

“ I can safely say I have always discharged this
“ disagreeable office with regret; regarding the
“ cruel necessity of it as an additional misfor-
“ tune †.

“ At present, Sir, I thank heaven, I am
“ quit of this duty; and am determined, for
“ the future, to be silent. For the sake,
“ therefore, of my own repose as well as that
“ of the State in which I have the happiness
“ to live, I voluntarily engage myself, so long
“ as I possess the same advantages, not to write
“ upon any subject which may give offence
“ to the people of this country, or of those
“ adjacent. I will even do more, and return
“ with pleasure to that state of obscurity, in
“ which I ought always to have lived, and hope
“ never more to excite the attention of the pu-
“ blic, in any shape, regarding myself.

“ I heartily wish I could offer my new coun-
“ try a tribute more worthy of it. The sacrifice
VOL. X. L I “ I

† Mr Rousseau received, indeed, during several months to-
gether, repeated and multiplied solicitations, even from Ge-
neva itself, to urge him to write in his justification. It is there-
fore not to be wondered at, if his friendship, his duty, his ho-
nour, at length yielded to them. It is surprising, however,
that people should be so fond of discovering, in the *Letters from
the Mountains*, sentiments which are not expressed there. For
my part, I sincerely avow, that the prudent, reserved, and pa-
triotic * conduct of the citizens of Geneva, since the publica-
tion of that work, appears to tally exactly with the maxims
and advice which those Letters inculcate. Not but I can ea-
sily discern, that a person, whose love of liberty and aversion
to despotism were less than mine, might not approve of the
publication of that Work, or labour to invest its author with
the title of a *Professor of truth and liberty*.

* Notwithstanding all that has been insinuated to the contrary by the
author of the *Dialogues between a citizen of Geneva and a foreigner*,
his writer making his citizen talk like a child, and his foreigner very in-
sensitive to the purpose indeed!

“ I here make it, indeed, is of little value, and
 “ as little to be regretted: since I prefer the
 “ friendship of its inhabitants, and the fa-
 “ vour of its Governors, infinitely above the
 “ breath of popularity and the vain applause of
 “ the world.

“ Let me intreat you, Sir, to accept of my
 “ most humble and respectful acknowledgments.

I have the honour to be, &c.

Neufchatel,

April 14, 1765,

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

“ P. S. In taking a review of my letter, I
 “ perceive, Sir, I have not strictly kept
 “ my promise; but have sometimes lost
 “ sight of my design, by dwelling too mi-
 “ nutely, perhaps heavily, on particulars.
 “ But the heart was afflicted, and it was
 “ impossible to do otherwise. Who could
 “ forbear expatiating on so copious a sub-
 “ ject? I do not flatter myself, however,
 “ that I have told you every thing; and
 “ am, therefore, satisfied that I have not
 “ altogether broken my promise.”

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

ON the publication of the foregoing letter, written, as it afterwards appeared, by Mr du Peyrou of Neufchatel, the reverend Pastor M. de Montmollin undertook, in defence of himself, a refutation of the facts and reasonings contained in it. This he published in the form of Letters, to the number of nine; the substance of which is contained in the following summary.

Ab.

Abstract of Professor de MONTMOLLIN's Refutation of the foregoing Libel.

“ If I had consulted only my own peace and tranquillity, I should have been silent with regard to the anonymous libel which hath lately appeared against me; and which, being only a farrago of misrepresentation, falsehood, calumny, and abuse, can excite only the contempt of men of understanding and probity.

“ A writer who is ashamed to subscribe his name to assertions or insinuations respecting the moral character and reputation of another, hath been in all ages held in just detestation, as the most dangerous enemy to society. Such a writer, indeed, may be truly compared to an assassin, who stabs a man in the dark, or destroys him while he sleeps securely in his bed. His word, at least, ought to pass for nothing with the public, as I have often heard Mr Rousseau himself acknowledge.

“ For my own part, I am not afraid to subscribe my own name, nor to mention those of others who may be interested in this affair; as I shall write nothing but what is exactly true, and shall besides strictly abide by that moderation which is so conformable both to my ministerial and personal character.”

After this introduction, the reverend professor goes on to relate the affair of Mr Rousseau's first application to him, on that gentleman's arrival at Motiers, in order to be admitted to the holy communion; giving a transcript of his letter on that occasion; which, being before

printed *, is here omitted. In the copy of a second letter, addressed to a brother pastor at Geneva, on the same occasion, M. de Montmollin proceeds, after the customary preamble, as follows:

“ It is now about three † months since Mr
 “ Rousseau arrived at Motiers, and took up his
 “ residence in the house wherein he now lives.
 “ My friends and relations recommended him
 “ to me as a person of merit and probity, who
 “ sought only a peaceful retreat where he might
 “ end his days in tranquillity, *without writing*
 “ *any more ‡*: a circumstance which was af-
 “ terwards confirmed to me by the verbal as-
 “ surance of Mr Rousseau, whose health is very
 “ precarious, and is daily on the decay. On
 “ his arrival, he wrote to my Lord Marshall,
 “ desiring permission to reside in this country;
 “ which was readily granted him. His Excel-
 “ lence also informed the King, who was pleased
 “ to admit of Mr Rousseau’s petition; *supposing*
 “ he would behave himself in a proper manner.
 “ From that day to this, Mr Rousseau, whom
 “ I have had frequent occasion to see, hath ap-
 “ peared in a very favourable light; comport-
 “ ing

* See page 390.

† This letter is dated Sept. 25, 1762.

‡ The passages marked in italics throughout this letter are those which Mr Rousseau either retrenched, added, or altered, in the copy submitted to his perusal by M. de Montmollin, when the latter was called upon, in his own vindication, to send it to several persons of eminence, both ecclesiastical and civil, who thought he had extended his toleration too far with regard to Mr Rousseau. Providentially, says the professor, I have retained this copy with the alterations and corrections written by Mr Rousseau’s own hand. The professor had written, *without troubling himself to write any more*.

ing himself with great prudence and discretion, and politely refusing to satisfy the impertinent curiosity of those who came hither to ask him imprudent or unnecessary questions.

“ In the mean time, he hath assiduously frequented the church, with such an external appearance of religious respect and devotion, that the people have entertained a very good opinion of him. For my own part, I have frequently conversed with him, and have started several objections against a number of propositions contained in his writings. On all which occasions he hath replied with great moderation; complaining bitterly that he hath been misrepresented, not only as an infidel and an enemy to religion, but even as an atheist; whereas he protested to me, that he was sincerely a Christian, and that of the reformed religion.

“ On the twenty-fourth of August, he wrote me the letter before mentioned; and the next day waited on me, in consequence of its contents; when I had an opportunity of entering into a more particular conversation with him, with regard to the nature and tendency of his writings, and principally that of *Emilius*. On that head, I observed to him, that there appeared to me a manifest contradiction between the principles established in his writings, and that ardent desire he testified to be admitted to the communion of the faithful.

“ He again protested, that he was at heart a Christian and a Protestant; that he was desirous of acting as such; and that he looked upon his participation at the Lord's table as

“ one of the most consolatory events that could
 “ happen to him ; expressing his hopes that my
 “ pastoral charity would not refuse him the ad-
 “ vantage of such consolation. To all which
 “ he added, as a proof of his sincerity, and of
 “ his request’s arising from motives purely con-
 “ scientious, that, being under the immediate
 “ protection of the king, he might reside at
 “ ease in this country, without being under any
 “ necessity of complying with any external
 “ modes of religion : but that he desired from
 “ his heart to know Jesus Christ for his Saviour ;
 “ whenever he should be called to appear before
 “ his sovereign Judge.

“ With regard to his *Emilius*, also, in parti-
 “ cular, he again assured me, that he meant to
 “ say nothing in that work against the reform-
 “ ed religion ; having in view only the three
 “ following objects: *First*, To combat the church
 “ of Rome, and particularly that doctrine which
 “ affirms that there is no salvation out of her
 “ pale ; as there can be no doubt that a Pagan
 “ of probity and virtue, Soerates, for instance,
 “ although he never had heard the name of
 “ Christ, might be saved.

“ On this occasion he admitted, that he was
 “ led to exalt the idea of natural religion, as
 “ being the foundation of revealed ; and that
 “ he might possibly have dropped some expres-
 “ sions that might be misapplied, and seem to
 “ have a tendency to depreciate the Protestant
 “ religion ; but that this was never his inten-
 “ tion.

“ In the *second* place, it was his design to op-
 “ pose, though not directly, yet sufficiently
 “ plain, that infernal performance *De l’Esprit* :

“ in

“ in which the author maintains the detestable
“ principle, that to perceive and to judge is the
“ same thing; *a principle which evidently tends*
“ *to establish materialism* *.

“ *Thirdly,* To demolish those of our modern
“ philosophers, whose vanity and presumption
“ have induced them to sap the foundations of
“ all religion, both natural and revealed.

“ In answer to all this, I freely represented
“ to Mr Rousseau, that, if these were his in-
“ tentions, his readers had indeed greatly mi-
“ staken them; and that they were very na-
“ turally led into such mistake, by the scepti-
“ cal and ludicrous manner in which he had
“ treated the most essential doctrines of Chri-
“ stianity.

“ Being thus pressed, he replied, that he ad-
“ mitted and believed every doctrine that was
“ essential, or that any minister ought to deem
“ essential, in the Christian religion: *that he*
“ *was so far from ludicrously endeavouring to*
“ *bring religion into ridicule, he had never spo-*
“ *ken of it but with the most profound respect;*
“ *although, in opposing two adversaries to each*
“ *other, and imitating their manner, which he*
“ *censures, he sometimes makes one of them speak*
“ *of it with less reverence* *. He ingenuously
“ confessed, that he had many doubts and scru-
“ ples which he could not get over; but that he
“ desired nothing more ardently than to have
“ these doubts removed, and in the mean time
“ adhered to that way of thinking which was
“ generally acknowledged the safest. He farther

“ &c.

* This was added by Mr Rousseau.

† Added by Mr Rousseau.

“ declared, that, if he was supposed to have an
 “ indifference for all religions, it was a * *false*
 “ imputation; for that he looked upon the
 “ Christian religion as the only one that was
 “ true, and capable of making us wise to sal-
 “ vation. At the end of this conference, I told
 “ him I would communicate the purport of it;
 “ as well as his letter, to the Consistory, and
 “ that I should afterwards return him my an-
 “ swer.

“ The Consistory unanimously determined;
 “ that Mr Rousseau might be admitted to the
 “ communion, on the supposition of his sincerity,
 “ and with the proviso that I should again
 “ converse with him on that head. I imparted
 “ this determination accordingly to Mr Rousseau,
 “ and in the mean time made farther inquiries
 “ after his character and conduct; for my own
 “ satisfaction and justification. After all which
 “ precautions, to prevent any scandal arising
 “ from the proposed admission, I waited again
 “ on Mr Rousseau, and told him that I was
 “ charged, on the part of the Consistory, to re-
 “ present to him, “ That every person who
 “ came to the holy communion made a public
 “ profession of believing in Jesus Christ, and
 “ that consequently the members of the church
 “ regarded him as a member of Christ: but
 “ that if in this case he only made an external
 “ and verbal profession, I thought myself obli-
 “ ged to tell him, he would be the most vile
 “ and deceitful of all hypocrites: that he was
 “ accountable, however, only to God; and that
 “ if he acted sincerely, as I was bound in Chri-
 “ stian charity to believe, I blessed God for the
 “ happy

* Added by Mr Rousseau.

“ happy circumstance, and felicitated him there-
“ on with all my heart.” To this I added,
“ that I doubted not, if he seconded the opera-
“ tions of grace which appeared to act in his
“ favour, but he would find, by happy experi-
“ ence, that the doubts and scruples he had
“ mentioned would insensibly dissipate; and
“ that, having a clear head and a good heart,
“ the work of grace would soon be compleated.
“ I then spoke to him again of his Emilius, and
“ of the public profession he was going to make
“ of Christianity: to which he replied, that in
“ time the prejudices conceived against him
“ would vanish.

“ Mr Rousseau received the communion the
“ Sunday following, with an humility and de-
“ votion that edified the whole church; and
“ seemed to carry with them all the appearance
“ of sincerity. A number of very sensible and
“ pious persons in the congregation were in
“ particular highly rejoiced at the religious de-
“ portment of Mr Rousseau, who hath made
“ himself loved and esteemed in these Cantons
“ by his candour, affability, moderation, and
“ charity. For though he is not rich, he is
“ very charitable, and that without ostentation;
“ of which he gave some extraordinary proofs
“ on the day of his receiving the sacrament.”

Under these circumstances, M. de Montmol-
lin thinks he should have been wanting in his
duty as a minister of Christ, had he refused Mr
Rousseau the privileges he was desirous of as a
member of his church; it belonging only to him
who searcheth the heart and trieth the reins, to
judge whether or not the participant was actually
sincere. “ It is to be wished, indeed,” continues
the

the reverend pastor, "for the sake of my own peace and tranquillity, that my toleration, tho' founded both on the principles of humanity and Christian charity, had been more reserved and confined. I should not in that case have been the dupe to the goodness of my own heart, nor have had so much reason to complain of having been unjustly traduced in the opinion of the public. Where is there a pastor, who would not have been rejoiced as I was, to see Mr Rousseau, whose celebrity was so general and extensive, present himself in a light so desirable to the cause of truth and religion? I will frankly confess to you, Sir, that, independent of the satisfaction I felt in regard to the salvation of Mr Rousseau, and the edification of my fellow Christians, my self-love was not a little flattered by this event, which I looked upon as one of the most honourable of my life. The consequences, however, have taught me the propriety of adopting the remark which the anonymous Libeller hath put into the mouth of a certain lady of his acquaintance respecting Mr Rousseau's commending an Ecclesiastic in his life-time. Yes, my friend, I may well say, in like manner, that I have learned, to the sorrow of my heart, the danger of commending an author during his life-time, especially when he piques himself so greatly on his reputation. To promise to write no more, yet still to write on, and that more than ever against religion, is a conduct so inconsistent and problematical, that, I confess frankly, I am unable to account for it. But to confine myself to facts, which I shall leave to explain themselves: During the time in which I imagined Mr Rousseau enjoyed at leisure that

tran-

tranquillity which he had by his abovementioned conduct procured to himself, without thinking of writing any more on religious subjects, it appears that he was very differently employed: For at the latter end of the year, behold his Letters from the Mountains made their appearance; in the perusal of which I saw the author discovered himself by his writings, and that it was no longer the Savoyard Curate who spoke, but Mr Rousseau himself. A copy of this work was sent me by the author, with the following letter *.

Motiers, Dec. 23, 1764.

“ What a pity, Sir, that a man, who is so
“ fond of peace, should be always engaged in
“ war! It was impossible for me to refuse stand-
“ ing up in defence of my compatriots, as they
“ had done in mine. This is what I could not
“ do, without resenting those insults, which,
“ with the blackest ingratitude, the ministers of
“ Geneva have had the baseness to load me in
“ the midst of my misfortunes; and which they
“ have carried even so far as to abuse me from
“ their pulpits, which they are unworthy to a-
“ scend. But as they are so fond of war, they
“ shall

* Let the reader put himself in my place, and judge what I ought to think of Mr Rousseau, when I saw to what degree he had insulted so distinguished and respectable a body as the clergy of Geneva. I confess, I was very little flattered with the exception this writer made of me in the Amsterdam edition of his book; as the odium he endeavoured to throw on the ministry in general, must necessarily in some degree affect me. But it is no wonder, that a writer, who could so indecently insult a respectable body of magistrates, should abuse the ministers of religion, who have no other arms to defend themselves than charity and patience.

“ shall have it; this, however, is my first act of
 “ hostility, tho’ I have suffered many from them
 “ who have been the aggressors. In this work,
 “ I have nevertheless defended one of their chief
 “ prerogatives; which they have tamely sub-
 “ mitted to be deprived of, voluntarily stooping
 “ under the yoke of tyranny themselves, that
 “ they may be supported in their insolent au-
 “ thority over others. As for the rest, the quar-
 “ rel is merely personal between them and me;
 “ or, if I have introduced the Protestant reli-
 “ gion, it is as its defender against those who
 “ would subvert it. Such are my reasons, Sir,
 “ for having written this performance; and you
 “ may be assured, that the more I am laid under
 “ the necessity of explaining myself, the greater
 “ honour will redound to you for your conduct
 “ towards me and the justice you have already
 “ done me.

J. J. ROUSSEAU.”

“ The Company of Pastors, being informed of
 the manner in which the *Letters from the Moun-
 tains* were received throughout Europe, and
 particularly by the churches of this country,
 thought themselves under an obligation to take
 notice of this work, as well as of the new edi-
 tion projected of Mr Rousseau’s other pieces.

“ The Libeller is pleased to represent it as an
 offence, that the reverend class were silent on
 this head for the space of two months. But
 could a body of men dispersed throughout the
 country take up less time to examine the work
 in question, and to judge properly of the effects
 it might produce? These, and these only, were
 the springs of their subsequent zeal and activity.

Will

“Will it be said that the clergy had no business to take these objects into their consideration? Surely their quality of ministers of the gospel necessarily called upon them to support the cause and interests of their Divine Master! The clergy of every communion would have done the same; and I can take upon me to aver, that both ours and the neighbouring churches, tho’ of a different communion, were greatly edified by that conduct and resolution, which are so conformable to the avowed principles of a company of defenders of the truth, who ought to maintain the cause of Christ.

“The anonymous libeller was not well informed, when he intimated that the clergy took no notice of *Emilius* at the first appearance of that work; the venerable class having made remonstrances on this head to the Government in the year 1762, in order to prevent its being circulated in this country; a proof of which fact the writer may find by recurring to the registers of the Council of State. It is farther observable, that in this remonstrance the class did not mention the author’s name; an instance of that moderation for which they have been ever distinguished, notwithstanding the libeller’s malicious insinuations to the contrary.

“The mistake of the crier, who proclaimed the prohibition of Mr Rousseau’s performance, was not less ridiculous than the anonymous writer’s remark on it. But to proceed to facts of greater importance.

“The Assembly of the Clergy appointed the 12th and 13th of March *, in order to deliberate

VOL. X.

M m

ON

* M. de Montmolin was not present at the former meet-

on the means of removing the scandal which the publication of Mr Rousseau's last work had occasioned. And here, with all the deference due to the anonymous writer, I must take the liberty to observe, that, according to the ecclesiastical constitutions of this country, the clergy have a right and authority to take notice of matters of faith, as well as morality, when any scandal arises from them. This is the very letter and the spirit of our discipline; of which I might cite numerous examples. The anonymous writer compares the proceedings of our clergy, with those of an inquisition. Absurd and ridiculous! The objects of inquisitorial prosecution are concealed facts, that of our Assembly was notorious and open.

“ Not having seen Mr Rousseau during my illness, I thought my pastoral duty required of me to pay him a visit before the meeting of the appointed Assembly. I accordingly waited on him, though hardly recovered, on Friday the 8th of March, in the afternoon; in order to prevail on him, if possible, to take such measures as might best agree with my sentiments respecting him, and the discharge of my own duty. I signified to him the apprehensions I was under on his account, and the consequences which I foresaw would be the result of the Assembly. I opened my heart freely to him on this occasion, as a citizen, a Christian, a pastor, and a friend; in doing which perhaps I did too much, but it was a proceeding which my heart dictated. I own Sir,
I

ing of the clergy, being, as he says, confined by sickness, and having no knowledge, either directly or indirectly, of what was done there; much less that Mr Rousseau's books were the objects of their deliberation.

I was desirous of preventing Mr Rousseau's suffering any chagrin this account, because I then firmly believed him to be sincere in his error. I proposed to him therefore several expedients which suggested themselves; and among others, that he would promise me not to receive the communion at Easter, as well for his own sake as for that of general edification; hoping that, in a short interval, the fermentation which had been raised in the minds of the people on his account might possibly subside. Was this, Sir, the conduct of a persecutor? Mr Rousseau hesitated some time; and at length gave me for answer, that if I would assure him he should participate on the ensuing festivals, he might be induced to acquiesce in my proposal. I represented to him, that this did not depend on me; that I was only a single member of a numerous body, and could answer only for my own vote. He persisted, however, in telling me, that his fortune was in my hands, and that he was determined to have all or nothing; while I continued to assure him, that I would do him all the service in my power, consistent with my duty. Mr Rousseau then said, that he would enter into an engagement with me, not to write any thing more upon the subject of religion; in consequence of which he hoped he should not be farther disturbed: to which he added hastily and abruptly, "Well, Sir, my fortune depends upon you: if you return with good news, I shall be heartily glad to see you; if not, we have nothing to say to each other." To this I replied, being much concerned at his prepossession, "As you please, Sir," and returned to my own house heartily afflicted. As I was not to set out till

Monday, I conceived Mr Rousseau might in the interim be better advised, and that I should hear from him: but I heard nothing of him till Sunday evening; when Mr Guyenet, Lieutenant of Val-de-Travers, who has the honour to be in the good graces of Mr Rousseau, came to inform me, that Mr Rousseau had sent for him to complain against me for the coldness with which I had received his declaration; and to tell him, that if I had required it in writing, he would certainly have given it me. He hath nothing more to do then, said I, then to send it to me; I am ready to receive it, and will present it to the Assembly: but I conjure you, added I, by that interest which you take in Mr Rousseau's affairs, as well as that which you are sensible I take myself, to let his declaration be clear and positive. Mr Guyenet would have had me return to Mr Rousseau: but the weather was too severe to permit me to risk my health; and as I had nothing new to say to him, Mr Guyenet went himself, and brought me soon after a written paper from Mr Rousseau, which I told him I thought insufficient, giving him my reasons for thinking it unsatisfactory. To these he told me he would bring an answer, and accordingly brought me a second paper * on Monday morning: to which I objected, in like manner, that instead of making our Clergy easy, it would rather irritate them the more against him †: desiring that he would alter the words

“ I

* The anonymous writer says, this declaration was not known till within a short time before his writing; whereas it was notoriously known in the very beginning of the affair, not only in the country, but even in Geneva. Mr Guyenet told me he had orders to make it public, as I also did to every one who had a mind to see it.

† The terms of his former declaration were still more exception-

tion-

“ *I will continue* to shew by my sentiments and
“ conduct the value I set upon the happiness of
“ being united to the church,” into, “ *I will*
“ *endeavour* to shew, &c.”; the expression *I*
will continue, after so flagrant an instance of his
late defection, being more than sufficient to give
offence. The Lieutenant was loath to return
with this message; but seeing I was going to
proceed on my journey, he went out hastily, de-
siring I would wait his return. I did so; when
he informed me, that he could not prevail on
Mr Rousseau to alter a single letter of his decla-
ration. So much the worse said I; I am really
sorry for his obstinacy: but please to tell him,
that he is himself the cause of those troubles in
which he will possibly be involved; but it is his
own affair, as he is determined not to listen to
the advice of his friends.—

“ Being arrived at Neufchatel, I found there the
same fermentation as in my own and the neigh-
bouring parishes. The *Letters from the Moun-*
tains, the projected edition of Mr Rousseau’s
writings, the remonstrances of our company,
and the proscription of his works by the civil
magistrate, all together did did not a little agi-
tate the minds of the people. Every body had
their eye on the conduct of the Clergy in this cir-
cumstance. What will our ministers do? said they
publicly. Will they defend the gospel, which hath
been so openly attacked; or will they suffer it to be
torn in pieces by its enemies? And what will you
do, Sir? said they to me. Will not this last per-

M m 3

form-

tionable; for he there made the offer of being silent, on condi-
tion of their not molesting him: but it is not for culpable in-
dividuals, as I then told Mr GUYENET, thus to make condi-
tions, and give law to their legal superiors.

formance of Mr Rousseau's put an end to your toleration? He is your parishioner. Will you do nothing for the sake of religion, for the edification of the faithful, and for your own character? Had a native of the country, added they, dared to speak or to write any thing like what hath been advanced by Mr Rousseau, the clergy would have been readily inflamed against him. What! is Mr Rousseau, a citizen of yesterday, invested with greater privileges than a natural born subject? Is he not subjected, like every other citizen, to the laws of the state, and those customs which have prevailed from times immemorial.

“ At the meeting of the Assembly, the Christianity of Mr Rousseau was brought on the tapis for examination; when I presented the declaration given me by Lieutenant Guyenet on the preceding Sunday. This, being taken into consideration, was deemed insufficient to repair the mischiefs which had been already effected by the publication of the *Letters from the Mountains*; and that something more was required of Mr Rousseau, in regard to the injured honour of religion. So that, so far were the Assembly from thinking that his declaration should be transcribed in letters of gold in their registers, that they conceived it included its own condemnation: for if the book in question had not insulted religion, Mr Rousseau had no need to enter into engagements to write no more against it.

“ Agreeable to the custom of the Assembly, I was then called upon to give in my information; which, I appeal to all present, was done in the spirit of toleration and charity, which I have ever displayed toward Mr Rousseau. After this I
went

went out of the Assembly, conformably also to the same customs *.

“ I know not where the anonymous libeller learned, that the reverend Assembly fulminated a sentence of excommunication against Mr Rousseau, in defiance of the laws and constitution of the country. They were by no means ignorant of the limits of their spiritual jurisdiction; but at the same time they knew themselves authorised to give directions to the members of their own body, respecting their behaviour in their respective consistories, without pretending to lay any restraint on the suffrage of the elders. It is false, it is absolutely false, that the Assembly deliberated on the anonymous letter which the libeller has inserted, and which was addressed only to some few members, of which I was one. On the contrary, it was not even publicly read, because it was anonymous.

“ The following is a copy of the directions given me by the Assembly to regulate my particular conduct towards Mr Rousseau.

Neufchatel, March 13, 1765.

“ The Assembly being this day met to deliberate on the measures it ought to take with regard to Mr Rousseau, whose antichristian sentiments, displayed in his writings, and particularly in his *Letters from the Mountains* lately published, have given the greatest scandal to the whole Christian church, and particularly to that of our own country; it was judged proper to begin with the examination
“ of

* It is the custom in this assembly, for the pastor of any parish to withdraw, when any matter is under deliberation respecting any one or more of his own parishioners.

“ of Mr de Montmollin pastor of Motiers
 “ whose parishioner Mr Rousseau at present is.
 “ The information of the said pastor, being heard,
 “ the Assembly were given to understand, that
 “ Mr Rousseau, having been previously advised
 “ of the object of the present deliberations, had
 “ sent him a paper, signed with his own hand,
 “ to be delivered to the Assembly *: Which
 “ paper being read, and maturely considered,
 “ the Assembly is of opinion that it is insuffi-
 “ cient to atone for the scandal which the publi-
 “ cation of his mischievous and impious wri-
 “ tings have raised.

“ They think themselves, therefore, indispen-
 “ sably obliged to declare to M. de Montmollin,
 “ that, after the publication of the *Letters from*
 “ *the Mountains*, he ought to not to look upon
 “ Mr Rousseau as a Christian or member of the
 “ church. At his requisition also the Assembly
 “ judge it expedient to give him directions for
 “ his future conduct towards Mr. Rousseau,
 “ whom he ought to cite to appear before the Con-
 “ sistory, in order to be properly admonished,
 “ and to be made acquainted with their resolu-
 “ tion concerning his being adjudged unworthy
 “ of communion with the faithful, until he shall
 “ have manifested, in every respect, the senti-
 “ ments of a true Christian, first, By solemnly
 “ declaring in the Consistory, that he believes in
 “ *Jesus Christ, who died for our transgressions,*
 “ *and rose again for our justification*; secondly,
 “ By acknowledging his regret for having writ-
 “ ten any thing contrary to that belief, and a-
 “ gainst revelation; and, lastly, By consenting
 “ that such declaration and acknowledgment
 “ should

* See page 373.

“ should be made public for the edification of
“ the church, and the reparation of the scandal
“ he hath occasioned.

Signed, A. DE LUZE,
*Pastor of the church at Cornaux, and
Secretary of the venerable Assembly.*

“ On the next day I quitted Neufchatel, in order to return home to my particular affairs. How then can the author of the libel rashly advance, that secret practices had been used in the church of Motiers? No secret practices were made use of, either on my part, or on that of the friends to religion and tranquillity. I call on all my parishioners to witness this, as also on the very elders themselves who voted against me in the affair of Rousseau.

“ The public were curious and impatient to know the resolution taken by that Assembly; that strict silence, however, was observed, to which the oath taken by the members necessarily obliged them; a silence which, nevertheless, the anonymous letter-writer affects, I know not why, to make so very mysterious. For my own part, I am still ignorant whether the ministers present made a secret of the above resolution to those who were absent: but I know very well that I made no mystery of it to any of my absent brethren, when I had an opportunity of seeing them. And why should I? when it is well known that the *Letters from the Mountains* were censured by the pastors in general, who were justly apprehensive of their dangerous effects on their respective flocks.

“ On Sunday, the twenty-fourth of March, the Consistory met, according to the practice of all
the

the churches of this country, to proceed on the subject of accusations *; at which time two new elders were presented and chosen; who, if they had not been prevented by various circumstances, would have been chosen some time before. But Easter was approaching; and the elders insisted on the election of colleagues, because they were become too few in number to sustain the burden of the church. Yet with what malignity doth the anonymous libeller take upon him to charge me “with having fixed on this opportunity to complete the Consistory, in order that I might have more of its members at my devotion?” But did not the officer of the Prince also vote at this election?

“On this very day, the Consistory came to my house, according to custom, before the morning service, with the two new-elected elders; at which time, and not before, I informed them of the affair of Mr Rousseau, which was to be proposed in the Assembly of the Consistory after the sermon.

“In this Assembly I represented to them, that it was not without great concern and reluctance that I laid before them the affair of Mr Rousseau, with whom I had had personal connections; but that the honour of religion and the edification of the churches in general, and that of Motiers in particular, induced me to lay aside all private considerations; and that the more especially, as
all

* These accusations consist in the inquiry made by the pastor, of the elders, whether any scandal hath come to their knowledge, and what he ought to do for their better edification? The pastor also relates what he knows of such things, and they all enter into such measures as they think most efficacious to remove them.

all the world had eye, since the publication of the *Letters from the Mountains*, on the conduct we should adopt with regard to Mr Rousseau, and more particularly the Assembly of the Clergy, and the neighbouring churches. I thought it would be proper, therefore, for the discharge of our duty, that Mr Rousseau should be cited to appear in the Consistory, and that, if they judged it expedient, I would confine myself to the merely asking him two general questions, viz. “Whether he believed the Scriptures to be the revealed will of God? And whether he also believed that Jesus Christ died for our transgressions, and rose again for our justification?” Two questions very simple; the affirmative answer to which is essential to the faith of a Christian*.

“In support of my opinion I made use of the direction which the reverend class had given me, and which the elders desired me to read. This I did; at the same time expressly declaring that I did not pretend to lay any restraint on their suffrage; and appealing to them, in the presence of the officer, whether I had ever so done. On which they all unanimously replied, that I always left them at perfect liberty in this respect, and that they were happy in having a pastor who behaved so well to them.

“On giving their votes, the majority were for citing Mr Rousseau to appear before the Consistory, to be held at the minister’s house on the 29th, after sermon, according to custom. Mr
Rouf-

* *Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you, 1 Pet. iii. 15.*

Rousseau was, in consequence, properly cited, and returned the answer above inserted †.

“ I pass over in silence what the anonymous writer has falsely imputed to me, in regard to my affirming in the Consistory that Mr Rousseau was the *antichrist*. Never did I say or think of such an absurdity. I know not what it is to abuse any one, though I can stand up boldly in the defence of truth when my duty calls upon me. Now my duty called upon me to represent to the Consistory what I thought we were bound to do in such a case, for the edification of the whole Christian church.”

Mr Montmollin proceeds to refute some other passages contained in the anonymous letter; but as every thing is already extracted that is of moment to his justification, it is here judged expedient to close this abstract of the professor's letters.

A Letter from Mr ROUSSEAU, relative to the preceding.

Motiers-Travers, Aug. 8, 1765.

“ No, Sir; let them say what they will, I shall never repent the praise I have bestowed on M. de Montmollin: I thought him worthy my greatest acknowledgments, and praised in him what I had experienced, his truly pastoral conduct with regard to me. I have not extolled his character, with which I am unacquainted.

“ I praised neither his truth nor probity. I will even confess that I received at first no very agreeable impressions from his outward
“ ap-

“ appearance; which is not calculated to pre-
“ judice one much in his favour. His tone of
“ voice, his deportment, and unpleasing aspect,
“ gave me an involuntary disgust; I was amazed
“ to find such affability, humanity, and sweet-
“ nefs of temper, such virtues concealed under
“ so gloomy a physiognomy. But I soon smo-
“ thered that unjust prepossession; for ought we
“ to form an opinion of a man on such delusive
“ signs, which are so plainly contradicted by
“ his conduct? Must one pry, with malignant
“ curiosity, into the secret principle of a per-
“ mission so little expected? I have the strongest
“ aversion for that base artifice of viewing the
“ good actions of others only on the dark side,
“ and never had sufficient sagacity to find out
“ bad motives for doing good. The more I per-
“ ceived an indifference for M. de Montmollin
“ arising in my mind, the more I strove to sub-
“ due it, by reflecting on the gratitude I owed
“ him: Let us suppose the same case possible
“ to happen again, and I should just act in the
“ manner I did.

“ M. de Montmollin now unmask, and shews
“ what he is in reality. His present conduct is
“ an explanation of his former behaviour. It is
“ easily seen that his pretended moderation,
“ which he loses at the very time it is most proper,
“ is derived from the same source as that perse-
“ cuting zeal with which he is so suddenly in-
“ spired. What was his original view? What
“ are his present designs? I really know not;
“ but I am sure his intention was never good.
“ He not only admitted me to the communion,
“ with an obliging warmth of friendship; but
“ sought me earnestly and induced me to hear

“ him, whenever I seemed to be cheerful, on the
 “ subject of Christianity: and when I proved
 “ that I did not attack it, or denied I had any
 “ such intention, he would in his turn rally me
 “ severely on my confidence in religion, on my
 “ person, and belief; he would have me excom-
 “ municated, banished; he raised the whole pa-
 “ rish against me. He pursued me with a re-
 “ morseless violence, bordering on madness.

“ Are these extraordinary diversities consist-
 “ ent with his duty! No; charity is unchange-
 “ able, virtue never contradicts itself, and con-
 “ science knows no equivocation.

“ After shewing himself so little moderate at
 “ the beginning, he resolved to be more so when
 “ it was too late. That affectation did not serve
 “ him; and as every one saw thro’ the disguise,
 “ he did well to return to his natural disposi-
 “ tion. By destroying his own work, in doing
 “ me more harm than good, he has acquitted me
 “ of all obligations. I owe him nothing but an
 “ acknowledgment of the truth: it is what I owe
 “ to myself; and since he obliges me to confess
 “ it, I shall do so.

“ You desire to know what passed between
 “ us relative to that affair.—M. de Montmol-
 “ lin gave his account to the public as a church-
 “ man; and dipping his pen in that poisoned
 “ honey which proves mortal, took all the ad-
 “ vantages his situation afforded. For my part,
 “ Sir, I shall unfold my narrative in that plain
 “ unaffected style which persons of probity al-
 “ ways use to each other. I shall waste no time
 “ in protestation of my sincerity. I leave it to
 “ your good understanding and love of truth to
 “ settle that affair between him and me.

“ I am not, thank heaven, one of those
“ whom the church makes bigots, and after-
“ wards despises. I have the honour to be one
“ who is esteemed, and at the same time perse-
“ cuted. When I took refuge in this country,
“ I brought letters of recommendation to no
“ person whatever, not even to my Lord Mar-
“ shal. I had but one letter, which I carried
“ every where, and which with my Lord Mar-
“ shal would have been alone sufficient. Two
“ hours after my arrival, as I was writing to
“ his Excellency to inform him of it, and to beg
“ his protection, a stranger, whom I had never
“ seen, entered, and called himself the minister
“ of the place, paying his compliments with
“ great familiarity; and seeing I wrote to my
“ Lord Marshal, made me an offer of adding a
“ few lines, by way of recommendation, with
“ his own hand. I did not accept his offer, but
“ sent away my letter; and met with such a
“ reception as oppressed innocence might hope
“ to find wherever virtue is held in esteem.

“ Having no expectation of so much civility
“ from a pastor, who was an entire stranger to
“ me, I told every body the circumstance the
“ same day; and among others to colonel Ro-
“ quin, who testified the most affectionate re-
“ gard for me, and would have very willingly
“ accompanied me hither.

“ M. de Montmollin continued his assidui-
“ ties; I thought this might be of some advan-
“ tage to me, and as the September communion
“ was approaching, I wrote him a letter, to
“ know if, notwithstanding the public report,
“ I might present myself there. I chose rather
“ to write than to pay him a visit, which might

“ be productive of tedious explanations, and
 “ those I endeavoured to avoid. For if I should
 “ make a declaration neither to disavow nor de-
 “ fend my book, that would in effect be con-
 “ strued as if I declined entering on any dis-
 “ cussion of that point; and indeed, whenever
 “ I was obliged to vindicate my honour and my
 “ person with respect to that book, I always
 “ condemned what errors it might contain, sa-
 “ tisfied with shewing that the author meant
 “ not to attack Christianity, and that it was
 “ wrong to prosecute him as a criminal on that
 “ account.

“ M. de Montmollin answered, that I might
 “ come the next morning and know his reso-
 “ lution. I should have done so, if he had not
 “ prevented me by coming himself. I may
 “ forget these trifles; but I think he came, and
 “ I certainly remember with what demonstra-
 “ tion of joy he testified the pleasure he recei-
 “ ved from my request. He told me very
 “ politely, that he and his congregation should
 “ be much honoured, and that a step so unex-
 “ pected would greatly edify all the faithful.
 “ That moment I confess was the happiest I had
 “ ever known. A man must be sensible of mis-
 “ fortunes like mine, and experience the distress
 “ of a tender heart torn from every object of
 “ its affection, in order to judge what consola-
 “ tion I received in belonging to a society of
 “ brethren, who might indemnify me for the
 “ losses I had sustained, and for those whose
 “ esteem I could no longer cultivate. I ima-
 “ gined, that by heartily joining with this small
 “ congregation, in an affecting and rational wor-
 “ ship, I should more easily forget all my ene-
 “ mies.

“ mies. The first time I went to the church,
“ I was affected, even to the shedding of tears.
“ Having never lived among Protestants, I form-
“ ed notions that they and their Clergy were
“ angels. Their worship, so pure and void of
“ ostentation, was exactly what suited my
“ mind; it seemed instituted on purpose to in-
“ spire the miserable with hope and resolution.
“ All those that partook of it appeared so ma-
“ ny true Christians united in bands of the
“ most perfect charity. How have they unde-
“ ceived me, in depriving me of the pleasure
“ of enjoying an error so agreeable! My eyes
“ were at last opened, and it was but from the
“ effect of imagination that I judged of the value
“ of being admitted amongst them.

“ Perceiving that M. de Montmollin never
“ mentioned a word with respect to my senti-
“ ments in matters of faith during his short vi-
“ sit, I believed he had reserved that conversa-
“ tion for another opportunity; and knowing
“ how fond these gentlemen are of assuming a
“ right which doth not belong to them, of jud-
“ ging of the faith of Christians, I declared to
“ him that I did not understand submitting to
“ any interrogation or eclclaircissement whatever.
“ He answered, that he should never require
“ it; and has so well kept his promise, that I
“ have always found him very circumspect in
“ avoiding any discussion on the subject of doc-
“ trine, and till the last affair he never hinted
“ any thing of it, though I happened to speak
“ to him sometimes on that head.

“ In this manner things went on, both before
“ and after the communion; still the same af-
“ fectionate concern on the part of M. de Mont-

“ mollin, and the same silence with respect to
 “ theological subjects. He even carried the
 “ spirit of toleration so far, and shewed it so
 “ openly in his sermons, that I was often in
 “ pain for him. As I had a real regard for
 “ him, I concealed not the fears I began to
 “ have on his account; and I remember, that
 “ preaching one day very strenuously against the
 “ want of toleration amongst the Protestants, I
 “ was very much startled to hear him maintain,
 “ with earnestness, that the reformed church
 “ had still need of a farther reformation, both
 “ in manners and doctrine. I then little ima-
 “ gined he would afterwards have shewn in
 “ himself so convincing a proof of the necessity
 “ of that reformation.

“ This doctrine of toleration, and the uni-
 “ versal esteem it met with, excited the jealousy
 “ of many of his brethren, particularly at Ge-
 “ neva. They loaded him with continual re-
 “ proaches, and spread those nets which have
 “ at last caught him; I am sorry for it, but
 “ this was not my fault. If M. de Montmolin
 “ had supported his pastoral character by ho-
 “ nourable means; if he had been satisfied to
 “ have only employed in his defence, with bold-
 “ ness and freedom, the weapons of Christiani-
 “ ty and the truth; what an example would he
 “ have given to the church and to all Europe,
 “ and what a glorious triumph would he have
 “ gained to himself! He made use of the arms
 “ of his profession; and finding them soften in
 “ defending himself, contrary to the truth, he
 “ then wanted to render them offensive by at-
 “ tacking me. But he was mistaken; these
 “ rusty weapons, strong indeed against those
 “ who

“ who fear them, but weak and useless when
“ courageously resisted, are now broken: He
“ took a wrong method to succeed.

“ Some months after my admission into this
“ congregation, M. de Montmollin entered my
“ apartment one evening, with an air of per-
“ turbation. He sat down, and continued a
“ long time silent; he at last spoke, beginning
“ with one of those tedious prefaces which cu-
“ stom had rendered easy. He came then to
“ the point, telling me, that his admitting me
“ to the communion had very much chagrined
“ his brethren, whose censure he had attracted
“ on that account; that he had been reduced
“ to the necessity of justifying himself in such
“ a manner as must undoubtedly stop their
“ mouths; and if his good opinion of my prin-
“ ciples had suppressed the demand of those
“ explanations which any other person in his
“ situation would have exacted, he could not,
“ however, suffer it to be believed, without
“ hurting his credit, that I had never yet given
“ him any account of my sentiments with regard
“ to religion. Thus saying, he drew a paper
“ from his pocket, and began to read, in a
“ rough draft of a letter to a minister at Gene-
“ va, some parts of a conversation between us
“ that never passed, but wherein he inserted,
“ very artfully, some words here and there,
“ spoken at random, and on quite a different
“ subject. Judge, Sir, what was my surprise:
“ it was such, that I recovered not my attention
“ till he had read the whole letter. In those
“ places where fiction was most prevalent, he
“ interrupted himself, saying, *If you perceive*
“ *the necessity—my situation—my profession—one*
“ *must*

“ *must take a little care of one’s self.* On the
 “ whole, this letter was written with a good
 “ deal of address; and, except in a few particu-
 “ lars, great care was taken to make me say
 “ what I might very naturally have said. When
 “ he had done, he asked me if I approved of
 “ that letter, and if he should send it just as it
 “ was?

“ I answered, I was sorry he was obliged to
 “ have recourse to such methods; but that as to
 “ myself, I could say no such thing: But that
 “ since he had taken upon him to say it, it was
 “ his own affair and not mine; and that I
 “ saw nothing there to which I should be ob-
 “ liged to give the lie. As this can prejudice
 “ nobody, replied he, and may be of use to
 “ you, I easily pass over a small scruple, which
 “ can answer no end, but to prevent a good act.
 “ But tell me if, on the whole, you are satisf-
 “ fied with this letter, or if you see any thing
 “ in it that might be altered for the better. I
 “ told him, I thought it very proper for the
 “ end it was intended. He urged me so much,
 “ that, to humour him, I pointed out some tri-
 “ fling corrections, of no consequence. Now I
 “ must tell you, that in the situation we sat, the
 “ standish was opposite to M. de Montmollin;
 “ but whilst we were talking, he pushed it, as
 “ by chance, to me; and as I held his letter,
 “ to read it again, he reached me the pen to
 “ make the necessary amendments; which I
 “ did, with all the frankness natural to me.
 “ That done, he put up his letter, and retired.
 “ Excuse my being so particular, it is absolutely
 “ necessary.

“ But I shall not be so explicit with respect

“ to my last interview with M. de Montmollin,
“ which is much easier conceived. You com-
“ prehend what might be said to a person who
“ coldly tells you, ‘ Sir, I am ordered to break
“ your head; but if you would have your leg
“ broke, perhaps that may satisfy them.’ M. de
“ Montmollin must undoubtedly have been
“ concerned in difficult affairs sometimes, and
“ yet I never saw a man more confused during
“ that whole transaction. In such a case, no-
“ thing can be more embarrassing than to be
“ at odds with a man of a free and open dispo-
“ sition, who, instead of using subtle and equi-
“ vocating arguments, answers abruptly, and
“ affronts you, contrary to reason and good
“ manners. M. de Montmollin affirms, that I
“ told him at parting, that if he returned with
“ agreeable news, I should embrace him; if
“ not, that we should turn our backs on each
“ other. I might have said something of that
“ kind, but in politer terms; but as to these
“ last expressions, I am certain I never made use
“ of them. M. de Montmollin may recollect,
“ that he did not make me turn my back so easi-
“ ly as he imagined.

“ As to the devout pathetic he employs to
“ prove the necessity of using rigour, it may be
“ perceived for what kind of persons it was in-
“ tended; persons, with whom neither you nor
“ I have any concern. But setting aside the
“ jargon of this inquisitor, I shall examine his
“ reasons, as they relate to myself, without en-
“ tering into those that may have a reference to
“ others.

“ Quite disgusted with the miserable profes-
“ sion of an author, to which I was so little ad

“ apted,

“ apted, I had long since resolved to renounce
 “ it. When *Emilius* was published, I had de-
 “ clared to my friends at Paris, Geneva, and
 “ elsewhere, that it should be my last work; and
 “ that in completing it, I had laid down the pen,
 “ never to resume it. I received many letters to
 “ dissuade me from that design. At my arrival
 “ here, I told the same to every body; even to
 “ to you and M. de Montmollin. He is the
 “ only person who thought of changing that
 “ proposal into a promise; and to pretend that
 “ I had engaged myself to him to write no more,
 “ because I shewed such an intention. Suppose
 “ I told him I should go to-morrow to Neuf-
 “ chatel, must that be taken as an engagement
 “ from my words; and if I should fail in going,
 “ must I be prosecuted? This is exactly the case;
 “ and I no more thought of making a promise
 “ to M. de Montmollin than I did to you, only
 “ from a bare intention, of which I equally in-
 “ formed both.

“ Dare M. de Montmollin affirm, that he e-
 “ ver understood the matter in any other light?
 “ Dare he be positive, as he has had the bold-
 “ nefs to report, that it was on that condition
 “ he admitted me to the communion? As a
 “ proof of the contrary, when I published my
 “ Letter to the Archbishop of Paris, M. de
 “ Montmollin, far from accusing me with
 “ breach of promise, was very well pleased with
 “ that piece, which he extolled to me and eve-
 “ ry body, without saying a word of that fabu-
 “ lous promise which he now accuses me of
 “ having made him. Take notice, however,
 “ that my Letter to the Archbishop is much
 “ stronger on the subject of mysteries, and even

“ miracles, than that about which he makes so
“ great a noise. Besides, observe, that I there
“ speak in my own name, and no longer in the
“ character of the Vicar. Could they find mat-
“ ters of excommunication in the one, which
“ have not even been subjects of complaint in
“ the other?

“ If I had actually made such a promise to
“ M. de Montmollin, which I really never
“ thought of doing, would he infer, that it was
“ of so absolute a nature as to admit of no ex-
“ ception; not even to publish a memorial of
“ defence, in case I should be attacked by a pro-
“ cess at law? And what exception would be
“ more permissible than that, where, in justify-
“ ing myself, I also justified him, by shewing
“ the falsehood of his admitting a profaner of
“ religion into his church? What promise could
“ acquit me of what I owed to myself and to o-
“ thers? How could I avoid writing in defence
“ of my honour, the honour of my ancient
“ countrymen, which so many extraordinary
“ motives rendered necessary, and in discharge
“ of such sacred duties? Who will believe that
“ I promised M. de Montmollin silently to en-
“ dure reproach and ignominy? Even now that
“ I have entered into a solemn engagement with
“ a respectable society, who can accuse me of
“ breaking my covenant, if, forced by the out-
“ rageous violences of M. de Montmollin, I
“ have repulsed him as publicly as he dared to
“ offer them? Whatever promise an honest
“ man may give, it will never be required,
“ much less presumed, that it should extend so
“ far as to be the witness of his dishonour.

“ In publishing the Letters written from the
“ Moun-

“ Mountains, I discharged my duty to myself,
 “ and at the same time did not neglect what I
 “ owed to M. de Montmollin. He judged so
 “ himself; for when the work was printed, of
 “ which I sent him a copy, he continued to act
 “ in the same manner as before. He read it
 “ with pleasure; spoke of me with praise; not
 “ a word that favoured of objection. He saw
 “ me often since, he always testified the greatest
 “ friendship; no complaint of my book. There
 “ was then a report of an intended edition of
 “ all my works. He not only approved that
 “ design, but even desired he might be con-
 “ cerned. He was so anxious, that I did not
 “ think proper to give any encouragement,
 “ knowing the present company was already too
 “ numerous, and wanted no more associates.
 “ He was displeas'd at my coldness, which he
 “ resent'd more than it deserv'd; and some time
 “ after cover'd his disappointment by casting
 “ a reflection, 'That the dignity of his station
 “ forb'd his engaging in any such design. It
 “ was then the Synod began to oppose him,
 “ and made remonstrances to the Court. In
 “ fine, our good understanding was still so en-
 “ tire, and my last work so little affect'd it,
 “ that, for a long time after that publication,
 “ M. de Montmollin, among other conversa-
 “ tion, told me, he had a mind to solicit the
 “ Court for an augmentation of his stipend, and
 “ request'd I would insert a few lines in a letter
 “ he intend'd to write to my Lord Marshal for
 “ that purpose. 'That method of recommend-
 “ ing himself, and making his interest, seeming
 “ too familiar, I ask'd fifteen days, in order to
 “ draw up an address to my Lord Marshal be-
 “ fore-

“ forehand. He gave me no answer, and never mentioned the affair afterwards. From that time he began to look on the Letters from the Mountains with another eye, tho’ he never in the least hinted his disapprobation in my presence. He only said once, *For my part, I believe in miracles.* I might have answered, *I believe in them as much as you.*

“ Since I am on the subject of my treatment from M. de Montmollin, I should acquaint you, that I have more matters of complaint to mention. Touched with a sense of gratitude, I have sought all occasions of testifying it, both in public and private ; but I never prostituted so noble a principle to the base purposes of interest ; I was never governed by example, and know not how to traffick in holy things. M. de Montmollin wanted to meddle in all my affairs, to be acquainted with all my correspondents, to direct and be the depositary of my last will, and superintend my little household. This is what I would never permit. M. de Montmollin liked sitting long at table ; for my part, it is a pain to me. He seldom eat at my house, and I never at his. In effect, I repulsed all the familiar intimacy he wanted to establish between us, in as gentle and polite a manner as possible ; which always becomes improper, when it is not equally convenient on both sides. These are the wrongs I complain of ; I confess them, without repenting the handsome things I have said. My injuries are great, but they are the only ones I received ; and I call to witness every person who knows this country, if I have not often made myself

“ disagreeable to honest people, by commend-
 “ ing what I thought praise-worthy in M. de
 “ Montmollin.

“ Notwithstanding any secret animosity he
 “ might have had against me, he would ne-
 “ ver have blazed it abroad at so improper a
 “ time, if other motives had not pressed him to
 “ resume the opportunity he had suffered to e-
 “ scape. He perceived too well that his con-
 “ duct began to be disgusting and contradictory
 “ to me. What conflicts must he have had
 “ with himself, before he presumed to charge
 “ me with so apparent a falsehood? For let us
 “ condemn the Letters from the Mountains as
 “ much as we please, will they say more against
 “ me in effect than Emilius; after the publi-
 “ cation of which I was not refused, but readi-
 “ ly admitted to the holy communion? Do they
 “ condemn me more than my letter to M. de
 “ Beaumont Archbishop of Paris, which never
 “ seemed to give any offence? Suppose these
 “ works were a complication of errors, as they
 “ would insinuate, of what consequence is that?
 “ Why then let me not be justified by them,
 “ and let the author of Emilius remain inex-
 “ cusable. But I can never admit, that the au-
 “ thor of the Letters from the Mountains de-
 “ serves the same censure on this account. Is
 “ it usual, after pardoning a criminal, to punish
 “ him for having made a bad defence on his
 “ trial? Yet this is the case with M. de Mont-
 “ mollin: and I defy either him, or his bre-
 “ thren, to produce any of those sentiments in
 “ my last writings, they so strongly censure,
 “ which I cannot prove to be more firmly esta-
 “ blished in those that precede them.

“ But

“ But being instigated underhand by others,
“ he seized the pretext they offered ; certain,
“ that by exclaiming, right or wrong, against
“ an infidel, the people would be immediately
“ excited to fury ; he rings the alarm-bell of
“ Motiers, when all was over, because a poor
“ man durst defend himself against the Gene-
“ vans ; and finding that nothing but success
“ could save him from contempt, he spared no
“ pains to make his point sure. I saw it plainly
“ at Motiers, and shall forbear troubling you
“ with a repetition of what passed there, as you
“ are better acquainted than I with the whole
“ procedure ; every one at Neufchatel knows
“ it ; strangers that came to the town saw it,
“ and sighed ; for my part, I was silent. M. de
“ Montmollin excused himself on account of the
“ orders he had received from the Synod. But
“ suppose these orders had been legally execu-
“ ted ; if they had been just, why did he not
“ know of them sooner ? Why did he not pre-
“ vent them, whose particular province it was ?
“ Why, after reading over and over the Let-
“ ters from the Mountains, could he find no-
“ thing in them worthy of censure ? or why was
“ he silent on that head to me, that was his pa-
“ rishioner, as often as he came to visit me ?
“ What became of all his pastoral zeal ? Would
“ he pass for a blockhead, who can see nothing
“ in a book relative to his own profession, but
“ what is pointed out to him by others ? But,
“ on the contrary, if these orders were unjust ;
“ why did he submit to them ? Ought a mi-
“ nister of the Gospel, a pastor of the church,
“ to persecute a man, whose innocence he is
“ assured of, in obedience to any power what-

“ ever? Did he not know, that to appear in
 “ judgement before the Consistory, is an indig-
 “ nity, an affront, too cruel for a man of my
 “ time of life, especially in a country-town,
 “ where they are ignorant of all consistorial
 “ matters but admonitions against pravity of
 “ manners? Ten years ago my appearance in
 “ the Consistory at Geneva was excused on a
 “ much more lawful occasion, (and for which
 “ I almost blame myself,) contrary to the ex-
 “ press words of the law. But it is not the
 “ least surprising that they should know these
 “ forms of decency and regularity at Geneva,
 “ of which they are ignorant at Motiers.

“ I cannot tell whence M. de Montmollin
 “ took his instructions, when he said there was
 “ nothing of the Inquisition in this affair. He
 “ might have said as justly that there was no
 “ Consistory, for it is the same thing on that
 “ occasion. He gives out, nay, he insists, that
 “ no matter of temporal cognisance ought to
 “ be within its jurisdiction. The contrary is
 “ known to every one in the affair of the pro-
 “ ject; and who is ignorant, that imposing on
 “ the credulity of the Council of State, with
 “ regard to matters of religion, they engaged
 “ them in measures which had well nigh de-
 “ prived me of the King’s protection? The
 “ proper step to be taken was, first an excom-
 “ munication; after which, fresh remonstrances
 “ to the Council of State would have done the
 “ business; they actually tried those methods,
 “ and their present uneasiness proceeds from
 “ their disappointment in failing of success.
 “ For otherwise, what is it to M. de Montmol-
 “ lin? Is he afraid I should not come to receive
 “ the

“ the communion from his hands? Let him be
“ satisfied; I am not so very anxious about
“ communions as many persons are. I admire
“ the voracious holiness with which they de-
“ vour the consecrated bread: for my part, my
“ stomach is not so strong.

“ He says he had but one plain question to
“ ask me on the part of the Consistory. Why
“ did he not let me know it, when I was served
“ with the citation? What a piece of artifice
“ was it, first to surprize a man, and then oblige
“ him to answer that moment, without giving
“ the least time for reflection. This was the
“ question mentioned by M. de Montmollin,
“ which he reserved *in petto*, as the principal,
“ among others he has not told us, and for
“ which he was unwilling I should be prepared.
“ It is well known, that his design was to catch
“ me tripping, and puzzle me with so many
“ litigious interrogatories as must in the end
“ answer his purpose. He very well knew my
“ weakness and bad state of health. I do not
“ think he intended to exhaust my strength;
“ but at the time I was cited I was extremely
“ ill, and not in a condition to go abroad, ha-
“ ving kept my room for six months: it was the
“ winter season, and very cold weather; a
“ strange remedy for a poor infirm creature, to
“ remain many hours standing, and to be inter-
“ rogated before elders concerning matters of
“ divinity, of which the most learned among
“ them declared they understood nothing! No
“ matter: they never inquired even if I was
“ able to leave my bed, if I had strength enough
“ to walk without support; they gave themselves
“ no trouble on that account. Pastoral charity,

“ entirely taken up with matters of faith, never
 “ stoops to the mean and sordid concerns of ter-
 “ restrial affairs.

“ You are no stranger to what passed in the
 “ Consistory, during my absence; of the read-
 “ ing of my letter there, and the methods that
 “ were proposed to hinder its effect. Your in-
 “ formation in that affair was well grounded.
 “ Can you imagine, that, after this, M. de
 “ Montmollin all at once changed his condition
 “ and title, and, transforming himself into an
 “ ecclesiastical solicitor to manage the cause,
 “ resumed his former character in order to
 “ become its judge. *I acted (says he) as Pastor,*
 “ *as President of the Consistory, and not as re-*
 “ *presentative of the venerable Synod.* It was
 “ too late to change his part, when he had till
 “ then played one so indifferent. We ought,
 “ Sir, to dread those who can voluntarily act two
 “ parts in the same piece. It would be strange
 “ if one good character could be made out of both.
 “ He rests the necessity of being rigorous, on
 “ the scandal raised by my book. Here are new
 “ scruples, which he had not at the publication
 “ of Emilius, the scandal of which was at least
 “ as great, and the Clergy and news-writers
 “ made no less noise. They burnt my book,
 “ railed at and insulted me all over Europe.
 “ M. de Montmollin finds now those reasons to
 “ excommunicate me, in the same arguments
 “ that were then no impediment then to my ad-
 “ mission to the communion. His zeal, accord-
 “ ing to the precept, acts in all forms, agreeable
 “ to time and place. But pray, who raised the
 “ scandal in his parish on account of my last
 “ book of which he now complains? Who was
 “ it

“ it affected to make a frightful uproar, both by
“ himself and by his friends? Who, among all
“ that people so full of sanctified rage; who
“ could have known that I had committed so e-
“ normous a crime, as to prove that the Council
“ of Geneva had wrongfully condemned me, if
“ pains had not been taken to paint so extra-
“ ordinary an act in colours that struck every
“ eye? Who, amongst these people, was capa-
“ ble of reading my book, and judging of the
“ matters it contained? If you please, the zea-
“ lous follower of M. de Montmollin, that learn-
“ ed blacksmith, whom he so often cites as an
“ evidence; that profound scholar, who is at
“ once so good a judge of horse-shoes and books
“ of theology. I am willing to believe he can
“ just read, and go through a whole line with-
“ out spelling; and who else of the conspiring
“ rabble can do so much? If they should glance
“ at the words *gospel* and *miracles* in the pages
“ of the book, they would imagine they were
“ reading a book of devotion; and knowing I
“ was a good man, they might have said, *God*
“ *bless him! he edifies us greatly.* But they had
“ been well assured that I was an impious abo-
“ minable wretch, who said there was no God,
“ and that women had no souls; so that, with-
“ out reflecting on what they might read to the
“ contrary, they repeated in their turn, like
“ parrots, *He is a wicked man, a villain; he is*
“ *Antichrist; he should be excommunicated, and*
“ *burnt.* They were charitably answered, no
“ doubt: *Go you on with your clamours; leave*
“ *the business to us, and all will be well.*

“ The usual method of the church-gentry
“ seems to me extremely well calculated to an-

“ swer

“ fwer their purpose. After establishing their
 “ competency of jurisdiction over all matters of
 “ scandal, they raise a scandal out of every sub-
 “ ject they please; and then, on account of
 “ that scandal, take cognifance of the cause in
 “ order to judge it. Here is a fure way to ren-
 “ der themselves masters of all the people, of all
 “ the laws, of all the kings, and of the whole
 “ world, without the contradiction of any per-
 “ fon whatever. You remember the ftory of
 “ the furgeon, whose fhop was at the corner of
 “ two ftreets, and who going out at one door,
 “ wounded the paffengers, and fuddenly retreat-
 “ ing, came out at the other in order to dress
 “ them. This ftory will fuit all the clergy in
 “ the univere, except in this particular, that the
 “ furgeon at leaft cured thofe he wounded,
 “ whereas thefe gentlemen deftroy all they attack.
 “ Let us not enter into the hiftory of their
 “ fecret intrigues, which will not bear the
 “ light. But if M. de Montmollin did nothing
 “ but in obedience to the fynod, or in difcharge
 “ of his confcience, why has he thewn fo much
 “ acrimony in this affair? Why was all the mob
 “ of the country raised? Why his violent fer-
 “ mons, flaming with remotelefs zeal and un-
 “ relenting bitternels? Why thefe private petty
 “ Councils? Why fo many idle reports fpread,
 “ to terrify me with the roarings of the popu-
 “ lace? Is not all this public and notorious?
 “ M. de Montmollin denies it. Why fhould he
 “ not, who denied his pretending to have two
 “ voices in the Conftitutory? Yet I find three
 “ voices, if I do not greatly miltake; one of
 “ his deacon, who was there only as his re-
 “ prefentative; then his own voice, which
 “ made

“ made the odd one ; and, lastly, that which
“ he claimed in order to divide the suffra-
“ ges. Three voices in himself had been a
“ great advantage, even to absolve or acquit a
“ delinquent. But he would make use of them
“ in order to condemn, and could not obtain
“ them. Where was the harm ? M. de Mont-
“ mollin was too happy, that his Consistory,
“ wiser than himself, had drawn him out of a
“ scrape with the synod, with his brethren, with
“ his correspondents, and with himself. *I have*
“ *done my duty*, might he have said, *I have vi-*
“ *gorously pursued the cause ; the Consistory have*
“ *not judged the affair according to my senti-*
“ *ments. Rousseau has been absolved, contrary*
“ *to my opinion. That is no fault of mine ; I have*
“ *done : I can carry matters no farther, with-*
“ *out flying in the face of the laws, without dis-*
“ *obeying the prince, and disturbing the public*
“ *peace. I am too good a Christian, too honest a*
“ *citizen, too devout a pastor, to attempt any*
“ *such thing.* Though he had been foiled, he
“ might still, with a little address, have prefer-
“ ved his dignity, and recovered his reputation.
“ But vanity, once irritated by disappointment,
“ is not so provident. We find it more difficult
“ to forgive those we have attempted to injure,
“ than those to whom we have done the injury
“ in fact. Enraged to see that credit on which
“ he so much piqued himself baffled in the face
“ of all Europe, he could not prevail on him-
“ self to give up the cause : he said in the Con-
“ sistory, that he was not without hopes of re-
“ newing it : he tries it at another Consistory ;
“ but, in order to screen himself, he proposes it
“ by his blacksmith, that faithful instrument of
“ his

“ his enterprizes, whom he calls to bear testi-
 “ mony that it was not done thro’ his means.
 “ Was not that a fine stroke! It is not that M. de
 “ Montmollin wants artifice; but a man, who
 “ is blinded by passion, is always committing
 “ blunders when he gives himself up to it.

“ That expedient failed him again, and you
 “ might imagine that his malignity ended there.
 “ Far from it: in the next meeting of the synod,
 “ he proposed another method, founded on the
 “ impossibility of escaping the diligence of the
 “ prince’s officer in his parish; that was, to
 “ wait till I went into another parish, and then
 “ begin the prosecution anew, at fresh costs. In
 “ consequence of this fine expedient, the violent
 “ sermons recommenced, the people were again
 “ put into disorder, and it was expected these
 “ animosities would have forced me to quit the
 “ parish. This, indeed, was too much for a
 “ man of M. de Montmollin’s tolerating spi-
 “ rit, who did nothing but by the orders of his
 “ superiors. My letter grows very long: but
 “ it is necessary it should be so; why should I
 “ curtail it? Would it shorten it to multiply
 “ ceremonies? Let us give M. de Montmollin
 “ the pleasure of saying ten times successively,
 “ *Sister Dinarzade, are you asleep?*

“ I have not entered upon the point of right:
 “ I have resolved to meddle no more with that
 “ affair. I confined myself, in the second part
 “ of this letter, to prove that M. de Montmol-
 “ lin, notwithstanding his affected tone of de-
 “ votion, was not brought into this affair thro’
 “ zeal for the faith, nor by a sense of his duty;
 “ but, according to custom, has made the cause
 “ of God subservient to his passions. Now
 “ judge

“ judge if for such purposes they usually employ
“ the most honest means; and excuse my en-
“ tering into a discussion of matters that would
“ draw a sigh from virtue herself.

“ In the former part of my letter I mention-
“ ed facts, in opposition to those advanced by
“ M. de Montmollin. He had the artifice to make
“ use of circumstances to which I could answer
“ nothing, but by a true recital of all that pass-
“ ed. From the different assertions on both sides,
“ you must conclude one of us to be a liar, and
“ I allow the propriety of that conclusion.

“ When I would finish my letter and dis-
“ patch it in haste, I am still turning over new
“ leaves. Reflections innumerable offer them-
“ selves, and one must not always begin a-new.
“ Yet I cannot pass over what I have this mo-
“ ment before me. *What shall our ministers do?*
“ (it is said;) *shall they defend the Gospel, at-*
“ *tacked so openly by its enemies?* It is I, there-
“ fore, who am this enemy to the Gospel, be-
“ cause I resent the manner in which they dis-
“ figure and degrade it. Why do not the pre-
“ tended defenders imitate the method I would
“ establish? Why do not they make use of such
“ parts as conduce to their edification, in ren-
“ dering them good and just, and lay aside such
“ as are of service to nobody, and which they
“ understand no better than myself?

“ *If a native of this country had dared to ad-*
“ *vance, in words or writing, any thing near*
“ *to what has been done by Mr. Rousseau, would*
“ *not the ministers have acted with the same ri-*
“ *gour?* No, certainly; I dare believe so for the
“ honour of the state. What would then be-
“ come of your privileges, you that are the people
“ of

“ of Neufchatel, if, for some small matter that
 “ might give your ministers a handle for being
 “ litigious, they could persecute, among your-
 “ selves, the author of a transaction, printed
 “ in another part of Europe, only for his de-
 “ fence in a strange country? M. de Montmol-
 “ lin has picked me out as a proper subject by
 “ which he may lay the yoke on you; but how
 “ unworthy must I be of your protection, if I
 “ could suffer, by my example, a servitude to
 “ be established which I found not amongst you!
 “ *Has Mr. Rousseau, our new citizen, any*
 “ *more privileges than all our ancient citizens?*
 “ I do not claim any of their privileges; I only
 “ demand those I am entitled to as a man and
 “ a stranger. The correspondent quoted by M.
 “ Montmollin, that wonderful person whom he
 “ has not named, and who praises him so much,
 “ is a very extraordinary reasoner. According
 “ to him, I would claim more privileges than
 “ all the citizens, because I opposed their mea-
 “ sures in which every citizen would have ac-
 “ quiesced. So that to take from me the right
 “ of defending my purse against a thief that
 “ would rob me, he might as well say, *You are*
 “ *certainly a very strange man, who will not*
 “ *suffer me to take your money! I could easily rob*
 “ *any of the natives, if they came in my way.*
 “ Observe here, that the Professor Montmollin
 “ is the only sovereign judge who condemns
 “ me; and that law, the Consistory, the Magi-
 “ stracy, the Government, the Governor, and
 “ the King himself who protects me, are all so
 “ many rebels against the supreme authority of
 “ M. de Montmollin.

“ The anonymous correspondent asks, if I
 “ am

“ am not obedient to the laws and customs of
“ the state? And from answering in the affir-
“ mative, he concludes, that I must submit to
“ a law that never existed, and to a custom that
“ never was known. M. de Montmollin re-
“ plies, that there is such a law at Geneva, and
“ that I myself complained of its being violated
“ to my prejudice. So that at Geneva they
“ have violated a law which exists there, and
“ doth not exist at Motiers, on purpose to con-
“ demn me; and they made use of it at Motiers
“ to excommunicate me. You must own that I
“ am in a pretty situation! It was certainly in
“ one of his gay humours that M. de Mont-
“ mollin reasoned in that manner.

“ He diverts himself in the same way in a re-
“ mark on the offer I made to the synod, provided
“ they dropped their prosecution. He says, I
“ did it in jest, and that we ought not thus to
“ pretend to give law to our superiors.

“ First, he certainly is not serious, in saying,
“ that an humble and satisfactory offer made to
“ persons who complain against us, tho’ in the
“ wrong, is dictating to them, and prescribing
“ them rules.

“ But the best of all is, his calling the gen-
“ tlemen of the Synod my superiors, as though
“ I was one of their brethren. For every one
“ knows that the Synod has no jurisdiction but
“ over the clergy; and besides, having no power
“ over any other person, its members are supe-
“ rior to nobody, as being such. So that to
“ treat me as a churchman, is, in my opinion,
“ a very ill-judged pleasantry. M. de Mont-
“ mollin knows very well I am no churchman;

“ and that I have, thank God, no very great call
 “ that way.

“ Indulge me a few words concerning the
 “ letter I wrote to the Consistory, and I have
 “ done. M. de Montmollin does not promise
 “ many remarks on that letter; I believe he is
 “ in the right, and that he would have still done
 “ better never to have meddled with it: give me
 “ leave to run over such as relate to myself; I
 “ shall not detain you long.

“ *How can a person (says he) answer to*
 “ *what he knows nothing of?* as I have done,
 “ by proving before-hand that they had no
 “ right to ask me. *Such a faith as we are*
 “ *only to account for to God, is not professed*
 “ *in any part of Europe.* And why is there
 “ any other faith, but such as makes us account-
 “ able only to God, published in any part of
 “ Europe? Observe that strange pretence of
 “ hindering a man from speaking his own opi-
 “ nion, by imputing to him other sentiments.

“ *He that errs as a Christian, is ready to re-*
 “ *nounce his errors.* A pleasant sophism! *He*
 “ *that errs as a Christian, knows not that he*
 “ *errs.* If he should reform his errors without
 “ knowing them, he would err nevertheless, and
 “ would besides be a liar. Then he could not
 “ err as a Christian.

“ *Is the rendering miracles doubtful, a re-*
 “ *liance on the authority of the Gospel?* Yes,
 “ when it is by the authority of the same Go-
 “ spel they are rendered doubtful. *And to ri-*
 “ *dicule them.*—Why not! when, relying on
 “ the authority of the Gospel, it can be proved,
 “ that the ridicule is no where but in the inter-
 “ pretations of divines. I am certain that M.

“ de