

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

NOVEMBER, 1836.

No. 11.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

As one more number will close this volume of the Magazine we would request those who wish their subscription to be stopped at that period, to inform us before that time of their desires, otherwise we shall consider them subscribers for the coming year.

The year begins with January. No subscription for less than a year.

No subscription discontinued but at the option of the publishers until arrears are paid

Those of our subscribers whose subscriptions for the last year and the present remain unpaid, will confer a favour on the printers, by forwarding it by mail at our risk.

All letters not containing *remittances* must be POST PAID.

MR. BRECKINRIDGE'S LETTER IN DEFENCE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, ADDRESSED TO DR. WARDLAW OF GLASGOW.

Most of our readers are familiar with the fact that a discussion took place in *Glasgow*, during last June, between *George Thompson* and *Mr. Breckinridge*, on the subject of AMERICAN SLAVERY. The discussion continued for five nights, during which Mr. Thompson exhibited his usual insolence and slanders of Americans. Mr. B. defended his country and the American churches with his usual ability. Some time after this, Mr. B. sailed for Paris. When Mr. B. had left Great Britain, Mr. T's. friends got up a large meeting, in which they declare that the arguments of Mr. B. were entirely inconclusive, the subject indefensible, and surprized that an American could hold up his head without blushing.

DR. WARDLAW, of *Glasgow* (who acted as chairman during the discussion) at the meeting held to express their pleasure at Mr T's. course and disapprobation of Mr. B's. engaged heartily in favour of Mr. T. and expressed himself decidedly against Mr. B. On receiving the proceedings of this meeting through the public papers, Mr. B. addressed from Paris to Dr. Wardlaw, the letter which here follows. It is a noble defence of our countrymen, and a home thrust at Great Britain such as they had never before received.

To the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D. D., of Glasgow.

SIR,—I observe in the *London Patriot*, of last week, an abstract of the proceedings of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, on the first of this month, at a public meeting held "for the purpose of expressing the senti-

ments of the society in reference to the recent discussion on American Slavery, between the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge and Mr. George Thompson." The greater portion of the report before me, is occupied with a speech made by you on that occasion, in proposing to the meeting the following resolution, viz., "That in the deliberate judgment of this meeting the wish announced by Mr. George Thompson, to meet publicly any antagonist, especially any minister of the gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery, or on any one of the branches of that subject, was dictated by a well founded consciousness of the integrity of his purpose, and assurance of the correctness of his facts; and that the recent discussion in this city between him and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge of Baltimore, has left, not merely unshaken, but confirmed and augmented their confidence in the rectitude of his principles, the purity of his motives, the propriety of his measures, the fidelity of his statements, and the straightforward honesty and undaunted intrepidity of his zeal." This motion was seconded by the venerable and respected Dr. Kidstone; whose speech on the occasion is but briefly reported. Other resolutions—some of similar import, some of a general character—were offered and seconded by Dr. Heugh, and Messrs. Eadie, King, M'Laren, and Kettle. But above all, the proceedings bear the signature of Robert Grahame, of Whitehall—whose venerable name is dear to every good man.

These proceedings, Sir, have relieved me from a state of great and painful anxiety, as to the view my countrymen might take of the propriety of my taking any notice, more or less, of Mr. George Thompson. For while nothing is further from my purpose than to wound the feelings of any friend of that individual, it is necessary to say, that in America, every one who is not an abolitionist, or, in other words, ninety-nine hundredths of the people, consider him, not only unworthy of credit, but unworthy of notice. At length, I have a tangible proof, by which to make my countrymen feel, that persons of the utmost respectability, excellence, and piety, in Britain, not only concur in all the principles and proceedings, but partake of all the prejudices and ignorance of that individual, and openly defend his flagitious conduct. From this day forth, I deem myself fully acquitted on the only part of the subject which filled me with personal anxiety. For although you have not hesitated to speak in terms sufficiently disparaging of my humble efforts to defend this truth, yet as you have given no reasons for the judgment you have delivered, those who read for themselves may escape the influence even of your authority. And as you have been pleased to decide on the whole merits of the case, as well as on the merits of the parties involved in it,—I escape, of course, from the whole blame of having damaged the truth by feeble advocacy.

In this state of the case, it cannot surprise you, that I turn with delight from those who have hitherto assailed, and address myself to you: that I avail myself of the right arising from your free and repeated use of my name, and your judgments both upon my character and acts, to speak freely in return. Let us forget the miserable trifling of Mr. Robert Bernard Hall. Let us pass over poor Moses Roper, who, it is but just to say, has written the most modest and sensible attack yet made on me. Let us even be moderate, in having absolutely silenced the gurrility of Mr. Thompson, who begs off in his last note, which has just reached me, in the *Patriot* of the 17th instant. I have that to say which you have not only invited, but challenged me to utter, and to which I ask your serious regard.

I have manifested my deference to the judgment of a Christian people, by discussing at its bar, questions purely national and personal, into which, under erroneous pretexts, they had interfered in a manner the most vexatious. I believe they were in great error,—I presumed they were sincerely disposed to do good,—I knew they were really doing us, and themselves, and the world harm;—and challenged and forced into the matter, I have discussed it on its mere merits—admitting you and your people to be all you professed to be—and only endeavoring to prove that we were not

as evil as you made us out. So far as you and those who can influence are concerned, you have declared that you remain more firmly than ever settled in your harsh judgments of us, and your fixed purpose to follow out all your offensive courses. Nay, you plainly declare, that rather than alter a tittle of your conduct, principles, opinions, or demands on this subject, you prefer that all fellowship between us and you should terminate. That argument and conclusion, then, being complete and final, we need say no more. I am content to wait and see, whether the American people will, at your suggestion change their national constitution; or whether, in the event of the adequate majority for that purpose not being attainable, they will, as the inference of your argument, break up the confederacy—to regain your good opinion.

There is, as I have said, quite another view of the whole case. You say in the course of your speech, "If our American brethren saw any thing in us, which they thought, and justly thought, was an evil of sufficient magnitude to induce their kind offices for its suppression, we ought to feel obliged by their using their endeavours to stir us up to a due consideration of it, and to practical efforts for its removal." And in the context you are somewhat pointed in enforcing this idea, as containing in it a great rule of duty. In general we have considered the ill doing of this delicate office more hurtful than its omission. In particular, it has appeared to us as a pretext liable to infinite abuse, and practically resorted to most by those who had least ground and least right to display it. But, sir, I can hardly, either in faithfulness or honour, abstain any longer from its use. And the main object of this communication is, to point out, in the actual condition of considerable portions of the British empire, evils, which really are, or which your party has declared to be, of so palpable and so monstrous a description, that decency would seem to require you to redress them, or be very modest in rebuking others while they exist.

1. To come at once to the grand cause of outcry against us—the unhappy and indefensible existence of slavery, in many of the States. Will you be so good as to turn your eyes to the map of Africa, and fix them on a spot longer than half of Western Europe? At its southern extremity, find Cape Town. Then find the speech of Dr. Phillip, delivered in Exeter Hall, ten days after you delivered yours. In that town and neighbourhood are 9 000 British slaves!! Scattered over that vast peninsula are many thousand more of British slaves!! And yet the ear of day is dull with being told that in the British empire there were no slaves; and the very speech that has elicited these remarks was made at a meeting on the anniversary devoted to a glorious fact that never occurred, namely, "Slave emancipation in the British colonies."

2. Turn, now, I pray you, to the map of Asia, and find the vast dominions which God has lent to you there, embracing a population of one hundred and thirty millions of souls. Then look over a file of papers, and read a conversation that occurred in the Commons House of Parliament, but a short time back, between the honorable Mr. Buxton and Sir J. Hobhouse, on the subject of British slavery in India!! There you will find it admitted that "domestic slavery prevails to a great extent" in India; "especially in Bengal." There you will find proof that no direct effort was ever made to abolish it,—and reasons urged by the government why it cannot now be abolished,—and why treaties now existing seem to render its future abolition impossible!

3. Turn your attention, next, to the Western side of the Atlantic Ocean, and see nearly a million of apprentices in the West India Islands; and then remember what you have yourself said and written on the subject of this system: and call to mind the innumerable declarations made weekly, up and down the country, by those who belong to your party, and who (at the Hondswoth Anti-Slavery Society, on the 2d of this month) denounced it "as aggravated slavery, under the delusive name of apprenticeship," and denounce every "proposal of government" as only calculated to excite suspicion.

Do I draw an inference at all strained, when I say, that the subjects of a Monarch, whose dominions in three quarters of the globe are, by their own showing and by irrefragable proofs, covered with slaves, should deal somewhat gently with other nations, who may chance to be in the same unhappy condition? Do I say too much, when I caution such people to be more guarded in boastful assertions, which are contradicted by the fact and the record of the case? Do I give needless offence, when I beg you to remember, that your Parliament is omnipotent over this subject, and is therefore responsible for all the evils which exist, either through their negligence or by their consent? Alas! sir, it is an ancient habit, to be bitter against our brother for a mote, when a beam is in our own eye.

But I have more to add. We have been spoken against with great severity for neglect of the spiritual welfare of the colored population of the United States; and you have, in an unhappy hour, said, you believed and approved these hard sayings. I have, in vain, denied; in vain, disproved them. My object now is, to show the condition of the country, whose people bring and credit them; still keeping the line of duty indicated by your suggestion.

4. Let me beg you then to look at the condition of Lower Canada, where the Roman Catholic religion is established by treaty and by law, where annual grants of public money are made to support it, and where it has had free course, until the people are so ignorant that by statute law the grand jurors and the school commissioners are allowed the privilege of making their marks instead of signing their names, and where, according to the belief of the whole universe, except papists, a system of idolatrous worship is guaranteed by the power of the British realm.

5. Then look over the voters in the Committee of supply in the present Parliament, and you will see 8,928l "for the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth," (which is just about the sum the vilified Americans pay annually to promote the religion of Jesus Christ in Western Africa, through the Colonization Society,) and I ask you as a Christian, to resolve the questions, which of these enterprises you deem most injurious to true religion? which you and your party have most actively opposed? and which is most under your eye and control? Heaven and earth are moved to prevent the spread of the gospel in Africa, through the Colonization Society; and not a whisper is heard to prevent the increase of idolatry in your own land, through governmental patronage.

6. But a more frightful case remains: Remember that you have above one hundred millions of heathen in your Indian possessions;—then read the noble speech of the Rev. W. Campbell, a missionary from Bangalore, delivered at Exeter Hall, at the last annual meeting of the London Missionary Society. There, Sir, you will find positive proof that the horrid system of Hindoo idolatry, in all its cruelty and corruption is upheld, partaken of, and made a source of gain by the British authorities in India! Temples are supported by the government; priests and dancing women are paid a monthly allowance out of the public revenue; magistrates are present and aiding officially at their brutal ceremonies; military officers do their peculiar honors to the abominable thing; and British functionaries collect the wages of iniquity. And now sir, what can the eagerness of party zeal find, in all its false allegations against us, equal to the naked deformity of these facts?!

7. But pass again to another portion of your wide empire. In multitudes of publications I have seen our alleged neglect of the religious instruction of the colored population of America; made the basis of insinuations against the sincerity of our religious profession. If you will read the speech of Dr. Phillip, already alluded to, you will find the following sentence: "Boteman, a Caffre chief, and others, have been petitioning me for missionaries, by every messenger through whom they could convey to me a verbal communication, for the last twelve years; and I have not yet been able to send them one." Gracious heaven! what an account will the twenty thousand protestant ministers of Great Britain have to render for the souls of these poor

Caffres, whom so many of them have forgotten, to abuse their brethren in America for neglecting a population amongst whom a larger proportion hear the gospel, than of the inhabitants of the capital of the British Empire.

Let us look at London, the seat of your wealth, power, and civilization; the abode of your Sovereign; the seat of your Parliament; the see of a bishop, whose income would support a hundred missionaries. Listen to what the bishop says of so much of his diocese, as is contained in the metropolis. "There are," says he, "thirty-four parishes, containing above 10,000 souls each, (omitting all notice of those which contain less) and in the aggregate 1,137,000 souls: but there is church room for only 101,682—less than one-tenth of the whole! Allow one church for every 3,000 souls, and 379 churches would be required; while in fact they are but 69: or if consecrated chapels be added, only 100." That is, above 1,000,000 souls, in a single city, and that city the seat of your glory, utterly unprovided for by the nation, and the Established Church. Now if we should add what is done by dissenters of all classes, and add also the destitute of the small parishes, the result might be varied a little; but still, make the best of it you can, and you are left with more people destitute of the means of grace in London alone, than in all the United States! If you doubt these statements of the Lord Bishop of London, consult the proceedings of the last annual meeting of the City Mission; and then ponder, whether the hundreds of pounds squandered on Mr. Thomson's trip to the United States—and in printing his slanders of that country—and the additional hundreds, which I see Dr. Heugh urged the people of Glasgow to give him by way of "Testimonial Fund"—might not have been fully as well laid out in sending the gospel to the British capital?

Besides, the accusations now made your own, on the general subjects of slavery in itself considered, and neglect of the religious instruction of the natives—the remaining charges which we have been arraigned upon—may to a certain extent, fall under the general head of severity, injustice, and deep-rooted prejudice against the blacks. These things may be true, or they may be false. The statements and evidence on both sides are in reach of the public. You have vouched for their truth, and it is not now my design to show the contrary, but to show who they are that are so ready to magnify real errors, and to allege false crimes upon their neighbors.

9. Pray, sir, were you ever in Ireland? If you were, you saw a land fertile and beautiful; a people, handsome, intelligent, and active; a climate more genial than any other in so high a northern latitude; in short, every thing that should make its teeming population rich, happy, and powerful. I was there. I saw hundreds of people who had no fixed abodes. I saw the majority of the houses of the lower classes to be worse than the stables and cow houses in England, I saw thousands in rags; hundreds naked, and hundreds more naked, except a piece of a single old garment. I looked at the third report on the expediency of a poor law for Ireland, made by order of Parliament, and I found that 2,385,000 souls are out of work, have nothing to depend on and are in distress for thirty weeks every year. It is a settled, indisputable truth, that one-third of the Irish people beg their bread two thirds of every year. And yet enormous quantities of grain and live stock, and all sorts of provision, are exported from Ireland. And yet, in defiance of all this tremendous, long-continued, and periodical suffering, there is no poor law, nor any sort of general provision by law, for the poor of that island. But there are forty-nine regiments of horse and foot, and a constabulary force of about equal magnitude—ready to stay the people's stomachs with lead at night, and steel in the morning. This is the happy consummation of six hundred years of British authority! And how can you, Sir, look any human being in the face, and charge his country with wrong, till you have strained every effort to redress this vast hereditary guilt? Or if you fail, how can you speak, *nationally*, in the hearing of earth, or heaven, about human wrongs?

10. Look, for the last time, to the vast plains of South Africa, wet with the blood of murdered nations. Read the clear and masterly speech of Dr.

Phillip, already twice referred to. "If a traveller who had visited that country twenty-five years ago, were to take his stand on the banks of the Keiskamma river, and ask what had become of the natives whom he saw there on his former visit; if he took his stand on the rocks of the Sundays river, and looked towards a country seventy miles in breadth before him, he might ask the same question; if he were to take his stand again on the Fish river, and then extend his views to Caffraria, he might ask the same question; and were he to take his stand on the Snow mountain, called Graaf Reinet, (he would have before him a country containing 40,000 square miles,) and ask where was the immense concourse he saw there twenty-five years ago; no man could tell him where they were?" Ask Lord Glenelg, his Majesty's principle Secretary for the colonies, and he will admit that the system of treachery, plunder, and butchery, by which these brave and upright savages have been wasted in exterminating oppression, constitutes perhaps the most degrading of all the chapters of the history of mankind! Is it a chapter written in the tears and blood of slaughtered tribes—and is hardly dry upon the paper that records it for the execration of posterity! It is a chapter that had not been fully enacted when you were concocting plans and arranging agencies, by which to make illustrious the benign sway of universal freedom, justice, and benevolence in your *Monarchy*—and to brand upon our *Republic* reproaches which all coming generations could not efface.

But why need I multiply particulars? When these things are set right, and you seek from us another list, we will say to you concerning your polity, in nearly all its parts, things which you will then be better able to bear. We will point out how you may establish real freedom amongst yourselves, and thereby show your acquaintance with its sacred principles; how you can make your laws just, equal, and humane, and thereby manifest in practice your devotion to principles commended for others. At present such a proceeding could only irritate, and is the more readily forborne, because it is not as an American or a Republican, but as a Christian, my mission brought me to you. The assurance, too, that the party with which you act, is, in point of numbers, a very small minority of the British nation, makes me the more willing to adhere to this view of my duty. Indeed it is chiefly because your party has much of its strength in that sect to which I was more particularly sent, that it seemed clearly necessary for me to take part at all in these discussions.

I readily admit that time, patience, sacrifices, and much labour, are needful for the redress of the evils I have pointed out. I know that the present generation is not responsible in such a sense, for most of them, as past generations, have been. I am convinced that multitudes of Englishmen deplore, and would gladly remove them. I am satisfied that it is by the silent influence of example, and the kind and clear exposition of general principles, rather than rude and harsh personal or national assaults, that we can do you good, in these or similar cases. And I gladly declare my belief, that the Christians of America as such, can and ought to hold Christian intercourse and sympathy with the Christians of Britain—notwithstanding the British nation may be responsible in the matters alledged; and that we can and ought so to do it—without perpetual vituperation and insult, even for what is true—not to say without gross perversions of the facts and merits of the case. Such, sir, are my views of the subject. I deeply regret that yours are so widely different. And I humbly beseech you to imagine the whole course of your proceedings and arguments—embracing of course the mission of Mr. Thompson, and his conduct since his return—made ours, and our case made yours; and then decide what would by this time have been the feelings of your people towards us, if we had treated you as you have treated us? I declare, in the presence of God, my firm belief, that if things go on much longer as they have progressed for the last two years, there will not be found on earth men more estranged from each other than the professors of religion in the two countries. I have already witnessed the spectacle of a part of the religious

press in England, urging forward the government of the country to an intervention, if necessary, with arms, against the progress of liberty in Texas, upon the false and ignorant pretext that the government of the United States unless prevented by force, would possess itself of that country, and introduce slavery there! The people generally of America are long ago roused to the highest pitch of indignation against your proceedings in this whole business. You have now reduced the Christians of that country to a position, where, if they act with you or admit your previous statements or principles—they become on your own showing infamous! You may now behold in the preceding statement the posture in which all the world but yourselves have viewed you during all this terrible affair!

Was it ignorance of your real condition, or was it ignorance still more gross of ours, or was it national vanity and prejudice, or was it all these unitedly, that impelled the abolition party in Britain to pursue the course they have adopted? It is not my desire to give offence, and I will not therefore attempt to decide. Your party profess to have full and accurate information about us; though it is very odd that at your meeting, Dr. Hough moved, and Mr. Ernie seconded, and your "very numerous and highly respectable meeting" unanimously voted, that our national constitution contained a very important principle, which is not only not in it all, but which the very discussion you were pronouncing on *ex cathedra*, proved not to be in it! Well informed gentlemen, not to say just judges, should be more cautious. It does not become me to say that your party are ignorant of the condition of their own country; but if they knew the facts now commended to their notice, it is not easy to reconcile their singular disregard of them, with their rampant benevolence on the other side of the water; and if they were unacquainted with them, they had better stay at Jericho till their beards be grown. Upon the delicate and painful subject of national prejudice, it is difficult to speak properly at all; but especially so to gentlemen whose passion lies in surmounting all prejudice whatever.—The *John Bull* newspaper is said to represent the views and feelings of the extreme High Church and Tory party; the *Record* is the reputed vehicle for Low Church sentiments; the *Patriot*, I am told, stands in the same relations to the Congregational Dissenters, embracing both Baptists and Independents, who are generally Whigs and Radicals. The *Times*, which from its great ability, must always wield a vast influence, is considered the organ of the Independent Conservative interest. I am very likely to be mistaken; but I have tried to inform myself of your condition—and this is what I learn. Be so good, Sir, as to read any editorial article in either of these papers, for the last four months, in which it was necessary to express opinions or feelings in regard to the United States, and you will at once catch my present drift. But to aid such as have neither time nor opportunity for such a review, excuse the following sample from a late number of the last named paper:—"In short, this is just the wretched 'Colonization scheme,' to which those pious slave-owners, the Baptists, Independents, and Presbyterians of the United States have betaken themselves, as a plaster to their consciences, rank and rotten with hypocrisy; and though that holy American humbug may command a congenial support from the canting zealots of liberty and lashes, hallelujahs and horse whippings, Bibles and brutality, missions and murders, religious revivals merging in slave auctions, and love feasts terminating in Lynch law." &c. &c. It is but justice to say, that I have seen equal grossness only in the *John Bull*, and in Mr. Thompson's speeches, to some of which latter, this has a most suspicious resemblance. It is my duty also to declare, which I do with sincere pleasure, that the present Foreign Secretary of the King (Lord Palmerston,) and the journals which speak the sentiments of the government, are by far better informed, and more candid in regard to American affairs in general, than any others whose published views have come to my knowledge.

I may, in the end be permitted to suggest, that perhaps too much has

been said in relation to the existing and prospective intercourse between the churches of the two countries; and possibly too much consequence attached to it by myself, as well as others. I have uttered the sentiments of those who sent me, in their name; and endeavored to enforce them by such considerations as appeared to me just and appropriate. But I am not aware of any thing having transpired which would justify the supposition that America, or her churches, looked for any advantage which was not likely to be reciprocal, in being permitted to hold this intercourse. Still less can I conceive that any one could be justified in demanding of our churches, as conditions of it, not only adhesion to moral principles which we reject, but the procurement of political changes which are impossible. Yet, if I comprehend the drift of all British abolitionism, it stops not a whit short of this.

It was the world more than America, we sought to benefit. We had no purpose of attempting a revolution in Britian; nor did it enter into our conceptions that a revolution in America, of the most terrible extent, would be dictated to us, in terms hardly supportable. It was the benighted heathen for whose good we were laying plans; and the thought of personal advantage, or honor, or enjoyment, to any portion of ourselves, had never place for a moment, nor even ground for exercise; and, therefore, we must needs be proof against all discriminating threats. It is quite gratuitous for the sects in England to decline receiving our delegates, except they be Abolitionists—which many individuals and some public meetings have recommended—which the Baptists, if I am rightly informed, have virtually done—and which seems nothing beyond the compass of your argument.

Indeed, this aspect of the case is so very far from the one which the facts exhibit, that, I am greatly surprised that wisdom, if not kindness, did not prevent its presentation. For I believe no delegate who has gone from Britian to America, has been assailed, in public and in private, on any of the great evils at which I have hinted in this communication, as every delegate who has come from America to Britian has been assailed on the subject of slavery. I believe, too, you would search in vain in America, for any man who had received from any sect or institution in Britian, any token of respect or esteem; while it will be equally hard to find in Britian any man amongst any sect to which any delegate from America has ever come, who is not indebted to us for all the consequence he has derived from literary and theological distinctions denied to him at home, but bestowed by the kinder or more discerning spirit of strangers!

For my own part, without intending to commit the folly of depreciating a great nation, I am obliged to say, that the thing which surprised me most in England, was the universal ignorance which prevails in regard to America; while the thing which grieved me most, was the almost equally universal prejudice against us.

You do not know us. You have little sympathy with us. You do us wrong in all your thoughts. In regard to all these points, I believe there is but one mind amongst all Americans, not being Abolitionists, who have been in England. And if you have been pleased to express the hope that I would return to America materially changed in many of my views and principles, I have only to say in reply, that so profound is my sense of the false estimate you put on every thing *national*, as between us and you, that my visit to England has opened a new source of devotion, in gratitude to God that he permitted your ancestors to persecute ours out of it. So little impression of the kind you expect, has all that I have been forced to hear in England against my country and my brethren produced, that when I return to embrace again those beloved men, I shall revere them more, as I measure them by all I have known elsewhere; and when my weary feet touch that sacred land, I shall rejoice in the very "dust and stones thereof"—as more precious than the pearls of all lands beside!

If I may not call my self your fellow-Christian without offence, I can at least sign my self your fellow-sinner.

R. J. BRECKENRIDGE.

Paris. Aug. 20, 1836.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL;

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Landing in France.—Boulogne.—French Custom House.—Courier.—Language Houses.—The People.—The Town—and Neighborhood.—Napoleon's Column.—Mode of life of the laboring classes.—The Old Town.—Travelling in France.—French Coins.—Departure from Boulogne.—Agitation in France.—Samer.—Montreuil.—Crescy.—Bernay.—Abbeville.—Bauvais.—The aspect of the Country.—Vexations.—Beggars.—An effect of Papism.—Villages.—Harvest.—Vines.—St. Denis.—French Possessions.—Entrance into Paris.

THE boat was made fast to the pier at Boulogne, Suer Wall (so called to distinguish it from another Boulogne near Paris) at 11 o'clock at night. It was as bright a night, as a full moon in July could make; and as we passed up the streets of the New Town to the Hotel des Baines, the various colours of the flags which hung from the windows of most of the houses were perfectly distinguishable. It reminded us at once, that this was the first of the three days of July, being the 27th of the month, in which France had accomplished, six years ago, so glorious a revolution. The flag, like every thing French, is rather striking; being composed of three stripes of equal width, running vertically; the outer one red, the middle white, and the one near the staff, blue.

We had not however landed so easily, as this slight notice might lead one to infer. Under any circumstances, the great crowd on board could not very speedily disgorge itself, when laden with such quantities and varieties of baggage, alive and inanimate. But the security of the ship owners threw some impediments, and the custom house regulations many more, in the way of a short walk from the boat's deck, to a comfortable chamber at a hotel. In our own case there was a special and vexatious difficulty: for a female who travelled under our protection, had packed away her passport, forgotten it, and pronounced it lost,—at least not in her possession. What should be done was uncertain; but the most probable result seemed either a delay of some days, till the nearest public American agent could be written to; or perhaps, a forced return to England. The first impulse was, of course, frankly to state the case to the proper authorities, and abide the issue. When we had arranged our plans for visiting the continent, the urgent advice of friends in Britain had induced me to employ a person, in the double capacity of interpreter and servant. We had taken into our service, a stout, handsome, young man, who speaks English tolerably well, and three or four of the languages of the continent perfectly. His demand, in the way of wages was exorbitant, being £10 a month, and his expences paid; which aided by a slight sinister expression, in his eye, rather settled my mind against him. He mentioned however very adroitly, that he was a Swiss, and a Protestant; both names went to my heart,—and Abram Bèjand, was engaged for the tour. This of course had occurred in England. And now in our exigency, he was summoned, and the difficulty explained, with di-

rections for him to act according to the view of the case stated above. He said, it was nothing; leave it to him, and all would be right &c; but steadily evaded explaining how he should proceed.

In the mean time most of the passengers were on shore. We in turn proceeded from the boat, by a single plank, one by one, the courier, (as he chose always to call himself) in advance. The first salutation was from a little Frenchman in a cocked hat nearly as large as himself, who was squatted on his hams on a sort of block, about as high as a man's breast,—at the shore end of the plank. He demanded evidence that we had paid our passage money; was shown a ticket, and bid us pass. We were next marched across an open space, into a room, where on one side of a counter sat, four or five very respectable looking men in an undress uniform of blue; and on the other stood a confused crowd of men, women and children, guards, porters, and soldiers all talking at once, and none regarding, apparently what his neighbour said. Pretty soon a man over the counter held up a passport, and uttered sounds, which on the third repetition bore a faint resemblance to my name. I pressed forward and found our courier and the officers, engaged in a close debate, which as nearly as my very imperfect knowledge of the language would allow me to comprehend, was to the following purport. "This is the passport of Mr. and Mrs. B— where are they." "No sir, it is the passport of Mr. and Mrs. and Miss B—," said Abram; and in an instant, his hope of smuggling our travelling companion through the custom house, flashed on my mind. I was at loss whether to laugh out right, at a *déviu* so superlatively ridiculous, when the ages of the parties were considered; or to renounce all benefit from so palpable a fraud, as a thing wrong in itself. But before I could summon self command, and French enough to interfere, the affair was ended. "There are but two named in the passport;" said the Frenchman. "Then the American minister has forgotten to put in *Miss. B.—*;" rejoined the courier! "What can be done, said the officer!" "Done—why let her pass," said Abram; and suiting the action to the word, hurried our party towards the door. A *gendarme*, who guarded the door near the end of the counter, seemed to regard all that passed; and spoke quickly in good English; "This way sir; this way ladies, let him settle it with the *Beureau*." And so saying he turned us out, and the courier back, but in a moment more, he joined us, and we mixed in the crowd and hurried to the hotel.

It was a very great relief: and the whole matter was treated by the authorities not only in the politest but in the kindest manner. They could not but see, that a fraud was practised. But at the same time, they could not but know, that being only travellers, and the person interested, a female, no possible evil could occur. In the inspection of our baggage, I had the same reason to find public fame, unjust here, as I had before found on landing in England. Our trunks, sacks, &c, were barely opened; it was a mere form. As to bribery, it is out of the question. And yet there is no part of the world where more smuggling is carried on, than along this very coast. There is but one solution of the case. Experience had made these people, both here and in England, acute

to the last degree. Where there is ground for suspicion it fastens at once; and the most searching examinations are made where there is obviously no design to evade the revenue laws; nor any intention, to do that, which the government could have any interest or desire to prevent, the traveller may confidently rely on receiving the utmost civility. A ready obedience to law, is surely the duty of all who go voluntarily into a strange country, and they who evince that purpose, in a frank and respectful manner, will find little reason, to join in the common outcry against the public authorities, for their treatment of strangers. Many laws are indeed absurd; and many customs, at once inconvenient and ridiculous. But we forget our duty to ourselves, when we attempt to evade or resist them; and are equally unmindful of our duty to others, when those whose office is merely ministerial, are viewed and treated, as if they were the responsible party. And it is strange that people should find it so hard to learn that in this as in every other case, their own good, is promoted by doing what is right.

The American who finds himself in France, for the first time will find himself in a new world. The language, which he may have been vain enough to suppose, he understood somewhat of, because he could read it, and comprehend it, when slowly spoken;—he will scarcely know to be French. For I take it that the two most dissimilar things that all the anomalies of human speech present are the written and spoken language of France.—Every thing however is strange and peculiar,—The people are as striking as their speech; their houses, are strange as themselves, their dress in keeping, with all the rest and their very domestic animals, and implements of labour, unique throughout.

In France, generally, all large establishments, are built in the form of a hollow square, into which there is usually one large arched entrance, admitting men, and beasts, and vehicles of all sorts. You enter upon a large paved court, and find yourself surrounded by all the appurtenances, of the establishment,—the walls of which often mount up six or seven stories in height. Except the shops, and the residences of people of the poorest kind, it is not common to see, doors entering from without, immediately into the house: but rather upon the inclosed court. The whole arrangement is admirable, for convenience, for privacy, for shelter from chilly winds, and hot sun, and what was not less important, in former days from external violence. Their roofs are of slate or tin;—the walls chiefly of stone, occasionally of brick—and more rarely of wood and mud: the floors, when made of plank are curiously constructed of short pieces of oak, laid down in squares, diamonds &c; and very highly polished,—but they are very often composed of marble, or tins of eight sides painted, red, and are seldom carpeted:—the windows, by a simple contrivance, open each way from the centre, inwards like a folding door, and are decidedly superior to ours; while the walls of the apartments are generally wainscoted with wood, highly polished and left of its natural colour; and decorated to excess with the most prodigious mirrors.

Such is a French house. If it be a palace, it is only more extensive and superb: if a chateau in the country, only flattened and wi-

dened; if a town establishment of a grandee, or a hotel of many residences, or a 'tavern'—in the American sense,—the model is the same. Of the people themselves, I had no juster ideas than of their places of abode. The French of the upper classes, are totally misconceived of by us. There is nothing of that frivolity and exaggerated lightness of manner, which has grown into a proverb, through the hereditary malice of the English; but the same dignity, self possession, and gentleness which characterise all gentlemen every where. Nor is there even in their personal appearance, so much to distinguish them, as I had supposed. All I have seen of the human race, and I have seen specimens of nearly every variety that exists, leads me decidedly to place the people of the middle states in America at the summit of their kind, for physical advantages. Comparing the French with them, they would be called too short, and too strongly built for their height. Except this and the common use of mustachios,—you meet every day, a hundred men, that you are ready to believe are your countrymen. Of the other sex, in this rank of life, I speak not now.

There seem to be few people of what the English delight to call the *middle classes*, in France: and there is well for France, a still smaller proportion of the *privileged classes*. A gentleman of independent circumstances, *Rautier* as they call him, is the real representative of the substantial population of the kingdom, and while those above him, are few in proportion, those below him, imperceptibly decline, from one condition to another, none sinking so low from the level as the rabble of England. The great body of the labouring people in France; are very peculiar in their dress and appearance. The men seldom wear a hat, which they substitute by a cap, resembling a common night cap. The women wear no bonnets, but instead, a singular looking cap put on hind part before. The consequence is, that all are burnt to a degree of sallowness, approaching the complexion of the mulatto. The females work in the fields, with the men, using indiscriminately the same implements of husbandry; and with their short petticoats and bare arms; are more exposed than the other sex. They are in consequence, coarse, large, and homely. About the towns they often claim an exclusive right to occupations, which in other countries belong only to men. Thus at Boulogne females, are the only porters, and may be seen bearing enormous burdens on their heads and backs, or dragging them in trundles. And yet we should be cautious in condemning such customs; for this one I found to be based in reasons at once politic and humane. It is a perquisite attached to the widows of those citizens who had been seamen, or in some way connected with the sea service of this coast.

Boulogne is divided into two towns, having little resemblance, and not much connexion. The lower and newer of the two is situated on the eastern bank of the little river Liane, and is a modern, brick town. The upper, or old town is built on the top of a high and steep bank, surrounded with a wide stone wall, and is itself of great antiquity. It is said to be the Gessoriacum of Cæsar, mentioned by him, as the capital of the Morinii: and here it was, that Caligula, as Suetonius relates, ordered his troops to rush upon the ocean as upon a hostile army,—and plucking up shells and pebbles, conveyed them to Rome, as evidences of his tri-

umph. And wherefore should he not? Or wherefore should I deride him? Cæsar, and Caligula—how immeasurably separated in all that makes man illustrious,—both in what he is and what he does. And yet as I tread where both have trod before me, and recall the meanness, the folly and the infamy of one,—and remember the other's greatness, majesty and long renown—what has twenty centuries left that makes either of them more to earth—or earth to them, than the very fine dust of the balance? It is eternity alone that is worth regarding, as the end of life; and it only, as an object of effort can be absolutely secured.

While our courier procured the passage of our trunks through the custom house, and was arranging for our departure for Paris on the morning after our arrival, we hired a carriage and drove to the monument, commenced by Napoleon, and now nearly completed by Louis Phillippe, to commemorate the military operations in this neighbourhood, preparatory to the contemplated invasion of England in the year 1804. The column is built of marble; it is a few miles from Boulogne, situated on an elevated plain in the midst of entrenchments once occupied by vast armies and mounting up one hundred and sixty French feet, is easily ascended by a flight of steps in the inside. We were shown to the top, by an amazon—and as far as the sense of insecurity arising from a position protected only by a slight open railing would allow, we enjoyed, a boundless prospect of sea and land. To the West the British channel lay at our feet and melted away into the horizon, out of all reach: towards the north the English coast was distinctly visible, along an extended line; and to the south and east, the plains of France, wide, naked, and uniform, dotted here and there by a village or a forest—indented by the course of some small stream—or roughened along the skirts by the barren red sand hills, that fringe the coast. It is a noble prospect, little known, and seldom visited. The few Americans who come to Boulogne are laughed out of countenance at the bare mention of so foolish a purpose by the multitudes of English who resort to this place, partly to enjoy sea bathing, partly to live cheaper than at home, partly to escape their creditors, and principally perhaps because the charge for coming here is less than for going so far in any other direction, out of England. They have not yet forgotten the event to which the monument relates, and in the degree that all England was terrified then—all England seems to think it right to be merry and make contemptuous speeches now.

I found a few labourers at work on blocks of marble, intended for the completion of a pavement at the base of the pillar; but when we descended they were sleeping on the ground under the shade of few neighboring trees. This led to a conversation with our giantess, as to the condition and habits of the agricultural labourers. I have since had many opportunities to observe their habits, and to obtain information as to their condition. They live generally in villages or small clusters of houses, which are built of stone, or mud, and covered with tile or thatch. Many own small portions of land, purchased at very reduced prices, during the first revolution, when the estates of those who fled, and those who suffered were confiscated and brought to the hammer. Their food con-

sists in an early breakfast, of bread only, and that of a coarse description; sometimes a little cheese, still more rarely vegetables, milk, tea or coffee. At 12 o'clock they dine on a soup made of vegetables, enriched by a small piece of butter, or animal fat of some kind, such as skimmings of boiled meat, or the drippings of such as has been roasted; and after dinner, a repose in the open air, of an hour or two is taken. Some go home to their mid-day meal—but most have it brought to them. About sun-set, they quit work, and eat a third meal of bread only. Meat is eaten once a week, and a pint of cheap wine, about as often is drank as a luxury. Such is the life of the agricultural labourers in France; and with it, they seem a healthy, contented, and cheerful race.

We returned through the old town, which is smaller than the new, and is very picturesque. In the centre is an ample paved square where most of the principal buildings for public use are situated; always excepting the churches, which in all Catholic countries are placed a little out of the town; for being always in former times connected with some establishment for the residence of priests, monks, nuns, or some other religious persons, they were located in situations favorable to retirement and privacy. The four principal streets, leading from the four gates of the city meet in this central square. The streets are all narrow, generally crooked, and overhung by houses, that get wider as they get higher, often having two or three offsets, at as many successive stories, at these offsets the floor and walls above are supported by the most grotesque figures, of men, beasts, and demons, in every condition of decay. The rampart is planted with trees; and affords a fine promenade, and delightful views of the sea, and the adjacent country. The house in which Le Sage the author of *Gil Blas* died, with an inscription over the door, is still shown. The old town is east of the new; and the two contain about *eighteen* thousand inhabitants, of whom an eighth part are English. In its essential characteristics the foregoing description will apply to all the walled towns of France, which once exceeded two thousand, and which are objects of curiosity to Americans at least,—in whose country, nothing like them is to be found.

The mode of travelling in France is left very much to the option of the traveller. You may hire horses and postilions, and ride; changing every eight or ten miles. The word *mile* however never occurs; distance being estimated entirely by *posts*, each post being two French leagues, equal to about five and a half English miles. You may take a seat in a diligence, which is a species of omnibus having four places to carry passengers, and taking in all about fourteen or seventeen persons exclusive of the conducteur and postilions. The latter usually ride the horses; the former rides in an affair exactly like a gig body, set on the top of the front apartment of the diligence. This place will hold two besides the conducteur; behind it all along the top is carried baggage; under it a place for three people; and then there are two apartments more, each containing six persons. The diligence is drawn by four, five, six, or even more horses, placed two or three abreast, and fastened to the vehicle, universally with ropes, and in such a way as to prevent them from standing exactly abreast, but rather in echelon.

I never saw a leather or chain trace to a diligence, or hired travelling carriage in France. If you prefer to travel in a more private way, you can hire a carriage of any description, for any length of time. I was shown into a magazine, as they call every such repository, and selected one, out of several dozen. The cost of it to Paris was one hundred francs—the owner responsible for its repairs—and I only for its delivery at an appointed place in that city. The horses belong entirely to the government. They are kept at fixed stations—are let at settled rates;—and you are certain to get them and postilions, not only when wanted—at cheap rates, and of excellent descriptions,—but you are forced to take as many at a time, and them as often, as the law has determined to be necessary. Our party consisting of three, and a courier, we were obliged to take three horses, and one postilion; the cost being for him and them seven and a half francs per post, of five miles; that is six for the three horses, and one and a half for the postilion. From Boulogne to Paris is twenty-four posts—about one hundred and twenty English miles; making the whole expence of carriage, horses and postilion, exclusive of other charges, two hundred and eighty francs for four persons—or about thirteen dollars each. This is about half the expense of travelling in the same way in England; and is far more comfortable, first because, in England you are obliged to change your carriage every few miles, and secondly because there is in France much less delay, and much more civility.

I had as well say a word about the money of France. Bills are not in common circulation, the Bank of France issuing them only of large denominations; five hundred francs being I believe the smallest. The gold coins oftenest met with are the forty franc and twenty franc pieces; but gold is always worth a premium here, and therefore enters but little into the ordinary exchanges. The ordinary silver coins are the pieces of five francs, two francs, one franc, three-quarters, half, and one-fourth of a franc. The coins of bellon (a mixed metal) and copper, are of various values from a deceme, which is two sous or the tenth part of a franc, to a centeme, which is the fifth part of a sous, or the hundredth part of a franc, and equal in value to less than a fifth part of one cent. The taile is very easy. The silver franc, may be said to be the basis of it; twenty of them make the gold Napoleon, while the twentieth part of one is the copper sous. The five franc piece which is very common in the United States makes this coinage familiar to Americans, who have only to recollect that the par value of the franc is about nineteen cents of our money. This is the monetry system established in 1795. There is another and much more ancient system and coinage, many of the pieces of which corresponded in value with those now used under other names. But the modern coinage becoming of more value in the market, a decree of 1810 sealed the two in such a way, as to render it the interest of the holders of the ancient coinage to have it recast; so that at present little of it is seen.

We left Boulogne the day after our arrival, in the afternoon, intending to divide the distance to Paris into three stages, to be travelled in as many days. As we drove out of the town, and indeed

as we passed through all the cities and villages on the way,—the crowds of neat looking people with joyful faces,—the long lines of flags streaming from the windows, and every aspect of all things around us,—showed how manifestly the revolution of July, was national in France. This was the second of the three joyfully remembered days; and having a more distinct view of the flags than by the moonlight of the preceding night, I observed many of them to have a fillet of crape around the upper part of the staff. I pointed it out several times, on that and the succeeding day, to different individuals; and received from all the same response, and the same equivocal exposition. It is, they would say, for the victims of the Revolution; and then would add,—but it is improper to allow it to remain after the first day,—especially improper to permit it on the third day. This perplexed me; for all admitted it to be outre, yet the great majority did it. It struck me there might be a deeper feeling; and I observed, perhaps it is for the Revolution itself—for its supposed failure, that you clothe your tri-colour in mourning? I got no answer, in any case, but a shrug of the shoulder—or a cast of the brow upwards,—or the mere remark that there was a difference of opinions in France, as elsewhere.—I found that the King had determined to put off the usual review of the National Guard,—that plots and conspiracies were talked of—arrests to a great extent made—a strong and anxious sensation excited in the country—and bodies of troops moving in various directions. That afternoon we met a fine squadron of cavalry consisting of several hundred men—each of whom led a spare horse.

Our route lay parallel with the coast for some distance—which at length bearing off towards the westward, left our course continued in a direction a little east of south, towards the heart of the kingdom. The first night we slept at Bemay, fourteen leagues from Boulogne; after passing through and in sight of numerous hamlets, the villages of Cormont and Nompport, and the walled towns of Samer and Montrueil. Samer is situated on the top of a hill, and the view of it, both as the traveller approaches it and departs from it, for several miles, is very beautiful. As it lay before me, in the warm and rich light of a July sun,—after I had lost the greater part of summer in a more northern climate, I thought I had seldom looked upon a prettier landscape, than its hill, its white wall, its green trees, and its wide rural vicinage presented. Not unlike it but far more extensive, is the view of Montrueil, as you emerge from the forest of Longvilliers, through which you have passed for half a league, and behold it a mile or two off, perched in almost impregnable strength upon a rock on the top of one of those chalk hills which abound in France as well as in England. It is an ancient—and must once have been a fine city. Some of its ruins are still noble. Before reaching our lodging we crossed the river Arethie, which divide the departments of Somme and Pas-de-Calais, and a little further on, entered the skirts of the renowned forest of Crecy—a name so full of glory to every British ear, and reaching Bemay, with the light of a bright moon, slept soundly, in an excellent inn.

The second day's journey brought us after twenty-six leagues'

travel to Bouvais, the chief town of the department of Oise. It contains about fifteen thousand inhabitants, is of unknown antiquity,—and though built principally of wood, is rather a handsome town. Its manufactures of woollen, but especially those of tapestry, are admirable; the latter being considered inferior only to those of the Gobelius near Paris. This art is carried to so great perfection, that when inspecting the Cathedral of Notre-Dame at Paris, I saw, in company with a considerable party, a picture of Saint somebody (I forget who)—in the guise of a shepherdess hanging in the treasury, behind the great sacristie,—it excited universal astonishment, when it was pronounced a piece of tapestry. It was little inferior to the majority of the paintings which are shown as great treasures in a cathedral—richer in holy relics than most others in Europe. During the day we passed through Abbeville on the river Somme, in ancient Picardy; an extensive manufacturing town a few leagues from Saint Valery, at the mouth of the river, and up to which point all the way from Boulogne our road lay parallel with the coast, and often in view of the sea. It interested me more for its namesake, and the sake of those persecuted Protestants, who in the new world have preserved the remembrance of it, in a district and town of the same name in South Carolina—whether as is well known a portion of the Hugonots fled; and where their offspring now occupy so conspicuous a rank, amongst the best citizens of our Republic. Bauvais is a walled town, and was never taken by an enemy, though repeatedly besieged. In 1143 the English were repulsed from it; and in 1472 the Burgundians to the number of eighty thousand were unable to take it.—This time it was saved by the courage of its females, under the direction of a girl called Jeanne Hotcheste,—in commemoration of which—after the lapse of four hundred years, the grateful citizens still keep up an annual fete, on the 10th of July. If we add to this, the fact, that an unusual number of distinguished men, have been natives of Bauvais, we shall see no reason to be surprised, that its inhabitants are proud of *La Pallu*—as they call their pretty town.

Of Marseille, Grouvilliers, Airsives and other smaller places, it is needless to make special mention. I am sure however, they err, who say, that France is destitute of charms to the traveller, even in this part of it, which is said to be the least interesting of all. Its general surface—is a wide, indeed an apparently unlimited, plain; elevated, undulating—intersected by numerous small streams, each causing a considerable but gradual depression; and crossed by many ranges raised somewhat above the general level, and whose tops and sides are the resting places of many towns. There is little wood, and what remains is in forests of some magnitude. There are no fences, no ditches, no hedges, no walls—except immediately about the places of human abode. The crops grow up to the road side; the plats of ground are divided by invisible lines; the flocks of sheep feed, in their pastures, kept from the ripe and growing crops, only by the vigilance of the shepherd and his dogs. Flocks, or single animals even, of other kinds are rarely seen; I have observed neither cow, hog, nor horse,—at large—and the whole face of France presents a continual aspect of culti-

vated grounds, interspersed only with human habitations. Through such a region, a wide and nearly straight road, paved or gravelled in the middle, about twenty feet wide, and having an unpaved space on either side of the same width, passes the whole distance from Boulogne to Paris. No tolls are demanded and the same liberality and good sense, which make the highways free, are adorning them with continuous rows of trees on both sides, sometimes to a considerable depth.

There are however several inconveniences, which remind us that we are in a land behind the age. At least once every day, and often twice, a gendarme demands a sight of your passports; or rather of the descriptive account of you and them, which was given to you, when they were taken from you on your entrance into France; and which are restored to you again at Paris. At every walled town you enter you are also stopped to be interrogated, as to whether you are carrying any thing that can be eaten or drank into them;—that you might be made to pay duty if you chanced to be going to market; and as if they could not see, without this nonsense, that all mankind are not hucksters. So again, every inn you remain a few hours at,—is forced to make out a far more perfect roll of your party, than is to found in most congregations of our church members: which is daily inspected by the police. But above all, the army of beggars, is intolerable. Luckily the inferior coins of France are of small value, or they whose principles or feelings impel them to attend to such calls of human want, or degradation, might soon be forced to give up their travels and turn mendicant, themselves. From the tenderest youth, to extreme old age embracing both sexes—beggars surround you wherever you go, except in Paris. There you see very few except in, and around the churches. But every where else, in the villages, on the road sides;—children in the arms of their parents;—little girls—boys,—young women—men, blind, lame,—every thing—every where. In several places, little huts had been cut out of the soft rock in the hill sides, and fitted up as habitations—out of which mendicants would emerge as soon as the rattling of the carriage gave them notice of your approach. This horrible condition of things seems peculiar to Papal countries—and can perhaps be easily explained. By the principles of that religion, the ecclesiastics are made the almoners of the public benevolence; insomuch that not to consult them as to the objects and methods of it, is as great a sin in their code as not to give alms at all. In all such states, where tythe was granted to the clergy—a regular part, generally one-fourth, was declared to be the patrimony of the poor; which being two and a half per cent. on all the gross product of labour,—would be a most abundant provision, for the misfortunes of society. Another result attendant on such a policy is that, no Catholic state makes any public provision for the poor—other than that contemplated above; which indeed would be useless,—if that were efficiently and honestly administered. Without calling in question the character of the Romish priesthood every where—it is quite manifest that such a system as this must be liable to enormous abuse on one hand; and corresponding suffering on the other,—even when fully in exercise. But if it be remembered that a vast proportion of these persons have

in all ages been mendicants themselves; there will appear but small chance for other poor. Then when it is considered that the tythe itself, which was the basis of the original scheme, is no longer paid in many papal countries; it is certain that no excuse can be available either for governments that permit such suffering amongst the poor, without any provision for them; or for a religion, that tolerates, when it might as easily as others, redress the wretchedness, and remove the causes of it. Besides the want which probably first produced the mendicity amongst the people at large, and which common humanity should impel all men to remedy; the moral effect of the begging itself, is perhaps, still more to be deplored. All sense of shame gives place—to deceit, and falsehood;—until to beg, creates no pain—and to deceive produces no compunction. Yet the very structure of their religion produces this condition of things in all papal states; and while you search in vain for one that has escaped it, you will not find a syllable of doctrine which forbids, nor one moral lesson which expostulates against the thing itself, in all the authorised expositions and teachings of that church, in all ages.

The greater part of the day which brought us from Bernay to Bauvais, had been damp and showery. Our third day's journey was a short one into Paris, a distance of only seventeen leagues, through Noailles, Puiseux, Beaumont upon the Oise, where the stream is of considerable breadth, Moisselles, and St. Denis. It was in the midst of hay, and wheat harvest; and the fields were full of persons of all ages, and both sexes,—busily engaged, in that season so joyful to the husbandman. Until to-day, we had not observed many vines; but as you recede from the sea coast, they become more abundant, and occupy a larger space. There is something rather mean, in the appearance of the vineyards. They are of small extent—planted without any order—at intervals of eighteen inches or two feet between the vines—which are trained up a small stick, and do not exceed three feet in height. The grapes seem hardly half grown. As I saw the harvest ready to be completed, and the vintage still far off—I recalled many instances from the Scriptures, where the former is mentioned as an emblem of peace, and of our ingathering,—and many others where the latter is used to shadow forth the wrath of God, and the destruction of wicked men; and I rejoiced in the beautiful illustration before my eyes, that the harvest evermore precedeth the vintage, so the mercy goeth before the woe! And shall it be thus for good, to us, and to you, my poor fellow worms—who pass each other by to-day, having nothing to unite us but our common sinful natures,—and the common hopes (if they indeed be ours) which the Lord Jesus only can bestow; shall it be good for us and you that the harvest is before the vintage, when we behold each other's faces for the second time—by the light that issues from the throne of God? And shall it be good for thee reader?

Our last change of horses was at the ancient village of St. Denis, so renowned in the history of the monarchs of France. From the end of the sixth century, to the end of the eighteenth,—they were interred in the abbey of St. Denis. One of the most brutal acts of the first revolution in France, was the decree of the convention in

1793, in obedience to which, the remains of the sovereigns of France, of the three first races, were disinterred and thrown into two trenches near the church. In this place too was deposited with the most religious care, the sacred banner of France, called *Oriflamme*;—which was the signal for the universal rising of the nation to arms,—and which so often led her enthusiastic armies to victory. This was a scarlet banner, which after the time of Charles VII. gave way to the white drapeau, and it, in its turn, after leading the millions to slaughter, for the space of three centuries, yielded to the tri-colour of the first revolution. I was roused from a reverie like this, by the rattling of what at first seemed a pair of kettles, which turned out to be a pair of boots. The French postilion is the most burlesque creature in the world; except the monkies you see dressed up in regimentals, riding on dogs, and bowing and doffing their caps, on all sides, for pennies for their master. I thought I was prepared by previous exhibitions for any thing in the shape of beasts; but I was mistaken. This fellow had to ride into Paris and must be better equipped than usual. Hence boots that come half way up the thigh, which all have—were too low for him; and spurs that on all their heels look like click blades more than spurs, was too small for him, and spencers that did not reach to the small of the back, and whose skirt was too short to button at all, were quite too full for him. His coat was a pair of sleeves, with two collars, one above and one below; and might as well be put on upside down, as any way. His boots he made no pretension of walking in—which indeed he admitted weighed ten pounds each—and which the spurs alone would render useless except on horseback. Equipped perfectly to his heart's content,—he took us rapidly over the two leagues that separate St. Denis from the capital. Montmartre was on the left; Les Batignoles on the right. The Barriere de Clichy is passed, and we enter Paris along the front of the garden of Tivoli, by the Rue Clichy and Rue de la Chaussée d'Antin; to the right along the Boulevard des Capucines; inclining to the left down the Rue de la Paix; by the place Vendome, and the magnificent bronze columns made of the canon taken in Germany;—on through the Rue Castiglione; to the left into the Rue Rivoli, to the Hotel Windsor, overlooking the Jardin des Thuilleries. I have named the most magnificent quarter of the noblest city in Europe. I write these lines in the midst of scenes which have witnessed, or which recall great events, through the lapse of sixty generations; and which are perhaps reserved for a still higher destiny!—

WALDENSIAN CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

It does the heart of the Christian good, to look back to the witnesses for the truth, that the Lord sustained and preserved in the midst of almost universal apostacy from the religion of Christ. It is delightful to see how clearly, and fully they maintain the simple truths of the gospel, freed from the corrupting and foolish ceremonies of men. The doctrines contained in the confession following, are indeed those of the martyrs, the witnesses for Jesus. The men

that professed them, held the same at the peril of their lives. Many—very many times did their blood flow like water for cleaving to them. This did not move them, neither did they like the apostles, count their lives dear that they might win Christ, and be found in him.

The first confession following was published in 1120 about *four hundred years* before Luther. It will be seen on comparing it with the doctrines of most evangelical Protestants; and particularly with the institutes of Calvin, and the sentiments of Luther, that these men, were really and truly Protestants against Popery. The doctrines which they held, we now hold. The doctrines which we are now permitted freely to hold, and diligently spread, are those, the very suspicion of which, exposed these holy men, to the most cruel tortures, and inhuman butchery of merciless priests. To exterminate from the earth, root and branch, the holders of this doctrine, was the grand design, and powerful operation of that hellish institution, called the *Holy Inquisition*.

Confession of the Waldenses bearing date 1120.

ARTICLE I. We believe and firmly do hold all that is contained in the twelve articles, called the Apostles' Creed, accounting for heresy whatsoever is disagreeing and not consonant thereunto.

ART. II. We believe that there is one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

ART. III. We acknowledge for the holy and canonical scripture, the books of the Bible; that is to say, Genesis, Exodus, &c. (reckoning up all the books of the Old Testament exactly as they stand in our Protestant Bibles, and then, come these words.) The Apocryphal books are these that follow, which are not received by the Hebrews; but we read them, [as says St. Jerom in his prologue to the Proverbs,] for the instruction of the people, not to establish the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines in the soul. Then they count the apocryphal books, and after that add;—Here follow the books of the New Testament, [which they recite just as we do.]

ART. IV. The books above named teach thus much, that there is one Almighty God, all-wise and all-good, who hath made all things by his goodness; for he created Adam after his own image, but by the malice of the devil, and disobedience of Adam sin entered into the world, and we are made sinners in Adam, and by Adam.

ART. V. Christ was promised to our forefathers who received the law, to the end, that knowing their sin by the law, and their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ to satisfy for their sins, and by himself accomplish the law.

ART. VI. Christ was born at the time appointed by God his Father; that is to say, at a time when all iniquity abounded, and not for the cause of good works only, for all were sinners, but to the end he might offer his grace and mercy to us.

ART. VII. Christ is our life and truth, and peace and justice, and advocate and master, and priest, who died for the salvation of all those that believe, and is raised again for our justification.

ART. VIII. We also, firmly hold, that there is no other mediator or advocate with God the Father, but only Jesus Christ: and as for the Virgin Mary, that she was holy, humble and full of grace. And in like manner we believe of all the other saints, viz.

That being in heaven they wait for the resurrection of their bodies at the day of judgment.

ART. IX. We likewise believe, that after this life there are only two places, the one for the saved, the other for the damned, that being called heaven, and this hell; utterly denying purgatory as being a dream of Antichrist's, and an invention contrary to the truth.

ART. X. We have always believed that the inventions of men are an unspeakable abomination before God, viz. such as the feasts and vigils of saints, holy water, the abstaining on certain days from flesh, but especially the mass.

ART. XI. We esteem for an abomination and as antichristian, all those human inventions which are a trouble or prejudice to the liberty of the spirit.

ART. XII. We believe that the sacraments are outward signs of holy things, or visible forms of the invisible grace, accounting it good that the faithful should use these signs and visible forms, if it may be done: however we believe and hold that the aforesaid faithful may be saved, without receiving the signs aforesaid, in case they have not power or means to use them.

ART. XIII. We acknowledge no other sacrament but baptism and the eucharist.

ART. XIV. We are bound to honour the secular powers by subjection, ready obedience, and payment of tributes.

The above confession is from Sir Samuel Moreland's history of the Waldenses. It is indeed striking how decidedly these holy men of old speak of the corruptions of Christianity by the Papacy. Every mediator but Jesus Christ, they reject.—*Purgatory* they call a dream of Antichrist. The *feasts* and *vigils* of the saints, especially the Mass, they consider abominable. On the subject of sacraments, they hold to the *two*, which are now held by evangelical Protestants, *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, which two they consider outward signs of holy things; rejecting all the five superstitious, and blasphemous additions of the Papacy.

In another confession of faith, to be found in *Charles du Moulin's* book, *De la Mon. des Francais*, page 65th, the 8th Art. runs thus: (see hist. of Popery, 1 vol. page 424)—“We hold the holy sacrament of the table, or supper of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be a *holy Remembrance* or *Thanksgiving*, for the benefits we have received by his death and passion, and which is to be received in faith, charity, &c.”

Since the above confession, they have published several, one in 1508, another in 1655, which appears from the following peroration, to be found in *Gilly's Excursion*, to have been published in 1603,

“For a more ample declaration of our faith, we do here reiterate the same protestation which we caused to be printed in 1603; that is to say, that we do agree in sound doctrine with all the reformed churches of France, Great Britain, the Low Countries, Germany, Switzerland, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and others, as it is represented by them in their confessions; as also we receive the confession of Augsburg, and as it was published by the authors, promising to persevere constantly therein, with the help of God, both in life and death, and being ready to subscribe to that eternal truth of God

with our own blood, even as our ancestors have done from the days of the apostles, and especially in these latter ages."

In the *Christian Observer* for March, 1827, we find an article on this subject containing the above confession, some additional remarks, and a later confession, dated February 20, 1819, part of which we give our readers.

"At first sight the confession of 1819, seems to be nearly a republication of that of 1655, but upon further inspection it appears that the modern pastors have made a few alterations, some of which deserve notice—They have also reduced the number of articles to thirty-two, by the omission of the twenty-seventh of the confession of 1655; which is as follows:—" That all men ought to join that church—[namely, 'the company of the faithful elected and called, as described in the twenty-fifth article]—and to continue in the communion thereof.' The reasons for omitting this article it is unnecessary to conjecture; the fear of giving offence, by an apparently exclusive or proselyting spirit, may sufficiently account for it, without supposing that the writers were themselves indifferent to the distinction between a true and a false church. This confession is, on various accounts, well worth examination. A few of the chief difference between this document and the declaration of 1655, will be pointed out: the merely verbal ones are not ascertainable, for want of the original Latin document of 1655. For the convenience of the general reader, both declarations are given in English. The articles of 1819, were drawn up expressly in reply to some charges urged against the Waldenses in some of the *London Journals*."

Confession of Faith of the Waldensian Pastors residing in Piedmont, dated February 20, 1819.

I. We believe (with respect to numerical unity) that God is one; and by this word we understand a spiritual, eternal, boundless, infinitely wise, merciful, and just—in one word, a most perfect Being; and that, in that simple essence, there are three Persons, or Hypostases, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

II. We believe that the same God has manifested himself to men by his works, both of creation and providence; and by his word, revealed in the beginning "in divers manners," written and contained in books, which are called the Holy Scripture.

III. We believe that the Holy Scripture should be received (and we do receive it) as divine and canonical; that is to say, as the rule of our faith and conduct; that it is contained in the books of the Old and New Testament; that in the Old Testament are contained only those books which God intrusted to the Jewish church, and which that church always approved, and acknowledged as of divine authority; namely, five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the first and second of Samuel, the first and second of Kings, the first and second of Chronicles, the first of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, four greater and twelve lesser Prophets; and, in the New Testament, four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the He-

brews, one of St. James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and, lastly, the Revelation.

IV. We acknowledge the divine authority of these books, not merely on the testimony of the church, but more especially on account of the eternal and unquestionable truth of the doctrine contained in them; the excellence, sublimity, and divine majesty which shine throughout; and by the operation of the Holy Spirit.*

V. We believe that God made all things out of nothing, of his own perfectly free will, and by the infinite power of his word.

VI. We believe that he undertakes the care of all things by his providence, and that he is neither the author nor the cause of the evil which men practise; "for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man."

VII. We believe that the angels were created pure and holy; that some of them have fallen into an irreparable state of corruption and perdition; but that others have persevered in holiness, through the divine goodness, which confirmed them.

VIII. We believe that man, who was created pure and holy, deprived himself, through his own fault, of the happiness allied to purity and holiness, by listening to the tempter, that is, the devil.

IX. That man, by his transgression, lost the righteousness and holiness which he had received, and incurred, with the wrath of God, death, and captivity under the dominion of him who "bath the power of death;" so that our free will is in a fallen condition, and we are become the "children of wrath," "dead in sins;" and are not able of ourselves, and without grace, to cherish a good thought.†

X. That all the descendants of Adam are guilty of his disobedience, infected with corruption, and have fallen into the same calamity; whence that infection proceeds, to which the fathers have given the name of original sin.‡

XI. That from that corruption and condemnation, God delivers men whom he has chosen through his mercy in his Son Jesus Christ.§

XII. We believe that Jesus Christ was ordained by God, by an eternal decree, as the only Saviour and Leader of his body, that is, of the church; that he redeemed it by his blood in the fulness of time; and presents to it all benefits by the gospel.

XIII. We believe that there are two natures in Christ, the divine and the human, truly in one sole person; neither confounded, nor divided, nor separated, nor changed; each nature preserving distinct properties; and that Jesus Christ is very God and very man.

*The confession of 1655 adds, "who gives us to receive with reverence the testimony of the church in that point, and opens the eyes of our understanding to discover the beams of that celestial light which shines in the Scripture, and prepares our taste to discern the divine favour of that spiritual food."

†The corresponding article of 1655 is fuller and stronger: it says, "in so much that our free will is become a servant and slave to sin: and thus all men both Jews and Gentiles, are by nature the children of wrath, being all dead in their trespasses and sins, and consequently incapable of the least good motion, or inclination to any thing which concerns their salvation; yea, incapable to think one good thought without God's special grace, all their imaginations being wholly evil, and that continually."

‡The article of 1655 adds, "even the very infants from their mothers' womb."

§The article of 1655 says—"That God saves from that corruption and condemnation, those whom he has chosen from the foundation of the world, not for any disposition, faith, or holiness, that he foresaw in them, but of his mere mercy in Jesus Christ his Son; passing by all the rest, according to the irreprehensible reason of his free will and justice."

XIV. That "God so loved the world,"* that he gave his Son to save us by his most perfect obedience—especially that which he displayed by enduring the death of the cross; and by the conquests he achieved over the devil, sin, and death.

XV. That Jesus Christ effected the complete expiation of our sins by his most perfect sacrifice, once made upon the cross; and that, therefore, a repetition of that sacrifice, neither can nor ought to be made.†

XVI. That the Lord Jesus, when he had reconciled us to God by his blood, became our Leader; and that we are not absolved and justified by our own works, but by his merit.‡

XVII. That we have fellowship with Christ, and participate in his benefits, by faith, which strives to obtain the promises of life which are offered to us in the gospel.

XVIII. That this faith proceeds from the gratuitous operation of the Holy Spirit, who illuminates our souls, and induces them to place all their hopes in the divine mercy; that we may impute to ourselves the merits of Christ; and that we may most firmly believe, that without him we cannot be saved.

XIX. We believe that Jesus Christ is our mediator, not only for the purpose of redemption, but for that of intercession also; and that, through his merits and mediation, we may have access to the Father, to call upon him with confidence, that we shall be heard.§

XX. We believe, that since God promises us regeneration in Jesus Christ, we, who are united to him by a lively faith, ought strenuously to perform || good works.

XXI. We believe good works to be so necessary to believers, that they cannot attain to the kingdom of heaven without such good works, which God (it is most certain) "hath foreordained that we should walk in them;" and, in like manner, that we should shun every vice, and cultivate all the virtues that Christ hath taught us.¶

XXII. We believe, that although our works, cannot, in the strict sense of the word, merit, yet, that the Lord will reward them with eternal life, ** his promises being unchangeably constant.

XXIII. We believe that we ought to regard those who have attained to eternal life, as the reward of faith and good works, as worthy of praise and imitation; but that they ought not to be adored nor invoked by us, since to God alone should prayer be offered through Jesus Christ.

("Let us not adopt the worship of the dead as our religion, since, if they lived a devout life, they are not to be deemed such as seek those honours, but such as desire that we should worship him, by whose illumination they rejoice that we are partakers of their merit.

*The corresponding article of 1655 had, in the true spirit of party controversy, qualified the Scriptural expression, "the world," by adding, "that is to say, those whom he has chosen out of the world."

†The older confession adds, "as they pretend to do in the mass."

‡That of 1655 adds, "neither is there any other purgatory besides his blood, which cleanses us from all sin."

§That of 1655 adds, "it being needless to have recourse to any other intercessor besides himself."

||That of 1655 has, in a parenthesis "and do really perform."

¶That of 1655 says, "making use of fasting, and all other means which may conduce to so holy a thing."

**That of 1655 adds, "through the merciful continuation of his grace," and it has no such qualifying expression as "in the strict sense of the word."

They should be honoured, therefore, as objects of imitation, but not adored as objects of religious worship."—Augustine.) *

XXIV. We believe that God gathers together † a church in the world for the salvation of men; and that this church has one Leader and Foundation, namely, Jesus Christ.

XXV. That this church consists in the union of believers, who, "chosen of God before the foundation of the world," and "called with an holy calling," are united to follow God's word, *and cherish a salutary religious fear, namely, such as is productive of holiness, and a reformation of manners.* ‡

XXVI. That this church cannot be destroyed, but is necessarily a perpetual church. §

XXVII. That in the church God not only teaches us by his word, but has moreover instituted sacraments, as means whereby we might be united to Christ, and might participate in the benefits which he has obtained for us. We believe, that under the New Testament dispensation, there are only two sacraments common to all the members of the church; namely, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

XXVIII. We believe that God instituted the sacrament of baptism for a testimony of our adoption, and that we might be washed from our sins in the blood of Christ, and renewed unto holiness of life.

XXIX. That he instituted the sacrament of the Lord's supper, in order to nourish our souls; that when, with a true and lively faith, (through the incomprehensible power of the Holy Spirit) we eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ, and are one with him, we may have spiritual and eternal life.

XXX. We believe it to be necessary, that the church should have learned pastors of blameless life, (bishops, priests, and deacons, as was usual in the primitive church,) to preach the word of God, to administer the sacraments, and to watch over the flock of Christ according to rules of good and holy discipline, after the example of the primitive church. ||

XXXI. We believe that God has appointed kings, princes, and magistrates, for the protection of the people; and that we should obey them, (agreeably to this precept, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God, &c.—Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake,") in all things that agree with the word of God, who is "King of kings, and Lord of lords."

XXXII. Lastly, we declare that we receive the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, as rules of faith

* The passage from Augustine is not in the articles of 1655.

† The older formula says, "hath chosen."

‡ That of 1655 says simply, "living in his fear."

§ The old document adds, "and that all the elect are upheld and preserved by the power of God, in such sort that they all persevere in the faith unto the end, and remain united in the holy church, as so many living members thereof."

|| The confession of 1655 gives some extracts from the formularies of the Vaudois church, in proof of their belief on this subject. It has not the word *bishops*.

*The word *bishops* is not used in the other confessions, and in the present case with the whole parenthesis, was probably forced in by some one who wished to make them admirers of Prelacy. The manner in which the venerable *Peyrami* signs his name at the end of this confession, is strong proof of our suspicion, and at any rate proves that if bishops, they were like Paul's *overseers*.—ED.

and conduct; from which we believe that we should not recede, even in the least degree.

Such is the confession of our faith, which we, the Waldensian pastors residing in Piedmont, oppose to the calumnies published against us, and printed in the London journals; and this our professed faith we have not received from Waldo of Lyons, nor from Luther, nor from Calvin, but we have inherited it from the earliest times, from our forefathers, who had received it in like manner from their remote ancestors; as is evident from various confessions presented to our princes, the dukes of Savoy, and princes of Piedmont; and from a work of the most reverend James Usher, formerly archbishop of Armagh, and primate of all Ireland, which contains an historical explanation of the important question respecting the continued succession and condition of Christian churches, especially those in the West, from the time of the apostles to the seventeenth century.

In this faith we desire to live; and we desire still to persevere in it to the end; and to be ready to evince our attachment to it, even, if required on that account, to endure torture and torments, the loss of our possessions, and death at the stake.

Moreover, we declare that we cheerfully accede to the sound doctrine taught in the reformed churches of England, the Netherlands, Germany, Prussia, Switzerland, Poland, Hungary, &c.; and we humbly entreat all those churches, and others settled in America, to regard our's, though few and destitute, as members of the mystical body of Christ.

With regard to the style of this composition, which is not in every instance distinguished for classical purity, it is the less necessary to offer an apology on this score to our readers, since even Cicero allows, that "whatever is perspicuously expressed on a useful or important subject, should be considered as well expressed; to lavish embellishments on subjects of that nature, being in fact a puerile attempt, since it is quite sufficient for a learned and intelligent man to state them in a clear and perspicuous manner."

JOHN RODOLPHE PEYRAN.

Pastor of the church of Pomaret, and moderator of the Waldensian churches, (with the consent of all his brethren.)

THE TRIAL OF ANTICHRIST.

(Continued from page 395)

Father Paul, sworn.

Q. As you wrote the History of the Council of Trent, will you relate to the Court what you know of the Prisoner, and some of the proceedings of that rebellious assembly?

A. The Council of Trent was first summoned by the Prisoner under the name of Paul III. It first met on the 13th of December, 1545, and continued about eighteen years. Previous to the opening of it, the Prisoner proclaimed a Jubilee at Rome, promising pardon of all sins, to all who prayed for the Council, confessed their sins, went in procession, and fasted three days. The

Council was opened by the Legate *Monte*, who sung the Mass of the Holy Ghost. Previous to the meeting of this Council, the Prisoner, by his base conduct, had caused many in *Germany* and other parts of *Europe* to reject his authority. By the name of *Urban II.* about the year 1100, he first set up the money-making trade of vending indulgences, and by the name of *Leo X.* in 1517, he acquired immense sums from all *Europe*. *Leo* however divided the profits with his sister *Magdalene*, the wife of *Cibo*, bastard of *Innocent VIII.* by reason of which *Leo* was made a Cardinal when he was only fourteen years old. *Leo* gave his sister all the profits arising from Indulgences in *Saxony* and a part of *Germany*, and she set them up to sale to the highest bidder. The pardon-mongers collected immense sums from every nation they were sent to, as appears by one *Friar Samson*, who collected 120,000 crowns among the *Swiss* only.

The Prisoner having changed his name to *Adrian VI.* in the year 1522, and to that of *Clement VII.* in 1524, and to *Paul III.* in 1534, he created his illegitimate son, *Peter Alosius*, Duke of *Parma* and *Placentia*, and a son of his, a Cardinal, at the age of fourteen. A son of his illegitimate daughter *Constanza*, was also made another; and his conduct was such, that he was detested by every honest man. His bastard *Peter* was assassinated in his own palace two years after. In the year 1549, he gave up the name of *Paul III.* in a violent fit of passion, and assumed that of *Julius III.* when he sent Cardinal *Pole* as his Legate into *England*, to restore *Great Britain* to his authority, bloody Queen *Mary* having ascended the throne. This darling of the Prisoner within one year burnt 176 persons of quality, and others who rejected his authority. To please him, she also dug up bodies out of their graves after being buried four years. Many also were burnt in *France*, by the Prisoner's orders. He commissioned the King to grant to *Diana Valentina* his mistress, all the goods confiscated for heresy; this covetous harlot required the death of multitudes to support her in her abominations as a true daughter of the Church.

The Prisoner having for a few days only assumed the name of *Marcellius II.* he changed it to *Paul IV.* He then presumed to absolve *England* from the crime of rejecting his supremacy in the reigns of *Henry VIII.* and *Edward VI.* After which he wrote to his own pet *Mary*, for the *Peter's Pence*, and the restoration of land, that he claimed as *St. Peter's* property. He told the people of *England* "that they could not hope that *St. Peter* would open heaven unto them so long as they usurped his goods upon earth;" and thus duped them out of a great deal of money. He also created a number of Cardinals, contrary to his most solemn oath; and when reminded of it in the conclave, he declared it *heresy* to suppose that the Pope could be bound, or bind himself.

Notwithstanding the infamous conduct of the *Fathers** who composed the Council of *Trent* and the Prisoner, he presumed to

* *Trent* was the rendezvous for prostitutes from every quarter during the sitting of the Council.

declare, that the Council was guided by the Holy Ghost; so that a blasphemous proverb was generally used "that the Council of *Trent* was guided by the Holy Ghost sent hither from time to time in a cloak-bag from *Rome*." I have taken notice of the laws this Council made, though some of them are too absurd for any meaning to be attached to them, and therefore the Prisoner prohibited any other than he should choose. But he clearly decreed himself to be the Vicar of Christ. His church the only true church. The doctrine of Transubstantiation; Merit of good works; Purgatory; Invocation of Saints; Veneration of Images; Seven Sacraments; His power to grant Indulgences, to anathematize *heretics*, and to lay a prohibition on the use of the Scriptures. And that every thing decreed and declared by the Council of *Trent* should be believed. He also prohibited by the name of *Pius IV.* the annotation on the New Testament written by *Erasmus*, which he had sanctioned by the name of *Leo X.* His inquisitors also made out a list of books to be condemned with their authors; and even prohibited all books printed by 62 printers to be read, whether good or bad. The Prisoner was known by five different appellations during the time the Council sat.

Q. Do you know how many Protestants the Prisoner put to death in the *Netherlands*?

A. Yes. In a very short time he hanged, burned, buried alive, and beheaded, 50,000.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Eq i*vocator.

Q. Are you not a Priest?

A. I am; but it is well known, that I was never fully reconciled to his authority.

Q. On your oath, were you promised pardon in consideration of giving evidence?

A. I gave my testimony voluntarily. I was never promised pardon for so doing.

William Tindal, sworn.

This witness said that he was born in *Wales*. That he wished to translate the Bible into the *English* tongue, but was prevented in *England*. That he went over into *Germany*, and there translated, first the New and afterwards the Old Testament, which being sent over into *Great Britain*, produced much good. That in consequence of his publishing the word of God, the Prisoner and his hireling Bishops thirsted for his blood. That during the reign of *Henry VIII.* one *Henry Philips* was sent to seize him at *Antwerp*. That he was imprisoned, tried and condemned. And that in the year 1536 he was chained to a stake at *Filford* and burnt, (as was supposed to death.)

Thomas Bennet, School-master of *Exeter*, sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner attempt to kill you in the reign of *Henry VIII.*?

A. He did. I wrote some papers which I placed on the doors of the Cathedral and other churches, saying, that "the Pope is *Antichrist*, and we ought to worship God *only*, and no Saint." This gave great offence to the Priests under the Prisoner's government, and they, by his authority, proceeded to curse the author, with Bell, Book and Candle. The Priest who was to pronounce the curse, being in the pulpit, clothed in white, and the Friars and Monks standing about him, a cross was held up with candles fixed on it, when he pronounced the following words. "By the authority of God the Father Almighty, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*, of *St. Peter* and *Paul*, and of the holy Saints, we excommunicate, we utterly curse and bann, commit and deliver to the devil of hell, him or her, whomsoever he or she be, that have in spite of God, and of *St. Peter*, whose church this is, in spite of all holy Saints, and in spite of our Most Holy Father the Pope, God's vicar here in earth, and in spite of the Reverend Father in God *John*, our Diocesan, and the worshipful Canons, Masters, Priests, and Clerks, which serve God daily in this Cathedral church, fixed up with wax such cursed and heretical bills, full of blasphemy, upon the door of this and other holy churches within this city.

"Excommunicate be he, she, or they plenary, and delivered over to the devil, as perpetual malefactors and schismatics. Accursed they be, and given body and soul to the devil. Cursed be they, he, or she, in cities and towns, in fields and ways, in houses and out of houses, and all other places, standing, lying, or rising, walking, running, waking, sleeping, eating, drinking, and whatsoever thing they do beside.

"We separate them, him, or her, from the threshold, and from all the good prayers of the Church, from the participation of the holy Mass, from all Sacraments, Chapels, and Altars, from holy bread and holy water, from all the merits of God's Priests, and religious men, and from all their cloisters, from all their pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities, which all the holy Fathers, Popes of Rome, have granted to them. And we give them over utterly to the power of the devil, and let us quench their souls, if they be dead this night, in the pains of hell-fire as this candle is now quenched and put out." And with that he put out one of the candles.

"And let us pray to God, if they be alive, that their eyes may be put out, as this candle-light is." Here he put out another candle. "Let us pray to God and our Lady, and to *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, and all holy saints, that all the senses of their bodies may fail them, and that they may have no feeling as now the light of this candle is gone;" putting out the third candle; "except they, he, or she, come openly now and confess their blasphemy, and by repentance (as in them shall lie) make satisfaction unto God and our Lady, *St. Peter*, and the worshipful company of this Cathedral Church."

Q. How did you act, after you heard this anathema pronounced?

A. I wrote other papers, till I was apprehended, when I confessed myself to be the author, and that I would do the same to

discover Antichrist, or the Pope, who wasted the church of God. After refusing to recant, I was condemned to be burnt, delivered over to the sheriff of Devonshire for execution, and in Livery-dale, without Exeter, I was chained to the stake.

Several Martyrs, who suffered in *England* during the reign of Queen *Mary I.* were now introduced into the Court to give their evidence against the Prisoner. Only a few were examined.

John Rogers, sworn.

Q. Was you the first person in *England* who suffered by fire during the reign of Queen *Mary*?

A. I was. *Mary* was employed by the Prisoner at the bar, as his common executioner in *England*, and she made a greater proficiency in kindling fires to burn her Protestant subjects than any other hangman before her time.

Q. In what year did she begin her reign?

A. In the year 1553: On the death of *Edward VI* Lady *Jane Grey* had been proclaimed agreeably to the request of *Edward*; but *Mary*, who by intrigue and flattery first drew the county of *Norfolk* to support her claim, soon obtained the crown. She then cut off the head of Lady *Jane* and her husband, Lord *Guilford Dudley*. Having established herself on the throne, she proceeded like a female fury to re-establish Popery. Cardinal *Pole* was restored and introduced to both houses of Parliament as the Pope's Legate, and addressed them upon the occasion. The Parliament after this drew up a petition acknowledging their sorrow for having rejected the prisoner's authority, requesting to be pardoned for their offences, and restored into the bosom of the Church of *Rome*.

This petition being delivered to the cardinal, he gave them absolution in these words; "we by the apostolic authority given unto us, by the Most Holy Lord, Pope *Julius* the third, Christ's vicegerent on earth, do absolve and deliver you, and every of you, with the whole realm and dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and from all judgments, censures, and pains, for that curse incurred; and also we do restore you again to the unity of our mother the holy church." The report of this coming to *Rome*, caused great joy. The prisoner published a bull for a jubilee, and went in procession to manifest the pleasure he felt on this occasion. He then delegated *Mary* to be his agent in *England* to put to death such as rejected popery, and I with many others, were dragged to prison.

Q. Was you not once one of his priests?

A. I was. I was educated at *Cambridge*, but being chosen chaplain to the factory at *Antwerp*, I became acquainted with *Tindal* and *Coverdale*, who were translating the Bible. Through their instrumentality, by the word I assisted them to translate, I was led to see the vile conduct of the prisoner, and to reject his authority. After this I married and travelled into *Saxony*, and preached the gospel of Jesus Christ, for some years. Upon the accession of King *Edward VI.* I came into *England*; and was appointed a

prebend of *St. Paul's*, where I was stationed on the return of popery. On a complaint being made that I preached the doctrines of the reformation, I was cited before the prisoner's bishops, and condemned as a heretic. During my confinement I drew up an answer to the charges brought against me, and vindicated the doctrines of the atonement and justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ.

After undergoing the ceremony of degradation, I was conducted to the flames in *Smithfield*. My wife with her ten children, with me requested an interview, before I was chained to the stake, but so little of the milk of human kindness did my enemies possess, that our united request was not granted. I was chained to the stake, and the flames were kindled around me, which continued to burn till I was delivered out of their sight; this was in the year 1555.

Lawrence Saunders, William Pigot, Stephen Knight, Thomas Tomkins, Thomas Hawkes, John Lawrence, and William Hunter, being sworn, said that they were all chained to separate stakes, and burnt by order of the prisoner. *Lawrence* affirmed, that when he was brought to *Colchester* to be executed, his legs being so worn by heavy irons in prison, and his body so weak, that he was obliged to be carried in a chair to the stake; and the fire kindled round him sitting.

Robert Farrar, bishop of *St. David's*, and *Rawlins White*, a fisherman, both of *Wales*, were next examined. They proved that they suffered in like manner by the prisoner's orders.

A pile of iron chains was now produced to the court, which had been used by the Prisoner, to bind the witnesses and others to stakes.

Rowland Taylor, Vicar of *Hadley* and *Essex*, being examined, affirmed, that he was cited before the bishop of *Winchester*, whose name was *Stephen Gardiner*, and who next to *Bonner* was one of the Prisoner's most active and cruel executioners. That he was sent up to *London* to the Queen's bench prison, and after repeated examinations was condemned to be burnt as a heretic. That he was sent down to his parish to be executed. That as he entered *Hadley*, the streets were lined with his old parishioners, who in general manifested their sorrow on his account. That at *Aldham-Common*, the place of execution, he addressed the spectators saying, "I have taught you nothing but God's holy word, and am come hither to seal with my blood, those doctrines of the gospel I have delivered unto you." That being chained to the stake and the fire kindled, he was burnt till he was delivered out of the fire, and left nothing but a few ashes, which led the Prisoner and others to suppose that he was dead.

Bishop Latimer, sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner attempt to burn you?

A. He did. Upon the accession of *Mary, I* with Bishop *Ridley*, and Archbishop *Cranmer*, were sent to the Tower, and from thence to Oxford, to dispute with twelve men under the Prisoner's government, selected from Cambridge and Oxford. When the dis-

putation was ended, we were brought as Prisoners on a stage, and asked "whether we would persist" in our opinions or recant?" We all affirmed that we would persist, and were then condemned as heretics to be burnt, but our execution was suspended for some time.

Q. Was *Nicholas Ridley* the Bishop, chained to the same stake with you?

A. He was. We were both chained together at one stake in *Oxford*. I was then about fourscore years of age, and my infirmities much increased by the severity of my confinement, yet as my day was, so strength was given. Having long since declined my ecclesiastical dignity, I appeared at the stake without any clerical habit. *Ridley* and I embraced and encouraged each other at the stake, he said to me, "God will either assuage the fury of the flames, or enable us to endure it," and so he did. The faggots being kindled, I was soon taken in a fiery chariot to my King, but *Ridley* was delayed for some time longer, when he was mercifully delivered in like manner.

Bishop *Ridley* being examined, confirmed the testimony of the last witness.

Cranmer, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, sworn.

Q. Did not the Prisoner condemn you?

A. He did, but I suffered for a long time in confinement before he attempted to execute the sentence. I was also so weak, that one day by threats and promises I was persuaded to sign my recantation, though not the one published by cruel *Bonner*. This however availed me nothing, "The tender mercies of the Prisoner are cruel." I was required to ratify my recantation publicly, and then to die for heresy. Being called upon to address the people in *St. Mary's Church, Oxford*, my enemies were thunderstruck at hearing me express my sorrow, for my apostacy and weakness, and declare the Pope to be *Antichrist*; and that I would first burn my unworthy right hand that signed the recantation.

Immediately a violent clamour ensued, and I was hurried to the place of execution. A fire being kindled round me, I held my right hand in the flames till it was burnt, repeating "this unworthy hand—this unworthy hand," and calling upon the Redeemer in the words of *Stephen*, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' when I was rescued out of their hands. This was on the 14th of February, 1556, at *Oxford*.

George Marsh affirmed that by order of the Prisoner, he was burnt at *Westchester*, *Robert Smith*, that he was burnt at *Uxbridge*, *Thomas Whittle*, that he and six more burnt in one fire, at *Smithfield*, on the 27th day of January, is 1556, *Anne Albright*, said that she and three other women and one man, were burnt at two stakes and one fire at *Canterbury*, the 31st day of January, *Joan Trunchfield*, and *Agnes Potter*, both married women, that they were burnt at *Ipswich*, *Robert Drake*, that he and five more suffered at one fire in *Smithfield*, on the 23d day of April in the same year. *Catharine Hut*, that she and two other women were treated in like manner at the said place. *Thomas Drowry*, a blind boy, that he and one *Thomas Croker*, were burnt at *Gloucester*. *Ralph Jackson*, that he, ten men and two women, in all thirteen, were by the

Prisoner's order, burnt together in one fire at *Stratford* near *London* on the 27th day of June. That the dean of *St. Paul's* having declared in a sermon he preached after their condemnation, that they held as many different opinions as persons, they drew up and signed a declaration of their faith, part of which declared, "that the See of *Rome* was the See of *Antichrist*, the congregation of the wicked, whereof the Pope is head under the devil."

Upwards of two hundred other witnesses were in court, who were martyred in the reign of *Queen Mary*, but the *attorney General* said, that as it was not necessary to examine them to prove the guilt of the prisoner, he would only bring forward one witness to prove the number that were burnt during her short but cruel reign.

Mr. *Historical Truth* again examined.

Q. Do you recollect how many were burnt during the reign of *Queen Mary*?

A. I do. She burnt 1 archbishop, 4 bishops, 21 ministers, 8 gentlemen, 84 artificers, 100 husbandmen, servants and labourers, 26 wives, 20 widows, 9 unmarried women, 2 boys, and 2 infants; one of them was whipped to death by *Bishop Bonner*, and the other, springing out of the mother's womb from the stake, as she burned, was thrown again into the fire. Several died in prison, and many were otherwise cruelly treated.*

Q. Were these burnt by the Prisoner's orders?

A. Yes. He not only presumes to put to death those whom he calls *heretics*, but his bishops take an oath, that heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the *Holy Father*, (or the Prisoner) they will resist and persecute.

One of his annotations on the New Testament says, "Protestants foolishly expound it, i. e. *Babylon* noticed in *Rev. xvii. 6* of *Rome*, for that there they put *heretics* to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries. But their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors; for the shedding of which by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."†

ON ANIMAL LIFE, OR THE "VITAL PRINCIPLE,"

BY MAXWELL M'DOWELL, M. D., OF BALTIMORE.

Continued from page 389.

We are aware that many, if not most, of the distinguished chemists of the present day advocate the doctrine of the existence of *carbonic acid* in the blood. In the list of those who deny the existence of *carbonic acid* in the blood, are found men of a high order of talents and extensive erudition. The experimental investigations of *Dr. Edwards* seems to have induced a general belief of

* *Vide Guthrie's Gram. England.*

† *Rhemish Translation. Rev. xvii. 6.*

the existence of carbonic acid in the blood. But unless it can be satisfactorily proven that Dr. Edwards was infallible as a manipulator, we cannot consider the doctrine which he advances as fully established, inasmuch as many eminent chemists by their experimental investigations have arrived at a conclusion diametrically opposite to his. Besides if carbonic acid actually exists in the blood, an expert manipulator could find no difficulty in detecting oxygen in that important fluid. Dr. Crawford, however, and my late colleague, professor De Butts, by repeated and careful analysis of the blood, were unable to discover any oxygen in it. We could mention several others, distinguished chemists, who were equally unsuccessful in discovering oxygen in the blood. Hufeland asserts that life is a chemico animal flame which cannot occur without the aid of oxygen, and that the vital power is the most general and strong of all the natural powers. In his view, the vital principle is the cause of organization. He considers that it has a greater affinity to some organized bodies than to others. How! the vital principle is the *cause* of organization, and yet has a greater affinity to some organized bodies than to others, we are not able to comprehend the accordance between these two sentences. In the opinion of this physiologist the stronger the affinity subsisting between the vital principle and an organized being, the more imperfect is the animal. Thus a polypus may be cut into pieces, and each piece still retains the vital principle. The body of a tortoise will retain the principle of life and motion for many hours after it has been decapitated. Hufeland maintains that some organized bodies contain a greater quantity of the principle of life than others, hence an elephant lives a century whilst an ephemeron exists only a day. He says the principle of life secures bodies from the chemical laws of inanimate matter, and transfers the important parts of a body from the physical to the organic world. It also prevents putrefaction. In the opinion of Humbolt, the degree of vitality is owing to the reciprocal balance of the chemical affinities of the elementary parts of which an animal is composed. Davy views life as a perpetual series of corpuscular changes of a peculiar kind, and that the living body is the theatre in which these changes occur. They are therefore found to be constantly varying, and inasmuch as all sensitive beings are unable to live without light and oxygen, he considers these two under the name of phosxygen as essential to animal existence. In the observations which Dr. Ferriar has made respecting the vital principle he is of opinion that some direct arguments may be produced against the general supposition of a distinct vital principle. He has divided his arguments into two kinds, the first of which he calls refutations of the general proofs offered in support of the vital principle, and instances of the direct influence of the mind and brain over what is called the principle of life. The chief proofs in support of a vital principle are the effects of stimulants upon muscles separated from the body, continuance of the vital and involuntary actions without any exertion or even consciousness of the mind, together with the birth of full grown fetuses without a brain. In

these cases a power, producing muscular motion, is supposed to exist independent of the mind. Dr. Ferriar in answering the first argument deduced from the contraction of separate muscles asserts that its power of contraction is lost before putrefaction takes place, i. e. before its organization is destroyed, which ought not to occur if its vitality depended on its texture. This argument may be conclusive against the opinion, that the *vital principle* is dependent upon organization for the manifestation of its operations; but, we think, cannot militate against the existence of that principle, *in toto*, as distinct from the intellect or mind. Again the doctor states that the contraction of a muscle separated, is strongest upon its first separation becoming weaker by degrees, from which circumstance, he infers that its power of contraction has been derived from a source from which it has been detached. We are not able to see the weight of this argument against the existence of a vital principle. It tends to prove that a muscle forms a part of a living system, and is destined to perform certain actions in the healthy state of that system, which it is incapable of performing when severed from it. As another argument to disprove the opinion of a distinct vital principle, Dr. Ferriar states that the irritation of the *medulla oblongata*, or of the nerves supplying particular muscles, produces stronger contractions than the irritation of the muscles themselves. In order that this experiment should be conclusive in disproving the existence of a *vital* principle in the muscles, and to establish the opinion that they were solely dependent on nervous influence for their contractions, it is in our opinion, absolutely necessary that the doctor should have satisfactorily proven that the nerves convey their influence to the muscles much more abundantly, when irritated than they do when in their natural state, or in other words, that the nerves perform their functions with more energy, and better, when wounded or diseased than they do in their healthy state of actions. In our view, the doctor is not fortunate in selecting the case of a paralytic limb as an evidence against the existence of a distinct vital principle. He says, the motion, in a paralytic limb, from an electric shock, never takes place without the consciousness of the patient. This we believe to be the fact, but in the cases which we have seen of a paralysed limb influenced by electricity, the *consciousness* of the patient has been, according to our observation, *subsequent* and not *antecedent* to the convulsion produced in the paralyzed muscle by the electric fluid, from which we conclude that a muscle possesses a vital principle although it is necessary that its connexion with the brain through the medium of the nerves, should be unimpaired in order that it may properly perform its functions. Dr. Ferriar, in order to show by direct proof that there is no independent vital principle, observes that Dr. Monro considers there is too much design in the actions of different muscles, when effected by different stimuli, to be the effect of mechanism alone. We are not certain that we fully understand the idea that the doctor designs to convey by the term "independent vital principle." If by that term he intends to say that a muscle is incapable of performing its functions without the influence of the brain conveyed to it through the nervous system, we perfectly agree with him in opinion; but if by

denying the existence of an independent vital principle, the doctor designs to convey to us the idea that a muscle is a mere passive instrument at all times to be brought into action by the *immediate* influence of the brain, we beg leave to differ in opinion with him. We cannot conceive that any organized substance, placed in the situation of a muscle of the body, capable of performing the same mechanical action as is performed by that muscle, when a proper force is applied to it, and so constructed, that every filament of nerve is interwoven with it that is distributed to the muscle whose place it occupies, would ever be brought into action by the most powerful nervous influence which could be exerted upon it; and for this obvious reason, the supposed mechanical instrument is destitute of a *vital principle* and of consequence incapable of being acted upon by the *vital principle* of the brain and nerves. We cannot avoid believing therefore, that a muscle possesses a *vital principle* independent of the brain and nerves, in one respect, whilst it is so constituted as to be unable to perform its functions without an uninterrupted influence of the brain through the nerves. The very sentiment which Dr. Ferriar brings from Dr. Monro to disprove the existence of a vital principle is so far from serving his purpose, in our opinion, that we think it supports the doctrine which he wishes to overturn. Thus he tells us "that there is too much design in the actions of different muscles, affected by different stimuli to be the effect of mere mechanism." We entirely agree with Dr. Monro in this sentiment, and think this manifestation of "design" strongly supports the doctrine of the existence of a vital principle in the muscles. We think that Dr. Ferriar is very unfortunate in the application of what he calls his *direct* proofs against the existence of a distinct vital principle. Thus he tells us that "the state of the vital and involuntary motions is considerably affected by the state of the mind, which equally disproves the existence of a separate vital principle, and proves the dependence of the nervous energy upon the brain." The reciprocal action of soul and body upon each other, though an undoubted fact, is nevertheless altogether inexplicable by any human intellect. "Latet et semper latebit" may with propriety be said of this subject as to any thing that human talent and ingenuity can effect in attempting to explain it. But who could for a moment suppose that the strong operations of the mind, which has a general influence upon the whole body, would not very much affect the *vital principle* of a particular organ! The last theory of life, or the vital principle, which has come under our notice is that advanced by the late Professor Rush. He bottoms his theory upon three general propositions. First, he says "every part of the human body, (the nails and hair excepted) is endowed with sensibility, or excitability, or with both of them. By sensibility, is meant the power of having a sensation excited, by the action of impressions. Excitability denotes that property in the human body by which motion is excited by means of impressions. This property has been called by several other names, such as irritability, contractility, mobility, and stimulability. In his second proposition the doctor states that "the whole human body is so formed and con-

nected, that impressions made in the healthy state upon one part, excite motion, or sensation, or both, in every other part of the body. From this view it appears to be an unit, or a simple and indivisible quality or substance. Its capacity for receiving motion and sensation, is variously modified by means of what are called the senses. It is external and internal. The impressions which act upon it shall be enumerated in order." In his third proposition the doctor states that "life is the effect of certain stimuli acting upon the sensibility and excitability, which are extended, in different degrees, over every external and internal part of the body. These stimuli are as necessary to its existence, as air is to flame. Animal life is truly, (to use the words of Dr. Brown) "a forced state." The same opinion was publicly taught by Dr. Cullen of Edinburg; but was afterwards abandoned by him. Agreeably to our last proposition, says professor Rush, "I proceed to remark, that the action of the brain, the diastole and systole of the heart, the pulsation of the arteries, the contraction of the muscles, the peristaltic motion of the bowels, the absorbing power of the lymphatics, secretion, excretion, hearing, seeing, smelling, taste, and the sense of touch, nay more, thought itself, are all the effects of stimuli acting upon the organs of sense and motion. These stimuli have been divided into external and internal." Professor Rush's third proposition has been considered highly exceptionable and as might be expected, his language has received the most unfavourable construction by his professional opponents. We regret that the professor's terms had not been qualified as they may very readily be made to convey an idea, which we believe their author never entertained, or intended to teach. To those persons who enjoyed the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Rush, his life and conversation afforded a sufficient qualification for the terms he makes use of on the subject of animal life; for we are persuaded he was *practically* as well as by *faith*, a Christian. We think, therefore, whatever may be the intrinsic merits of professor Rush's theory of animal life it is completely defensible without inflicting the slightest wound upon Christianity. And could we, for a moment, entertain a contrary opinion, we would abandon the theory as speedily as we would do the most deadly *poison*. From the terms which professor Rush has adopted in speaking upon this subject, we find his opponents have called in the aid of wedges, levers, and pulleys in their endeavours to refute the doctrine. It is very natural to associate the mechanical powers with the term *force*; but a careful and dispassionate examination of the language of professor Rush must convince any unprejudiced mind that he did not design to convey any such idea by that term, "Life," says professor Rush, "is the effect of certain stimuli acting upon the sensibility and excitability, which are extended, in different degrees, over every external and internal part of the body." Now it must be evident to every dispassionate mind, that it was *acting* and *operating* life that the professor had in view, when he penned the foregoing sentence, and not the *abstract principle*. But his opponents wish to make him say that animal life is *produced* by *force* when he pronounces it "a forced state." Professor Rush, however,

says "life is the effect of certain stimuli acting upon the sensibility and excitability" &c. Now sensibility and excitability are qualities of animal life, or the vital principle, and existed in the system before the stimuli, which the professor mentions are brought to act upon them. We consider it very evident from a fair view of professor Rush's language, that it was *acting* and *operating* life which he considered to be produced by the *force* of stimuli acting upon the sensibility and excitability existing in the system. In the 7th verse of the 2d chapter of the book of Moses called Genesis, it is thus written "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Observe, we are informed that man was first formed, by which we understand that complete organization was affected in every part of his body, and then the Creator "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here we have a distinct account from *paramount* authority, of organization, as entirely separate from a vital principle. The formation of man may have taken place in the twinkling of an eye, in the smallest conceivable portion of time; but we are warranted by undoubted authority, to believe that man's bodily frame was completely organized anterior to its animation. It has pleased the Creator to place man, thus organized, thus animated, and also possessed of an immortal as well as material part in his own composition, in a world where he is surrounded by a variety of substances which have been called stimuli, in consequence of an impression and succeeding action which they produce on his body. We, therefore, say in the language of professor Rush, that "these stimuli are as necessary to its existence (animal life,) as air is to flame." We also consider that "thought itself" in our present state of being may be considered as the effect of stimuli acting upon the organs of sense and motion. Let us be understood,—we maintain that no kind or degree of stimulus applied to an organized animal body will ever produce sensation, motion, or thought in it; but as we are convinced that the total abstraction of all stimuli, external and internal, from a man in the complete exercise of his mental and bodily faculties, will in a short time deprive him of sensation, motion, and even the power of thinking—*acting* and *operating* life may be considered "a forced state." Such it appears to us in our present state of existence. The union of soul and material part is such that upon the healthy action of the latter, its capacity of being acted upon by stimuli, and its being supplied by a suitable quantity as well as kind of these stimuli, depend the vigorous and correct exercise of the former. When we first leave our beds in the morning, life is languid. It is invigorated by the gradual and successive application of stimuli, during the day. In the evening, those stimuli cease to produce their usual effects, and life becomes again languid at bed time. Professor Rush says, "it is probable the first impulse of life was imparted to the body of Adam by the decomposition of air in the lungs." The professor infers this from the account given by Moses of the creation of man in the passage of scripture which we have already quoted. Here again we find professor Rush use unqualified lan-

guage. The language will convey the idea that life, or the *vital principle*, was *produced* in the body of Adam by the decomposition of atmospheric air. Now we believe that professor Rush had *acting or operating* life in view when he wrote the sentence under consideration, and therefore that the first sensation of *acting* life was experienced in the body of Adam by the decomposition of atmospheric air. It is impossible that a decomposition of atmospheric air can ever *produce* life in any inanimate organized body. We ought never to fail in restoring to life those who have been drowned, if the decomposition of atmospheric air will *produce* life in an inanimate organized structure, provided we got possession of the body of the person drowned before the organs were deteriorated by incipient putrefaction. We know, however, the most skillful often fail in their endeavors to restore to life, those who have been drowned, even tho' they obtain possession of the body a short time after it had been immersed in the water, and are fully satisfied that the body had sustained no injury by contusion. In such cases the body had been deprived of the *vital principle*, or animal life.

We do not find that physiologists of the present day have made any advance in developing the nature of the vital principle. Bichat, Magendi and Broussais rest satisfied with viewing and endeavoring to explain the phenomena or operations of animal life without attempting to investigate the nature of the *abstract principle*. In this brief view which we have taken of the subject, we at least, calculate upon having succeeded in convincing you of one fact, and that is, how ignorant philosophers have been in all ages of the world respecting the nature of the vital principle, or animal life. Among the opinions which we have noticed, that of Praxagoras, who said that the soul, or *vital principle*, is strengthened by spirituous air, is we think, most unexceptionable. How much more rational is his opinion, than that advanced by the celebrated Mr. Davy who maintains that "life is a perpetual series of corpuscular changes of a peculiar kind," from which it would appear that the body is merely the theatre where this dance of corpuscular changes takes place. It is highly probable that Sir Humphrey Davy, by the sentiment which we have quoted from him intended to convey the idea that *acting or operating* life consisted of "a perpetual series of corpuscular changes of a peculiar kind." He has, however, not taken care to qualify his language, so as to confine it exclusively to the acting consideration of animal life. For we could as soon believe that this earth, the variegated substances that are found upon its surface, and that those spangled bodies which adorn the heavens, and which have for centuries performed regular revolutions, were the result of a fortuitous concourse of atoms, as believe that animal life is *produced* by the "peculiar corpuscular changes" of Sir Humphrey Davy. Animal life, or the *vital principle*, still remains a subject calculated to exercise the talents of the most erudite and profound among medical philosophers and physiologists.

ERRATUM.—In the part of this essay which is published in the October number of this Magazine, page 386, seventh line from the bottom, for Dr. Momo, read Dr. Monro.