

The Bazaar.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xviii.

VOLUME V.—No. 21.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1848.

[WHOLE NUMBER 229]

THE TRUE AMERICAN.

Though ages long have past,
Since our fathers left their home,
Their pilot, in the blast,
O'er untravell'd seas to roam,
Yet lives the blood of England in our veins;
And shall we not proclaim
That blood of honest fame,
Which no tyranny can tame
By its chains?

While the language free and bold
Which the bard of Avon sung,
In which our Milton told
How the vault of Heaven rung
When Satan, blasted, fell with all his host;
While these with reverence meet,
Ten thousand echoes greet,
And, from rock to rock repeat,
Round our coast!

While the manners, while the arts,
That mould a nation's soul,
Still cling around our hearts;
—Between let ocean roll,
Our joint communion breaking with the sun;
Yet, still, from either beach,
The voice of blood shall reach,
More audible than speech,
We are one.

Washington Allston.

THE THOUGHTS OF GOD, TO THE RIGHTEOUS.

How often the writer of Psalm xcii., (who is presumed on internal evidence to have been David himself) was placed under circumstances calculated to test his own confidence in God;—how often he "walked in darkness and saw no light," how the terrors of death compassed him about, and the overflows of ungodliness made him afraid, and he cried to Jehovah out of the depths of trouble; it is needless to repeat. But it was upon the principle, not the process, of Jehovah's working, that he stayed and soothed his soul. When he looked upon the works which were very great; "when I consider," he said, "thy heavens, and the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained;" "What is man," he asked, "that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" He knew, however, that Jehovah was mindful of him; that his Lord not only knew, but directed his path, even when his "spirit was overwhelmed within him;" that if he held fast his integrity, light would arise to him in the midst of darkness, and that whether deliverance came "from the east or the west, from the north or the south," come it assuredly would, in God's own manner, and in God's own time. The deepness of God's thoughts he could not fathom, but he knew their ultimate purpose and design;—that his thoughts were "thoughts of peace, and not of evil," to give his servant "an expected end." "With the Lord," he said, "when at the worst, 'with the Lord is mercy;' and with Him is plentiful redemption;" for while "clouds and darkness are round about him, righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his Throne." Precisely the same confidence is that which the Apostle expresses, in language, if possible, more cheering and consolatory, because more circumstantial, when he says, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able, but with the temptation, also make a way to escape."

And in like manner, the Apostle Peter testifies to the faithful, "though now, for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, it is only that the trial of your faith, being more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." However "deep," then, God's thoughts and judgments in our own case may be, we may rest assured that "all things are working together for good to them that love Him." Had the sore trial of Job been broken off abruptly in the midst,—had he gone down to the grave, which seemed already yawning to receive him, we might have been bewildered and perplexed; but we know "the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy." "I remembered thy judgments of old," said the Psalmist, "and have comforted myself;" and is not that comfort, in far more abundant measure, the privilege of the disciples of Christ?—O then let not our souls be cast down and disquieted within us; let us still hope in the Lord, and let us read a lesson of hope from the Book of creation itself. When we cannot find out by reading the deepness of God's thoughts, let us be encouraged by beholding the greatness of his works. The glorious sun in his noontide chariot of flame; the moon that walks in silent majesty through the firmament of heaven; the stars that light up the sky, as though it were the city inhabited by angels; that waves that dash upon the shore, yet respect it as their eternal boundary; the stately hills, that seem to swell into the skies; the valleys that "stand so thick with corn that they do laugh and sing;" nay, the most minute, as well as the most insignificant objects in creation, all speak one language to the believing soul, and it is this, "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but My salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." And as this is said to all, so it is said to each; "The mountains shall depart, and the hills shall be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee; neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee!"—Rev. Thomas Dale.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

A Review of: "Scriptural Principles, as applicable to Religious Societies. By Walter Fairbank Hook, D. D., Vicar of Leeds. London, 1841." In the "Churchman's Monthly Review," March, 1841.

Two phrases of the most ambiguous character, but capable of being used, and adopted in order to be used, as party watchwords, have lately been brought into fashion. Of one of these,—“Church Principles,”—we have already spoken; and it will now be our endeavour, fairly, but unreservedly, to examine into both the real and the conventional meaning of the other.

The necessity for such a discussion is clearly forced upon us. The aggressive movement is already made; and made by those whom we feel to have no substantial ground for the attack which they are leading. Meetings are being held in various parts of the country, at which “Church Unions” are formed, and resolutions entered into for the support of what are called “The Church Societies.” And if any explanations be asked, as to which Societies are thus designated, the reply is *always* in the same tenor,—“The Christian Knowledge Society; the Gospel Propagation Society; the National Society; the Incorporated Church Building Society; the Additional Curates Society.” These, and these alone, are allowed to bear the name.

Divers others, consisting either solely or chiefly of churchmen, and presided over by bishops of the Church, are thus virtually excommunicated. Among these we may name, the Church Missionary Society with *twelve* prelates at its head; the Church Pastoral Aid, with *ten*; the Prayer Book and Homily Society, with *four*; and the Naval and Military Bible Society, over which preside their Graces the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and of York!

All these, by the invidious claim set up by the associated five, or rather, set up on their behalf,—of being “the Church Societies,” are virtually consigned into the class of irregular or schismatical associations, with which any churchman of a doubtful or sensitive conscience will take care to have nothing to do.

Such being the existing state of things, we are greatly indebted to Dr. Hook for manfully venturing into print, and affording us something wherewith we may grapple, in an earnest wish to understand, and to form a correct judgment on, this interesting question. We have carefully read the Doctor's tract, and find in it the strongest confirmation of our previous apprehensions. A more singularly inconsecutive argument we have never happened to encounter; and the natural effect upon the mind is, a conviction that if even the Vicar of Leeds can make out no better case than this, the cause which he has taken in hand must surely be a most indefensible one.

Happy should we be, did our limits allow us to transfer the whole of Dr. Hook's arguments into our own pages. As they, however, is not practicable, we shall endeavour to select the leading points of his statement; and to show by the most simple and notorious facts, against what precedents and authorities he is vainly contending.

We begin with the Doctor's first positive conclusion. He says:—
“Here then we find our first principle. An institution worthy of a churchman's support should be confined exclusively to members of the Church. This may sound illiberal. That is no business of mine. I simply state what is scriptural.” (p. 9.)
This is a very off-hand way of settling the question: “What is scriptural?”
“Aye, but, good Dr. Hook, you have not taken the trouble to *prove* that it is scriptural. You have, indeed, quoted two or three texts, such as, “A man that is an Heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject;” but in what way these establish the doctrine, that “an institution worthy of a churchman's support should be confined exclusively to members of the Church,”—you have not even so much as endeavoured to show us.

Nay, more, your own practice considerably *qualifies*, if it does not entirely destroy, your own argument. Within these few weeks a meeting was called in the town of Leeds, to take measures for the relief of the poor. And there stood, in his proper place, the Vicar of the parish, surrounded and aided by, and acting in close and intimate concert with, a host of Independents, Quakers, Socinians! There may, then, it seems, be some institutions “worthy of a churchman's support,” which are *not* “confined exclusively to members of the Church.”

But it is immediately rejoined, that a distinction is to be drawn between societies for religious objects, and those for merely secular purposes. We might answer that charity is a religious object; as much so as teaching the poor to read. But we readily admit the existence of a shade of difference between the two cases, and claim only to draw *this* deduction from the fact which we have stated:—The Vicar of Leeds does not refuse to associate with schismatics or even with heretics, when he finds that he can do so without the compromise of any religious principle. His theory, as we have above quoted it, is stern and unbending; but his practice admits the entrance of distinctions, and the possibility of exceptions to the rule.

Now a great number of the members of the Church, and even of the clergy of that Church,—nay, even his own diocese,—carry this admitted principle of possible exceptions one step further than Dr. Hook

chooses to do. Having seen, with him, that it may be right to associate with schismatic works of charity, they have applied this rule of exception to one of the greatest acts of charity that can be named—the giving the word of God to the poor. Having a plan set before them, by which, without compromising any one principle of the Church, they can assist in a great effort to disperse the Gospel over all lands, they have consented, upon this common ground, and without so much as touching upon any controverted topic, to unite with believers of every denomination in this one simple and yet all-important work. This has been done, in the last forty years, by at least from twenty to thirty Bishops of our Church. It passes only by one single and narrow step, the recent public act of Dr. Hook himself. But it is utterly at variance with his “first principle,”—that “an institution worthy of a churchman's support should be confined exclusively to members of the Church.”

Let us apply the same principle to another class of institutions, our Parochial Schools. In the metropolis, in which this is written and published, we have probably two hundred of these institutions, all of them carried on under the parochial incumbent's eye, and giving a purely Church education. But, has ever such a fancy entered any one's head, as to “confine” these “exclusively to the members of the Church?”

They are generally “parochial” schools. The support of *all* the parishioners is distinctly asked, and ordinarily obtained. The subscribers, in most cases, partake, without restriction, in the management. Socinians, Baptists, and Quakers, often contribute to their support, attend meetings, and committees of the subscribers, and speak and vote like other members. No one ever thinks of refusing their aid, or of excluding them from the work. The security of the institution is found in its fundamental rules. Dissenters are aware of these; and are aware that they concede much in joining in such a work—but if they can overlook this obstacle, for the sake of the work, it would be strange indeed if churchmen refused to accept their aid, or affixed upon them a badge of contumacious exclusion.

But we pass on to Dr. Hook's second point. He thus states it:—
“But now comes another question. Admitting that we are to unite for religious purposes with churchmen only,—are laymen by themselves, or laymen assisted by Deacons and Presbyters, competent to organize a religious society? And on the authority of the text before quoted, ‘Obey them that rule over you,’ we give our answer in the negative.” (p. 9.)

The drift of all this we can perfectly understand. Every one who is at all conversant with the religious history of the last seven years, will perceive at once that it is framed for the purpose of illegitimizing, by an *ex-post-facto* law, the Church Pastoral Aid Society.

But is Dr. Hook not aware, or is he regardless of the fact, that his canon smites with an equal anathema both the Pastoral Aid Society and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge? Can he be ignorant of, or has he forgotten, the history of the formation of this last-named institution? The official statement, published by the Society itself, informs us, that “it took its rise from a very small beginning;”—“a few private gentlemen of the Church of England, about the year 1699, met together to consult upon methods for promoting the real and practical knowledge of true religion.” In another account we are told, that they “met together to praying psalms, and read the Holy Scriptures; and to improve, exhort, and edify one another by their religious conferences.”

According to Dr. Hook, no society “instituted for general purposes” can be considered a Church Society, except placed “under the superintendence of the Archbishops and all the Bishops.” Now in the Standing Orders of the Christian Knowledge Society, of the date of 1722, we find these provisions:—
“Before any person be admitted a member, he who proposes him shall assure the society of his being well affected to his Majesty King George, and his Government.” (i. e. that he was a Whig.) “But where any Bishop of the Church of England is proposed, he” (having been made a Bishop by the said Whig Government) “shall be chosen a member without any such enquiry.”

A Bishop, then, might be admitted, or might be rejected,—the vote being by ballot: such was the standing assigned to the prelates, at the commencement of the Christian Knowledge Society! In fact, both of this, and of the sister society,—that for the Propagation of the Gospel—it may be enough to say, that while Dr. Hook requires, to make a Church Society, the countenance of both the Archbishops and all the Bishops,—neither of these “venerable societies” enjoyed this amount of episcopal patronage,—indispensable as it is now alleged to be,—for many years after their formation.

So much of the affirmative side of the question. Let us now take a different view, and ask, how does Dr. Hook justify his own standing and course of action? He professes a strict adherence to the rules ascribed to Ignatius, which author he thus quotes:—

“Let no one,” says Ignatius, “do any thing pertaining to the Church *separately from the Bishop.*” Let Presbyters and Deacons, say the Apostolical Canons, “attempt nothing without the Bishop's allowance, for, it is he to whom the Lord's people are committed.” Some, says Ignatius, call him Bishop, and yet do all things without him; but these seem not to me to have a good conscience, but rather to be hypocrites and scorners.”

These doctrines Dr. Hook appears to adopt; but how does his practice consist with his professions? His own diocese, the Bishop of Ripon, gives his cordial support and patronage to the Church Pastoral Aid Society. The prelate of the adjoining see, the Bishop of Chester, does the same. Yet Dr. Hook, in the knowledge, too, that his Bishop had so distinctly declared his judgment as to have preached the last anniversary sermon of that society,—Dr. Hook calls a meeting of clergy and laity, at Leeds, and there arraigns his own Bishop of heterodoxy, by formally arguing, before some twenty or thirty of his diocesan's clergy, that the Pastoral Aid Society, which his Bishop patronizes, is “*not a Church Society*,”—is “a society from which we ought to withhold our support!” And, not content with this, he calls in the aid of Dr. Molesworth, one of the Bishop of Chester's clergy, to assist him in the pious work of destroying, in the minds of all these clergymen, all respect to the judgment of both their diocesan's!

“Let no one do anything,” says Ignatius, “separately from the Bishop.” That is my doctrine, says Dr. Hook;—but I see no objection to holding a public meeting in my parish, for the purpose of proving *him* to be wrong, and *myself* to be right, in the question of what is or is not a Church Society.

But Dr. Hook has provided himself with a defence as to this obvious inconsistency. Here is the sophism by which he hopes to escape from this manifest dilemma:—

“But Bishops are only, like ourselves, fallible men; and therefore we are not to suppose that the converse of this proposition must be true,—that because no society, except such as has the diocesan at its head, can be worthy of a churchman's support; therefore every society which has a diocesan's sanction must have a claim upon each inhabitant of that diocese. The Church defers to her Bishops as the executive power, but she does not regard them as irresponsible, or infallible, or despotic. She does not intend that they should transgress scripture, and lay it over God's heritage. To them, as well as to us, the principles of the Church are to be a guide, and they, like ourselves, may err occasionally in the application of those principles. And in deciding whether a society is conducted on Church principles, it is not to the diocesan, but to the society itself, that we are to refer. And the question is not merely whether the diocesan belongs to it, but also whether the society places the diocesan in his right position. We are to vindicate the rights of the diocesan, even though the diocesan himself neglect them; for these rights pertain not to him personally, but to the Church. We are, therefore, to ascertain whether he is recognised by the society as the diocesan—as the spiritual ruler, presiding of right over the society—so recognised as that if he refused to sanction its proceedings it would retire from the field—whether it receives him out of deference to his spiritual character, or only out of respect for temporal rank, where, as in this country, temporal rank—a circumstance of minor consideration, not indeed worthy of notice—is conceded to him. If the society does not do this, it is not one which improved, so far as its constitution is concerned, though a diocesan may adventure to be one of its members. Here, then, we come to another principle, and we may sum up what has been said, by asserting that a religious society, conducted on strictly Church principles, should consist of churchmen only, and should be under the superintendence, if instituted for general purposes, of the Archbishops, and all the Bishops of both provinces of the Church of England; if for diocesan purposes, of the diocesan; if for parochial purposes, of the parochial clergy, who act as the Bishop's delegates.” (pp. 11, 12.)

Never was any theory more obviously framed to serve a purpose.

To be concluded in our next.

GLEANINGS FROM FULLER'S CHURCH HISTORY.

HOOKER AND TRAVERS AS PREACHERS.—Mr. Hooker's voice was low, stature little, gesture none at all, standing stone-still in the pulpit, as if the posture of his body were the emblem of his mind, unmoveable in his opinions. Where his eye was left fixed at the beginning, it was found fixed at the end of his sermon. In a word, the doctrine he delivered had nothing but itself to garnish it. His style was long and pithy, driving on a whole flock of several clauses before he came to the close of a sentence. So that when the copiousness of his style met not with proportionable capacity in his auditors, it was unjustly censured for perplexed, tedious, and obscure. His sermons followed the inclination of his studies, and were for the most part on controversies, and deep points of school-divinity.

Mr. Travers's utterance was graceful, gesture plausible, matter profitable, method plain, and his style carried in it *indolem pietatis* “a genius of grace” flowing from his sanctified heart. Some say, that the congregation in the Temple ebbed in the forenoon, and flowed in the afternoon; and that the auditory of Mr. Travers was far the more numerous,—the first occasion of emulation betwixt them. But such as knew Mr. Hooker, knew him to be too wise to take exception at such trifles, the rather because the most judicious is always the least part in all audiences.

Here might one on Sundays have seen almost as many writers as hearers. Not only young students, but even the gravest

benchers, (such as Sir Edward Coke and Sir James Altham then were,) were not more exact in taking instructions from their clients, than in writing notes from the mouths of their ministers. The worst was, these two preachers, though joined in affinity, (their nearest kindred being married together,) acted with different principles, and clashed one against another. So that what Mr. Hooker delivered in the forenoon, Mr. Travers confuted in the afternoon. At the building of Solomon's temple “neither hammer, nor axe, nor tool of iron was heard therein.” 1 Kings vi. 7; whereas, alas! in this temple not only much knocking was heard, but (which was worst) the nails and pins which one master-builder drove in, were driven out by the other. To pass by lesser differences betwixt them about predestination:—

HOOKER MAINTAINED.—“The church of Rome, though not a pure and perfect, yet is a true church; so that such who live and die therein, holding justification in part by works, cannot be said by the Scriptures to be saved.

TRAVERS DEFENDED.—“The church of Rome is no true church at all; so that such as live and die therein, holding justification in part by works, cannot be said by the Scriptures to be saved.
Thus much disturbance was caused to the disquieting of people's consciences, the disgrace of the ordinance, the advantage of the common enemy, and the dishonour of God himself.

Being weak, ignorant, and seduced.
THE SILENCING OF TRAVERS.—Here Archbishop Whitgift interposed his power, and silenced Travers from preaching either in the Temple or any where else. It was laid to his charge: 1. That he was no lawful-ordained minister according to the church of England. 2. That he preached here without licence. 3. That he had broken the order made in the seventh year of her majesty's reign; wherein it was provided, that erroneous doctrine, if it came to be publicly taught, should not be publicly refuted; but that notice thereof should be given to the ordinary, to hear and determine such causes, to prevent public disturbance.

As for Travers's silencing, many which were well pleased with the deed done were offended at the manner of doing it. For all the congregation on a sabbath in the afternoon were assembled together, their attention prepared, the cloth (as I may say) and napkins were laid, yea, the guests set, and their knives drawn for their spiritual repast, when suddenly, as Mr. Travers was going up into the pulpit, a sorry fellow served him with a letter, prohibiting him to preach any more. In obedience to authority, (the mild and constant submission wherewith won him respect with his adversaries,) Mr. Travers calmly signified the same to the congregation, and requested them quietly to depart to their chambers. Thus was our good Zacharias struck dumb in the Temple, but not for infidelity; impartial people accounting his fault at most but indiscretion. Mean time, his auditory (pained that their pregnant expectation to hear him preach should so publicly prove abortive, and sent sermons home) manifested in their variety of passion, some grieving, some frowning, some mummuring, and the wisest sort, who held their tongues, shook their heads, as disliking the managing of the matter.

Travers addressed himself by petition to the lords of the Privy Council, (where his strength lay, as Hooker's in the archbishop of Canterbury and High Commission,) grievously complained that he was punished before he was heard, silenced (by him apprehended the heaviest penalty) before sent for, contrary to equity and reason;

“The law condemning none before it hear him, and know what he had done,” John vii. 51.

1. To the exception against the lawfulness of his ministry, he pleaded that the communion of saints allows ordination legal in any Christian Church. Orders herein are like degrees; and a doctor graduated in any university hath his title and place granted him in all Christendom.

2. For want of licence to preach, he pleaded that he was recommended to this place of the Temple by two letters of the bishop of London, the diocesan thereof.

3. His anti-preaching in the afternoon against what was delivered before, he endeavoured to excuse by the example of St. Paul, who, “gave not place to Peter, no, not an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue amongst them,” Galatians ii. 5.

But we are too tedious herein, especially seeing his petition is publicly extant in print, with Mr. Hooker's answer thereunto; whither we refer the reader for his more ample satisfaction.
By the way it must not be forgotten, that in the very midst of the paroxysm betwixt Hooker and Travers, the latter still bare (and none can challenge the other to the contrary) a reverent esteem of his adversary. And when an unworthy aspersion (some years after) was cast on Hooker, (if Christ was dashed, shall Christians escape clean in their journey to heaven?) Mr. Travers being asked of a private friend what he thought of the truth of that accusation: “In truth,” said he, “I take Mr. Hooker to be a holy man.” A speech which coming from an adversary, sounds no less to the commendation of his charity who speaks it, than to the praise of his piety of whom it was spoken.

Thus Mr. Travers, notwithstanding the plenty of his potent friends, was overborne by the archbishop; and, as he often complained, could never obtain to be brought to

a fair hearing. But his grief hereat was something abated, when Adam Loftus, archbishop of Dublin, and Chancellor of Ireland, his ancient colleague in Cambridge, invited him over to be Provost of Trinity-college in Dublin. Embracing the motion, over he went, accepting the place; and continued some years therein, till, discomposed with the fear of their civil wars, he returned into England, and lived here many years very obscurely, (though in himself a shining light,) as to the matter of outward maintenance.

Yet had he Agur's wish, “neither poverty, nor riches,” though his ENOUGH seemed to be of a shortest size. It matters not whether men's means be mounted, or their minds descend, so be it that both meet as here in him in a comfortable contentment. Yea, when the right reverend and religious James Usher, then Bishop of Meath, since archbishop of Armagh, (brought up under him, and with him agreeing in doctrine, though dissenting in discipline,) proffered money unto him for his relief, Mr. Travers returned a thankful refusal thereof. Sometimes he did preach, rather when he durst, than when he would; debarred from all cure of souls by his non-conformity. He lived and died unmarried; and though leaving many nephews, (some eminent scholars, bequeathed all his books of oriental languages, (wherein he was exquisite,) and plate worth fifty pounds, to Stion College in London. O! if this good man had had a hand to his heart, or rather a purse to his hand, what charitable works would he have left behind him! But, in pursuance of his memory, I have intrenched too much on the modern times. Only this I will add, perchance the reader will be angry with me for saying thus much; and I am almost angry with myself for saying no more of so worthy a divine.

CONSTANCY UNTO DEATH.—About this time Mr. John Molle, governor to the lord Ross in his travels, began his unhappy journey beyond the seas. This Mr. Molle was born in or near South-Molton in Devon. His youth was most spent in France, where both by sea and land he gained much dangerous experience. Once the ship he sailed in sprung a leak; where in he and all his company had perished, if a Hollander, bound for Guernsey, passing very near, had not speedily taken them in; which done, their ship sunk immediately. Being treasurer for Sir Thomas Shirley of the English army in Brittany, he was in the defeat of Cambray wounded, taken prisoner, and ransomed; Providence designing him neither to be swallowed by the surges, nor slain by the sword, but in due time to remain a land-mark of Christian patience to all posterity. At last he was appointed by Thomas, earl of Exeter, who formerly had made him examiner in the Council of the North, to be governor in travel to his grandchild, the lord Ross; undertaking the charge with much reluctance, (as a presage of ill success,) and with a profession and a resolution not to pass the Alps.

But a vagary took the lord Ross to go Rome; though some conceive this motion had its root in more mischievous brains. In vain did Mr. Molle dissuade him, govern now so will he in some sort governing his governor. What should this good man do? To leave him were to desert his trust; to go along with him, was to endanger his own life. At last his affections to his charge so prevailed against his judgment, that unwillingly willing he went with him. Now, at what rate soever they rode to Rome, the fame of their coming came thither before them; so that no sooner had they entered their inn, but officers asked for Mr. Molle, took and carried him to the Inquisition-house, where he remained a prisoner, whilst the lord Ross was daily feasted, favoured, entertained; so that some felt not stick to say, that here he changed no religion for a bad one.

However, such Mr. Molle's glorious constancy, that, whilst he looked forward on his cause, and upwards to his crown, neither frights nor flattery could make any impression on him. It is questionable, whether his friends did more pity his misery or admire his patience. The pretence and allegation of his so long and strict imprisonment was, because he had translated Du Plessis's book of “The Visibility of the Church,” out of French into English; but, besides, there were other contumaces therein, not so fit for a public relation. In vain did his friends in England, though great and many, endeavour his enlargement by exchange, for one or more Jesuits or priests, who were prisoners here; papists beholding this Molle as “a man of a thousand,” who, if discharged the Inquisition, might give an account of Romish cruelty to their great disadvantage.

In all the time of his duration, he never heard from any friend, nor any from him, by word or letter; no Englishman being ever permitted to see him, save only one, namely, Mr. Walter Strickland, of Boynton-house, in Yorkshire. With very much desire and industry, he procured leave to visit him, an Irish friar being appointed to stand by and be a witness of their discourse. Here he remained thirty years in restraint; and in the eighty-fourth year of his age died a prisoner, and constant confessor of Christ's cause. God be magnified, in and for the sufferings of his saints!

TRUE SELF-DEVOTION.

To the Editor of the London Record.

Sir,—Agreeing *in toto* with your remarks upon the death of the Archbishop Molle, his son.