* of persons, who, had they been suffered to obey their own inclinations, and followed some trade or handicraft,

might have ranked themselves among the ablest of their profession.

Menia, whence menial, the set or whole number of slaves or inferior servants, attached to a menial Estate, Farm, or *Lordship*. Query, a menia? *i.e.*, a menial set, a set of menial souls, who, &c.

*Ibid.* pp. 25—7.

For the first: I could never yet make so bad an idea of a true University, as that it should serve for no nobler end than to nurture a few raw striplings, come out of some miserable country-school, with a few shreds of Latin, that is as unmusical to a polite ear as the grunting of a sow, or the noise of a saw can be to one who is acquainted with the laws of harmony; and then possibly before they have surveyed the Greek alphabet, to be racked and tortured with a sort of harsh abstracted logical notions, which their wits are no more able to endure, than their bodies the strapado; and to be delivered over to a jejune, barren, Peripatetic Philosophy, suited only (as Monsieur Des Cartes says) to wits that are seated below mediocrity, which will furnish them with those rare imaginations of *Materia prima*, *Privation*, *Universalis*, and such trumpery, which they understand no more than their tutors, and can make no more use of in the affairs of life, than if 3000 years since they had run through all the hieroglyphical learning of the Egyptians, and had since that time slept in their mummy, and were now awoken. And then as soon as they have done licking of this file, to be turned to graze in poor Ethics; which perhaps tell them as much, in harder words, as they had heard their mothers talk by the fire-side at home. Then are they turned loose, and with their paper barks committed to the great ocean of learning; where if they be not torn, they return back so full of desperation and contempt of their profession, and sad remembrance of their youth so trivially spent, that they hate all towardly engagements that way, and suffer them-

selves to sink either in a quagmire of idleness, or to be snatched away in a whirlpool of vice. But in case some with much ado get ashore (for a long or a far voyage upon these terms they cannot make), and by the foresaid means stilt themselves into some profession, what deplorable things (unless it be those few which nature makes for ostentation, to be jewels in this earth) prove they, in filling the world with detestable quacking empirics, lewd and contentious gowmsmen, or ignorant mercenary divines?

It would be thought unjust and calumnious to offer this paragraph to line 3rd, page 27, as a portrait of either of our two universities in their present state. Yet—within three Decennia last past, a true *exposé* of Oxford tuition would have differed from this only by substituting nothing for nothing's worth, *nihil vice nihilorum*. But at this very moment I will consent to take a hard student, and an average or οἱ πολλοὶ man of the Oxford of 1640, and of 1820, and, on a detailed statement of the schemes of study and of the kinds and quantum of the knowledge of the former two, and those of the latter two, after a fair comparison of the first with the first, and of the second with the second, in respect of intrinsic worth, and of (not adventitious and conventional, but) actual utility, to maintain the superiority of the Oxford of A.D. 1640.

Some Animadversions upon the Declaration of, and the Plea for the Army. By Robert Chambre, 1659.

Page 22.

Oh that God would convince you, that sins against the first Table are greater, and more grievous in the sight of God; than against the second Table; as being immediately against His majesty!

On the contrary, the vices against the Second

Table would therefore be greater, if that were possible (Epistle of James), because they preclude obedience to the first table,—nay, heap the crime of hypocrisy on the pretence to obedience.

*Written on the blank page at the end of the Volume.*

Eighth Tract, 1649.

Justice upon the Remonstrance of the Army, by William Sedgwick—highly interesting. I must make myself better acquainted with this W. Sedgwick, who re-excites the regret I have so often felt, that a History of Charles I., the Republic, and Protectorate, were not written with especial reference to the numberless Pamphlets, Books, &c., then published, or while yet there is time.

But, alas! every year destroys its quota; the noble, probably unique, collection of Sir W. Lawson's Predecessor, left out of spite to the Butler, lasted the Grocers, Chandlers, and Druggists of Penrith and Kendal during a destruction of 20 years and more!—W.S. appears an instance of an Independent sublimated into a theosophic Behmenist, greatly to the improvement of his political insight at least. Several passages on the Spirit of Fear, as symptomatic of hollowness and weakness, and the contrary spirit of co-inherence, are almost sublime. Sedgwick's views of immortality seem, however, to coincide with those of Spinoza, rather than with Behmen's. See page 25, last paragraph, and the three or four following pages.

NOTES WRITTEN IN A VOLUME OF TRACTS  
RELATING TO THE CIVIL WARS.

---

England's Dust and Ashes raked up; or, the King and  
People beguiled.

To thee, Reader.

Yet now for human ends, thou seest we are forced to forsake the Almighty, to deny the blessed conduct of His most holy Word, and turn our belief to a new piece of Parliament divinity, which compels to pay no tribute to Cæsar, but rather take violently from him his own inheritance and royal patrimony, while he refuses to be under command.

The King (which in the New Testament ought to have been translated Emperor) means the Supreme Power, in whomever placed. In England it was placed in the King and two Houses of Parliament. The King separately from these was no more than a Constable without a warrant.

The Preface of the same Tract.

The King therefore cannot be capable of constraint from his vassals; for whom, if they miscarry for want of temper at his correction, he is said, in a qualified sense, to be generally accountable; which could by no means be, if his power were not above all men, and his dominion absolute.

Here we have an open avowal of arbitrary monarchy, which Charles I. encouraged in his followers, while he disavowed it in the public papers, written for him and in his name, but with his full consent and authority, by Clarendon, Falkland and Culpepper.

*Written on the blank leaf at the end of the Volume.*

In all questions of wide and deep interest it is scarcely less than a fatal Necessity, that the best cause should be the worst defended; the consequence of which is, the temporary victory of the false and the superficial, and its establishment in the chair of learned as well as popular opinion. The cause is in the instinct of the mind to aim at the highest in the first instance—and hence with imperfect means, and in the absence of all the main conditions of its attainment:—the Cherub's aim—the Child's or Savage's wishes, passions, prejudices—Alchemy, Astrology. But the remark was intended chiefly in reference to the Nominalist's controversy with, and temporary (though still *continuing*) victory over the Realists in the fifteenth century.

---

#### NOTE ON HAYLEY'S LIFE OF MILTON.\*

—◆—  
Page 101.

The odium which the President [Bradshaw] justly incurred in the trial of Charles.

Why justly? What would the contemptible Martyr-worshippers (who yearly apply to this fraudulent would-be-Despot the most awful phrases of holy writ concerning the Saviour of Mankind, concerning the Incarnate *Word*, that is with *God*, and is *God*, in a cento of ingenious blasphemy that has no parallel in the annals of impious adulation) what



would even these men have? Can they, as men, expect that Bradshaw and his Peers *should* give sentence against the Parliament and Armies of England, as guilty of all the blood that had been shed as Rebels and Murderers! Yet there was no other alternative. That he and his Peers were influenced by Cromwell is a gross calumny, sufficiently refuted by their after lives and by their death hours, and has been amply falsified by Mrs. Hutchinson in her incomparable Life of her incomparable Husband Colonel Hutchinson. O! that I might have such an action to remember on my Death-bed. The only enviable part of Charles's fate and life is that his name is connected with the greatest names of ancient or modern times—*Qui cum victus erat, tantis certasse feratur.*

---

NOTES ON THE ROYALIST'S DEFENCE, VINDICATING THE KING'S PROCEEDINGS IN THE LATE WAR MADE AGAINST HIM.

---

The Epistle to the Reader.

Now amongst those, he who hath once got the reputation of an Antiquary, and hath accustomed himself to discourse of things out of the common road, *ipso facto*, is master of this art. It is then but making use of some dull expressions found in an old *worm-eaten Record*, selecting the mistaken opinions of some particular judge's *obiter*, delivered in arguments, or some dark sentences taken out of a rotten manuscript. And if any printed book be deigned the mentioning, it must not be the known authentic authors, reporting the resolutions of the Courts of Justice, nor such as show the common and constant practice of the kingdom, which is the Law itself, but some antiquated thing, whose

author is unknown, and his meaning is obscure. These rules being observed, his work is done; the people, observing this Cynic's discourse to be different from other men, presently conclude him to be far more learned than his fellow lawyers, and gaze upon him as an infallible guide.

Palpably a sneer at Selden.

*Ibid.*

And the King on the other side, with wonderful expressions of loyalty (even by the same Serpent) ["this Parliament"] was told he should be made more glorious than any of his ancestors or predecessors; but the members having thus increased the flame between the King and the subject, and having by these false surmises and cunning dissemblings gulled the people into a belief that whatever the members declared, be it in things either spiritual or temporal, the one was good law, and the other true Gospel; which the members perceiving, they instantly made use thereof, and upon that score voted it a high breach of the privilege of Parliament for any (the Judges, the Courts of Justice, nor the King himself, excepted) either to oppose their commands, or to deny that to be law, which they declared so to be. By which sleight their whole work was finished, for by this the known law was absolutely subverted, and both King and People (for their consciences, their lives, estates, and fortunes) enslaved, to their will and doom.

How strange, if, under the influence of party-spirit, anything can be thought strange, that this Royalist, evidently a man of sense and learning, should have suffered himself to forget, who and what portion of the nation these *members* were, in the two or three first Parliaments of Charles I.

Vide Clarendon's own confession.

*Ibid.*

And for those of the latter rank, how far their following the dictamen of their own conscience in points of Divinity may excuse them, I will not dispute, but certain I am, by the constitutions of this realm, in temporal things, it neither extenuates the crime, nor mitigates the punishment.

One sophism pervades the whole of this reasoning—*pars pro toto*—or the confusion of the individual and what he *represents* but does not possess. Our King represents the whole power of the nation and its Laws, but does not possess it.

Page 48.

By this it appears, that when the two Houses have passed a bill for an Act of Parliament, and to it the King's Royal assent is had, the Parliament's power ends, and then begins the authority of the Judges of the Realm, whose office is (the case being regularly brought before them) first to judge whether the Act itself be good, and, if binding, then to declare the meaning of the words thereof. And so the necessity of having a power upon emergent occasions to make new laws is supplied, and yet the fundamental grounds of the law, by this limitation of the power of the law-maker, with reference to the Judges to determine which Acts of Parliament are binding, and which void, is preserved.

In a state of society, in which the active and influential portion of the inhabitants was small, scarcely perhaps trebling the number of the members of the two Houses—the right and power here contended for might have been wisely vested in the Judges of the Realm.

It is curious to observe, that the thinner the realm was (the less both the wealth and influence, and the

less they were *diffused*,) the greater was the division of power. It is now almost merged in the House of Commons. Formerly, the Convocation, the Judges, &c., shared in it.

The dispensing power, as completory of the Law and supplying the inherent deficiency of all human provisions expressed in determinate words, is so natural and necessary a prerogative of the supreme Executive's trust, that Charles I. richly deserved death for this alone, that he had treacherously and treasonably perverted a power entrusted to him for the completion of Law, into a means of destroying Law, and of evacuating its essential purpose—viz., the ensurance of the subject against individual will. It was an abuse of terms to say, that the King has the right of dispensing with the Laws. It can only be asserted, the King *had* a dispensing power in such or such a case—or the King has a dispensing power in *this* case. The particular case must be known and specified in order to the determination of the Right—for what is true of all ordinance is eminently true of this—the Reason and ultimate purpose of the ordinances must determine its interpretation.

Since the Revolution we have deemed it necessary to secure this principle, by throwing the *onus probandi* in each instance on the Dispenser, by *presuming* that he had *not* the power; and this is, perhaps, the wisest plan. But the substance is the same: as is evident by the fact, that, in certain emergencies, the Parliament might, and would be bound to, impeach a Minister for not dispensing (advising the King to dispense) with an existing statute.

## NOTES ON LIVES OF BRITISH STATESMEN.\*

—◆—

Life of Sir T. More. Page 70, note K.

Picus of Mirandola, whom he so much admired, was distinguished for the freedom of his religious opinions. He was during his whole lifetime, persecuted \* by the devotees of Rome, with charges of heresy, and saved from their hands probably by his rank.

\* Utterly false. He was, or suffered himself, owing to his own superstition, to be *seized* by some accusers of his nine-hundred Theses, and his explanation of them. But this endured for a few years only, and never amounted to *persecution*. Innocent VIII., who first approved and then prohibited the discussion, at the same time expressly preserved the reputation of Picus as a faithful and dear son of the Church, and Alexander VI. cleared him still more honourably. In fact Count Mirandola was the idol of his age—and but for Savonarola's oath that, he had seen him in *Purgatory*, or rather that Picus clothed in flames had appeared to him and informed him that he was prevented from going immediately to Heaven by the crime of having delayed to become a Dominican Monk, he would probably have been beatified.

Life of Burleigh. P. 162.

Whitgift, the succeeding primate, taught by this example, proceeded to exercise severities which Parker would not have ventured to commit, nor the Queen, in the earlier part of her reign, have countenanced.

\* Lives of British Statesmen. By John Macdiarmid. 4to. 1807.

Is it not then singular, that Richard Baxter (in his Life) should have mentioned Whitgift among the good and wise prelates of the early Church in contrast with their successors?

Life of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. P. 266.

At no period was the omnipotence of Parliament a more established doctrine [than in the time of Henry VIII.]. It was not enough that More confessed its power to make or depose a king; he suffered for a treasonable offence, because he would not acknowledge its right to confer a supreme control over men's consciences.

Is not this a contradiction, this very King being an essential part of this omnipotent Parliament? And would Henry have endured such a doctrine as that his Vassals and Subjects had the right to depose him?

*Ibid.* p. 269.

In this conjuncture two expedients seem to have been requisite for the prevention of violent civil dissensions; the limitation of the royal prerogative by such accurate and insuperable barriers as would for ever guard the persons and property of the subject from arbitrary encroachments, and the separation of the King's private expenditure from the disbursements of the public, &c. But of these expedients, the separation of the King's expenditure from that of the nation, however simple and obvious it may now appear, does not seem to have then occurred either to the Prince or the people.

Now this appears to me one of those *plausible* silly remarks that even sensible men may sometimes fall on. At a second thought, however, a man of reflection would see, that this "*simple and obvious*" expedient involves one or other of two consequences.

Either the two Houses of Parliament were to appoint, appropriate, and control the nation's expenditure ; or they were not. If the latter, the separation would be nominal only—a mere powerless Act of Parliament ! If they were, it would itself be and constitute such a limitation as the boldest Patriot at that time would not have thought of. With no greater patronage than the Crown *then* possessed, it would have reduced the King to a mere Stadtholder.

*Ibid.* p. 468.

Strafford was aware that his life was in the hands of his enemies ; that no chance of escape remained ; but he was not prepared to expect so sudden a dereliction by his sovereign, &c. &c., and when assured of the fatal truth, he raised his eyes to heaven, and, laying his hand on his heart, exclaimed, 'Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation.'

Canting scoundrel—a hypocrite in his very last act ! Nothing indeed can justify the measures of the House of Commons, nothing palliate the baseness of the House of Lords ; unless it be the unvaried example of all their predecessors, and the faithful imitation of the same submission to the stronger party by all their successors spiritual and temporal. It was not this remorseless apostate that suffered undeservingly ; he deserved a thousand deaths ; but England, but Law, and the everlasting principles and grounds of Law in the sense of public justice, that received a deadly wound : and every Bill of Pains and Penalties since then has been a fresh hydra-head sprouting from this wound. Thus is the cycle of retributive Providence completed. What the Gracchi begin, a Blue-beard and a Heliogabalus finish.

*Ibid.* p. 472.

In his address to the people from the scaffold, he assured them that he submitted to his sentence with perfect resignation, &c. &c. He declared that, however his actions might have been misinterpreted, his intentions had always been upright, that he loved Parliaments,\* that he was devoted to the Constitution, and to the Church of England, &c. &c.

\* If aught could—but nothing can, nor dare we indeed desire, that anything should—remove the superstition in favour of dying words, this fact and the similar fact in Charles's own scaffold scene are well fitted to produce the effect. Both died with a lie in their mouths. Strafford with his love of Parliaments and devotion to the Constitution by which the King was made dependent on them; and Charles with the delivery of his Icon Basiliké as his own work!

Life of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. P. 495.

The King however found reason, from this incident, to respect the sentiments of Hyde still more than formerly, when he discovered that his opposition had proceeded from his objection to a statement of Colepepper's, affirming that the King, the Lords, and the Commons, formed the three estates of the kingdom; whereas the King, in his opinion, should have been mentioned as the sovereign of the whole, and the bishops as the third estate.

This is a Tory tenet, which it would be good policy in the Whigs to adopt; if indeed any party deserving the name of Whigs in its right import, is still extant. For a genuine Whig according to my conviction, may be defined: A patriot, who (considering *practical good sense*, in distinction from a



theoristic predilection for strict logical *consequence*, as the characteristic of the English People and the only appropriate interpreter of the English Constitution) acts in the spirit of *Compromise* with the Monarchy and the Major Barons to the advantage *on the whole*, of the great mass of Proprietors, landed, mercantile, and professional; and who giving its largest sense to the term, Property, so as to make it commensurate with its true ground and justifying definition, viz., a sphere of individual free-agency; and, therefore extending it to the lowest kind and degree of Property compatible with the possessor's personal independence in the performance of his civic duties: judicial (*i. e.* as a jury-man) municipal, and elective, includes actually, or by probable reversion, the whole effective male adult population; and yet so as that the accruing of civic (not natural) rights of the People, thus contra-distinguished from the Populace (as *Populus à Plebe*) should be formally and functionally realised in such times and ways, and under such circumstances, conditions, and limitations, as render the rights of the third class consistent with the co-existence of an effective Royalty and Aristocracy; nay, an additional safeguard to each against the other; and thus indirectly to both against its own encroachments. This is the *Ideal*, by the light of which the genuine Whig (the proper ENGLISH *Publicola sed et Patriota nihilominus*) guides and regulates his aims and efforts, corrective and perfective; his regrets, fears, and wishes. And for the attainment of this by as close an approximation as wisdom dare expect from human imperfection, our Constitution had provided, and still prescribes, the sufficient means. Let only the House of Lords consist exclusively of *bonâ-fide* Major Land-owners, of ancient families, or of men whose eminent merits and services entitle them to

become the Founders of Families, but who on being raised to the Peerage should, as an indispensable accompaniment have, or be put in possession of, *Lands* proportional: and the House of Commons of two classes, the one, constituting a powerful and respectable minority in number, the representatives of the Minor Barons, *i. e.*, the landed Proprietors, free-hold or copy-hold, not sitting with the Major Barons *jure proprio*, nor yet included in their Estates and Dependencies; and of a majority (say two-thirds) the representatives of Cities, Towns, and Sea-Ports. The Cities and Boroughs, to whom the elective franchise is entrusted, need not be more numerous than at present—if only (alas! the *one* oversight of our ancestors) the franchise adhered to the thing originally meant, and not to the *name* (Old Sarum for instance) when the thing had ceased—if from A—C it passed to B + C, instead of remaining in A—C only because it was *ci-devant* A + C! These are the three proper *Estates* of the Realm,—change of times having dis-estated the Church or identified it with the first or second as they now exist—namely, first, the Major Barons who sit *jure proprio* and form a House of their own; second, the Minor Barons, who sit by representatives; and, thirdly, the Inhabitants of Towns, &c., or the commercial, manufacturing, distributive, and professional interests, who sit by their representatives in the same House with those of the Minor Barons. The two former estates form the elements of permanence in a nation, and bind the present with the past: the third is the element of Progression and Improvement, the former supplying the main nutriment of the common-weal, the latter its requisite stimulus. Call them A, E, I. Then, whenever, as will oftenest happen, the interests of A and E coincide, their combined strength will suffice

to counteract any attempted encroachment on the part of I, though I is numerically the majority in the lower House: and when, as will sometimes happen, a real or supposed division of interest takes place between A and E, it is not less than a moral certainty that I will join with E to the efficient protection of E against any novelty attempted by A: and should (as in the case of Corn Laws and the like) A and E combine against I, I by its numerical majority has the power of protecting itself. To connect, therefore, this long note with the text that occasioned it—it is clear, I say, that the King is not an *Estate* of the Realm, but the Majesty of all three—that is, the Crown in its legislative character represents the Nation, its ancient Laws and Customs, ante-Parliamentary as well as Parliamentary, and on his solemn oath alone (violent and extra-regular means not in question) does the Commonwealth depend for the continuance of its super-Parliamentary Rights: while as the Executive Power, the Crown is the Agent and Trustee for all, chosen by the Nation, not elected by the Estates; or, more truly, appointed by Providence, as the copula of all the complex causes, the grounds and acts and results of which constitute the National History. Thus, my dear Gillman! without intending it, I have left on record for you the sum of my political religion, or the Constitutional Creed of S. T. Coleridge.

*Ibid.* p. 520.

It is not to be concealed that even Hyde encouraged the attempts of Captain Titus and others to remove Cromwell by assassination.

Nor ought it to be concealed that Hyde suborned assassins against an honest man than Cromwell, the patriot Ludlow. When to this detestable

wickedness we add his hardening of Charles I. in his prelatical superstition, his being an accomplice of the King's in the three contradictory treaties with three different parties at the same time, neither of which the King intended to fulfil, and his total abandonment of the religious rights of the subjects to the fury of the Bishops after the Restoration, we must attribute the high praise bestowed on Clarendon by historians, and the general respect attached to his memory chiefly to the infamy of the rest of the Cavalier Faction canonising bad by incomparably worse.

*Ibid.* p. 522.

When the death of Cromwell, and the deposition of his son, enabled the active spirits to resume the business of framing Constitutions, they showed that their political sagacity had undergone no improvement. Without comprehending the distribution of powers, by which the authority of rulers is rendered at once effectual and innoxious, their crude discussions turned upon the eligibility of vesting the supreme power in one man, in a few, or in the people at large; and men seemed ready to lose their lives for theoretical governments, which were either pernicious or impracticable.

*This* at least cannot be said of Harrington's scheme: nor should it be forgotten, that Cromwell's Scheme of Representation, eulogised by Clarendon himself, and which would have more than superseded the Revolution, owed its failure not to the ambition of Cromwell, but the narrow prejudices and persecuting bigotry of the Presbyterians, who furthermore brought back the perjured popish Brotheller without conditions, and met their due reward.

*Ibid.* pp. 538-9.

It would have been fortunate for the memory of Clarendon, if the same good sense and benevolence which guided his civil policy had governed his religious opinions. But in these prejudice triumphed over his better judgment; and we find him breathing sentiments, which, in a darker age, would have led him to promote the most cruel persecution. From his early youth he had imbibed the maxim of *No Bishop, no King*, as an infallible truth; and had conscientiously instilled into the mind of his sovereign the doctrine that Episcopacy is the only form of Church Government compatible with Monarchy.

It is sad to think, how dangerous a poison the tone and general spirit of our modern historians instil into the public mind, and (still worse) into the souls of the young men, whose talents, rank, or connections destine them to a public life: a poison, slow indeed and lurking, and therefore the fittest to undermine the moral constitution. What an effect must not [be produced by] the mere attachment of the honours of virtue to wicked statesmen only because they were much less wicked than others! “Conscientiously!” What? was Hyde a poor simple recluse? must not the knowledge, that this tenet was despised as absurd, and detested as base and ruinous by Falkland, Southampton, and a majority of the great and good men who lived and died for the monarchy, have at least so far influenced an honest mind as to prevent him from persecuting with remorseless cruelty thousands, nay, myriads, of men whose only charge was that of holding the same opinion respecting the prelates (for the quarrel was not concerning Episcopacy, such as Archbishop Usher supported, but *Prelacy*), as Falkland? If a conscience sere'd by party-passions, and the assumption of infallibility, is to be the sufficient

reason for calling actions conscientious, for Heaven's sake, say not an unkind word against the Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day, or the horrors of Bonner and Gardner!

The plausibility of the sophism, No Bishop, no King! rests wholly on the circumstance, that there is *some* truth in the converse, viz.: No King, no Prelate.

## NOTES WRITTEN IN THE "LAW MAGAZINE,"

FOR JANUARY AND APRIL, 1830. VOL. III.

Life of Lord Hardwicke. P. 97.

In framing his judgments, Lord Hardwicke appears always to have been anxious to bring the case within the scope of some broad general principle. This, however, he never effected by means of forced interpretations or fanciful analogies.

I am too well aware of my incompetence to set any value on my own opinion; but in reading, some years back, Atkyn's and Vesey's Reports (23 Vol.) and afterwards, Sir James Burrows, and (while I was at Malta) Robinson's Admiralty Reports, I was exceedingly impressed with the measureless superiority of Lords Hardwicke and Mansfield and of Sir W. Scott to Lord Eldon, on the score of solid and comprehensive principle.

*Ibid.* p. 102.

It is to no purpose to argue that none but weak and *plastic* minds suffer themselves to be influenced by habit.

Better thus—none but soft and fictile minds yield

to the impressions of habit. Influences excite, modify, temper, contemper, &c., but can rarely be said to *mould*.

Is there any authority for the use of this word ["plastic"] in a passive sense? *Qu.* fictile! "Soft" would have been better than "weak."

*Ibid.* p. 108.

Some obloquy has been cast upon Lord Hardwicke, because he disposed of the Church patronage belonging to his office with a view rather to increase his own political influence, than to forward obscure merit or to further the interests of religion. This accusation is undoubtedly just; but whether the fault be a very venial, or a highly criminal one, is a question likely to be decided by different persons in very different ways; no one, at all events, will deny that it is a very common one.

—by the Venialists, I presume, in Change-Alley, or in the Hells, or at Windsor. The denizens of Newgate would be ashamed of such a sentiment. But Lawyers are sorry moralists, and both they and the men in office are in whimsical wise contemptuously jealous of literary men.

*Ibid.* p. 112.

But unhappily his cupidity led him to regard the increase of his fortune as a primary object of ambition; and though to accomplish it he never descended to employ means inconsistent with the strictest integrity, there cannot be a doubt that he sacrificed to it a species of fame which it was in his power to earn, and which it was incumbent on him to deserve. Had he not been deterred by avarice from effecting the reform of the Court of Chaucery, he might have left behind him a smaller inheritance to his children, but he

would have transmitted to them the glory of being descended from a disinterested benefactor of his country.

The Devil! What? an infamous prostitution of his immense patronage to his own dirty interests, "not inconsistent," &c. I will even risk the scorn of the Biographer by asking him, in what chapter of the New Testament he found Avarice, a foible: or base breach of a sacred trust, a very venial fault!

---

## NOTES WRITTEN IN THE ENCYCLOPEDIA LONDINENSIS.

— — —  
ERASMUS.

In conformity with the *pedantic* taste then prevailing among men of letters, of assuming names of Greek or Latin etymology, he translated his family name of Gerard, signifying amiable, into the equivalent ones of Desiderius in Latin, and Erasmus in Greek.

And why pedantic? What man of the least taste would have preferred Mynheer Groot to Grotius, Reuchlin to Caprio, or Schwartzerecht to Melancthon? While the Latin was the *lingua communis* of Europe such translations were fit and graceful.

*Ibid.*

He first lodged with Sir Thomas More, and amused himself with writing his "Moriæ Encomium," or Praise of Folly, a facetious and satirical composition which became popular.

And is that all that can be said of the (perhaps)



most exquisite work of wit and wisdom extant! In its kind certainly the most exquisite.

#### LIBERTY.

It were endless to enumerate all the affirmative acts of parliament wherein justice is directed to be done according to the law of the land; and what that law is, every subject knows or may know if he pleases; for it depends not upon the arbitrary will of any judge, but is permanent, fixed, and unchangeable, unless by authority of parliament.

Mere declamation! In a rich and populous, a commercial and manufacturing people, the practical Law exists in precedents, far more than in statutes, and every new judge furnishes new precedents. Hence the "glorious uncertainty of the Law." How can it be truly affirmed that every man may know [the law], when it requires the study and practice of a life to be qualified even to give an opinion; and when nothing is more common than for two men equally qualified to give opposite opinions? Not to mention the ruinous expenses of a law-suit to all but rich men; so that the power of appeal from lower to higher courts, instead of protecting the poor man, enables a rich tyrant, such as the late Lord L. to ruin whom he chooses.

I wrote this, not in complaint, for the evil is inevitable, and results from the very nature of Property in the present state of human nature; but because the strongest arguments of Jacobinism are drawn from these rash assertions, and the actual state of things so opposite to them.

These positions should be treated as the declared *Ideal* and ultimate object of Legislature, which every man is bound to hold in view in his administration of Law, not as the actual result of Law; and men should

be taught that the evils here stated are great indeed, yet cannot be removed without far greater evils; and that there are advantages on the other hand, resulting from those very evils, and, in some measure, counterbalancing them: such is the existence of a large and learned profession, a check [put] on Litigiousness, and not least a general sense of the insufficiency of Law, and the consequent praise and value attached to Honour and Morality as contradistinguished from Legality.

#### LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

With religion, Christian governments have no further concern than as it tends to promote the practice of virtue.

*Note.*—No! If this were once admitted, even the Inquisition might be defended. Not the practice of *virtue*, but the peace of Society and the Legality of the Individuals, are the objects of Law; these secured, we may safely trust to Religion, Education, and Civilisation for the rest.

---

#### NOTE ON THE "VOCATION OF OUR AGE FOR LEGISLATION AND JURISPRUDENCE."\*

---

Written on the blank leaf before the Title-page.

The purely evil nature of the ambition which agitates, like a *lust*, the French nation, is betrayed and evinced by the merely *physical* character of their pretexts; *ex. gr.*, that the *Rhine* is the natural

\* Translated from the German of Frederick Charles Von Savigny, by Abraham Hayward. (Not for sale.)

boundary of France—that the interspace between the Rhine and the Pyrenees cannot endure a divided sovereignty. Languages, manners, religion, historical recollections, even *race*, may be diverse. What are all these compared with a *River*? though the said River never, for a short week, stopped the march of a superior force! But alas! incapable of the sense of duty, the French seek a substitute for it, by generalising their Self-lust in a demand for *Rights*. God and the Devil cannot be more strikingly contrasted than in this different ordination of the two antitheta, Persons and Things, Duties and Rights. According to the will of God it is, *Persons* and Things in order to Persons, Duties, and thence Rights, as derived from the obligation to perform Duties. According to the Devil, the Cotton-factors and the West Indian Planters, and the Revolutionists it is, Persons as Things, and in order to Things, *Rights*, *i. e.*, Desires, and *other men's duty* to submit to them.

---

NOTE ON A LETTER TO VISCOUNT GODERICH,  
BY VINDEK, ON THE CONDUCT OF THE BRITISH  
GOVERNMENT TOWARDS THE CHURCH OF  
ENGLAND IN THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES.

---

A vigorous, eloquent, and for the greater portion, wise and well-reasoned Remonstrance. My only objection—only important objection—respects the ambiguity of the word “compatible” and “incompatible” in reference to Christianity. That slavery is and ever was compatible with the co-existence of the Christian Church, is fact of history; but so is ingratitude, gaming, &c.

But surely what may co-exist with the Preaching is not necessarily consistent with the precepts and ultimate aims, *i. e.*, with the Spirit of Christianity. *War* is not forbidden by the Gospel, but only the Passions, whence alone come Wars among men. Evils, the ultimate, though perhaps slow and very gradual removal of which, are among the *Objects* of a Religion, cannot be incompatible with its *existence*. But let every remedy be applied according to its specific Power. The Gospel is a remedy for corruptions in the will, and darkness in the Reason, (whence proceed the only dangerous errors in the understandings) of Persons, of Individuals. It was not intended as a *direct* remedy for *Things*—and Institutions, States of Society, &c., are *Things*, and therefore excluded from a *Spiritual* agency. Indirectly indeed, and inasmuch as *Causa causæ, causa causati*, the Gospel no doubt is an antidote to the evil of Slavery, and to the evils of War—of a bribed or a mob-managed Legislature, and what not? In this one respect only I differ equally from Vindex and Buxton and his confrères. Slavery is compatible with Christianity, and therefore Parliament may protect it, argues Vindex. Slavery is utterly incompatible with Christianity, screams Buxton, and therefore put it down by an act of Parliament! Slavery, *i. e.*, the perversion of a Person into a Thing, is contrary to the Spirit of Christianity, say I, and therefore it is the duty of Christians to labour (as far as it is in their power, and lies within the sphere of their immediate duties) for its ultimate removal from the Christian World. But that an act of Parliament would be a fit or effectual means toward this end, I not only do not believe, but I believe the very contrary, and under these convictions give my conscientious vote for the measures

recommended by Vindex as the right substitute for the fiery remedies prescribed by the Anti-Slavery Society.

---

NOTES ON PARK'S DOGMAS OF THE  
CONSTITUTION.\*

—♦—  
Page xi.

If the theory of the Constitution turn out, upon close examination, to be fraught with the most invincible absurdities; and if, notwithstanding, these absurdities have not been practically felt, the question must be by what means they have been escaped from; and the answer can only be this, by a constant practical violation of the theory itself, although without an open or avowed renunciation of it, and with the cautious preservation of most of its *forms*.

The *theory* of the Constitution? Why, the Constitution itself is the idea, ultimate aim, and as such the moral actuating and plastic *law* of the *government*? But even a theory of the *government* (government used *sensu latissimo*)—where, Mr. Devil! is it to be found? In the dreams of Blackstone or De Lolme, or the yet shallower Locke? A theory = θεωρία—*contemplatio*, *i. e.*, such a subjective (mental) arrangement of all the parts or particulars, as far as they have hitherto been known, which appear to constitute a given thing, as enables us to reflect on that complex thing, as a unity of interdependents. Now, laws, rules, and customs of Parliament are the *subjects* of the synopsis, not its materials. The resolution of the Lower House read at the opening

\* Lectures on Dogmas of the Constitution. By J. J. Park, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. 1832.

of every session, I believe, against interference of Peers in Elections is, and was, a mere asinine fling out of the Commons, that never had, and never could have (*i. e.*, since the polygarchy of the feudal Lords was sufficiently repressed to allow the existence of a House of Commons) any practical meaning. But Burke, in his criminatory letter to the Duke of Portland against Mr. Fox, exposed this answer (argument?). Do beware, Henry,\* of confounding the terms, theory and principle—theory and law. A theory is ordinarily a mere piece-toy for the benefit of the memory—a *μνημόνικον τεχνικόν*, made like squibs or crackers, to be exploded by the first spark of a new fact or *term*. Of course mathematical theorems are (for this very reason) an exception. But in all real knowledge the account of the terms is as below.

Hypopoiēsis = Suffiction, *ex. gr.* Des Cartes' Vortices. Hypothesis = Supposition, *ex. gr.*, Oxygen + Hydrogen = water. Theory, *ex. gr.* Orrery, Walker's Eidouranian. Law = Objective, *ens et agens*.

*Ibid.*

The whole argument of the Conservative party in the House of Commons, *talented* as it has been in some respects, has involved one grand and fatal error in logic.

This vile, barbarous, vocable '*talented!*' why not shillinged, farthinged, tenpenced, &c.? The formation of a participle passive from a noun, is a license that requires some peculiar felicity to excuse it.

Page xv.

Now either the theoretic right of the people to a "full and fair representation; in other words, to an exclusive occupation of the House of Commons by their own representatives,

\* Henry Nelson Coleridge.—Ed.

is a real right, or it is not; while Lord Erskine, in effect, admitting it to be so, treats it in the same breath like the toy of a child, to be given out or withheld for the day, according as he is ill or well-behaved. A constitution which cannot weather an occasional fit of bad humour, must surely be a very faulty one !

Excellent ! But the Whig principle, like the devil, “ was a liar from the beginning.” Even its essence is a contradiction under the form or notion of a compromise. And as the devil is, *per se*, a mere *ens non vere ens*, that can *appear* only in co-existence with the product of the Logos, or God-fiat—so Whiggism only by virtue of Toryism, or Republicanism with a symbol of unity.

Pp. xvi., xvii.

It will be seen, from the following pages, that the writer is neither Whig nor Tory, that neither “ Reformer ” nor “ Anti-Reformer ” would define his school of politics ; but that he is a disciple or promoter, whichever the reader may choose, of the nascent school of *inductive politics*, or *observational* political science ; a science which, leaving on the right hand and on the left all conventional principles which have hitherto been accredited, to be ultimately adopted or rejected, as scientific judgment and resolution alone shall decide, seeks first, and above all things, to elevate the vague and notional element of political philosophy to the rank of the certain sciences, or, as they are felicitously \* denominated by French authors, “ les sciences d’observation.”

!! *i. e.* no sciences at all. It grieves me to find this passage in a man of such very superior intellect and soundness of principle as Mr. Park so evidently is. I boldly affirm that my philosophy is the true

\* O for an Act of Parliament for the transportation to America of Van Dæmon’s Land of this vile infelicissimus “ felicitously ! ”

*inductive* logic. The "Science d'Observation" of the Celtic anthropoid is, if anything, *deductive*.

Pp. xxi., xxii.

The general long-continued prevalence of *excess* in the force or influence of the Crown or Government, as the constituent evil of the political world, an evil which, under various modal varieties, this country has been struggling with, with few interventions, from the period of the Norman Conquest, &c.

Has not Mr. Park in this instance confounded the evils of the Baronial Polyarchy, and the grinding insolence of a conquering race, aggravating that polyarchy, with the excess of the royal power? Did the Norman kings do more than enact the tyrannies of the Norman barons on a somewhat larger scale?

Lecture 1, p. 4.

The propositive or theoretic constitution of Great Britain (if it ever existed in a pure state, which is very doubtful) has ceased to have any existence for upwards of a century and a half—has for upwards of a century and a half been superseded by a totally different machinery; but the fact has never been publicly recognised or recorded; the substituted constitution has never been formally reduced to proposition: no De Lolme, or Blackstone, has descanted upon *its* virtues, or pointed out *its* defects: and a sufficient number of the forms of the old constitution have been tenaciously observed, to satisfy all persons who think merely by rote, that a government by separate and independent estates of King, Lords, and Commons, was, with certain irregularities or corruptions, still the government of the country.

Very *doubtful*? Yes, as it is very doubtful that the moon is made of green cheese, and that



the spirits of virtuous Welchmen made perfect are transplanted thither in the shape of mites! Blackstone's was the age of shallow law. Monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, as *such*, exclude each the other; but if the elements are to interpenetrate, how absurd to call a lump of sugar hydrogen, oxygen, and carbon! —nay, to take three lumps, and call the first hydrogen, the second oxygen, and the third carbon!

*Ibid.*, p. 8.

The real government of this country unquestionably *is*, or *has been*, a commixture or combination of the three elements of the constitution in the Commons' House of Parliament, as the arena of Government.

Never! at no period.

*Ibid.*, p. 9.

To contrast them with the instances in which the forms of the accredited constitution have been scrupulously preserved.

More truly, nonsensically *blaired*.

*Ibid.*, p. 11.

We shall be told, in the language of Paley, that the balance of power in the constitution consists in this: that there is no power possessed by one part of the legislature, the abuse or excess of which is not checked by some antagonist power residing in another part; and that the power of the two Houses of Parliament to frame laws is checked by the King's negative; and yet we should find so accomplished a constitutional writer as Mr. Hallam, describing that exercise of prerogative as one "which no ordinary circumstances can

reconcile either with prudence or with a *constitutional administration of government*."—Hallam's *Constit. Hist.*, iii. 202.

Nevertheless the royal veto is and remains an essential part of the constitution. That, in the spirit of compromise, characteristic of England, it acts virtually and by prevention, does not evacuate the power itself.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.



## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

---

---

### NOTES ON A NEW METHOD OF CHEMISTRY.\*

---

Page 43. Note.

Bidding him, therefore, take a piece of a leaden spout fastened to the wall of the room, and melt it, the chemist threw in a little yellow powder; then pouring the whole upon the ground, the lead was all gold.

What became of this gold? Did the gold weigh six drachms? Was it assayed? It is verily a lame testimony. Had Frederick III. no political design in spreading the belief of the chryso-poietic powers?

*Ibid.*, p. 56.

⊙ Gold.

∩ Silver.

♀ Copper.

♂ Iron, &c. &c.

Platinum might be marked ⊙ ♂ Gold + Iron, or rather Gold + (+ Iron); *i. e.*, Iron acting positively, where + (— Iron) would signify, Iron acting privatively, by diminution of specific gravity.

\* A New Method of Chemistry; including the Theory and Practice of that Art. By H. Boerhåave. Translated from the printed Edition, collated with the best Manuscript Copies. By P. Shaw, M.D., and E. Chambers, gent. 4to. London. 1727.

*Ibid.*, p. 58.

Quicksilver evidently shows gold in the middle, or body of it, silver at top, or in the face, and a corrosive at bottom; accordingly all the adepts say of mercury that it is gold at heart, whence its heaviness; that its outside is silver, whence its white colour; but that there is a pernicious corrosive sulphur adhering to it, denoted by the cross; that if its brightness and its corrosive could be taken away, it would remain gold; that the quantity of sulphur is here so great, as to render it wholly combustible by fire; that the more 'tis burnt, the nearer it comes to be gold; and that were it perfectly calcined and purified, and its colour changed, it would be gold.

Here the sulphur must be supposed to mean the excess of light, light not neutralised by gravitation, super-oxygenated.—From this point of view, viz., that the thing (*phenomenon fixum sive mortuum*) was taken symbolically for the powers, and the materia (*phenomenon fluxionale*) as the magnetic and electrical materiæ, the alchemists may perhaps be decipherable into intelligible notions.

*Ibid.*, p. 60. Note.

Again, clay does not show the least sign of any metal, work it how you will, without mixing; but add linseed oil to it, and by fire you will have a metal, which is no other than real iron.

The clay of course contained the iron, the linseed oil supplying the carbon for its separation. But with regard to plants and to the blood, it is more doubtful, it would be so very difficult to weigh with sufficient accuracy the various volatile products, with the oxygen used in the burning.

*Ibid.*, p. 72.

The *second character* of mercury is to be the most fluid of all bodies, *i. e.* its parts separate and recede from each other by the smallest force; consequently, of all bodies it is that whose parts cohere the least, or are the least tenacious, and therefore of all others the least ductile and malleable.

Here is an instance from which we may learn the utility of a just definition. Mercury is *è contra* the least fluid of all bodies, under an equal specific portion of heat—*i. e.*, equally fused. For the only tenable definition of a fluid is a body the parts of which are not interdistinguishable by figure. Now mercury retains its globoseness *ad infinitum*. So I reasoned, but I see the defect of the logic (though I nevertheless retain my objection to the proper fluidity of quicksilver). Globoseness, is the  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$ , the figure that necessarily results from the indifference or equilibrium of all dimensions. Schelling's definition of fluid is incorrect, because inadequate. An equilibrium of the whole, which prevents its being parts at all, but by accidental force, *ab extra*, not favoured, but counteracted by the essential character of the proper fluid. In short, melting is not fluidising.

*Ibid.*, p. 73.

The parts of water do not divide so readily as those of quicksilver; and the parts of oil much less; there is a certain tenacity even in the parts of spirits of wine, which resists a separation; but there is scarce any cohesion at all in the parts of mercury.

It is in vain to reason on these facts, till we have formed *distinct* conceptions of the difference between

adhesion and cohesion, attraction and contraction, dilatation and repulsion, and of centrality from them all.

*Ibid.*, p. 74. Note.

Notwithstanding mercury receives such a degree of cold, its great separability and fluidity prevents its congealing. Mr. Boyle tried various ways to bring it to freeze, by making an extream cold, and exposing an exceedingly thin skin of mercury thereto, but without effect.

A warning against the use of the word "extreme;" whereas we now know, that even that degree of cold which is compatible with human life will freeze quicksilver.

*Ibid.*, p. 120. Note.

A fluid seed seems a contradiction. True, a seed may be contained in a fluid vehicle; which we actually suppose is the case in animals; but the proper seed or stamen itself, inevitably must be a solid. This is obvious from the very notion of a seed, which is nothing but a little organised body, wherein all the parts of the future production are contained in small; the production itself is only the seed enlarged, so as to show its several parts to the eye. But fluidity is inconsistent with any such organism; a fluid is a body whose parts are either actually in continual motion, or at least are liable to be continually moved by the smallest force; and how can the structure and arrangement of parts, which constitute an animal or vegetable, persist in so slippery a thing, where the situation of the parts is continually interchangeable? 'Tis no more possible for the seed, *ex. gr.* of a tree, to be fluid, and yet remain a seed, than for the tree itself to be fluid while a tree; so that the seminal origin of stones does not seem tenable.

This question has more recently been a subject of



controversy between the adherents of the justly celebrated John Hunter, and the no less deservedly celebrated — Blumenbach, who has adopted this argument, viz., the inconsistency of fluidity with organisation, in the very conceptions of the two terms. But I doubt the validity of the argument. The *conception* of a fluid is not a, or the, fluid; but a logical *abstract*. First it must be inquired whether there exists in nature any substance adequate to the generic definition? and if this were affirmed, yet secondly, whether the blood, semen, &c., nay, whether the whole of an organised body during life, be not gradative media between solid figure accurately (rigid) and fluid? It is clear to me that nothing vital is properly either rigid or fluid, but mere approximations to the one or the other, either of which realised would be death. If a perfect fluid be defined as quantitative indifference, a fixed body or solid, as quantitative difference, a vital organism must be defined participially as a continuous differencing of the indifference, equal to a continued indifferencing of the difference. Without the former, no *figure*, without the latter, no *life*. The whole controversy, therefore, is resolved into a pseudological logomachy, or a dispute about words, from a misappropriation of the words in dispute.

*Ibid.*, p. 125.

It must be owned, however, that spirit of wine, which is a sulphur, is miscible with water; but it is owing to this, that the sulphur in spirit of wine is so changed, and its parts so attenuated and divided, as to insinuate themselves among the parts of the water, where they would not otherwise be admitted.

A good instance of a subjective and perhaps

arbitrary definition understood in a term with the concrete represented by the same term: as sulphur with sulphur, *i. e.*, Brimstone.\*

*Ibid.*, p. 126.

The second is arsenic, the most fatal of the whole tribe, as destroying all animals, both man and beast; which the word itself imports, being compounded of ἀνῆρ, man, and νίκω, I overcome.

Then it must have been *andronicon*. Even from ἀρσην masculus, it would be arsenīcum, not arsēnicum. Probably it is simply from ἄρσην—the masculine, *i. e.*, the active, penetrating.

*Ibid.*, p. 126. Note.

Sulphur contains some parts which render it more inflammable than either nitre or oil; and yet abounds with acid and vitriolic particles, which strongly resist the flame in several other bodies; the fire of sulphur, besides its common effect, seen in matches, in another capacity, acts by means of its acidity upon some metals, especially iron; and also on red rose-leaves, which are turned white by its fumes.—*Boyle, Useful. of Exper. Philos.*

Instance for Logic. Here Fumes are taken = Sulphur, without proof. Now *we* know that the Fumes are Sulphur + Oxygen; and B. ought to have seen that the Fumes *might* be Sulphur +  $\times$ , or an unknown something.

\* A chemical theorist might even now so extend the use of the word *sulphureous*, as to include oil and alcohol, as the two antithetic proportions of carbon and hydrogen; but in no state of the science could he find an excuse for defining a genus by one of its species.

*Ibid.*, p. 236.

Thus they who dig mines, wells, &c., constantly observe, that while they are yet but a little below the surface, they find it a little cool; as they proceed lower, it grows much colder, as being then beyond the reach of the sun's heat; insomuch that water will freeze almost instantaneously, and hence the use of ice-houses, &c.

Excellent examples might be selected for my Practical Logic, *de terminis haud adhuc exhaustis*, or  $A = B$  C D taken as  $A = A$ .

---

NOTES WRITTEN IN A JOURNAL OF NATURAL  
PHILOSOPHY, CHEMISTRY, AND THE ARTS.\*

Vol. XXII. A Letter on the Basaltic Country in Ireland.  
By William Richardson, D.D.

Page 162. Note.

By the word Nature, which frequently occurs in the course of this memoir, I always mean, according to Ray's definition, the wisdom of God in the creation of the world.

Far better and more reverential, as well as more correspondent to the phenomena, would the following definition of Nature be, *Me saltèm judice*: The law, or constructive powers, excited in matter by the influence of God's Spirit and Logos.

P.S.—We have no other reason for continuing the inchoative acts of the Spirit and Word after the creative week, than as all existence is grounded in

\* Edited by William Nicholson.

the Abysmal Asëity, the Divine Nature as invisibly distinguished from the Divine Personëity.

A Letter on Comets, addressed to Mr. Bode, Astronomer Royal at Berlin.

*Ibid.*, p. 210.

These oyster-shells acquire different properties in this respect, according to the degree of calcination, or some other unknown circumstance. I have seen them emit red, green, and yellow light; but they never shine again, each with its own colour, except from the immediate action of the solar rays; and each single-coloured ray causes them to emit the same colour, but more faintly, the ray of *their own colour* having no advantage over the rest. Hence, I infer that the rays of the sun produce a *decomposition* in these calcined substances, in consequence of which they give out the *light* that entered into their composition.

In what way are we to conceive the matter of light (= solar rays) to produce a decomposition or extrication of matter of light (= rays chemically combined with matter not light)? Not by homogeneous attraction, for the extrication continues after the removal of the solar rays, *i.e.*, the attracting substances. By the motion, then, of the solar rays exciting correspondent motions in the calcined shells? —and what else is meant by vibrations? Mem.: Experim. with various instruments (musical) of glass and steel on the Bononian stone, calcined oyster-shells, &c.

*Ibid.*, p. 212.

The particles of the fluid of the tail, as they are detached from the comet, possess the same *projectile* movement with it, and in the same direction. Accordingly they must continue to follow it. But if they extend very far, that is to say, if

the tail become very long, the particles that proceed the furthest, continuing to move with the same velocity, but in a larger orbit, must have a less angular movement.

Bode, in this very ingenious speculation, assumes the absence of any perceptible action of gravity in this more refined and uncombining sort of electric fluid. If so, how can the particles, self-projected from the comet, in the direction opposite to that in which the comet is moving, possess the *same* projectile movement? I ask *formâ pauperis*, not *ad confutandum*. A stone thrown from a coach in full motion, I know, will follow the coach, or rather accompany it. But would a body projected from a pistol do so? *i.e.*, supposing the earth's gravity removed. And the tail has been measured at a hundred millions of miles!!

What a prodigious idea—an outline of motion = A extending 100,000,000 of miles, and in the direction U, while all the area included, with exception of 500 or 1000 miles, is filled by particles moving in the opposite direction X! Query—would not the perpetual evolution of the phosphorescent vapour keeping up a continuum from the evaporating disc, *sunfro*, to the end of the tail—like smoke issuing from the stern-holes of a vessel sailing against the wind—supply a less startling hypothesis? The smoke of a steam-boat for instance. The expansive, or, more probably, the self-projective power of the cometary vapour =  $p$  would be instead of the wind =  $w$ .— $p : \text{vapour} :: w : m$ .

An Essay on Electrical Attractions and Repulsions.

By Mr. ———.

*Ibid.*, p. 315.

We see above, that the author requires the ball of glass to

be very thin ; this is a necessary condition for producing the rotatory and revolving motion, for everything made of glass in this state is moved by the slightest electric action : it kindles, as it were, like charcoal before the blow-pipe ; and being moved in one point, the neighbouring points tend by affinity to carry themselves in succession to the centre of activity.

This, the most important of all, is so expressed as to be utterly unintelligible. What does " it " mean ? and " tend by affinity to *carry* themselves ? " Does the writer mean that what *each* point *would* do separately, but which neither (no one) *can* do, manifests itself in the motion of the *whole* as the representative of *all* ? This would be something could it be proved.

Vol. XXVI. On the Heat produced by Friction.

By Dr. Haldat.

Page 31.

The property of friction to develope heat had long been known ; but this fact, so deserving of attention, had not yet been subjected to proper examination. Count Rumford having made a blunt borer turn in a brass cylinder immersed in water, obtained from it a quantity of heat so disproportionate to anything the brass could have lost, that he thought himself warranted to infer, that this heat could not have arisen from any condensation of the metal, but must have been produced by the agitation of the particles communicated to the water, in the manner of sound.

A striking and beautiful instance of the theory of equation, arising in the attempt to objectionise powers by substituting the sensuous products as their representatives. An hypothetic fluid, or an hypothetic motion, are really the same object in the mind—in the one, we borrow the void by abstracting the act

from the image, in the other by abstracting the image from the act.

Analysis of the Galvanic Pile. By J. A. De Luc, Esq. F.R.S.

Part I.

*Ibid.*, p. 131.

I dare not doubt the substantial merits of a naturalist so highly admired as De Luc is, by so competent a judge as Blumenbach. But there is a complexity in all De Luc's experiments, with a multiplicity in his data, rendered more hopeless by the absence of ideas (or first principles) that *for me* amounts in the effect to positive entanglement. If he means to prove that chemismus, or the power of composition and decomposition exercised by bodies on each other, is not the same as the electrical, he is right; and Davy carried his anticipation too far. But if De Luc meant, as he does, that the electrical power is the property of a peculiar fluid, or rather but another word for the presence of that fluid, and therefore as diverse from chemical agency as from the ponderable bodies, the properties of which are denoted thereby, and that the chemical agency is as independent of the electrical as the electrical of it, he is far astray, and deduces a falsity from a fiction. For his electrical fluid is a mere picture-word of the fancy, a short-hand hieroglyphic mark or memento of a class and series of phenomena, a generic name for a certain set of changes substituted and passed off for their common cause. Chemismus is the third and synthetic power, magnetism being the *thetic* and the + and - electricity the antithetic: while galvanism is the transition of electricity into chemismus, or the co-aduration of magnetism and electricity. As depth to length and breadth, so chemismus to

magnetism and electricity. It is to bodies what the corporific power is to matter, the continuance of the same, as the reproductive and conserving power— analogous to the dogma of the Theologians, that the preservation of the material world is but the continuance of the creative act.

New Theory of the Diurnal Motion of the Earth round its Axis. In a letter from Professor Wood.

*Ibid.*, p. 186. Note.

Professor Wood supposes the stones that fall from the atmosphere, to be projected into it from volcanoes; and that, as the point from which they are thrown has its rotary velocity increased or diminished, while the stones retain that impressed on them at the time of their projection, they must consequently reach the earth at a greater or less distance east or west of the volcano.

This hypothesis neither solves the heterogeneity of the *composition* of meteoric stones from any minerals, volcanic or otherwise, hitherto found in this planet, nor their homogeneity with each other, which makes their volcanic origin from any planet improbable, and suggests their being products of our atmosphere, analogous to hail, snow, &c.: whether by electrical re-aggregation of metallic particles that continually effluviae wherever exposed to the air and—sun-light, or by contraction of the matter of fire, first magnetically, and then electrically (or rather the union of both in the galvanic or constructive act) according to Heraclitus and the present *natur-philosophen*, is to be decided.



Analysis of the Galvanic Pile. By J. A. De Luc, Esq. F.R.S.

Part II.

*Ibid.*, p. 243.

Must we, *in the present state of our knowledge*, be satisfied with *electrical energies*, which might be considered as *essential properties of matter*? Or rather, in this very *state of our knowledge*, is it not already ascertained that a particular *substance* exists, namely, the *electric fluid*, which, beside the objects here in view, produces greater and more general effects on our globe?

No! till De Luc tells what he means by a *substance*, and how a particular substance is to be *proved* except by weight and vision. De Luc quotes Bacon. Pity he had not learned from him, that the notion of cause and effect belongs to logic—to the arrangement of *our* thoughts, and dare not be supposed in nature, or rather cannot without contradiction in terms. And then a *particular* substance that exists *everywhere*! (See p. 131.) It remains clear that the utmost which De Luc's experiments prove, is that the electrical is not the same act or modification of power as the chemical, but different as  $\wedge$  from  $\Delta$ , or the power of 2 from that of 3, and this we grant on higher evidence than his experiments can afford.

De Luc's predilection for subtle fluids, with his abuse of occult properties and essential powers, reminds me of Moore's anecdote. The cruelty of the mode being objected to the scheme of sweeping chimneys by dragging a goose down, the proposer replied, "Why it is rather cruel, but two ducks will do as well." Yet even this is not enough. To make it a full equivalent in absurdity, the proposer must have substituted the *same* goose, but tied to and

under the belly of a phœnix. For what but the never-yet-seen-and-exhibited phœnix is a fair parallel to these subtle fluids, with *specific properties, i. e.*, each with the old goose under it?

The Bakerian Lecture for 1809. By Humphry Davy, Esq., Sec. R.S., &c. Experiments on the Metals from the fixed Alkalis.

*Ibid.* p. 330.

Mr. Ritter's argument in favour of potassium and sodium being compounds of hidrogen\* is their extreme lightness. This argument I had in some measure anticipated in my paper on the decomposition of the earths; no one is more easily answered. Sodium absorbs much more oxygen than potassium, and on the hypothesis of hidrogenation, must contain much more hidrogen; yet, though soda is said to be lighter than potash in the proportion of 13 to 17 nearly +, sodium is heavier than potassium in the proportion of 9 to 7 at least.

This is singular in Ritter, since his friend Steffens, a year or more before Davy's experimental analysis of the alkalis, had deduced the metallicity of soda and potash in very nearly the same proportions of metal to oxygen found by Davy, from the polar theory—nay, had answered by anticipation this objection to their metallic nature from the levity of the asserted bases.

*Ibid.*

On the theory which I have adopted, this circumstance is what ought to be expected. Potassium has a much stronger affinity for oxygen than sodium, and must condense it much more, and the resulting higher specific gravity of the combination is a necessary consequence.

\* Spelled "hidrogen, oxygen," through all the passages quoted from H. Davy.—ED.

Steffens would not have objected to Ritter, had he considered the two bases as metallic, no less than zinc or tin, yet as metals composed of carbon and hydrogen, the latter being the same as nitrogen, only under the state of positive electricity as nitrogen under that of + magnetism  $X + \text{pos. E.} = \text{H. X.} + \text{pos. M.} = \text{N.}$  But he would have contended that this must ever remain a *speculative* analysis, and the alkaline metals practically indecomposable equally with any other metal.

The Bakerian Lecture for 1809. By H. Davy, Esq., Sec. R. S.

(Continued from vol. xxvi., p. 339.)

Vol. xxvii., p. 38.

One of the queries that I advanced, in attempting to reason upon the singular phenomenon produced by the action of potassium upon ammonia, was that nitrogen might possibly consist of oxygen and hydrogen, or that it might be composed from water.

For important reasons I should rather say that hydrogen is a modification of nitrogen by + E. But then it must not be forgotten that each of the four polar stuffs is composed of all,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ B & C \\ C & D \\ D & A \end{array} \right\}$  &c. and that this as their Ousia, must be distinguished from their after-modifications.

On the Place of a Sound, produced by a Musical String. In a Letter from a Mr. John Gough.

(Supplement to vol. xxx. p. 323.)

This discovery points out a distant analogy connecting the thundering noise of a drum and the smooth sounds of a harp or lute.

*Smooth* is not the appropriate term, I think. The

first difference is that of *discrete* and *continuous*—but then comes another in the latter (the Drum) viz., the want of all harmonic proportion between the last sound of the diminishing interval with the renewed sound given by the drum-stick—this changes the continuous into confused, while the tone or specific quality from the cavity makes it rumbling.

---

NOTE ON OBSERVATIONS ON THE DISEASES  
OF THE ARMY.\*

—◆—  
Chap. i. p. 7.

In proportion to the coolness of the season, to the height and dryness of the grounds, this fever is milder, remits or intermits more freely, and recedes further from the nature of a continued putrid, or an ardent fever. But to judge from its worse state, we must refer most of the symptoms to a septic origin.

Sir J. Pringle's septic hypothesis is well worthy of attention, and is capable of a great enlargement by distinction of species, though I should prefer the wider and generic name of Virus to the unnecessarily narrow one of septic or putrid Principle. There seems to me three distinct kinds, as the origin of the three genera of Fevers.

1. The Hydroseptic or vegeti-aqueous, originating agues, &c., from the mild Intermittents of Essex, to the Fever of the Pontine Marshes, in which the violence of the poison prevents the reaction, or rather counter-action of the arterial system.

\* By John Pringle. 4to. 1765.

2. The aëro-septic, or chemico-atmospheric Typhus and Plague.

3. Zöoseptic—Small-pox, and those Fevers which do not regularly recur to the same patient. The second, or aëro-septic, may or may not derive its materials from animal corruption, which is then rendered poisonous by chemical combination; but the third, or Zöoseptic, is a Poison elaborated by the Life itself in the living Body, that is both its parent and its birth-place. Hence its greater affinity with the living Principle, and the fact, that it can be as it were familiarised and domesticated with the living Principle, as in the majority of inoculated variolous cases, with so little disturbance of the organs, and the Organic Functions. To these may be added, perhaps, the disputed Synocha, or pure inflammatory Fever from undue excitement of the Arteriality, or the Irritable system, from excessive exercise of the muscles, and respiratory organs, as in harvesting, running races, and so forth; though it is to be expected, that if not removed by depletion, abstraction of Heat, *et similibus*, it will soon affect the other systems, and only in the earlier stages therefore exist and appear as pure inflammatory Fever.

Thus, then, we should have four kinds of Fever, which may likewise be named in reference to the systems attacked, or the primary seats and objects of the disease.

1. The Synocha or the Fever of Irritability.

2. The Remittent and Intermittent, from injury and disturbance of the skin and reproductive system, and the reactions set up by Nature to counterpoise this, and restore the balance of the Powers.

3. The Nervous, &c., Typhus, and Typhoid Fevers.

4. Affection of the Life or vital Principle, as the

Root, Unity, or Band of the three constituent Powers, and yet subsisting for itself, as a distinct and *inwarder* Power, and under certain conditions and circumstances capable of being affected singly, while neither the Systems nor the Organs, in which they are severally predominant, are affected, either structurally or functionally : or so slightly, at least, as to bear no proportion to the Affection or Change which the Life or Vital Principle is undergoing.

May 8th, 1821.

---

NOTE WRITTEN IN THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL  
OF FOREIGN MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

—♦—  
Vol. i. 1818—19. P. 89.

Geoffroi St. Hilaire on the Operculum of Fishes.

Nature constantly employs the same materials, and only displays her ingenuity in varying their forms. As if, in fact, she had been confined to certain primary data, we see her always bringing forward the same elements, in the same number, under the same circumstances, and with the same connexions. If one organ is found of an extraordinary size, the neighbouring parts are less developed ; yet each of them is not the less preserved, although in a degree so minute as frequently to render them almost useless. They become so many rudiments, which bear witness in some measure to the permanence of the general plan.

*i. e.*, in the simplest living organism, *ex. gr.* the Polyp, all the powers of Life are potentially contained in the lowest ; but as productive power cannot be without product, we must presume, even in the minimum of energy, a correspondent minimum of

Product—and a production bearing the character of potentiality, answering to the potential state of the productivity—viz., of no or obscure use to the animal, yet prophetic of an important function in some higher genus or species — or again historic of a by-gone use.

---

### NOTES ON DONNE'S POEMS.\*

—♦—

#### Versification of Donne.

To read Dryden, Pope, &c., you need only count syllables; but to read Donne you must measure *Time*, and discover the *Time* of each word by the sense of Passion.

Doubtless, all the copies I have ever seen of Donne's Poems are grievously misprinted. Wonderful that they are not more so, considering that not one in a thousand of his readers have any notion how his lines are to be read. To the many, five out of six appear anti-metrical. How greatly this aided the compositor's negligence or ignorance, and prevented the corrector's remedy, any man may ascertain by examining the earliest editions of blank verse plays,—Massinger, Beaumont and Fletcher, &c. Now Donne's rhythm was as inexplicable to the many as blank verse, spite of his rhymes—*ergo*, as blank verse, misprinted. I am convinced that where no mode of rational declamation by pause, hurrying of voice, or apt and sometimes double emphasis, can at once make the verse metrical and bring out the sense of passion more prominently, that there we are entitled to alter the text, when it can be done by

\* Communicated by Mr. George T. Strong, of New York.

simple omission, or addition of *that, which, and,* and such "small deer;" or by mere new placing of the same words. I would venture nothing beyond.

The Triple Fool. Ver. 15.

And by delighting many, frees again  
Grief which Verse did restrain.

A good instance how Donne read his own verses. We should write, "The grief, verse did restrain;" but Donne roughly emphasised the two main words, Grief and Verse, and therefore, made each the first syllable of a trochee or dactyl:—

"Griēf, which | vērse dīd rē | strāin."

---

"Ānd wē joīn to 't oūr strēngth,  
Ānd wē teāch ĩt ārt ānd lēngth."—*Song.*

The anapest judiciously used, in the eagerness and haste to confirm and aggravate. This beautiful and perfect poem proves by its title "Song," that *all* Donne's poems are equally *metrical* (misprints allowed for) though smoothness (*i.e.* the metre necessitating the proper reading) be deemed appropriate to *songs*; but in poems where the writer *thinks*, and expects the reader to do so, the sense must be understood in order to ascertain the metre.

Satire iii.

If you would teach a scholar in the highest form how to *read*, take Donne, and of Donne this satire. When he has learned to read Donne, with all the force and meaning which are involved in the words,



then send him to Milton, and he will stalk on like a master, *enjoying* his walk.

*Songs and Sonnets.*

The Flea.

Be proud as Spaniards. Leap for pride ye Fleas !  
 In nature's *minim* realm ye're now grandees.  
 Skip-jacks no more, nor civiller skip-johns ;  
 Thrice-honored Fleas ! I greet you all as *Dons*.  
 In Phœbus' archives registered are ye,  
 And this your patent of nobility.

The Good Morrow.

Whatever dies is not mixed equally ;  
 If our two loves be one, both thou and I  
 Love just alike in all ; none of these loves can die.

Too good for mere wit. It contains a deep practical truth this triplet.

Woman's Constancy.

After all, there is but one Donne ! And now tell me yet wherein, in *his own kind*, he differs from the similar power in Shakspeare ? Shakspeare was all men, potentially, except Milton ; and they differ from him by negation, or privation, or both. This power of dissolving orient pearls, worth a kingdom, in a health to a whore ! — this absolute right of dominion over all thoughts, that dukes are bid to clean his shoes, and are yet honored by it ! But, I say, in this lordliness of opulence, in which *the* positive of Donne agrees with *a* positive of Shakspeare, what is it that makes them *homoiousian*, indeed,—yet not *homoousian* ?

## The Sun Rising.

Busie old fool, unruly Sun,  
 Why dost thou thus  
 Through windows and through curtains  
 Look on us?  
 Must, to thy motions, Lover's seasons run?  
 Saucy, pedantique wretch, go chide  
 Late school-boys or sour 'prentices;  
 Go tell court-huntsmen that the king will ride;  
 Call country ants to harvest offices:  
 Love, all alike, no season knows nor clime;  
 Nor hours, days, months, which are the rags of Time.  
 Thy beams so reverend and strong,  
 Dost thou not think  
 I could eclipse and cloud them with a wink,  
 But that I would not lose her sight so long?

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*

Fine, vigorous exultation, both soul and body in full puissance!

## The Indifferent.

I can love both fair and brown;  
 Her whom abundance melts, and her  
 Whom want betrays;  
 Her who loves louness best, and her  
 Who masks and plays;  
 Her whom the country formed, and whom the town;  
 Her who believes, and her who tries;  
 Her who still weeps with spungy eyes,  
 And her who is dry cork and never cries;  
 I can love her, and her, and you, and you;  
 I can love any, so she be not true.

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*

How legitimate a child was not Cowley of Donne ! But Cowley had a soul-mother, as well as a soul-father, and who was she ? What was that ? Perhaps, sickly court-loyalty, conscientious per accident—a discursive intellect, *naturally* less vigorous and daring, and then *cowed* by king-worship. The populousness, the activity, is as great in C. as in D. ; but the *vigour*, the insufficiency to the poet of active fancy without a substrate of profound, though mislocate thinking,—the will-worship, in squandering golden hecatombs on a fetisch, on the first stick or straw met with at rising,—this pride of doing what he likes with his own, fearless of an immense surplus to pay all lawful debts to self-subsisting themes, that rule, while they cannot create, the moral will—this is Donne ! He was an orthodox Christian only because he could have been an infidel *more* easily ; and therefore willed to be a Christian : and he was a Protestant, because it enabled him to lash about to the right and the left, and without a  *motive* to say better things for the Papists than they could say for themselves. It was the impulse of a purse-proud opulence of innate power ! In the sluggish pond the waves roll this or that way ; for such is the wind's direction : but in the brisk spring or lake, boiling at bottom, wind this way, that way, all ways ; most irregular in the calm, yet inexplicable by the most violent *ab extrà* tempest.

#### Canonization.

One of my favourite poems. As late as ten years ago, I used to seek and find out grand lines and fine stanzas ; but my delight has been far greater since it has consisted more in tracing the leading thought throughout the whole. The former is too much like

coveting your neighbour's goods; in the latter you merge yourself in the author, you *become He*.

#### A Fever.

For I had rather owner be  
Of thee one hour, than all else ever.

Just and affecting, as *dramatic*; *i. e.* the outburst of a transient feeling, itself the symbol of a deeper feeling, that would have *one* hour, *known* to be *only* one hour (or even one year), a perfect hell! All the preceding verses are detestable. Shakspeare has nothing of this. He is never *positively* bad, even in his sonnets. He *may* be sometimes worthless (N.B. I don't say he *is*), but nowhere is he *unworthy*.

#### A Valediction forbidding Mourning.

Our two souls, therefore, which are one,  
Though I must go, indure not yet  
A breach, but an expansion,  
Like gold to airy thinness beat.

If they be two, they are two so  
As stiff twin compasses are two;  
Thy soul, the fixt foot, makes no show  
To move, but doth, if th' other do.

And, though it in the centre sit,  
Yet, when the other far doth roam,  
It leans and hearkens after it,  
And grows erect, as that comes home.

Such wilt thou be to me, who must  
Like th' other foot, obliquely run;  
Thy firmness makes my circle just,  
And makes me end where I begun.

An admirable poem, which none but Donne could have written. Nothing was ever more admirably made out than the figure of the compass.

The Extasy.

I should never find fault with metaphysical poems, were they all like this, or but half as excellent.

The Primrose.

I am tired of expressing my admiration ; else I could not have passed by the Will, the Blossom, and the Primrose, with the Relique.

NOTES ON DONNE'S LETTERS.



To Sir H. G.

I send not my letters as tribute, nor recompense, nor for commerce, nor as testimonials of my love, nor provokers of yours, nor to justify my custom of writing, nor for a vent and utterance of my meditations ; for my letters are either above or under all such offices, *yet I write very affectionately and I chide and accuse myself of diminishing that affection which sends them, when I ask myself why.* Only I am sure, that I desire that you might have in your hands letters of mine of all kinds, as conveyancers and deliverers of me to you, whether you accept me as a friend, or as a patient, or as a penitent, or as a beadsman ; for I decline no jurisdiction, nor refuse any tenure. I would not open any door upon you, but look in, when you open it. Angels have not, nor affect not, other knowledge of one another, than they list to

reveal to one another. It is then in this only, that friends are angels, that they are capable and fit for such revelations, when they are offered. If at any time I seem to study you more inquisitively, it is for no other end but to know how to present you to God in my prayers, and what to ask of Him for you; for even that holy exercise may not be done inopportunately, nor importunately. I find little error in that Grecian's counsel, who says, If thou ask anything of God, offer no sacrifice, nor ask elegantly, nor vehemently; but remember, that thou wouldst not give to such an asker. Nor in his other countryman, who affirms sacrifice of blood to be so unproportionable to God, that perfumes, though much more spiritual, are too gross; yea, words, which are our subtilest and delicatest outward creatures, being composed of thoughts and breath, are so muddy, so thick, that our thoughts themselves are so; because (except at the first rising) they are ever leavened with passions and affections. And that advantage of nearer familiarity with God, which the act of Incarnation gave us, is grounded upon God's assuming us, not our going to Him; and our accesses to His presence are but His descents into us. And when we get anything by prayer, He gave us beforehand the prayer and the petition; for I scarce think any ineffectual prayer free from both sin and the punishment of sin. Yet as God seposed a seventh of our time for His exterior worship, and as His Christian Church early presented Him a type of the whole year in a Lent, and after imposed the obligation of canonique hours, constituting thereby moral sabbaths every day, I am far from dehorting those fixed devotions; but I had rather it were disposed upon thanksgiving than petition, upon praise than prayer; not that God is endeared by that, or wearied by this; all is one in the receiver, but not one in the leader; and thanks doth both offices. For nothing doth so innocently provoke new graces, as gratitude. I would also rather make short prayers than extend them, though God can neither be surprised nor besieged; for long prayers have more of the man, as ambition of eloquence, and a complacency in the work, and more of the devil by often dis-

tractions; for after in the beginning we have all intreated God to hearken, we speak no more to Him. Even this letter is some example of such infirmity; which being intended for a letter is extended and strayed into a homily; and whatsoever is not what it was purposed, is worse. Therefore it shall at last end like a letter, by assuring you, I am, &c.

A noble letter in that *next* to the best style of correspondence, in which friends communicate to each other the accidents of their meditations, and baffle absence by writing what, if present, they would have talked. Nothing can be tenderer than the sentence I have lined.

To the Countess of Bedford.

Happiest and worthiest Lady,—I do not remember that ever I have seen a petition in verse; I would not therefore be singular, nor add these to your other papers. I have yet adventured so near as to make a petition for verse, it is for those your ladyship did me the honour to see in Twicknam Garden, except you repent your making, and have mended your judgment by thinking worse, that is, better, because more justly, of their subject. They must needs be an excellent exercise of your wit, which speak so well of so ill. I humbly beg them of your ladyship, with two such promises, as to any other of your compositions were threatenings; that I will not show them, and that I will not believe them; and nothing should be so used which comes from your brain or heart. If I should confess a fault in the boldness of asking them, or make a fault by doing it in a longer letter, your ladyship might use your style and old fashion of the Court towards me, and pay me with a pardon. Here, therefore, I humbly kiss your ladyship's fair learned hands, and wish you good wishes and speedy grants.

Your ladyship's servant,

JOHN DONNE.

A truly elegant letter, and a happy specimen of that dignified courtesy to sex and rank, of that white flattery in which the wit unrealises the falsehood, and the sportive exaggeration of the thoughts, blending with a delicate tenderness, faithfully conveys the truth as to the feelings.

To the Lady G——.

Madam,—I am not come out of England, if I remain in the noblest part of it, your mind; yet, I confess, it is too much diminution to call your mind any part of England, or this world, since every part, even of your body, deserves titles of higher dignity. No prince would be loath to die, that were assured of so fair a tomb to preserve his memory? \* but I have a greater advantage than so; for since there is a religion in friendship, and a death in absence, to make up an entire friend, there must be an heaven too; and there can be no heaven so proportional to that religion, and that death, as your favour; and I am gladder that it is a heaven, than that it were a court, or any other high place of this world, because I am likelier to have a room there than here, and better cheap; Madam, my best treasure is time, and, my best employment of that (next my thoughts of thankfulness for my Redeemer) is to study good wishes for you, in which I am by continual meditation so learned, that any creature (except your own good angel), when it would do you most good, might be content to come and take instructions from

Your humble and affectionate servant,

J. D.

*Amiens*, the 7 Feb., 1611.

Contrast this letter with that to the Countess of Bedford. There is, perhaps, more wit and more

\* "Thou in our wonder and astonishment  
Hast built thyself a live-long monument;  
And, there sepulchred, in such state dost lie,  
That kings for such a tomb might wish to die."

*Milton's Lines on Shakspeare.*—S. T. C.



vigour in this, but the thoughts played upon are of so serious a nature, and the exception in the parenthesis so awful, that the wit, instead of carrying off, aggravates the flattery, and Donne must either have been literally sincere, or adulatory to extravagance, and almost to blasphemy.

To my Honored Friend, G. G., Esq.

Of my Anniversaries, the fault that I acknowlege in myself, is to have descended to print anything in verse, which though it have excuse even in our times by men who profess and practise much gravity; yet I confess I wonder how I declined to it, and do not pardon myself; but for the other part of the imputation of having said too much, my defence is, that my purpose was to say as well as I could: for since I never saw the gentlewoman, I cannot be understood to have bound myself to have spoken just truths, but I would not be thought to have gone about to praise her, or any other, in rhyme; except I took such a person as might be capable of all that I could say; if any of those ladies think that Mistress Drewry was not so, let that lady make herself fit for all those praises in the book, and they shall be hers.

This excuse reminds me of Sallust's (the Greek Platonic Philosopher's) apology for the Pagan mythology, *viz.*:—that the fables are so excessively silly and absurd, that they are incapable of imposing on any man in his senses, and therefore to be acquitted of falsehood. To be sure, these Anniversaries were the strangest caprices of genius upon record. I conjecture that Donne had been requested to write something on this girl, whom he had never seen, and having no other subject in contemplation, and Miss Drewry herself supplying materials, he threaded upon her name all his thoughts as they crowded into

his mind, careless how extravagant they became, when applied to the best woman on earth. The idea of degradation and frivolity which Donne himself attached to the character of a professed poet, and which was only not universal in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, which yet exhibited the brightest constellation of poets ever known, gives a *settling* answer to the fashionable outcry about patronage.

To my Honored Friend, G. G., Esq.

It hath been my desire (and God may be pleased to grant it) that I might die in the pulpit; if not that, yet that I might take my death in the pulpit, that is, die the sooner by occasion of those labours.

*Jan 7th, 1630.*

This passage seems to prove that Donne retained through life the same opinions defended in his *Biothanatos*; at least this, *joined* with his dying command, that the treatise should not be destroyed, though he did not think the age ripe for its publication, furnishes a strong presumption of his perseverance in the defensibility of suicide in certain cases.

---

NOTES ON THE ELEGIES UPON DR. DONNE.

---

To the Memory of my ever desired Friend, Dr. Donne.

To have liv'd eminent, in a degree  
 Beyond our lofty'st flights, that is, like Thee,  
 Or t'have had too much merit, is not safe;  
 For, such excesses find no epitaph.

\* \* \* \* \*

We cannot better illustrate the weight and condensation of metal in the old English Parnassian Guinea, or the immense volume of French writing which it would cover and ornament, if beat into gold leaf, than by recurrence to the funereal poems of our elder writers, from Henry VIII. to Charles II. These, on Donne, are more than usually excellent, their chief, and, indeed, almost only fault, being want of smoothness, flow, and perspicuity, from too great compression of thought—too many thoughts, and, often, too much thought in each.

There are occasions in which a regret expresses itself, not only in the most manly, but likewise in the most natural way, by intellectual effort and activity, in proof of intellectual admiration. This is one; and with this feeling should these poems be read. This fine poem has suggested to me many thoughts for "An Apology for Conceits," as a sequel to an Essay I have written, called "An Apology for Puns."

---

The careful perusal of modern Latin verses is not without its use. They furnish instances of every species of nice characteristic of modern English poetry; and in some measure, are, perhaps, a cause. But even Virgil and Horace (in his serious odes) will do the same, though in a less glaring way. Yet, compare them, or the best of their successors, with Lucretius, Catullus, Plautus, and even Terence, the difference is as between Rowe, Dr. Johnson, &c., and the writers of Elizabeth and James.

## NOTES ON LETTERS CONCERNING MIND.\*



At the time in which these letters were written, the *haut ton philosophique* was ascendant, according to which Plato, Aristotle, and the rest of the ante-anti, who wrote before John Locke had thrown the *first* ray of light on the nature of the human mind, and the true sources of all our ideas, were mere dreamers or word-splitters. Yet still there were many of a better mould, who, retaining their love and veneration of the ancients, were anxious to combine it with the new orthodoxy by explaining Aristotle, and even Plato, *down* into John Locke. Such was that excellent man and genuine classic scholar, the poet Gray. Others there were—Petvin appears to have been one of the number—who, if they did not love the ancients more than the former class, understood them better, and yet wanted either will or courage to oppose the reigning dynasty. These men attempted to reconcile the old with the new authority by a double operation,—now, like the former class, lowering down Plato and Aristotle to John Locke; and now pulling John Locke up to Plato and Aristotle. The result was, now a confusion in their own thoughts, and an inconsistency in their several positions; now, and more frequently, an expression of the truth in lax, inaccurate, and inappropriate terms. But the general effect, a nearly universal neglect of metaphysics

\* Letters Concerning Mind: to which is added a Sketch of Universal Arithmetic. By the late Rev. Mr. John Petvin, A.M., Vicar of Islington in Devon. London: 1750. 8vo.

altogether, and the substitution of a shallow semi-mechanical psychology, under the pretended *law* (but, in fact, no more than a vague generalisation) of association, in which a mode of causation is made the ground of cause, and explanation of causation itself.

But the whole scheme of Locke is an Hětěrozētēsis, by which the sun, rain, air, soil, &c., are made to constitute the germs (as of wheat, oats, or rye) of the growth and manifestation, of which they are the efficient conditions. Instead of the words *give, convey,* and the like, wherever they occur, read *excite, awaken, bring into consciousness,* or words equivalent, and little will remain in Locke's Essay to be complained of but its dulness and superficiality—its putting up of straw men to knock them down again—in short, the making a fuss about nothing, and gravely confuting nonsense which no man ever had asserted, and which, indeed, no man ever *could* believe—*ex. gr.*, (as Descartes says to the Jesuit Voetius, who had assailed him in the true Locke style, though before Locke's Essay) that men saw before they saw—heard before they heard, and the like. S. T. Coleridge, Oxford, October 14, 1820, Saturday afternoon.

The things that have been and shall be, have respect, as we said before, to present, past, and future. These, likewise, that now are, have, moreover, place; that, for instance, which is here, that which is to the west, that which is to the east.

Pray did Petvin's love to his wife stand north-east or south-west of his esteem for his friend? But here P. was misled by Aristotle, who has erroneously placed the *ubi* among the categories of the pure understanding.

Perhaps 'tis a mistaken notion . . . that has made the moderns go about to prove immediately a Deity by his idea.

By the moderns, the author can have meant Descartes only, though the same notion occurs in Anselm and the anti-scholastic theologians. I am far from thinking it a mistaken attempt; nor has Kant's distinction of existence as the *position of attributes from attributes*, convinced me.

The argument is briefly this:—The absolute equidistance of the radii from the centre of a circle is a necessary truth of reason, because it is contained in the theorem, or necessary contemplation of our circle, which is one with our reason itself. Even so is the existence of God a necessary truth of the reason, for it is contained in the necessary idea of God, which is one with reason itself. The only difference is, that in the circle the reason creates a correspondent to the truth by an act of the pure imagination, in the other it does and may not imagine at all—though the imagination is so prone to do [so] of its own accord, that almost all the world are more or less idolators.

Truth + Good = Wisdom.

Love of Truth + Love of Good = Philosophy.  
Philosophy is the wisdom of Love, as well as the love of Wisdom.

He that knows how to pursue truth in the way of induction, as in the ways of synthesis and analysis, . . . is a complete philosopher.

God forbid! for then the first shrewd knave I met with might be a philosopher.

NOTES WRITTEN ON THE FLY-LEAVES AND  
MARGINS OF A COPY OF JOHN REYNOLDS'S  
"GOD'S REVENGE AGAINST MURTHUR."\*

---

It is exceedingly entertaining to observe how absolutely and integrally J. Reynolds's heart and soul are swallowed up in the notion "murder," and in all other crimes only so far as they lead to murder. The most execrable wretch, about to be murdered, becomes "poor, innocent man," "worthy, harmless gentleman," &c., and the most heroic character, as that of chaste Perina, "execrable bloody lady," as soon as she forms the thought of punishing the horrible crimes to herself, and her poisoned lord and husband, and his mother, in the old monster who had perpetrated them. And then his never for a moment, nor for half a sentence, relaxing or elanguescing from the height and high top-gallant of sensibility and impassioned moralising upon all and every act however often repeated, from p. 1 to p. 986—so flatly delicious—so deliciously flat! I like John Reynolds.

P.S. Almost every tale in this folio is maimed, as a tale, through its being catastrophied by torture, and yet so *totus in illis* is J. R., that it seems never once to have suggested itself to his mind—though he was an Englishman, that the same horrible agonies which overpowered the guilty, spite of all their interests and strongest predetermination, would equally empower the innocent—nay more so—for the innocent and guilty would be the same in preferring death to such tortures, or else the guilty would not

\* Folio.

have confessed, and the former would have hopes in another world which the latter would not have. But no such notion occurred to the honest murthero-maniacal John Reynolds. And then the judges—they are such glorious abstracts one and all, of omniscieny, incorruptibility, and firmness. They are not judges, but justice and judgment. But the beauties of this work are endless. There is something half celestial in that infantine combination of intense feeling with the vulgarest truisms, the merest mouldy scraps of generalising morality. "It is an excellent felicity to grow from virtue to virtue, and a fatal misery to run from vice to vice. Love and charity are always the sure marks of a Christian, and malice and revenge," &c. &c. The nicest feeling is that concerning duels, which verbally he always condemns as loss both of body and soul, of course, as leading to the same hell as murder—but yet this is all matter of course. In the author's feelings, as shown in the event of his stories, the duels are always innocent or virtuous. Oh, what a beautiful *concordia discordantium* is an unthinking, good-hearted man's soul!

---

Notice through all these tales, and in the writings of Sir P. Sidney and many others, that the natural antipathy (as has been supposed) of English to Frenchmen had not commenced. *E contra*, our writers in general speak of the French with a manifest predilection, and [in speaking] of all other nations we had the feeling of the great Commonwealth of Christendom predominant. A king is a king, sacred though an enemy, a nobleman always a nobleman, the ranks common to all as yet outweighed the differences by which country was distinguished from country. With



them the emphasis was laid on the last word, as with us on the first, in the phrase "French nobleman."

---

There is something very amusing in this writer's sudden change of feeling as soon as a villain, a monster, or even a murderer himself, is about to be murdered. And the *levis macula* on the conscience, when these murders are effected by duels, however unfair and savage, is curious as a proof how much of what superstition *calls* conscience is mere love of reputation, character, admission into accustomed society, &c. Hence the utility of penal laws, death, [&c.] not so much as deterring to the crime when tempted to it, but as by prior blind horror precluding the temptation to the very thought. O Mr. Clarkson and Co., think how much of the *guilt* of murder, &c., in men's consciences originates in the gallows and the Newgate Calendar!

---

#### NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S "RELIGIO MEDICI." 1802.\*

---

Strong feeling and an active intellect conjoined, lead almost necessarily, in the first stage of philosophising, to Spinozism. Sir T. Browne was a Spinozist without knowing it.

If I have not quite all the faith that the author of the *Religio Medici* possessed, I have all the inclination to it; it gives me pleasure to believe.

The postscript at the very end of the book is well

\* Communicated by Mr. Wordsworth.—ED.

worth reading. Sir K. Digby's observations, however, are those of a pedant in his own system and opinion. He ought to have considered the R. M. in a dramatic, and not in a metaphysical, view, as a sweet exhibition of character and passion, and not as an expression, or investigation, of positive truth. The R. M. is a fine portrait of a handsome man in his best clothes; it is much of what he was at all times, a good deal of what he was only in his best moments. I have never read a book in which I felt greater similarity to my own make of mind—active in inquiry, and yet with an appetite to believe—in short an affectionate visionary! But then I should tell a different tale of my own heart; for I would not only endeavour to tell the truth (which I doubt not Sir T. B. has done), but likewise to tell the whole truth, which most assuredly he has not done. However, it is a most delicious book.

His own character was a fine mixture of humourist, genius, and pedant. A library was a living world to him, and every book a man, absolute flesh and blood! and the gravity with which he records contradictory opinions is exquisite.

Part I. Sect. 9.

Now contrarily, I bless myself, and am thankful that I lived not in the days of miracles, that I never saw Christ nor his disciples, &c.

So say I.

*Ibid.* Sect. 15.

I could never content my contemplation with those general pieces of wonder, the flux and reflux of the sea, the increase of Nile, the conversion of the needle to the north; and have studied to match and parallel those in the more obvious and

neglected pieces of nature; which without further travel I can do in the cosmography of myself; we carry with us the wonders we seek without us. There is all Africa and her prodigies in us; we are that bold and adventurous piece of nature, which he that studies wisely learns in a *compendium* what others labour at in a divided piece and endless volume.

This is the true characteristic of genius; our destiny and instinct is to unriddle the world, and he is the man of genius who feels this instinct fresh and strong in his nature; who perceiving the riddle and the mystery of all things, even the commonest, needs no strange and out-of-the-way tales or images to stimulate him into wonder and a deep interest.

*Ibid.* Sect. 16, 17.

All this is very fine philosophy, and the best and most ingenious defence of revelation. Moreover, I do hold and believe that a toad is a comely animal; but nevertheless a toad is called ugly by almost all men, and it is the business of a philosopher to explain the reason of this.

*Ibid.* Sect. 19.

This is exceedingly striking. Had Sir T. B. lived now-a-days, he would probably have been a very ingenious and bold infidel in his real opinions, though the kindness of his nature would have kept him aloof from vulgar prating obtrusive infidelity.

*Ibid.* Sect. 35.

An excellent burlesque on parts of the Schoolmen, though I believe an unintentional one.

*Ibid.* Sect. 36.

Truly sublime—and in Sir T. B.'s very best manner.

*Ibid.* Sect. 39.

This is a most admirable passage. Yes,—the history of a man for the nine months preceding his birth, would, probably, be far more interesting, and contain events of greater moment than all the three score and ten years that follow it.

*Ibid.* Sect. 48.

This is made good by experience, which can from the ashes of a plant revive the plant, and from its cinders recall it into its stalks and leaves again.

Stuff. This was, I believe, some lying boast of Paracelsus, which the good Sir T. B. has swallowed for a fact.

## Part II. Sect. 2.

I give no alms to satisfy the hunger of my brother, but to fulfil and accomplish the will and command of my God.

We ought not to relieve a poor man merely because our own feelings impel us, but because these feelings are just and proper feelings. My feelings might impel me to revenge with the same force with which they urge me to charity. I must therefore have some rule by which I may judge my feelings,—and this rule is God's will.

*Ibid.* Sect. 5, 6.

I never yet cast a true affection on a woman ; but I have loved my friend as I do virtue, my soul, my God.

We cannot love a friend as a woman ; but we may love a woman as a friend. Friendship satisfies the highest parts of our nature ; but a wife, who is capable of friendship, satisfies all. The great business of real unostentatious virtue is—not to eradicate any genuine instinct or appetite of human nature ; but—to establish a concord and unity betwixt all parts of our nature, to give a feeling and a passion to our purer intellect, and to intellectualise our feelings and passions. This a happy marriage, blest with children, effectuates in the highest degree of which our nature is capable, and is therefore chosen by St. Paul as the symbol of the union of the church with Christ ; that is, of the souls of all good men with God. "I scarcely distinguish," said once a good old man, "the wife of my old age from the wife of my youth ; for when we were both young, and she was beautiful, for once that I caressed her with a meaner passion, I caressed her a thousand times with love—and these caresses still remain to us." Besides, there is another reason why friendship is of somewhat less value than love, which includes friendship, it is this—we may love many persons, all very dearly ; but we cannot love many persons all equally dearly. There will be differences, there will be gradations. But our nature imperiously asks a summit, a resting-place ; it is with the affections in love as with the reason in religion, we cannot diffuse and equalise ; we must have a supreme, a one, the highest. What is more common than to say of a man in love, "he idolises her," "he makes a god of her?" Now, in order that a person should continue to love another better than all others,

it seems necessary that this feeling should be reciprocal. For if it be not so, sympathy is broken off in the very highest point. A. (we will say by way of illustration) loves B. above all others, in the best and fullest sense of the word, love, but B. loves C. above all others. Either, therefore, A. does not sympathise with B. in this most important feeling; and then his love must necessarily be incomplete, and accompanied with a craving after something that is not, and yet might be; or he does sympathise with B. in loving C. above all others—and then, of course, he loves C. better than B. Now it is selfishness, at least it seems so to me, to desire that your friend should love you better than all others—but not to wish that a wife should.

*Ibid.* Sect. 6.

Another misery there is in affection, that whom we truly love like ourselves, we forget their looks, nor can our memory retain the idea of their faces;\* and it is no wonder: for they are ourselves, and our affection makes their looks our own.

A thought I have often had, and once expressed it in almost the same language. The fact is certain, but the explanation here given is very unsatisfactory. For why do we never have an image of our own faces—an image of fancy, I mean?

*Ibid.* Sect. 7.

I can hold there is no such thing as injury; that if there be, there is no such injury as revenge, and no such revenge as the contempt of an injury; that to hate another, is to

\* We retain *too many* images, and they confuse each other. We want a mental stereoscope to reduce them to unity.—D. C.

malign himself, and that the truest way to love another is to despise ourselves.

I thank God that I can, with a full and unfeigning heart, utter Amen to this passage.

*Ibid.* Sect. 10.

In brief, there can be nothing truly alone, and by itself, which is not truly one; and such is only God.

Reciprocity is that which alone gives stability to love. It is not mere selfishness that impels all kind natures to desire that there should be some one human being, to whom they are most dear. It is because they wish some one being to exist, who shall be the resting-place and summit of their love; and this in human nature is not possible, unless the two affections coincide. The reason is, that the object of the highest love will not otherwise be the same in both parties.

\* *Ibid.* Sect. 11.

I thank God for my happy dreams, &c.

I am quite different from Sir T. B. in this; for all, or almost all, the painful and fearful thoughts that I know, are in my dreams;—so much so, that when I am wounded by a friend, or receive an unpleasant letter, it throws me into a state very nearly resembling that of a dream.

*Ibid.* Sect. 13.

Statists that labour to contrive a commonwealth without any poverty, take away the object of our charity, not only not understanding the commonwealth of a Christian, but forgetting the prophecies of Christ.

O, for shame! for shame! Is there no fit object

of charity but abject poverty? And what sort of a charity must that be which wishes misery in order that it may have the credit of relieving a small part of it,—pulling down the comfortable cottages of independent industry to build alms-houses out of the ruins!

This book paints certain parts of my moral and intellectual being, (the best parts, no doubt,) better than any other book I have ever met with;—and the style is throughout delicious.

---

## NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S RELIGIO MEDICI,

MADE DURING A SECOND PERUSAL. 1808.\*

—♦—  
Part I. Sect. 1.

For my religion, though there be several circumstances that might persuade the world I have none at all, *as the generall scandall of my profession, &c.*

The historical origin of this scandal, which in nine cases out of ten is the honour of the medical profession, may, perhaps, be found in the fact, that Ænesidemus and Sextus Empiricus, the sceptics, were both physicians, about the close of the second century.† A fragment from the writings of the former has been preserved by Photius, and such as would leave a painful regret for the loss of the work, had not the invaluable work of Sextus Empiricus been still extant.

\* Communicated by Mr. Wordsworth.—ED.

† A mistake as to Ænesidemus, who lived in the age of Augustus.—ED.



*Ibid.* Sect. 7.

A third there is which I did never positively maintaine or practise, but have often wished it had been consonant to truth, and not offensive to my religion, and that is, the prayer for the dead, &c.

Our church with her characteristic Christian prudence does not enjoin prayer for the dead, but neither does she prohibit it. In its own nature it belongs to a private aspiration; and being conditional, like all religious acts not expressed in Scripture, and therefore not combinable with a perfect faith, it is something between prayer and wish,—an act of natural piety sublimed by Christian hope, that shares in the light, and meets the diverging rays, of faith, though it be not contained in the focus.

*Ibid.* Sect. 13.

He holds no counsell, but that mysticall one of the Trinity, wherein, though there be three persons, there is but one mind that decrees without contradiction, &c.

Sir T. B. is very amusing. He confesses his part heresies, which are mere opinions, while his orthodoxy is full of heretical errors. His Trinity is a mere trefoil, a  $3=1$ , which is no mystery at all, but a common object of the senses. The mystery is, that one is three, that is, each being the whole God.

*Ibid.* Sect. 18.

'Tis not a ridiculous devotion to say a prayer before a game at tables, &c.

But a great profanation, methinks, and a no less

absurdity. Would Sir T. Brown, before weighing two pigs of lead, A. and B. pray to God that A. might weigh the heavier? Yet if the result of the dice be at the time equally believed to be a settled and predetermined effect, where lies the difference? Would not this apply against all petitionary prayer?—St. Paul's injunction involves the answer:—*Pray always.*

*Ibid.* Sect. 22.

They who to salve this would make the deluge particular, proceed upon a principle that I can no way grant, &c.

But according to the Scripture, the deluge was so gentle as to leave uncrushed the green leaves on the olive tree. If, then, it was universal, and if (as with the longevity of the antediluvians it must have been) the earth was fully peopled, is it not strange that no buildings remain in the since then uninhabited parts—in America for instance? That no human skeletons are found may be solved from the circumstance of the large proportion of phosphoric acid in human bones. But cities and traces of civilisation?—I do not know what to think, unless we might be allowed to consider Noah a *homo repræsentativus*, or the last and nearest of a series taken for the whole.

*Ibid.* Sect. 33.

They that to refute the invocation of saints, have denied that they have any knowledge of our affairs below, have proceeded too farre, and must pardon my opinion, till I can thoroughly answer that piece of Scripture, *At the conversion of a sinner the angels of Heaven rejoyce.*

Take any moral or religious book, and, instead of

understanding each sentence according to the main purpose and intention, interpret every phrase in its literal sense as conveying, and designed to convey, a metaphysical verity, or historical fact :—what a strange medley of doctrines should we not educe? And yet this is the way in which we are constantly in the habit of treating the books of the New Testament.

*Ibid.* Sect. 34.

And, truly, for the first chapters of *Genesis* I must confesse a great deal of obscurity; though divines have to the power of humane reason endeavoured to make all go in a literall meaning, yet those allegorical interpretations are also probable, and perhaps, the mysticall method of Moses bred up in the hieroglyphicall schooles of the Egyptians.

The second chapter of *Genesis* from v. 4, and the third chapter are to my mind, as evidently symbolical, as the first chapter is literal. The first chapter is manifestly by Moses himself; but the second and third seem to me of far higher antiquity, and have the air of being translated into words from graven stones.

*Ibid.* Sect. 48.

This section is a series of ingenious paralogisms.

*Ibid.* Sect. 49.

Moses, that was bred up in all the learning of the Egyptians, committed a grosse absurdity in philosophy, when with these eyes of flesh he desired to see God, and petitioned his maker, that is, truth itself, to a contradiction.

Bear in mind the Jehovah *Logos*, the 'Ο ἰΩΝ ἐν

κόλπω πατρὸς—the person *ad extra*,—and few passages in the Old Testament are more instructive, or of profounder import. Overlook this, or deny it, —and none so perplexing or so irreconcilable with the known character of the inspired writer.

*Ibid.* Sect. 50.

For that mysticall metall of gold, whose solary and celestiall nature I admire, &c.

Rather anti-solar and terrene nature! For gold, most of all metals, repelleth light, and resisteth that power and portion of the common air, which of all ponderable bodies is most akin to light, and its surrogate in the realm of ἀντιφῶς or gravity, namely, oxygen. Gold is *tellurian* κατ' ἐξοχήν: and if solar, yet as in the solidity and dark *nucleus* of the sun.

*Ibid.* Sect. 52.

I thank God that with joy I mention it, I was never afraid of hell, nor never grew pale at the description of that place; I have so fixed my contemplations on heaven, that I have almost forgot the idea of hell, &c.

Excellent throughout. The fear of hell may, indeed, in some desperate cases, like the *moxa*, give the first rouse from a moral lethargy, or like the green venom of copper, by evacuating poison or a dead load from the inner man, prepare it for nobler ministrations and medicines from the realm of light and life, that nourish while they stimulate.

*Ibid.* Sect. 54.

There is no salvation to those that believe not in Christ, &c.

This is plainly confined to such as have had Christ preached to them;—but the doctrine, that salvation is in and by Christ only, is a most essential verity, and an article of unspeakable grandeur and consolation. Name—*nomen*, that is, *νοούμενον*, in its spiritual interpretation, is the same as power, or intrinsic cause. What? Is it a few letters of the alphabet, the hearing of which in a given succession, that saves?

*Ibid.* Sect. 59.

*Before Abraham was, I am*, is the saying of Christ; yet is it true in some sense if I say it of myself, for I was not only before myself, but Adam, that is, in the idea of God, and the decree of that synod held from all eternity. And in this sense, I say, the world was before the creation, and at an end before it had a beginning; and thus was I dead before I was alive;—though my grave be England, my dying-place was Paradise, and Eve miscarried of me before she conceived of Cain.

Compare this with s. 11, and the judicious remark there on the mere accommodation in the *præ* of predestination. But the subject was too tempting for the rhetorician.

## Part II. Sect. 1.

But as in casting account, three or four men together come short in account of one man placed by himself below them, &c.

Thus 1,965. But why is the 1, said to be placed below the 965?

*Ibid.* Sect. 7.

Let me be nothing, if within the compass of myself, I do not finde the battaile of Lepanto, passion against reason, *reason against faith*, faith against the devil, and my conscience against all.

It may appear whimsical, but I really feel an impatient regret, that this good man had so misconceived the nature both of faith and reason as to affirm their contrariety to each other.

*Ibid.*

For my originale sin, I hold it to bee washed away in my baptisme; for my actual transgressions, I compute and reckon with God, but from my last repentance, &c.

This is most true as far as the imputation of the same is concerned. For where the means of avoiding its consequences have been afforded, each after transgression is actual, by a neglect of those means.

*Ibid.* Sect. 14.

God, being all goodnesse, can love nothing but himself; he loves us but for that part which is, as it were, himselfe, and the traduction of his Holy Spirit.

This recalls a sublime thought of Spinoza. Every true virtue is a part of that love, with which God loveth himself.

NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S GARDEN  
OF CYRUS,

OR THE QUINCUNCIAL, ETC., PLANTATIONS OF THE  
ANCIENTS, ETC.



Chap. iii.

That bodies are first spirits, Paracelsus could affirm, &c.

Effects purely relative from properties merely comparative, such as edge, point, grater, &c., are not proper qualities: for they are indifferently producible *ab extra*, by grinding, &c., and *ab intra*, from growth. In the latter instance, they suppose qualities as their antecedents. Now, therefore, since qualities cannot proceed from quantity, but quantity from quality,—and as matter opposed to spirit is shape by modification of extension, or pure quantity,—Paracelsus's *dictum* is defensible.

*Ibid.*

The æquivocall production of things, under undiscerned principles, makes a large part of generation, &c.

Written before Harvey's *ab ovo omnia*. Since his work, and Leuwenhoek's *Microscopium*, the question is settled in physics; but whether in metaphysics, is not quite so clear.

Chap. iv.

And mint growing in glasses of water, until it arriveth at

the weight of an ounce, in a shady place, will sometimes exhaust a pound of water.

How much did Browne allow for evaporation?

*Ibid.*

Things entering upon the intellect by a pyramid from without, and thence into the memory by another from within, the common decussation being in the understanding, &c.

This nearly resembles Kant's intellectual *mechanique*.

The Platonists held three knowledges of God;—first, *παρουσία*, his own incommunicable self-comprehension;—second, *κατὰ νόησιν*—by pure mind, unmixed with the sensuous;—third, *κατ' ἐπιστήμην*—by discursive intelligential act. Thus a Greek philosopher:—*τοὺς ἐπιστημονικοὺς λόγους μύθους ἡγήσεται συνοῦσα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ συνεστιωμένη ἢ ψυχῇ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ ὄντος, καὶ ἐν ἀγῆ καθαρᾷ.*—Those notions of God which we attain by processes of intellect, the soul will consider as mythological allegories, when it exists in union with the Father, and is feasting with him in the truth of very being, and in the pure, unmixed, absolutely simple and elementary, splendour. Thus expound Exod. c. xxxiii. v. 10. *And he said, thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live.* By the "face of God," Moses meant the *ἰδέα νοητικῆ*, which God declared incompatible with human life, it implying *ἐπαφή τοῦ νοητοῦ*, or contact with the pure spirit.



NOTES ON SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S VULGAR  
ERRORS.



Address to the Reader.

DR. PRIMROSE,

Is not this the same person as the physician mentioned by Mrs. Hutchinson in her Memoirs of her husband?

Book I. Chap. viii. Sect. 1.

The veracity and credibility of Herodotus have increased and increase with the increase of our discoveries. Several of his relations deemed fabulous, have been authenticated within the last thirty years from this present 1808.

*Ibid.* Sect. 2.

Sir John Mandevill left a book of travels :—herein he often attesteth the fabulous relations of Ctesias.

Many, if not most, of these Ctesian fables in Sir J. Mandevill were monkish interpolations.

*Ibid.* Sect. 13.

Cardanus—is of singular use unto a prudent reader ; but unto him that only desireth *hoties*, or to replenish his head with varieties,—he may become no small occasion of error.

*Hoties*—*ὄτιες*—“whatevers,” that is, whatever is written, no matter what, true or false,—*omniana* ;

"all sorts of varieties," as a dear young lady once said to me.

*Ibid.* Chap. ix.

If Heraclitus with his adherents will hold the sun is no bigger than it appeareth.

It is not improbable that Heraclitus meant merely to imply that we perceive only our own sensations, and they of course are what they are;—that the image of the sun is an appearance, or sensation in our eyes, and, of course, an appearance can be neither more nor less than what it appears to be;—that the notion of the true size of the sun is not an image, or belonging either to the sense, or to the sensuous fancy, but is an imageless truth of the understanding obtained by intellectual deductions. He could not possibly mean what Sir T. B. supposes him to have meant; for if he had believed the sun to be no more than a mile distant from us, every tree and house must have shown its absurdity.

IN the following books I have endeavoured, wherever the author himself is in a vulgar error, as far as my knowledge extends, to give in the margin, either the demonstrated discoveries, or more probable opinions, of the present natural philosophy;—so that, independently of the entertainingness of the thoughts and tales, and the force and splendour of Sir Thomas Browne's diction and manner, you may at once learn from him the history of human fancies and superstitions, both when he detects them, and when he himself falls into them,—and from my notes, the real truth of things, or, at least, the highest degree of probability, at which human research has hitherto arrived.

## Book II. Chap. i.

Production of crystal. Cold is the attractive or astringent power, comparatively uncounteracted by the dilative, the diminution of which is the proportional increase of the contractive. Hence the astringent, or power of negative magnetism, is the proper agent in cold, and the contractive, or oxygen, an allied and consequential power. *Crystallum, non ex aquâ, sed ex substantiâ metallorum communi confrigeratum dico.* As the equator, or mid point of the equatorial hemispherical line, is to the centre, so water is to gold. Hydrogen is to the electrical azote, as azote to the magnetic hydrogen.

*Ibid.*

Crystal—will strike fire—and upon collision with steel send forth its sparks, not much inferiourly to a flint.

It being, indeed, nothing else but pure flint.

*Ibid.* Chap. iii.

And the magick thereof (the lodestone) is not safely to be believed, which was delivered by Orpheus, that sprinkled with water it will upon a question emit a voice not much unlike an infant.

That is:—to the twin counterforces of the magnetic power, the equilibrium of which is revealed in magnetic iron, as the substantial, add the twin counterforces or positive and negative poles of the electrical power, the indifference of which is realised in water, as the superficial—(whence Orpheus employed the term 'sprinkled,' or rather affused or superfused)—and you will hear the voice of infant nature;—that

is, you will understand the rudimental products and elementary powers and constructions of the phenomenal world. An enigma this not unworthy of Orpheus, *quicumque fuit*, and therefore not improbably ascribed to him. N.B. Negative and positive magnetism are to attraction and repulsion, or cohesion and dispersion, as negative and positive electricity are to contraction and dilation.

*Ibid.* Chap. vii. Sect. 4.

That camphire begets in men τὴν ἀναφροδισίαν, observation will hardly confirm, &c.

There is no doubt of the fact as to a temporary effect; and camphire is therefore a strong and immediate antidote to an overdose of *cantharides*. Yet there are, doubtless, sorts and cases of ἀναφροδισία, which camphire might relieve. Opium is occasionally an aphrodisiac, but far oftener the contrary. The same is true of *bang*, or powdered hemp leaves, and, I suppose, of the whole tribe of narcotic stimulants.

*Ibid.* Chap. vii. Sect. 8.

The yew and the berries thereof are harmless, we know.

The berries are harmless, but the leaves of the yew are undoubtedly poisonous. See Withering's British Plants. *Taxus*.

Book III. Chap. xiii.

For although lapidaries and *questuary* enquirers affirm it, &c.

"Questuary" having gain or money for their object.

## Book VI. Chap. viii.

The river Gihon, a branch of Euphrates and river of Paradise.

The rivers from Eden were, perhaps, meant to symbolise, or rather expressed only, the great primary races of mankind. Sir T. B. was the very man to have seen this; but the superstition of the letter was then culminant.

*Ibid.* Chap. x.

The chymists have laudably reduced their causes—(of colors)—unto *sal*, *sulphur*, and *mercury*, &c.

Even now, after all the brilliant discoveries from Scheele, Priestley, and Cavendish, to Berzelius and Davy, no improvement has been made in this division,—not of primary bodies (those idols of the modern atomic chemistry), but of causes, as Sir T. B. rightly expresses them,—that is, of elementary powers manifested in bodies. Let mercury stand for the bi-polar metallic principle, best imaged as a line or *axis* from north to south,—the north or negative pole being the cohesive or coherentific force, and the south or positive pole being the dispersive or incoherentific force: the first is predominant in, and therefore represented by, carbon,—the second by nitrogen; and the series of metals are the primary and, hence, indecomposable *syntheta* and proportions of both. In like manner, sulphur represents the active and passive principle of fire: the contractive force, or negative electricity—oxygen—produces flame; and the dilative force, or positive electricity—hydrogen—produces warmth. And lastly, salt is the equilibrium or compound of the two former. So taken, salt, sulphur, and mercury

are equivalent to the combustive, the combustible, and the combust, under one or other of which all known bodies, or ponderable substances, may be classed and distinguished.

---

The difference between a great mind's and a little mind's use of history is this, The latter would consider, for instance, what Luther did, taught, or sanctioned: the former, what Luther,—a Luther,—would now do, teach, and sanction. This thought occurred to me at midnight, Tuesday, the 16th of March, 1824, as I was stepping into bed,—my eye having glanced on Luther's Table Talk.

If you would be well with a great mind, leave him with a favourable impression of you;—if with a little mind, leave him with a favourable opinion of himself.

---

It is not common to find a book of so early date as this (1658), at least among those of equal neatness of printing, that contains so many gross typographical errors;—with the exception of our earliest dramatic writers, some of which appear to have been never corrected, but worked off at once as the types were first arranged by the compositors. But the grave and doctrinal works are, in general, exceedingly correct, and form a striking contrast to modern publications, of which the late edition of Bacon's Works would be paramount in the infamy of multiplied unnoticed *errata*, were it not for the unrivalled slovenliness of Anderson's British Poets, in which the blunders are, at least, as numerous as the pages, and many of them perverting the sense, or killing the whole beauty, and yet giving or affording a meaning, however low, instead. These are the most execrable of all typographical errors. 1808.

(The volume from which the foregoing notes have been taken, is inscribed in Mr. Lamb's writing—

'C. Lamb, 9th March, 1804. Bought for S. T. Coleridge.' Under which in Mr. Coleridge's hand is written—

'N. B. It was on the 10th; on which day I dined and punched at Lamb's, and exulted in the having procured the *Hydriotaphia*, and all the rest *lucro apposita*. S. T. C.'

That same night, the volume was devoted as a gift to a dear friend in the following letter.—*Ed.*)

*March 10th, 1804.  
Saturday night, 12 o'clock.*

MY DEAR \_\_\_\_\_,

Sir Thomas Browne is among my first favorites, rich in various knowledge, exuberant in conceptions and conceits, contemplative, imaginative; often truly great and magnificent in his style and diction, though doubtless too often big, stiff, and hyperlatinistic: thus I might without admixture of falsehood, describe Sir T. Browne, and my description would have only this fault, that it would be equally, or almost equally, applicable to half a dozen other writers, from the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth to the end of Charles II. He is indeed all this; and what he has more than all this peculiar to himself, I seem to convey to my own mind in some measure by saying,—that he is a quiet and sublime enthusiast with a strong tinge of the fantast,—the humourist constantly mingling with, and flashing across, the philosopher, as the darting colours in shot silk play upon the main dye. In short, he has brains in his head which is all the more interesting for a little twist in the brains. He sometimes reminds the reader of Montaigne, but from no other than

the general circumstances of an egotism common to both; which in Montaigne is too often a mere amusing gossip, a chit-chat story of whims and peculiarities that lead to nothing,—but which in Sir Thomas Browne is always the result of a feeling heart conjoined with a mind of active curiosity,—the natural and becoming egotism of a man, who, loving other men as himself, gains the habit, and the privilege of talking about himself as familiarly as about other men. Fond of the curious and a hunter of oddities and strangenesses, while he conceived himself, with quaint and humourous gravity a useful inquirer into physical truth and fundamental science,—he loved to contemplate and discuss his own thoughts and feelings, because he found by comparison with other men's, that they too were curiosities, and so with a perfectly graceful and interesting ease he put them too into his museum and cabinet of varieties. In very truth he was not mistaken:—so completely does he see everything in a light of his own, reading nature neither by sun, moon, nor candle light, but by the light of the faery glory around his own head; so that you might say that nature had granted to him in perpetuity a patent and monopoly for all his thoughts. Read his *Hydriotaphia* above all:—and in addition to the peculiarity, the exclusive Sir Thomas-Browne-ness of all the fancies and modes of illustration, wonder at and admire his entireness in every subject, which is before him—he is *totus in illo*; he follows it; he never wanders from it,—and he has no occasion to wander;—for whatever happens to be his subject, he metamorphoses all nature into it. In that *Hydriotaphia* or Treatise on some Urns dug up in Norfolk—how earthy, how redolent of graves and sepulchres is every line! You have now dark mould, now a thigh-



bone, now a scull, then a bit of mouldered coffin! a fragment of an old tombstone with moss in its *hic jacet*;—a ghost or a winding-sheet—or the echo of a funeral psalm wafted on a November wind; and the gayest thing you shall meet with shall be a silver nail or gilt *Anno Domini* from a perished coffin top. The very same remark applies in the same force to the interesting, though the far less interesting, Treatise on the Quincuncial Plantations of the Ancients. There is the same attention to oddities, to the remoteness and *minutiæ* of vegetable terms, —the same entireness of subject. You have quincunxes in heaven above, quincunxes in earth below, and quincunxes in the water beneath the earth; quincunxes in deity, quincunxes in the mind of man, quincunxes in bones, in the optic nerves, in roots of trees, in leaves, in petals, in every thing. In short, first turn to the last leaf of this volume, and read out aloud to yourself the last seven paragraphs of Chap. v. beginning with the words ‘More considerables,’ &c. But it is time for me to be in bed, in the words of Sir Thomas, which will serve you, my dear, as a fair specimen of his manner.—‘But the quincunx of heaven—(the Hyades or five stars about the horizon at midnight at that time)—runs low, and ’tis time we close the five ports of knowledge: we are unwilling to spin out our waking thoughts into the phantasmes of sleep, which often continueth præcogitations,—making tables of cobwebbes, and wildernesses of handsome groves. To keep our eyes open longer were but to act our Antipodes. The huntsmen are up in America, and they are already past their first sleep in Persia.’ Think you, my dear Friend, that there ever was such a reason given before for going to bed at midnight;—to wit, that if we did not, we should be acting the part of our Antipodes!

And then 'the huntsmen are up in America.'—What life, what fancy!—Does the whimsical knight give us thus a dish of strong green tea, and call it an opiate! I trust that you are quietly asleep—

And that all the stars hang bright above your dwelling,  
Silent as tho' they watched the sleeping earth!

S. T. COLERIDGE.

OMNIANA.



## OMNIANA.



### THE FRENCH DECADE.

I HAVE nothing to say in defence of the French revolutionists, as far as they are personally concerned in this substitution of every tenth for the seventh day as a day of rest. It was not only a senseless outrage on an ancient observance, around which a thousand good and gentle feelings had clustered; it not only tended to weaken the bond of brotherhood between France and the other members of Christendom; but it was dishonest, and robbed the labourer of fifteen days of restorative and humanising repose in every year, and extended the wrong to all the friends and fellow-labourers of man in the brute creation. Yet when I hear Protestants, and even those of the Lutheran persuasion, and members of the church of England, inveigh against this change as a blasphemous contempt of the fourth commandment, I pause, and before I can assent to the verdict of condemnation, I must prepare my mind to include in the same sentence, at least as far as theory goes, the names of several among the most revered reformers of Christianity. Without referring to Luther, I will begin with Master Frith, a founder and martyr of the Church of England, having witnessed his faith amid the flames in the year 1533. This meek and

enlightened, no less than zealous and orthodox, divine, in his "Declaration of Baptism," thus expresses himself:—

Our forefathers, which were in the beginning of the Church, did abrogate the sabbath, to the intent that men might have an example of Christian liberty. Howbeit, because it was necessary that a day should be reserved in which the people should come together to hear the word of God, they ordained instead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next following which is Sunday. And although they might have kept the Saturday with the Jew as a thing indifferent, yet they did much better.

Some three years after the martyrdom of Frith, in 1536, being the 27th of Henry VIII., suffered Master Tindal in the same glorious cause, and this illustrious martyr and translator of the word of life, likewise, in his "Answer to Sir Thomas More," hath similarly resolved this point:—

As for the Sabbath, we be lords of the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or any other day, as we see need; or we may make every tenth day holy day only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, save only to put a difference between us and the Jews: neither need we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught without it.

This great man believed that if Christian nations should ever become Christians indeed, there would every day be so many hours taken from the labour for the perishable body, to the service of the souls and the understandings of mankind, both masters and servants, as to supersede the necessity of a particular day. At present our Sunday may be considered as so much Holy Land, rescued from the sea of oppression

and vain luxury, and embanked against the fury of their billows.

## RIDE AND TIE.

“On a scheme of perfect retribution in the moral world,” observed Empeiristes, and paused to look at, and wipe his spectacles.

“Frogs,” interposed Musaello, “must have been experimental philosophers, and experimental philosophers must all transmigrate into frogs.”

“The scheme will not be yet perfect,” added Gelon, “unless our friend Empeiristes is specially privileged to become an elect frog twenty times successively, before he reascends into a galvanic philosopher.”

“Well, well,” replied Empeiristes, with a benignant smile, “I give my consent, if only our little Mary’s fits do not recur.”

Little Mary was Gelon’s only child, and the darling and god-daughter of Empeiristes. By the application of galvanic influence Empeiristes had removed a nervous affection of her right leg, accompanied with symptomatic epilepsy. The tear started in Gelon’s eye, and he pressed the hand of his friend, while Musaello, half suppressing, half indulging, a similar sense of shame, sportively exclaimed, “Hang it, Gelon! somehow or other these philosopher fellows always have the better of us wits, in the long run!”

## JEREMY TAYLOR.

The writings of Bishop Jeremy Taylor are a perpetual feast to me. His hospitable board groans under the weight and multitude of viands. Yet I seldom rise from the perusal of his works without repeating or recollecting the excellent observation of

Minucius Felix. *Fabulas et errores ab imperitis parentibus discimus ; et quod est gravius, ipsis studiis et disciplinis elaboramus.*

#### CRITICISM.

Many of our modern criticisms on the works of our elder writers remind me of the connoisseur, who, taking up a small cabinet picture, railed most eloquently at the absurd caprice of the artist in painting a horse sprawling. "Excuse me, Sir," replied the owner of the piece, "you hold it the wrong way : it is a horse galloping."

#### PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Our statesmen, who survey with jealous dread all plans for the education of the lower orders, may be thought to proceed on the system of antagonist muscles; and in the belief, that the closer a nation shuts its eyes, the wider it will open its hands. Or do they act on the principle, that the *status belli* is the natural relation between the people and the government, and that it is prudent to secure the result of the contest by gouging the adversary in the first instance? Alas! the policy of the maxim is on a level with its honesty. The Philistines had put out the eyes of Samson, and thus, as they thought, fitted him to drudge and grind

Among the slaves and asses, his comrades,  
As good for nothing else, no better service :—

But his darkness added to his fury without diminishing his strength, and the very pillars of the temple of oppression—



With horrible convulsion, to and fro,  
 He tugged, he shook, till down they came, and drew  
 The whole roof after them with burst of thunder,  
 Upon the heads of all who sat beneath :  
 Lords, ladies, captains, counsellors, and priests,  
 Their choice nobility.

The error might be less unpardonable with a statesman of the Continent ;—but with Englishmen, who have Ireland in one direction, and Scotland in another ; the one in ignorance, sloth, and rebellion,—in the other general information, industry, and loyalty, verily it is not error merely, but infatuation.

#### PICTURESQUE WORDS.

Who is ignorant of Homer's Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον? Yet in some Greek manuscript hexameters I have met with a compound epithet, which may compare with it for the prize of excellence in flashing on the mental eye a complete image. It is an epithet of the brutified archangel, and forms the latter half of the verse :—

Κερκοκερώνυχα Σατάν.

Ye youthful bards! compare this word with its literal translation, “ tail-horn-hoofed Satan,” and be shy of compound epithets, the components of which are indebted for their union exclusively to the printer's hyphen. Henry More, indeed, would have naturalised the word without hesitation, and *cerco-ceronychous* would have shared the astonishment of the English reader in the glossary to his *Song of the Soul* with *Achronycul*, *Anaisthæsie*, &c., &c.

#### TOLERATION.

The state, with respect to the different sects of

religion under its protection, should resemble a well drawn portrait. Let there be half a score individuals looking at it, every one sees its eyes and its benignant smile directed towards himself.

The framer of preventive laws, no less than private tutors and school-masters, should remember, that the readiest way to make either mind or body grow awry, is by lacing it too tight.

#### WAR.

It would have proved a striking part of a vision presented to Adam the day after the death of Abel, to have brought before his eyes half a million of men crowded together in the space of a square mile. When the first father had exhausted his wonder on the multitude of his offspring, he would then naturally inquire of his angelic instructor, for what purposes so vast a multitude had assembled? what is the common end? Alas! to murder each other,—all Cains, and yet no Abels!

#### PARODIES.

Parodies on new poems are read as satires; on old ones,—the soliloquy of Hamlet for instance—as compliments. A man of genius may securely laugh at a mode of attack by which his reviler, in half a century or less, becomes his encomiast.

#### M. DUPUIS.

Among the extravagancies of faith which have characterised many infidel writers, who would swallow a whale to avoid believing that a whale swallowed Jonas,—a high rank should be given to Dupuis, who, at the commencement of the French Revolution,

published a work in twelve volumes, octavo, in order to prove that Jesus Christ was the sun, and all Christians, worshippers of Mithra. His arguments, if arguments they can be called, consist chiefly of metaphors quoted from the Fathers. What irresistible conviction would not the following passage from South's Sermons (vol. v. p. 165) have flashed on his fancy, had it occurred in the writings of Origen or Tertullian! and how complete a confutation of all his grounds does not the passage afford to those humble souls, who, gifted with common sense alone, can boast of no additional light received through a crack in their upper apartments:—

Christ, the great sun of righteousness and Saviour of the world, having by a glorious rising, after a red and bloody setting, proclaimed his deity to men and angels; and by a complete triumph over the two grand enemies of mankind, sin and death, set up the everlasting gospel in the room of all false religions, has now changed the Persian superstition into the Christian doctrine, and without the least approach to the idolatry of the former, made it henceforward the duty of all nations, Jews and Gentiles, to worship the rising sun.

This one passage outblazes the whole host of Dupuis' evidences and extracts. In the same sermon, the reader will meet with Hume's argument against miracles anticipated, and put in Thomas's mouth.

#### ORIGIN OF THE WORSHIP OF HYMEN.

The origin of the worship of Hymen is thus related by Lactantius. The story would furnish matter for an excellent pantomime. Hymen was a beautiful youth of Athens, who for the love of a young virgin disguised himself, and assisted at the

Eleusinian rites : and at this time he, together with his beloved, and divers other young ladies of that city, was surprised and carried off by pirates, who supposing him to be what he appeared, lodged him with his mistress. In the dead of the night when the robbers were all asleep, he arose and cut their throats. Thence making hasty way back to Athens, he bargained with the parents that he would restore to them their daughter and all her companions, if they would consent to her marriage with him. They did so, and this marriage proving remarkably happy, it became the custom to invoke the name of Hymen at all nuptials.

#### EGOTISM.

It is hard and uncandid to censure the great reformers in philosophy and religion for their egotism and boastfulness. It is scarcely possible for a man to meet with continued personal abuse, on account of his superior talents, without associating more and more the sense of the value of his discoveries or detections with his own person. The necessity of repelling unjust contempt, forces the most modest man into a feeling of pride and self-consciousness. How can a tall man help thinking of his size, when dwarfs are constantly on tiptoe beside him?—Paracelsus was a braggart and a quack; so was Cardan; but it was their merits, and not their follies, which drew upon them that torrent of detraction and calumny, which compelled them so frequently to think and write concerning themselves, that at length it became a habit to do so. Wolff too, though not a boaster, was yet persecuted into a habit of egotism both in his prefaces and in his ordinary conversation; and the same holds good of the founder of the

Brunonian system, and of his great namesake Giordano Bruno. The more decorous manners of the present age have attached a disproportionate opprobrium to this foible, and many therefore abstain with cautious prudence from all displays of what they feel. Nay, some do actually flatter themselves, that they abhor all egotism, and never betray it either in their writings or discourse. But watch these men narrowly; and in the greater number of cases you will find their thoughts, feelings, and mode of expression, saturated with the passion of contempt, which is the concentrated vinegar of egotism.

Your very humble men in company, if they produce any thing, are in that thing of the most exquisite irritability and vanity.

When a man is attempting to describe another person's character, he may be right or he may be wrong; but in one thing he will always succeed, that is, in describing himself. If, for example, he expresses simple approbation, he praises from a consciousness of possessing similar qualities;—if he approves with admiration, it is from a consciousness of deficiency. A. “Ay! he is a sober man.” B. “Ah! Sir, what a blessing is sobriety!” Here A. is a man conscious of sobriety, who egotises in *tuism*;—B. is one who, feeling the ill effects of a contrary habit, contemplates sobriety with blameless envy. Again:—A. “Yes, he is a warm man, a moneyed fellow; you may rely upon him.” B. “Yes, yes, Sir, no wonder; he has the blessing of being well in the world.” This reflection might be introduced in defence of plaintive egotism, and by way of preface to an examination of all the charges against it, and from what feelings they proceed. 1800.\*

\* From Mr. Gutch's commonplace book.—Ed.

Contempt is egotism in ill-humour. Appetite without moral affection, social sympathy, and even without passion and imagination—in plain English, mere lust)—is the basest form of egotism—and being *infra* human, or below humanity, should be pronounced with the harsh breathing, as *he-goat-ism*. 1820.

#### CAP OF LIBERTY.

Those who hoped proudly of human nature, and admitted no distinction between Christians and Frenchmen, regarded the first constitution as a colossal statue of Corinthian brass, formed by the fusion and commixture of all metals in the conflagration of the state. But there is a common fungus, which so exactly represents the pole and cap of liberty, that it seems offered by nature herself as the appropriate emblem of Gallic republicanism—mushroom patriots, with a mushroom cap of liberty.

#### BULLS.

Novi ego aliquem qui dormitabundus aliquando pulsari horam quartam audiverit, et sic numeravit, una, una, una, una; ac tum præ rei absurditate, quam anima concipiebat, exclamavit, Næ! delirat horologium! Quater pulsavit horam unam.

I knew a person who, during imperfect sleep, or dozing, as we say, listened to the clock as it was striking four, and as it struck, he counted the four, one, one, one, one; and then exclaimed, “Why, the clock is out of its wits; it has struck one four times over!”

This is a good exemplification of the nature of *Bulls*, which will be found always to contain in them a confusion of what the schoolmen would have called

objectivity with subjectivity ;—in plain English, the impression of a thing as it exists in itself, and extrinsically, with the image which the mind abstracts from the impression. Thus, number, or the total of a series, is a generalisation of the mind, an *ens rationis* not an *ens reale*. I have read many attempts at a definition of a *Bull*, and lately in the Edinburgh Review ; but it then appeared to me that the definers had fallen into the same fault with Miss Edgeworth, in her delightful essay on *Bulls*, and given the definition of the genus, *Blunder*, for that of the particular species. I will venture, therefore, to propose the following : a *Bull* consists in a mental juxtaposition of incongruous images or thoughts with the sensation, but without the sense, of connection. The psychological conditions of the possibility of a *Bull*, it would not be difficult to determine ; but it would require a larger space than can be afforded here, at least, more attention than my readers would be likely to afford.

There is a sort of spurious *Bull* which consists wholly in mistake of language, and which the closest thinker may make, if speaking in a language of which he is not master.

#### WISE IGNORANCE.

It is impossible to become either an eminently great, or truly pious man, without the courage to remain ignorant of many things. This important truth is most happily expressed by the elder Scaliger in prose, and by the younger in verse ; the latter extract has an additional claim from the exquisite terseness of its diction, and the purity of its Latinity. I particularly recommend its perusal to the commentators on the Apocalypse.

Quare ulterior disquisitio morosi atque satagentis animi est; humanæ enim sapientiæ pars est, quædam æquo animo nescire velle.—*J. C. Scalig.* Ex. 307, s. 29.

Ne curiosus quære causas omnium,  
 Quæcunque libris vis prophetarum indidit,  
 Afflata cælo, plena veraci Deo :  
 Nec operta sacri supparo silentii  
 Irrumpere aude ; sed prudenter præteri !  
 Nescire velle quæ magister optimus  
 Docere non vult, erudita inscitia est.

JOSEPH. SCALIG.

ROUGE.

Triumphant generals in Rome wore rouge. The ladies of France, and their fair sisters and imitators in Britain, conceive themselves always in the chair of triumph, and of course entitled to the same distinction. The custom originated, perhaps, in the humility of the conquerors, that they might seem to blush continually at their own praises. Mr. Gilpin frequently speaks of a "picturesque eye:" with something less of solecism, I may affirm that our fair ever-blushing triumphants have secured to themselves the charm of picturesque cheeks, every face being its own portrait.

Ἐπεα πτερόεντα. HASTY WORDS.

I crave mercy (at least of my contemporaries: for if these *Omniana* should outlive the present generation, the opinion will not need it) but I could not help writing in the blank page of a very celebrated work,\* the following passage from *Picus Mirandula*:—

Movent mihi stomachum grammatistæ quidam, qui cum duas tenuerint vocabulorum origines, ita se ostentant, ita

\* *Diversions of Purley.*—ED.



venditant, ita circumferunt jactabundi, ut præ ipsis pro nihilo habendos philosophos arbitrentur.—*Epist. ad Hermol. Barb.*

#### MOTIVES AND IMPULSES.

It is a matter of infinite difficulty, but fortunately of comparative indifference to determine what a man's motive may have been for this or that particular action. Rather seek to learn what his objects in general are. What does he habitually wish, habitually pursue? and thence deduce his impulses, which are commonly the true efficient causes of men's conduct; and without which the motive itself would not have become a motive. Let a haunch of venison represent the motive, and the keen appetite of health and exercise the impulse: then place the same or some more favourite dish before the same man, sick, dyspeptic, and stomach-worn, and we may then weigh the comparative influences of motives and impulses. Without the perception of this truth, it is impossible to understand the character of Iago, who is represented as now assigning one, and then another, and again a third motive for his conduct, all alike the mere fictions of his own restless nature, distempered by a keen sense of his intellectual superiority, and haunted by the love of exerting power on those especially who are his superiors in practical and moral excellence. Yet how many among our modern critics have attributed to the profound author this the appropriate inconsistency of the character itself.

A second illustration:—Did Curio, the *quondam* patriot, reformer, and semi-revolutionist, abjure his opinion, and yell the foremost in the hunt of persecution against his old friends and fellow-philosophists, with a cold clear predetermination, formed at one moment, of making 5000*l.* a year by his apostacy?—I neither know nor care. Probably not. But this I

know, that to be thought a man of consequence by his contemporaries, to be admitted into the society of his superiors in artificial rank, to excite the admiration of lords, to live in splendour and sensual luxury, have been the objects of his habitual wishes. A flash of lightning has turned at once the polarity of the compass needle : and so, perhaps, now and then, but as rarely, a violent motive may revolutionise a man's opinions and professions. But more frequently his honesty dies away imperceptibly from evening into twilight, and from twilight into utter darkness. He turns hypocrite so gradually, and by such tiny atoms of motion, that by the time he has arrived at a given point, he forgets his own hypocrisy in the imperceptible degrees of his conversion. The difference between such a man and a bolder liar, is merely that between the hour hand and that which tells the seconds, on a watch. Of the former you can see only the past motion ; of the latter both the past motion and the present moving. Yet there is, perhaps, more hope of the latter rogue ; for he has lied to mankind only, and not to himself—the former lies to his own heart, as well as to the public.

#### INWARD BLINDNESS.

Talk to a blind man—he knows he wants the sense of sight, and willingly makes the proper allowances. But there are certain internal senses, which a man may want, and yet be wholly ignorant that he wants them. It is most unpleasant to converse with such persons on subjects of taste, philosophy, or religion. Of course there is no reasoning with them ; for they do not possess the facts, on which the reasoning must be grounded. Nothing is possible but a naked dissent, which implies a sort of unsocial contempt ;

or, what a man of kind dispositions is very likely to fall into, a heartless tacit acquiescence, which borders too nearly on duplicity.

#### THE VICES OF SLAVES NO EXCUSE FOR SLAVERY.

It often happens, that the slave himself has neither the power nor the wish to be free. He is then brutified ; but this apathy is the dire effect of slavery, and so far from being a justifying cause, that it contains the grounds of its bitterest condemnation. The Carlovingian race bred up the Merovingi as beasts ; and then assigned their unworthiness as the satisfactory reason for their dethronement. Alas ! the human being is more easily weaned from the habit of commanding than from that of abject obedience. The slave loses his soul when he loses his master ; even as the dog that has lost himself in the street, howls and whines till he has found the house again, where he had been kicked and cudgelled, and half starved to boot. As we, however, or our ancestors must have inoculated our fellow-creature with this wasting disease of the soul, it becomes our duty to cure him ; and though we cannot immediately make him free, yet we can, and ought to, put him in the way of becoming so at some future time, if not in his own person, yet in that of his children. The French, you will say, are not capable of freedom. Grant this ;— but does this fact justify the ungrateful traitor, whose every measure has been to make them still more incapable of it ?

#### CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD.

The ancients attributed to the blood the same motion of ascent and descent which really takes place

in the sap of trees. Servetus discovered the minor circulation from the heart to the lungs. Do not the following passages of Giordano Bruno (published in 1591) seem to imply more? I put the question, *pauperis formâ*, with unfeigned diffidence.

“De Immenso et Innumerabili,” lib. vi. cap. 8.

Ut in nostro corpore sanguis per totum circumcursat et recursat, sic in toto mundo, astro, tellure.

Quare non aliter quam nostro in corpore sanguis  
Hinc meat, hinc remeat, neque ad inferiora fluit vi  
Majore, ad supera a pedibus quam deinde recedat :—

and still more plainly, in the ninth chapter of the same book :—

Quid esset

Quodam ni gyro naturæ cuncta redirent  
Ortus ad proprios rursus ; si sorbeat omnes  
Pontus aquas, totum non restituatque perenni  
Ordine ; qua possit rerum consistere vita ?  
Tanquam si totus concurrat sanguis in unam,  
In qua consistat, partem, nec prima revisat  
Ordia, et antiquos cursus non inde resumat.

It is affirmed in the “Supplement to the Scotch Encyclopædia Britannica,” that Des Cartes was the first who in defiance of Aristotle and the Schools, attributed infinity to the universe. The very title of Bruno’s poem proves that this honour belongs to him.

Feyjoo lays claim to a knowledge of the circulation of the blood for Francisco de la Reyna, a farrier, who published a work upon his own art at Burgos, in 1564. The passage which he quotes is perfectly clear. *Por manera, que la sangre anda en torno, y en rueda por todos los miembros, excluye toda duda.* Whether Reyna himself claimed any discovery, Feyjoo does not mention ;—but, these words seem to

refer to some preceding demonstration of the fact. I am inclined to think that this, like many other things, was known before it was discovered; just as the preventive powers of the vaccine disease, the existence of adipocire in graves, and certain principles in grammar and in population, upon which bulky books have been written and great reputations raised in our days.

PERITURÆ PARCERE CHARTÆ.

What scholar but must at times have a feeling of splenetic regret, when he looks at the list of novels, in two, three, or four volumes each, published monthly by Messrs. Lane, &c., and then reflects that there are valuable works of Cudworth, prepared by himself for the press, yet still unpublished by the University which possesses them, and which ought to glory in the name of their great author! and that there is extant in manuscript a folio volume of unprinted sermons by Jeremy Taylor. Surely, surely, the patronage of our many literary societies might be employed more beneficially to the literature and to the actual *literati* of the country, if they would publish the valuable manuscripts that lurk in our different public libraries, and make it worth the while of men of learning to correct and annotate the copies, instead of ——, but it is treading on hot embers!

TO HAVE AND TO BE.

The distinction is marked in a beautiful sentiment of a German poet: \* Hast thou anything? share it with me and I will pay thee the worth of it. Art thou anything? O then let us exchange souls!

\* "*Hast du etwas, so theile mir's mit, und ich zahle was recht ist Bist du etwas, o dann tauschen die Seelen wir aus.*" Schiller.—S.C.

The following is offered as a mere playful illustration :—

“ Women have no souls,” says prophet Mahomet.

Nay, dearest Anna ! why so grave ?  
 I said you had no soul, 'tis true :  
 For what you are, you cannot have—  
 'Tis I that have one, since I first had you.

#### PARTY PASSION.

“ Well, Sir ! ” exclaimed a lady, the vehement and impassionate partisan of Mr. Wilkes, in the day of his glory, and during the broad blaze of his patriotism, “ Well, Sir ! and will you dare deny that Mr. Wilkes is a great man, and an eloquent man ? ”—“ Oh ! by no means, Madam ! I have not a doubt respecting Mr. Wilkes's talents ! ”—“ Well, but Sir ! and is he not, a fine man, too, and a handsome man ? ”—“ Why, Madam ! he squints, doesn't he ? ”—“ Squints ! yes to be sure he does, Sir ! but not a bit more than a gentleman and a man of sense ought to squint ! ”

#### GOODNESS OF HEART INDISPENSABLE TO A MAN OF GENIUS.

*If men will impartially, and not asquint, look toward the offices and function of a poet, they will easily conclude to themselves the impossibility of any man's being the good poet without being first a good man. Dedication to the Fox.\**

Ben Jonson has borrowed this just and noble sentiment from Strabo.

\* “ He who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things ought himself to be a true poem—that is a composition and pattern of the best and honourablest things—not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and practice of all that which is praiseworthy.” *Milton, Apology for Smectym.*—S. C.

Ἡ δὲ (ἀρετὴ) ποιητοῦ συνέξενκται τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·  
καὶ οὐχ οἶόντε ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι ποιητῆν, μὴ πρότερον  
γενηθέντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν. Lib. I. p. 33. folio.

## MILTON AND BEN JONSON.

Those who have more faith in parallelism than myself, may trace Satan's address to the sun in "Paradise Lost" to the first lines of Ben Jonson's "Poetaster :

"Light! I salute thee, but with wounded nerves,  
Wishing thy golden splendour pitchy darkness!"

But even if Milton had the above in his mind, his own verses would be more fitly entitled an apotheosis of Jonson's lines than an imitation

## STATISTICS.

We all remember Burke's curious assertion that there were 80,000 incorrigible jacobins in England. Mr. Colquhoun is equally precise in the number of beggars, prostitutes, and thieves in the City of London. Mercetinus, who wrote under Lewis XV. seems to have afforded the precedent; he assures his readers, that by an accurate calculation there were 50,000 incorrigible atheists in the City of Paris! Atheism then may have been a co-cause of the French revolution; but it should not be burthened on it, as its monster-child.

## MAGNANIMITY.

The following ode was written by Giordano Bruno, under prospect of that martyrdom which he soon after suffered at Rome, for atheism: that is, as is

proved by all his works, for a lofty and enlightened piety, which was of course unintelligible to bigots and dangerous to an apostate hierarchy. If the human mind be, as it assuredly is, the sublimest object which nature affords to our contemplation, these lines which portray the human mind under the action of its most elevated affections, have a fair claim to the praise of sublimity. The work from which they are extracted is exceedingly rare (as are, indeed, all the works of the Nolan philosopher), and I have never seen them quoted:—

Dædaleas vacuis plumas nectere humeris  
 Concupiant alii ; aut vi suspendi nubium  
 Alis, ventorumve appetant remigium ;  
 Aut orbitæ flammantis raptari alveo ;  
 Bellerophontisve alitem.

Nos vero illo donati sumus genio,  
 Ut fatum intrepidi objectasque umbras cernimus,  
 Ne cæci ad lumen solis, ad perspicuas  
 Naturæ voces surdi, ad Divum munera  
 Ingrato adsimus pectore.

Non curamus stultorum quid opinio  
 De nobis ferat, aut queis dignetur sedibus.  
 Alis ascendimus sursum melioribus !  
 Quid nubes ultra, ventorum ultra est semita,  
 Vidimus, quantum satis est.

Illuc conscendent plurimi, nobis ducibus,  
 Per scalam proprio erectam et firmam in pectore,  
 Quam Deus, et vegeti sors dabit ingeni ;  
 Non manes, pluma, ignis, ventus, nubes, spiritus,  
 Divinantum phantasmata.

Non sensus vegetans, non me ratio arguet,  
 Non indoles exculti clara ingenii ;



Sed perfidi sycophantæ supercilium  
 Absque lance, statera, trutina, oculo,  
 Miraculum armati segete.

Versificantis grammatistæ encomium,  
 Buglossæ Græcissantum, et epistolia  
 Lectorem libri salutantum a limine,  
 Latrantum adversum Zoilos, Momos, mastiges,  
 Hinc absint testimonia !

Procedat nudus, quem non ornant nubila,  
 Sol ! Non conveniunt quadrupedum phaleræ  
 Humano dorso ! Porro veri species  
 Quæsita, inventa, et patefacta me efferat !  
 Etsi nullus intelligat,  
 Si cum natura sapio, et sub numine,  
 Id vere plus quam satis est.

The conclusion alludes to a charge of impenetrable obscurity, in which Bruno shares one and the same fate with Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and in truth with every great discoverer and benefactor of the human race ; excepting only when the discoveries have been capable of being rendered palpable to the outward senses, and have therefore come under the cognisance of our “sober judicious critics,” the men of “sound common sense ;” that is, of those snails in intellect, who wear their eyes at the tips of their feelers, and cannot even see unless they at the same time touch. When these finger-philosophers affirm that Plato, Bruno, &c. must have been “out of their senses,” the just and proper retort is,—“Gentlemen! it is still worse with you! you have lost your reason!”

By the by, Addison in the “Spectator” has grossly misrepresented the design and tendency of Bruno’s *Bestia Triomphante*; the object of which was to show of all the theologies and theogonies which have been conceived for the mere purpose of solving problems

in the material universe, that as they originate in fancy, so they all end in delusion, and act to the hindrance or prevention of sound knowledge and actual discovery. But the principal and most important truth taught in this allegory is, that in the concerns of morality all pretended knowledge of the will of Heaven which is not revealed to man through his conscience; that all commands which do not consist in the unconditional obedience of the will to the pure reason, without tampering with consequences (which are in God's power, not in ours); in short, that all motives of hope and fear from invisible powers, which are not immediately derived from, and absolutely coincident with, the reverence due to the Supreme Reason of the universe, are all alike dangerous superstitions. The worship founded on them, whether offered by the Catholic to St. Francis, or by the poor African to his Fetish, differ in form only, not in substance. Herein Bruno speaks not only as a philosopher, but as an enlightened Christian;—the Evangelists and Apostles everywhere representing their moral precepts not as doctrines then first revealed, but as truths implanted in the hearts of men, which their vices only could have obscured.

#### NEGROES AND NARCISSUSES.

There are certain tribes of negroes who take for the deity of the day the first thing they see or meet with in the morning. Many of our fine ladies, and some of our very fine gentlemen, are followers of the same sect; though by aid of the looking-glass they secure a constancy as to the object of their devotion.

## AN ANECDOTE.

We here in England received a very high character of Lord —— during his stay abroad. “Not unlikely, sir,” replied the traveller; “a dead dog at a distance is said to smell like musk.”

## THE PHAROS AT ALEXANDRIA.

Certain full and highly-wrought dissuasives from sensual indulgences, in the works of theologians as well as of satirists and story-writers, may, not unaptly, remind one of the Pharos; the many lights of which appeared at a distance as one, and this as a polar star, so as more often to occasion wrecks than prevent them.

At the base of the Pharos the name of the reigning monarch was engraved, on a composition, which the artist well knew would last no longer than the king's life. Under this, and cut deep in the marble itself, was his own name and dedication: “Sostratos of Gnydos, son of Dexiteles to the gods, protectors of sailors!”—So will it be with the *Georgium Sidus*, the *Ferdinandia*, &c., &c. — Flattery's plaster of Paris will crumble away, and under it we shall read the names of Herschel, Piozzi, and their compeers.

## SENSE AND COMMON SENSE.

I have noticed two main evils in philosophising. The first is, the absurdity of demanding proof for the very facts which constitute the nature of him who demands it,—a proof for those primary and unceasing revelations of self-consciousness, which every possible proof must pre-suppose; reasoning, for instance, *pro* and *con*, concerning the existence of the power of reasoning. Other truths may be ascertained; but

these are certainty itself (all at least which we mean by the word), and are the measure of everything else which we deem certain. The second evil is, that of mistaking for such facts mere general prejudices, and those opinions that, having been habitually taken for granted, are dignified with the name of common sense. Of these, the first is the more injurious to the reputation, the latter more detrimental to the progress of philosophy. In the affairs of common life we very properly appeal to common sense; but it is absurd to reject the results of the microscope from the negative testimony of the naked eye. Knives are sufficient for the table and the market;—but for the purposes of science we must dissect with the lancet.

As an instance of the latter evil, take that truly powerful and active intellect, Sir Thomas Browne, who, though he had written a large volume in detection of vulgar errors, yet peremptorily pronounces the motion of the earth round the sun, and consequently the whole of the Copernican system unworthy of any serious confutation, as being manifestly repugnant to common sense; which said common sense, like a miller's scales, used to weigh gold or gasses, may, and often does, become very gross, though unfortunately not very uncommon, nonsense. And as for the former, which may be called *Logica Præpostera*, I have read in metaphysical essays of no small fame, arguments drawn *ab extra* in proof and disproof of personal identity, which, ingenious as they may be, were clearly anticipated by the little old woman's appeal to her little dog, for the solution of the very same doubts, occasioned by her petticoats having been cut round about:—

If it is not me, he'll bark and he'll rail,  
But if I be I, he'll wag his little tail.

## TOLERATION.

I dare confess that Mr. Locke's treatise on Toleration appeared to me far from being a full and satisfactory answer to the subtle and oft-times plausible arguments of Bellarmin, and other Romanists. On the whole, I was more pleased with the celebrated W. Penn's tracts on the same subject. The following extract from his excellent letter to the king of Poland appeals to the heart rather than to the head, to the Christian rather than to the philosopher; and, besides, overlooks the ostensible object of religious penalties, which is not so much to convert the heretic, as to prevent the spread of heresy. The thoughts, however, are so just in themselves, and expressed with so much life and simplicity, that it well deserves a place in these Omniana:—

Now, O Prince! give a poor Christian leave to expostulate with thee. Did Christ Jesus or His holy followers endeavour, by precept or example, to set up their religion with a carnal sword? Called He any troops of men or angels to defend Him? Did He encourage Peter to dispute His right with the sword? But did He not say, *Put it up?* Or did He countenance His over-zealous disciples, when they would have had fire from heaven to destroy those that were not of their mind? No! But did not Christ rebuke them, saying, *Ye know not what spirit ye are of?* And if it was neither Christ's spirit, nor their own spirit that would have fire from heaven, Oh! what is that spirit that would kindle fire on earth to destroy such as peaceably dissent upon the account of conscience!

O King! when did the true religion persecute? When did the true church offer violence for religion? Were not her weapons prayers, tears, and patience? Did not Jesus conquer by these weapons, and vanquish cruelty by suffering? Can clubs, and staves, and swords, and prisons, and banish-

ments reach the soul, convert the heart, or convince the understanding of man? When did violence ever make a true convert, or bodily punishment a sincere Christian? This maketh void the end of Christ's coming. Yea, it robbeth God's Spirit of its office, which is to convince the world. That is the sword by which the ancient Christians overcame.

The theory of persecution seems to rest on the following assumptions. 1. A duty implies a right, We have a right to do whatever it is our duty to do. 2. It is the duty and consequently the right of the supreme power in a state to promote the greatest possible sum of well-being in that state. 3. This is impossible without morality. 4. But morality can neither be produced or preserved in a people at large without true religion. 5. Relative to the duties of the legislature or governors, that is the true religion which they conscientiously believe to be so. 6. As there can be but one true religion, at the same time, this one it is their duty and right to authorise and protect. 7. But the established religion cannot be protected and secured except by the imposition of restraints or the influence of penalties on those, who profess and propagate hostility to it. 8. True religion, consisting of precepts, counsels, commandments, doctrines, and historical narratives, cannot be effectually proved or defended, but by a comprehensive view of the whole as a system. Now this cannot be hoped for from the mass of mankind. But it may be attacked, and the faith of ignorant men subverted by particular objections, by the statement of difficulties without any counter-statement of the greater difficulties which would result from the rejection of the former, and by all the other stratagems used in the desultory warfare of sectaries and infidels. This is, however, manifestly dishonest and dangerous,

and there must exist, therefore, a power in the state to prevent, suppress, and punish it. 9. The advocates of toleration have never been able to agree among themselves concerning the limits to their own claims ; have never established any clear rules, as to what shall and what shall not be admitted under the name of religion and conscience. Treason and the grossest indecencies not only may be, but have been, called by these names : as among the earlier Anabaptists. 10. And last, it is a *petitio principii*, or begging the question, to take for granted that a state has no power except in case of overt acts. It is its duty to prevent a present evil, as much at least as to punish the perpetrators of it. Besides, preaching and publishing are overt acts. Nor has it yet been proved, though often asserted, that a Christian sovereign has nothing to do with the eternal happiness or misery of the fellow creatures entrusted to his charge.

#### HINT FOR A NEW SPECIES OF HISTORY.

The very knowledge of the opinions and customs of so considerable a part of mankind as the Jews now are, and especially have been heretofore, is valuable both for pleasure and use. It is a very good piece of history, and that of the best kind, namely, of human nature, and of that part of it which is most different from us, and commonly the least known to us. And, indeed, the principal advantage which is to be made by the wiser sort of men of most writings, is rather to see what men think and are, than to be informed of the natures and truth of things ; to observe what thoughts and passions have occupied men's minds, what opinions and manners they are of. In this view it becomes of no mean importance to notice and record the strangest ignorance, the most putid fables, impertinent, trifling, ridiculous disputes, and more ridiculous pugnacity in the defence and retention

of the subjects disputed.—*Publisher's Preface to the Reader, in Lightfoot's Works, vol. i.*

In the thick volume of title pages and chapters of contents (composed) of large and small works correspondent to each (proposed) by a certain *omni-pregnant, nihili-parturient* genius of my acquaintance, not the least promising is,—“A History of the morals and (as connected therewith) of the manners of the English Nation from the Conquest to the present time.” From the chapter of contents it appears that my friend is a steady believer in the uninterrupted progression of his fellow-countrymen; that there has been a constant growth of wealth and well-being among us, and with these an increase of knowledge, and with increasing knowledge an increase and diffusion of practical goodness. The degrees of acceleration, indeed, have been different at different periods. The moral being has sometimes crawled, sometimes strolled, sometimes walked, sometimes run; but it has at all times been moving onward. If in any one point it has gone backward, it has been only in order to leap forward in some other. The work was to commence with a numeration table, or catalogue, of those virtues or qualities which make a man happy in himself, and which conduce to the happiness of those about him, in a greater or lesser sphere of agency. The degree and the frequency in which each of these virtues manifested themselves, in the successive reigns from William the Conqueror inclusively, were to be illustrated by apposite quotations from the works of contemporary writers, not only of historians and chroniclers, but of the poets, romance writers, and theologians, not omitting the correspondence between literary men, the laws and regulations, civil and ecclesiastical, and whatever



records the industry of antiquarians has brought to light in their provincial, municipal, and monastic histories:—tall tomes and huge! undegenerate sons of Anak, which look down from a dizzy height on the dwarfish progeny of contemporary wit, and can find no associates in size at a less distance than two centuries; and in arranging which the puzzled librarian must commit an anachronism in order to avoid an anatopism.

Such of these illustrations as most amused or impressed me, when I heard them (for alas! even his very title-pages and contents my friend composes only in air!) I shall probably attempt to preserve in different parts of these *Omniana*. At present I shall cite one article only which I found wafered on a blank leaf of his memorandum-book, superscribed; —“Flattering news for *Anno Domini* 2000, whenever it shall institute a comparison between itself and the 17th and 18th centuries.” It consists of an extract, say rather, an exsection from the “Kingston Mercantile Advertiser,” from Saturday, August the 15th, to Tuesday, August 18th, 1801. This paper, which contained at least twenty more advertisements of the very same kind, was found by accident among the wrapping-papers in the trunk of an officer just returned from the West India station. They stand here exactly as in the original, from which they are reprinted:—

*Kingston, July 30, 1801.*

Ran away, about three weeks ago, from a penn near Halfway Tree, a negro wench, named Nancy, of the Chamba country, strong made, an ulcer on her left leg, marked D. C., diamond between. She is supposed to be harboured by her husband, Dublin, who has the direction of a wherry working between this town and Port Royal, and is the property of

Mr. Fishley, of that place; the said negro man having concealed a boy in his wherry before. Half a joe will be paid to any person apprehending the above-described wench, and delivering to Mr. Archibald M'Lea, East-end; and if found secreted by any person, the law will be put in force.

*Kingston, August 13, 1801.*

Strayed, on Monday evening last, a negro boy of the Moco country, named Joe, the property of Mr. Thomas Williams, planter, in St. John's, who had sent him to town under the charge of a negro man, with a cart for provisions. The said boy is, perhaps, from 15 to 18 years of age, about twelve months in the country, no mark, speaks little English, but can tell his owner's name; had on a long Oznaburg frock. It is supposed he might have gone out to vend some pears and lemon-grass, and have lost himself in the street. One pistole will be paid to any person apprehending and bringing him to this office.

*Kingston, July 1, 1801.*

*Forty Shillings Reward.*

Strayed on Friday evening last, (and was seen going up West Street the following morning), a small bay

**HORSE.**

the left ear lapped, flat rump, much scored from the saddle on his back, and marked on the near side F. M. with a diamond between. Whoever will take up the said horse, and deliver him to W. Ballantine, butcher, back of West Street, will receive the above reward.

*Kingston, July 4, 1801.*

Strayed on Sunday morning last, from the subscriber's house, in East Street, a bright dun He-Mule, the mane lately cropped, a large chafe slightly skinned over on the near buttock, and otherwise chafed from the action of the harness in his recent breaking. Half a joe will be paid to any person taking up and bringing this mule to the subscriber's house, or to the Store in Harbour Street.

JOHN WALSH.

Kingston, July 2, 1801.

TEN POUNDS REWARD,

*Ran away*

About two years ago from the subscriber, a Negro woman named

DORAH.

purchased from Alexander M'Kean, Esq. She is about 20 years of age, and 5 feet 6 or 7 inches high; has a mark on one of her shoulders, about the size of a quarter dollar, occasioned, she says, by the yaws; of a coal black complexion, very artful, and most probably passes about the country with false papers and under another name; if that is not the case, it must be presumed she is harboured about Green pond, where she has a mother and other connexions.

What a history! horses and negroes! negroes and horses! It makes me tremble at my own nature. Surely, every religious and conscientious Briton is equally a debtor in gratitude to Thomas Clarkson and his fellow-labourers with every African: for on the soul of every individual among us did a portion of guilt rest, as long as the slave-trade remained legal.

A few years back the public was satiated with accounts of the happy condition of the slaves in our colonies, and the great encouragements and facilities afforded to such of them, as by industry and foresight laboured to better their situation. With what truth this is stated as the general tone of feeling among our planters, and their agents, may be conjectured from the following sentences, which made part of what in England we call the leading paragraph of the same newspaper:—

Strange as it may appear, we are assured as a fact, that a number of slaves in this town have purchased lots of land,

and are absolutely in possession of the fee-simple of lands and tenements. Neither is it uncommon for the men-slaves to purchase or manumise their wives, and *vice versâ*, the wives their husbands. To account for this, we need only look to the depredations daily committed, and the impositions practised to the distress of the community and ruin of the fair trader. Negro yards too, under such direction, will necessarily prove the asylum of runaways from the country.

#### TEXT SPARRING.

WHEN I hear (as who now can travel twenty miles in a stage-coach without the probability of hearing) an ignorant religionist quote an unconnected sentence of half-a-dozen words from any part of the Old or New Testament, and resting on the literal sense of these words the eternal misery of all who reject, nay, even of all those countless myriads, who have never had the opportunity of accepting this, and sundry other articles of faith conjured up by the same textual magic; I ask myself what idea these persons form of the Bible, that they should use it in a way in which they themselves use no other book? They deem the whole written by inspiration. Well! but is the very essence of rational discourse, that is, connection and dependency done away, because the discourse is infallibly rational? The mysteries, which these spiritual lynxes detect in the simplest texts, remind me of the 500 nondescripts, each as large as his own black cat, which Dr. Katterfelto, by aid of his solar microscope, discovered in a drop of transparent water.

But to a contemporary who has not thrown his lot in the same helmet with them, these fanatics think it a crime to listen. Let them then, or far rather, let those who are in danger of infection from them, attend to the golden aphorisms of the old and

orthodox divines. "Sentences in scripture (says Dr. Donne) like hairs in horses' tails, concur in one root of beauty and strength; but being plucked out, one by one, serve only for springes and snares."

The second I transcribe from the preface to Lightfoot's works. "Inspired writings are an inestimable treasure to mankind; for so many sentences, so many truths. But then the true sense of them must be known: otherwise, so many sentences, so many authorised falsehoods."

#### PELAGIANISM.

OUR modern latitudinarians will find it difficult to suppose, that anything could have been said in the defence of Pelagianism equally absurd with the facts and arguments which have been adduced in favour of original sin (sin being taken as guilt; that is, observes a Socinian wit, the crime of being born). But in the comment of Rabbi Akibah on Ecclesiastes, xii. 1, we have a story of a mother, who must have been a most determined believer in the uninheritability of sin. For having a sickly and deformed child, and resolved that it should not be thought to have been punished for any fault of its parents or ancestors, and yet having nothing else for which to blame the child, she seriously and earnestly accused it before the judge of having kicked her unmercifully during her pregnancy.

I am firmly persuaded that no doctrine was ever widely diffused among various nations through successive ages and under different religions (such as is the doctrine of original sin, and redemption, those fundamental articles of every known religion professing to be revealed), which is not founded either in the nature of things or in the necessities of our

nature. In the language of the schools, it carries with it presumptive evidence that it is either objectively or subjectively true. And the more strange and contradictory such a doctrine may appear to the understanding, or discursive faculty, the stronger is the presumption in its favour. For whatever satirists may say, and sciolists imagine, the human mind has no predilection for absurdity. I do not, however, mean that such a doctrine shall be always the best possible representation of the truth on which it is founded; for the same body casts strangely different shadows in different places, and different degrees of light, but that it always does shadow out some such truth, and derive its influence over our faith from our obscure perception of that truth. Yea, even where the person himself attributes his belief of it to the miracles, with which it was announced by the founder of his religion.

#### THE SOUL AND ITS ORGANS OF SENSE.

It is a strong presumptive proof against materialism, that there does not exist a language on earth, from the rudest to the most refined, in which a materialist can talk for five minutes together, without involving some contradiction in terms to his own system. *Objection.* Will not this apply equally to the astronomer? Newton, no doubt, talked of the sun's rising and setting, just like other men. What should we think of the coxcomb who should have objected to him, that he contradicted his own system? *Answer*—No! it does not apply equally; say rather, it is utterly inapplicable to the astronomer and natural philosopher. For his philosophic, and his ordinary language speak of two quite different things, both of which are equally true. In his ordinary language he

refers to a fact of appearance, to a phenomenon common and necessary to all persons in a given situation; in his scientific language he determines that one position or figure, which being supposed; the appearance in question would be the necessary result, and all appearances in all situations may be demonstrably foretold. Let a body be suspended in the air, and strongly illuminated. What figure is here? A triangle. But what here? A trapezium;—and so on. The same question put to twenty men, in twenty different positions and distances, would receive twenty different answers: each would be a true answer. But what is that one figure which, being so placed, all these facts of appearance must result according to the law of perspective?—Ay! this is a different question, this is a new subject. The words which answer this would be absurd if used in reply to the former.\*

Thus, the language of the scripture on natural objects is as strictly philosophical as that of the Newtonian system. Perhaps more so. For it is not only equally true, but it is universal among mankind, and unchangeable. It describes facts of appearance. And what other language would have been consistent with the divine wisdom? The inspired writers must have borrowed their terminology, either from the crude and mistaken philosophy of their own times, and so have sanctified and perpetuated falsehood, unintelligible meantime to all but one in ten thousand; or they must have anticipated the terminology of the true system, without any revelation of the system itself, and so have become unintelligible to all men; or lastly, they must have revealed the system itself, and thus have left nothing for the exercise, development, or reward of the human

\* See Church and State. Appendix, p. 231.—ED.

understanding, instead of teaching that moral knowledge, and enforcing those social and civic virtues, out of which the arts and sciences will spring up in due time and of their own accord. But nothing of this applies to the materialist; he refers to the very same facts, of which the common language of mankind speaks: and these too are facts that have their sole and entire being in our own consciousness; facts, as to which *esse* and *conscire* are identical. Now, whatever is common to all languages, in all climates, at all times, and in all stages of civilisation, must be the exponent and consequent of the common consciousness of man as man. Whatever contradicts this universal language, therefore, contradicts the universal consciousness, and the facts in question subsisting exclusively in consciousness, whatever contradicts the consciousness contradicts the fact.

I have been seduced into a dry discussion where I had intended only a few amusing facts, in proof, that the mind makes the sense far more than the senses make the mind. If I have life, and health, and leisure, I purpose to compile from the works, memoirs, and transactions of the different philosophical societies in Europe, from magazines, and the rich store of medical and psychological publications, furnished by the English, French, and German press, all the essays and cases that relate to the human faculties under unusual circumstances, (for pathology is the crucible of physiology), excluding such only as are not intelligible without the symbols or terminology of science. These I would arrange under the different senses and powers: as the eye, the ear, the touch, &c.; the imitative power, voluntary and automatic; the imagination, or shaping and modifying power; the fancy, or the aggregative and associative



power; the understanding, or the regulative, substantiating, and realising power; the speculative reason, *vis theoretica et scientifica*, or the power, by which we produce, or aim to produce, unity, necessity, and a universality in all our knowledge by means of principles,\* *a priori*; the will or practical reason; the faculty of choice, (*Willkühr*), and (distinct both from the moral will, and the choice), the sensation of volition which I have found reason to include under the head of single and double touch. Thence I propose to make a new arrangement of madness, whether as defect, or as excess, of any of these senses or faculties; and thus by appropriate cases to shew the difference between:—1. A man having lost his reason but not his senses or understanding—that is, when he sees things as other men see them,—adapts means to ends as other men would adapt them, and not seldom, with more sagacity,—but his final end is altogether irrational: 2. His having lost his wits, that is, his understanding or judicial power; but not his reason or the use of his senses,—(such was Don Quixote; and, therefore, we love and reverence him, while we despise Hudibras): 3. His being out of

\* This phrase, *a priori*, is, in common, most grossly misunderstood, and an absurdity burthened on it which it does not deserve. By knowledge *a priori*, we do not mean that we can know any thing previously to experience, which would be a contradiction in terms; but having once known it by occasion of experience † (that is, something acting upon us from without) we then know, that it must have pre-existed, or the experience itself would have been impossible. By experience only I know, that I have eyes; but then my reason convinces me, that I must have had eyes in order to the experience.

---

† He endeavours in the "Aids" to explain this notion thus—"Reason—either pre-determines experience, or avails itself of a past experience, to supersede its necessity in all future time, and affirms truths which no sense could perceive, nor experiment verify, nor experience confirm;"—a sort of way of asserting what some metaphysicians call "the Fundamental Laws of Belief."?—S. C.

his senses, as in the case of a hypochondriac, to whom his limbs appear to be of glass, although all his conduct is both rational, or moral and prudent: 4. Or the case may be a combination of all three, though I doubt the existence of such a case, or of any two of them: 5. And lastly, it may be merely such an excess of sensation, as overpowers and suspends all, which is frenzy or raving madness.

A diseased state of an organ of sense, or of the inner organs connected with it, will perpetually tamper with the understanding, and unless there be an energetic and watchful counteraction of the judgment (of which I have known more than one instance, in which the comparing and reflecting judgment has obstinately, though painfully, rejected the full testimony of the senses,) will finally overpower it. But when the organ is obliterated, or totally suspended, then the mind applies some other organ to a double use. Passing through Temple Sowerby, in Westmoreland, some ten years back, I was shown a man perfectly blind; and blind from his infancy. Fowell was his name. This man's chief amusement was fishing on the wild and uneven banks of the River Eden, and up the different streams and tarns among the mountains. He had an intimate friend, likewise stone blind, a dexterous card-player, who knows every gate and stile far and near throughout the country. These two often coursed together, and the people here, as everywhere, fond of the marvellous, affirm that they were the best beaters up of game in the whole country. The every way amiable and estimable John Gough of Kendal is not only an excellent mathematician, but an infallible botanist and zoologist. He has frequently at the first feel corrected the mistakes of the most experienced sportsman with regard to the birds or vermin which

they had killed, when it chanced to be a variety or rare species so completely resembling the common one, that it required great steadiness of observation to detect the difference, even after it had been pointed out. As to plants and flowers, the rapidity of his touch appears fully equal to that of sight; and the accuracy greater. Good heavens! it needs only to look at him! Why his face sees all over! It is all one eye! I almost envied him; for the purity and excellence of his own nature, never broken in upon by those evil looks, (or features, which are looks become fixtures,) with which low cunning, habitual cupidity, presumptuous sciolism, and heart-hardening vanity, coarsen the human face,—it is the mere stamp, the undisturbed *ectypon* of his own soul! Add to this that he is a Quaker, with all the blest negatives, without any of the silly and factious positives, of that sect, which, with all its bogs and hollows, is still the prime sun-shine spot of Christendom in the eye of the true philosopher. When I was in Germany, in the year 1798, I read at Hanover, and met with two respectable persons, one a clergyman, the other a physician, who confirmed to me, the account of the upper-stall master at Hanover, written by himself, and countersigned by all his medical attendants. As far as I recollect, he had fallen from his horse on his head, and in consequence of the blow lost both his sight and hearing for nearly three years, and continued for the greater part of this period in a state of nervous fever. His understanding, however, remained unimpaired and unaffected, and his entire consciousness, as to outward impressions, being confined to the sense of touch, he at length became capable of reading any book (if printed, as most German books are, on coarse paper) with his fingers, in much the same manner in which

the *piano-forte* is played, and latterly with an almost incredible rapidity. Likewise by placing his hand with the fingers all extended, at a small distance from the lips of any person that spoke slowly and distinctly to him, he learned to recognise each letter by its different effects on his nerves, and thus spelt the words as they were uttered. It was particularly noticed both by himself from his sensations, and by his medical attendants from observation, that the letter R, if pronounced full and strong, and recurring once or more in the same word, produced a small spasm, or twitch in his hand and fingers. At the end of three years he recovered both his health and senses, and with the necessity soon lost the power, which he had thus acquired.

SIR GEORGE ETHEREGE, ETC.

Often and often had I read Gay's "Beggar's Opera," and always delighted with its poignant wit and original satire, and if not without noticing its immorality, yet without any offence from it. Some years ago, I for the first time saw it represented in one of the London theatres; and such were the horror and disgust with which it impressed me, so grossly did it outrage all the best feelings of my nature, that even the angelic voice and perfect science of Mrs. Billington lost half their charms, or rather increased my aversion to the piece by an additional sense of incongruity. Then I learned the immense difference between reading and seeing a play;—and no wonder, indeed; for who has not passed over with his eye a hundred passages without offence, which he yet could not have even read aloud, or have heard so read by another person, without an inward struggle? —In mere passive silent reading the thoughts remain

mere thoughts, and these too not our own,—phantoms with no attribute of place, no sense of appropriation, that flit over the consciousness as shadows over the grass or young corn in an April day. But even the sound of our own or another's voice takes them out of that lifeless, twilight, realm of thought, which is the confine, the *intermundium*, as it were, of existence and non-existence. Merely that the thoughts have become audible by blending with them a sense of outness gives them a sort of reality. What then,—when by every contrivance of scenery, appropriate dresses, according and auxiliary looks and gestures, and the variety of persons on the stage, realities are employed to carry the imitation of reality as near as possible to perfect delusion? If a manly modesty shrinks from uttering an indecent phrase before a wife or sister in a private room, what must be the effect when a repetition of such treasons (for all gross and libidinous allusions are emphatically treasons against the very foundations of human society, against all its endearing charities, and all the mother virtues,) is hazarded before a mixed multitude in a public theatre? When every innocent woman must blush at once with pain at the thoughts she rejects, and with indignant shame at those, which the foul hearts of others may attribute to her!

Thus, too, with regard to the comedies of Wycherley, Vanbrugh, and Etherege, I used to please myself with the flattering comparison of the manners universal at present among all classes above the lowest with those of our ancestors even of the highest ranks. But if for a moment I think of those comedies as having been acted, I lose all sense of comparison in the shame, that human nature could at any time have endured such outrages to its dignity; and if conjugal affection and the sweet name of sister were

too weak, that yet filial piety, the gratitude for a mother's holy love, should not have risen and hissed into infamy these traitors to their own natural gifts, who lampooned the noblest passions of humanity, in order to pander for its lowest appetites.

As far, however, as one bad thing can be palliated by comparison with a worse, this may be said, in extenuation of these writers; that the mischief, which they can do even on the stage, is trifling compared with that style of writing which began in the pest-house of French literature, and has of late been imported by the *Littles* of the age, which consists in a perpetual tampering with the morals without offending the decencies. And yet the admirers of these publications, nay, the authors themselves, have the assurance to complain of Shakspeare (for I will not refer to one yet far deeper blasphemy)—Shakspeare, whose most objectionable passages are but grossnesses against lust, and these written in a gross age; while three-fourths of their whole works are delicacies for its support and sustenance. Lastly, that I may leave the reader in better humour with the name at the head of this article, I shall quote one scene from Etherege's "Love in a Tub," which for exquisite, genuine, original humour, is worth all the rest of his plays, though two or three of his witty contemporaries were thrown in among them, as a make weight. The scene might be entitled, the different ways in which the very same story may be told without any variation in matter of fact; for the least attentive reader will perceive the perfect identity of the footboy's account with the Frenchman's own statement in contradiction to it.

## SCENE IV.

*Scene*—Sir Frederick's lodging.

*Enter* DUFOY and CLARK.

*Clark.* I wonder Sir Frederick stays out so late.

*Dufoy.* Dis is noting; six, seven o'clock in the morning is ver good hour.

*Clark.* I hope he does not use these hours often.

*Dufoy.* Some six, seven time a veek; no oftiner.

*Clark.* My Lord commanded me to wait his coming.

*Dufoy.* Matré Clark, to divertise you, I vil tell you, how I did get be acquainted vid dis Bedlam Matré. About two, tree year ago me had for my conveniance dischargé myself from attending (*Enter a foot-boy*) as Matré D'ostel to a person of condition in *Parie*; it hapen after de dispatch of my little affairé.

*Foot B.* That is, after h'ad spent his mony, sir.

*Dufoy.* Jan foutré de lacque; me vill have de vip and de belle vor your breeck, rogue.

*Foot B.* Sir, in a word, he was a *Jack-pudding* to a moun-tebank, and turned off for want of wit: my master picked him up before a puppit-show, mumbling a halfpenny custard, to send him with a letter to the post.

*Dufoy.* Morbleu, see, see de insolance of de foot-boy English, bogre, rascale, you lie, begar I vil cutté your troaté. [*Exit Foot Boy.*]

*Clark.* He's a rogue; on with your story, Monsieur.

*Dufoy.* Matré Clark, I am your ver humble serviteur; but begar me have no patience to be abusé. As I did say, after de dispatché of my affairé, van day being idele, vich does producé the mellancholique, I did valké over de new bridge in *Parie*, and to divertise de time, and my more serious thoughté, me did look to see de marrioneté, and de *jack-puddinge*, vich did play hundred pretty trické; time de collation vas come; and vor I had no company, I vas un-villing to go to de Cabareté, but did buy a darriolé, littel

custardé vich did satisfie my appetite ver vel: in dis time young Monsieur de Grandvil (a jentleman of ver great quality, van dat vas my ver good friendé, and has done me ver great and insignal faveure) come by in his caroché vid dis Sir *Frollick*, who did pention at the same academy, to learn de language, de bon mine, de great horse, and many oder trické. Monsieur seeing me did make de bowé and did becken, becken me come to him ! he did tellé me dat de Englis jentleman had de letré vor de posté, and did entreaté me (if I had de opportunity) to see de letré deliver: he did tellé me too, it vold be ver great obligation: de memory of de faveur I had receive from his famelyé, beside de inclination I naturally have to servé de strangeré, made me returné de complemen vid ver great civility, and so I did take de letré and see it deliveré. Sir *Frollick* perceiving (by de management of dis affairé) dat I vas man d'esprit, and of vitté, did entreaté me to be his serviteur; me did take d'affection to his personé, and vas contenté to live vid him, to counsel and to advisé him. You see now de lie of de bougre de lacque Englishe, morbleu.

#### EVIDENCE.

When I was at Malta, 1805, there happened a drunken squabble on the road from Valette to St. Antonio, between a party of soldiers and another of sailors. They were brought before me the next morning, and the great effect which their intoxication had produced on their memory, and the little or no effect on their courage in giving evidence, may be seen by the following specimen. The soldiers swore that the sailors were the first aggressors, and had assaulted them with the following words: "—— your eyes ! who stops the line of march there ?" The sailors with equal vehemence and unanimity averred, that the soldiers were the first aggressors, and had burst in on them calling out—"Heave to, you lubbers ! or we'll run you down."



## FORCE OF HABIT.

An Emir had bought a left eye of a glass eye-maker, supposing that he would be able to see with it. The man begged him to give it a little time: he could not expect that it would see all at once as well as the right eye, which had been for so many years in the habit of it.

## PHŒNIX.

The Phœnix lives a thousand years, a secular bird of ages; and there is never more than one at a time in the world. Yet Plutarch very gravely informs us, that the brain of the Phœnix is a pleasant bit, but apt to occasion the head ache. By the by, there are few styles that are not fit for something. I have often wished to see Claudian's splendid poem on the Phœnix translated into English verse in the elaborate rhyme and gorgeous diction of Darwin. Indeed Claudian throughout would bear translation better than any of the ancients.

## MEMORY AND RECOLLECTION.

Beasts and babies remember, that is, recognise: man alone recollects. This distinction was made by Aristotle.

*Aliquid ex Nihilo.*

In answer to the *nihil e nihilo* of the atheists, and their near relations, the *anima-mundi* men, a humourist pointed to a white blank in a rude wood-cut, which very ingeniously served for the head of hair in one of the figures.

## BREVITY OF THE GREEK AND ENGLISH COMPARED.

As an instance of compression and brevity in

narration, unattainable in any language but the Greek, the following distich was quoted :

χρυσὸν ἀνήρ εὐρῶν, ἔλιπε βρόχον· αὐτὰρ ὁ χρυσὸν,  
ὄν λίπεν, οὐκ εὐρῶν, ἤψεν, ὃν εὔρε, βρόχον.

This was denied by one of the company, who instantly rendered the lines in English, contending with reason that the indefinite article in English, together with the pronoun " his," &c. should be considered as one word with the noun following, and more than counterbalanced by the greater number of syllables in the Greek words, the terminations of which are in truth only little words glued on to them. The English distich follows, and the reader will recollect that it is a mere trial of comparative brevity, wit and poetry quite out of the question :

Jack finding gold left a rope on the ground ;  
Bill missing his gold used the rope, which he found.

1809—1816.

#### THE WILL AND THE DEED.

The will to the deed,—the inward principle to the outward act,—is as the kernel to the shell ; but yet, in the first place, the shell is necessary for the kernel, and that by which it is commonly known ;—and, in the next place, as the shell comes first, and the kernel grows gradually and hardens within it, so is it with the moral principle in man. Legality precedes morality in every individual, even as the Jewish dispensation preceded the Christian in the education of the world at large.

#### THE WILL FOR THE DEED.

When may the will be taken for the deed ?—Then when the will is the obedience of the whole man ;—

when the will is in fact the deed, that is, all the deed in our power. In every other case, it is bending the bow without shooting the arrow. The bird of Paradise gleams on the lofty branch, and the man takes aim, and draws the tough yew into a crescent with might and main,—and lo! there is never an arrow on the string.

#### SINCERITY.

The first great requisite is absolute sincerity. Falsehood and disguise are miseries and misery-makers, under whatever strength of sympathy, or desire to prolong happy thoughts in others for their sake or your own only as sympathising with theirs, it may originate. All sympathy, not consistent with acknowledged virtue, is but disguised selfishness.

#### TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD.

The pre-eminence of truth over falsehood, even when occasioned by that truth, is as a gentle fountain breathing from forth its air-let into the snow piled over and around it, which it turns into its own substance, and flows with greater murmur; and though it be again arrested, still it is but for a time,—it awaits only the change of the wind to awake and roll onwards its ever increasing stream:—

I semplici pastori  
 Sul Vesolo nevoso,  
 Fatti curvi e canuti,  
 D'alto stupor son muti,  
 Mirando al fonte ombroso  
 Il Po con pochi umori;  
 Poscia udendo gl' onori  
 Dell' urna angusta e stretta,  
 Che 'l Adda, che 'l Tesino  
 Soverchia il suo cammino,

Che ampio al<sup>l</sup> mars' affretta,  
 Che si spuma, e si suona,  
 Che gli si dà corona !

*Chiabrera, Rime, xxviii.*

But falsehood is fire in stubble;—it likewise turns all the light stuff around it into its own substance for a moment, one crackling blazing moment,—and then dies ; and all its converts are scattered in the wind, without place or evidence of their existence, as viewless as the wind which scatters them.

#### RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES.

A man may look at glass, or through it, or both. Let all earthly things be unto thee as glass to see heaven through !\* Religious ceremonies should be pure glass, not dyed in the gorgeous crimsons and purple blues and greens of the drapery of saints and saintesses.

#### ASSOCIATION.

Many a star, which we behold as single, the astronomer resolves into two, each perhaps the centre of a separate system. Oft are the flowers of the bindweed mistaken for the growth of the plant, which it chokes with its intertwine. And many are the unsuspected double stars, and frequent are the parasite weeds, which the philosopher detects in the received opinions of men :—so strong is the tendency of the imagination to identify what it has long consociated. Things that have habitually, though perhaps acci-

\* It has been suggested to me that the origin of this little aphorism was perhaps the following stanza in Herbert's poem entitled "Elixir:"—

"A man that looks on glass,  
 On it may stay his eye ;  
 Or, if he pleaseth, through it pass,  
 And then the Heaven espy."—H. N. C.

dentally and arbitrarily, been thought of in connection with each other, we are prone to regard as inseparable. The fatal brand is cast into the fire, and therefore Meleager must consume in the flames. To these conjunctions of custom and association—(the associative power of the mind which holds the mid place between memory and sense,)—we may best apply Sir Thomas Browne's remark, that many things coagulate on commixture, the separate natures of which promise no concretion.

#### CURIOSITY.

The curiosity of an honourable mind willingly rests there, where the love of truth does not urge it farther onward, and the love of its neighbour bids it stop ;—in other words, it willingly stops at the point, where the interests of truth do not beckon it onward, and charity cries, Halt !

#### NEW TRUTHS.

To all new truths, or renovation of old truths, it must be as in the ark between the destroyed and the about-to-be renovated world. The raven must be sent out before the dove, and ominous controversy must precede peace and the olive-wreath.

#### VICIOUS PLEASURES.

Centries, or wooden frames, are put under the arches of a bridge, to remain no longer than till the latter are consolidated. Even so pleasures are the devil's scaffolding to build a habit upon ;—that formed and steady, the pleasures are sent for 'fire-wood, and the hell begins in this life.\*

\* This may be found in Jeremy Taylor's apples of Sodom, Serm. xix., vol. v. ; Heber's edit. A few words are altered.—S. C.

## MERITING HEAVEN.

Virtue makes us not worthy, but only worthier, of happiness. Existence itself gives a claim to joy. Virtue and happiness are incommensurate quantities. How much virtue must I have, before I have paid off the old debt of my happiness in infancy and childhood! O! We all outrun the constable with heaven's justice! We have to earn the earth, before we can think of earning heaven.

## DUST TO DUST.

We were indeed,—

*πάντα κόνις, καὶ πάντα γέλως, καὶ πάντα τὸ μηδὲν—*

if we did not feel that we were so.

## HUMAN COUNTENANCE.

There is in every human countenance either a history or a prophecy, which must sadden, or at least soften, every reflecting observer.

## LIE USEFUL TO TRUTH.

A lie accidentally useful to the cause of an oppressed truth: Thus was the tongue of a dog made medicinal to a feeble and sickly Lazarus.

## SCIENCE IN ROMAN CATHOLIC STATES.

In Roman Catholic states, where science has forced its way, and some light must follow, the devil himself cunningly sets up a shop for common sense at the sign of the Infidel.

## VOLUNTARY BELIEF.

“It is possible,” says Jeremy Taylor, “for a man to bring himself to believe anything he hath a mind

to." But what is this belief? Analyse it into its constituents;—is it more than certain passions or feelings converging into the sensation of positiveness as their focus, and then associated with certain sounds or images?—*Nemo enim, says Augustin, huic evidentia contradicet, nisi quem plus defensare delectat, quod sentit, quam, quid sentiendum sit, invenire.*

## AMANDA.

Lovely and pure—no bird of Paradise, to feed on dew and flower-fragrance, and never to alight on earth, till shot by death with pointless shaft; but a rose, to fix its roots in the genial earth, thence to suck up nutriment and bloom strong and healthy,—not to droop and fade amid sunshine and zephyrs on a soilless rock! Her marriage was no meagre prose comment on the glowing and gorgeous poetry of her wooing;—nor did the surly over-browning rock of reality ever cast the dusky shadow of this earth on the soft moonlight of her love's first phantasies.

## HYMEN'S TORCH.

The torch of love may be blown out wholly, but not that of Hymen. Whom the flame and its cheering light and genial warmth no longer bless, him the smoke stifles; for the spark is inextinguishable, save by death:—

nigro circumvelatus amictu

Mæret Hymen, fumantque atræ sine lumine tædæ.

## YOUTH AND AGE.

Youth beholds happiness gleaming in the prospect. Age looks back on the happiness of youth; and instead of hopes, seeks its enjoyment in the recollections of hope.

## DECEMBER MORNING.

The giant shadows sleeping amid the wan yellow light of the December morning, looked like wrecks and scattered ruins of the long, long night.

## ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON.

Next to the inspired Scriptures,—yea, and as the vibration of that once-struck hour remaining on the air, stands Leighton's "Commentary on the first Epistle of Peter."

## CHRISTIAN HONESTY.

"Oh! that God," says Carey in his Journal in Hindostan, "would make the Gospel successful among them! That would undoubtedly make them honest men, and I fear nothing else ever will." Now this is a fact,—spite of infidels and philosophising Christians, a fact. A perfect explanation of it would require and would show the psychology of faith,—the difference between the whole soul's modifying an action, and an action enforced by modifications of the soul amid prudential motives or favouring impulses. Let me here remind myself of the absolute necessity of having my whole faculties awake and imaginative, in order to illustrate this and similar truths;—otherwise my writings will be no other than pages of algebra.

## INSCRIPTION ON A CLOCK IN CHEAPSIDE.

What now thou dost, or art about to do,  
Will help to give thee peace or make thee rue  
When hovering o'er the line this hand will tell  
The last dread moment—'twill be heaven or hell.

Read for the last two lines—

When wav'ring o'er the dot this hand shall tell  
The moment that secures thee heaven or hell!



## RATIONALISM IS NOT REASON.

*Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord.* An awful text! Now because vengeance is most wisely and lovingly forbidden to us, hence we have by degrees, under false generalisations and puny sensibilities, taken up the notion that vengeance is nowhere. In short, the abuse of figurative interpretation is endless;—instead of being applied, as it ought to be, to those things which are the most comprehensible, that is, sensuous, and which therefore are the parts likely to be figurative, because such language is a condescension to our weakness,—it is applied to rot away the very pillars, yea, to fret away and dissolve the very corner stones of the temple of religion. O, holy Paul! O, beloved John! full of light and love, whose books are full of intuitions, as those of Paul are books of energies,—the one uttering to sympathising angels what the other toils to convey to weak-sighted yet docile men:—O Luther! Calvin! Fox, with Penn and Barclay! O Zinzendorf! and ye too, whose outward garments only have been singed and dishonoured in the heathenish furnace of Roman apostacy, Francis of Sales, Fénelon;—yea, even Aquinas and Scotus!—With what astoundment would ye, if ye were alive with your merely human perfections, listen to the creed of our, so called, rational religionists! Rational!—They who, in the very outset deny all reason, and leave us nothing but degrees to distinguish us from brutes;—a greater degree of memory, dearly purchased by the greater solitudes of fear which convert that memory into foresight. O! place before your eyes the island of Britain in the reign of Alfred, its unpierced woods,

its wide morasses and dreary heaths, its blood-stained and desolated shores, its untaught and scanty population; behold the monarch listening now to Bede, and now to John Erigena; and then see the same realm, a mighty empire, full of motion, full of books, where the cotter's son, twelve years old, has read more than archbishops of yore, and possesses the opportunity of reading more than our Alfred himself; and then finally behold this mighty nation, its rulers and its wise men listening to——Paley and to——Malthus! It is mournful, mournful.

#### INCONSISTENCY.

How strange and sad is the laxity with which men in these days suffer the most inconsistent opinions to lie jumbled lazily together in their minds,—holding the antimoralism of Paley and the hypophysics of Locke, and yet gravely, and with a mock faith, talking of God as a pure spirit, of passing out of time into eternity, of a peace which passes all understanding, of loving our neighbour as ourselves, and God above all, and so forth!—Blank contradictions!—What are these men's minds but a huge lumber-room of *bully*, that is, of incompatible notions brought together by a feeling without a sense of connection?

#### HOPE IN HUMANITY.

Consider the state of a rich man perfectly *Adam Smithed*, yet with a naturally good heart;—then suppose him suddenly convinced, vitally convinced, of the truth of the blessed system of hope and confidence in reason and humanity! Contrast his new and old views and reflections, the feelings with

which he would begin to receive his rents, and to contemplate his increase of power by wealth, the study to relieve the labour of man from all mere annoy and disgust, the preclusion in his own mind of all cooling down from the experience of individual ingratitude, and his conviction that the true cause of all his disappointments was, that his plans were too narrow, too short, too selfish!

*Wenn das Elend viel ist auf der Erde, so beruhet der grund davon, nach Abzug des theils erträglichen, theils verbesserlichen, theils eingebildeten Uebels der Naturwelt, ganz allein in den moralischen Handlungen der Menschen.\** O my God! What a great, inspiring, heroic thought! Were only a hundred men to combine even my clearness of conviction of this, with a Clarkson and Bell's perseverance, what might not be done! How awful a duty does not hope become! What a nurse, yea, mother of all other the fairest virtues! We despair of others' goodness, and thence are ourselves bad. O! let me live to show the errors of the most of those who have hitherto attempted this work,—how they have too often put the intellectual and the moral, yea, the moral and the religious, faculties at strife with each other, and how they ought to act with an equal eye to all, to feel that all is involved in the perfection of each! This is the fundamental position.

#### SELF-LOVE IN RELIGION.

The unselfishness of self-love in the hopes and fears of religion consists;—first,—in the previous

\* Although the misery on the earth is great indeed, yet the foundation of it rests, after deduction of the partly bearable, partly removable, and partly imaginary, evil of the natural world, entirely and alone on the moral dealings of men.—Ed.

necessity of a moral energy, in order so far to subjugate the sensual, which is indeed and properly the selfish, part of our nature, as to believe in a state after death, on the grounds of the Christian religion:—secondly,—in the abstract and, as it were, unindividual nature of the idea, self, or soul, when conceived apart from our present living body and the world of the senses. In my religious meditations of hope and fear, the reflection that this course of action will purchase heaven for me, for my soul, involves a thought of and for all men who pursue the same course. In worldly blessings, such as those promised in the Old Law, each man might make up to himself his own favourite scheme of happiness. “I will be strictly just, and observe all the laws and ceremonies of my religion, that God may grant me such a woman for my wife, or wealth and honour, with which I will purchase such and such an estate,” &c. But the reward of heaven admits no day-dreams; its hopes and its fears are too vast to endure an outline. “I will endeavour to abstain from vice, and force myself to do such and such acts of duty, in order that I may make myself capable of that freedom of moral being, without which heaven would be no heaven to me.” Now this very thought tends to annihilate self. For what is a self not distinguished from any other self, but like an individual circle in geometry, uncoloured, and the representative of all other circles. The circle is differenced, indeed, from a triangle or square; so is a virtuous soul from a vicious soul, a soul in bliss from a soul in misery, but no wise distinguished from other souls under the same predicament. That selfishness which includes, of necessity, the selves of all my fellow-creatures, is assuredly a social and generous principle. I speak, as before observed, of the objective or reflex self;—

for as to the subjective self, it is merely synonymous with consciousness, and obtains equally whether I think of me or of him; - in both cases it is I thinking.

Still, however, I freely admit that there neither is, nor can be, any such self-oblivion in these hopes and fears when practically reflected on, as often takes place in love and acts of loving kindness, and the habit of which constitutes a sweet and loving nature. And this leads me to the third, and most important reflection, namely, that the soul's infinite capacity of pain and of joy, through an infinite duration, does really, on the most high-flying notions of love and justice, make my own soul and the most anxious care for the character of its future fate, an object of emphatic duty. What can be the object of human virtue but the happiness of sentient, still more of moral, beings? But an infinite duration of faculties, infinite in progression, even of one soul, is so vast, so boundless an idea, that we are unable to distinguish it from the idea of the whole race of mankind. If to seek the temporal welfare of all mankind be disinterested virtue, much more must the eternal welfare of my own soul be so;—for the temporal welfare of all mankind is included within a finite space and finite number, and my imagination makes it easy by sympathies and visions of outward resemblance; but myself in eternity, as the object of my contemplation, differs unimaginally from my present self. Do but try to think of yourself in eternal misery!—you will find that you are stricken with horror for it, even as for a third person; conceive it in hazard thereof, and you will feel commiseration for it, and pray for it with an anguish of sympathy very different from the outcry of an immediate self-suffering.

Blessed be God ! that which makes us capable of vicious self-interestedness, capacitates us also for disinterestedness. That I am capable of preferring a smaller advantage of my own to a far greater good of another man,—this, the power of comparing the notions of “ him and me ” objectively, enables me likewise to prefer—at least furnishes the condition of my preferring—a greater good of another to a lesser good of my own ;—nay, a pleasure of his, or external advantage, to an equal one of my own. And thus too, that I am capable of loving my neighbour as myself, empowers me to love myself as my neighbour,—not only as much, but in the same way and with the very same feeling.

This is the great privilege of pure religion. By diverting self-love to our self under those relations, in which alone it is worthy of our anxiety, it annihilates self, as a notion of diversity. Extremes meet. These reflections supply a forcible, and, I believe, quite new argument against the purgatory, both of the Romanists, and of the modern Millennarians, and final salvationists. Their motives do, indeed, destroy the essence of virtue.

The doctors of self-love are misled by a wrong use of the words,—“ We love ourselves ! ” Now this is impossible for a finite and created being in the absolute meaning of self ; and in its secondary and figurative meaning, self signifies only a less degree of distance, a narrowness of moral view, and a determination of value by measurement. Hence the body is in this sense our self, because the sensations have been habitually appropriated to it in too great a proportion ; but this is not a necessity of our nature. There is a state possible even in this life, in which we may truly say, “ My self loves,”—freely constituting its secondary or objective love in what it wills

to love, commands what it wills, and wills what it commands. The difference between self-love, and self that loves, consists in the objects of the former as given to it according to the law of the senses, while the latter determines the objects according to the law in the spirit. The first loves because it must; the second, because it ought; and the result of the first is not in any objective, imaginable, comprehensible, action, but in that action by which it abandoned its power of true agency, and willed its own fall. This is, indeed, a mystery. How can it be otherwise?—For if the will be unconditional, it must be inexplicable, the understanding of a thing being an insight into its conditions and causes. But whatever is in the will is the will, and must therefore be equally inexplicable,

In a word, the difference of an unselfish from a selfish love, even in this life, consists in this, that the latter depends on our transferring our present passion or appetite, or rather on our dilating and stretching it out in imagination, as the covetous man does; while in the former we carry ourselves forward under a very different state from the present, as the young man, who restrains his appetites in respect of his future self as a tranquil and healthy old man. This last requires as great an effort of disinterestedness as, if not a greater than, to give up a present enjoyment to another person who is present to us. The alienation from distance in time and from diversity of circumstance, is greater in the one case than in the other. And let it be remembered, that a Christian may exert all the virtues and virtuous charities of humanity in any state; yea, in the pangs of a wounded conscience, he may feel for the future periods of his own lost spirit, just as Adam for all his posterity.

Oh magical, sympathetic, *anima ! principium hylar-chicum ! rationes spermaticæ ! λόγοι ποιητικοὶ !* Oh formidable words ! And O man ! thou marvellous beast-angel ! thou ambitious beggar ! How pompously dost thou trick out thy very ignorance with such glorious disguises, that thou mayest seem to hide it in order only to worship it !

#### LIMITATION OF LOVE OF POETRY.

A man may be, perhaps, exclusively a poet, a poet most exquisite in his kind, though the kind must needs be of inferior worth ; I say, may be ; for I cannot recollect any one instance in which I have a right to suppose it. But, surely, to have an exclusive pleasure in poetry, not being yourself a poet ; to turn away from all effort, and to dwell wholly on the images of another's vision—is an unworthy and effeminate thing. A jeweller may devote his whole time to jewels unblamed ; but the mere amateur, who grounds his taste on no chemical or geological idea, cannot claim the same exemption from despect. How shall he fully enjoy Wordsworth, who has never meditated on the truths which Wordsworth has wedded to immortal verse ?

#### HUMILITY OF THE AMIABLE.

It is well ordered by nature, that the amiable and estimable have a fainter perception of their own qualities than their friends have ; otherwise they would love themselves. And though they may fear flattery, yet if not justified in suspecting intentional deceit, they cannot but love and esteem those who love and esteem them, only as lovely and estimable, and give them proof of their having done well, where they have meant to do well.



## TEMPER IN ARGUMENT.

All reasoners ought to be perfectly dispassionate, and ready to allow all the force of the arguments they are to confute. But more especially those, who are to argue in behalf of Christianity, ought carefully to preserve the spirit of it in their manner of expressing themselves. I have so much honour for the Christian clergy, that I had much rather hear them railed at, than hear them rail; and I must say, that I am often grievously offended with the generality of them for their method of treating all who differ from them in opinion.

MRS. CHAPONE.

Besides, what is the use of violence? None. What is the harm? Great, very great; chiefly, in the confirmation of error, to which nothing so much tends, as to find your opinions attacked with weak arguments and unworthy feelings. A generous mind becomes more attached to principles so treated, even as it would to an old friend, after he had been grossly calumniated. We are eager to make compensation.

## PATRIARCHAL GOVERNMENT.

The smooth words used by all factions, and their wide influence, may be exemplified in all the extreme systems, as, for instance, in the patriarchal government of Filmer. Take it in one relation, and it imports love, tender anxiety, longer experience, and superior wisdom, bordering on revelation, especially to Jews and Christians, who are in the life-long habit of attaching to patriarchs an intimacy with the Supreme Being. Take it on the other side, and it imports, that a whole people are to be treated and governed as children by a man not so old as very many, not older than very many, and in all probability

not wiser than the many, and by his very situation precluded from the same experience.

#### CALLOUS SELF-CONCEIT.

The most hateful form of self-conceit is the callous form, when it boasts and swells up on the score of its own ignorance, as implying exemption from a folly. "We profess not to understand;"—"We are so unhappy as to be quite in the dark as to the meaning of this writer;"—"All this may be very fine, but we are not ashamed to confess that to us it is quite unintelligible:"—then quote a passage without the context, and appeal to the PUBLIC, whether they understand it or not! Wretches! Such books were not written for your public. If it be a work on inward religion, appeal to the inwardly religious, and ask them! If it be of true love and its anguish and its yearnings, appeal to the true lover! What have the public to do with this?

#### A LIBRARIAN.

He was like a cork, flexible, floating, full of pores and openings, and yet he could neither return nor transmit the waters of Helicon, much less the light of Apollo. The poet, by his side, was like a diamond, transmitting to all around, yet retaining for himself alone, the rays of the god of day.

#### TRIMMING.

An upright shoe may fit both feet; but never saw I a glove that would fit both hands. It is a man for a mean or mechanic office, that can be employed equally well under either of two opposite parties.

## DEATH.

Death but supplies the oil for the inextinguishable lamp of life.

## LOVE AN ACT OF THE WILL.

Love, however sudden, as when we fall in love at first sight (which is, perhaps, always the case of love in its highest sense), is yet an act of the will, and that too one of its primary, and therefore ineffable acts. This is most important; for if it be not true, either love itself is all a romantic *hum*, a mere connection of desire with a form appropriated to excite and gratify it, or the mere repetition of a day-dream; or if it be granted that love has a real, distinct, and excellent being, I know not how we could attach blame and immorality to inconstancy, when confined to the affections and a sense of preference. Either, therefore, we must brutalise our notions with Pope:—

Lust thro' some certain strainers well refined,  
Is gentle love and charms all woman-kind:

or we must dissolve and thaw away all bonds of morality by the irresistible shocks of an irresistible sensibility with Sterne.

## WEDDED UNION.

The well-spring of all sensible communion is the natural delight and need, which undepraved man hath to transfuse from himself into others, and to receive from others into himself, those things, wherein the excellency of his kind doth most consist; and the eminence of love or marriage communion is, that

this mutual transfusion can take place more perfectly and totally in this, than in any other mode.

Prefer person before money, good-temper with good sense before person; and let all, wealth, easy temper, strong understanding and beauty, be as nothing to thee, unless accompanied by virtue in principle and in habit.

Suppose competence, health, and honesty; then a happy marriage depends on four things:—1. An understanding proportionate to thine, that is, a reciprocity at least of thine:—2. Natural sensibility and lively sympathy in general:—3. Steadiness in attaching and retaining sensibility to its proper objects in its proper proportions:—4. Mutual liking; including person and all the thousand obscure sympathies that determine conjugal liking, that is, love and desire to A. rather than to B. This seems very obvious and almost trivial: and yet all unhappy marriages arise from the not honestly putting, and sincerely answering each of these four questions: any one of them negatived, marriage is imperfect, and in hazard of discontent.

#### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HOBBS AND SPINOZA.

In the most similar and nearest points there is a difference, but for the most part there is an absolute contrast, between Hobbes and Spinoza. Thus Hobbes makes a state of war the natural state of man from the essential and ever-continuing nature of man, as not a moral, but only a frightenable being:—Spinoza makes the same state a necessity of man out of society, because he must then be an undeveloped man, and his moral being dormant; and so on through the whole.

## THE END MAY JUSTIFY THE MEANS.

Whatever act is necessary to an end, and ascertained to be necessary and proportionate both to the end and the agent, takes its nature from that end. This premised, the proposition is innocent that ends may justify means. Remember, however, the important distinction:—*Unius facti diversi fines esse possunt: unius actionis non possunt.*

I have somewhere read this remark:—*Omne meritum est voluntarium, aut voluntate originis aut origine voluntatis.* Quaintly as this is expressed, it is well worth consideration, and gives the true meaning of Baxter's famous saying,—“Hell is paved with good intentions.”

## NEGATIVE THOUGHT.

On this calm morning of the 13th of November, 1809, it occurs to me, that it is by a negation and voluntary act of no thinking that we think of earth, air, water, &c. as dead. It is necessary for our limited powers of consciousness, that we should be brought to this negative state, and that this state should pass into custom; but it is likewise necessary that at times we should awake and step forward; and this is effected by those extenders of our consciousness—sorrow, sickness, poetry, and religion. The truth is, we stop in the sense of life just when we are not forced to go on, and then adopt a permission of our feelings for a precept of our reason.

## MAN'S RETURN TO HEAVEN.

Heaven bestows light and influence on this lower world, which reflects the blessed rays, though it

cannot recompense them. So man may make a return to God, but no requital.

#### YOUNG PRODIGIES.

Fair criticism on young prodigies and Rosciuses in verse, or on the stage, is arraigned,—

as the envious sneaping frost  
That bites the first-born infants of the spring.

If there were no better answer, the following a good heart would scarcely admit;—but where nine-tenths of the applause have been mere wonderment and miracle-lust (*Wundursucht*) these verses are an excellent accompaniment to other arguments:—

Well, say it be!—Yet why of summer boast,  
Before the birds have natural cause to sing?  
Why should we joy in an abortive birth?  
At Christmas I no more desire a rose,  
Than wish a snow in May's new budding shows;  
But like of each thing that in reason grows.

*Love's Labour's Lost.\**

#### WELCH NAMES.

The small number of surnames, and those Christian names and patronymics, not derived from trades, &c. is one mark of a country either not yet, or only recently, unfeudalised. Hence in Scotland the Mackintoshes, Macaulays, and so on. But the most remarkable show of this I ever saw, is the list of subscribers to Owen's Welch Dictionary. In letter D. there are 31 names, 21 of which are *Davis* or *Davies*, and the other three are not Welchmen. In

\* Slightly altered.—ED.

E. there are 30 ; 16 *Evans* ; 6 *Edwards* ; 1 *Edmonds* ; 1 *Egan*, and the remainder *Ellis*. In G. two-thirds are *Griffiths*. In H. all are *Hughes* and *Howell*. In I. there are 66 ; all *Joneses*. In L. 3 or 4 *Lewis*es ; 1 *Lewellyn* ; all the rest *Lloyds*. M. four-fifths *Morgans*. O. entirely *Owen*. R. all *Roberts* or *Richards*. T. all *Thomases*. V. all *Vaughans* ; —and W. 64 names, 56 of them *Williams*.

#### GERMAN LANGUAGE.

The real value of melody in a language is considerable as subadditive ; but when not jutting out into consciousness under the friction of comparison, the absence or inferiority of it is, as privative of pleasure, of little consequence. For example, when I read Voss's translation of the *Georgics*, I am, as it were, reading the original poem, until something particularly well expressed occasions me to revert to the Latin ; and then I find the superiority, or at least the powers, of the German in all other respects, but am made feelingly alive, at the same time, to its unsmooth mixture of the vocal and the organic, the fluid and the substance, of language. The fluid seems to have been poured in on the corpuscles all at once, and the whole has, therefore, curdled, and collected itself into a lumpy soup full of knots of curds insided by interjacent whey at irregular distances, and the curd lumpets of various sizes.

It is always a question how far the apparent defects of a language arise from itself or from the false taste of the nation speaking it. Is the practical inferiority of the English to the Italian in the power of passing from grave to light subjects, in the manner of Ariosto, the fault of the language itself ? Wieland, in his *Oberon*, broke successfully through equal

difficulties. It is grievous to think how much less careful the English have been to preserve than to acquire. Why have we lost, or all but lost, the *ver* or *for* as a prefix,—*fordone*, *forwearied*, &c. ; and the *zer* or *to*,—*zerreissen*, to rend, &c. *Jugend*, *Jüngling* ; *youth*, *youngling* ; why is that last word now lost to common use, and confined to sheep and other animals ?

Ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος. Soph.

His life was playful from infancy to death, like the snow which in a calm day falls, but scarce seems to fall, and plays and dances in and out till the very moment that it gently reaches the earth.

#### THE UNIVERSE.

It surely is not impossible that to some infinitely superior being the whole universe may be as one plain, the distance between planet and planet being only as the pores in a grain of sand, and the spaces between system and system no greater than the intervals between one grain and the grain adjacent.

#### HARBEROUS.

*Harberous*, that is, harbourous, is the old version of St. Paul's *φιλόξενος*, and a beautiful word it is. *Κόσμιος* should be rendered a gentleman in dress and address, in appearance and demeanour, a man of the world in an innocent sense. The Latin *mundus* has the same double force in it; only that to the rude early Romans, to have a clean pair of hands and a clean dress, was to be drest ; just as we say to boys, "Put on your clean clothes !"

The different meanings attached to the same word



or phrase in different sentences, will, of course, be accompanied with a different feeling in the mind; this will affect the pronunciation, and hence arises a new word. We should vainly try to produce the same feeling in our minds by *and he* as by *who*; for the different use of the latter, and its feeling having now coalesced. Yet *who* is properly the same word and pronunciation as *ó* with the digammate prefix, and as *qui καὶ ó*.

#### AN ADMONITION.

There are two sides to every question. If thou hast genius and poverty to thy lot, dwell on the foolish, perplexing, imprudent, dangerous, and even immoral, conduct of promise-breach in small things, of want of punctuality, of procrastination in all its shapes and disguises. Force men to reverence the dignity of thy moral strength in and for itself,—seeking no excuses or palliations from fortune, or sickness, or a too full mind that, in opulence of conception, overrated its powers of application. But if thy fate should be different, shouldest thou possess competence, health, and ease of mind, and then be thyself called upon to judge such faults in another so gifted,—oh! then, upon the other view of the question, say, Am I in ease and comfort, and dare I wonder that he, poor fellow, acted so and so? Dare I accuse him? Ought I not to shadow forth to myself that, glad and luxuriating in a short escape from anxiety, his mind over-promised for itself; that, want combating with his eager desire to produce things worthy of fame, he dreamed of the nobler, when he should have been producing the meaner, and so had the meaner obtruded on his moral being, when the nobler was making full way on his intellectual. Think

of the manifoldness of his accumulated petty calls ! Think, in short, on all that should be like a voice from heaven to warn thyself against this and this, and call it all up for pity and for palliation ; and then draw the balance. Take him in his whole,—his head, his heart, his wishes, his innocence of all selfish crime, and a hundred years hence, what will be the result ? The good,—were it but a single volume that made truth more visible, and goodness more lovely, and pleasure at once more akin to virtue and, self-doubled, more pleasurable ! and the evil,—while he lived, it injured none but himself ; and where is it now ? in his grave.

Follow it not thither.

TO THEE CHERUBIM AND SERAPHIM CONTINUALLY DO CRY.

The mighty kingdoms angelical, like the thin clouds at dawn, receiving and hailing the first radiance, and singing and sounding forth their blessedness, increase the rising joy in the heart of God, spread wide and utter forth the joy arisen, and in innumerable finite glories interpret all they can of infinite bliss.

#### DEFINITION OF MIRACLE.

A phenomenon in no connection with any other phenomenon, as its immediate cause, is a miracle ; and what is believed to have been such, is miraculous for the person so believing. When it is strange and surprising, that is, without any analogy in our former experience—it is called a miracle. The kind defines the thing :—the circumstances the word.\*

\* A reader of this definition compared it with the following saying of Dr. Johnson :—“ There is undoubtedly a sense in which all life is miraculous, as it is an union of powers of which we can image no connection, a succession of motions of which the first cause must be supernatural.”—Life of Sir Thomas Browne.—S. C.

To stretch out my arm is a miracle, unless the materialists should be more cunning than they have proved themselves hitherto. To reanimate a dead man by an act of the will, no intermediate agency employed, not only is, but is called, a miracle. A Scripture miracle, therefore, must be so defined, as to express, not only its miracular essence, but likewise the condition of its appearing miraculous; add therefore to the preceding, the words *præter omnem priorem experientiam*.

It might be defined likewise an effect, not having its cause in any thing congenerous. That thought calls up thought is no more miraculous than that a billiard ball moves a billiard ball; but that a billiard ball should excite a thought, that is, be perceived, is a miracle, and, were it strange, would be called such. For take the converse, that a thought should call up a billiard ball! Yet where is the difference, but that the one is a common experience, the other never yet experienced?

It is not strictly accurate to affirm, that everything would appear a miracle, if we were wholly uninfluenced by custom, and saw things as they are:—for then the very ground of all miracles would probably vanish, namely, heterogeneity of spirit and matter. For the *quid ulterius?* of wonder, we should have the *ne plus ultra* of adoration.

Again, the word miracle has an objective, a subjective, and a popular meaning;—as objective,—the essence of a miracle consists in the heterogeneity of the consequent and its causative antecedent;—as subjective,—in the assumption of the heterogeneity. Add the wonder and surprise excited, when the consequent is out of the course of experience, and we know the popular sense and ordinary use of the word.

## DEATH, AND GROUNDS OF BELIEF IN A FUTURE STATE.

It is an important thought, that death, judged of by corporeal analogies, certainly implies discription or dissolution of parts ; but pain and pleasure do not ; nay, they seem inconceivable except under the idea of concentration. Therefore the influence of the body on the soul will not prove the common destiny of both. I feel myself not the slave of nature (nature used here as the *mundus sensibilis*) in the sense in which animals are. Not only my thoughts and affections extend to objects transnatural, as truth, virtue, God ; not only do my powers extend vastly beyond all those, which I could have derived from the instruments and organs, with which nature has furnished me ; but I can do what nature *per se* cannot. I ingraft, I raise heavy bodies above the clouds, and guide my course over ocean and through air. I alone am lord of fire and light ; other creatures are but their alms-folk, and of all the so-called elements, water, earth, air, and all their compounds (to speak in the ever-enduring language of the senses, to which nothing can be revealed, but as compact, or fluid, or aerial), I not merely subserve myself of them, but I employ them. *Ergo*, there is in me, or rather I am, a præter-natural, that is, a super-sensuous thing : but what is not nature, why should it perish with nature ? why lose the faculty of vision, because my spectacles are broken ?

Now to this it will be objected, and very forcibly too ;—that the soul or self is acted upon by nature through the body, and water or caloric, diffused through or collected in the brain, will derange the faculties of the soul by deranging the organisation of the brain ; the sword cannot touch the soul ; but

by rending the flesh, it will rend the feelings. Therefore the violence of nature may, in destroying the body mediately destroy the soul! It is to this objection that my first sentence applies; and is an important, and I believe, a new and the only satisfactory reply I have ever heard.

The one great and binding ground of the belief of God and a hereafter, is the law of conscience: but as the aptitudes, and beauty, and grandeur of the world, are a sweet and beneficent inducement to this belief, a constant fuel to our faith, so here we seek these arguments, not as dissatisfied with the one main ground, not as *of little faith*, but because, believing it to be, it is natural we should expect to find traces of it, and as a noble way of employing and developing, and enlarging the faculties of the soul, and this, not by way of motive, but of assimilation, producing virtue.

2nd April, 1811.

#### HATRED OF INJUSTICE.

It is the mark of a noble nature to be more shocked with the unjust condemnation of a bad man than of a virtuous one; as in the instance of Strafford. For in such cases the love of justice, and the hatred of the contrary, are felt more nakedly, and constitute a strong passion *per se*, not only unaided by, but in conquest of, the softer self-repaying sympathies. A wise foresight too inspires jealousy, that so may principles be most easily overthrown. This is the virtue of a wise man, which a mob never possesses, even as a mob never, perhaps, has the malignant *finis ultimus*, which is the vice of a man.

## RELIGION.

Amongst the great truths are these:—

I. That religion has no speculative dogmas; that all is practical, all appealing to the will, and therefore all imperative. *I am the Lord thy God: Thou shalt have none other gods but me.*

II. That, therefore, miracles are not the proofs, but the necessary results, of revelation. They are not the key of the arch and roof of evidence, though they may be a compacting stone in it, which gives while it receives strength. Hence, to make the intellectual faith a fair analogon or unison of the vital faith, it ought to be stamped in the mind by all the evidences duly co-ordinated, and not designed by single pen-strokes, beginning either here or there.

III. That, according to No. I., Christ is not described primarily and characteristically as a teacher, but as a doer; a light indeed, but an effective light, the sun which causes what it shows, as well as shows what it first causes.

IV. That a certain degree of morality is presupposed in the reception of Christianity; it is the *substratum* of the moral interest which substantiates the evidence of miracles. The instance of a profligate suddenly converted, if properly sifted, will be found but an apparent exception.

V. That the being of a God, and the immortality of man, are everywhere assumed by Christ.

VI. That Socinianism is not a religion but a theory, and that, too, a very pernicious, or a very unsatisfactory, theory. Pernicious,—for it excludes all our deep and awful ideas of the perfect holiness of God, his justice and his mercy, and thereby makes the voice of conscience a delusion, as having no correspondent in the character of the legislator;

regarding God as merely a good-natured pleasure-giver, so happiness be produced, indifferent as to the means:—Unsatisfactory, for it promises forgiveness without any solution of the difficulty of the compatibility of this with the justice of God; in no way explains the fallen condition of man, nor offers any means for his regeneration. “If you will be good you will be happy,” it says: that may be, but my will is weak; I sink in the struggle.

VII. That Socinianism never did and never can subsist as a general religion. For 1. It neither states the disease, on account of which the human being hungers for revelation, nor prepares any remedy in general, nor ministers any hope to the individual. 2. In order to make itself endurable on scriptural grounds, it must so weaken the texts and authority of Scripture, as to leave in Scripture no binding ground of proof of anything. 3. Take a pious Jew, one of the Maccabees, and compare his faith and its grounds with Priestley's; and then, for what did Christ come?

VIII. That Socinianism involves the shocking thought that man will not, and ought not to be expected to, do his duty as man, unless he first makes a bargain with his Maker, and his Maker with him. Give me, the individual me, a positive proof that I shall be in a state of pleasure after my death, if I do so and so, and then I will do it, not else! And the proof asked is not one dependent on, or flowing from, his moral nature and moral feelings, but wholly *extra-moral*, namely, by his outward senses, the subjugation of which to faith, that is, the passive to the actional and self-created belief, is the great object of all religion!

IX. That Socinianism involves the dreadful reflection, that it can establish its probability (its certainty

being wholly out of the question and impossible, Priestley himself declaring that his own continuance as a Christian depended on a contingency,) only on the destruction of all the arguments furnished for our permanent and essential distinction from brutes ; that it must prove that we have no grounds to obey, but, on the contrary, that in wisdom we ought to reject and declare utterly null all the commands of conscience, and all that is implied in those commands, reckless of the confusion introduced into our notions of means and ends by the denial of truth, goodness, justice, mercy, and the other fundamental ideas in the idea of God ; and all this in order to conduct us to a Mahomet's bridge of a knife's edge, or the breadth of a spear, to salvation. And, should we discover any new documents, or should an acute logician make plain the sophistry of the deductions drawn from the present documents (and surely a man who has passed from orthodoxy to the loosest Arminianism, and thence to Arianism, and thence to direct Humanism, has no right from his experience to deny the probability of this)—then to fall off into the hopeless abyss of atheism. For the present life, we know, is governed by fixed laws, which the atheist acknowledges as well as the theist ; and if there be no spiritual world, and no spiritual life in a spiritual world, what possible bearing can the admission or rejection of this hypothesis have on our practice or feelings ?

Lastly, the Mosaic dispensation was a scheme of national education ; the Christian is a world-religion ; and the former was susceptible of evidence and probabilities which do not, and cannot, apply to the latter. A savage people forced, as it were, into a school of circumstances, and gradually in the course of generations taught the unity of God, first and for centuries merely as a practical abstinence from the



worship of any other,—how can the principles of such a system apply to Christianity, which goes into all nations and to all men, the most enlightened, even by preference?

Writing several years later than the date of the preceding paragraphs, I commend the modern Unitarians for their candour in giving up the possible worshipability of Christ, if not very God,—a proof that truth will ultimately prevail. The Arians, then existing, against whom Waterland wrote, were not converted; but in the next generation the arguments made their way. This is fame *versus* reputation.

#### THE APOSTLES' CREED.

Is it not probable, from what is found in the writings of Cyril, Eusebius, Cyprian, Marcellus of Ancyra, and others, that our present Apostles' Creed is not the very *Symbolum Fidei*, which was not to be written,\* but was always repeated at baptism? For this latter certainly contained the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Logos; and, therefore, it seems likely that the present Apostles' Creed was an introductory, and, as it were, alphabetical, creed for young catechumens in their first elementation. Is it to be believed that the *Symbolum Fidei* contained nothing but the mere history of Jesus, without any of the peculiar doctrines, or that, if it did not contain something more, the great and vehement defenders of the Trinity would speak of it so magni-

\* "So either by the Apostles, or at the leastwise out of their writings, we have the substance of Christian belief compendiously drawn into few and short articles, &c."—Hooker's *Ecl. Pol.*, vol. ii., p. 81; Keble's edit., B. V. C., 18. 3.

See the passage from Rufinus, quoted at the same place: "*Hæc non scribi chartulis atque membranis, sed retineri cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset, neminem hæc ex lectione, quæ interdum pervenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex apostolorum traditione didicisse.*"—Ed.

ficently as they do, even preferring its authority to that of the Scriptures? Besides, does not Austin positively say that our present Apostles' Creed was gathered out of the Scriptures? Whereas the *Symbolum Fidei* was elder than the Gospels, and probably contained only the three doctrines of the Trinity, the Redemption, and the Unity of the Church. May it not have happened, when baptism was administered so early, and at last even to infants, that the old *Symbolum Fidei* became gradually *inusitatum*, as being appropriated to adult proselytes from Judaism or Paganism? This seems to me even more than probable; for in proportion to the majority of born over converted Christians must the creed of instruction have been more frequent than that of doctrinal profession.

#### A GOOD HEART.

There is in Abbt's Essays an attempt to determine the true sense of this phrase, at least to unfold (*auseinandersetzen*) what is meant and felt by it. I was much pleased with the remarks, I remember, and with the counter-position of Tom Jones and Sir Charles Grandison. Might not Luther and Calvin serve? But it is made less noticeable in these last by its co-existence with, and sometimes real, more often apparent, subordination to fixed conscious principles, and is thus less naturally characteristic. Parson Adams contrasted with Dr. Harrison in Fielding's "Amelia" would do. Then there is the suppression of the good heart and the substitution of principles or motives for the good heart, as in Laud, and the whole race of conscientious persecutors. Such principles constitute the virtues of the Inquisition. A good heart contrasts with the Pharisaic

righteousness. This last contemplation of the Pharisees, the dogmatists, and the rigorists *in toto genere*, serves to reconcile me to the fewness of the men who act on fixed principles. For unless there exist intellectual power to determine aright what are the *principia jam fixa et formata*, and unless there be the wisdom of love preceding the love of wisdom, and unless to this be added a graciousness of nature, a loving kindness,—these rigorists are but bigots often to errors, and active, yea, remorseless in preventing or staying the rise and progress of truth. And even when bigoted adherents to true principles, yet they render truth unamiable, and forbid little children to come thereunto. As human nature now is, it is well, perhaps, that the number should be few, seeing that of the few, the greater part are prematurities.

The number of those who act from good-hearted impulses, a kindly and cheerful mood, and the play of minute sympathies, continuous in their discontinuity, like the sand-thread of the hour-glass, and from their minuteness and transiency not calculated to stiffen or inflate the individual, and thus remaining unendangered by egotism, and its unhandsome vizard contempt, is far larger: and though these temperamental *pro*-virtues will too often fail, and are not built to stand the storms of strong temptation; yet on the whole they carry on the benignant scheme of social nature, like the other instincts that rule the animal creation. But of all the most numerous are the men, who have evermore their own dearest beloved self, as the only or main goal or butt of their endeavours, straight and steady before their eyes, and whose whole inner world turns on the great axis of self-interest. These form the majority, if not of mankind, yet of those by whom the business of life

is carried on ; and most expedient it is, that so it should be ; nor can we imagine anything better contrived for the advantage of society. For these are the most industrious, orderly, and circumspect portion of society, and the actions governed by this principle with the results, are the only materials on which either the statesman or individuals can safely calculate.

There is, indeed, another sort (a class they can scarcely be called) who are below self-interest ; who live under the mastery of their senses and appetites ; and whose selfishness is an animal instinct, a goad *à tergo*, not an attraction *à re prospectu*, or (so to speak) from a projected self. In fact, such individuals cannot so properly be said to have a self, as to be machines for the self of nature : and are as little capable of loving themselves as of loving their neighbours. Such there are. Nay (if we were to count only without weighing), the aggregate of such persons might possibly form a larger number than the class preceding. But they may safely be taken up into the latter, for the main ends of society, as being or sure to become its materials and tools. Their folly is the stuff in which the sound sense of the worldly-wise is at once manifested and remunerated ; their idleness of thought, with the passions, appetites, likings and fancies, which are its natural growth, though weeds, give direction and employment to the industry of the other. The accidents of inheritance by birth, of accumulation of property in partial masses, are thus counteracted,—and the aneurisms in the circulating system prevented or rendered fewer and less obstinate,—whilst animal want, the sure general result of idleness and its accompanying vices, tames at length the selfish host into the laborious slaves and mechanic implements of the self-interested. Thus, without

public spirit, nay, by the predominance of the opposite quality, the latter are the public benefactors: and, giving steadfastness and compactness to the whole, lay in the ground of the canvass, on which minds of finer texture may impress beauty and harmony.

Lastly, there is in the heart of all men a working principle,—call it ambition, or vanity, or desire of distinction, the inseparable adjunct of our individuality and personal nature, and flowing from the same source as language—the instinct and necessity in each man of declaring his particular existence, and thus of singling or singularising himself. In some this principle is far stronger than in others, while in others its comparative dimness may pass for its non-existence. But in thoughts at least, and secret fancies there is in all men (idiocy of course excepted) a wish to remain the same and yet to be something else, and something more, or to exhibit what they are, or imagine they might be, somewhere else and to other spectators. Now, though this desire of distinction, when it is disproportionate to the powers and qualities by which the individual is indeed distinguished, or when it is the governing passion, or taken as the rule of conduct, is but a “knavish sprite,” yet as an attendant and subaltern spirit, it has its good purposes and beneficial effects: and is not seldom

— sent with broom before,  
To sweep the dust behind the door.

Though selfish in its origin, it yet tends to elevate the individual from selfishness into self-love, under a softer and perhaps better form than that of self-interest, the form of self-respect. Whatever other objects the man may be pursuing, and with whatever other inclinations, he is still by this principle

impelled and almost compelled to pass out of himself in imagination, and to survey himself at a sufficient distance, in order to judge what figure he is likely to make in the eyes of his fellow-men. But in thus taking his station as at the apex of a triangle, while the self is at one angle of the base, he makes it possible at least that the image of his neighbour may appear at the other, whether by spontaneous association, or placed there for the purposes of comparison; and so both be contemplated at equal distance. But this is the first step towards disinterestedness; and though it should never be reached, the advantage of the appearance is soon learnt, and the necessity of avoiding the appearance of the contrary. But appearances cannot be long sustained without some touch of the reality. At all events there results a control over our actions; some good may be produced, and many a poisonous or offensive fruit will be prevented. Courtesy, urbanity, gallantry, munificence; the outward influence of the law shall I call it, or rather fashion of honour—these are the handsome hypocrisies that spring from the desire of distinction. I ask not the genius of a Machiavel, a Tacitus, or a Swift;—it needs only a worldly experience and an observing mind, to convince a man of forty that there is no medium between the creed of misanthropy and that of the gospel.

A pagan might be as orthodox as Paul on the doctrine of works. First,—set aside the large portion of them that have their source in the constitutional temperament,—the merit of which, if any, belongs to nature, not to the individual agent; and of the remaining number of good works, nine are derived from vices for one that has its origin in virtue. I have often in looking at the water-works and complex machinery of our manufactories, indulged a humorous

mood by fancying that the hammers, cogs, fly-wheels, &c., were each actuated by some appetite, or passion—hate, rage, revenge, vanity, cupidity, &c., while the general result was most benignant, and the machine, taken as a whole, the product of power, knowledge, and benevolence! Such a machine does the moral world, the world of human nature, appear—and to those who seem evermore to place the comparison and the alternative between hell and earth, and quite overlook the opposition between earth and heaven, I recommend this meditation.

#### EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.\*

I. Miracles—as precluding the contrary evidence of no miracles.

II. The material of Christianity, its existence and history.

III. The doctrines of Christianity, and the correspondence of human nature to those doctrines,—illustrated, 1st, historically—as the actual production of a new world, and the dependence of the fate of the planet upon it;—2nd, individually—from its appeal for its truth to an asserted fact,—which, whether it be real or not, every man possessing reason has an equal power of ascertaining within himself;—namely, a will which has more or less lost its freedom, though not the consciousness that it ought to be and may become free;—the conviction that this cannot be achieved without the operation of a principle con-natural with itself;—the evident rationality of an entire confidence in that principle, being the condition and means of its operation;—the experience in his own nature of the truth of the process described by

\* Dictated to, and communicated by, Dr. Brabant, of Devizes.—  
ED.

Scripture as far as he can place himself within the process, aided by the confident assurances of others as to the effects experienced by them, and which he is striving to arrive at. All these form a practical Christian. Add, however, a gradual opening out of the intellect to more and more clear perceptions of the strict coincidence of the doctrines of Christianity, with the truths evolved by the mind, from reflections on its own nature. To such a man one main test of the objectivity, the entity, the objective truth of his faith, is its accompaniment by an increase of insight into the moral beauty and necessity of the process which it comprises, and the dependence of that proof on the causes asserted. Believe, and if thy belief be right, that insight which gradually transmutes faith into knowledge will be the reward of that belief. The Christian, to whom, after a long profession of Christianity, the mysteries remain as much mysteries as before, is in the same state as a schoolboy with regard to his arithmetic to whom the *facit* at the end of the examples in his cyphering book is the whole ground for his assuming that such and such figures amount to so and so.

3rd. In the above I include the increasing discoveries in the correspondence of the history, the doctrines, and the promises of Christianity, with the past, present, and probable future of human nature; and in this state a fair comparison of the religion as a divine philosophy, with all other religions which have pretended to revelations, and all other systems of philosophy; both with regard to the totality of its truth and its identification with the manifest march of affairs.

I should conclude that, if we suppose a man to have convinced himself that not only the doctrines of Christianity, which may be conceived independently of



history or time, as the Trinity, spiritual influences, &c., are coincident with the truths which his reason, thus strengthened, has evolved from its own sources, but that the historical dogmas, namely, of the incarnation of the creative Logos, and his becoming a personal agent, are themselves founded in philosophical necessity; then it seems irrational, that such a man should reject the belief of the actual appearance of a religion strictly correspondent therewith, at a given time recorded, even as much as that he should reject Cæsar's account of his wars in Gaul, after he has convinced himself *à priori* of their probability.

As the result of these convictions he will not scruple to receive the particular miracles recorded, inasmuch as it would be miraculous that an incarnate God should not work what must to mere men appear as miracles; inasmuch as it is strictly accordant with the ends and benevolent nature of such a Being, to commence the elevation of man above his mere senses by attracting and enforcing attention, first through an appeal to those senses. But with equal reason will he expect that no other or greater force should be laid on these miracles as such; that they should not be spoken of as good in themselves, much less as the adequate and ultimate proof of that religion; and likewise he will receive additional satisfaction, should he find these miracles so wrought, and on such occasions, as to give them a personal value as symbols of important truths when their miraculousness was no longer needful or efficacious.

## CONFESSIO FIDEL. Nov. 3rd, 1816.

## I.

I. I believe that I am a free-agent, inasmuch as, and so far as, I have a will, which renders me justly responsible for my actions, omissive as well as commissive. Likewise that I possess reason, or a law of right and wrong, which, uniting with my sense of moral responsibility, constitutes the voice of conscience.

II. Hence it becomes my absolute duty to believe, and I do believe, that there is a God, that is, a Being, in whom supreme reason and a most holy will are one with an infinite power; and that all holy will is coincident with the will of God, and therefore secure in its ultimate consequences by His omnipotence;—having, if such similitude be not unlawful, such a relation to the goodness of the Almighty, as a perfect time-piece will have to the sun.

## COROLLARY.

The wonderful works of God in the sensible world are a perpetual discourse, reminding me of His existence, and shadowing out to me His perfections. But as all language presupposes in the intelligent hearer or reader those primary notions, which it symbolises; as well as the power of making those combinations of these primary notions, which it represents and excites us to combine,—even so I believe, that the notion of God is essential to the human mind; that it is called forth into distinct consciousness principally by the conscience, and auxiliarily by the manifest adaptation of means to ends in the outward creation. It is, therefore, evident to

my reason, that the existence of God is absolutely and necessarily insusceptible of a scientific demonstration, and that Scripture has so represented it. For it commands us to believe in one God. *I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but me.* Now all commandment necessarily relates to the will; whereas all scientific demonstration is independent of the will, and is apodictic or demonstrative only as far as it is compulsory on the mind, *volentem nolentem.*

III. My conscience forbids me to propose to myself the pains and pleasures of this life, as the primary motive, or ultimate end, of my actions;—on the contrary, it makes me perceive an utter disproportionateness and heterogeneity between the acts of the spirit, as virtue and vice, and the things of the sense, such as all earthly rewards and punishments must be. Its hopes and fears, therefore, refer me to a different and spiritual state of being: and I believe in the life to come, not through arguments acquired by my understanding or discursive faculty, but chiefly and effectively, because so to believe is my duty, and in obedience to the commands of my conscience.

Here ends the first table of my creed, which would have been my creed, had I been born with Adam; and which therefore constitutes what may in this sense be called natural religion, that is, the religion of all finite rational beings. The second table contains the creed of revealed religion, my belief as a Christian.

## II.

IV. I believe, and hold it as the fundamental article of Christianity, that I am a fallen creature; that I am of myself capable of moral evil, but not of myself capable of moral good, and that an evil

ground existed in my will, previously to any given act, or assignable moment of time, in my consciousness. I am born a child of wrath. This fearful mystery I pretend not to understand. I cannot even conceive the possibility of it,—but I know that it is so. My conscience, the sole fountain of certainty, commands me to believe it, and would itself be a contradiction, were it not so—and what is real must be possible.

V. I receive with full and grateful faith the assurance of revelation, that the Word, which is from all eternity with God, and is God, assumed our human nature in order to redeem me, and all mankind from this our connate corruption. My reason convinces me, that no other mode of redemption is conceivable, and, as did Socrates, would have yearned after the Redeemer, though it would not dare expect so wonderful an act of divine love, except only as an effort of my mind to conceive the utmost of the infinite greatness of that love.

VI. I believe that this assumption of humanity by the Son of God, was revealed and realised to us by the Word made flesh, and manifested to us in Christ Jesus; and that his miraculous birth, his agony, his crucifixion, death, resurrection, and ascension, were all both symbols of our redemption (*φαινόμενα τῶν νουμένων*) and necessary parts of the awful process.

VII. I believe in the descent and sending of the Holy Spirit, by whose free grace obtained for me by the merits of my Redeemer, I can alone be sanctified and restored from my natural inheritance of sin and condemnation, be a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of God.

## COROLLARY.

The Trinity of persons in the Unity of the God would have been a necessary idea of my speculative reason, deduced from the necessary postulate of an intelligent creator, whose ideas being anterior to the things, must be more actual than those things, even as those things are more actual than our images derived from them; and who, as intelligent, must have had co-eternally an adequate idea of himself, in and through which he created all things both in heaven and earth. But this would only have been a speculative idea, like those of circles and other mathematical figures, to which we are not authorised by the practical reason to attribute reality. Solely in consequence of our Redemption does the Trinity become a doctrine, the belief of which as real is commanded by our conscience. But to Christians it is commanded, and it is false candour in a Christian, believing in original sin and redemption therefrom, to admit that any man denying the divinity of Christ can be a Christian. The true language of a Christian, which reconciles humility with truth, would be;—God and not man is the judge of man: which of the two is the Christian, he will determine; but this is evident, that if the theanthropist is a Christian, the psilanthropist cannot be so; and *vice versa*. Suppose, that two tribes used the same written characters, but attached different and opposite meanings to them, so that *niger*, for instance, was used by one tribe to convey the notion *black*, by the other *white*;—could they, without absurdity, be said to have the same language? Even so, in the instance of the crucifixion, the same image is present to the theanthropist and to the psilanthropist or Socinian—but to the latter it represents a mere man, a good man indeed and

divinely inspired, but still a mere man, even as Moses or Paul, dying in attestation of the truth of his preaching, and in order by his resurrection to give a proof of his mission, and inclusively of the resurrection of all men :—to the former it represents God incarnate taking upon himself the sins of the world, and himself thereby redeeming us, and giving us life everlasting, not merely teaching it. The same difference, that exists between God and man, between giving and the declaration of a gift, exists between the Trinitarian and the Unitarian. This might be proved in a few moments, if we would only conceive a Greek or Roman, to whom two persons relate their belief, each calling Christ by a different name. It would be impossible for the Greek even to guess, that they both meant the same person, or referred to the same facts.

---

ESSAY ON FAITH.

Faith may be defined, as fidelity to our own being—so far as such being is not and cannot become an object of the senses ; and hence, by clear inference or implication, to being generally, as far as the same is not the object of the senses : and again to whatever is affirmed or understood as the condition, or concomitant, or consequence of the same. This will be best explained by an instance or example. That I am conscious of something within me peremptorily commanding me to do unto others as I would they should do unto me ;—in other words, a categorical (that is, primary and unconditional) imperative ;—that the maxim (*regula maxima* or supreme rule) of my actions, both inward and outward, should be such as I could, without any contradiction arising

therefrom, will to be the law of all moral and rational beings ;—this, I say, is a fact of which I am no less conscious (though in a different way), nor less assured, than I am of any appearance presented by my outward senses. Nor is this all ; but in the very act of being conscious of this in my own nature, I know that it is a fact of which all men either are or ought to be conscious ;—a fact, the ignorance of which constitutes either the non-personality of the ignorant, or the guilt, in which latter case the ignorance is equivalent to knowledge wilfully darkened. I know that I possess this consciousness as a man, and not as Samuel Taylor Coleridge ; hence knowing that consciousness of this fact is the root of all other consciousness, and the only practical contradistinction of man from brutes, we name it the conscience ; by the natural absence or presumed presence of which, the law, both divine and human, determines whether X Y Z be a thing or a person :—the conscience being that which never to have had places the objects in the same order of things as the brutes, for example, idiots ; and to have lost which implies either insanity or apostasy. Well—this we have affirmed is a fact of which every honest man is as fully assured as of his seeing, hearing, or smelling. But though the former assurance does not differ from the latter in the degree, it is altogether diverse in the kind ; the senses being morally passive, while the conscience is essentially connected with the will, though not always, nor indeed in any case, except after frequent attempts and aversions of will, dependent on the choice. Thence we call the presentations of the senses impressions, those of the conscience commands or dictates. In the senses we find our receptivity, and as far as our personal being is concerned, we are passive ;—but in the fact of the conscience we are

not only agents, but it is by this alone, that we know ourselves to be such ; nay, that our very passiveness in this latter is an act of passiveness, and that we are patient (*patientes*)—not, as in the other case, *simply* passive.

The result is, the consciousness of responsibility ; and the proof is afforded by the inward experience of the diversity between regret and remorse.

If I have sound ears, and my companion speaks to me with a due proportion of voice, I may persuade him that I did not hear, but cannot deceive myself. But when my conscience speaks to me, I can, by repeated efforts, render myself finally insensible ; to which add this other difference in the case of conscience, namely, that to make myself deaf is one and the same thing with making my conscience dumb, till at length I become unconscious of my conscience. Frequent are the instances in which it is suspended, and as it were drowned, in the inundation of the appetites, passions and imaginations, to which I have resigned myself, making use of my will in order to abandon my free-will ; and there are not, I fear, examples wanting of the conscience being utterly destroyed, or of the passage of wickedness into madness ;—that species of madness, namely, in which the reason is lost. For so long as the reason continues, so long must the conscience exist either as a good conscience, or as a bad conscience.

It appears, then, that even the very first step, that the initiation of the process, the becoming conscious of a conscience, partakes of the nature of an act. It is an act, in and by which we take upon ourselves an allegiance, and consequently the obligation of fealty ; and this fealty or fidelity implying the power of being unfaithful, it is the first and fundamental sense of Faith. It is likewise the commencement



of experience, and the result of all other experience. In other words, conscience, in this its simplest form, must be supposed in order to consciousness, that is, to human consciousness. Brutes may be, and are scious, but those beings only, who have an I, *scire possunt hoc vel illud una cum seipsis*; that is, *conscire vel scire aliquid mecum*, or to know a thing in relation to myself, and in the act of knowing myself as acted upon by that something.

Now the third person could never have been distinguished from the first but by means of the second. There can be no He without a previous Thou. Much less could an I exist for us, except as it exists during the suspension of the will, as in dreams; and the nature of brutes may be best understood, by conceiving them as somnambulists. This is a deep meditation, though the position is capable of the strictest proof,—namely, that there can be no I without a Thou, and that a Thou is only possible by an equation in which I is taken as equal to Thou, and yet not the same. And this again is only possible by putting them in opposition as correspondent opposites, or correlatives. In order to this, a something must be affirmed in the one, which is rejected in the other, and this something is the will. I do not will to consider myself as equal to myself, for in the very act of constituting myself I, I take it as the same, and therefore as incapable of comparison, that is, of any application of the will. If then, I *minus* the will be the *thesis*; \* Thou *plus* will must

\* There are four kinds of *Theses*, *thesis*, puttings or placings.

1. *Prothesis.*
2. *Thesis.*
3. *Antithesis.*
4. *Synthesis.*

A. and B. are said to be *thesis* and *antithesis*, when if A. be the *thesis*, B. is the *antithesis* to A., and if B. be made the *thesis*, then A. becomes the *antithesis*. Thus making me the *thesis*, you are thou to me, but making you the *thesis*, I become thou to you. *Synthesis* is a putting

be the *antithesis*, but the equation of Thou with I, by means of a free act, negating the sameness in order to establish the equality, is the true definition of conscience. But as without a Thou there can be no You, so without a You no They, These or Those; and as all these conjointly form the materials and subjects of consciousness, and the conditions of experience, it is evident that the conscience is the root of all consciousness,—*à fortiori*, the precondition of all experience,—and that the conscience cannot have been in its first revelation deduced from experience.

Soon, however, experience comes into play. We learn that there are other impulses beside the dictates of conscience; that there are powers within us and without us ready to usurp the throne of conscience, and busy in tempting us to transfer our allegiance. We learn that there are many things contrary to conscience, and therefore to be rejected, and utterly excluded, and many that can coexist with its supremacy only by being subjugated, as beasts of burthen; and others again, as for instance, the social tenderness and affections, and the faculties and excitations of the intellect, which must be at least subordinated. The preservation of our loyalty and fealty under these trials and against these rivals constitutes the second sense of Faith; and we shall need but one more point of view to complete its full import. This is the consideration of what is presupposed in the human conscience. The answer is ready. As in the equation of the correlative I and Thou, one of the twin constituents is to be taken as *plus* will, the

together of the two, so that a third something is generated. Thus the *synthesis* of hydrogen and oxygen is water, a third something, neither hydrogen nor oxygen. But the blade of a knife and its handle when put together do not form a *synthesis*, but still remain a blade and a handle. And as a *synthesis* is a unity that results from the union of two things, so a *prothesis* is a primary unity that gives itself forth into two things.

other as *minus* will, so is it here : and it is obvious that the reason or *super*-individual of each man, whereby he is man, is the factor we are to take as *minus* will ; and that the individual will or personalising principle of free agency (arbitrement is Milton's word) is the factor marked *plus* will ;—and again, that as the identity or coinherence of the absolute will and the reason, is the peculiar character of God ; so is the *synthesis* of the individual will and the common reason, by the subordination of the former to the latter, the only possible likeness or image of the *prothesis*, or identity, and therefore the required proper character of man. Conscience, then, is a witness respecting the identity of the will and the reason effected by the self-subordination of the will, or self, to the reason, as equal to, or representing, the will of God. But the personal will is a factor in other moral *syntheses* ; for example, appetite *plus* personal will, = sensuality ; lust of power *plus* personal will, = ambition, and so on, equally as in the *synthesis*, on which the conscience is grounded. Not this, therefore, but the other *synthesis*, must supply the specific character of the conscience ; and we must enter into an analysis of reason. Such as the nature and objects of the reason are, such must be the functions and objects of the conscience. And the former we shall best learn by recapitulating those constituents of the total man which are either contrary to, or disparate from, the reason.

I. Reason, and the proper objects of reason, are wholly alien from sensation. Reason is supersensual, and its antagonist is appetite, and the objects of appetite the lust of the flesh.

II. Reason and its objects do not appertain to the world of the senses inward or outward ; that is, they partake not of sense or fancy. Reason is

supersensuous, and here its antagonist is the lust of the eye.

III. Reason and its objects are not things of reflection, association, discursion, discourse in the old sense of the word, as opposed to intuition; "discursive or intuitive," as Milton has it. Reason does not indeed necessarily exclude the finite, either in time or in space, but it includes them *eminenter*. Thus the prime mover of the material universe is affirmed to contain all motion as its cause, but not to be, or to suffer, motion in itself.

Reason is not the faculty of the finite. But here I must premise the following. The faculty of the finite is that which reduces the confused impressions of sense to their essential forms,—quantity, quality, relation, and in these action and reaction, cause and effect, and the like; thus raises the materials furnished by the senses and sensations into objects of reflection, and so makes experience possible. Without it, man's representative powers would be a delirium, a chaos, a scudding cloudage of shapes; and it is therefore most appropriately called the understanding, or substantiative faculty. Our elder metaphysicians, down to Hobbes inclusively, called this likewise discourse, *discursus*, *discursio*, from its mode of action, as not staying at any one object, but running as it were to and fro to abstract, generalise, and classify. Now when this faculty is employed in the service of the pure reason, it brings out the necessary and universal truths contained in the infinite into distinct contemplation by the pure act of the sensuous imagination, that is, in the production of the forms of space and time abstracted from all corporeity, and likewise of the inherent forms of the understanding itself abstractedly from the consideration of particulars, as in the case of geometry, numeral mathe-

matics, universal logic, and pure metaphysics. The discursive faculty then becomes what our Shakspeare with happy precision calls "discourse of reason."

We will now take up our reasoning again from the words "motion in itself."

It is evident then, that the reason, as the irradiative power, and the representative of the infinite, judges the understanding as the faculty of the finite, and cannot without error be judged by it. When this is attempted, or when the understanding, in its *synthesis* with the personal will, usurps the supremacy of the reason, or affects to supersede the reason, it is then what St. Paul calls the mind of the flesh (*φρόνημα σαρκός*), or the wisdom of this world. The result is, that the reason is super-finite; and in this relation its antagonist is the insubordinate understanding, or mind of the flesh.

IV. Reason, as one with the absolute will, (*In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God,*) and therefore for man the certain representative of the will of God, is above the will of man as an individual will. We have seen in III. that it stands in antagonism to all mere particulars; but here it stands in antagonism to all mere individual interests as so many selves, to the personal will as seeking its objects in the manifestation of itself for itself—*sit pro ratione voluntas*;—whether this be realised with adjuncts, as in the lust of the flesh, and in the lust of the eye; or without adjuncts, as in the thirst and pride of power, despotism, egoistic ambition. The fourth antagonist, then, of reason is the lust of the will.

#### COROLLARY.

Unlike a million of tigers, a million of men is very different from a million times one man. Each man

in a numerous society is not only coexistent with, but virtually organised into, the multitude of which he is an integral part. His *idem* is modified by the *alter*. And there arise impulses and objects from this *synthesis* of the *alter et idem*, myself and my neighbour. This, again, is strictly analogous to what takes place in the vital organisation of the individual man. The cerebral system of the nerves has its correspondent *antithesis* in the abdominal system; but hence arises a *synthesis* of the two in the pectoral system as the intermediate, and, like a drawbridge, at once conductor and boundary. In the latter as objectised by the former arise the emotions, affections, and in one word, the passions, as distinguished from the cognitions and appetites. Now the reason has been shown to be super-individual, generally, and therefore not less so when the form of an individualisation subsists in the *alter*, than when it is confined to the *idem*; not less when the emotions have their conscious or believed object in another, than when their subject is the individual personal self. For though these emotions, affections, attachments, and the like, are the prepared ladder by which the lower nature is taken up into, and made to partake of, the highest room,—as we are taught to give a feeling of reality to the higher *per medium commune* with the lower, and thus gradually to see the reality of the higher (namely, the objects of reason) and finally to know that the latter are indeed and pre-eminently real, as if you love your earthly parents whom you see, by these means you will learn to love your Heavenly Father who is invisible;—yet this holds good only so far as the reason is the president, and its objects the ultimate aim; and cases may arise in which the Christ as the Logos or Redemptive Reason declares, *He that loves father or mother more than me, is not*

*worthy of me*; nay, he that can permit his emotions to rise to an equality with the universal reason, is in enmity with that reason, Here then reason appears as the love of God; and its antagonist is the attachment to individuals wherever it exists in diminution of, or in competition with, the love which is reason.

In these five paragraphs I have enumerated and explained the several powers or forces belonging or incidental to human nature, which in all matters of reason the man is bound either to subjugate or subordinate to reason. The application to Faith follows of its own accord. The first or most indefinite sense of faith is fidelity: then fidelity under previous contract or particular moral obligation. In this sense faith is fealty to a rightful superior; faith is the duty of a faithful subject to a rightful governor. Then it is allegiance in active service; fidelity to the liege lord under circumstances, and amid the temptations, of usurpation, rebellion, and intestine discord. Next we seek for that rightful superior on our duties to whom all our duties to all other superiors, on our faithfulness to whom all our bounden relations to all other objects of fidelity, are founded. We must inquire after that duty in which all others find their several degrees and dignities, and from which they derive their obligative force. We are to find a superior, whose rights, including our duties, are presented to the mind in the very idea of that Supreme Being, whose sovereign prerogatives are predicates implied in the subjects, as the essential properties of a circle are co-assumed in the first assumption of a circle, consequently underived, unconditional, and as rationally insusceptible, so probably prohibitive of all further question. In this sense then faith is fidelity, fealty, allegiance of the moral nature, to God, in opposition to all usurpation, and in resistance to all

temptation to the placing any other claim above or equal with our fidelity to God.

The will of God is the last ground and final aim of all our duties, and to that the whole man is to be harmonised by subordination, subjugation, or suppression alike in commission and omission. But the will of God, which is one with the supreme intelligence, is revealed to man through the conscience. But the conscience, which consists in an inappellable bearing-witness to the truth and reality of our reason, may legitimately be construed with the term reason, so far as the conscience is prescriptive; while as approving or condemning, it is the consciousness of the subordination or insubordination, the harmony or discord, of the personal will of man to and with the representative of the will of God. This brings me to the last and fullest sense of Faith, that is, as the obedience of the individual will to the reason, in the lust of the flesh as opposed to the supersensual; in the lust of the eye as opposed to the supersensuous; in the pride of the understanding as opposed to the infinite; in the *φρόνημα σαρκός* in contrariety to the spiritual truth; in the lust of the personal will as opposed to the absolute and universal; and in the love of the creature, as far as it is opposed to the love which is one with the reason, namely, the love of God.

Thus then to conclude. Faith subsists in the *synthesis* of the reason and the individual will. By virtue of the latter therefore it must be an energy, and inasmuch as it relates to the whole moral man, it must be exerted in each and all of his constituents or incidents, faculties, and tendencies;—it must be a total, not a partial; a continuous, not a desultory or occasional energy. And by virtue of the former, that is, reason, faith must be a light, a form of knowing,



a beholding of truth. In the incomparable words of the Evangelist, therefore—*faith must be a light originating in the Logos, or the substantial reason, which is coeternal and one with the Holy Will, and which light is at the same time the life of men.* Now as life is here the sum or collective of all moral and spiritual acts, in suffering, doing, and being, so is faith the source and the sum, the energy and the principle of the fidelity of man to God, by the subordination of his human will, in all provinces of his nature, to his reason, as the sum of spiritual truth, representing and manifesting the will Divine.

FORMULA FIDEI DE SANCTISSIMA TRINITATE. 1830.

THE IDENTITY.

The absolute subjectivity, whose only attribute is the Good; whose only definition is—that which is essentially causative of all possible true being; the ground; the absolute will; the adorable *πρόπρωτον*, which, whatever is assumed as the first, must be presumed as its antecedent; Θεός, without an article, and yet not as an adjective. See John i. 18. Θεόν οὐδέις ἑώρακε πρόποτε, as differenced from ib. 1. καὶ Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος.

But that which is essentially causative of all being must be causative of its own,—*causa sui*, *αὐτοπάτωρ*. Thence

THE IPSEITY.

The eternally self-affirmant self-affirmed; the “I Am in that I am,” or the “I shall be that I will to be;” the Father; the relatively subjective, whose attribute is, the Holy One; whose definition is, the

essential finific in the form of the infinite; *dat sibi fines*.

But the absolute will, the absolute good, in the eternal act of self-affirmation, the Good as the Holy One, co-eternally begets

#### THE ALTERITY.

The supreme being; ὁ ὄντως ὄν; the supreme reason; the Jehovah; the Son; the Word; whose attribute is the True (the truth, the light, the *fiat*); and whose definition is, the *pleroma* of being, whose essential poles are unity and distinctity; or the essential infinite in the form of the finite;—lastly, the relatively objective, *deitas objectiva* in relation to the I Am as the *deitas subjectiva*; the divine objectivity.

N.B. The distinctities in the *pleroma* are the eternal ideas, the subsistential truths; each considered in itself, an infinite in the form of the finite; but all considered as one with the unity, the eternal Son, they are the energies of the finific; πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο—καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν. John i. 3, 16.

But with the relatively subjective and the relatively objective, the great idea needs only for its completion a co-eternal which is both, that is, relatively objective to the subjective, relatively subjective to the objective. Hence

#### THE COMMUNITY.

The eternal life, which is love; the Spirit; relatively to the Father, the Spirit of Holiness, the Holy Spirit; relatively to the Son, the Spirit of truth, whose attribute is Wisdom; *sancta sophia*; the Good in the reality of the True, in the form of actual Life.

Holy! Holy! Holy! ἰλάσθητί μοι.

## A NIGHTLY PRAYER. 1831.

ALMIGHTY GOD, by thy eternal Word, my Creator, Redeemer, and Preserver! who hast in thy free communicative goodness glorified me with the capability of knowing thee, the one only absolute Good, the eternal I Am, as the author of my being, and of desiring and seeking thee as its ultimate end;—who, when I fell from thee into the mystery of the false and evil will, didst not abandon me, poor self-lost creature, but in thy condescending mercy didst provide an access and a return to thyself, even to thee the Holy One, in thine only begotten Son, the way and the truth from everlasting, and who took on himself humanity, yea, became flesh, even the man Christ Jesus, that for man he might be the life and the resurrection!—O Giver of all good gifts, who art thyself the one only absolute Good, from whom I have received whatever good I have, whatever capability of good there is in me, and from thee good alone,—from myself and my own corrupted will all evil and the consequents of evil,—with inward prostration of will, mind, and affections I adore thy infinite majesty; I aspire to love thy transcendent goodness!—In a deep sense of my unworthiness, and my unfitness to present myself before thee, of eyes too pure to behold iniquity, and whose light, the beatitude of spirits conformed to thy will, is a consuming fire to all vanity and corruption;—but in the name of the Lord Jesus, of the dear Son of thy love, in whose perfect obedience thou deignest to behold as many as have received the seed of Christ into the body of this death;—I offer this my bounden nightly sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, in humble trust, that the fragrance of my Saviour's righteousness

may remove from it the taint of my mortal corruption. Thy mercies have followed me through all the hours and moments of my life; and now I lift up my heart in awe and thankfulness for the preservation of my life through the past day, for the alleviation of my bodily sufferings and languors, for the manifold comforts which thou hast reserved for me, yea, in thy fatherly compassion hast rescued from the wreck of my own sins or sinful infirmities;—for the kind and affectionate friends thou hast raised up for me, especially for those of this household, for the mother and mistress of this family, whose love to me hath been great and faithful, and for the dear friend, the supporter and sharer of my studies and researches; but above all, for the heavenly Friend, the crucified Saviour, the glorified Mediator, Christ Jesus, and for the heavenly Comforter, source of all abiding comforts, thy Holy Spirit! O grant me the aid of thy Spirit, that I may with a deeper faith, a more enkindled love, bless thee, who through thy Son hast privileged me to call thee Abba, Father! O, thou who hast revealed thyself in thy holy word as a God that hearest prayer; before whose infinitude all differences cease of great and small; who like a tender parent foreknowest all our wants, yet listenest well-pleased to the humble petitions of thy children; who hast not alone permitted, but taught us, to call on thee in all our needs,—earnestly I implore the continuance of thy free mercy, of thy protecting providence, through the coming night. Thou hearest every prayer offered to thee believingly with a penitent and sincere heart. For thou in withholding grantest, healest in inflicting the wound, yea, turnest all to good for as many as truly seek thee through Christ, the Mediator! Thy will be done! But if it be according to thy wise and righteous ordinances, O

shield me this night from the assaults of disease, grant me refreshment of sleep unvexed by evil and distempered dreams; and if the purpose and aspiration of my heart be upright before thee who alone knowest the heart of man, O in thy mercy vouchsafe me yet in this my decay of life an interval of ease and strength; if so (thy grace disposing and assisting) I may make compensation to thy church for the unused talents thou hast entrusted to me, for the neglected opportunities, which thy loving-kindness had provided. O let me be found a labourer in the vineyard, though of the late hour, when the Lord and Heir of the vintage, Christ Jesus, calleth for his servant.

*Our Father, &c.*

To thee, great omnipresent Spirit, whose mercy is over all thy works, who now beholdest me, who hearest me, who hast framed my heart to seek and to trust in thee, in the name of my Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus, I humbly commit and commend my body, soul, and spirit.

Glory be to thee, O God!

#### CHANGE OF THE CLIMATES.

The character and circumstances of the animal and vegetable remains discovered in the northern zone, in Siberia and other parts of Russia,—all with scarcely an exception belonging to *genera* that are now only found in, and require, a tropical climate,—are such as receive no adequate solution from the hypothesis of their having been casually floated thither, and deposited, by the waters of a deluge, still less of the Noachian deluge, as related and described by the great Hebrew historian and legislator.

In order to a full solution of this problem, two

*data* are requisite:—1. a total change of climate; 2. that this change shall have been, not gradual, but sudden, instantaneous, and incompatible with the life and subsistency of the animals and vegetables in these high latitudes, at that period, and previously, existing.

Now these *data* or conditions will be afforded, if we assume a total submersion of the surface of this planet, even of its highest mountains then and now existing, by a sudden contemporaneous mass of waters, and that the evaporation of these waters was aided by a steady wind, especially adapted to this purpose in a peculiarly dry atmosphere, and was (as it must of necessity have been) most rapid and intense at the equator and within the tropics proportionally. For (as it has been demonstrated by Dr. Wollaston's experiment, in which the evaporation, occasioned by boiling water at the mid point of a line of water, froze the fluid at the two ends, *i. e.*, at a given distance from the greatest intensity of the evaporative process) the effect of an evaporation of the supposed power and rapidity would be to produce at certain distances from the *maximum* point, north and south, a vast barrier of ice,—such as, having once taken place, and being of such mass and magnitude as to be only in a small degree diminishable by the ensuing summer, must have become permanent, and beyond the power of all the known and ordinary dissolving agents of nature. That the situation of the magnetic poles of the earth, and the almost certain connection of magnetism with cold, no less than with metallic cohesion, co-operated in determining the distance of the barriers, or two poles, of evaporation, from its centre or the *maximum* of its activity, is highly probable, and receives a strong confirmation from the open sea and diminished cold, both at the north

and south zones, on the ulterior of the barrier, and towards the true or physical poles of the earth.

Now the action of a powerful co-agent in the evaporative process, such as is assumed in this hypothesis, is a fact of history. *And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged.*—Genesis viii. 1.

I do not recollect the Hebrew word rendered “assuaged,” but I will consult my learned friend Hyman Hurwitz on its radical, and its primary sense. At all events, the note by Pyle in D’Oyley and Mant’s Bible is arbitrary, though excusable by the state of chemical science in his time.

The problem of the multitude of *genera* of animals, and their several exclusive acclimatements at the present period may, likewise, I persuade myself, receive a probable solution by an hypothesis legitimated by known laws and fair analogies. But of this hereafter. 1823.

#### PARTS OF SPEECH.

Prothesis—identity of Act and Being, or a Being essentially Act, an Act essentially Being: Noun = Verb + Verb = Noun, Verb = Substantive I AM.

Thesis	Mesothesis	Antithesis
Noun	Infinitive Mood	Verb
	Synthesis	
	Participle	

The modification of the noun by the verb is the *ADNOUN* or Adjective; the modification of the Verb by the Noun is the *Adverb*.

Every language must have five parts of speech; no language can have more than seven. Conjunctions and Prepositions are one or the other of the preceding, but most commonly the Verb in the imperative mood—as *But*, *i. e.*, divide δέ corrupt. imper. from δάω divido δῆ; (= then, from δέω, connecto; or the participle.) The visual image as expressing a *concrete*, is, by the frequent recurrence, made to express a *relation*, either of Time or Space—in the same way, in which Foot, Cubit, &c. lose their visual image by abstraction of length. When such a word governs a whole sentence, we call it a conjunction; when only part of a sentence, a preposition: *ex. gr.*, We encountered many obstacles; but we all went on but<sup>2</sup> (*i. e.*, except) James. An Interjection or Exclamation is no part of *Speech*, *i. e.*, it does not express a thought, but a *sensation*, and is common to men and brutes.

This is the Logical Pentad; Prothesis, Thesis, Antithesis, Mesothesis (or the *Indifference* of Thesis and Antithesis, *i. e.*, that which is both in either, but in different Relations; while the Prothesis is both as one in one and the same relation) and lastly the Synthesis. The modification of Thesis by Antithesis, and *vice versâ*, constituting Adnoun and Adverb, convert the Pentad to an Heptad—analogue to the law of colours.

The interpenetration of Light and Shade in the highest unity, or the identity of Light and Shadow is RED, colour κατ' ἐξοχήν, in positive energy. It is the zenith, to which BLACK is the harmonious opposite, or Nadir—Colour in negative energy.—

Prothesis

Red

Thesis

Yellow

Mesothesis

Green indecomponible

Antithesis

Blue



Synthesis  
Green

compon. and decomponible.

But from the Prothesis, Red, to the Thesis an oblique line may be drawn, the bisecting point of which constitutes the Mesothesis of Red and Yellow, *i. e.*, Orange, and in like manner a line from the Prothesis to the Antithesis, the bisecting point of which is the Mesothesis or Indifference of Red and Blue, *i. e.*, Violet or Indigo. And this is the Heptad of colours.—The infinitive mood is the Mesothesis or indifference of noun and verb.

“For not *to dip* the Hero in the lake,  
Could save the son of Thetis from *to die*.”

SPENSER.

Now here “to dip” is a verb relative to “the Hero,” as its objective or accusative case: but it is a *noun* and the nominative, relatively to the verb “could save.” In the Greek and Italian languages this form is of perpetual occurrence—from to die, ἀπὸ τοῦ θανεῖν could hinder him from to destroy brave Hector. Here “to destroy” is the noun governed by the preposition (*i. e.*, abbreviated verb) from, and a verb governing the noun and adnoun, brave Hector.

Thesis

Antithesis

Alkali

Acid

Now hydrosublimite is the Mesothesis,

*i. e.*, an acid relatively to an alkali, an alkali relatively to an acid—music, (and verse as its articulate analogon) is the Mesothesis of order and passion, or of law and life—of controlling, predetermining will, of reason and of sponteneity, or lawless will—*will* of the flesh, φρόνημα σαρκός, will surging up toward and against

reason—as fluid life. Painting is the Mesothesis of thing and thought. A coloured wax peach is one *thing* passed off for another thing—a practical lie, and not a work appertaining to the Fine Arts—a delusion—not an imitation. Every imitation, as contra-distinguished from a copy, is a Mesothesis, but which according to the variable propiority to the Thesis or the Antithesis may be called the librating Mesothesis. Thus, Real and Ideal are the two poles, the Thesis and Antithesis. The Sophoclean drama, or the Samson Agonistes is the Mesothesis in its propiority or comparative proximity to the ideal—the tragedies of Heywood, Ford, &c. (*ex. gr.*, The Woman killed by Kindness,) is the Mesothesis in comparative proximity to the Real, while the Othello, Lear, &c. is the *Mesothesis* as truly as possible ἐν μέσῳ though with a *climamen* to the ideal. The tragic dance of the Horatii and Curiatii, to the music of Cimarosa, such as I saw and heard at Leghorn, was the most perfect specimen of imitation, *i. e.*, of a Mesothesis of likeness and difference, under the maximum of the latter, that I can even conceive. The proportions may vary manifoldly, but not lawlessly, and the proofs of the legality is found in the *unity* resulting. Oil and alcohol are both equally *units*, though their common components, carbon and hydrogen, are in almost reverse proportions, the one (hydrogen) with predominance of carbon, the other (carbon) with predominance of hydrogen: and the atmospheric air as true a unit as the nitrous oxyde, though the one gas be as 4 nitrogen to 1 oxygen, and the other as  $2\frac{1}{2}$  nitrogen to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  oxygen. Hence the possible varieties in the fine arts, yet none *arbitrary*. The arbitrary at once betrays itself, as a genus hybridum, a *patch-work*, like our modern inflated *prose* tragedies, verse and prose, singing and dialoguing comic operas, &c. &c. Chinese

mermaids, by stitching on the busts of monkeys to the tails of seals.

#### BISHOP BERKELEY'S SIRIS.

This great man needed only an entire, instead of partial, emancipation from the fetters of the mechanic philosophy to have enunciated all that is true and important in modern chemistry. Combining its (= hodiernity's) more accurate detail and discrimination of facts with the more profound and vital philosophy of Heraclitus, Pythagoras, and Plato, he might have refined and integrated both into one harmonious system, the centre of which would be Theosophy, and its circumference Physiognomy.

Plato and Aristotle considered God as abstracted or distinct from the natural world. But the Egyptians considered God \* and Nature as making one whole, or all things together as making one universe. In doing which they did not exclude the intelligent mind, but considered it as containing all things. Therefore, whatever was wrong in their way of thinking, it doth not, nevertheless, imply or lead to atheism.—*Siris, Sect. 300.*

\* Probably not God *sensu eminenti*, but the NATURE of God, while as Wisdom and Holy Will they too might have considered God as abstracted from the *natural* world.

#### WITCHCRAFT.\*

Plotinus magorum maleficia superavit: dæmonem suum vidit: paucis indicîis mirabiliter divinavit.—*Ex vita Plotini.*

One of the many lamentable effects of despotism

\* Transcribed from a copy of the works of Plotinus (Basileæ MDXXV.) in possession of the present Editor.

with civil wars, is this monstrous conjunction of philosophy with magic. Gloom from perpetual insecurity and hopeless alienation from the duties and honourable aims of public life will always generate superstition. Hence logic, geometry, rhetoric, and moral philosophy have been the offspring of republics; but Theosophy and its half-broken witchcraft or Diabolosophy, of empires that have been military democracies under a succession of dictators. In the present instance it is impossible to say how much of this infamous imposture was a scheme of the Pagans to counteract Christianity, and invalidate the evidence of miracles, by reducing it to an ἀδιάφορον τι, to be found on each side. The lofty speech of Plotinus appears a blasphemous imitation of Christ: Ἐκείνους δεῖ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐρχέσθαι, οὐκ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἐκείνους.

#### WITCHCRAFT IN CHRISTENDOM.

*Quære*, whether witchcraft in Christendom did not originate in concealed Paganism after the establishment of Christianity by penal laws? Idolatry divorced from the light fancy, and from local and national associations, and practised under the influence of terror, and in secrecy, would very soon pass into witchcraft, and would often be mistaken for it. An accurate examination of the oldest writers, and judicial records of wizards, witches, &c., might perhaps detect various remnants of ancient sacrifices, and sacrificial rites and libations.

Plotinus, this Plato under a huge despotism.

O shame! a vulgar conjuror, cunning man, white witch, and caster of nativities!! Verily who can wonder at the victory of Christianity over Paganism

when the heroes of the latter were so sunk in anility!

It is one of Kant's greatest errors, that he speaks so slightly of psychology, and the weakest parts of his system are attributable to his want of the habits and facts of Psychology, which, with all its imperfections and uncertainty, is next to necessary to prevent metaphysics from passing into theosophy and theurgy—*i. e.*, dreaming and conjuring. How can we otherwise explain the woful fact of the contemptible spirit-raising and wizardry of Plotinus, Porphyry, and Proclus?

Mementote præterea vos haudquaquam vel *sensu* comite, vel *humanâ ratione* duce, sed *mente quâdam sublimiore* excelsum Plotini mentem penetratis.—*Echortatio Marsilii Ficini Florentini ad auditores, et legentes Plotinum.*

Sensus = the understanding confining itself to facts and images given by the senses.

Ratio = the understanding extending itself by abstractions, general terms, and analogical deductions.

Mens = the mind bearing witness to new truths by acts of direct self-intuition, without images or general terms.

#### MAXIMS OF S. T. C.\*

What is a gentleman?

One who in all the detail of ordinary life, and with all the consciousness of habit, shows respect to others in a way that implies anticipation of reciprocal respect to himself.

\* Probably *sayings*, committed to writing, it is believed, by a young friend about the year 1822.—ED.

Our plan will teach—first to distinguish and generalise the component parts of one subject of knowledge in order to understand that knowledge—which is science,—and then will consider that subject in its relation to the *man*, happiness of man, which is philosophy.

Human knowledge twofold—truth and error. In order to know the human mind, we must therefore know both the truths which it has discovered, and the errors and absurdities which it has entertained; and historically know by what steps error and false supposition have led to true discovery, and the connection indissoluble and close between error and truth.

To discover those things which form human happiness is philosophy, and the act and employment of discovery there is itself probably the largest ingredient in the composition of human happiness.

NOTE ON MR. COLERIDGE'S OBSERVATION UPON  
THE GIFT OF TONGUES.

BY SARA COLERIDGE.

---

ACCORDING to the old and still general way of understanding the supernatural event at Pentecost, recorded in the second chapter of Acts, the twelve Apostles, on the descent of the Holy Ghost, began to speak languages before unknown to them,—the miracle consisting in the impartation of a power to discourse fluently in tongues, the knowledge of which had not been acquired by the ordinary means, a power not merely *pro tempore*, but retained ever after. It is commonly supposed that “the women and Mary, the mother of Jesus,” with “His brethren,” who, in the preceding chapter (Acts i. 14), are said to have remained in company of the Apostles, shared the gift with them; and many, perhaps most, divines are of opinion, that it was extended to the twelve disciples also mentioned in chap. i.; that the word *they* in the first verse of chap. ii. refers to all the Christian converts. The object or purpose of the miracle is understood to have been this, that the recipients of the heavenly effusion might thereby be enabled to convert and instruct the various Gentile nations, exempt from the delay and hindrance, which the necessity of acquiring foreign tongues and expressing religious mysteries in unfamiliar words and idioms, must needs impose. Against this interpretation and explanation the following arguments have been used:—

1. It seems hardly to be doubted that all the converts assembled at Pentecost, and not the Apostles alone, spake in other tongues: the same thing afterwards came to pass in the case of Cornelius and his company (Acts x. 46); and of the disciples of John (Acts xix. 6): and yet there is no reason to suppose, that all these were designed for foreign teachers.

2. The Corinthians exercised the faculty of speaking in strange tongues in the Church of Corinth itself, where there was no need of foreign languages for instructing men who knew Greek.

3. Neither the Apostles nor such teachers as might be added to them required any other language for the work of *discipling* throughout the civilised world (where the tongues enumerated in the text were in use), than the vernacular dialect of Palestine, *i. e.*, the Syro-Chaldaic, or the Greek, both of which they knew quite sufficiently for teaching and preaching. Greek was understood throughout the known world in that age. St. Paul, who undertook so many journeys for the sake of spreading the Christian religion among the Gentiles, does not appear to have known all languages (Acts xiv. 11). As for the old legends, according to which certain of the Apostles went into India and Scythia to convert the people of those regions, supposing them true, some reference would probably have been made to the languages spoken there in the account of the Pentecost miracle, if the popular view of it were just.

4. Jesus had indeed foretold to his disciples, that they should speak with *new tongues* (Mark xvi. 17). But by new tongues in that passage was signified a new style of speaking;—unusual eloquence, which belonged not to the Apostles before.\*

5. It is not affirmed in St. Luke's narrative, that the speakers used tongues *before unknown to them*, nor does it appear that the auditors supposed so. Is it not improbable that none of the foreign Jews, who were at this time in such numbers at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 5), should have been among the hearers of the Apostles and converts to their doctrine? And how should the auditors have known all at once for certain, that the languages they heard were previously unknown to the utterers; when any native of Galilee might have learned divers tongues from the people settled amongst them, Egyptians, Phœnicians, Arabians, and Syrians?

\* See an answer to this argument at the end of the abstract.



6. The devout Jews (*out of every nation under heaven*), strict persons, who scrupulously observed whatsoever belonged to the outward service and ceremonial of divine worship, and entertained especial reverence for the divine law and ordinances, were amazed to hear the Christians celebrating the wonderful works of God in profane tongues; others, mocking, pronounced the speakers *drunk with new wine*. Why should the devout Jews have been thus astounded or others have spoken scornfully, to hear men talk in languages unknown to them before? Instead of emotions of angry surprise—of grave scandal in the serious and contempt in the light-minded—would not breathless awe have reigned in the spirits of the former, curiosity mixed with admiration in those of the latter, on the perception of such a portent? The sentiments, which St. Luke seems to ascribe to the auditors, are just such as would be excited by an innovation—a new and, to the minds of the observers, irreverent procedure; and, granting that there would have been an *innovation* in either case, yet surely feelings of offence would have been suspended by the wonder of the miracle, had it been of that obvious kind commonly supposed.

7. Again, in the speech of Peter to the multitude, what was *now seen and heard* was declared to be a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, in which prophecy no mention is made of any knowledge of foreign languages wherewith the Spirit should endue men in *the last days*. "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." (Acts ii. 17, 18.) *All flesh* cannot refer to the Apostles and the women alone, or to them and the hundred and twenty disciples exclusively: the prophetic annunciation relates not to the *form and manner* of conveying divine knowledge, but to a supernatural influence exciting in the subjects of it the *substance* of new thoughts and impressions. Why did not St. Peter declare plainly that the power of speaking strange tongues had been conveyed to the speakers by an infusion from above, had this really taken place?

8. If the power above-mentioned came to the Apostles by miracle, why did they not divine from this very circumstance, without further instruction, that they were destined to deliver the doctrine of Christ to the Gentiles? This they seem never to have suspected till Peter was informed by a vision, that Gentiles, as well as Jews, were to be received into the fold of Christ; and, when reproved by Jewish Christians (Acts xi.) for eating and conversing with uncircumcised persons, he never, in his apology, refers to a gift of foreign tongues conferred on himself and his fellow teachers, nor connects the miracle of Pentecost in any way with his mission to the Gentiles.

9. Among the Corinthians were many who *spake with tongues*,—a phrase probably equivalent to *speaking with other tongues*. The disciples of John, when they joined the standard of Christ, as well as Cornelius and his family, are recorded to have *spoken with tongues*. (Acts x. 44, 46; xix. 6.) Is it not improbable that one species of miracle should be so often repeated, and the gift imparted to so many of the converts?\*

10. St. Paul, when he recounts the *χαρίσματα* (1 Cor. xii. 28) or graces accorded to believers, put the gift of tongues in the last place (1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv. 1) and declares that no advantages redound from it to the Church, unless the things the speaker utters are explained. Many of the Corinthians displayed the gift out of vanity and ostentation (1 Cor. xiv. 28, 33) and is it to be thought of, that God would have bestowed an admirable faculty only to be abused, whether the gift were supposed perpetual or temporary?† It is more reasonable to believe that they used foreign tongues in the sacred assemblies in imitation of the affair at Pentecost, independently of divine actuation, not at the impulse of a pious enthusiasm, but from love of novelty and the vanity of parading a striking accomplishment.‡

After all, it may be said, that the wording of the passage

\* See the answer at the end.

† See as above.

‡ These arguments are for the most part taken substantially from Kuinoel's Latin Commentary on Acts, chap. ii.

plainly implies the sense commonly imputed to it. "Are not these *Galileans*, and how hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?" Does not this intimate the astonishment of the hearers, that men all of one country, natives of the confined region of Galilee, should on a sudden magnify the Lord in the various languages of the known world? To this objection it has been replied, that by *Galileans* was meant *followers of Christ*, that being the earliest name given to the faithful; the marvel being this, that a Jewish sect should depart so far from the rule and constant practice of the Jewish worship as to discourse upon divine things in profane Gentile languages. Some suggest, that they who prayed and sang hymns in Greek, Latin, Arabic, and perhaps in Persic, though really foreign Jews, may have been mistaken by the hearers for natives of Galilee; but this view does not cohere with some of the arguments above recited. It is plain that the words of the narrative cannot be taken close to the letter, because, in some of the countries which it mentions, the same languages were in use as in some of the others, as the Greek in Phrygia and Pamphylia, the Syro-Chaldaic in Judea and Mesopotamia, the Persian in Parthia, Media, and Elymäis: though it appears that different dialects were spoken in different districts of Asia Minor.

Again it will doubtless be objected to some of the positions which have been brought forward in the argument against the common view, that in the twelfth chapter of Corinthians, speaking divers kinds of tongues is mentioned as one of the *gifts of the Spirit*, verses 10, 30; that such a gift, though in itself divine, the Corinthians might abuse, diverting it from the purposes for which it was bestowed, as is plainly intimated in the thirteenth chapter of the same Epistle. And some perhaps might reply to the second branch of objection 3, that as the account in the text is not to be taken literally, all languages, as they were needed, and not merely those specified in the sacred record, were doubtless at the command of the converts.

To number 4, it may fairly be objected that till proof of

such a use of the term *new tongues* as it supposes, has been given, we ought to take it in the literal sense, and further that the literal sense seems more accordant than any other with the general scope of the passage (Mark xvi. 16, 17), in which most of the powers promised to believers are of an outward and sensuous character, as taking up serpents, drinking poison unharmed, restoring those that were sick in the body. Indeed this passage in St. Mark's Gospel forms, to my mind, the strongest argument that can be alleged for the old interpretation of the event at Pentecost.

With regard to the general question it may be observed, that the nature and object of the gift of tongues has never yet been satisfactorily explained, and that while this obscurity and uncertainty continues, the miracle at Pentecost cannot be thoroughly understood. For immediate spiritual edification, it is quite enough to know that there was an outpouring of the Spirit, which both fulfilled a divinely inspired prophecy and served to the propagation of the Gospel. I have stated the arguments used against the ordinary view, not as holding them conclusive, but in the belief that they at least merit consideration, if only that they exhibit the difficulties of the question, and show how far, in common with much else relating to the Church in those times, it is from being clearly understood. It is always desirable to show in what shades any important subject is involved, in order that delusive spectres of darkness may not be mistaken for objects discerned by light of day in their true colours and lineaments.

The miracle—for such it is as fully on one view as on the other, since to fulfil prophecy by speaking with eloquence and power divinely inspired, is as miraculous as to discourse in tongues unknown before—is indeed a far greater work of the Holy Ghost—appears to be of a similar nature and import with that vision, whereby Peter was instructed that God is no respecter of persons; that no man is to be called common or unclean by reason of his birth; that in every nation whoso feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him. This magnifying of the divine works in the common speech of the Gentiles, and setting aside the

formally sacred languages, was a fit preliminary to the annunciation, that the Gentiles were to be included in the spiritual covenant; that the promise was to all that were afar off, even as many as the Lord should call, not confined to the one chosen nation. Certainly the event, thus understood, has vastly more both of rational significance and of spiritual and symbolical grandeur, than when interpreted merely of a power to speak foreign tongues, or as if *that* were the sole cause of the emotions displayed; since this latter faculty may be acquired by human endeavours, sufficiently for all missionary purposes, if not with such suddenness as is here supposed; whereas to believe in the Saviour redeemingly, and to express that faith in words of force to convert others, is such a work as could only be brought about by a special influence of the Spirit. For *no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* (1 Cor. xii. 3.) The ordinary view tends to merge the deeper miracle in one of a far lower character.

The misrepresentation of the subject by Popish painters is a striking sign of the propensity of the Church of Rome to corrupt the Gospel record, and reduce the heavenly and purely spiritual to the earthly, though preternatural. They exhibit the effusion of the Spirit, which was to be upon *all flesh*, as confined to the Apostles and to the Virgin, whom, indeed, without a shadow of Scriptural authority, they set up as the head of the assembly. The grand mosaic in the dome of St. Mark's at Venice is a notable instance of this way of presenting the miracle.\* It may be alleged that this is a symbolical rather than an historical representation; but there can be little doubt that it both originated in a wrong notion of the nature of the event, and must have produced unscriptural views of it among the people. Painting in her palmary period was the vassal of Popery, a servant, and yet in some sort a teacher and mistress.

S. C.

\* See Mrs. Jameson's "Sacred and Legendary Art," vol. i., pp. 153-4.

LONDON:  
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.









