

The Church.

"Her Foundations are upon the holy hills."

"Stand ye in the days and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

TORONTO, CANADA, FEBRUARY 22, 1855.

No. 30

Vol. XVIII.]

Poetry.

For the Church.

THOUGHTS ON SEBASTOPOL.

By G. B. VINEY.

When, at Creation's birth, the Godhead viewed
His works, replete with love and harmony,
He blessed, pronounced them to be very good:
God said, "Be fruitful, grow and multiply."
How changed the scene a few short years afford
Of sin and sorrow, suffering and crime!
Man 'gainst his brother man takes up the sword,
Through bygone ages to the present time.

Even now, upon Sebastopol's bleak plain,
The rushing squadrons feel the shock of war;
Mid shouts of victory, groans and cries of pain,
How many fall, in time to rise no more!
Before those walls, which the besieging camp
Girdles as with a flame of fire by night,
Wearied with watching, wounds, chill frost and damp,
How many valiant souls disdain the flight!

Beneath those tattered vestments brave hearts
beat
With warm affections and stern courage high;
They fight, nor ever think on base retreat.
While yet unconquered foes before them lie!
There the fond parent dreams of distant home;
Pale fancy calls his wife (unheeding space)
With eager looks, and fond his children come,
And now he locks them in his warm embrace.

The generous youth, whom love of country fires,
Is onward urged to brief deeds of glory:
He to the envied epithet aspires,
"Ducis, dulcis est pro patria mori."
Another pants the laurelled wreath to wear!
(His courage no one dares then to impeach);
Before his eyes, of death he has no fear!
And now he feels it high in his reach.

To what bright dreams delusive hopes impel!
To-morrow numbered with the noble dead!
The graven stone alone remains to tell
How valiantly 'twas done and fought and bled!
We too, though far removed from war's alarms,
Yet in a struggle with our watchful foes,
As Christian soldiers, must gird on our arms
While time is spared us, while life's stream
still flows.

Not 'gainst an arm of flesh, embattled towers,
Death's iron messenger 's against us hurled
"But against principalities and powers,
And rulers of the darkness of this world."
Oh! pray we then for Zion's lasting peace,
To him who God and sinners reconciled;
Henceforth that wars in all the world may cease,
And Love supernal reign with Mercy mild.

Toronto, Feb. 12, 1855.

From the Church Review.

American Ecclesiastical History.

MARYLAND TOLERATION,

OR SKETCHES OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF MARYLAND, TO THE YEAR 1650.

BY THE REV. ALLEN ALEX. PRESBYTER OF THE P. E. CHURCH, BALTIMORE CO.

Virginia petitions against the Charter. No sooner did the Virginia colony—which, as we have seen, was a Church of England colony—hear of the grant to Lord Baltimore, than they sent a petition to the king remonstrating against it. The petition itself is not known to be extant, nor is its precise date known. But from the decision of the Star Chamber upon that petition,* we learn they stated, "that some grants have lately been obtained [by Lord B.] of a great portion of lands and territories of the colony, [of Va.] being the places of their traffic and so near to their habitations as will give a general disheartening to the planters if they be divided into several governments, and a bar put to that trade which they have long since exercised towards their supportation and relief, under the confidence of his Majesty's royal and gracious intentions towards them." This, however, was more largely stated in the petition itself.

On the 12th of May, 1633, the king referred the petition to the Star Chamber. And their lordships ordered that the parties, the Virginia planters and Lord Baltimore, should be heard on the 25th of June, and accordingly on that day they were heard. It was then ordered that the parties should meet together, and accommodate their controversy in a friendly manner, if it might be, and likewise set down in writing the propositions made by either party, with their several answers and reasons to be presented to the board. This was complied with, and in July, "their lordships having heard, and maturely considered the said propositions, answers and reasons, and whatsoever else was alleged on either side, did think fit to leave Lord Baltimore to his patent, and the other parties, to the course of law according to their desire." But for the preventing of further questions and differences, their lordships did also think fit to order, that things stand as they do—the planters on either side, shall have free traffic and commerce with each other, and that neither party shall receive any fugitive persons belonging to the other, nor do any act, which may draw on a war from the natives, upon either of them. And lastly, that they shall entertain all good correspondence, and assist each other, on all occasions, in such manner as becometh subjects and members of the same state."

So reads the decision in Hazzard's and so Bozman has it, in his first edition. But in his second, he follows Chalmers' reading of it; which, instead of being "that things stand as they do," reads, "that things stand as they do." The authority of Hazzard is, however, to be preferred before that of Chalmers. And as the former has it, things were to stand as they then did, till the matter should be settled by course of law. In the latter, it is made

the ground of deciding about assisting each other, and was decided.

And how did things stand? Why, the Virginia planters were not by that decision to be dispossessed of Kent Island; nor was Lord Baltimore's patent to be invalidated. The question of the *prior claim* of the Virginians, was left at their desire, to a course of law. That question, the Star Chamber did not decide upon. They did not decide any more against the Virginians, than they did against Lord Baltimore. So, at least, it is clear, that the Virginians themselves understood it, as shown both by their after course, and by Burk in his history of Virginia,* where he says, that the board "acknowledged the justice of the claim of the Virginia planters." They certainly granted the request of these planters, that the matter should be left to take the course of law which they desired.

In November 22nd, 1633, Lord Baltimore's colony left England for America. Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, was then twenty-eight years of age. He does not seem to have been so dissatisfied with the disabilities under which he was placed in England, but that he remained there instead of crossing the Atlantic, to his retreat from Protestant persecution. He therefore, sent out his brother Leonard Calvert, then at the age of twenty-six, as governor of his colony, appointing two of the colonists for his assistants. A younger brother, George, also came out, but it seems that he was so little of a Romanist, that he could do what his father declined to do in Virginia—that is, to take the oaths required; for, as it is said, he lived and died there. Indeed, it must not be overlooked, that the first and second Lord Baltimores were two different men. For while the elder, as it may be conceded, sought in the Virginia territory to build up an asylum for the oppressed and persecuted Romanists, the son, as proof in abundance may be found to show, had his eye upon the pecuniary advantages to be derived from his large grant of land, in no small degree.

It was now eighteen months from the date of his charter, that his colonists set sail. The number of colonists, is stated by Oldmixon, at about two hundred.† He mentions Leonard Calvert, Esq., Governor Jeremy Hawley and Thomas Cornwallis, Esqrs., assistants or councillors. The other chief and principal characters, were Richard Gerard, Edward Winter, Frederick Winter, Henry Wiseman, Esquires. Mr. John Saunders, Mr. Edward Canfield, Mr. Thomas Greene, Mr. Nicholas Fairfax, Mr. John Baxter, Mr. Thomas Dorrell, Capt. John Hill, Mr. John Medcote and Mr. William Sayre. Most of these are said to have been gentlemen of fortune, and also Roman Catholics. And among others, were two Jesuit priests, Fathers Andrew White, and John Altham, and two lay-brothers, or temporal coadjutors, John Knowles and Thomas Gervase.‡ They were sent out by the superior of their order, on the application of Lord Baltimore. The colonists came over in the *Ark*, a vessel of four hundred tons burthen, and the *Done*, a pinnace of forty tons. How large a proportion of the emigrants were Roman Catholics, is not now known. All, however, certainly were not such. Father White, in his narrative of their voyage, written about a month after the landing at St. Mary's, speaks repeatedly of the Roman Catholics, in such a way, as to show that they did not constitute the whole number of the emigrants—that there were others besides them. One instance in particular, would show the number, not Romanists, to have been a very large proportion. They were now in the West Indies. And "no one," says Father White, "was attacked with any disease, till the festival of the Nativity of our Lord. That the day might be more joyfully celebrated, the wine flowed freely, and some who drank immoderately, about thirty in number, were seized with a fever the next day, and twelve of them not long after died, and among them, two Catholics, Nicholas Fairfax and James Barefoot, caused great regret with us all." If the number not Romanists, that died, indicates anything like a true proportion, the proportion of protestants among the colonists must have been large. The fact thus stated, speaks however for itself. But though care was taken to have four Romanist priests and assistants, as before stated, yet the Protestants were not favored with even one minister to look after them and break to them the Bread of Life. They were in this thing, uncared and unprovided for.

In the month of February, the 27th, Lord Baltimore's colony on their way to Maryland, stopped for a few days at Jamestown, in Virginia. While there, as stated by Captain Claiborne, (that title he had borne since 1631, and was still a member of the council and secretary of state,) to the governor and council of Virginia, March the 14th, Governor Calvert had "signified to him, that he, Claiborne, was now a member of that [Maryland] plantation, and therefore, he should relinquish all relation and dependence on this [the Virginia] colony." And yet Claiborne himself was now, not only a resident in Jamestown, but was still a member of the council and secretary of state there, and had been for the ten years past. Still, he was the proprietor of Kent Island, and the colony there were Virginians, and had been and were now under the jurisdiction of the Virginia government. The claim of Governor Calvert was not only, that the Kent Island settlers, with the proprietor, should submit to his government, but it involved their title to the right of soil also. Admit Governor Calvert's claim, which, as we have seen, the Star Chamber did not decide upon, but referred to the courts of law, and it

involved the necessity of abandoning their plantation, and thus losing the fruits of past years of labor, or a repurchase of the soil from Lord Baltimore, upon his own terms of plantation, as they were then called, so that instead of holding under Captain Claiborne, upon the annual payment of two capons, Lord Baltimore would become entitled to his quit rents from them, of which more will be said presently.

"On making the statement thus of the demand of Governor Calvert upon him, which Captain Claiborne did to the governor and council of Virginia, he requested the opinion of the board, as to 'how he should demean himself, in respect to Lord Baltimore's patent, and his deputies in the bay.'" "It was answered by the board, that they wondered why any such question was made; that they knew of no reason why they should render up the rights of the place of the Isle of Kent, more than any other formerly given to this [the Virginia] colony, by his Majesty's patent, and that the right of his Majesty's [Baltimore's] grant, being yet undetermined in England, we are bound in duty, and by our oaths, to maintain the rights and privileges of this colony." &c. "They thus clearly understood the decision of the privy council of July previous, not to have been against their claim, and also that the matter was as yet undetermined. And they therefore determined, not to relinquish their jurisdiction, nor Claiborne his proprietorship. Captain Claiborne and his colonists were thus sustained in Virginia, as well as in England, in not surrendering to Lord Baltimore's governor, either the government of the settlement at Kent Island, or their right of soil.

Eleven days after this action of the governor and council of Virginia, March 25th, 1634, Governor Calvert landed with his colonists at the island which they named St. Clements. It was the day of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary. After celebrating Mass, the Romanists formed a procession, and proceeding to a spot selected, they erected a great cross, while the Litany of the Holy Cross was chanted—"the governor, commissioners, and other Catholics, participating in the ceremony."‡ It does not appear thus, that the Protestants did participate in it.

After having explored the Potomac as far up as Piscataway, the governor and men returned, and under the direction of Captain Fleet, a resident of Virginia, who had accompanied them on the 27th of March, they sailed up St. George's River, which they so named—a tributary of the Potomac—and landed on the right bank, and having proceeded about a thousand paces from the shore, we gave the name of St. Mary's to the intended city. And that we might avoid all appearances of injury and hatchets, having paid in exchange, axes, hatchets, hoes and some yards of cloth, we bought from the [Indian] king, thirty miles of his territory, which part now [1634] goes by the name of Augusta Carolina—containing upwards of 150,000 acres.

St. Mary's is twenty miles from the mouth of the Potomac, one hundred miles from Jamestown, and forty-three miles from Kent Island, in a direct line, and about eighty by water, as measured upon the map. Here a town grew up, with the progress of population called a city. It was the seat of government and continued so to be, till 1694, when the government was removed to the city of Annapolis. In 1720 the State House was given to the parish of William and Mary for a church. In 1830, the building was very much decayed and a new edifice was erected in its place, the only building now on the spot, where the city of St. Mary's once was. Now then, there were at this time within the territory of Maryland two settlements; one of which, consisting of more than one hundred, had been settled on Kent Island, for five or six years. This was a Church of England settlement and had a resident Church of England clergyman. Its proprietor was a Protestant, and it was under the Protestant government of Virginia. A settlement as before mentioned had been made at Christina on the Delaware—which was also Protestant, but was not at this time, it is believed, replaced.

The other of the two mentioned was the settlement of St. Mary's, consisting of about two hundred. Its proprietor was a Roman Catholic and so was its government. Its priests were of the Order of the Jesuits. The settlers were partly Romanists and partly protestants. So that putting the settlers of both the settlements together, it is by no means unlikely, that the majority was Protestant even then.

The claim of Virginia on Kent Island, as understood by Virginians, had been sustained at least for the time being, by the privy council in England, and also by the governor and council of Virginia. And now, four months after the arrival of Lord Baltimore's colonists in St. Mary's, on the 22nd of July, the committee of the privy council for the colonies, known as the commissioners for plantations, wrote to the governor and council of Virginia thus: "His Majesty doth let you know, that 'tis not intended that interests which have been settled, when you were a corporation, should be impeached: that for the present, they may enjoy their estates with the same freedom and privilege, as they did, before the recalling of their patents:—to which purpose also, we do hereby authorize you, to dispose of such portions of lands to all those planters being freemen, as you had power to do before the year 1625." This shows, "that no invasion of any individual right of any Virginian was intended by Lord Baltimore's grant." Captain Claiborne, and his islanders, as well as others were thus informed by these commis-

sioners, that they might still enjoy their estates, and that there was no intention that Lord Baltimore's patent should impeach their interests. They could not therefore but feel safe in their possessions. Backed then, as we have seen, by the governor and council of Virginia, by the king's privy council, and his commissioners also, can we wonder, that Captain Claiborne declined compliance with the intimation and claim of Lord Baltimore's governor, Leonard Calvert?

Besides, not long after this, the date is not given, but circumstances show that it could not have been far from this time—as stated in Claiborne's petition, "his Majesty was pleased to signify his royal pleasure, by letter, intimating, that it was contrary to justice and to the true intent of his Majesty's grant to Lord [Baltimore], to dispossess them of Kent Island."—that notwithstanding the patent, the petitioners should have freedom of trade, requiring the governor and all others in Virginia to be aiding and assisting them,—prohibiting the Lord Baltimore, and all other pretenders (under) him, to offer them any violence, or to disturb or molest them in their [Kent Island] plantation." Bozman says "it is not to be doubted, but that a letter of that import, was signed by his Majesty."‡

And yet, notwithstanding all this, in September of this very year, Lord Baltimore in England, issues orders to his governor in Maryland, "that if Claiborne would not submit to his government, he should be seized and punished."‡ Yes, seized and punished, if he should not submit to his, Lord B's government!

But with this the king's own declaration before him, that Lord Baltimore's claim was contrary to justice, and to the true intent of his, Lord B's patent; and the decisions of the privy council, and the commissioners, and the governor and council of Virginia just mentioned, is it surprising, that Captain Claiborne should not submit? Besides, what was this order but a declaration of war? And it was, as we shall presently see, not only against Capt. Claiborne, but it included also his Protestant settlement. It was not merely personal, it was a contest for the possession and government of Kent Island. Or is it surprising that such a declaration of hostility—showing Lord Baltimore to be his enemy—that Claiborne should be the enemy of Lord Baltimore?

"A historian of the colony," says Dr. Hawks,§ "has not scrupled to call him—Claiborne—the bane of Maryland," desisting, in 1634, the authority of the infant settlement, because its power was less than his right." The historian mentioned was none other than Lord Baltimore himself, in a pamphlet of a few pages—and as to Lord Baltimore's power being less than his right, the reader can judge for himself.

In the carrying on of this contest, a circumstance is mentioned, which has called forth much condemnation of Claiborne. Bozman says, "that he made an ungenerous and cruel attempt, to set the savages at war upon this infant colony." at St. Mary's, and placet after the failure, "to seize and punish him," and as it would seem to reach the end of the year, on the authority of the writers to whom he refers. Mr. B. U. Campbell, on the same authorities, places it in the early part of the following year. But Father White, in his narrative,¶ written before the expiration of one month from the landing at St. Mary's, speaks of it as having occurred before he wrote, and as the work of Capt. Fleet under Claiborne's influence. "At the first, he, Captain Fleet, was very friendly to us. Afterwards, seduced by the evil counsels of a certain Claiborne, who entertained the most hostile disposition, he stirred up the minds of the natives against us, with all the art of which he was master." "We have been here only one month" &c. Thus Father White, writing on the spot, and at the time, ascribes it to Captain Fleet, bringing in only Claiborne's influence. Captain Fleet was indeed in the colony. But Claiborne was a hundred miles off. This Captain Fleet was an Indian trader from the Jamestown colony, induced by Governor Calvert when there, to serve the Maryland colony, by having a portion of the beaver-trade, and was a Protestant. But clearly, in the estimation of Governor Calvert himself and the St. Maryans, it was no great fault he had committed, if even true, and was easily and fully forgiven, for he continued to reside in the colony for some years. In the second year of the colony, the governor and council had four thousand acres of land conveyed to them.†† Four years after, 1638, he was a member of the assembly,§ and licensed to trade with the Indians;§§ and in 1644, was appointed to go against the Indians with twenty men §§

We have said that the contest was not merely personal, between Lord Baltimore and Captain Claiborne. In a report of the committee of the navy to parliament, dated Dec. 31st, 1652, it is stated, "that upon the arrival of Lord Baltimore's agent in Maryland, 1634, the Virginians were prohibited from trading with the Indians, in any part of Maryland, to which formerly they had been accustomed."‡‡ This prohibition was unquestionably leveled against the Kent Island settlers themselves, here called, by high authority, Virginians.

From the narrative of Father White¶¶ and others, we learn, that with the emigrants who came out this year, there was the addition of another priest to the number already in the colony. The narrative remarks, that "from this mission, which was but lately commenced, there has been as yet but small fruit, on account of the very many difficulties which occur on it,

especially among the barbarians whose language is slowly acquired by our countrymen. Nothing in a manner can be written. There are five members in it, three priests and two lay coadjutors, who, with much alacrity, sustain their present labors in hope of future success." Thus in a colony, not all Roman Catholics, consisting of but little upward of three hundred, if so many, there was full provision for the religious oversight of the Romanists and a mission to the natives also. While, so far as the ministry was concerned, the Protestant portion of the colony were unprovided for. And we cannot but wonder somewhat, if Maryland was intended for an asylum for the oppressed Roman Catholics of England, why so many Protestant emigrants were brought into the colony; and, not less, why so many being brought in, no Protestant Ministry was provided to care for them. —But they had, notwithstanding, their guides and helps, which their Romanist brethren had not. They had the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, and that, too, in their own language; and were themselves a part of that spiritual priesthood of which St. Peter speaks,* to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. As has been well remarked,† "all the faithful, baptized into One Body and having drunk of one Spirit, constitute that single Vine, that Spouse, that single Church, which altogether each member discharging its own separate duty and ministry, is sent into the world by Christ, even as He was sent by the Father."

The Romanists had indeed their priests there, but their bible and their mass book, in which their prayers were, were in an unknown tongue, the Latin, or otherwise quite beyond their reach; while the Protestants had their bible and prayer book in their own language, and could thereby search the Scriptures daily, as the noble Bereans‡ of old, whether the things taught them, by those around them, were in truth taught there. It is a matter to be much regretted, that we have no more account of what was the condition of the Protestants, furnished us, as that of the Romanists was, by a contemporary writer of their own. As it is, we learn little about them except from incidental facts. The commercial spirit of individual Protestants of that day, seems to have been as absorbing as it still is, so that the things of the kingdom of God were not sought first. Lord Baltimore could avail himself of them to swell the number of his colonists and increase his revenue from their occupation of his lands, but he could make no provision for their religious wants. He could care for his own—the Romanists, and for the poor Indian—but not for Protestants.

For the Protestants of Kent Island, as we have seen, Captain Claiborne did make provision. A Protestant Minister was there, and indeed more than one; for among the depositions taken in Virginia, 1640, "allowances for ministers," are testified to, among the expenses incurred by Captain Claiborne between the years 1631—1636 inclusive, on Kent Island. For this and other interesting facts, I am indebted to the kindness and personal examination of the Virginia Colonial Records, to S. F. Streeter, Esq., Baltimore.

In the narrative of Father White,§ one fact is mentioned, perhaps deserving of notice. It is this, that "four servants we bought for necessary use in Virginia." One of these was Francisco, a mulatto. For, in a memorandum recorded, p. 37, of the oldest land record book of the province of Maryland, * * * mention is made, that "Francisco, a mulatto, was brought in by Andrew White, in the year 1635" and right to land was therefore claimed.¶ This is the first notice on record, of the introduction of this race into the Province. This fact is mentioned in connection with the record, because the owner was entitled to one hundred acres of land, for bringing in a servant. Father White, therefore, must have the credit of introducing colored servants by purchase, into Maryland.

But our attention is called here to the progress of the war between the government of St. Mary's and the Kent Islanders. It is stated,‡ that early this year, Captain Claiborne granted a special warrant to Lieutenant Warran, to seize and capture any of the vessels belonging to the government or colonists of St. Mary's; and in pursuance thereof, an armed boat, belonging to Claiborne, was fitted out for this purpose and manned with about fourteen men. The authority for this statement is not given us by our author. Bearing in mind, however, that Claiborne's seizure and punishment had been ordered—and in his seizure, &c., that of his islanders—it will not appear astonishing that he should prepare to act on the defensive, or to make reprisals even, if found needful. Our author also states that the government of St. Mary's, probably apprized of Captain Claiborne's measures, equipped and armed two boats under the command of Captain Cornwallis, one of the governor's assistants. In April, or May, these boats met Captain Claiborne's boat, in the Pokomoke River—where Captain Cornwallis had gone in pursuit—and the result was, a battle ensued, in which one of Lord Baltimore's men was killed; and Lieutenant Warren, and two others of Captain Claiborne's men, were also killed, and the rest of his men and his boat were taken. Thus it will be seen that the order to seize and punish Captain Claiborne, was understood to include his colonists, for Captain Claiborne himself was not there.

Captain Claiborne, however, in his petition to the king, gives quite another version of the affair. And it is but right that he should have a hearing. He states there, and the statement he well knew would be denied and disproved too, if not

true, that "his boats had gone with goods to purchase corn of the Indians, being utterly destitute of themselves." It was in pursuance of this design, he says, that his boats went out. And it is notorious, that his boats and men were found by the enemy, not at Kent Island, nor near even to the St. Mary's colony, but lower down, and on the opposite side of the bay therefrom, some seventy miles distant, near the Pokomoke Indians, on the Pokomoke River, from whom corn was to be obtained in trade. And here it is admitted that Captain Claiborne's boat was found, on the 23rd of April, when the capture took place. There was also another rencontre, in the same river, on the 10th of May, the particulars of which are not stated.

Each party indeed claim, that the other fired first. But it certainly matters little which fires the first gun when a state of war exists. Either side may have fired first, and still have been acting only in defense. Captain Claiborne was at this time in Virginia, where it is claimed he had fled for refuge. But it seems unfortunate for this charge, that he was not a resident of Kent Island, but of Jamestown, where his duties as a member of the council and secretary of state, required him to be. He was no more a resident in his colony, than Lord Baltimore was in his.

Governor Calvert, however, sends commissioners to the governor of Virginia to reclaim him, as a criminal against the laws of Maryland; and yet, singularly enough, not a single law had as yet been enacted in Maryland. The only law was the order given by Lord Baltimore for Claiborne's seizure and punishment.¶ This was unquestionably presuming on Governor Harvey's friendship for Lord Baltimore and his opposition to Captain Claiborne. But the governor had just then been deposed by the people of Virginia, and sent to England. It is sufficient, therefore, to say, that they did not comply with Governor Calvert's demand. The demand, indeed showed an unauthorized assumption of power. It had not yet been decided in England that Captain Claiborne or his colony, were at all amenable to Lord Baltimore's jurisdiction. The courts of law there, had not yet decided upon the validity, or invalidity, of their claim, while, as we have seen, the king, the privy council, the commissioners of plantations, together with the governor and council of Virginia, had, for the time being at least, sustained their claim. And it was in the face of all this, that war was made on the Kent Islanders—three men killed—eleven captured—their goods and boat taken, and the proprietor himself claimed as a criminal! Such was the war waged by the Roman Catholic government of St. Mary's, against the Protestants of Kent Island.

We have very little bearing on the main point before us, the religious condition of Maryland, relating to this year. The narrative of Father White and others, shows us only, that another priest had been added to the number on the ground, that there was one temporal coadjutor less—but no letters are published as having been sent to the superiors. There were now thus four priests and one lay assistant.

* Streetier.
(To be continued.)

From the Clerical Journal.

MEMOIR OF JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.

The eminent services rendered by Dr. Kitto to Biblical Literature demand from us more than a mere obituary notice, especially when we remember that he was, in private life, an ornament and devoted friend of the Church of England. From some cause, to us incomprehensible, he has generally been placed on the side of the Dissenters, and more often than not, treated as a Dissenting minister. He was a layman incapacitated by natural infirmity for any public duty, and throughout his whole life, as far as we are aware, belonged, with his family, to the communion of our Church.

In early life Dr. Kitto fell from the roof of a house, while assisting his father as a mason. When recovering from this nearly fatal accident, it was discovered that he had entirely lost the sense of hearing, and being then, if we remember rightly, under twelve years old, his remembrance of the intonations of human speech gradually faded, and left him, except to intimate friends, practically dumb. The death of his father soon after rendered it necessary for him to become an inmate in Plymouth workhouse, and there he first attracted notice by the publication, in a local paper, of some essays, which were afterwards printed in a separate volume, and sold for his benefit. He afterwards travelled in the East, especially in Persia, with Sir John M'Neil, and there acquired familiarity with Oriental life which proved eminently useful to himself and others. On his return to England he devoted himself to literary occupations, and succeeded, for the remainder of his life, in attracting the public eye by publications generally directed to the illustration of the Scriptures. His work on "The Lost Senses," as far as deafness is concerned, is autobiographical, and contains some most curious information, conveyed in a very engaging style. He wrote the notes of the "Pictorial Bible," edited the "Biblical Cyclopaedia," and originated and edited for some years the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. His works are very numerous; and we can only glance at the principal of them. His usefulness, and perhaps his fame, will permanently rest on his "Daily Bible Readings," completed just before his death, in eight small 8vo. volumes. They contain an immense body of information on Biblical subjects, historical, archaeological and physical, and are particularly serviceable to the clergy, as containing illustrations which may be appropriately introduced into their

discourses. To young persons they have been found of extraordinary attraction; while persons of all ages rise from their perusal refreshed and charmed with the light they throw upon the Scriptures.

With the completion of this extensive work, the labours of Dr. Kitto ended. At the early age of fifty, protracted and undue mental occupation, rendered necessary by the claims of a very large family, brought on an attack of paralysis, or apoplexy, we are not certain which. He left home, by the advice of medical men, and retired with his family to Cannstatt, near Stuttgart; but there the fatal disease again attacked him, and proved fatal, shortly after his exile had been embittered by the deaths of two of his children, the oldest and the youngest. He has left his family unprovided for, except so far as £50. per annum, half his pension, has been continued to his widow by her Majesty, and a subscription, which is still going on, has been raised by private benevolence, as a testimonial deserved by his services in the cause of religion and virtue. It is proposed shortly to publish a memoir, for which there are ample materials; and it is hoped that, from these different sources, the loss of their head may in some measure be supplied to those left behind. To accomplish this object, however, very strenuous exertions will be necessary on the part of all who value his writings.

Dr. Kitto exerted a powerful literary influence on the treatment of the Holy Scriptures, for nearly a quarter of a century. From the idea of the "Pictorial Bible" many works originated, not only from the mode of illustration by suitable engravings, but from the character of the notes. He showed the possibility of throwing great light on the substance of Holy Writ, by the means of existing materials, without the discussion of its doctrinal portions. By the "Biblical Cyclopaedia," and the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, he did much to raise the character of hermeneutical science in this country. His entire seclusion from public religious life, and consequent ignorance of the state of parties among us, made him perhaps more careless of doctrine in the writers he engaged as his coadjutors than we could wish him to have been. Hence these works have in many quarters been undervalued, and the *Journal of Sacred Literature* has received far less encouragement than its character, as the only organ of Biblical science in this country, claims for it.

In private life Dr. Kitto was exceedingly amiable, and he was much loved by the few who had the privilege of his acquaintance. He was devotedly fond of flowers and gardening, and has been heard to say that the sight of trees was necessary to his happiness. Hence his study was always chosen where the majestic waving and stately beauty of those natural objects could meet his eye.

CHARACTER OF ST. ATHANASIUS.

The following notice of one who, after the Apostles, has been a principal instrument through whom the sacred truths of Christianity have been secured to the world, are extracted from the writings of his contemporaries, which may show us their opinion of him. The first is a letter written by St. Basil of Caesarea:

"To Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria: "The more the sicknesses of the Church increase, so much the more earnestly do we all turn toward thy fulness of grace, persuaded that thy guardianship is our sole remaining comfort in our difficulties. By the power of thy prayers, by the wisdom of thy counsels, thou art able to carry us through this fearful storm, as all are sure, who have made trial of thy gifts ever so little. Wherefore cease not, both to pray for our souls, and to stir us up by thy letters; didst thou know the profit of these to us, thou wouldst never let pass an opportunity of writing to us. For me, were it vouchsafed to me, by the help of thy prayers, once to see thee, and to profit by the gifts lodged in thee, and to add to the history of my life a meeting with so great and apostolical a soul, surely I should consider myself to have received from the loving mercy of God a compensation for all the ills with which my life has ever been afflicted."

Our second quotation is from St. Gregory Nazianzen, who thus writes of him: "He was as humble in his mind as he was sublime in his life; a man of an inimitable virtue, and yet withal so courteous that any might freely address him; meek, gentle, compassionate, amiable in his discourse, but much more so in his life; of an angelic temper and disposition. . . . He was one that so governed himself that his life supplied the place of sermons, and his sermons prevented his corrections, much less need he to cut or lance where he did, but once shake his rod. In him all ranks and orders might find something to admire, something particular for imitation; one might commend his unwearied constancy in fastings and prayers; another his vigorous and incessant perseverance in watchings and praises; a third, his admirable care and protection of the poor; a fourth, his resolute opposition to the proud, or his condescension to the humble. He was a patron to the widow, a father to the orphan, a friend to the brethren, a physician to the sick, a keeper to the heartful, one who became all things to all men, that if not all he might at least gain the more. With respect to his predecessors in his see, of some he imitated their discourses, of others their actions, the meekness of some, the zeal of others, the patience and constancy of the rest, borrowing their perfections, and so making up a complete representation of virtue, like skillful limners, who to make the piece absolute, do from sundry persons draw the several perfections within the idea

* 2 Buz. 505. † Hazzard. ‡ 1 Bozman, 381.

* 2 Burk, 39. † 2 Bozman, 29, from 1 Oldmixon, 164. ‡ Diol on the voyage. § P. U. Campbell's Sketch. ¶ N. C. Brock's Translation, pp. 11, 12, 19.

* 2 Bozman, 571. † Father White, p. 19. ‡ 2 Bozman, 30. § 1 Ibid, p. 21. ¶ Hazzard, 342; 2 Bozman, 42, note. C. Brock's Translation, pp. 11, 12, 19.

* Bozman, 582. † 1 Bozman, 60, note. ‡ 2 Bozman, 31. § See Contributions, vol. 25. ¶ 2 Bozman, 33. p. 20. ** 2 Bozman, 24. †† Streeter, 17. ‡‡ 1 Ibid, 54. §§ 2 Bozman, 55. ¶¶ 2 Ibid, 592. ¶¶ 2 Ibid, 270.

* 1 Ep. II, 5, 9. † Moberly's forty days, p. 79. ‡ Acts xvii, 11. § p. 25. ¶ 2 Bozman, 571. † 2 Bozman, 51.