The Great Vanity of every Man, with a curious dedication to King Charles. Ware describes him as "bountiful in his charity, an excellent divine, and an extraordinary preacher." He was offered a pension by Henry Cromwell of 100L per annum, yet he would not accept it. He also refused a living of 400L a year offered him by the Earl of Pembroke.

Thompson Gimlette, C.I., St. Olave's, Waterford.

THE CRESCENT.

(Vol. viii., pp. 198, 319.; Vol. x., p. 114.)

The following passages from the Koran and the Turkish History I had overlooked in my former communication, as a supplement to which they may now serve to throw some better light on the subject of your correspondent's inquiry (Vol. viii., p. 196.).

The fifty-fourth chapter of the Koran, entitled "The Moon," commences thus:

"The hearth of judgment approacheth, and the moon hath been split in sunder: but if the unbelievers see a half of it falling from heaven in his sleeve?" He replied, "That indeed in the course of nature the thing could not be done, but as in the Koran this miracle was affirmed to have been wrought, he resigned his reason and embraced the miracle. For," he added, "God can do whatever he pleases." (History of the Othman Empire, p. 31.)

The same author farther tells us that when at Constantinople he had frequent conversations with Tekeli, the celebrated Hungarian chief, and had often heard him say, —

"What can we do, my brother? It has pleased God to make us subject to a master, who by his actions very well denotes their inconstancy." — Ibid., p. 295.

After having related the institution of the janizaries, A.D. 1362, the historian adds the following note:

"The janizaries bear in their banners a two-edged sword, bent like a ray of lightning, opposite to a crescent; on their heads they wear a black or white handkerchief, in form of a sleeve. In other respects they are dressed like the rest of the infantry." — F. C. H.

Brydone the Tourist.

(Vol. x., p. 270.)

The extract from M. Dutens' Memoirs of a Traveller now in Retirement, which is given by Mr. Bates, ante, p. 270., as tending to substantiate the statement that the tourist never made the ascent of Mount Etna, furnishes another instance of the unfairness which I complained of in my former communication:

"Mr. Brydone dined himself," says this extract, "with having seen from the summit of Mount Etna a horizon of 500 miles diameter, the radius of which would have been 400 miles. Now, from an examination of the convexity of the globe, it is proved that it would require that Etna should be sixteen miles high to see that distance, even with the best telescope."
discovered from the top of Etna objects which would only be visible with the best telescope from a height of sixteen miles; and in this sense alone could it substantiate the statement it is brought forward to confirm. The misrepresentation of M. Dutens will be best exposed by subjoining the whole passage from Brydone's work—"I cannot in fairness abridge it,—which shows that all the objects described by him from the top of Etna are undoubtedly within the limits of vision; and that the utmost which can be laid to his charge is, that in making a rough calculation of what the extent of the horizon ought to be, he has fallen into an error.

"The circumference," he writes, "of the visible horizon on the top of Etna cannot be more than 2000 miles; at Malta, which is near 200 miles distant, they perceive all the eruptions from the second region; and that island is often discovered from about one half the elevation of the mountain; so that at the whole elevation, the horizon must extend to nearly double that distance, or 400 miles, which makes 800 for the diameter of a circle, and 2400 for the circumference. But this is by much too vast for our senses, not intended to grasp so boundless a scene. I find, indeed, by several of the Sicilian authors, particularly Massa, that the African coast, as well as that of Naples, with many of its islands, have often been discovered from the top of Etna. Of this however we cannot boast, though we can very well believe it. Indeed, if we knew exactly the height of the mountain, it would be easy to calculate the extent of its visible horizon."—Tour, Letter X.

I am not about to deny the incorrectness of the above calculation; the mistake is obvious; for the extent of the horizon at the whole elevation will not be nearly double its extent at half the elevation. But does this in the least affect the author's veracity? The whole thing is a matter of calculation, not of fact; and though his mathematics may be faulty, he is no more guilty of falsehood than a boy who makes a mistake in his arithmetic. I would point out, on the other hand, that the above passage is quite opposed to the inference Mr. Bates seeks to draw from it; for our author states that he failed to discover the coast of Africa and Naples, which were said to be visible, but which, as we now know, are below the horizon; showing plainly that his account of the scene is given from actual observation, and not taken from the descriptions of others.

After criticising Brydone on his inaccuracy, the extract given by Mr. Bates finishes by relating a circumstance in corroboration of the writer's view, the absurdity of which has not struck your correspondent:

"Lord Seaforth told me," says M. Dutens, "that as he was bathing one afternoon in the sea, near the island of Malta, he saw the sun set behind Mount Etna, the top of which only he was then able to perceive." How the sun could be seen setting nearly due north, or, to be quite exact, a point and a half to the east of north, which is the bearing of Mount Etna from Malta, I leave others to explain, as the statement is made not by Brydone, but by his criticiser.

As to the last portion of Mr. Bates' Note, I have only to remark that it is quite beside the question at issue. The time has passed by when charges of heresy and infidelity were the common weapons of controversy, and I should regret to see the use of them revived. Suffice it therefore to say, that the opinions which subjected Brydone to this charge are now shared in by all men of science, whether clerical or lay.

In conclusion, let me suggest to your correspondents, first, that before mentioning the truth of any alleged statement of our author, it would be well to ascertain whether he ever made it, the omission of which precaution has filled your volumes with much needless discussion. And, secondly, that when authorities are quoted against him, they should be something more reliable than stories of the sun setting in the north. G. Elliot.

---

roman catholic divorces.

(Vol. x., p. 326.)

The Querist D., who conversed "with a member of the Romish communion upon the subject of divorce," and was informed that in the case of "the dissolution of the marriage contract by authority of the pope, the parties are never allowed to marry again," has been perplexed by the employment of terms either not correctly used, or misunderstood.

In the language of the Romish casuists, divorce it but a separation of the parties by a judicial sentence, and does not dissolve their marriage. So Dens, No. 61, Tract. de Matrimonio:

"Divortium est separatio conjugum, quod thorum, vel habitationem, manente matrimonii vinculo." The same authority declares it to be a consequence of matrimony being a sacrament, that it is indissoluble "jure divino, positivo, et naturali." Dens proceeds, however, to except four cases. His first is "matrimonium infidelium (sae non baptizatorum," No. 55.), respecting which he observes, that if the separating party becomes a Christian, the Church will allow him to marry unless "lapsus sit in adulterium." The two next cases allow that monastic vows, or a papal dispensation, may dissolve a marriage, so long as it has not been consummated. The remaining case is a grave concession, that a marriage may be dissolved by the death of either party, "ita ut si vir a mortuis resuscitaretur, vinculum matrimonii maneret dissoluto: casus hic unicus est, quo matrimonium fluidum, ratum et consummatum, dissolvitur." The Curist, Dens says, "Certum est..."