





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
MARCH JUNE 1831.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. LIII.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY,
FOR LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN, LONDON;
AND ADAM BLACK, EDINBURGH.

1831.

19462
8/12/91 G.

CONTENTS OF NO. CV.

	Page.
ART. I. A History of England, from the Invasion by the Romans. By John Lingard, D.D.,	1
II. 1. Three Lectures on the Rate of Wages, with a Preface on the Causes of the present Disturbances. By N. W. Senior, Esq.	
2. State of the Nation at the close of 1830. By T. Potter Macqueen, Esq.	
3. Bill to facilitate Emigration to his Majesty's Possessions abroad, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 22d February, 1831.	
4. Bill to Amend the Laws in England relative to Game, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 15th February, 1831,	43
III. 1. A Latin Grammar, for the Use of Westminster School.	
2. Græcæ Grammaticæ Compendium, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis,	64
IV. Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe, in den Jahren. 1794 bis 1805. (Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe, from 1794 to 1805,)	82
V. 1. Cain the Wanderer, and other Poems.	
2. The Revolt of the Angels, and the Fall from Paradise. An Epic Drama. By Edmund Reade, Esq., Author of Cain the Wanderer,	105
VI. The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race. By C. O. Müller, Professor in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the German, by Henry Tufnell, Esq., and George Cornwall Lewis, Esq.,	119
VII. The Siamese Twins. A Satirical Tale of the Times. By the Author of Pelham, &c.,	142
VIII. Historic Survey of German Poetry, interspersed with various Translations. By W. Taylor, of Norwich,	151

	Page.
ART. IX. Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum, aliaque aevi decimi sexti monumenta rarissima.—Die Briefe der Finsterlinge an Magister Ortuinus von Deventer, nebst andern sehr seltenen Beytraegen zur Litteratur-Sitten-und Kirchengeschichte des Sechzehnter Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben und erlaeutert durch Dr Ernst Muench,	180
X. Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific, and Behring's Strait, to co-operate with the Polar Expeditions: performed by his Majesty's Ship Blossom, under the command of Captain F. W. Beechey, Royal Navy, F.R.S. F.R.A.S., and F.R.G.S., in the years 1825, 26, 27, 28,	210
XI. Corrected Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable the Lord Advocate of Scotland, upon the Motion of Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, on the 1st of March, for Reform of Parliament,	232
Quarterly List of Publications,	253

CONTENTS OF NO. CVI.

	Page.
ART. I. 1. A Letter on the Gifts of the Spirit. By Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate.	
2. The Brazen Serpent, or Life coming through Death. By Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate.	
3. Neglected Truths. By the Rev. A. Scott.	
4. The Morning Watch, or Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, and Theological Review. Nos. 8. and 9. (Art. by the Rev. Edward Irving.)	261
II. Two Essays on the Geography of Ancient Asia; intended partly to illustrate the Campaigns of Alexander, and the Anabasis of Xenophon. By the Rev. John Williams, Rector of the Edinburgh Academy,	306
III. Fauna Boreali-Americana; or the Zoology of the Northern Parts of British America. By John Richardson, M.D. F.R.S. F.L.S. Part First; containing the Quadrupeds,	328
IV. The Undying One; and Other Poems. By the Hon. Mrs Norton,	361
V. Lettres à M. Letronne, Membre de l'Institut, et de la Légion d'Honneur, Inspecteur-Général de l'Université de France, sur les Papyrus Bilingues et Grecs, et sur quelques autres Monumens Gréco-Egyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités de l'Université de Leide. Par C. J. C. Reuvens, Professeur d'Archéologie, et Directeur du Musée.	370
VI. 1. Addenda ad Corpus Statutorum Universitatis Oxoniensis.	
2. The Oxford University Calender, for 1829,	384
VII. Observations on the Paper Duties,	427

annals of England. This chronicle, either on account of its miscellaneous and comprehensive nature, or from the circumstance of its being translated into English, has, more than any other, supplied the canvass for our general history. Trevisa's translation of Higden was printed by Caxton in 1483, with a continuation by himself, from the year 1357 to 1460. In the preface to this, our venerable printer complains of the almost total want of materials, so that he had been forced to rely on two books published in Germany, and now very obscure. It is hardly necessary to say, that better materials existed in manuscript; but it was not reasonable to expect that he should desist from his valuable labours to procure them. Another book, commonly called Caxton's Chronicles, and printed by him in 1480, is written by one Douglas, a monk of Glastonbury, and contains partly a version, partly a continuation, of Geoffrey of Monmouth, brought down to the accession of Edward IV. This chronicle, under the name of Caxton, was more than once reprinted; but is now so obscure, as well as so brief and unsatisfactory, that we should not have thought of naming it, except as the earliest English publication upon our history.

Robert Fabyan, an Alderman of London, and member of the Draper's Company, may be reckoned, with more justice, the father of English historians. His 'New Chronicles of England and France' were first published in 1516, which seems to have been four years after his death. They were several times reprinted; and a valuable edition was given to the world, in 1811, by Mr Ellis of the British Museum. Fabyan shows himself a zealous Catholic, which caused some phrases to be suppressed in editions subsequent to the Reformation, and as good a citizen of London as his ward could desire; heading the annals of each year with the names of the mayor and sheriffs, as Livy begins those of Rome with the consuls, and communicating many little particulars about the city, which at present form the most original part of his volume. For his more general materials he had mainly recourse to Higden, but consulted likewise a good many Latin and French authors, so that his name deserves to be held in respect; and his chronicle, though it would be absurd to recommend its perusal, remains a monument of honest diligence, especially praiseworthy in one of his occupation in life, and, as there is reason to believe, of affluent fortune.

In the long reign of Henry VIII. nothing more seems to have come from the press, to our present purpose, than Rastell's *Pastime of People*, a most jejune epitome of English history; which, on account of its extreme scarceness, and also of certain wooden cuts, which were supposed too ugly to be lost, has, within the last twenty years, been republished by Dr Dibdin;

to which may be added, a Chronicle by Cooper, afterwards a bishop, and one or two more mentioned in Nicolson's Historical Library. But, in 1548, the second year of Edward VI., a far more important accession was made to this branch of our literature, in the Chronicle of Thomas Hall, or, according to the original titlepage, 'The Union of the two Noble and Illustrious Families of Lancaster and York.' This began with the accession of Henry IV., in 1399, and ended with the death of Henry VIII. Hall himself died the year before the publication. Robert Grafton, an eminent printer, not only performed the office of an editor, but compiled, from Hall's manuscripts, the annals of about fifteen years. It is singular, that the last editor of Ames's *Typographical Antiquities*, copying apparently his immediate predecessor, should have said—'He [Grafton] tells us himself that he wrote the greater part of Hall's Chronicles, but without particularizing how much.' Grafton is not only more precise than is here represented, but his precision entirely contradicts the editor's statement. 'The author thereof,' he says, in his address to the reader, 'was a man, in the latter time of his life, not so painful and studious as before he had been; wherefore, he perfected and writ this history no farther than to the four-and-twentieth year of King Henry the Eighth; the rest he left noted in divers and many pamphlets and papers, which so diligently and truly as I could, I gathered the same together, and have, in such wise, compiled them, as may after the said years appear in this work, *but utterly without any addition of mine.*'

Bishop Nicolson observes of Hall, 'If the reader desires to know what sort of clothes were worn in each king's reign, and how the fashions altered, this is an historian for his purpose; but in other matters his information is not so valuable.*' This sentence is, in our opinion, by much too sweeping and novel. We do not perceive that Hall has any great excess of that petty information that the bishop derides as so trifling, though it is not without its use for several purposes; but a little more candour and attention would have shown him, that a considerable proportion of the knowledge we possess as to the internal history of England during the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. is due to this respectable chronicler, who has been largely copied by those who followed. It would be hard to say whom else we could vouch for the narrative of the different rebellions and insurrections under Henry VII., or for the tumultuous resistance of the citizens and commons to the illegal encroachments of Wol-

* Nicolson's Hist. Library, p. 71

sey. The truth of these facts is confirmed by contemporary letters and authentic records; but such documents rarely furnish the whole circumstances of a transaction, as we find them collected by the historian. Polydore Virgil, the only other writer who can be called original, is much inferior to Hall in credibility. The character of Hall is that of an honest and fearless simplicity, wherein it was very long before any one was found to equal him; if indeed, considering the change of times, it can be said that he ever had an equal.

We ought, perhaps, sooner to have mentioned the celebrated 'Pitiful Life of King Edward the Fifth,' by Sir Thomas More. But we have not been able to satisfy ourselves, without pretending, however, to have made a laborious search, as to the date of its earliest publication. It is printed in the folio edition of his works by Rastell, in 1557. But we also find it inserted verbatim in Hall's Chronicle, published, as has been said above, in 1548. Whether Hall, or his editor Grafton, had preserved the manuscript, or whether there is some earlier edition which we have not been able to trace, more learned antiquarians will determine. None is mentioned in Dibdin's *Typographical Antiquities*, containing a long list of the works that came from the presses of all known printers in that age, and especially of Rastell, brother-in-law of More: it seems plain also, from the historic doubts of Horace Walpole, that he did not know when the book was first published. We may add, that the marginal note in Hall rather leads us to presume, that the work of More then appeared for the first time. However this may be, it was probably written in More's youth, while he was under-sheriff of London: its composition has been referred by some to the year 1513. It is unnecessary to speak of the credibility of this narrative, which has encountered such severity from Walpole and Laing, some of whose strictures Mr Turner and Dr Lingard have shown to be unjust; but in its style it may be said to form a sort of epoch, especially if we suppose it to have been published not long after its composition, in our native literature. Unlike the senile laboriousness of Fabian, it is written with manifest emulation of classical models;—it is *ornata verbis, distincta sententiis*, such as might be expected from the friend and pupil of Erasmus, taming a reluctant language to somewhat affected graces, and anticipating with uncertain endeavours the copiousness and harmony it was one day destined to display. It has been said to be unfinished, and this would afford a presumption that it was a posthumous publication; but the assertion does not seem well founded, the story terminating with the murder of the two princes in the Tower, beyond which there is no proof that he intended to carry it.

Grafton himself published an abridgement of the Chronicles of England in 1562; and Stow, a learned and diligent tailor of London, a summary of the same in 1565. Both works are dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, whose many faults were partially redeemed by a disposition to patronise learning. Stow and Grafton are said to have been jealous of each other's credit; there can, however, be no doubt of the former's superiority, though an unfortunate predilection for the more ancient church, so often suspected in our antiquarians since the Reformation, kept him under a cloud in his lifetime, and sometimes exposed his papers to the rude hands of pursuivants and messengers. In 1569, Grafton, who was printer to the Queen, put forth 'a Chronicle at large, and new History of the affairs of England, and Kings of the same, deduced from the creation of the world unto the first habitation of this island, and so by continuance unto the first year of the reign of our most dear and sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth.' This Chronicle of Grafton may be divided into two parts. In the first, from the creation of the world to the accession of Henry IV., being about one-third of the whole, he follows the Polychronicon of Higden, and Fabyan's Chronicle, with occasional assistance from Malmsbury, Hoveden, and other Latin historians of our country. Buchanan, according to Bishop Nicolson, calls him a very heedless and unskilful writer; a character which no one is likely to dispute. It may be added, rather as illustrative of the times than of Grafton's work, that he is one of the most cautious, if not dastardly, performers that ever undertook the annals of a free nation. We can hardly hope to be believed on our word, when we assert that, in writing the reign of John, he has made no mention whatever of Magna Charta; an omission 'of the part of Hamlet,' which can scarcely be imputed to mere confusion and ignorance. The following is a more definite instance of the queen's printer's cautiousness. At the year 1112 we read—'At this time began the Parliament in England first to be instituted and advanced for reformation and government of this realm. The manner whereof, as I have found it set forth in an old pamphlet, I intend at large to set forth in the reign of King Edward III., where and when Parliaments were yearly and orderly kept.' In his preface, however, we find this noticed in the following words:—'And where I have in the thirteenth year of King Henry I. promised to place the manner and order that was first taken for the holding of the Parliament in the time of King Edward the Third, I have since that time thought meet to omit the same, and therefore I admonish the reader not to look for it.' The rest of Grafton's Chronicle, from the accession of Henry IV., with the exception, of course, of the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary, is nothing

more than a republication of Hall, the differences being not so great as frequently take place in successive editions of the same work; in fact, we believe it would be found that Grafton did not insert any one phrase or sentence, though he softened in many places the warm and zealous language of his predecessor.

A more useful, laborious, and celebrated compiler of English affairs than Grafton, was Raphael Holingshed, who, after twenty-five years employed in the task for Wolfe the printer, brought out, in 1577, his *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, in two large volumes folio. This first edition is remarkably scarce. A second, in three volumes, appeared in 1587. Of this several sheets were suppressed by order of the Privy Council, but a very few copies escaped mutilation, and the obnoxious passages have been separately printed in later times. What is remarkable is, that no very obvious motive for this interference of the council appears on the face of them. Holingshed was assisted in this vast work by several coadjutors—Harrison, Hooker, (sometimes called Vowell,) Stanyhurst, Thyn, and Stow. In point of erudition they much exceed the preceding chroniclers; several Latin works are inserted in verbatim translations, and some degree of critical judgment is exercised upon the early and obscure periods of history. The most useful portions at present are the description of Britain, by Harrison, in the first volume, and the annals of Elizabeth's reign, by Holingshed himself, continued by Thyn and Stow. In these, however, for obvious reasons, nothing more than ordinary facts can be expected to appear. Like Grafton, though not so indiscriminately, he transcribes Hall; yet our modern historians are apt either to quote Holingshed alone, or to refer to both as distinct and independent sources.

The 'Acts and Monuments' of John Fox, more usually called his *Book of Martyrs*, must have a place among the principal historical works of the sixteenth century. None certainly can be compared to it in its popularity and influence. Four editions of these bulky folios were published in the reign of Elizabeth; the first in 1563. It may not be too much to say, that it confirmed the Reformation in England. Every parish (by order of the council, or the bishops, we forget which) was to have a copy in the church; and every private gentleman, who had any book but the Bible, chose that which stood next in religious esteem. Whatever be the amount of the mistakes into which the pretty common habit of assuming the truth of facts according to an estimate previously formed of the characters of those concerned in them may have led our worthy martyrologist, it is certain that we owe him thanks for collecting and inserting at length a great body of documents illustrative of our civil and ecclesiastical history.

In the long and, comparatively at least with former times, the learned reign of Elizabeth, no other contribution appears to have been made to the history of our own country in our own language, except a short work by Sir John Hayward, in 1599, entitled, 'The first part of the Life and Reign of King Henry 'IV., extending to the end of the first year of his reign.' This is deemed a rhetorical performance of little value, and chiefly remarkable for the persecution it brought upon him at the hands of that jealous government. Bacon, in his Apophthegms, relates a sally of his own wit, by which he saved the unfortunate author from his angry sovereign. 'The queen,' he says, 'asked Mr 'Bacon whether there were not treason contained in the book.— "Nay, madam," he answered, "for treason I cannot deliver my 'opinion that there is any, but very much felony." The queen, 'apprehending it, gladly asked, "How and where?" Mr Bacon 'answered, "Because he hath stolen many of his sentences and 'conceits out of Cornelius Tacitus.'" At another time, the queen threatened to have Hayward racked, to discover the real author, whom she suspected to be disguised. Bacon advised her rather to rack his style; to shut him up with pen, ink, and paper, and let him try if he could write like it. According to Camden, the offence was taken at the dedication to the Earl of Essex, wherein he was called 'Magnus et præsentis judicio, et futuri 'temporis expectatione.' Not having access to Hayward's book, we quote Camden's words in Latin. Hayward remained for a considerable time in prison.

The spirit of the Tudor government, evinced in this severity towards Sir John Hayward, as well as in the castigation of Holingshed's second edition, goes far to account for the paucity of English historical writers in the sixteenth century. Meanwhile, there was no deficiency of materials for men of learning, nor any want of interest among them for the preservation of the records of antiquity. Leland, Bale, Pitts, Tanner, Archbishop Parker, among others of less note, diligently laboured in collecting relics of past times, which the devastation committed among the monasteries rendered valuable by their scarcity, if not always by their importance. The public repositories were constantly searched by lawyers, and by those who sought arrows from the quiver of ancient precedent for the recovery of their constitutional privileges. Perhaps, indeed, the multiplicity of authentic records, and the practice of relying upon them in all legal and Parliamentary questions, rather tended to discourage the composition of regular history, wherein it was not so much the practice as at present to vouch the authorities on which it was founded. But the former cause had doubtless a more powerful efficacy.

Two chroniclers, of that rather humble name, as it began to be reckoned, belong to the reign of James I., Stow and Speed, both tailors. The former's Summary of the Chronicles of England, an octavo volume, has already been mentioned; it was reprinted several times, as was also an abridgement of it, in the reign of Elizabeth. An enlargement of the Summaries, under the title 'Flores Historiarum,' was published in 1600. After the death of Stow, his collection of papers, which the industry of a long life had amassed, fell into the hands of Edmond Howes, who, having put them together with additions of his own, printed the whole under the name of Stow's Chronicle. The first edition is in 1615. The preceding year, Speed had published 'the History of Great Britain under the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans,' in one volume folio. Nicolson, although he gives some praise to this book, adds, rather foolishly, 'But what could be expected from a tailor?' The imputation of appertaining to a trade so essential to civilized man, and especially to the courtiers of Elizabeth and James, is more than redeemed by Speed's diligence and learning, in which he seems inferior to none of his predecessors, except Stow, a member also of the cross-legged craft. He is, however, less agreeable than either Stow or Holingshed.

A far more able pen was employed on the same subject by Samuel Daniel, groom of the chamber to Anne of Denmark, an elegant poet, not quite unworthy to receive, as he did, the laurel from Spenser, and to transmit it to Ben Jonson. He published, in 1613 and 1616, a very well-written history of England from the Norman conquest, after an introduction for the previous period, to the death of Edward III. In this he had occasional recourse to records, used more critical judgment in sifting facts, than those who had gone before him, and, if he is now superseded as an historian, ought still to be remembered in the annals of English literature, for the purity and elegance of his style.

Daniel's history was continued some time afterwards by Nicholas Trussel to the death of Edward IV.; but this is said to be a very indifferent performance, and has not been republished along with Daniel in Kennet's 'Complete History.' Lord Bacon's Life of Henry VII. appeared in 1622, and proved that in this hardly trodden path of literature, we were not incapable of emulating the Italian writers in what they had made their main boast, the acuteness and depth of their political reflections. After so fine a specimen of genius, it is only to make our enumeration complete, that we mention the lives of the three first kings after the conquest, published by Sir John Hayward in 1613. Meantime Camden, for whatever reason, thought fit to adopt the Latin language in his Annals of Elizabeth; yet, as that import-

ant work was soon translated, it may be named, without much impropriety, in the series of English history. Bishop Godwin published also, in Latin, the Annals of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary. They were translated in the ensuing reign by his son.

A few select portions of English history were attempted under Charles I. Sir John Hayward wrote the reign of Edward VI.; Thomas Habington that of Edward IV.; and George Buck anticipated the paradox of Walpole and Laing, in sustaining the dark cause of Richard III. The much more valuable Life of Henry VIII., by Lord Herbert of Cherbury, did not appear till 1649, a year after the author's death. Less profound, but not less judicious, and certainly more fully to be trusted in the absence of other authorities, than Lord Bacon, he stands far above any third English historian who had as yet appeared, and might challenge comparison with the celebrated Latin annalist of Elizabeth. In the reign of Charles also came to light the Life of Sir Thomas More, by his son-in-law Roper, and that of Wolsey by Cavendish; but we cannot pretend to enumerate any more works of biography, even when they may throw light on public events.

The last, and not the least renowned of the chroniclers, was Sir Richard Baker, who prudently acted on the plan of not troubling the unlearned reader with references to authorities he could not estimate, or curious disquisitions on antiquity; for which, indeed, his own residence in the Fleet prison did not particularly qualify him. Baker's Chronicle, first published in 1641, enjoyed a pretty extensive reputation for the best part of a century. It was the book of the parlour-window to the squire, the parson, and the ancient gentlewoman; they read there the fatal bowl held out to fair Rosamond in her secret bower by the revengeful Eleanor, the glorious apotheosis of the Countess of Salisbury's garter, the dying pangs of Jane Shore, and the rejection of the Princess Bona for the beautiful Elizabeth Woodville. A frigid inquisitiveness had not torn away the stolen zone of truth from these false Florimels of our ancient story. As Holingshed was a very bulky and expensive writer, and Speed not an interesting one, the success of Baker is not surprising. Nicolson says, 'his manner is new, and seems to please the rabble; but learned men will be of a different opinion.' In fact, it is a book full of great errors in the eyes of such men; yet has probably given more pleasure, and diffused more universal knowledge, than what they would have written. It was enough for Sir Roger de Coverley; but since the Sir Rogers are extinct, it is natural that their instructors should be forgotten. After the Restoration, a continuation of Baker's Chronicle, which ended with Elizabeth's decease, was annexed to the subse-

quent editions by Thomas Philips, who is understood to have had some assistance from Sir Thomas Clarges, brother-in-law of General Monk, for the contemporary period. May's *History of the Parliament*, published in 1647, is upon a more regular and classical model than any former author had adopted; and had he completed the whole with as much moderation and coolness as we find in what is published, which, there is some reason to suspect, would not have been the case, no historian of that century would have deserved a higher reputation. We shall not mention in future either memoirs by persons concerned in public events, or particular accounts of detached periods, making one exception for Milton's *History of England to the Norman Conquest*, for the sake of the greatness of his name, and in some measure for the value of the work.

The struggle between liberty and prerogative, resumed, with still greater dissent of opinion than before, about the year 1680, produced a learned controversy as to the antiquity of the Commons in Parliament, and the sources, in general, of popular privileges. Dr Brady, a physician of Cambridge, devoted to the support of monarchical authority in its highest claims, having published, in 1684, an answer to Petyt and Atwood, the advocates of Parliamentary rights, entitled, 'An Introduction to the *Old English History*,' followed this up next year with the first volume of a complete history of England; the second not appearing till 1700, and carrying down the narrative to the close of Richard II.'s reign. This work, being little else than a series of extracts, translated from Matthew Paris, Walsingham, and others, arranged merely as annals, and confined chiefly to the constitutional and Parliamentary department, can hardly be reckoned among our general histories. Tyrrell, as strenuous on the Whig as Brady was on the Tory side, thought it necessary to refute the unfair representations of the latter in five folio volumes,—'A General History of England, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, from the earliest times;' printed from 1700 to 1704. It is said that his design was to bring it down to the revolution in 1688; a miscalculation either of his own or his readers' time, since the pretty serious achievement above mentioned conducts us only to the days of Richard II. Of a work so diffuse as to be almost equally useless to the learned and the unlearned, since it would save time to read the original writers, it is needless to say much: we have heard Tyrrell praised by a competent judge for his industry and fairness in the detail of constitutional antiquities.

We have now come down to the reign of Anne, and to the eighteenth century; and it cannot be said that any one history of England existed, to which a foreigner could be referred, or

from which a citizen might learn the story of his ancestors; those which we have enumerated, being either written with little research and discrimination, or broken off at a very distant point of time. Lawrence Echard, a clergyman, attempted to remove this discredit by his own 'History of England from the time of Julius Cæsar to the death of King James I.,' published in 1706; the second and third volumes, which came out in 1718, carrying on the narrative to the revolution of 1688. Considered as to its extent, this was the most complete history that had appeared; but Echard, though not a very bad writer, failed both in impartiality and good sense when he descended to the great contention of the preceding age. Yet, as he fell in with the prejudices of a very numerous body, the Tory and High-church party, and, though with no original information much worthy of credit, had the advantage of several highly-important works printed within forty years before, which had not yet been reduced into a single narration, he seems for some years to have enjoyed a certain popularity.

This popularity, however, must be ascribed in a very low sense to Echard, when compared with what was obtained by another historian in a few more years. Strange it seems, that the first history of England, which exercised any considerable influence over the national opinion, or acquired a permanent reputation, was to come from the pen of a Frenchman.

Quod minimè reris, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe.

Rapin de Thoyras, of an ancient family in Languedoc, was one of those Protestants whom the tyranny of Louis XIV. drove to England in 1685. He obtained a small pension from William III., and the Earl of Portland intrusted to him the education of his son. Motives of economy induced him afterwards to settle at Wesel, in the duchy of Cleves, where he undertook and completed, after a labour of near twenty years, his well-known History of England. This was first published at the Hague in seventeen volumes, the last in 1725; and two translations of it, by Tindal and by Kelly, appeared within a very few years. The former is the best known, on account of the continuation down to 1760, which, though bearing all along the name of Tindal, is understood to have been written, in the latter volumes, by Dr Birch. Rapin had the advantage of correcting the loose and slovenly narrative of his predecessors, especially as to names and dates, by means of the recent publication of Rymer's *Fœdera*, which he studied with great care, and from which he had previously published a selection of treatises and other important documents, entitled *Acta Regia*. Yet all the earlier part of his history is very inexact, according to the measure of our present knowledge; and he is

little worthy of perusal before the reign of Henry VIII. From that period, his probity and love of truth render him a very respectable, though not profound or lively writer; he has preserved entire several public documents—a practice, which, if not quite agreeable to the critical laws of composition, is highly convenient in such a history as that of England—and has been diligent in comparing his materials, and in allowing for the distortion of party prejudice. A slight bias towards the Parliamentary side, is sometimes perceptible in his relation of the reign of Charles I. But the unfortunate situation of Rapin, not only as a foreigner, but as resident in a foreign country, seems to have kept him in ignorance of much that was necessary for an English historian; a more striking instance of which cannot be mentioned, than that he never quotes, and apparently did not know, the existence of Whitelock's Memorials, a book of such standard character for the period of the civil wars, and the first edition of which had been published nearly forty years.

Guthrie, one of the first who practised the trade of serving the booksellers with copy by the ream, produced, in 1744, three very thick folio volumes, with double columns, according to the fashion of that time, denominated a History of England. Of his predecessor, he observes: 'Rapin's history appeared at a time when the principles on which he wrote were useful to a party, who therefore powerfully recommended it from the press, of which they were then masters. To this, and to the ridiculous prepossession that a foreigner was best fitted to write the English history, was owing the reception it met with from the public.' This is foolish enough, considering that no party could at that time be called masters of the press, any more than when Guthrie himself wrote, and leads us to expect a less temperate performance than we really find. This history, however, seems not deficient in general impartiality, though with about as much leaning towards the royalist, as Rapin shows towards the Parliamentary side. But, as it was uncommonly diffuse, inconvenient from bulkiness, and proceeded from a man who had no literary reputation sufficient to warrant what he wrote without vouching authorities, and who seemed to have had recourse to none but such as were common, he so far from succeeded in his expectation of superseding the foreigner whom he disparaged, that few books of the kind are lower in price and reputation at the present moment. It was not much better in his own age: Horace Walpole said sarcastically, when some reviewer quoted Guthrie's History, that 'he himself was conversant with the living works of dead authors, not the dead works of the living.' We will deviate so far from our system of mentioning no history which relates to a particular period, as to praise the very prolix, but

useful and able Ralph, who, in the years 1744 and 1746, was delivered of two immense folios, which comprise the term of forty years, from the Restoration to the death of William III.; and which have been raised by the commendation bestowed on them by Mr Fox, and by the attention thus shown to their merit, from complete neglect to a considerable price in catalogues. Ralph, however, is not impartial, or always fair, in his political opinions; a strong dislike to William III. leavening his second volume; and he seems on the whole to have wished rather to please the Tories of his own age, changed as they had been by long exclusion from power, than the Whigs, who had as long breathed the air of a court. As Ralph had the reputation of letting his pen to hire in factious pamphlets, some suspicion, though perhaps unjustly, might fall on his sincerity in this greater work.

A far superior writer to Guthrie, or even Rapin, was Thomas Carte, a nonjuring clergyman, distinguished for his beautiful edition of Thuanus, commonly called Buckley's, his *Life of the Duke of Ormond*, and several other contributions to historical literature. A large subscription enabled him to undertake a *History of England*, to be founded on more extensive researches than had hitherto been required. The universal exactness of historical learning, the diligence shown in topographical and biographical illustrations of past times, the controversies as to political and personal character, the prevailing spirit of scepticism, sometimes acute, sometimes excessive, but always demanding industry to repel it, had raised the standard of truth both in narration and discussion of general facts; so that errors, which, if observed at all, would have been slighted a century before, assumed a new magnitude in the microscope of an antiquary or controversial disputant. Carte appeared, by his industry and command of materials, well qualified to fill a post, which as yet was but imperfectly supplied by a foreigner. In 1747, he published the first volume of a '*History of England, by Thomas Carte, an Englishman.*' It was immediately evident, that he was master of his ground in a very different degree from any of his predecessors. Not only the collection of Rymer, but the *Rolls of Parliament*, hitherto unknown, except by an incorrect abridgement, and other archives of our ancient government, were made contributory to his purpose. It might, indeed, have been predicted, that an honest jacobite could scarcely give such a colour to the Tudor and Stuart reigns, to say nothing of older times, as the friends of constitutional liberty were likely to approve. But Carte managed to anticipate their objections by inserting in his first volume a story of one Thomas Lovell, who being afflicted with a scrofulous complaint, had recovered his

health on being touched at Avignon, 'by the descendant of a 'long line of kings.' The loyal subjects of the House of Hanover took the alarm; the city of London withdrew its subscription; and Carte was compelled to prosecute his task with very diminished assistance from the public, and a slur on the reputation of his work. He did not yield to those discouragements; a second volume appeared in 1750, a third in 1752, and a fourth in 1755. This, however, brings down the history only to 1654, instead of the Revolution, as originally designed. Carte is certainly no concise writer. On a loose calculation, we find that, down to the reign of James I., his letter-press is to that of Rapin about as three to two; to that of Hume as nine to four; and to that of Dr Lingard, less than two to one. This prolixity, and the inconvenience of the folio size, which excludes so many books of ancient repute from the tables of a more indolent generation, have rendered Carte's History, comparatively even with Rapin, an obscure book. As far, however, as the reign of James I. inclusive, he is incomparably superior to Rapin, in copiousness of materials and accuracy of statement. Instead of confining himself, like his predecessor, to the more common printed authorities, he sought access to original papers, both in Paris and London; and perhaps fell sometimes into the not unusual fault of relying too much on rare and unpublished documents when they disagreed with popular history. It is hardly necessary to observe, that Carte is to be read with great caution on all subjects of constitutional privileges.

The last volume of Carte had not issued from the press, when an eminent writer, conspicuous already for a diversified and brilliant, though sometimes too eccentric, career over the fields of literature and philosophy, undertook a labour not apparently very congenial to the habits of his mind, as they had hitherto been displayed, in a History of the House of Stuart. Hume published the first volume of this in 1754, and the second in 1756. The History of the House of Tudor followed at equal length in 1759; and two more volumes in 1761, by a curiously retrograde process, completed the usual course from Julius Cæsar to the Revolution. Eulogy is superfluous on a work which is not only the greatest monument of historical literature in our language, but in many respects equal perhaps to any which either ancient or modern Italy has produced. Many have excelled, and others will hereafter excel Hume in their knowledge of the spirit of antiquity, in their exactness and circumstantiality of narration, and, what is more important, in their rigorous adherence to the laws of moral and historical truth, in the estimate of political transactions and characters. But we can hardly hope to see his rival in reflections usually just, and often profound, with-

out the involution of mystical pedantry, in the harmonious subordination of illustrative digressions to the main stream of history, or, still less perhaps, in a style equally fitted for narration and for dissertation,—easy without being feeble, simple without dryness, and, if not always free from a little affectation in idiom, never losing its elegance in redundant ornament, or learned abstraction.

It has been often asserted that Hume has made great use of Carte's History, especially in his first two volumes; and he has even been called his copyist. We have had the curiosity to compare a few passages at random, and the result is, to a great extent, in confirmation of this fact. We mean only, that Hume appears to have written with Carte always open before him, and to have followed him, generally speaking, not only in the arrangement of events, but in the structure of his exposition of them; giving, however, the colour of his own thoughts and style to the whole narration, and continually, as we believe, both verifying the statements of his predecessor, and adding what he thought requisite to his own by a reference to the original sources. As this is a matter of some literary curiosity, we will insert two very short extracts in order to exhibit this parallelism.

‘ Henry was hunting in the New Forest, when he heard the news of his brother William's death; and resolving to make a push for the throne, went immediately to the Castle of Winchester, to demand the keys of the royal treasury, which the guards made some difficulty in delivering. They were in the custody of William de Breteuil, (the eldest son of William Fits-Osborn, formerly Earl of Hereford,) who was likewise in another quarter of the forest; when, being surprised with an account of the king's death, he made all possible haste home to take care of his charge; and, arriving in the middle of the dispute, told the young prince that neither the treasure nor the sceptre of England belonged to him, but to his elder brother Robert, to whom he and others of the chief nobility had already done homage. High words arose, and blows were likely to follow, when Robert, Count of Meulant, with a great number of the late king's attendants, coming in, took the part of the prince present, and forced William to leave him master of the treasure, with which they hoped, perhaps, to be rewarded for their service.’—*Carte*, vol. i. p. 480.

‘ Prince Henry was hunting with Rufus in the New Forest, when intelligence of that prince's death was brought him; and, being sensible of the advantage attending the conjuncture, he immediately galloped to Winchester, in order to secure the royal treasure, which he knew to be a necessary implement for facilitating his designs upon the crown. He had scarcely reached the place when William de Breteuil, keeper of the treasure, arrived, and opposed himself to Henry's pretensions. This nobleman, who had been engaged in the same party of hunting, had no sooner heard of his master's death, than he hastened to take care of his charge; and he told the prince,

that this treasure, as well as the crown, belonged to his elder brother, who was now his sovereign; and that he himself, for his part, was determined, in spite of all other pretensions, to maintain his allegiance to him. But Henry, drawing his sword, threatened him with instant death if he dared to disobey him; and as others of the late king's retinue, who came every moment to Winchester, joined the prince's party, Bretenil was obliged to withdraw his opposition, and to acquiesce in this violence.—*Hume*, vol. i., p. 222. 4to. 1762.

It will be understood by the reader that we produce these passages as an example, not as sufficient proof, of Hume's use of Carte. A single incident cannot, of course, display this so conclusively as a series of events expanded into several paragraphs, which we have not room to insert. But we believe that any one will satisfy himself of what we have said by a comparison of the two volumes in different parts. If it should be conceived that historians, relating the same events from several authorities, will naturally adopt an identical arrangement, even in the structure of their sentences, the contrary will be shown by trying the experiment upon Rapin or Lingard. It will appear, if a fair number of instances be tried, that the diversities in the order and tone of impressions made on the mind of an historian who compares and meditates upon his materials, will prevent two wholly independent writers, as soon as they leave the track of mere translation, from presenting similar narrations to the reader's eye. In these observations we have not the slightest intention of bringing the absurd charge of plagiarism against our philosophical historian. On the contrary, we think that having ascertained, as he undoubtedly did, the judiciousness and veracity of Carte, he acted much more fairly by his readers in keeping a valuable model before his eyes in composition, than if he had endeavoured to weave a new web of a texture which he would, perhaps, himself have felt to be inferior. It had not been the occupation of his life to investigate the early annals of England; and those who can only devote a limited time to any historical study, know well the importance of a standard work to marshal and methodize their enquiries.

The unpretending and elegant, though necessarily superficial, abridgement of Goldsmith, hardly deserves notice in this place; much less an epitome of that abridgement, entitled, 'History of England, in Letters from a Nobleman to his Son,' which the booksellers' catalogues ridiculously attribute to Lord Lyttleton. Nor has Smollett in the slightest degree better pretensions than Goldsmith to authority as an historian, while he is utterly deficient in the qualities of style which belong to the latter. His continuation of Hume, nevertheless, having been generally bound up in the same series by those Mezentziuses, the book-

sellers, who yoke the dead to the living, and the high-bred courser to their own battered hackney, has obtained, not a reputation, but a sale which it little deserves. The history of the same period, which we hope to obtain from the pen of Sir James Mackintosh, will send Smollett to the cheesemongers. Not more than a few years had elapsed since the publication of Hume's last volumes, when Dr Henry announced a History of Britain upon a new plan. Each volume, of which he promised twelve, was to be divided into seven chapters, for the civil and military, the ecclesiastical, the legal and constitutional, the literary history, that of arts, of commerce, and of manners, for the several periods which the entire work was to comprehend. It seems that he had contemplated its continuance to his own time; but death intercepted his progress in the sixth volume, at the death of Henry VIII. The success of Henry's history for many years after its appearance, cannot be ascribed to any grace of his style, which is homely, though not absolutely bad, nor to any depth of research, for he is superficial, perhaps inevitably so, in every portion of his multifarious narrations, but to the increasing avidity for information upon arts and learning, and upon the domestic life of our ancestors, which his peculiar scheme of composition led him to display on a far greater scale than had been usual with the historian of public events. The scheme itself merits no great praise; even as an arrangement to facilitate reference, it does not supersede the necessity of an index, though he has given none; and the reader, who undertakes the perusal of the whole, is distracted by continually passing from one subject to another of a totally different nature. The important accessions to our knowledge on the subjects of many chapters in Dr Henry's history since its publication, have diminished its usefulness; though they cannot, of course, take away from his just praise of having made much accessible which was then beyond the reach of an ordinary reader.

We shall no otherwise advert to living historians than to observe, that Mr Sharon Turner has earned the honourable reputation of indefatigable diligence, of the love of truth and mankind, but has exposed himself more and more in each successive volume to literary criticisms, which this is not the place to point out; and that in the first volume of Sir James Mackintosh's History of England, in the Cabinet Cyclopædia, we find enough to warrant the anticipations of the public, that a calm and luminous philosophy will diffuse itself over the long narration of our British story. But we must expect the full display of that eminent writer's powers in the ensuing volumes.

From Dr Lingard we have perhaps suffered ourselves to be

too long detained. His first three volumes were published in quarto in the year 1819; and he has now completed eight in the same form. An edition in octavo has also been published. Though we do not believe that the sale has been remarkably extensive, few modern works of the kind have obtained a more general notoriety, which has by no means been confined to our own country. A translation into French by M. Roujoux was, under the late government, used as the standard history of England in all the colleges of France. It would be unjust to suppose that the motive which will probably suggest itself, was the sole cause of this preference. The merits of Dr Lingard are of a high class. He generally discusses controverted facts with candour, (except on one subject,) acuteness, and perspicuity. He selects, in general, judiciously, arranges naturally, relates without prolixity or confusion. Abstaining from any comprehensive views of society, and from any profound remarks on human character, and thus certainly falling short of the first rank among historians, he at least avoids by this the habit of verbose declamation on these topics, which the minor Italian historians, and even Guicciardini, have practised, and of which abundant instances may be found in the writings of M. Sismondi, and, still more, of Mr Godwin. His style, which in earlier volumes was somewhat too much constructed after that of Gibbon, has become more easy and spirited by practice; and though not free from small blemishes, nor rising into any eloquence, may be considered as good from its conciseness and perspicuity. We shall presently give some extracts, which display Dr Lingard's powers of historical narration in a very favourable light.

It is impossible to deny that the celebrity of this work has been in some measure owing to the hostility it was calculated, or perhaps designed, to excite. In the first three volumes, though Dr Lingard was known to be a Catholic priest, little was found that provoked much controversy; nor indeed were they very much read before the publication of the fourth. It might be observed, that he disposed of the story of Edwy and Elgiva, and of the dispute between Henry II. and Becket, rather differently from most of his Protestant predecessors; but such matters have been reckoned open ground, and not very important to the Established Church. It was quite otherwise when, in descending to the Tudor dynasty, he exhibited the fathers of the Anglican reformation, and all the circumstances of that great revolution in the laws and opinions of England, so unfavourably, and yet to all appearance so dispassionately, and with so perpetual an appeal to authority, that, while many were startled to find their ancient

prejudices disturbed without much power of resistance, the champions of orthodox Protestantism were quick to take up the gauntlet, and expose, if they could, the misrepresentation and sophistry which was dimming the lustre of its historical glory. The time drew more than usual attention to such a contest. The great question, since so happily terminated, had begun to assume far more the character of a religious dispute, than it had done at the outset; an activity in proselytism was perceived, or strongly suspected, on both sides; and though no rational and cool-headed men were disposed to rest the merits either of Catholic Emancipation, as a political measure, or of the Reformation, as a theological one, on the personal characters of Mary and Elizabeth, of Pole and Cranmer, yet it is certain, that nothing is more common than to measure the truth of doctrines by the honesty of their professors; nor had any argument been more efficacious, in the seventeenth century, to withdraw members of the Anglican Church from its tenets, than to raise unfavourable notions of those who, in the preceding age, had established it. Even the writings of its professed friends, when tinctured with the strong leaven of hierarchical principles, such as prevailed in the reigns of the two first Stuarts, tended to alienate their readers from the protestant theory of lay judgment in religion, and reform of the church by the temporal power; and thus James II. has mentioned Heylin's *History of the Reformation* as one of the two books which satisfied his mind, that the truth had been lost by those who seceded from the Church of Rome.

The manner of Dr Lingard's attack on the northern heresy, as established in these kingdoms, was conducive to his success. No angry expression, no arrogance or indignation, betrays the writer's intention; a placid neutrality, and almost an affected indifference to the whole subject, seems to guide his pen: aware of the propensity of mankind, and perhaps of the greater ease of the undertaking, he prefers lowering his adversaries, to exalting his friends; and if he can degrade the memory of Cranmer, or taint the fame of Anne Boleyn, or darken a shade in the character of Elizabeth, is not comparatively solicitous to interest us for the virtues of Gardiner, or to palliate the cruelties of Bonner. Whatever, indeed, is done either way—for much is done in the way of defence, though more in that of accusation—is executed with consummate dexterity; the conclusions are always left for the reader, while the facts seem related with so much simplicity and fairness, that, when they are unfairly represented, it is not a slight acquaintance with authentic history which enables us to detect their fallaciousness.

L' arte che tutto fa, nulla si scuopre.

It was not, however, to be expected that any misrepresentations of importance would escape detection in an age when historical criticism is vigilant, and when public libraries are universally accessible. For several years Dr Lingard's want of candour in relating the history of the English Reformation was the theme of periodical criticism, sometimes also of more extended animadversion. Many attacked him with increased animosity on account of the pending Catholic question; a few, probably, defended him chiefly on the same account. Upon the whole, perhaps, each party came off with nearly an equal number of wounds in the controversy. If, on the one hand, Dr Lingard rendered it abundantly clear that Burnet, and those who have written the annals of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. in the same spirit, had somewhat overcharged the faults of the ancient church, and considerably disguised the injustice and intolerance which accompanied its overthrow; if he was successful in vindicating the English Catholics under Elizabeth from many aspersions, and held out to just indignation the persecuting laws which so long had passed for necessary safeguards against conspiracy; it is not less certain, on the other hand, that he was convicted of frequently going beyond the meaning of the authorities which he vouches, and of still more frequent suppression of the truth.

We have the less scruple, if indeed any scruple on such a topic could be felt by critics, in alluding to the faults of Dr Lingard in a portion of his history published some years ago, because we can bestow upon him the high, and not very usual commendation, of having corrected, in a great degree, that propensity to carry a party spirit into the narrative of past times, from which writers of his profession are seldom exempt. Historical unfairness is indeed the besetting sin of the Roman Catholic advocates; and the name of Bossuet, in this respect, hardly reaches higher than that of Maimbourg. Even the soft and moderate Mr Charles Butler, who might pass for an exception, has sometimes brought to our remembrance the malicious Greek epigram,

Λεριοι κακοι εχ, ο μεν, ος δ'ε.
 Παντες, πλην Προκληεος και Προκληης Λεριος.

which Porsen very unjustly adapted to the following epigram on a scholar little inferior to himself:—

‘ The Germans in Greek
 Are sadly to seek;
 Not five in five-score,
 But ninety-five more;

All, all, except Herman,
And Herman's a German.'

But be this as it may, we sincerely congratulate our author, as well as the public, on the manifest signs of increased candour and impartiality which distinguish his three quarto volumes on the reigns of the four Stuarts in England, especially the two latter. Not that we never detect *prisca vestigia fraudis*; but the objections we could raise on this score are much less frequent. One of the most remarkable proofs of this is, that the fortunes of the Catholics, which occupied a most disproportionate share in the history of Elizabeth, those of the Puritans, though far more important in their political consequences, being reduced into small compass, and many interesting events of the Maiden Queen's story slurred over with very slight notice, are less and less prominent as we advance, till the Popish Plot, and the designs of James II. to restore his religion, bring them naturally into the foreground.

Of the three quarto volumes to which we have alluded, the first comes down to the death of Charles I.; the next to the year 1673, and the last to the Restoration. They are consequently on a sufficient scale to permit the development of facts with their causes and circumstances, and even some degree of critical examination of them. We have found, however, that partly perhaps from some habitual indisposition to circumstantial narrative, the civil war between Charles and his Parliament is more briefly related than may be satisfactory to the general reader, considering the copiousness of materials, and the consequent accumulation of records and events; nor do we think Dr Lingard is always full enough on the still more interesting conflicts of party within the walls of Parliament. These defects are more than compensated by a rigorous impartiality, which he uniformly displays on political questions, and which stands in singular contrast with the bias he, at one time at least, used to manifest as to the interests of his church.

We have already mentioned the remarkable improvement in Dr Lingard's language, and in his powers of narration, since the commencement of his laborious undertaking. Several instances might be brought from the last two volumes of the quarto edition. Among these a high place is deserved by the account of Charles the Second's memorable adventures after his escape from the field of Worcester, not literally from unpublished sources, but from such as historians, who follow the inaccurate story of Clarendon, have not taken the trouble, or possessed the opportunity, to explore. It appears that the king did not embark from Brighthelmstone, as commonly supposed, but from

Shoreham, though he had remained a short time in the former place. But it is rather too long for a single extract. The following account of Cromwell's celebrated expulsion of the Parliament from their seats in 1653, may be very advantageously compared with that given by Mr Godwin, whose great power of delineation in works of fiction, has never been imparted to his historical narrative, which is frigid and deficient in picturesque liveliness. But Dr Lingard stands in need of no foil. It cannot be denied, that Hume had given a great deal of spirit to the same transaction, and several differences will be observed in the characteristic traits of the usurper; but as the publication of Lord Leicester's, and of Burton's Diaries, as well as of Mrs Hutchinson's Memoirs, has furnished additional materials of undisputed authority since the days of Hume, we think it reasonable to prefer our present historian. The last paragraph of the following extract is not inserted in our pages as a specimen of Dr Lingard's narrative talent, but of his good sense; and we earnestly recommend it to the attention of those at the present day whom it concerns. It is still a duty to bring the lessons of the past before the eyes of mankind, whatever grounds we may apprehend to exist for the melancholy suspicion, that each successive generation, collectively as well as individually, is destined to profit only by the experience of its own follies, and not those of its ancestors.

‘ At length Cromwell fixed on his plan to procure the dissolution of the Parliament, and to vest for a time the sovereign authority in a council of forty persons, with himself at their head. It was his wish to effect this quietly by the votes of the Parliament—his resolution to effect it by open force, if such votes were refused. Several meetings were held by the officers and members, at the lodgings of the lord-general, in Whitehall. St John and a few others gave their assent: the rest, under the guidance of Whitelock and Widrington, declared that the dissolution would be dangerous, and the establishment of the proposed council unwarrantable. In the meantime, the House resumed the consideration of the new representative body; and several qualifications were voted; to all of which the officers raised objections, but chiefly to the “admission of members,” a project to strengthen the government by the introduction of the presbyterian interest. “Never,” said Cromwell, “shall any of that judgment who have deserted the good cause, be admitted to power.” On the last meeting held on the 19th of April, all these points were long, and warmly debated. Some of the officers declared that the Parliament must be dissolved “one way or other;” but the general checked their indiscretion and precipitancy; and the assembly broke up at midnight, with an understanding that the leading men on each side should resume the subject in the morning.

‘ At an early hour the conference was recommenced, and after a

short time interrupted, in consequence of the receipt of a notice by the general, that it was the intention of the House to comply with the desires of the army. This was a mistake: the opposite party had indeed resolved to pass a bill of dissolution; not, however, the bill proposed by the officers, but their own bill containing all the obnoxious provisions, and to pass it that very morning, that it might obtain the force of law before their adversaries could have time to appeal to the power of the sword. While Harrison "most strictly and humbly" conjured them to pause before they took so important a step, Ingoldsby hastened to inform the lord-general at Whitehall. His resolution was immediately formed; and a company of musketeers received orders to accompany him to the House. At this eventful moment, big with the most important consequences, both to himself and his country, whatever were the workings of Cromwell's mind, he had the art to conceal them from the eyes of the beholders. Leaving the military in the lobby, he entered the House, and composedly seated himself on one of the outer benches. His dress was a plain suit of black cloth, with grey worsted stockings. For a while he seemed to listen with interest to the debate; but when the speaker was going to put the question, he whispered to Harrison, "This is the time: I must do it;" and rising, put off his hat to address the House. At first his language was decorous, and even laudatory. Gradually he became more warm and animated; at last he assumed all the vehemence of passion, and indulged in personal vituperation. He charged the members with self-seeking and profaneness, with the frequent denial of justice, and numerous acts of oppression; with idolizing the lawyers, the constant advocates of tyranny, with neglecting the men who had bled for them in the field, that they might gain the Presbyterians, who had apostatized from the cause; and with doing all this in order to perpetuate their own power, and to replenish their own purses. But their time was come; the Lord had disowned them; he had chosen more worthy instruments to perform his work. Here the orator was interrupted by Sir Peter Wentworth, who declared that he had never heard language so unparliamentary; language, too, the more offensive, because it was addressed to them by their own servant, whom they had too fondly cherished, and whom, by their unprecedented bounty, they had made what he was. At these words Cromwell put on his hat, and, springing from his place, exclaimed, "Come, come, sir, I will put an end to your prating." For a few seconds, apparently in the most violent agitation, he paced forward and backward, and then, stamping on the floor, added, "You are no Parliament; I say you are no Parliament; bring them in, bring them in." Instantly the door opened, and Colonel Worsley entered, followed by more than twenty musketeers. "This," cried Sir Henry Vane, "is not honest. It is against morality and common honesty."—"Sir Henry Vane," replied Cromwell, "O Sir Henry Vane! The Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane! He might have prevented this. But he is a juggler, and has not common honesty himself!" From Vane he directed his discourse to Whitelock, on whom he poured a torrent of abuse; then, pointing to Chaloner, "There," he cried, "sits

a drunkard;" next, to Marten and Wentworth, "There are two whoremasters;" and afterwards, selecting different members in succession, described them as dishonest and corrupt livers, a shame and scandal to the profession of the gospel. Suddenly, however, checking himself, he turned to the guard, and ordered them to clear the House. At these words, Colonel Harrison took the Speaker by the hand and led him from the chair; Algernon Sidney was next compelled to quit his seat; and the other members, eighty in number, on the approach of the military, rose and moved towards the door. Cromwell now resumed his discourse. "It is you," he exclaimed, "that have forced me to do this. I have sought the Lord both day and night, that he would rather slay me than put me on the doing of this work." Alderman Allan took advantage of these words, to observe, that it was not yet too late to undo what had been done; but Cromwell instantly charged him with pecculation, and gave him into custody. When all were gone, fixing his eye on the mace, "What," said he, "shall we do with this fool's bauble? Here, carry it away." Then taking the act of dissolution from the clerk, he ordered the doors to be locked, and, accompanied by the military, returned to Whitehall.

'That afternoon the members of the council assembled in their usual place of meeting. Bradshaw had just taken the chair, when the lord-general entered, and told them, that if they were there as private individuals, they were welcome; but if as the Council of State, they must know that the Parliament was dissolved, and with it also the council. "Sir," replied Bradshaw, with the spirit of an ancient Roman, "we have heard what you did at the house this morning; and before many hours, all England will know it. But, sir, you are mistaken to think that the Parliament is dissolved. No power under Heaven can dissolve them but themselves; therefore, take you notice of that." After this protest, they withdrew. Thus, by the parricidal hands of its own children, perished the Long Parliament, which, under a variety of forms, had, for more than twelve years, defended and invaded the liberties of the nation. It fell without a struggle or a groan, unpitied and unregretted. The members slunk away to their homes, where they sought by submission to purchase the forbearance of their new master; and their partisans, if partisans they had, reserved themselves in silence for a day of retribution, which came not before Cromwell slept in his grave. The royalists congratulated each other on an event which they deemed a preparatory step to the restoration of the king; the army and navy, in numerous addresses, declared that they would live and die, stand and fall, with the lord-general; and in every part of the country, the congregations of the saints magnified the arm of the Lord, which had broken the mighty, that in lieu of the sway of mortal men, the fifth monarchy, the reign of Christ, might be established on earth.

'It would, however, be unjust to the memory of those who exercised the supreme power after the death of the king, not to acknowledge that there existed among them men capable of wielding with energy the destinies of a great empire. They governed only four years; yet,

under their auspices, the conquests of Ireland and Scotland were achieved, and a navy was created, the rival of that of Holland, and the terror of the rest of Europe. But there existed an essential error in their form of government. Deliberative assemblies are always slow in their proceedings; yet the pleasure of Parliament, as the supreme power, was to be taken on every subject connected with the foreign relations, or the internal administration, of the country; and hence it happened, that among the immense variety of questions which came before it, those commanded immediate attention which were deemed of immediate necessity; while the others, though often of the highest importance to the national welfare, were first postponed, then neglected, and ultimately forgotten. To this habit of procrastination was perhaps owing the extinction of its authority. It disappointed the hopes of the country, and supplied Cromwell with the most plausible arguments in defence of his conduct.—Vol. xi. Svo. edition. p. 269.

Though no class of Charles I.'s subjects had suffered more in his cause than the Catholics, one third of five hundred gentlemen who lost their lives being reckoned of that persuasion, they did not altogether reject the hope of toleration, for which they had endured so much, when it shone, though with a faint uncertain ray, from an opposite quarter of the horizon. After the execution of the king, both the systematic tendency of the independent party, and especially of Cromwell, towards indulgence in religion, and the dangerous position of the new Commonwealth, led to an overture, which, as Dr Lingard at least expresses it, came from the government to the Catholic leaders.

‘The sentiments,’ he says, ‘of Sir Kenelm Digby and Sir John Winter were sounded, and conferences were held, through the agency of the Spanish ambassador, with O’Reilly and Quin, two Irish ecclesiastics. It was proposed that toleration should be granted for the exercise of the Catholic worship, without any penal disqualifications, and that the Catholics in return should disclaim the temporal pretensions of the Pope, and maintain ten thousand men for the service of the Commonwealth. In aid of this project, Digby, Winter, and the Abbé Montagu, were suffered to come to England under the pretence of compounding for their estates; and the celebrated Thomas White, a secular clergyman, published a work, entitled, “The Grounds of Obedience and Government,” to show that the people may be released from their obedience to the civil magistrate by his misconduct; and that when once he is deposed, (whether justly or unjustly makes no difference,) it may be for the common interest to acquiesce, rather than attempt his restoration. That this doctrine was satisfactory to the men in power, cannot be doubted; but they had so often reproached the late king with a coalition with the papists, that they dared not to make the experiment; and, after some time, to blind perhaps the eyes of the people, severe votes were passed against Digby, Montagu, and

Winter, and orders were given for the apprehension of priests and Jesuits.—Vol. xi. p. 32.

We know not how to review a general history of England, except by adverting to some of the facts which are not contained, or which are differently related, in other books, and to some of the author's opinions on disputable points. It is asserted by Hume, whom Mr Brodie and several others have followed, that the ordinance of the Long Parliament in 1651, punishing incest and adultery with death, extended the same severity to fornication for the second offence. Mr Godwin has observed, and Dr Lingard, without referring to him, and perhaps without knowledge of what he had written, explains the ordinance in the same way, that the capital punishment is not annexed to fornication, but to the keeping of a brothel. On looking to Scobell's Collection of Ordinances during the Commonwealth, we think this admits of no doubt. But we have accidentally found a similar remark suggested in Daines Barrington's Observations on the Ancient Statutes, (p. 126,) though the learned author says, 'it was certainly otherwise understood under the Protectorate.' Why this was certain, he does not inform us, except by quoting the index to Scobell. But as an index is not usually thought sufficient authority to contradict the text of any book, especially of a statute, we must adhere to the plain meaning of the ordinance, which has been given by Messrs Godwin and Lingard. (*Vide* Scobell, anno 1650, c. 10.)

The story of Don Pantaleon Sa, brother to the Portuguese ambassador, who was beheaded on Tower Hill, for the murder of an English gentleman on the Exchange, is told in Dr Lingard's manner, with a sceptical balancing of authorities, but rather partially towards the criminal. 'That Pantaleon and his friends were armed, cannot be denied; was it for revenge? So it would appear, from the relation in Somers' Tracts, iii. 65, Whitelock, 569, and State Trials, v. 482. Was it solely for defence? Such is the evidence of Metham, (Thurloe, ii. 222,) and the assertion of Pantaleon at his death, (Whitelock, ii. 595.)' This is one of the instances where either an excess of hesitation, or a little bias towards a Catholic delinquent, has misled Dr Lingard. The plain facts are, that Pantaleon, having had a quarrel on the Exchange with a Mr Gerard, went there the next day, with a number of friends armed, where they killed a Mr Greenway, whom they mistook for the person they sought. What is there in this that looks like self-defence, or even a sudden fray? The account written at the time by Whitelock and others, as well as the evidence on the trial, represent it as one

of those violent outrages not unusual at that time in the south of Europe; nor do we recollect that the absolute justice of Pantaleon's execution has ever before been doubted, though it was made a question, how far he was protected by the law of nations, as being named, if the fact be such, in the ambassador's commission. The evidence of Metham, in Thurloe, which Dr Lingard vouches in defence, is that of a suspected accomplice; and admitting it to be all true, it does not overturn that on the contrary side. Nor is it quite correct to quote Whitelock for Pantaleon's assertion of innocence at his death. Whitelock's words are:—'On the scaffold he spake something to those that understood him, in excuse of his offence, laying the blame of the quarrel and murder on the English in that business.' This is rather different from an assertion that he went armed for the purpose of self-defence.

The predominant leaning of Dr Lingard's mind is very discoverable in his account of 'that event, which by Protestants has been called the massacre, by Catholics the rebellion of the Vaudois.' It amounts to this, that about the middle of the thirteenth (why not the twelfth?) century, the peculiar doctrines of the 'poor men of Lyons' penetrated into the valleys of Piedmont; that they 'were exchanged,' at the Reformation, for those of Geneva; that the Dukes of Savoy repeatedly confirmed to the natives of the valleys the free exercise of their religion, so that they should not transgress their ancient limits; that they, however, abused this privilege, and formed settlements in the plains; that the Court of Turin referred the disputes that arose in consequence to the civilian Gastaldo, who, 'after a long and patient hearing, pronounced a definitive judgment, that Lucerne and some other places lay without the original boundaries, and that the intruders should withdraw, under the penalties of forfeiture and death,' but with the permission to sell the lands they had planted, though forfeited to the sovereign; that the Vaudois, being hardy half-civilized mountaineers, bound themselves by oath to stand by each other, sent messengers to the Swiss and French Protestants, and threw a garrison of six hundred men into La Torre. This was reduced by a military force sent from Turin; the lower valleys were occupied; but the inhabitants, which, it seems, was a heinous offence, 'had already retired to the mountains with their cattle and provisions; and the soldiers found no other accommodation than the bare walls. Quarrels soon followed between the parties; one act of offence was retaliated with another; and the desire of vengeance provoked a war of extermination. But the military were generally successful, and the natives found themselves

‘compelled to flee to the summits of the loftiest mountains, or to seek refuge in the valleys of Dauphiné, among a people of similar habits of religion.’ For this he quotes, in a note, the ‘Mercury’ of Vittorio Siri, a pensioned writer, whose representations of a matter which so much interested the whole Catholic body, must be taken with the utmost distrust. Dr Lingard adds, in another note, ‘It would be a difficult task to determine by whom, after the reduction of La Torre, the first blood was wantonly drawn, or to which party the blame of superior cruelty really belongs. The authorities on each side are interested, and therefore suspicious.’ Why then state unhesitatingly in the text what comes from only one side? ‘The persecutions alleged by the one, are as warmly denied by the other; and to the ravages of the military in Angrogna and Lucerne, are opposed the massacres of the Catholics in Perousa and San Martino.’ (Vol. xi. 261.) The best authorities probably are in Thurloe’s Collection of Papers; and Dr Lingard quotes several of these on either side. But we find no mention of any massacre of the Catholics in Perousa and St Martin. The great massacre was in Lucerne, on April 21, 1655, by an army of several thousand men. This was the slaughter of the Vaudois, followed up by other ravages, which resounded through Europe. It is true that, having taken up arms with the usual intrepidity of that extraordinary people, and driven their oppressors from La Torre and other villages, they did not give much quarter. It may be admitted also, on Morland’s authority, that some exaggerations were circulated by the Vaudois ministers. Yet Morland himself, having been in the country, and not disposed, as appears, to take any thing on trust, has written a history of this very massacre. Such authority is surely better than that of Siri, and far better than that of a letter from Mazarin (Thurloe, iii. 536) to the French ambassador at the court of Cromwell, whom it was his business to conciliate; the varnish of a man, not only interested, but proverbially regardless of veracity. We shall add, that Denina (*Istoria dell’ Italia Occidentale*, iii. 328) asserts, that by conversation with some of the inhabitants of the valleys themselves, he has ascertained that many of the stories of Vaudois ministers tortured and murdered, are the invention of Leger, instigated by the judicial punishment of a relation. But the accounts we read in Thurloe, of the date of May 1655, are not, in general, borrowed from Leger. Independently of external evidence, which in such cases is usually contradictory, we need only consider the circumstances of the two parties, and the general disposition of the Catholic potentates in that age, to decide which was more likely to be the aggressor. In the great cause of

Wolf *versus* Lamb, we are irresistibly sceptical of the plaintiff's grievances.

It is mentioned, in another place, (p. 133,) of the Vaudois, probably in order to insinuate that their case was not a very hard one; that they refused the offer of Cromwell to settle in Ireland. This is certainly true. But the grounds of their refusal, besides the general attachment of mountaineers to their fastnesses, are given in a letter from Leger to Mr Stoupe. (Thurloe, iii. 459.) They display the noble constancy of that people, and their generous pride in the consciousness of their antiquity. They were the last survivors, as they were probably the eldest, of those churches in Italy who stood aloof from the corruptions of Rome. 'I confess,' says Leger, 'when at first I heard of the massacre made among them, I had that thought, that those who had escaped that butchery ought to go and settle themselves elsewhere, not seeing any likelihood for them to return home, or to live peaceably there. But having imparted the matter to the pastors of those churches that are now dispersed, they have represented unto me, that they ought not to yield so easily to those, who, little by little, do mutilate and consume the body of our churches; having destroyed those of Calabria in the year 1650, those of the Marquisate of Saluces in 1597 and 1602, and those of the valley of Barcelonne, within the dominions of the Duke of Savoy, in 1623. That they ought not to forsake those churches, which can prove their succession from the very time of the apostles; Claudius Turinensis, Bishop of Turin, who had been counsellor to Charles the Great, having highly erected there the standard of the truth, long before the Waldenses came thither. That, in the said valleys, there are several places that are strong by nature. That there are yet great numbers of our brethren under arms, who have taken up heart again, and are entered again into part of the inheritance of their fathers,' &c. It is well known that they not only compelled the house of Savoy to respect their property and religion in this contest, but, when expelled in the following generation from their valleys, returned by one of the most romantic enterprises related in history, traversing the whole line of Alps from Geneva, and obtained by force the possession of their country, which, with more discouragement than persecution, they continue to enjoy.

It has often been questioned whether Cromwell was rescued by death from a reverse of fortune in 1658, or might have maintained his authority as before, had his life been protracted. Mr Godwin seems to think he was in little danger. Dr Lingard, on the other hand, is of opinion, that his authority was never on

a more precarious footing; arguing from his poverty, and the impossibility of calling any Parliament which would answer his purpose, as well as from the ambitious intrigues of some among his generals and counsellors, who, from his increasing infirmities, began to cherish other views. The supposition, however, ought to exclude those infirmities; and it may still be asked, whether the same Cromwell, who reached supreme power, might not, with equal vigour of mind and body, have retained it. That he had little to fear from the royalist partisans, except assassination, of which he was more painfully apprehensive than became so brave a man, we entertain no doubt; nor do we see what the republicans could have done against him, after so many failures, unless he had provoked the army, by too imprudently urging forward his favourite scheme of putting the crown on his head. Speculations, however, as to what might have happened in circumstances which did not occur, are not apt to be very satisfactory; nor are they perhaps of much utility, though it is sometimes amusing to indulge them.

On the debated question, whether Monk began, long before he left Scotland, to entertain the design of restoring Charles to the throne, Dr Lingard inclines to the affirmative side; and we are disposed to agree with him, though we think he relies too much on the authority of Price. In the account of the manner in which the lords took their seats in the Convention Parliament, which met April 25, 1660, he is not strictly accurate. 'A few,' he says, 'of the excluded peers attempted to take their seats, and met with no opposition; the example was imitated by others, and in a few days the Presbyterian lords formed not more than one-fifth of the House.'—P. 439. But, in fact, on the first day a committee was appointed to consider what lords should have letters written to require their attendance. There was never any intention to exclude the peers whose creation was antecedent to 1642; but those whose patent had passed the great seal, after it was taken to Oxford, and had been declared incapable by ordinances of the Long Parliament, were still excluded by an order of the House of Lords, so late as May 4, 1660. This was vacated May 31; but it indicates that the Presbyterian lords formed more a good deal than one-fifth of the House.

The change which took place in 1664, as to the direct taxation of the clergy, is well known; but it has not been so important in its consequences as the following paragraph intimates:—

'Hitherto the clergy had preserved the honourable privilege of taxing themselves, and had usually granted in convocation the same number of clerical subsidies as was voted of lay subsidies by the two Houses of Parliament. But this distinction could not conveniently be

maintained, when money was to be raised by county rates; and it was therefore agreed, that the right of the clergy should be waved in the present instance; but, at the same time, be preserved for them by a proviso in the act. The proviso, however, was illusory, and the right has never since been exercised. In return, the clergy claimed what could not in justice be denied, the privilege of voting as freeholders at elections; a privilege which, though never expressly granted, has since been recognised by different statutes. But a consequence followed from this arrangement, which probably was not foreseen. From the moment that the convocation ceased to vote money, it became of little service to the crown. It was no longer suffered to deliberate, to frame ecclesiastical canons, or to investigate the conduct, or regulate the concerns, of the church. It was, indeed, summoned, and the members met as usual, but merely as a matter of form; for a royal mandate immediately arrived, and an adjournment, prorogation, or dissolution followed. That, however, which seems the most extraordinary is, that this change in the constitution, by which one of the three estates ceased, in fact, to exist, and a new class of freeholders, unknown to the law, was created, owes its origin, not to any legislative enactment, but to a merely verbal agreement between the Lord Chancellor and Archbishop Sheldon.—Vol. xii. 121. 8vo. edit.

It is not an uncommon opinion among the English clergy at the present day, that they have been despoiled of their ancient constitutional privileges by the discontinuance of the convocation. Not that they contend for the right of separate taxation, which, in the modern system of finance, would of course be found impracticable; but a notion has been promulgated among them, that laws affecting ecclesiastical interests were formerly passed with the consent of their own representatives. This error is in some degree countenanced by the preceding passage; for, to say that ‘one of the three estates ceased, in fact, to exist,’ by the practice of proroguing the convocation without proceeding to business, is at least to imply that that body was previously an estate of the realm. This it certainly never was; the clergy are strictly one of the three estates, and that name is also very regularly given to the lords spiritual in Parliament; but the convocations, separately called by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their respective provinces, by authority of the king, never had the smallest pretension to any other legislative power than to enact canons for the government of the church, which, when sanctioned by the crown, are binding on the clergy, but have no authority, as has been repeatedly decided, over the laity; nor was their consent, on any occasion, required for the validity of a statute in ecclesiastical concerns. It is true, that in the reign of Edward I., and three or four of his successors, an assembly of delegates from the clergy, not provincial but national, and sum-

moned immediately by the king's writ to the bishops, appears to have sometimes enjoyed a decisive voice in statutes affecting the church; but this assembly, commonly said to be called by virtue of the *præmunientes* clause, from the first word of a sentence in the writ, has very long gone into disuse, nor has any return been made to the writ, we believe, since the reign of Henry VIII. But the mistake of Dr Lingard is still greater, if possible, in supposing that the convocation was no longer suffered to deliberate, or regulate the concerns of the church, in consequence of its discontinuing to grant subsidies, and thus becoming of little service to the crown. The fact is, on the contrary, that the period when the convocation for the province of Canterbury (that of York having never been of the slightest importance) sat most frequently, attracted most attention, and put forward the most ambitious claims, was after it had ceased altogether to impose taxes on its constituents. In this respect also, the clergy at the present day have permitted themselves to be deceived. Far from the cessation of these ecclesiastical assemblies being an infringement of their ancient rights, their meetings, except for the purposes of taxation, were not at all common before the reign of Anne, when a theory favourable to their authority having gained ground, chiefly through the artful misrepresentations of Atterbury, and the ministers favouring, or not venturing to oppose, the high-church party, they were permitted to sit during the session of Parliament, and to enter upon many topics which had not been handled by their predecessors. This continued after the accession of George I., till it was found expedient for public tranquillity to silence a very factious spirit by a prorogation. But whoever looks at Wilkins's *Concilia*, will see how few had been their effective meetings since the Reformation. They were consulted by Henry VIII. about his divorce; they sat under Edward VI., but with no share in the great changes of his reign; they opposed in vain the restoration of Protestantism in the first year of Elizabeth; they sanctioned (when changed in person and character) the Thirty-Nine Articles in the queen's fifth year, which is the principal instance of their interference; they enacted some canons in 1603, which are still in force, and some in 1640, which have not been confirmed; and they agreed to some changes proposed by the crown in 1661. These, we believe, are all the instances of any importance wherein they did any thing more than grant money, while to grant their own money remained their privilege; while, on the other hand, subsequently to their loss of that privilege, they appear to have debated on subjects affecting the church's interest once or twice in the reign of Charles II., for some short time under William III., and very frequently,

as we have observed above, under Anne and George I. It has not been deemed necessary by the crown, which has the exclusive initiative in such matters, to propound any ecclesiastical canons for the convocation's assent since the restoration of Charles II.

The following extract will do full justice to Dr Lingard's manner. It is longer than usual, but of an interesting nature, as it relates to events among the most remarkable that occurred in that period,—the obstinate battle between the English and Dutch fleets in the summer of 1665, and the great plague of London, which was nearly contemporaneous with it. The latter has never been noticed by any historian in more than a very few lines. Dr Lingard has made good use of his materials, and may fairly challenge comparison with the well-known account of the plague at Athens by Thucydides.

‘ At length an easterly wind drove the English to their shores, and the Dutch fleet immediately put to sea. It sailed in seven divisions, comprising one hundred and thirteen ships of war, under the command-in-chief of Opdam, an officer, who, in the late war, had deserved the confidence of his countrymen. It exhibited a gallant and animating spectacle; the bravest and noblest youths of Holland repaired on board to share the dangers of the expedition; and, as the admiral had received a positive order to fight, every heart beat high with the hope or assurance of victory. Opdam himself was an exception. His experienced eye discovered, in the insufficiency of many among his captains, and the constitution of their crews, reason to doubt the result of a battle; and to his confidants he observed, “ I know what prudence would suggest; but I must obey my orders, and, by this time tomorrow, you will see me crowned with laurel or with cypress.”

‘ Early in the morning of the 3d of June, the hostile fleets descried each other near Lowestoffe. Seven hours were spent in attempts on each side to gain and keep the advantage of the wind; at length the English, by a skilful manœuvre, tacked in the same direction with the enemy, and accompanied them in a parallel line, till the signal was made for each ship to bear down and engage its opponent. The sea was calm; not a cloud could be seen in the sky; and a gentle breeze blew from the south-west. The two nations fought with their characteristic obstinacy, and, during four hours, the issue hung in suspense. On one occasion, the duke was in the most imminent peril. All the ships of the red squadron, with the exception of two, had dropped out of the line to refit; and the weight of the enemy was directed against his flag-ship, the *Royal Charles*. The Earl of Falmouth, the Lord Muskerry, and Boyle, son to the Earl of Burlington, who stood by his side, were slain by the same shot; and James himself was covered with the blood of his slaughtered friends. Gradually, however, the disabled ships resumed their stations; the English obtained the superiority; and the fire of the enemy was observed to slacken. A short

pause allowed the smoke to clear away; and the confusion which the duke observed on board his opponent, the *Eendracht*, bearing *Opdam's* flag, induced him to order all his guns to be discharged into her in succession, and with deliberate aim. At the third shot from the lower tier she blew up; and the admiral, with five hundred men, perished in the explosion. Alarmed at the loss of their commander, the Dutch fled; James led the chase; the four sternmost sail of the enemy ran foul of each other, and were consumed by a fire-ship; and three others shortly afterwards experienced the same fate. Van Tromp endeavoured to keep the fugitives together; the darkness of the night retarded the pursuit of the conquerors; and in the morning the Dutch fleet was moored in safety within the shallows. In this action, the most glorious hitherto fought by the navy of England, the enemy lost four admirals, seven thousand men slain, or made prisoners, and eighteen sail either burnt or taken. The loss of the victors was small in proportion. One ship of fifty guns had been taken in the beginning of the action; and the killed and wounded amounted to six hundred men. But among the slain, besides the noblemen already mentioned, were the Earls of Marlborough and Portland, and two distinguished naval commanders, the Admirals Lawson and Sampson.

At another time the report of such a victory would have been received with the most enthusiastic demonstrations of joy; but it came at a time when the spirits of men were depressed by one of the most calamitous visitations ever experienced by this or any other nation. In the depth of the last winter, two or three isolated cases of plague had occurred in the outskirts of the metropolis. The fact excited alarm, and directed the attention of the public to the weekly variations in the bills of mortality. On the one hand, the cool temperature of the air, and the frequent changes in the weather, were hailed as favourable circumstances; on the other, it could not be concealed that the number of deaths, from whatever cause it arose, was progressively on the advance. In this state of suspense, alternately agitated by their hopes and fears, men looked to the result with the most intense anxiety; and at length, about the end of May, under the influence of a warmer sun, and with the aid of a close and stagnant atmosphere, the evil burst forth in all its terrors. From the centre of *St Giles's*, the infection spread with rapidity over the adjacent parishes, threatened the court at *Whitehall*, and, in defiance of every precaution, stole its way into the city. A general panic ensued; the nobility and gentry were the first to flee; the royal family followed; and then all, who valued their personal safety more than the considerations of home and interest, prepared to imitate the example. For some weeks the tide of emigration flowed from every outlet towards the country; it was checked at first by the refusal of the lord mayor to grant certificates of health, and by the opposition of the neighbouring townships, which rose in their own defence, and formed a barrier round the devoted city.

The absence of the fugitives, and the consequent cessation of trade and breaking up of establishments, served to aggravate the calamity.

It was calculated that forty thousand servants had been left without a home, and the number of artisans and labourers thrown out of employment was still more considerable. It is true, that the charity of the opulent seemed to keep pace with the progress of distress. The king subscribed the weekly sum of L.1000; the city of L.600; the queen-dowager, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Craven, and the lord mayor, distinguished themselves by the amount of their benefactions; and the magistrates were careful to ensure a constant supply of provisions in the markets; yet the families that depended on casual relief for the means of subsistence were necessarily subjected to privations, which rendered them more liable to receive, and less able to subdue, the contagion. The mortality was at first confined chiefly to the lower classes, carrying off, in a larger proportion, the children than the adults, the females than the men. But, by the end of June, so rapid was the diffusion, so destructive were the ravages of the disease, that the civil authorities deemed it time to exercise the powers with which they had been invested by an act of James I., "for the charitable relief and ordering of persons infected with the plague." 1. They divided the parishes into districts, and allotted to each district a competent number of officers, under the denomination of examiners, searchers, nurses, and watchmen; 2. They ordered that the existence of the disease, wherever it might penetrate, should be made known to the public by a red cross, one foot in length, painted on the door, with the words, "Lord, have mercy on us!" placed above it. From that moment the house was closed; all egress for the space of one month was inexorably refused; and the wretched inmates were doomed to remain under the same roof, communicating death one to another. Of these many sunk under the horrors of their situation; many were rendered desperate. They eluded the vigilance, or corrupted the fidelity of the watchmen; and by their escape, instead of avoiding, served only to disseminate the contagion; 3. Provision was also made for the speedy interment of the dead. In the daytime, officers were always on the watch to withdraw from public view the bodies of those who expired in the streets; during the night the tinkling of a bell, accompanied with the glare of links, announced the approach of the pest-cart, making its round to receive the victims of the last twenty-four hours. No coffins were prepared; no funeral service was read; no mourners were permitted to follow the remains of their relations or friends. The cart proceeded to the nearest cemetery, and shot its burden into the common grave, a deep and spacious pit, capable of holding some scores of bodies, and dug in the churchyard, or, when the churchyard was full, in the outskirts of the parish. Of the hardened and brutal conduct of the men to whom this duty was committed, men taken from the refuse of society, and lost to all sense of morality or decency, instances were related, to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in the annals of human depravity.

The disease generally manifested itself by the usual febrile symptoms of shivering, nausea, headach, and delirium. In some these

affections were so mild, as to be mistaken for a slight and transient indisposition. The victim saw not, or would not see, the insidious approach of his foe; he applied to his usual avocations, till a sudden faintness came on, the maculæ, the fatal "tokens" appeared on his breast, and within an hour life was extinct. But, in most cases, the pain and the delirium left no room for doubt. On the third or fourth day, buboes or carbuncles arose; if these could be made to suppurate, recovery might be anticipated; if they resisted the efforts of nature, and the skill of the physician, death was inevitable. The sufferings of the patient often threw them into paroxysms of frenzy. They burst the bands by which they were confined to their beds; they precipitated themselves from the windows; they ran naked into the streets, and plunged into the river.

Men of the strongest minds were lost in amazement, when they contemplated this scene of woe and desolation; the weak and the credulous became the dupes of their own fears and imaginations. Tales the most improbable, and predictions the most terrific, were circulated; numbers assembled at different cemeteries to behold the ghosts of the dead walk round the pits in which their bodies had been deposited; and crowds believed that they saw in the heavens a sword of flame, stretching from Westminster to the Tower. To add to their terrors, came the fanatics, who felt themselves inspired to act the part of prophets. One of these, in a state of nudity, walked through the city, bearing on his head a pan of burning coals, and denouncing the judgments of God on its sinful inhabitants; another, assuming the character of Jonah, proclaimed aloud, as he passed, "Yet forty days, and London shall be destroyed;" and a third might be met, sometimes by day, sometimes by night, advancing with a hurried step, and exclaiming, with a deep sepulchral voice, "Oh the great and dreadful God!"

During the months of July and August, the weather was sultry, the heat more and more oppressive. The eastern parishes, which at first had been spared, became the chief seat of the pestilence, and the more substantial citizens, whom it had hitherto respected, suffered in common with their less opulent neighbours. In many places, the regulations of the magistrates could no longer be enforced. The nights did not suffice for the burial of the dead, who were now borne in coffins to their graves at all hours of the day; and it was inhuman to shut up the dwellings of the infected poor, whose families must have perished through want, had they not been permitted to go and seek relief. London presented a wide and heart-rending scene of misery and desolation. Rows of houses stood tenantless, and open to the winds; others, in almost equal numbers, exhibited the red cross flaming on the doors. The chief thoroughfares, so lately trodden by the feet of thousands, were overgrown with grass. The few individuals who ventured abroad, walked in the middle; and, when they met, declined on opposite sides, to avoid the contact of each other. But, if the solitude and stillness of the streets impressed the mind with awe, there was something yet more appalling in the sounds

which occasionally burst on the ear. At one moment were heard the ravings of delirium, or the wail of woe, from the infected dwelling; at another, the merry song, or the loud and careless laugh, issuing from the wassailers at the tavern, or the inmates of the brothel. Men became so familiarized with the form, that they steeled their feelings against the terrors of death. They waited each for his turn with the resignation of the Christian, or the indifference of the stoic. Some devoted themselves to exercises of piety; others sought relief in the riot of dissipation, and the recklessness of despair.

September came; the heat of the atmosphere began to abate; but, contrary to expectation, the mortality increased. Formerly, a hope of recovery might be indulged; now infection was the certain harbinger of death, which followed, generally, in the course of three days, often within the space of twenty-four hours. The privy council ordered an experiment to be tried, which was grounded on the practice of former times. To dissipate the pestilential miasm, fires of sea-coal, in the proportion of one fire to every twelve houses, were kindled in every street, court, and alley of London and Westminster. They were kept burning three days and nights, and were at last extinguished by a heavy and continuous fall of rain. The next bill exhibited a considerable reduction in the amount of deaths; and the survivors congratulated each other on the cheering prospect. But the cup was soon dashed from their lips; and in the following week, more than ten thousand victims, a number hitherto unknown, sunk under the augmented violence of the disease. Yet even now, when hope had yielded to despair, their deliverance was at hand. The high winds which usually accompany the autumnal equinox, cooled and purified the air; the fever, though equally contagious, assumed a less malignant form, and its ravages were necessarily more confined, from the diminution of the population on which it had hitherto fed. The weekly burials successively decreased from thousands to hundreds; and in the beginning of December, seventy-three parishes were pronounced clear of the disease. The intelligence was hailed with joy by the emigrants, who returned in crowds to take possession of their homes, and resume their usual occupations: in February, the court was once more fixed at Whitehall, and the nobility and gentry followed the footsteps of the sovereign. Though more than one hundred thousand individuals are said to have perished, yet in a short time, the chasm in the population was no longer discernible. The plague continued indeed to linger in particular spots, but its terrors were forgotten or despised; and the streets, so recently abandoned by the inhabitants, were again thronged with multitudes in the eager pursuit of profit, or pleasure, or crime.—Vol. xii. p. 123.

We observe a singular oversight in our diligent and learned historian, vol. xii. p. 213: On the third reading of Lord Rous's Divorce bill, in 1670, a measure in which the king took great interest; for reasons which were suspected to be personal, he surprised the House by taking his seat on the throne, and directing the lords to proceed as if he were not present. This fact is

well known. But Dr Lingard in a note says, The king had previously consulted *Sir Robert Cotton*, who replied, that 'it was the custom for the sovereign to be present in Parliament till the reign of Henry VIII. ;' since which time it was admitted to have been disused. For this he refers to *Sir Robert Cotton's* 'answer in manuscript, in the collection of *Thomas Lloyd, Esq.*' Nothing can more display the inevitable danger of occasional oversights in a long work, than this introduction of *Sir Robert Cotton's* name, who, as Dr Lingard must be well aware, died nearly forty years before the time of which he is here writing. The inadvertence possibly arose from an erroneous indorsement of the manuscript he refers to ; and the king, who consulted that learned antiquary, would be Charles I., who is known to have gone down to the House of Lords on the Duke of Buckingham's impeachment in 1626.

The secret treaty of 1670, between Charles and Louis XIV., for the war against Holland, and the establishment of arbitrary power and Popery in England, is now published for the first time, (xii. 354,) from an original in the possession of Lord Clifford, the descendant of one of the principal negotiators. Dalrymple had given only the draft, or project, of this extraordinary royal conspiracy ; and though it does not in the slightest degree differ from the original, we are much indebted to Dr Lingard for having procured the latter, were it only as an additional confirmation of Dalrymple's fidelity. It is supposed by Dr Lingard that a fresh treaty, being, in fact, the third, was signed early in 1672, though Dalrymple calls it a Latin copy of what is called the second, or *traité simulé*, which was intended as a blind to the Protestant ministers of Charles, omitting every part of the first that related to the king's change of religion. The ground of this supposition is, that 'the command of the English auxiliaries was given by it to the Duke of Monmouth.' For this he quotes Dalrymple, ii. 88. But we do not find this mentioned as part of the treaty, nor is it likely that the choice of a general should have been determined in any treaty ; and as Dalrymple seems to write on the authority of Colbert's dispatches, in calling it a Latin copy, we do not see why it should be presumed to be any thing else.

The latter part of Charles's reign is recounted, not with great minuteness, nor so as to satisfy any one who wishes to become master of the subject, but with a judicious selection of circumstances, according to the necessary limits of the present volumes ; and, we think, upon the whole, with considerable impartiality. The Popish plot, indeed, which Dr Lingard does not lay on any higher conspirators than Oates and Tonge, was so foul an im-

posture, and the innocence of the accused so manifest, that there could be neither pretext nor temptation for distorting any portion of the truth. We think, however, that, as far as uncontradicted evidence goes, the suicide of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey is more improbable than Dr Lingard supposes it to be; though we have not the remotest thought of attributing his murder to the Catholics; nor even do we deny that he might have fallen by his own hands, upon which hypothesis great part of the testimony must be very incorrect. But while we perceive scarce the slightest bias towards the religion he professes in this last portion of Dr Lingard's work, we cannot wholly acquit him of a little leaning towards the administration of Charles II. In stating all the proceedings which have been justly reckoned violent and unconstitutional, the last word is invariably given to the side of government; nor could any one suppose, from what they here read of the trials of College, Sidney, Armstrong, and Rosewell, that they were conducted with that unfairness which posterity has imputed to them. A natural indignation at the imposture of the Popish plot, which even the best of the Whig party too much encouraged, has probably led our author to view with some complacency the retaliation of violence and injustice that so soon fell upon their heads. The following passage seems judicious and dispassionate; it relates to the sudden dissolution of the Oxford Parliament in 1681:—

‘ Such was the abrupt termination of this, the last Parliament in the reign of Charles II. ; and it may be considered a fortunate circumstance for the country, that it never brought to a termination the important question of the succession. James was not of a temper to acquiesce either in the expedient or the exclusion : he would have appealed to arms in defence of what he considered his right ; and so profound was the reverence felt for the principles of the ancient constitution, so strong the prepossession in favour of the divine right of hereditary succession, that he would have found multitudes ready to draw the sword in his cause. Had he succeeded, he would have come a conqueror to the throne, armed with more formidable authority than he could have possessed in the ordinary way of inheritance ; and if he had failed, there was reason to fear, from the political bias of the popular leaders, that the legitimate rights of the sovereign would have been reduced to the mere name and pageantry of a throne. It is probable that a dissolution preserved the nation from a civil war, and from its natural consequences, the establishment of a republican, or of an arbitrary government.’—Vol. xiii. p. 274.

A tendency to extenuate the severities exercised on the Cameronians in Scotland, might be anticipated from Dr Lingard's general predilection (the word may be a trifle too strong) for the government and characters of Charles II. and the Duke of York.

He sometimes adopts a style of rather too much levity, either for a humane historian, or for a minister of any denomination of religion. Thus, speaking of two unfortunate females, Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey, put to death for fanatical opinions, rather than any actual crime, he says: 'In prison, the Bible ' was their chief consolation; the lecture of the Book of Canticles ' threw them into ecstasies of joy; and as they ascended the fatal ' ladder, they cheered their last moments by applying to them- ' selves the passage, "My fair one, my lovely one, come away." '— Vol. xiii. 298. The sneering style which pervades these volumes, when the religious tenets of Protestants are mentioned, 'alarm- ' ing the orthodox,' 'scandalizing the godly,' and so forth, is in a taste which has a little gone by, at least in grave histories, and, as we have observed, sits not very becomingly on one of Dr Lingard's profession. It is a much smaller sort of criticism, that the word 'lecture,' in the above sentence, is not used in a sense which usage warrants; and we may remark, that Dr Lingard's style, though good in most essential qualities, has not yet attained as much purity as we should think desirable. We observed in one place 'civilian,' in the sense of one who is not a soldier; 'a very vile phrase' anywhere but in the mess-rooms where it originated. A fault of a different kind, though still verbal, is the name of Lord William Russell, instead of Lord Russell; a mistake not uncommon, especially in older books, but so palpable that it should not have found place repeatedly as it does in Dr Lingard's history.

The reign of James II., might be deemed a test of a Roman Catholic historian. Dr Lingard has passed very successfully through this ordeal. His imperturbable serenity never deserts him; the arbitrary conduct, and infatuated policy of the king are surrendered without much extenuation; and though he is evidently unwilling to assign any better motive than ambition to the enterprise of William, he abstains from every thing like invective; nor do we find any strong expression used, except once, when he speaks of the *perfidy* of Lord Cornbury in joining the Prince of Orange. We should only complain of too favourable a colouring in respect of some of the judicial proceedings in this reign, as we did with regard to the preceding. The trials of Alderman Cornish, and of Mrs Gaunt, (the latter of whom was burned alive,) are not mentioned; and in the account of that of Mrs Lisle, there are several mistatements, tending to palliate the enormity of her sentence. It is intimated that she was selected for punishment, on account of 'the displeasure ' occasioned by the countenance which she had always given to ' the doctrines of the "good old cause." ' (Vol. xiv. p. 73.) But

this was never suggested, and is contrary to the known fact; we do not wait to enquire what sort of a justification it would have been. Burnet says, 'she was known to be much affected with the king's death, and not easily reconciled to her husband for the share he had in it.' And she asserted at her trial, that 'she abhorred that rebellion as much as any woman in the world.' These may be called slender proofs; but when there is not a syllable on the other side, but the baseless presumption of a writer, coming one hundred and fifty years afterwards, they have surely more strength than his mere breath can overcome. The note, page 74, is intended to excuse the conduct of Jeffries on this trial, and charges Burnet with representations calculated to mislead the reader. But we see nothing blamable in Burnet, beyond that circumstantial incorrectness from which he is rarely free; and after reading the printed trial, or even this note of Dr Lingard, we believe that every one would come pretty much to the same conclusion as to the demerits of Jeffries. 'The king,' Dr Lingard goes on to say, 'substituted decapitation for the legal punishment of burning; a mitigation of the judgment which his opponents have termed an usurpation of power contrary to law, as if our princes had not always exercised that power.' Though it is not easy to prove a negative, we much doubt if any of the king's 'opponents' ever thought of calling this act of clemency an usurpation, or of making the least objection to it.

In the relation of Monmouth's invasion, we have observed a somewhat important inaccuracy:

'After several contradictory resolutions, it was resolved to cross the Avon at Keynsham Bridge, the Severn at Gloucester, and to march along the right bank of the last river till they should be joined by their friends in Cheshire; but Venner and Mason, two of his most distinguished partisans, dissenting from this advice, and conceiving themselves released from their obligations to him, made their escape. The duke still lay at Bridgewater, when the royal army reached Somerton. . . . It thus became doubtful whether he could reach Keynsham before his opponents, and a resolution was taken to surprise the royal camp during the night.'—Vol. xiv. 55.

Dr Lingard has here overlooked the actual march of Monmouth from Bridgewater upon Keynsham, a skirmish with the royalists in that village, his unsuccessful summons of Bristol and of Bath, another slight engagement in the village of Philip's Norton, a few miles from the last city, wherein he was victorious, and his retreat by Frome to Bridgewater. These events occupied about seven days; no small portion of time in that disastrous attempt of an imbecile adventurer, under the pretext of vindicating the

liberties of England, to disgrace her by a most impotent usurpation.

The excellent work of the late M. Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, has been of considerable service to Dr Lingard for the reign of James II. ; but he has also had copies made for him of the correspondence of Barillon from the *Depôt des Affaires étrangères* at Paris. These two histories, therefore, of Mazure and Lingard, may fairly be presumed to contain whatever is most new and valuable in that celebrated correspondence. The effect is to throw off from the English Catholics in general, the imputation of having encouraged or approved the imprudent and illegal measures by which the king sought to reinstate their church in its ascendancy ; measures of which, however, they long paid the penalty in a severe proscription, and deprivation of civil rights. It is more difficult to fix upon any other persons by whom that deluded prince was instigated ; and, upon the whole, it seems very doubtful whether he had any evil counsellor, exercising a permanent influence, except his pride and obstinacy. Dr Lingard, after a long note, wherein he collects various authorities from Barillon, D'Avaux, and other authentic sources, comes to the conclusion that ' there can be little doubt that Sunderland, to secure the favour of the Prince of Orange, betrayed to him, occasionally at least, the secrets of his sovereign, in violation of his duty and his oath. His assertion that " he had contributed all that lay in him to the advancing of the revolution," may also be true ; but most probably it was nothing more than an afterthought, artfully put forward for the purpose of claiming merit to himself for that from which he had hitherto incurred blame.'—Vol. xiv. 301. This is fairly stated, and with probability ; and it may be added, that both Sunderland and Father Pêtre, who have passed for the worst advisers of James II., appear, from Barillon's dispatches, to have dissuaded the most injudicious of all his proceedings, the prosecution of the seven bishops.—Vol. xiv. 200. This is contrary to what has been asserted, or surmised, in all former histories. The character of Sunderland is so bad, on every hypothesis, that it matters little as to him which we please to adopt.

Dr Lingard brings his long labour to a close, when James, embarking from Rochester, quits for ever the throne he had so ill occupied. The memorable interregnum, which ended in the elevation of his nephew, finds, therefore, no place in his pages ; and if we knew nothing but from them, the curtain would seem to fall rather abruptly on the destinies of England. We should not know that a revolution so momentous and so unexpected was accomplished without bloodshed or anarchy, though not without

a long train of inconveniences and internal discontents, which belong almost inevitably to every great change in government; a blessing which may be attributed to the absence of merely popular intervention, and to the circumstance that it was effected by a foreign force, strong enough to preserve order, but utterly incompetent to control the national will, or subvert the constitution which it was called in to protect.

ART. II.—1. *Three Lectures on the Rate of Wages, with a Preface on the Causes of the present Disturbances.* By N. W. SENIOR, Esq. 8vo. London: 1830.

2. *State of the Nation at the close of 1830.* By T. POTTER MACQUEEN, Esq. 8vo. London: 1831.

3. *Bill to facilitate Emigration to his Majesty's Possessions abroad, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 22d February, 1831.*

4. *Bill to amend the Laws in England relative to Game, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 15th February, 1831.*

THE outrages that have broken out during the last few months among the peasantry of the southern counties of England—their tumultuary assemblages—the terms they have dictated to their employers—their attacks upon machinery—the repeated instances that have occurred of incendiarism—(with which there is but too much reason to suppose that some of the labourers have been connected)—and the proceedings under the late Special Commission, afford topics of deep and painful interest. But much as these outrages are to be regretted, evincing, as they do, the existence of great irritation, distress, and ignorance, it is some satisfaction to know that the sphere to which they have extended is but of limited extent. The northern, and most of the midland counties, have been perfectly tranquil; and though, in such a complicated system as ours, it is impossible, perhaps, to fix on any period in which some important business is not depressed, and those dependent upon it involved in distress, which is always the most prolific source of disorder, we are bold to affirm, that at no former period has industry been in a healthier condition. Most sorts of farm produce bring good prices. Our manufactures are all in a state of activity, and most classes of workmen receive high wages. To whatever causes, therefore, the distress of the peasantry in some districts of the South, and the outrages that have been perpetrated, may be ascribed, they must be of a local and partial character. Had it been otherwise, Northumberland and Durham would not have

escaped calamities that have been so prevalent in Kent and Hampshire.

Many, both in the House of Commons and out of doors, ascribe all the distress that now exists, and all that has at any time existed in the country, during the last ten years, to the proceedings with respect to the currency in 1819, and the return to specie payments in 1821. Such ridiculously exaggerated statements carry with them their own refutation. We do not mean to deny that the act of 1819 made some addition to the burdens of the country, but that addition was comparatively trifling; and Parliament could not have refused to restore the standard, without receding from the express terms of the contract into which it had entered with those who advanced money to the state. But it is not necessary to enter at present into any vindication of the return to specie payments at the old standard. Whatever additions it may have made to the public burdens, no one has hitherto dreamed of affirming that it added more to those of one district or county than to those of another. It is clear, therefore, that it has had nothing to do with the *peculiar* distresses of the peasantry of the South. It would be easy, indeed, to show that the labouring classes are always benefited by a rise in the value of money, and injured by its fall. But though the reverse were true, it is obvious, inasmuch as the value of money rose to the same level in the Lothians as in Kent or Sussex, that this rise affords no explanation of the peculiarly depressed condition of the agricultural labourers in many districts of the latter.

Nearly the same remarks may be made as to taxation. There was indeed one tax, that on sea-borne coal, which pressed exclusively upon the southern counties, and inflicted on them far more injury than would be readily imagined by those who look only to the amount of the tax. But thanks to the press and Lord Althorpe, this odious impost has been repealed; and it will ever be a subject of astonishment how a tax so glaringly unjust and oppressive—a tax not only upon a necessary of life; but upon the most important instrument of manufacturing industry, was suffered to exist for so long a period. Pernicious, however, as the influence of this tax certainly was, its operation is not sufficient to account for the condition of the southern counties. That it inflamed and aggravated the existing distress, there cannot be a doubt; but it did not create it. Other causes were at work of a still more powerful and destructive character. But with the exception of the tax on sea-borne coal, the other taxes press equally on all parts of the island. They are as heavy in the most as in the least flourishing districts, and might

with as much truth be said to be the sole cause of the peculiar prosperity of the latter, as of the peculiar depression of the former. We certainly have no wish to underrate the inconveniences arising from heavy taxation. But it is an evil inseparable from our condition; for so long as the public faith is preserved unbroken, and adequate provision made for maintaining tranquillity, and national independence and honour, so long must a very large revenue be raised. It is certain, however, that the pernicious influence of our system of taxation has been much exaggerated; and though we should charitably acquit those who represent it as the sole or principal cause of all public distresses, of any intention to inflame popular prejudice, and excite discontent, we should be forced to maintain that they are exceedingly ignorant of the effects of taxation, and of the sources of public wealth. We shall at no distant period enter fully into the subject of tithes, and shall endeavour to ascertain and illustrate the principle on which they ought to be commuted. But though none can be more fully impressed than we are with a conviction of the mischievous and demoralizing influence of this impost, still it is a general, and not a local evil, and will not, therefore, account for distresses and disturbances incident only to the South. That it has increased their intensity and violence, is most true. Tithe, however, is levied in districts that have been perfectly tranquil, and without laying other abuses to its charge, its own natural operation is sufficient for its condemnation.

But if the distresses that afflict the southern counties can neither be ascribed to the return to specie payments, nor to the pressure of taxation, still less can they be ascribed—as Mr Sadler and others of that school would have us believe—to the ascendancy of the doctrines as to free trade. How these astute persons may explain it, we do not presume to conjecture; but the fact is unquestionable, that those branches of industry that were said to be ruined by the ‘newfangled’ theories of ‘hardhearted’ economists, are in the most flourishing condition. This is especially the case with the silk and glove trades. We believe we are warranted in affirming that the trade of Spitalfields was never in a sounder state than at present; and the British silk manufacture is now nearly three times as extensive as when Mr Huskisson originated those well-advised and judicious measures which so many contended would be productive of its ruin. The trade of Glasgow has been, for the last two years, exceedingly prosperous; and the same may be said of the trade of Manchester, Birmingham, and generally, indeed, of all the great manufacturing towns. Agriculture is the only great branch of national indus-

try not in a satisfactory condition, and exposed to ruinous vicissitudes; and we take leave to say, that it is idle to expect that it will ever be otherwise, without a decided modification of the present corn laws. They are most hostile to the best interests of all classes, and to none are they more hostile than to those of the agriculturists. Still, however, the operation of these laws is not partial. They are as injurious in Scotland as in England, and are in no respect more mischievous in the southern than in the northern counties.

Seeing, therefore, that the distress which exists in many districts of the South, cannot be accounted for by the operation of any of those general causes on which so much stress has been laid, we must seek for its sources in those that are more confined and limited in their operation; and these, certainly, are not difficult to discover. There can be no doubt whatever, that the comparatively depressed condition of the labouring classes in the South, may, for the most part, be fairly ascribed to the abuse of the poor-laws in that part of the empire. Instead of securing a refuge for the really destitute, the poor-laws have been perverted in the southern counties to the very worst purposes; they have been made a means of reducing wages to the lowest level, of pauperising the whole population, and of throwing a large proportion of the expense of labour upon those who do not employ a single labourer. This perversion began in 1795. The circumstances in which it originated have been explained by Sir F. M. Eden, and others. The prices of corn, and most other articles of provision, having risen to an unusual height in 1795, the condition of the labourers was changed very much for the worse, and many of them were subjected to severe privations and difficulties. But instead of meeting the exigencies of particular cases as they arose, one uniform system was for the most part adopted. The practice appears to have begun in Berks. The justices of that county issued tables in 1795, stating what the wages per week of a labourer should be, according to the magnitude of his family, and the price of the gallon loaf; directing, at the same time, the overseers, and others concerned in the management of the poor, to regulate their allowances accordingly. And, by an act passed in 1796, (36th Geo. III. cap. 23,) the orders of the justices to this effect were rendered valid, notwithstanding any regulations to the contrary. In consequence, the system did not cease with the accidental circumstances that gave rise to it, but has ever since been allowed to continue to spread pauperism and improvidence over the greater part of the South. Happily the contamination has not yet extended to the North.

In the first table issued by the Berkshire magistrates, the minimum weekly wages of an unmarried labourer, supposing the gallon loaf to sell at 1s., were set down at 3s.; when married, and having one child, wages were to be at least 6s.; if he had five children, they were to be at least 12s.; if he had seven children, they were to be 15s. In the event of the price of the gallon loaf rising from 1s. to 1s. 6d., the wages of an unmarried man were not to be less than 4s. 3d. a-week; while the wages of a married man, with a single child, were not to be less than 8s. 3d.; and those of a married man, with seven children, not less than 20s. 3d. The monstrous folly of such regulations must be obvious to every one; and considering how prevalent they have become in the southern counties, can any one wonder at their being overrun with pauperism, idleness, and crime? The attempt to make the wages of labour vary directly with the variations in the price of bread, displays a total ignorance of the most obvious principles;—it is an attempt to secure to labourers the same supply of food in scarce, as in plentiful years, and, consequently, to relieve them from the necessity of making those retrenchments, by which a deficient supply is distributed over the whole year, and absolute famine averted. But this regulation was wisdom itself, compared with that which increased the wages of the labourer precisely in proportion to the number of his children. Of all the stimuli that could be applied to increase the pauper population of the country, this was the most efficient. It did whatever a public regulation could do to destroy all forethought and consideration on the part of the poor. Instead of marriage being a connexion formed with due deliberation, after comparing its pleasures and advantages with the contingent difficulties that might arise from having a family to provide for, it came to be principally looked to as a means of augmenting the claims of the parties on the parish. The practical results have been precisely such as might have been anticipated. Mr Hodges, M.P. for Kent, stated, in his very valuable evidence before the Emigration Committee, that formerly labouring people in Kent (and the same is true of the other southern counties) usually staid in service till they were twenty-five, or thirty, or thirty-five years of age, and until they had saved from £40 to £50, and some much more; but that now they married early, very often when *minors*, speculating upon parish relief, and upon something being done for them. *The moral character of the poor*, Mr Hodges adds, *has been totally changed within my memory.* (*First Report*, p. 136.)*

* Mr Burke, who had a far more profound and extensive know-

The operation of the system on the industry of the labourers is equally disastrous. It has reduced the earnings of the sober and industrious to the same level as those of the profligate and idle. The conduct of a labourer is no longer regarded in determining his wages. These have been made to depend on the tables put forth by the magistrates, by whom all classes—the prodigal and the parsimonious, the careless and the diligent, the able-bodied and the feeble, are put on the same footing! Were the allowance-tables entitled, *Rules for the Discouragement of Industry and Providence, and the Encouragement of Idleness and Improvidence*, they would be pretty correctly described.

In many districts, bodies of labourers, under the name of *roundsmen*, or *gangs*, are sent round to the farmers, and receive always a part, and sometimes the whole, of their subsistence from the parish, while working upon the lands of individuals. The farmer is thus tempted either to dismiss altogether, or greatly reduce the wages of the regular labourers in his employment. In the South, every sort of industrious undertaking is either carried on by means of paupers or helots, or the wages of those who carry it on are reduced by their competition. The magistrates and overseers fix the tariff of human subsistence. Its amount is not determined by the fair competition of the parties, on the principle of contending interests and compromised advantage. Owing to the factitious increase of population caused by the allowance-system, the labourer is without the means of stipulating for wages. He must take what is offered to him; and the magistrates have only to consider, how far they may go in reducing the allowances without exciting a *bellum servile*.

Mr Senior has made some very pertinent and striking observations on this subject, in the preface to his valuable *Lectures on Wages*. ‘In the natural state,’ says he, ‘of the relation between the capitalist and the labourer, where the amount of wages to be paid, and of work to be done, are the objects of a free and open bargain; where the labourer obtains, and knows that he is to obtain, just what his services are worth to his employer, he must feel any fall in the price of his labour to be an evil, but is not likely to complain of it as an injustice. Greater exertion, and severer economy, are his first resources in distress; and what they cannot supply, he receives with

ledge of the just principles of public economy than any other statesman of his time, pointed out, with a prophetic and powerful pen, the consequences of this tampering, in his *Tract entitled Thoughts and Details on Scarcity*.

‘gratitude from the benevolent. The connexion between him and his master has the kindness of a voluntary association, in which each party is conscious of benefit, and each feels that his own welfare depends, to a certain extent, on the welfare of the other. But the instant wages cease to be a bargain, the instant the labourer is paid, not according to his *value*, but his *wants*, he ceases to be a freeman. He acquires the indolence, the rapacity, and the malignity, but not the subordination, of a slave. He is told that he has a *right* to wages, but that he is *bound* to work. Who is to decide how hard he ought to work, or how hard he does work? Who is to decide what amount of wages he has a *right* to? As yet the decision has been made by the overseers and the magistrates. But they were interested parties. The labourer has appealed to *force* to correct that decision.’

It may appear astonishing that a system productive of such results should have been allowed to grow up; but it will appear so to those only who do not reflect on the circumstances which gave it birth, and who are unacquainted with the causes of its being continued. It was entered into from benevolent motives. Unhappily, however, the ignorance of the magistrates and the legislature of all those principles that ought to have guided their proceedings, in endeavouring to provide for the exigencies of the poor, has changed their intended benevolence into a bitter curse. And the system, once established, has been continued, because the farmers contrived to throw a portion of the burdens growing out of it upon others; and because of the difficulty of dealing with the mass of pauperism it has engendered.

Had the employers of labour been always identical with the payers of the rates, there is reason to think that the allowance system would never have made any considerable progress, and that it would long since have been rooted out. But, in consequence of all sorts of fixed property being assessed to the poor’s rate, a large proportion of the wages of farm labour is, in many cases, paid by those who have no concern with agriculture; and hence it is that this system combines injustice to others with degradation to the poor. Its tendency is, to rob the former and enslave the latter.

Lest readers resident in those happy districts into which this system has not been introduced, should accuse us of exaggerating its pernicious influence, we beg leave to lay before them the following extract from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Labourers’ Wages, printed in 1824. It is highly deserving of attention.

‘ The evils which follow from the allowance system may be thus enumerated :—

‘ 1st, The employer does not obtain efficient labour from the labourer whom he hires. In parts of Norfolk, for instance, a labourer is quite certain of obtaining an allowance from the parish, sufficient to support his family ; it consequently becomes a matter of indifference to him, whether he earns a small sum or a large one. It is obvious indeed, that a disinclination to work must be the consequence of so vicious a system. He whose subsistence is secure without work, and who cannot obtain more than a mere sufficiency by the hardest work, will naturally be an idle and careless labourer. Frequently the work done by four or five such labourers does not amount to what might easily be performed by a single labourer at task-work. Instances of this fact are to be found in the evidence, and in the statement of all persons conversant with the subject.

‘ 2dly, Persons who have no need of farm labour, are obliged to contribute to the payment of work done for others. This must be the case wherever the labourers necessarily employed by the farmers, receive from the parish any part of the wages which, if not so paid, would be paid by the farmers themselves.

‘ 3dly, A surplus population is encouraged ; men who receive but a small pittance know that they have only to marry, and that pittance will be augmented in proportion to the number of their children. Hence the supply of labour is by no means regulated by the demand, and parishes are burdened with thirty, forty, and fifty labourers, for whom they can find no employment, and who serve to depress the situation of all their fellow-labourers in the same parish. An intelligent witness, who is much in the habit of employing labourers, states, that when complaining of their allowance they frequently say to him, “ *We will marry, and then you must maintain us.*”

‘ 4thly, By far the worst consequence of the system is, the degradation of the character of the labouring class.

‘ There are but two motives by which men are induced to work ; the one, the hope of improving the condition of themselves and their families ; the other, the fear of punishment. The one produces industry, frugality, sobriety, family affection, and puts the labouring class in a friendly relation with the rest of the community ; the other causes, as certainly, idleness, imprudence, vice, dissension, and places the master and the labourer in a perpetual state of jealousy and mistrust. Unfortunately, it is the tendency of the system of which we speak, to supersede the former of these principles, and introduce the latter. Subsistence is secure to all ; to the idle, as well as the industrious ; to the profligate as well as the sober ; and, as far as human interests are concerned, all inducement to obtain a good character is taken away. The effects have corresponded with the cause. Able-bodied men are found slovenly at their work, and dissolute in their hours of relaxation ; a father is negligent of his children ; the children do not think it necessary to contribute to the support of their parents ; the employers and the employed are engaged in perpetual quarrels, and the pauper, always relieved, is always discontented ; crime ad-

vances with increasing boldness, and the parts of the county where this system prevails are, in spite of our jails and our laws, filled with poachers and thieves.

‘The evil of this state of things has often induced individuals to desire further means of punishing labourers who refuse or neglect to work, and the legislature has sometimes listened with favour to such proposals; but we are persuaded, that any attempt to make the penalties of this kind more efficacious, would either be so repugnant to the national character as to be totally inoperative, or, if acted upon, would tend still further to degrade the labouring classes of the kingdom.’

After this authoritative exposition of the mischiefs arising from the allowance system, need we add, that its abolition is the imperative duty of the legislature? We say abolition; for nothing short of this can be of any material service. Labour is a commodity; and, as such, an article of commerce, and ought to be left, like every thing else, to find its own fair value in the market. It is not possible that the interference of the magistrate, in adjusting the terms of the contract of employment, can be otherwise than pernicious. His compulsory equalisations extinguish industry on the part of the poor, and prevent competition on the part of their employers. They give to the former the vices of slaves, to the latter, those of petty despots. And instead of wondering at the outrages and atrocities that have recently been perpetrated, our only wonder is, that they did not break out sooner, and have not been ten times more extensive and appalling.

But though a legislative fiat gave birth to the allowance system, such a fiat cannot extinguish it. Wherever it has been long acted upon, there is a considerable excess of labourers, or a considerable number of labourers for whose services there is no effective demand. Suppose it were enacted, that henceforth no able-bodied labourer, engaged in any sort of regular industry, should be entitled to any allowance from the parish, and that all those who were not so employed should be separated from the others, and employed as paupers by the parish, *the allowance given to the latter would determine the wages of the former.* For, in the first place, if this allowance were higher than the wages paid to free labourers, the latter would immediately become so careless and indolent, that their employers would be obliged to dismiss them, or, which is the same thing, to hand them over to the pauper ‘gang;’ and, in the second place, supposing the allowance given to paupers to be less than the wages of labourers, the former would go to the farmers, and, by offering to work for them at less than they are paying, would sink the rate of wages to the level of the parish allowance. It is therefore quite impossible to establish a system of free competi-

tion in the adjustment of wages in parishes where there is an excess of labourers. The rate of wages in them must inevitably correspond with the allowance given to paupers; they are not places in which superior industry and ingenuity in the labouring class can obtain any reward; the wages and the performances of the 'gangs' at public works, are there the only standards by which to measure the wages and the work of others.

In order, therefore, to pave the way for the abolition of that helotism now so prevalent in England, means must be resorted to for the disposal of the labourers for whose services there is no real demand. Now, this, it is plain, can only be done in one of two ways; that is, either by placing them on unoccupied and uncultivated lands at home, or by removing them to the colonies. But the first of those modes would really occasion an aggravation of the mischief; we should be merely shifting the locality of the disease; exciting, after the manner of the fashionable quacks of the day, an ulcer in one part of the body politic, by way of curing an inflammation in another. If we locate the labourers at home, the lands assigned to them must, speaking generally, be of a decidedly inferior quality to the worst of those that are now cultivated; for, had it been otherwise, they would have been occupied in preference. They will, consequently, obtain less for their labour than the occupiers of the poorest lands obtain at present. We shall thus reach a lower step in the descending scale, and lay the foundation of a frightful increase of pauperism. It is, indeed, most probable, that the condition of the persons located on such inferior lands would be so very bad, that, unless they were cooped up in Mr Owen's parallelograms, or reduced, like the Dutch pauper colonists, to a state of predial slavery, they would quit their situations, and return to beat down the wages of the ordinary labourers by their competition. These effects might not be manifested for a year or two; but we are to look at the ultimate and lasting, and not at the immediate and transitory, effects of such a system. And if we do this, and consider the disastrous influence that a forced cultivation of poor land would have on the condition of the labourer, and the rate of profit, we must be satisfied, that it would be in the last degree injurious.

Luckily, however, the other method for effecting the removal of the surplus labourers would have none of these disadvantages. Emigration would be beneficial to the emigrants themselves, by conveying them to countries where none but good lands are cultivated, where labour is in extensive demand, and where every industrious individual would have a reasonable prospect of attaining to a state of comfortable independence.

It would be advantageous to the labourers who remained at home, by removing those paupers whose competition depresses their wages to the lowest limit, and by providing for the abolition of the allowance system ; and it would be advantageous to all classes, by drying up the most copious source of internal commotion, and by extending and multiplying our commercial relations with other countries.

But it is unnecessary to dwell on the peculiar advantages of emigration. They have been rendered familiar to every one by the speeches and writings of Mr Wilmot Horton. It is impossible, indeed, for any one who has attended to these subjects, to estimate too highly the services of that right honourable person. He has laboured for years with a zeal and perseverance that was proof against the hostility of avowed enemies, the sneers of witlings, and the indifference of the multitude. But the recent events have shown the solidity of his leading principles, and the correctness of his general views ; and we hope that, before setting out for the Eastern world, he will have the gratification of seeing his opinions adopted and acted upon by Parliament.

There are no materials for correctly estimating the number of surplus labourers in England. We do not, however, believe that it is nearly so great as is commonly supposed. A small excess of agricultural labourers is sufficient to plunge the whole into the abyss of pauperism. The removal of 200,000 individuals from the agricultural counties would, we have little doubt, be quite sufficient to admit of the total abolition of the allowance system, and, at the same time, to raise wages to a proper level. But, whatever be the extent to which it might be proper to carry emigration, there is in the colonies far more than ample accommodation for all the emigrants that would be sent out. Canada, South Africa, and New Holland, have all a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land. And while, by sending settlers to them, we relieve ourselves from that mass of pauperism by which we are now weighed down, we shall, at the same time, be laying the foundations of new empires, and diffusing the blessings of civilisation, religion, and the arts.

But apart from all that has previously been stated, the events of the last few months have shown, that the existing evils in the condition of the poor can no longer be trifled with ; the time for anodynes and soporifics has gone by, and recourse must be had to more powerful medicines. The *bellum servile*, so lately raging in the southern counties, has been, for the present, put down. But the embers are still alive, and may easily be fanned into a flame. Though the jails and the hulks have been crowded with the victims of offended justice, the peasantry have, on the

whole, been successful. They have, in most cases, succeeded in forcing the farmers and occupiers to promise them very high wages. We doubt, however, whether it be possible, even were rents entirely remitted, for the farmers to fulfil their engagements. If they do not, this breach of contract will infallibly lead to new commotions; and if they do, is it to be supposed that the labourers will rest satisfied with what they have already gained?

— Nullus, semel ore receptus,
Pollutas, patitur sanguis, mansuescere fauces.

Being all reduced to a state of pauperism, having no motive to distinguish themselves by superior diligence or good behaviour, their sole object must be to improve their victory, by forcing their employers, by dint of threats and violence, to augment their allowances, and to lighten their tasks. That such will be the progress of events, if no efforts be made to dissolve the union that now subsists among them, seems obvious. But to dissolve it we must deal with each labourer as with a responsible individual, influenced by the same motives that influence other men, instead of dealing with the species in the gross, according to scales and tables, as if they were mere brute machines, inaccessible to reason, and governable only by force. So monstrous a practice will certainly terminate, if it be left to run its course, in throwing down all that is high, without, however, raising any thing that is low. The security of property has been shaken, and much capital lost; and it is next to certain, that both will be destroyed, unless an end be put to the slavery of the working classes,—unless their wages be determined on the principle of competition, and industry, forethought, and good conduct, be again rendered the only means by which labourers can hope to improve their condition.

We, therefore, cordially approve of the principle, and of most of the details, of the bill introduced by the present Ministry for facilitating emigration. It might safely, as we think, have gone a good deal farther; but perhaps it was best to begin with a measure like the present. The bill authorizes the appointment of a commission by the crown, who are to have power to contract, either with vestries or individuals, for the removal of paupers, chargeable, or likely to become chargeable, to the colonies, under such regulations as government may think fit, from time to time, to issue. The sums advanced, in the first instance, by government, are to be repaid by an assessment upon all property liable to contribute to the poor's rate, at the rate of 10 per cent per annum, till the whole be extinguished. The powers vested in the com-

missioners and lords of the treasury by the act are limited to the term of five years.

The expense of maintaining a man, his wife, and two or three children, as paupers in the southern counties, may be set down, at a rough average, at from L.22 to L.26 a-year. It is difficult, among the conflicting accounts that are in circulation, to estimate the probable expense of conveying such a family to Canada, and establishing them there; but taking the *largest* estimate, it could not exceed L.80; so that the parish or landlord, bound to support such a family, would be a very great gainer by contracting for their removal. To talk, as some honourable gentlemen have done, from whom we expected better things, of emigration diminishing the capital of the country to the same extent that it diminished population, is a good deal worse than absurd. About a *sixth*, or, at the very outside, a *fifth* part of the capital will suffice to establish a pauper family in Canada that is required for its support at home. It may be said, perhaps, that we must deduct from the expense of keeping such a family the value of their labour. But those who consider the mischievous influence which the maintenance of able-bodied labourers in a state of pauperism has on the industry of others, will be ready to acknowledge that far more work would be done by the remaining labourers, were the paupers removed, than is at present executed by the whole; and that, consequently, nothing ought to be set down to the credit of the work performed by the paupers. It must also be borne in mind, that if no efforts be made to subvert the present allowance system, by providing an outlet for the surplus labourers, the charge on their account will, from the natural progress of the evil, go on regularly increasing, until it swallows up the whole net revenue of the country. Nothing, therefore, can be a greater mistake, than to suppose, that those who consent to make an advance for the removal of paupers, are making a sacrifice to get rid of an accidental and transitory evil. The fact is, they are making a comparatively small sacrifice, to rid themselves of an evil which is deeply seated, which is rapidly spreading, and which, if it be not effectually counteracted, will, at no distant period, sink all classes below the level of that which is now lowest.

It is very properly provided in the bill, that no one is to be sent abroad as an emigrant, except with his own express consent; and that no sort of force or undue persuasion is to be used to induce any one to give such consent. But if the bill should pass into a law, parishes will not do their duty by the public, or by themselves, if they do not materially lessen the present inducements to continue at home as paupers. It was

stipulated in some parts of the country, during the late disturbances, that *all* labourers, however slothful or negligent, and whether employed by the parish or not, should receive 2s. 3d. a-day at an average of the year! In the event, however, of the present bill passing, the parishes that have entered into this agreement may fairly recede from it. They are entitled to tell the labourers, that, when it was made, there was no outlet for the surplus labourers; that such an outlet is now provided; that the parish is willing to defray the expense of their conveyance to countries where land is cheap and labour dear, and where, instead of getting two, they may, if they choose to be industrious, realize four or five shillings a-day; and that, having given them this option, they have resolved upon reducing the allowance to one shilling a-day.

An end ought, then, also to be put to the present practice of making a distinction between the allowances to single and married men. The choice of going to the colonies deprives the latter of any just cause of complaint they might have had, had the allowances been equalized without this option being offered. The total abolition of this distinction is absolutely indispensable to the abolition of the allowance system, and the growth of provident habits among the poor.

The clamour that has been raised against the bill for ‘Facilitating Emigration,’ as if it were, ‘A bill for the Transportation of Men because of Poverty,’ will not, we trust, make any serious impression. The bill is eminently calculated, were it passed into a law, to promote the interests of the poor; and they are not their friends, but their worst enemies, who labour to procure its rejection. We disclaim all participation in the tender mercies of those who would persuade the labourer to continue in a state of slavery and destitution in England, when he may become free and prosperous in the colonies. If such persons be honest, their notions of humanity are about as singular as those of the chemist who mistook salt for sugar; if they be dishonest, and assume the cant of charity, and so forth, merely as a cloak to mask their designs, knavery cannot well go farther.

We recommend the following paragraph, which is not more striking than true, from the *Sydney Gazette*, to the attention of those who honestly think that emigration would be injurious to the poor:

‘Here, then, is a country, prepared to our very hands, for all the purposes of civilized life. While England is groaning under a population for which she cannot provide bread, here is an unmeasured extent of rich soil, that has lain fallow for ages, and to which the starving thousands of the north are

‘beckoned to repair. The great want of England is employ-
 ‘ment; the great want of New South Wales is labour. Eng-
 ‘land has more mouths than food; New South Wales has more
 ‘food than mouths. England would be the gainer by lopping
 ‘off one of her superfluous millions; New South Wales would
 ‘be the gainer by their being planted upon her ample plains.
 ‘In England, the lower orders are perishing for lack of bread;
 ‘in New South Wales, they are, like Jeshurun, “waxing fat
 ‘and kicking” amid superabundance. In England, the master
 ‘is distracted to find work for his men; in New South Wales,
 ‘he is distracted to find men for his work. In England, the
 ‘capitalist is glad to make his three per cent; in New South
 ‘Wales, he looks for twenty. In England, capital is a mere
 ‘drug—the lender can scarcely find a borrower, the borrower
 ‘can scarcely repay the lender; in New South Wales, capital
 ‘is the one thing needful—it would bring a goodly interest to
 ‘the lender, and would make the fortune of the borrower.

‘Then, let the capitalist wend his way hither, and his one
 ‘talent will soon gain ten, and his ten, twenty. Let the labour-
 ‘ing pauper come hither, and if he can do nothing in the world
 ‘but dig, he shall be welcome to THREE AND TWENTY SHILLINGS
 ‘A-WEEK, and shall feast on fat beef and mutton at a penny or
 ‘twopence a-pound. Let the workhouses and jails disgorge
 ‘their squalid inmates upon our shores, and the heart-broken
 ‘pauper, and the abandoned profligate, shall be converted into
 ‘honest, and industrious, and jolly-faced yeomen.’—(*Sydney
 Gazette, 22d May, 1830.*)

It was contended, in the debate on the introduction of the bill, that the increase of population may, at present, be estimated at 200,000 a-year; and that, unless emigration were carried to this extent, it could do no good. But, with all due respect, we take leave to say, that nothing can be more entirely unfounded than this statement. Capital and population are, at present, advancing in certain ratios; and the object in proposing emigration, is not to hinder any increase of population, but to lessen the ratio of its increase, so that the balance may be made to incline in favour of capital. An emigration of 20,000 or 30,000 a-year may be quite sufficient for this purpose; and would, there can be no doubt, in a very few years, materially improve the condition of the labourers.

Besides providing an outlet for the existing surplus labourers, measures ought to be taken to check their undue increase in future, by removing every direct encouragement to improvidence. For this purpose, a change should be made in the law

of settlement, and in the present practice of assessing houses and cottages to the poor's rate. The present law of settlement is, to the last degree, complicated; and cases are perpetually occurring, as to which the opinions of the ablest lawyers differ entirely. This ambiguity has led to a frightful mass of litigation; so much so, that the sums annually expended, in England and Wales, upon lawsuits as to questions of settlement, &c., exceed the whole expense of the established Church of Scotland! Now, it may easily be shown, that almost the whole of this enormous expense may be saved, and various very advantageous results secured, by merely declaring, that no settlement shall be obtained otherwise than by birth; or that the place where an individual is born, shall be held to be the place of his settlement. At present, settlements may be obtained by apprenticeship, service, the occupancy of lands or houses of a certain value, &c.; and the desire to prevent a stranger, coming to reside in a parish, from obtaining a settlement by these means, has led to various practices, productive of much inconvenience, and of endless litigation. But, were the place of one's birth declared to be the place of his settlement, all these inconveniences would be avoided; at the same time that landlords and occupiers would have the strongest motives to exert themselves to check those improvident unions which have led to so much mischief. It is not easy to see what reasonable objection could be made to the proposed change: and we look forward to its favourable consideration by Parliament.

Besides amending the law with respect to settlements, something decisive ought to be done to check the practice of building cottages for paupers. Various plans have been proposed for this purpose. Some have suggested that the proprietor of the ground on which a cottage is built, should be made responsible for its occupiers; and that if they become chargeable, he should be bound to provide for them. Perhaps, however, the object in view may be secured by directly assessing cottages to the poor's rate; making the assessment, in all cases, fall upon the landlord, and not upon the occupier. At present, it often happens that the public economy of a parish, otherwise in a very healthy condition, is vitiated by the proprietor of a few acres, speculating upon turning them to good account, by covering them with cottages, that ultimately become the receptacles of paupers; the support of such paupers falling almost entirely on others, the rate affecting the small patch of land upon which the cottages are built being quite inconsiderable. This is a flagrant abuse; and one, the influence of which is most extensive, and calls loudly for amendment. Nothing, indeed, has done more to mul-

tively the number of paupers than the encouragement that has thus been held out to the improper increase of cottages; and there is nothing, with the exception of the abolition of the allowance system, that would do more to arrest the progress of pauperism, than the enactment of a law that should render such sort of speculations as unprofitable to the speculators, as they are injurious to the public.

The evils arising from the temptations at present held out to the erection of cottages, were forcibly alluded to by Mr Hodges in his evidence already quoted. ‘Perhaps,’ said this very intelligent gentleman, ‘I am taking a liberty in adverting to what I stated the other day; but without an attention to the fact there disclosed, of the prodigious increase of cottages of late years, all other regulations will be nugatory; and I cannot forbear urging again, that this [a plan of emigration] or any similar measure, having for its object the relief of parishes from their over-population, must of necessity become perfectly useless, unless the act of Parliament contain some regulations with regard to the erecting and maintaining of cottages; this may be done in parishes taking the benefit of such act, either by rating the proprietors of them, and not the occupiers,—or perhaps it might be thought advisable even to rate the proprietor of any cottage whose inhabitants might become chargeable, for want of regular employ, to the maintenance of that pauper to the full amount of the rent agreed to be paid to his landlord by the said pauper.’—‘It is notorious,’ said Mr Hodges, in answer to another question, ‘that almost numberless cottages have of late years been built by persons speculating on the parish rates for their rents.’—(*First Emig. Rep. Evid.* p. 185.)

We may remark, by the way, that among a certain class of speculators as to the causes of the late disturbances, much stress has been laid upon the disappearance of small farms, and the conversion of cottagers into mere labourers. But we are satisfied that these circumstances have been as innocent of the disturbances, and of the depressed condition of the labourers, as they are of the Parisian revolution. We have the means, and propose taking an early opportunity of showing, that the labourers of all those counties where the allowance system has not been introduced, are, speaking generally, at this moment in a decidedly better condition than they have ever previously been in. They are better fed—that is, they eat more butcher meat, and use more wheat—better clothed, better lodged, and healthier, than at any former period of our history. And, what is still more conclusive as to the groundlessness of the statements in question, Durham, Northumberland, the Lothians, and all

those counties where farms are largest, are those where the condition of the peasantry is most prosperous. Let us, therefore, hear no more of this senseless cry against large farms and 'gentlemen farmers.' We are ready to admit, and have, indeed, always contended, that the condition of cottagers is materially improved by attaching a moderate-sized garden to their cottages; but no landlord or farmer, who has a just sense of what is either for his own advantage, or for that of his workmen, will suffer them to possess more land. This is the practice of Northumberland and the Lothians, and where else are the peasantry so comfortable?

Next to the helotism occasioned by the abuse of the poor laws, we are inclined to think that the Game-Laws have had the greatest influence in degrading the peasantry, and in spreading irritation amongst them. The southern counties have been peculiarly afflicted with this scourge; and we have been assured, by those who have the best means of knowing, that the oppressions perpetrated for offences against these laws, have been the main cause of the late fires. They have long been rankling in the minds of the peasantry, and the desire to avenge them might, perhaps, have been suppressed for some time longer, but for the excitement caused by the late events on the continent. If we would prevent the recurrence of still darker atrocities, the existing game laws must be totally abolished. It is not easy, indeed, to imagine for what other purpose this detestable code could be so long kept up, except to fill the country with bloodshed and crime. The law prohibiting the sale of game, ought to have been entitled 'A Law for the encouragement of Murder and Robbery.' More than half the rich men of the empire have no land, and no qualification entitling them to kill game; and as the legislature, in its wisdom, would not allow them to be supplied with this luxury in a legitimate way, they were forced to buy it, though at a higher price, from poachers. In vain has statute after statute, and penalty after penalty, been added to this barbarous code. Instead of putting down poaching, they have rendered it universal; and have produced a degree of irritation and disgust, and a yearning after vengeance among the peasantry, that has been and may be turned to the most dangerous purposes.

We therefore hail with infinite satisfaction the bill introduced by Lord Althorpe, for legalizing the sale of game, and for abolishing all those regulations, devised by the Nimrods of former days, as to qualifications. This bill declares that game shall be the property of the individual on whose land it is found;

and that every individual, on taking out a license, costing L.6 a-year, shall be entitled to kill game on his obtaining leave from the proprietors of the lands over which he shoots. Dealers in game are to take out a license. Poachers taken at night with guns, dogs, &c., for the killing of game, are, for the first offence, to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for any period not more than *four* months; for a second offence, the party may be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for *eight* months; and every subsequent offence is to be deemed a misdemeanour, and the party offending may be imprisoned at the discretion of the court, and kept to hard labour for any period not exceeding *two years*.

Should this bill pass into a law, it will confer the greatest benefit upon the public. It is one of the first instances in which an attempt to amend the game-laws has been bottomed on the principles of common sense, and will do much to rid them of their enormities. At the same time, we must say, that the proposed penalties on poaching seem to be a great deal too rigorous. It is all very well for the legislature to declare that animals *feræ naturæ* are property; but mankind will never be brought to believe that the right of property is as much violated by killing a partridge or a hare, which may, by a volition of its own, become the property of twenty individuals in a day, as it is by killing a turkey or a sheep; or that the former offence should be visited with the same penalties as the latter. We, however, agree in opinion with those who consider that the practice of breeding and preserving vast quantities of game in particular places, for the purpose of a *battue*, that is, for enabling the lame and the blind to rival the shooting feats of Mr Osbaldiston and Lord Kennedy, is the principal cause of poaching. We do not say that this is a practice that ought to be directly suppressed by a legislative enactment; but certainly we know of none that is less entitled to protection. This accumulation of game creates an overpowering temptation to poaching; and so long as preserves are multiplied all over the country,—as over-fed pheasants and half-fed cottagers are brought into contact,—so long will the latter prey upon the former. Surely, then, there can be neither hardship nor injustice in laying it down, that those who choose to regale themselves with a luxury of this sort,—who choose to indulge in a sport that tempts their fellowmen to commit what the law has declared to be a crime of no common dye,—should be made to pay smartly for the gratification of their tastes. And we would, therefore, beg to suggest, that all individuals employed, for whatever period, as gamekeepers or as keepers of preserves, whether by night or by day, should be charged with an excise license of at least L.12,

12s. or L.15, 15s. a-year. This would not entirely prevent the formation of preserves, but it would confine the practice within reasonable bounds, and render it infinitely less noxious than at present.

But supposing that the present unemployed labourers were conveyed to the colonies, that the abuses of the poor-laws were corrected, and the game-laws abolished or reconciled to the obvious principles of justice and common sense, still we should not have done enough to secure the public tranquillity. The situation of Great Britain is at present without any parallel in the history of the world, and is pregnant with many difficulties. The very large proportion of our population depending for subsistence on manufactures and commerce, and liable, consequently, to sudden and severe reverses, is one of those circumstances that merits the most anxious attention of statesmen. No one can doubt that it is the bounden duty of government to do every thing that is possible to diminish the chances of commercial distress, by giving freedom to the merchant, and especially by abolishing the existing restrictions on the corn trade—restrictions which multiply the chances of famine at the same time that they injure the agriculturist. But, do what we will, the manufacturing population must always be liable to be thrown out of employment, and deprived of their accustomed means of support, by changes of fashion or policy abroad and at home. Surely, then, it is of the utmost importance that they should be taught to meet such trying vicissitudes, when they do occur, with patient fortitude, and without aggravating the pressure of calamity by any rash proceedings of their own. The outrages of the agriculturists may be repressed and put down with comparatively little difficulty; but were such a spirit to arise among the manufacturers of Lancashire as has recently prevailed in the southern counties, national bankruptcy and ruin would be the result. Let no man think that, if the spirit of discontent and outrage should once insinuate itself into the manufacturing districts, it could be suppressed or kept down by force. So mighty a mass cannot be dragooned and coerced into obedience. If we would prolong that *security* which has been the principal foundation of our prosperity, we must show the labourers that they are interested in its support; and that whatever has any tendency to weaken it, is even more injurious to them than to any other class. For this reason, we are deeply impressed with the conviction that Parliament ought to lose no time in setting about the organization of a really useful system of public education. *The safety*

of the empire depends wholly on the conduct of the multitude ; and such being the case, can any one doubt the paramount importance of the diffusion of sound instruction ?

This is not a subject that ought any longer to be trifled with, or left to individuals or societies. The astounding exhibition of ignorance made at the late trials for rioting, shows how wretchedly the agricultural population is educated. A larger proportion of the manufacturing population can read and write ; but a knowledge of these arts is not enough. Besides being instructed in them, and in the duties and obligations enjoined by religion and morality, the poor ought to be made acquainted with those circumstances which principally determine their condition in life. They ought, above all, to be instructed in the plain and elementary doctrines respecting population and wages ; in the advantages derived from the institution of private property, and the introduction and improvement of machinery ; and in the causes which give rise to that gradation of ranks, and inequality of fortunes, that are as natural to society as heat to fire, and cold to ice. The interests of the poor are identified with the support of all those great principles, the maintenance of which is essential to the welfare of the other classes. And, were they made fully aware that such is the fact, it would be a contradiction and an absurdity to suppose, that the securities for peace and good order would not be immeasurably increased. Those revolutionary and anti-social doctrines, now so copiously distributed, would be rejected at once by an instructed population. But it is not easy to estimate what may be their influence in a period of political excitement and public distress, when addressed to those whose education has been entirely neglected, and whose judgment is, in consequence, guided by prejudice, and not by principle.

We hope that the attention of Parliament and the country will be speedily called to this most important subject. The foundations of real security are beyond and above the law. They depend on the knowledge and morals of the people. Nor can there be a doubt, that rulers who neglect to provide their subjects with the means of procuring cheap and really useful instruction, are justly chargeable with the neglect of a most essential duty.

We have not chosen to encumber this article with any remarks as to the condition of the Irish poor, and their immigration into England. These are subjects that require, and must have, a separate discussion.

ART. III.—1. *A Latin Grammar, for the Use of Westminster School.* London : 1830.

2. *Græcæ Grammaticæ Compendium, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis.* London : 1830.

IT may be remembered by some of our readers, that, in a former number, we attempted to give a brief account of the system of education pursued at the College of Eton, and to explain its principal merits and defects, so as to enable a person unacquainted with that school to form an estimate of the probable advantage which a boy may derive from becoming one of its members. As parents and guardians, in making the important decision on which so much of a boy's future welfare must depend, are naturally guided by a comparison of different establishments, and are compelled to select the *best*, without regard to its *absolute* merits, we have thought that we should perform a useful work in extending our regards to other public schools; among which that of Westminster, by reason of its numbers and antiquity, claims our first attention.

The school of Westminster is governed by a head-master and an under-master, who respectively preside over the upper and under schools, and by five ushers, to each of whom is allotted the care of a particular class or form. The number of boys ordinarily varies from 300 to 350, of whom rather more than two-thirds are in the upper school. This division contains four out of the eight forms into which the school is divided, viz. the sixth, the *shell*, the fifth, and the fourth. The under school likewise contains four forms, viz. the third, the second, the first, and a small class called the *petty*. Every one of these forms is again subdivided into an upper and an under part, the period requisite for passing through each of these parts being half a year.* A year must thus elapse after the first admission of a boy into a form before he can be removed into that immediately above it. Such is the general rule; but to reward singular merit, and to punish great neglect, the customary time is shortened or prolonged at the discretion of the head-master. No boy

* It should, however, be observed, that the third form is divided into four parts, the upper part and under part being again respectively subdivided. So that, according to the regular course, a boy is detained two years in that form.

is allowed to pass from one of these forms to another, without undergoing an examination by the head-master in the upper, or by the under-master in the lower school. This examination takes place once at least in the course of every year. The boys are further divided into two orders, viz. the *Town Boys*, who answer to the *Oppidans* at Eton, and the *King's Scholars*, or those who are admitted on the foundation, and (unlike their corresponding order at Eton) enjoy, in consequence, very considerable advantages. The *King's Scholars* are always forty in number, and they are chosen yearly from all boys, under the age of fifteen, in the upper, fourth, fifth, and shell forms, who wish to become candidates for admission into college. The election being absolutely free, the competitors are numerous; and, after a long public examination, in the course of which the numbers are gradually diminished, the eight or ten boys who remain at the head, become formally elected to supply the vacancies occasioned by the annual elections to the two universities; and they themselves, after a period, varying from four to five years, are, in their turn, appointed either students of Christ Church at Oxford, or scholars of Trinity College, Cambridge. The *Town Boys* lodge in five boarding-houses, in each of which an usher resides, and exercises a personal superintendence; while the *King's Scholars* inhabit a large dormitory, set apart for their exclusive use, and are subject, out of school, to rules and discipline of their own. In comparing the respective plans according to which the boys on the foundation are managed at Eton and Westminster, it cannot be doubted that the scale preponderates greatly in favour of the latter institution. At Eton, boys, generally either on first coming to the school, or while they are in the lower forms, are admitted on the foundation, either as a matter of favour or charity to the parents. Not only are they not selected for their merit from the whole school, but they are commonly inferior in attainments to boys of their own standing. And the change from an oppidan to a collegier, so far from being reckoned an honour and reward, is, at Eton, universally considered as a degradation; so that the collegiers form a caste completely distinct from the rest of the school, and little intercourse or good feeling exists between the two orders. But that which at Eton is a stigma, becomes at Westminster an honour; as an admission into college is made a distinction, and is a path to attaining places on the foundations of Christ Church and Trinity. If this wise plan were adopted at Eton, and the conveniences of the collegiers judiciously increased, there is no reason why King's College at Cambridge should not, under an

improved system, rear its head, and regain a respectable rank among the colleges of its university.*

A considerable number of hours in the week are passed in school at Westminster. Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays are whole school days; the other three week-days are half holydays. On the former days the school hours begin at eight o'clock in winter and seven o'clock in summer, and, with the exception of one hour allowed for breakfast, continue till twelve. The school meets again at two, and continues till five; on half holydays the same order of time is preserved till twelve, when the school breaks up for the day. The boys, therefore, never go into school more than twice a-day, when they remain there for three consecutive hours. They are not, however, occupied during all this time in repeating and construing lessons already learned, but also in preparing for the next day. If there is sufficient time after the lesson is finished, (which is of a variable length,) exercises, such as themes and verses, may be done in school. In construing the appointed lessons, places are taken in all parts of the school beneath the sixth form, and the emulation of the boys is purposely excited by the masters. In both these respects, the system of Westminster differs greatly from that of Eton, where, in the upper school, no places are taken, the masters appearing to consider that this kind of emulation necessarily leads to jealousy and ill-will among the boys; and the school times are shorter and more numerous, and are exclusively occupied in the repetition of lessons learnt out of school.

The only whole holydays at Westminster are the saints' days, and some few other days of solemn ceremony. On these occasions all the boys are required to attend morning service in Westminster Abbey; but in the evening of whole holydays, as well as on all half holydays, the church is not irreverently made to perform the office of a roll-call; although the substitute for compulsory attendance in chapel is not a little extraordinary. All the boys, of whatever age and habits, and whatever may be the weather or season of the year, are confined in their respective dwellings; the Town Boys in their boarding-houses, the King's

* 'The King's Scholars at Westminster' (said Mr Brougham, in presenting a report of the Select Committee on Education) 'were on a similar foundation. The boys might be either of the richer or the poorer classes; but here a vast improvement was introduced into the rule of admission. Boys were placed on the foundation, not from any regard to the circumstances of their parents, but their own respective merits.'—*Parl. Debates*, vol. xxxiv. p. 1234.

Scholars in their dormitory, from the hour of two till five. What may be the advantage of this social imprisonment of three hours in the middle of the day, during which silence and quiet are neither expected nor imposed, we confess that we are unable to discover. The boys are then again allowed to go out till six o'clock in the winter, and half-past eight in the summer, the time increasing in proportion as the weather becomes milder and the nights less dark.

The instruction at Westminster, as at most other public schools, is, for the most part, confined to a study of the chief Latin poets, and of portions of the chief Latin prose writers and Greek poets. The books read in the higher parts of the school are, Virgil, Horace, Terence, Cicero's Orations, or the first Decad of Livy, Homer, and some of the Greek tragedies, particularly the four plays of Euripides, published by Professor Porson. To these must be added, for the sixth form, the three first books of Euclid, the work of Grotius *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, and collections of speeches from the Latin and Greek historians. With the exception of these two collections of *Conciones et Orationes*, no book of extracts is used at Westminster; but the authors are read continuously, a practice which (for reasons which we detailed in a former number) meets with our decided approbation. No Greek prose writer, with the exception of Xenophon, is read in any part of the school.* As far as this limited range of books and subjects extends, the selection appears to have been discreetly and judiciously made; but here our approbation of the system of classical instruction at Westminster must stop. In all parts of the school, from the lowest boy in the lowest form, up to the sixth form, the Latin and Greek grammars are inculcated in every possible shape, and appealed to on every occasion, as the grand test of advanced proficiency, and the supreme object of diligent application. Even in the higher forms, what is called the '*holyday's task*,' consists in learning by heart large portions, not of Homer, or Virgil, or Horace, but of the doggerel Latin verse into which grammatical rules, with their various exceptions or limitations, have been violently tortured; while the unhappy boy, toiling through these wilds of poetical grammar, bewildered, and unconscious of an object, is told, as if in mockery, that

'Visum est grammaticæ metricis *leuire* laborem
Præceptis'

* Parts of his *Anabasis* and *Memorabilia* are occasionally read in the higher forms.

We are firmly convinced, after much consideration on the subject, that the practice of learning grammatical rules by heart, not only is not the only or the best, but is one of the very worst methods of acquiring a language which the wit of man can devise. The declensions of the articles, pronouns, substantives, and adjectives, and the conjugations of the verbs, need alone be committed to memory. All farther labour is, at the best, a mere waste of time, and often is positively mischievous, in exciting a disgust of a language of which the approaches seem beset with such difficulties, and in associating with it the idea of the most irksome drudgery. The truth is, that however boys may be tormented, the grammar must be learnt from the language, not the language from the grammar. The idioms and structure of a language can only be learnt by a comparison of similar usages and expressions; and a reference to a copious grammar, arranged on a scientific plan, and illustrated with numerous examples, such as the Greek grammars of Buttman, Thiersch, and Matthiæ, and the Latin grammar of Zumpt, is of the highest use to a learner. But to refer a boy who meets with the words *do tibi* in a Latin book, to a grammar in which he is told that ‘verbs of giving govern ‘a dative case,’ conveys to him absolutely no information. The rule is proved by the example, not the example by the rule. The enunciation of the general proposition neither demonstrates nor illustrates the particular case. A philosophical grammar affords continually the most valuable assistance to a student somewhat advanced in a language; but a meagre statement of a few simple grammatical facts, without order or method, such as is complementarily called a syntax in the Westminster and Eton grammars, and, above all, when embodied in a barbarous metrical jargon, is useless to most beginners, mischievous to many, and contemptible in the eyes of all proficients.

The Latin and Greek grammars now employed at Westminster, have been recently introduced in the place of those formerly in use. They have, we understand, (with the exception of those parts retained from the old grammars,) been drawn up by the masters of the school, and therefore may be fairly taken as affording an estimate of their opinion as to the best grammars which, in the present state of classical literature, can be prepared for the wants of learners. The first twenty-eight pages of the Latin grammar appear to contain all that a beginner need commit to memory: the syntax, which occupies the next twenty-nine pages, is written in English, and not (like the Eton Latin Syntax) in Latin; it cannot, of course, make any pretensions to completeness or ingenuity; but as far as such a treatise can be useful, it appears to us fitted to attain its end. Then follow

sixty-one pages of Latin hexameter verses, called a *Rudimentum Grammaticæ Latinæ Metricum*, followed by a literal English translation. Near the end of this poem is an explanation of the meaning of a foot and a verse, and a hexameter and a pentameter, after the pupil has been toiling through some pages of rules, forced, by every kind of barbarous contrivance and license, into hexameter verses, for the sake of making them more easy to him! We subjoin, as a specimen of this strange medley, inconvenient for reference, and useless as a *memoria technica*, the last eight lines of 'The Latin Verse Grammar, for the use of the *Lower* Forms in Westminster School.'

‘ Schemata vim verbis addunt : vocat *Ecphonema*,
Pasma rogat ; simili illustratque *Parabola** sensum.
 Rem positam ante oculos digito notat *Hypotyposis* ;
 Quaque *Prosopöpoëia* personam efficit ex re.
Aposiopesis silet ; hæret *Diaphoresis* :
Epimone ingeminans auget ; *Paralipsis* omittit.
 Arguit anticipans *Prölepsis*, *Epitropë* cedit.
 Scite *Oxymoron* secum pugnancia dicit.’

With this choice specimen of a kind of poetry not known to the inventors of the epic, lyric, elegiac, and dramatic styles, viz. the *grammatical* style of poetry, we take our leave of the Latin, and proceed to the Greek grammar. The first part of this work, comprising the rules for the declensions, conjugations, &c., apparently occupies eighty-five pages ; but is, in fact, contained in a smaller compass, as the rules are given in Latin on one page, while the opposite page contains a literal translation of them in English. In some places, however, we observe that the English is fuller than the Latin version. In a report to the States General of the Netherlands, before the late revolution, we can conceive that it would have been highly useful to print the Dutch version on the one side of the leaf, and the French on the other ; but as England is not a *bilingual* nation, we should recommend an immediate and perpetual banishment of the Latin moiety of this Greek grammar. The arrangement of the declensions and conjugations, and of the various rules in this elementary part, is much less simple and intelligible than that adopted in the small grammar compiled by the present Bishop of London, (which is, in every respect, far superior to this new Westminster grammar ;) and there occur, in the new Westminster grammar, several assertions which appear to have been made without

* Numerous false quantities occur throughout this poem, which are pointed out by marking over the syllables their true quantity.

sufficient caution. For instance, we are quite unable to understand what is meant by the following passage :

‘ The etymology [of the Greek language] agrees with the Latin ; except that the Greeks supply the place of the Latin ablative by a dative, or genitive, with or without a preposition ; and add a dual number, a middle voice, a subjunctive mood, distinct in form from the potential, or optative, and a paulopost future, and two aorists, or indefinite tenses.’—P. 4.

In p. 31, we find it stated, that

‘ There seems to be no difference of meaning between the first and second aorist.’

The treatise on the prepositions, in pp. 74—76, (of which there is not any corresponding Latin version,) is founded on completely erroneous principles. It is hopeless to attempt to reduce the multifarious usages of the Greek prepositions to a few simple rules ; for instance, it is not true, generally, that ‘ the particular force implied by the genitive, is *motion*, or *pro-cession from*,’ or that ‘ the particular force implied by the accusative, is *motion to*,’ as is there asserted. The treatise on the particles is likewise too imperfect to be of any use to a learner.* Some rules on the Greek accent, in Latin and English, close the first part.

The rest of the Greek grammar, amounting to sixty-two pages, is filled with extracts from the old metrical ‘ *Grammatica Busbeiana*,’ which contains a variety of rules with regard to anomalous forms omitted in the other grammar ; and concludes with a poetical treatise on Greek syntax, prosody, accent, and dialect, in twenty-eight pages : of this space, the syntax fills no more than eight pages. We shall only trouble our readers with one verse from these effusions of the Busbeian muse, which appears to us to express, with great propriety, a fundamental maxim of the grammatical school of poetry :

‘ Effræni canonem omnem exturbat jure pœsis.’—P. 46.

There is one, and only one, excuse which we can imagine for the maintenance of an antiquated and inaccurate grammar, viz. : that the change from one grammar to another is inconvenient in itself, and unfair towards those boys who have already learnt the old one. We do not indeed consider that this argument has

* It is stated in this section, (p. 77,) that ‘ in a train of reasoning *αγα* expresses a particular *inference*, and *ειν* draws the general *conclusion*.’ This distinction between the two particles cannot be supported. The author of the above paragraph appears, moreover, to suppose that there is a distinction between an *inference* and a *conclusion* ; he seems to think that a conclusion can only come at the *end*.

any real weight, as we cannot admit that grammars are meant to be learnt by heart; and for purposes of reference, an accurate is better than an inaccurate treatise, whatever may be their respective dates. But the managers of Westminster school have not even this defence, poor as it is; for they *have* changed their Greek grammar, and yet the new production deserves the same fate as its predecessor.

All boys in the upper school are required to make, every week, at least twenty Latin hexameter verses on some sacred subject, called the *Bible-exercise*. A theme, or short prose essay, on some trite moral subject, is likewise required, being alternately Latin or English, in succeeding weeks. In the fifth form, this theme is sometimes supplanted by a literal translation of about twenty lines of Homer or Virgil into English prose. In the two highest forms, an additional exercise is imposed, viz. to turn an ode of Horace into Latin elegiac verses, or a stanza of an ode into Greek trimeter iambs, six lines being sufficient. Sometimes, however, this task is commuted into twenty or more Latin elegiac verses on a given subject. The practice of learning by heart, which, when properly regulated, tends both to improve the taste, and strengthen the memory, is at Westminster either neglected, or rendered useless. With the exception of the Greek grammar, an ode of Horace, or twenty lines of Virgil, once a-week, is alone required even from those at the head of the school.

From this account of the studies of a Westminster boy in the higher forms of the school, it will be seen that the *negative* list, or the number of subjects which he does *not* learn, is of very considerable magnitude. Arithmetic, algebra, modern languages, modern history, are wholly excluded. Some feeble attempts are made to communicate a slight knowledge of ancient history; but not to such an extent as to afford afterwards much assistance in the serious prosecution of historical studies. We have purposely omitted all mention of the physical and moral sciences; and we are well aware that an extensive knowledge of ancient and modern history and languages is not to be acquired in a few years. But why are some of these branches *wholly* neglected—why is not an attempt made to teach a few portions at least of modern history, and to give an elementary acquaintance with some modern languages? If, however, even the Greek and Latin languages were really taught to a large portion of the boys by either of the different systems adopted at Eton and Westminster, we should be less inclined to censure the neglect of other branches of learning. But the fact is notoriously the contrary. A considerable portion of the boys who leave those public schools, are unable to read with ease an ordinary Latin book, and still fewer

have even a tolerable acquaintance with the Greek language. In too many cases, when a boy's compulsory education is finished, his Latin and Greek books are thrown aside, as associated in his mind with none but painful recollections. When we remember that the Greeks were not only the inventors and originators of almost every branch of art and literature, but that their language contains the most admirable, and, in many cases, confessedly the finest models of poetry, whether epic, lyric, or dramatic, of the various styles of historical composition, of deliberative and forensic oratory, of philosophical discussion and exposition; we can only account for the general indifference to Greek literature which prevails in this country, where in all the public schools it is one of the principal subjects of instruction, by the imperfect, tedious, and disgusting manner in which it is communicated.

It will likewise be observed, that the subject of composition does not receive at Westminster that attention which it deserves. The practice of compelling boys to compose original essays of a given length on moral subjects, necessarily encourages a habit of diffuse declamation, and of spreading the least possible quantity of thought over the greatest possible surface of words. In the poetical parts there is little more praise to be bestowed; the custom of travestyng the Odes of Horace into Latin elegiac verses, is a most barbarous contrivance, and quite unworthy of the good taste and judgment of the masters of a public school.

The system of rewards and punishments is at Westminster arranged on nearly the same inartificial plan as at Eton. The rewards consist in the distribution of prizes, in the obtaining a higher place in the form in all forms below the two highest, and in the selection of an exercise for its merit by the master. The principal punishments are transcription, and flogging with a rod. When a boy is complained of by the usher, he is immediately flogged in the middle of the school, sometimes on the hand, and sometimes on the naked back. These inflictions are not of unfrequent occurrence.

It is not our intention to repeat, in this place, the arguments which, in a former article, we urged against the use of corporal punishment in the upper forms of a large public school. Our meaning on that occasion has, however, been so strangely misunderstood, that we will take the liberty of shortly explaining the drift of our former reasoning. We asserted that it is an essential attribute of a good punishment, that the pain should increase with the duration of the punishment, or the number of its inflictions. For instance, that solitary confinement is a good punishment, because it is more than twice as painful to

be imprisoned in a solitary dungeon for two days, than to be so imprisoned for one day, and so on. That, on the same principle, corporal punishment at schools, where its efficacy depends not on the pain of the infliction, but on the shame attending it, is a bad punishment, because the first infliction is more severely felt than the second, the second than the third, and so on, till at length in many, and the worst cases, it ceases to operate as a punishment at all. This argument, which we must admit to be very simple and obvious, seems to us expressed with sufficient clearness in the place alluded to. We have, however, been understood as suggesting not only the abolition of corporal punishment at public schools, but also the substitution of solitary confinement in its place. ‘Do we,’ it is asked, ‘take Eton School for the county jail? Do we intend to convert it into a penitentiary? Is the school to be converted into a barred and grated receptacle for delinquency, and are the masters to be turned into prison keepers?’* We can sincerely assure the author or authors (whichever it may be) of these remarks, that we have no such desire or intention; that whenever the defects of the system of punishments adopted at Eton are admitted, it will be time for us to suggest remedies; a consummation to which we can never hope to attain, if our plainest arguments are to be thus misrepresented in order to be refuted.† In like manner we stated that the system of rewards at Eton was defective, inasmuch as ‘the incentive to industry afforded by emulation and competition does not exist; no places are taken, no prizes or distinctions of any sort are conferred, except for Latin verses.’ The fact is as we have stated it; farther, we said nothing. We have, however, been understood by these words to recommend the taking of places in the upper forms of a public school as a stimulus to exertion. We repeat that we merely examined the existing institutions of Eton, without proposing

* *Observations on an article in the Edinburgh Review, entitled Public Schools of England—Eton.*

† It is likewise alleged that we have been guilty of ‘a remarkable error,’ in saying, that ‘there is no sort of punishment at Eton but corporal,’ inasmuch as ‘transcription is much the most common sort.’ We repeat that our statement was strictly correct. The only regular punishment at Eton for ignorance of a lesson, or a breach of the regulations of the school, is flogging. We are aware that by the mercy of the assistant masters, this penalty is frequently commuted for transcription; but this change of the punishment is always considered in the light of a pardon; and we repeat, as a fact not admitting of dispute, that any offence brought in a regular official manner before the headmaster of Eton, is, as a matter of course, visited with flogging.

substitutes ; that we had nothing to do with the cure, but only with the existence of the disease. In this article, however, where we are enquiring into the system of a public school, in which the practice of taking places in the higher forms does exist, we have no hesitation in declaring our opinion, that this mode of exciting emulation is *not* to be approved. We entertain no doubt that a periodical examination of the boys in the books which they have read in school, and an arrangement of them according to their several degrees of merit, would have the effect both of teaching them to combine and retain what they read, and of exciting among them a lively, though not hostile spirit of emulation. What are our reasons for holding this opinion, it would be needless to state, so long as it is maintained that *each one* of all the *many different* systems adopted at the public schools of England is the best possible.

Westminster is one of those public schools in which the practice of *fagging* is still maintained. The three highest forms have the privilege of commanding : the fourth form is in a sort of intermediate, or probationary state, as it neither fags nor is fagged : all boys in the under school are subject to the duty of obeying. In comparing the condition of the fags at Eton and Westminster, it appears that the former have the advantage of being more numerous in proportion to their masters ; for, whereas at Eton, the lower boys outnumber the upper boys, at Westminster the lower boys are scarcely a third part of the whole. At Westminster, however, boys, on their first entrance, are not unfrequently placed in the upper school ; but at Eton it is a rule, for which we know no reason, but which we believe to be universally acted upon, that no boy at his first coming shall be placed in a form where he is not liable to be fagged.

We have heard with pleasure that the system of fagging has at Westminster been lately alleviated, and the number of menial services required of the lower boys considerably lessened. We say with pleasure, for we can see nothing useful or improving in the imposition of menial duties on the sons of persons, who, by their station in life, are not dependent for their livelihood upon bodily labour ; and we abide by our former arguments and our former conviction, notwithstanding the defence which it has lately been attempted to make for the practice of fagging. We are perfectly willing to take the issue which has been offered to us, and to ask ‘ whether in large public schools, on the whole, much ‘ tyranny is not saved by laying down a rule for the subordination of the boys, instead of leaving them to settle the matter ‘ amongst themselves.’ In the first place, it is natural to ask, how a rule which legalizes tyranny can be said to save it ? Boys

are capricious in their wishes and tempers, imperfectly restrained by moral principle and the sense of shame, fond of exercising power, and unscrupulous about the means by which they exercise it. It is therefore certain, that when several hundred boys live together at a large school, the strong will combine against the weak, and compel them, by bodily force, to obey the commands of their superiors in strength. Comparative strength in such cases depends chiefly upon age; and the older boys being most advanced in learning, it may be generally said that the boys in the upper part of the school will attempt to exact obedience from those in the lower part. A lower boy soon finds that if he refuses to submit, he is beaten, and that other strong boys will be unwilling to protect him, both from the natural unwillingness to interfere in the quarrels of others, and from a fear of sanctioning a principle which may be turned against themselves. Still the rule of submission is not fixed, and some bold spirits among the weaker party may attempt to set up a right of resistance. At this point the authorities of the school are supposed to step in, and say to the boys: ‘in order to prevent a recurrence of the unfortunate disputes which have arisen amongst you, we declare that those commands which some of you contend to be harsh and oppressive, are, if properly considered, conducive to your benefit; and that henceforth all boys beneath a certain form shall be bound to obey the orders of all above that form.’ We call this not mitigating oppression, but sanctioning it; not the toleration of a necessary evil, but the deliberate confirmation of an iniquitous and needless tyranny. The practice of fagging does not diminish tyranny—it authorizes and multiplies it. A refusal to obey would equally entail a beating, whether, by the law of the school, the boy is bound to obey or not. Fagging has no tendency to restrain the wanton infliction of pain, to which boys are unhappily so prone. Indeed, so far from believing that fagging has been established at large schools by the masters from a deliberate and well-considered persuasion that it is beneficial to the boys, we doubt not that in most cases they have, either from indolence, or ignorance how to act, tacitly sanctioned a custom which they could not conscientiously approve. We assert that no master in a public school has done his duty, so long as he has not attempted to prevent the weaker from becoming the slaves of the stronger boys, and has failed in the attempt. At Westminster, for example, there is one form in which the boys are neither fagged by those above them, nor fag those below them. If this partial exemption is successfully maintained, if there are some boys who neither order nor obey, why is no endeavour made to extend the same

abstinence further? The tutor of a public school must have formed a low notion of his duties, of the vicarious functions with which he is intrusted, and of the high charge which is devolved upon him, before he can rest satisfied with remaining a patient spectator of the maltreatment, and consequent mental suffering, of his younger pupils. Ought he to be referred for the lessons of a higher morality to the heathen poet of a most corrupt and wicked age? And could he join in the beautiful exclamation

‘ Di majorum umbris tenuem et sine pondere terram,
Spirantesque crocos et in urna perpetuum ver,
Qui præceptorem sancti voluere parentis
Esse loco?’

For the same reason that no parent would permit, still less compel, the younger to become the slaves of their elder brothers, the tutor of a public school ought, as far as in him lies, to protect the weak against the strong; to study the characters of his pupils; to confirm the feeble-hearted; to attempt, by instruction and admonition, to soften the fierce natures of the cruel and tyrannical; and, where advice failed, to curb, by prompt punishment, the bad dispositions of those who still maintained their authority by brute force. It is a fatal mistake, which tutors, often from inadvertence, but sometimes from incapacity and indolence, commit, to imagine that they are merely instruments for the communication of a certain quantity of knowledge. The moral part of education, if not the most important, is not at least to be wholly neglected.

Such, indeed, seems to be the indifference of the masters at Westminster on this point, that by the annual representations of Latin plays, they permit several boys near the head of the school to be thoroughly imbued with the morality, or rather immorality, of Terence. Notwithstanding the conclusive remarks of Dr Whately on this subject, the custom has not (as far as we are aware) been either defended or abandoned: we trust that the masters of the school will see that they have only to choose between these two alternatives. The performance of the play of Terence is preceded and followed by the repetition of a prologue and epilogue, written in Latin hexameters and pentameters. The prologues are sometimes written with great spirit and elegance;* but the epilogues are intended to be com-

* We allude particularly to the prologues on the deaths of General Wolfe and the Princess Charlotte.

posed in a comic and humorous vein, and are filled with Latinized modern words, and various other barbarisms; upon the whole, they bear less resemblance to ancient Roman Latin than any collections of Latin words which it is our good or bad fortune occasionally to read. Indeed, it is clear to us, that they are imitated from no other model than the Latin poetry at the end of the Westminster grammars, complying strictly with its fundamental canon of the violation of all canons, and that they are just such compositions as the founder of the grammatical school of poetry would, in a jocosely and playful mood, have himself thrown off.

The defects of the system of education adopted at Westminster school seem to us rather negative than positive. It is not that boys learn what is mischievous, but that they do not learn what is good. There are, indeed, many positive errors both in the modes of instruction and moral discipline: nevertheless the faults of omission preponderate greatly over those of commission. To estimate the effects of moral discipline at a school is not easy: but the test of intellectual advancement is simple: we need only ask how much knowledge has a youth of seventeen gained by five or six years' residence at Westminster? A little divinity, a little ancient geography, a knowledge of the elements of geometry, a fair knowledge of Latin, an imperfect knowledge of Greek, and a slight smattering of ancient history, and beyond this nothing. With the single exception of religion, of those things which it is most important that he should know, of the history of his own country, of the history of foreign countries, of modern languages, he is wholly ignorant. It is useless to say that these things cannot be taught to boys, when no attempt is made to teach them. At Eton, indeed, a pretence is kept up of teaching mathematics and the modern languages, but nothing more than a pretence, as every one acquainted with that school, and even the author of a late defence of Eton, notwithstanding the parade of assertion which he makes on this point, must well know. It is admitted, that at Eton mathematics and modern languages 'are not made part of the general business of the school.' 'But,' we are told, 'it is only justice to acknowledge that the French language is as well taught by the present master, as it can possibly be taught at any school. The German language is also taught with great skill; though the teacher has not yet been incorporated into the school. And the reviewer seems ignorant that a mathematical master of high respectability has been lately appointed. Unforeseen circumstances have hindered this latter gentleman from doing all the good that could be wished; but it is to be hoped that things may be so arranged in a short

‘time, that any boy *desirous* of studying the elements of mathematical science, *may do so* at Eton as elsewhere.’

We cannot say that, taking this picture in its most favourable light, the prospect of mathematical studies at Eton is very promising. But this account is calculated to deceive a reader not acquainted with the affairs of Eton. From the statement that the teacher of German is *not* incorporated into the school, it would be natural to infer that the teachers of mathematics and the other modern languages *are* incorporated into the school. Now we do not wish to quarrel about words: but it seems to us that this champion of Eton must entertain a very singular notion of the process of *incorporation*. The fact is, that these teachers are in no way connected with the regular business of the school: they have no authority over the boys; nor are they considered as belonging to the institution. They merely receive permission from the head-master to give lessons to the boys in the hours of play. Their powers of instruction are, therefore, very limited, as their pupils learn not in classes, but singly. This necessary limitation of their efforts may be easily illustrated. We will suppose that the teacher of French, for example, contrives to arrange his hours, and procure the attendance of his pupils, so as to give regularly six lessons of an hour each on every week day. Reckoning, therefore, that 600 boys pass forty weeks of the year at Eton, and that they all learn French of the French teacher, each boy will receive between two and three lessons in the year. A boy who remains at Eton five years, would, according to this calculation, receive about twelve lessons, divided from one another by intervals of several months. The same reasoning applies to all the other extra teachers. This, however, is to put the matter in the light most favourable for Eton. The truth is, that a very inconsiderable portion of the boys are pupils of the extra masters, that those few who learn French and mathematics, being neither compelled by the fear of punishment, nor incited by the hope of reward, are very irregular in their attendance; and we are greatly deceived if, although the lessons are given to single boys, the time of the extra masters is fully occupied. The quantity of mathematics and the modern languages taught at Eton is so small, that it may be safely neglected in a general estimate of the amount of knowledge communicated at that school.

We are, moreover, charged with having made, through ignorance or malice, another important omission, to the disparagement of Eton, in our account of the result of the instruction afforded there. It is allowed that our statements are correct as far as relates to the instruction given publicly in school; but it

is stated that we overlooked the private instruction given by the tutors.

‘Private instruction is not given to all boys equally; those that have the greatest quantity being called “private pupils,” on paying an extra price. The boys in the lower parts of the school have their time so much occupied, that they are not commonly private pupils; but of the fifth form I should think the greater proportion, and all boys boarding in tutors’ houses, are private pupils, which alone accounts for more than 200: and so far is it from being true, that no Eton boy reads a Greek play, that there are very few boys advanced in the fifth form who have not read several; and many of them have read a considerable number.’

Now, to this accusation we have two answers. In the first place, we stated distinctly and positively that in our account of the fruits of an Eton education, we confined ourselves to the instruction given *in school*. It can, therefore, avail nothing to accuse us of exaggeration, when it is admitted that our statements are true so far as we professed that they were meant to go. In the next place, being well aware of the system of private instruction in use at Eton, we omitted all mention of it, not because we thought it creditable, but because we thought it discreditable to the masters and the system of that school. As, however, we have been put upon our defence, we shall (which we should not otherwise have done) give our opinion on this subject. It is quite true that all the boys who board in a tutor’s house, and all his other pupils who pay an extra price, receive the benefit of private instruction from him at extra hours. We believe that some of the most valuable and useful knowledge communicated at Eton, is communicated in this manner.* But we cannot reconcile with our notions of strict propriety the taking of an extra fee for teaching out of school, what, under a better system, might be taught in school, when the improvement of the system, by the badness of which the masters profit, mainly depends upon the masters themselves. It must be evident to every one, what abuses such a system, if carried to a wide extent, might lead to. When a man has accepted the office of tutor at a public school, and agreed to a price at which he will receive pupils, he is (in our opinion) bound to devote the whole of his time and energies to their instruction, both intellectual and

* It will be observed that the King’s Scholars, from whom, in their chrysalis state of Fellows of King’s College, the masters of Eton are almost universally selected, cannot, according to the rules of the school, be private pupils, and consequently are debarred from some of the most valuable instruction to be obtained at Eton.

moral, as well in as out of school. We cannot admit that a distinction ought to be made between profitable and unprofitable pupils. But considered in another light, this method of private instruction conveys the strongest censure on the general system of the school. If the public instruction is so conducted, as not only to leave ample time for private instruction by the public tutors, but to allow that instruction to be the most valuable of the two, how cannot the former be capable of amendment? The merits of a school are to be judged by the amount of advancement, intellectual and moral, which its system has a tendency to produce in the majority of boys educated at it. It is no defence of Eton or Westminster to say, that out of school, a boy, desirous of learning history and mathematics, may learn history and mathematics: the question is, will he be taught this knowledge in school, according to the school system, and by the regular masters? The goodness of a school is not a mere matter of locality: whether a boy teaches himself in his tutor's or in his father's house, is, as far as the merits of the school are concerned, absolutely indifferent. It is not a physical impossibility that a man, shipwrecked on an uninhabited island, might, by his unassisted genius, make important discoveries in mathematical science. But no one would say, that to expose a man without books on a bare rock would have that tendency. It is quite conceivable that a boy, educated at Eton or Westminster, might, on leaving school, have an accurate and extensive knowledge of the mathematical, physical, and moral sciences, of ancient and modern history, and of modern languages. We can only say, that such a person would have great reason to rejoice at the happy issue of his 'voluntary and unassisted researches,' and that he would deserve an honourable place in a future number of the work on the *Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties*.

There is only one more point which we shall mention before we close this article. It is not indeed of much importance: but as our honesty and veracity have been impugned, it is necessary that we should rebut the charge.

· In speaking of the books used at Eton, the Reviewer touches more especially upon the annotations which have been lately added by one Dr Niblock, to the *Scriptores Graeci*. These notes are, without doubt, as utterly worthless as any that have been produced in this most note-loving age; but when the government of the school is made responsible for them, it is right that their real history should be known. The bookseller appointed by the head-master to print the school books, took upon himself to engage, or permit, this Dr Niblock to write these notes; and not only was this done without the knowledge of the head-master, but as soon as it came to his ears, met with his severest reprobation. From the fact of the Review calling Mr Niblock

“the new editor,” one would imagine that his name must actually appear in the titlepage of the *Scriptores Græci*. *If such a titlepage does exist anywhere, and I suppose it must, as one to this effect is given in the catalogue of Eton books at the head of the review, at all events it has never been seen at Eton. And we cannot help thinking that the observations of the Reviewer, reflecting, as they do, so much discredit on Eton College, should not have been made without a more careful examination of the circumstances.*’

Now, as this anonymous defender of Eton is pleased to insinuate, that for the sake of maligning an English public school, we have been guilty of fabricating a titlepage, we think it right to say that the charge is false: we assert that the titlepage exists—that the book exists—and that both book and titlepage are in our corporal possession. We procured the new edition of the *Scriptores Græci*, by Mr Niblock, from the regular Eton bookseller, as the latest at the time when our article was written. It bears the name of Mr Niblock on the titlepage, and contains a short advertisement, written in bad Latin, signed by Mr Niblock, in which he informs the reader what ‘he has done in *this new edition*,’ and states that in *‘editing this book, he has done his best to make it accurate.’** We maintain that this was ample authority for our considering this new edition of the Eton *Scriptores Græci*, by Mr Niblock, as published with the sanction of the masters of Eton, and used at that school. The *prima facie* evidence was strong enough to justify us: indeed we are not aware that the most suspicious person would have perceived any ground for doubt. Neither, therefore, were we bound to ‘make a more careful examination of the circumstances,’ before the appearance of our article, nor have we made any since. The management of the Eton school books must indeed be lax, if the Eton bookseller could even conceive himself authorized to engage a person to make a new edition of one of the most important of them, without any previous communication with the head-master. We are, however, perfectly willing that the Eton masters should disown Mr Niblock’s edition of the *Scriptores Græci*; only they must bear in mind that their disavowal should be as public as the book, and properly authenticated: the declaration of an

* As it is not long, we subjoin this *monitum*. ‘*Quæ hac in nova editione præstitimus, te, lector candide, nos oportet præmonere. Errata, mendaque typographica, quotquot deprehendere contigit, correximus: Scriptorum locos citatos plerumque scrutati sumus: Notulasque multas, ab litera N distinctas, passim adjecimus. In libro hoc edendo, fecimus quod in nobis fuit, ut in lucem accuratissimus prodeat. Vale, L. B. et fruere. J. W. Niblock.*’

anonymous pamphleteer is of no weight against the authority of the published titlepage with the regular marks of the Eton school books. As the case stands, judgment must go against them. But their defender is much mistaken if he thinks that the detraction of Mr Niblock's notes will leave the Eton *Scriptores Græci* in a state creditable to the managers of any public school. We will take this collection in any form in which the masters of Eton will present it to us, and will undertake to prove, that the extracts are ill chosen, and inaccurately printed from antiquated editions; and that the notes of Mr Niblock were selected by us, not because they were the most worthless, but because they were the most recent. There is but one remedy for the Latin and Greek grammars of Eton and Westminster, and for the Eton collections of extracts. They are only *una litura corrigendi*.

ART. IV.—*Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe, in den Jahren, 1794 bis 1805.* (*Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe, from 1794 to 1805.*) 6 vols. 8vo. Stuttgart und Tübingen. 1829.

IT is so difficult a matter, in general, to get at the truth with regard to literary men, and particularly those who have long occupied a prominent position in the eyes of the public, that any authentic contributions to the history of their minds must be received with satisfaction, though mingled with much that is but of trifling or doubtful interest. Biographies written by third parties, must always be but unsatisfactory. The outward actions may be described; though, even as to these, the picture must often be distorted by erroneous or defective information, or discoloured by the peculiar feelings, opinions, and prejudices of the biographer; but the inward man himself, his moral and intellectual organization, can be but feebly, if at all, indicated to our view. Autobiographies, again, though not liable to these objections, are, in general, but apologies for the particular views or conduct of the writer. They may be undertaken in the spirit of sincerity; Truth may at first hold the pen; but, somehow or other, Vanity soon contrives to wrest it out of her hand, and to write down whatever Self-love, sitting concealed behind, is pleased to dictate. But this objection does not apply to familiar letters, written with no eye to publication, in which, though the writer is truly painting his own character, he does it unconsciously; and where the scattered strokes which he has traced first assume significance and meaning, when they are all

collected and combined—perhaps after death has for ever put a stop to the chance of their being retouched or altered by the hand by which they were originally drawn.

Such, we think, will be found to be the case with the Letters of Schiller and Goethe. Many of them, it is true, might have been omitted entirely, with advantage to the interest of the collection; others are full of details, which, if interesting at all, can only be so from the character of the men to whom they relate. Commissions for the purchase of carpets—presents of biscuit—dissertations on fine paper copies, and coarse paper copies—and covers for periodicals, ‘white, black, and grey, with all their trumpery’—thoughts on colds and meazles, rheumatism, and the other ills which poor Schiller, in particular, was heir to—these, and many other such matters of no special moment, must be put up with, because the very homeliness and familiarity of these details are our guarantee for the confidential sincerity of the rest. But with these are intermingled acute and profound observations on literature and life—free and eloquent speculation on philosophical opinions—many lights as to the origin and progress of their respective literary enterprises—their habits of study and composition—their hopes and fears as to the great and stormy events, the moral and political revolutions which were passing around them—their views, on some points, harmonizing,—in others, standing opposed to each other; in strong contrast, both in their substance and in the manner in which they are advocated and illustrated. Schiller writes with the earnestness, the logical sequence, and amplitude of one who arrives at his conclusions by patient progressive investigation. He cannot discuss his subject in a sentence, or content himself with a hint or shadow of his meaning. Goethe, on the contrary, leaps lightly from one point of his argument to another, and reaches his mark with rapidity; more comprehensive in his views, more diffusive in his sympathies, he has more subjects that interest him, and less time to bestow on any one in particular; more tempered in his feelings, he is often calm and composed where his friend was all fire and vehemence. The one writes with a stoical energy, the other with an almost epicurean tranquillity.

We have said *almost*, for it would be injustice to Goethe to assimilate him even to the best of that sect to which we have alluded. At the time when he was first brought into contact with Schiller, his opinions, literary and moral, might be considered as pretty completely formed; some modification may since have been made, but the grand outlines continue the same. Already the fabric of his mind displayed that singular symmetry

and harmony of parts, which, as when we look at St Peter's, makes us for a moment forget its vastness. The colossal and conflicting masses which had at first seemed to lie about, without connexion, had all, by culture and discipline, been built up, and fused together with a compactness and felicity of adjustment, of which literary history scarcely affords a parallel: noiselessly and rapidly it had risen, almost like an exhalation, and already stood proudly eminent amidst the edifices which surrounded it.

But though the progress of Goethe's intellectual fabric had scarcely been marked, the change had indeed been almost a total one. Like most profound thinkers, he had had his share of the doubts, the gloomy despairing feelings, the thoughts that for a time wander through eternity, only to be driven back again to the realities of life, and of the despondency which the prospect of the world, with its many mysteries and contradictions, must excite in every mind which does not repose in confidence upon revealed religion, and the solution which it affords, or promises, of the perplexities of existence. The ideas thus fermenting in his mind, were brought to a height by the sudden death of his friend, Jerusalem: like water long on the point of freezing, they sprang into solidity by a touch, and *Werther* was the result; and all Germany was for a time overrun with insane pictures of sceptical gloom, and new editions of the 'Miseries of Human Life.'

But in healthy and vigorous minds, this state of feeling, though perhaps, like some of those disorders to which our bodily frame is subjected, it may even be useful in the ultimate formation of the constitution, cannot last long. The path which at first led us into darkness, if steadily pursued, guides us back again to the day. We soon come to perceive, that if life has many evils, it has also many comforts; that it is better to bear, and, where we can, to alleviate those evils, than to whine over them; nay, that in activity, moral and intellectual, a remedy may be found for many of those which appeared most formidable; that if joy be transient, misery is not immortal; if crime and selfishness too often sadden our hopes, some trait of self-devotion, some emanation of that benevolence which makes the whole world akin, ever and anon occurs to revive our confidence, and to remind us that man is not entirely of the earth, earthy.

These considerations are forced upon us by our intercourse with our fellow-men; nor was it possible that they could long escape the observation of Goethe, in whom the reflective powers were as conspicuously developed from the first, as his imaginative faculties, and in whom good health, and natural cheerful-

ness, were combined. Accordingly, the very utterance of his complaints through the mouth of Werther, seemed to have allayed his disorder; he had raved himself to rest; and while his countrymen were still enveloped in the tempest he had raised, and tossing in their cockboats on a sea of doubt, with the thick shadow of night overhead, he, the author of the storm, had worked his way through, and was looking quietly back upon the vexed ocean, with the firm ground of reason beneath his feet, and the guiding lights of Hope and Faith appearing to him again through a thousand openings in that still troubled but fast clearing sky.

It is not often that men escape thus unhurt from these moral storms. They generally leave some part of their stores behind them in their retreat. A man like Voltaire, for instance, attains tranquillity, or an appearance of tranquillity, by banishing passion, and extracting from the enigma of human life, nothing but materials for wit and sarcasm. His sympathy with the great and good, he throws behind him for ever, as a useless incumbrance. The man whose better feelings, and stronger faith, protect him from this unsatisfactory and hollow resource, too often forgets the practical in the visionary, and, absorbing himself in cloudy reveries, loses his sympathy with human life as it is, with its real interests and duties, and, of course, loses his hold on the feelings and sympathies of his fellow-men. But Goethe emerges from the limbo of doubt, without bating a jot or scruple of his varied gifts. He does not throw his wit overboard, in order to save his pathos; nor make shipwreck of his feeling, nor attempt to lighten his bark by getting rid of the heavy ballast of philosophy. Quietly and steadily he steers through all; he only keeps a firmer hold of the helm, and restores the equilibrium of his vessel, by balancing his antagonist forces against each other. He lands his whole freight in safety, and forthwith rebuilds his intellectual home from those varied stores, laying its foundations deep in the spirit of reverence, cementing its broad and massive front by the bands of reason, and gilding its airy and glittering pinnacles with the sunshine of wit and graceful humour. It is the Holy Alliance of the head and heart, in which neither compromises its independence, but each supports, and relieves, and elevates the other.

A change in a man's speculative views soon gives a corresponding tone to his writings, unless he be a mere imitator, who only reproduces the ideas of others, instead of drawing from his own stores of intellect and feeling. As society and nature present themselves to our view, so they are reflected back;—harmonious and consistent, from the well-regulated mind,—faint

and wavering, from the vacillating,—perplexed and perplexing, from the disordered. The cheerful heart paints the world as it finds it, like a sunny landscape; the morbid mind depicts it like a sterile wilderness, palled with thick vapours, and dark as the valley of the shadow of death. It is the mirror, in short, on which it is caught, which lends to the face of nature the aspect of its own turbulence or tranquillity.

The softened spirit and calm extension of view which had opened upon Goethe's mind, could not fail shortly to manifest its influence in his theories of art and composition. The clamorous energy of Werther, his vain struggles against the rules of society, his angry questioning with his fate, no longer suit with his more tempered views; nay, at these stormy ejaculations he is now almost tempted to smile, if he can be moved to smile at any thing. Even a rude sketch of the reality of chivalrous life, like Goetz, now appears to him exaggerated—not perhaps exaggerated or untrue in itself, but unsuited to the purposes of art, which seeks to paint life as a whole,—not in fragments, but in its spirit and essence, and therefore is not satisfied with the partial and local, but aspires after general or universal truth. We may take a single captive with Sterne, shut him up in his dungeon, and 'send our hearers weeping to their beds' with the stern and iron truth of the picture; but then it is not a true picture of life as a whole,—of that life whose joy and sorrow, crime and virtue, meanness and magnificence, jostle each other, and which, in its enlarged significance and moral meaning, can only be indicated by a work the spirit of which is varied, and tempered, and comprehensive as its own. Hence in these productions which characterise the second era of Goethe's apprenticeship, the first thing that strikes us, (and at first unquestionably with rather a disappointing feeling,) is the absence of all scenes of strong passion;—when our feelings, sympathizing with the tale, are yielding themselves to his spell, he suddenly, and with apparent caprice, leaves the point, and shoots off into some devious alley, into which we follow him at first with reluctance, till, without knowing how, we feel ourselves again absorbed in the new prospects to which he has introduced us. But this is, after all, no capricious diversion, but the practical exposition of that principle, which, considering every great literary composition as in itself a microcosm, thus endeavours to imitate the ever shifting variety of life, and, passing with a light touch over all the chords of feeling, tries to emulate its harmony, and to leave on the mind that resignation and tranquillity which arises from the comprehensive view of the present condition and future destiny of man. Thus, tranquillity is the grand feature of Goethe's matured

works ; passion is always presented to us in its wane, rather than in its crisis ; nothing engrosses, nothing overpowers : his sunshines, dimmed with a gentle haze, and fading away into transparent shade, come mellowed and refreshing upon the eye ;— while, stealing in upon the darkest spots in the bosom of night, we can trace the glimmering light and ‘ golden exhalations of ‘ the dawn.’

Schiller presents himself in some points in strong contrast to his friend. Many things had concurred to retard in him the growth of this moral serenity, or, as it might appear to many, indifference ;—to confine his sympathies to a narrower channel, and permanently to incline the balance of his mind towards solemnity and earnestness. He had suffered much from poverty, something also from political persecution ; while illness, adding the evil of physical pain to other sources of discomfort, saddened, though it could not suppress, his activity of mind. Agitated, like Goethe, at an early stage of his history, with the same restless and gloomy spirit of enquiry and discontent with the world around him, he had given vent to his complaints and his doubts with the same exaggeration, in his *Robbers* and his *Letters of Julius and Raphael*. From this comfortless condition he too had emerged, but not with the same integrity of all his faculties, or with all his wealth so unharmed about him. Some portions of it are damaged ; his sympathy with the lighter spirit of life is damped for ever ; nor will those stores which he has saved cohere with the same compactness and cordial union as in the case of Goethe. Goethe, with the world smiling about him, with renewed health and constant activity, is open to all its influences, and, without leaving the field of reality, can oppose its light and ludicrous combinations as a counterpoise to its griefs and evils. But Schiller, to whom these views present themselves more rarely, and sicklied over with the cast of his own melancholy, must draw his topics of consolation, not so much from the actual as the future, by letting loose his imagination upon the ideal, and by exalting, spiritualizing, and deepening, the emotions with which in real life we are familiar. But, ever and anon, the spirit of deep reflection, the old Adam of metaphysical enquiry which had spoken in the mouth of Charles and Julius, comes over him ; and the airy creations of the fancy, arrested in mid air, and suddenly subjected to a strict analysis beneath the cold grey light of philosophy, fade away into unsubstantial things. Instead of cordially uniting, the reason and the imagination, like Varro and Æmilius in the campaign against Hannibal, take the command on alternate days, and divided counsels, and inconsistent and wavering execution, are too often the natural result. When he

writes history, the poet is but too visible; when he writes poetry, the dramatist is often lost in the political or ethical philosopher. Shut out too, as it were, by the effects of illness, from any sympathy with gaiety, he had also applied himself with less diligence to the acquisition of general knowledge, and his thoughts moved in a narrower tract. None knew all this better than Schiller himself, nor better appreciated the extent of that gulf which divided his views on these subjects from those of his friend.

‘Do not expect in me,’ says he, in one of his first letters, (August, 1794,) ‘any very great actual wealth of ideas,—for this I must look to you. My need and endeavour is, to make much out of little; and when you are better acquainted with my poverty in all which is called acquired knowledge, you will probably think that I have on the whole succeeded in doing so pretty well. From the smallness of my circle of ideas, I move over it the quicker and the oftener, make a better use of my little means, and attain in the form that multiplicity and variety which is wanting in the subject. You labour to simplify your mighty world of ideas; I seek variety for my little possessions. You have to govern a whole kingdom; I, only a tolerably respectable family of ideas, which I would gladly increase and multiply to a little world. Your mind works by intuition to an extraordinary degree, and all your thinking powers appear to have chosen the imagination as their common representative. In truth, this is the highest that man can attain, as soon as he has succeeded in generalizing his views and making his sentiments legislative. This has been your aim, and how completely have you succeeded! My understanding works far more by symbols, and thus I float, like a hermaphrodite, between conception and perception, between rule and sentiment, technicality and genius. This it is which, particularly in my earlier years, gave me so awkward an air, both in the field of speculation and poetry; for poetry took me by surprise when I should have philosophized, and philosophy when I should have been poetical. And even now it happens often enough, that imagination destroys my abstractions, and cold understanding, my verse. Oh! if I could only become so far master of both powers that I could with freedom assign bounds to each, my lot would be enviable; but, alas! now when I first begin to know and to use my moral strength, disease threatens to undermine my physical powers.’

Though Schiller speaks thus disparagingly of his own genius, compared with that of his rival, in whom he seemed to consider all the mental powers as blended in the most desirable proportions, and with the most intimate union, it is not difficult to see that his own views, as embodied in his works, were likely to be at least as popular as the more refined and subtle views of Goethe. Both are idealists; but the ideal of the one consists in repose arising from variety and quick succession of emotions, none of which are allowed to become predominant or lasting;

that of the other, in the entire banishment or sequestration of some classes of ideas, and the refining or rendering more intense those which remain to be developed. We are not here to enter upon the question as to the comparative truth of these views, (that would be a matter by no means to be discussed in a few pages;) but it is obvious that the latter is the one most likely to be understood and appreciated by the great class to whom poetry must be directed. The first, it requires an effort to understand and to sympathize with; we must seek in it an esoteric purpose beyond the mere interest arising from the events delineated; and, after all, it cannot be denied, that the effect is as often shadowy and theatrical as profound, and that the whole hangs too much in the same metaphorical atmosphere as the types and figures of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Accordingly, such was very much the feeling with which Goethe's '*Pilgrimage*,' his *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, was received; and even now we suspect that, by the mass of readers, it is praised more because it bears the name of Goethe, than from any great sympathy with the views upon which it appears to be constructed.

Schiller's actual views of composition, whatever might be his admiration for Goethe's theoretically, were far more popular. He who ran might read them. They were only a transcript of the emotions, feelings, and passions of life—somewhat purified and exalted, and heightened a little with the colours of poetry, but clothed in no masquerade garb, nor shorn of any of their force, nor exhibited in any elaborate sequence and contrast to suit some particular view;—a section, in short, from life, instead of a philosophical epitome of its leading features. He moved the mind, and strong emotion is always pleasure; he appealed to the best sympathies of our nature, and his energetic appeal is rarely unanswered; and if, in one sense, less wisdom is embodied in them, if his lessons are less adapted to all circumstances, it can hardly be denied that they are given with more energy and distinctness. Even the comparative limitation of the subjects with which he was conversant, was in one sense favourable to his purpose; for Goethe seems too often to start from his subject, to hover for a time over some of the collateral topics in all of which his mind was interested, while Schiller moves straight forward, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, and, though embarrassed a little by the Kantian trappings which he wore for a time, gaining his mark at last with unerring certainty.

Such were, in some of their leading features, the two men who, from 1794, down to the death of Schiller in 1805, con-

tinued almost in daily correspondence, as to their literary enterprises, and the culture of their minds. At this time Schiller held the Chair of History at Jena, though the state of his health, in 1793, had prevented his delivering his lectures as usual, or following out that grand outline of a historical course, which he had sketched in one of his essays. A pulmonary complaint left him but few intervals perfectly free from pain, and this tendency was increased by his habits of study, which were prolonged far into the night. Goethe was living at Weimar at the court of the Duke, and holding an official situation in the government. Wars and rumours of wars then pervaded the continent. The tragedies of the French Revolution, and the threatened advance of their armies into Germany, filled all minds with anarchy. 'We were almost afraid,' says Goethe, 'to rejoice at the fate of Robespierre, lest a worse should arise in his room.' Families in the neighbourhood of the Rhine quitted their residences, and moved farther north. Valuables of all kinds were confided to the care of friends; Goethe had as much as would have filled a warehouse committed to him. All, in short, was restlessness, and uncertainty, and doubt; and this spirit pervaded literature as well as other things. An irreligious tendency and utilitarianism in philosophy, shallowness in criticism, a spirit of ridicule connected with all lofty feelings, were the characteristics of the times, and had been too much sanctioned even by the high talent of the reigning monarch of periodical criticism, Wieland. To arrest this spirit, to form the public mind to better things, and to supersede these principles of philosophy and criticism, Schiller projected a monthly periodical, 'Die Horen,' (The Hours,) and endeavoured to draw round him a cycle of literary Paladins, equal to a task so arduous. To secure Goethe was, of course, one of the first objects. They had been introduced to each other some years before, but no intimacy then took place betwixt them; they had turned, as it were, their repelling poles to each other. But now, with his literary project so much at heart, Schiller wrote with earnestness; and Goethe, in a spirit of great candour and kindness, promised and gave his cordial support to the undertaking. He writes to Schiller, 4th September, 1794, as follows:

'I have a proposal to make to you. Next week the court goes to Eiscenach, and I shall be more alone and independent than I am likely to be again for some time. Could you not come and visit me? and stay with me during that time? You may pursue your labours as you will. We shall talk together when our hours suit, see such friends as most resemble ourselves, and part not without advantage. You shall live in your own way, and make yourself quite at home.'

Schiller's answer gives rather a gloomy picture of his condition at the time.

' I accept your kind invitation with pleasure, but earnestly beg that you will not let your domestic arrangements depend on me ; for, alas ! the pain I feel obliges me, in general, to devote the whole morning to sleep, as it gives me no rest at night ; nor can I even count upon an hour as certain during the day. You will look upon me, then, in your house, as one to whom no attention is to be paid ; and, by allowing me to shut myself up as I please, prevent any other person's time or comfort from being dependent on mine. Order, which is so useful to other men, is my deadliest foe ; for I have only to be aware that I must do something good within a given time, and I feel myself at once quite incapable of doing it.

' Excuse these preliminaries, they are really necessary to make my existence possible with you. I only beg the melancholy privilege of being an invalid at your house.'

Great part of the first volume, and, indeed, too much of the succeeding, are, accordingly, occupied with preparations for this periodical, and communications in regard to it. We cannot now, perhaps, enter with much interest into all these little minutæ in the mysteries of editing, and, indeed, as true disciples of the ' bona dea' of reviewing, should hardly think ourselves justified in revealing them to the eye of day. But, in its generation, the *Horen* made a prodigious noise, partly owing, no doubt, to the great names which were associated in it as contributors ; partly also to a less creditable source of interest, namely, that arising from its persevering system of literary sarcasm directed against the popular authors of the day. Great men and varied talents, it must be admitted, were combined in its support ; but it was more doubtful whether, with the exception of Goethe and Schiller, they were the men best adapted to address themselves to the popular mind. Even Schiller was a little too apt to play the moralist at unseasonable times, and also to propound his critical theories of ' The Elevated,' ' The Naive ' and ' Sentimental,' and so on, in the language of Kaut's philosophy, which was, to the many, foolishness, or worse. Goethe, on the other hand, with his every-day book of pleasing elegies, and poetical epistles, his memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini, and such like, relieved the somewhat stilted character of Schiller's essays, the subtlety of Jacobi and Fichte, and the eloquent, but often cloudy, theories of William Schlegel ; and like

' The gently warbling wind, low answered to all.'

Jacobi's ideas were, in fact, far too remote from common apprehension ever to be very influential. The defects of Fichte and the Schlegels, are noticed by Schiller himself. ' Frederick Jacobi

‘ is to be a contributor. He interests me much as an individual, though I must confess that I cannot bring myself to assimilate with his productions.’ Of Fichte and his philosophy he speaks thus, after a defence of his own Kantian creed, the permanency of which he has been maintaining :—‘ With the philosophy of our friend Fichte, the case will be otherwise. Strong opponents are already rising up in his own neighbourhood, who do not hesitate to say, that it all terminates in a subjective Spinozism. He has got an old college friend, one Weissshuhn, sent hither, apparently, with the view of preaching his doctrine. This person, however, as I hear, who has a good philosophical head, thinks he has discovered a hole in the system, and is going to write against him. According to some verbal communications of Fichte, for he had not yet come to the point in his book, the “ Ego” is the creator of his own images, and all reality is in the Ego himself. The world is but a ball which the Ego has thrown up, and catches again by reflection.’ Of the Schlegels he writes thus at a later period (1798) to Goethe :—‘ A certain earnestness and deep penetration into things, I cannot deny to both the Schlegels, particularly the younger. But this virtue is so mingled with egotistical and contradictory ingredients, that it loses much of its use and value. I must confess, too, that, in the criticisms of both, I find such a dreariness, such a dryness and mass of words, that I am often in doubt, whether any thing really lies beneath them. The poetical labours of the elder, confirm me in this suspicion ; for it is to me absolutely inconceivable, how the same individual, who seems truly to comprehend your genius, and to feel, for instance, the beauty of your Hermann and Dorothea, can ever bear, and far less like, the antipodical nature, the dreary and heartless coldness, of his own.’ Another matter, however, which at the time gave a particular notoriety to the *Horen*, was the series of epigrams, amounting to a thousand, called the *Xenien*, the joint production of Schiller and Goethe, directed against their literary enemies, and exposing their weak points with some wit, some coarseness, and, let us add, with an occasional spirit of rancour, which seems unworthy of Schiller’s elevation of sentiment, and altogether inexplicable in the tranquil and self-balanced Goethe. The natural result of these somewhat gratuitous attacks was, that although some, like Wieland, only revenged themselves as literary men ought, by urbanity, most of the smaller men that were assailed,—Nicolai and the set of the Nicolaitanes, for instance,—retorted upon these literary Ishmaelites, in articles of all kinds, critical, sarcastic, poetical, or merely abusive, according to the powers or turn of mind of the

individual; and with as great a superiority, in point of coarseness, as a deficiency in point of wit. Thus an unseemly feud was prolonged through all the numbers of the *Horen*, till the work was finally dropped in 1799.

But, besides this periodical, which certainly forms the main subject of the letters during the years 1794, 1795, and 1796, other literary enterprises, on which the writers were respectively engaged, are occasionally alluded to, or criticised. *Faust*, begun during the earlier and more unsettled period of Goethe's views, and long laid aside, had been about this time resumed, and by slow degrees was forming itself into shape,—if that name can be given to the mutilated and Torso-like form, in which as yet it lies before us. Schiller, who had seen some of the scenes, and who had been deeply struck with the effect of these Titanian fragments, urges him strenuously in his letters to persevere; but Goethe seems to have felt the task a very troublesome one; and while he is labouring hard at botany and mineralogy, and dissecting butterflies, writing romances and translations, getting up dramas and operas for the Weimar stage—not to mention his duties as Prime Minister—shuffles off the completion of that strange drama as long as possible. 'My ideas on the subject,' says he, in the conclusion of one of his letters to Schiller, 'are like powders which have precipitated themselves in water; after you have shaken them a little, they seem to be uniting, but the moment you let them alone, down they go to the bottom.' Still, however, the work proceeded, and had made some progress, when Schiller writes again, June, 1797: 'Your resolution to proceed with *Faust* really delights and surprises me, particularly when you are preparing for a journey to Italy. But I have long ago given up the idea of measuring you by the common rules of logic, and have no doubt that your genius will extricate you triumphantly out of all. Your request, that I should communicate to you my expectations and desires, is not easily fulfilled. But this much I may remark here, that *Faust*, (I mean the piece,) notwithstanding its poetical individuality, cannot divest itself of a certain symbolical air and meaning, as was probably your idea. The attempt to illustrate the double nature of man, and the hopeless contest between the godlike and the physical in his constitution, is always kept in view; and, although the fable diverges into the formless and the terrible, we do not rest satisfied with the mere subject before us, but are guided to it by deeper ideas. One great difficulty which I foresee, seems to me this, that, in order fully to unfold your idea, a mass of materials will be required, which, I fear, no poetical band will embrace. For

‘ instance, Faust should, according to my idea, be conducted into actual life; and whatever subject you may select for that, still seems to me, in its nature, to require too great length and breadth. In as far as regards the manner of treatment, I think you have successfully overcome the main difficulty, between the serious and comic. It is a subject on which the intellect and the feelings fight, as it were, for life and death. In its present fragmentary form, this is much felt in Faust; but we suspend our expectations till the whole is unfolded. The Devil seems in the right before the tribunal of the understanding, and Faust before that of the heart. Another difficulty I have is, that the Devil, by the realism of his character, seems to destroy his own existence, which is ideal. The mind can conceive him only as he is presented in action before it.’ Goethe expresses his pleasure at the encouragement afforded to him by Schiller: ‘ Your remarks on Faust were very encouraging to me; they fall in, as might have been expected, very naturally with my plans and projects, save that, I must confess, I begin to take this barbarous composition more easily, and rather intend to touch upon than to exhaust all its demands:—so that the feelings and the heart, after pommelling each other all day like two cudgel players, shall lie down quietly beside each other in the evening.’

With *Wilhelm Meister*, however, which had long been maturing in his mind, he proceeded rapidly. Of this singular novel we have already spoken. With great talent in parts, with much eloquence, much profound observation and acute criticism, and some pathos, its airy, theatrical, unreal look, must always render it a stumbling-block in this country, as indeed it did in Germany on its first appearance. Goethe had already attained too high a position in literature to allow the critical flock to laugh at this tedious and planless novel, as Mr Taylor of Norwich boldly terms it, but they felt completely puzzled, and wist not what to do;—standing stock-still, like Dante’s sheep, till some adventurous belwether should take the lead.

‘ Come le pecorelle escon dal chiuso,
A una, a due, a tre; e l’altre stanno,
Timidette, atterrando l’occhio e l’muso—
E cio che fa la prima e l’altre fanno.’

Accordingly, as soon as William Schlegel, by his ingenious, but, as it appears to us, not a little sophistical, criticism in the *Karakteristiken*, had given the key-note, all voices were uplifted in its praise. Schiller, who had seen the work in its progress, had already committed himself by a favourable opinion. He writes, (7th January, 1795,) ‘ I return you my best thanks for

‘ the copy of your romance, (the two first books,) I cannot better
 ‘ express the feeling I experienced on reading it, and in an in-
 ‘ creasing degree as I proceeded, than by a sweet and internal
 ‘ sensation of comfort, and feeling both of bodily and mental
 ‘ health; and such, I am sure, will be its impression on the mass
 ‘ of readers. I account for this sensation by the clearness, equa-
 ‘ bility, and transparency which reigns throughout, which leaves
 ‘ behind nothing that can annoy or discompose the mind, and
 ‘ which gives no greater rapidity to the action than is necessary
 ‘ to lend cheerfulness to life. I cannot express the painful sen-
 ‘ sation I feel on turning from a production of this nature to look
 ‘ into my own being. With you, all is so cheerful, so loving, so
 ‘ harmoniously blended,—so true to humanity :—with me, every
 ‘ thing so harsh, so rigid, and abstract—and so unnatural; for
 ‘ all nature is synthesis, and all philosophy antithesis. True, I
 ‘ may venture to bear witness in my own favour, that I have
 ‘ adhered to nature as truly as was reconcilable with the idea of
 ‘ analysis; nay, perhaps a little more truly than some of our
 ‘ Kantists would have thought allowable. But not the less dis-
 ‘ tinctly do I feel the difference between life and mere abstrac-
 ‘ tion; and in such melancholy moments, I cannot but consider
 ‘ as a defect in my nature, what in more cheerful hours I per-
 ‘ haps would look upon as a natural property in the thing itself.
 ‘ This much is indeed certain, that the poet is the only true
 ‘ man, and the best philosopher but a caricature beside him.’

As the work proceeded, it was communicated, book by book, to Schiller, who never fails to express his admiration of those qualities to which, in the letter last quoted, he alludes. Many suggestions, too, were made by him as to individual incidents, and adopted by Goethe, and many acute and deep remarks upon the delineation of particular characters. We doubt much, however, whether many of our readers will sympathize to the full extent with Schiller’s enthusiastic criticisms; but they are illustrative of his own nature, and may perhaps, by our German readers, be received with as much reverence as the opinions of Mr Taylor. They show, at all events, that Schiller saw plainly enough the objections that might be urged against it, and was disposed to allow to them considerable weight.

‘ I now understand you completely,’ he writes, (2d July, 1796,) ‘ when you said that it was peculiarly the beautiful and true which had the power of affecting you even to tears. Calm and deep, clear, and yet unfathomable as nature itself, the work stands before us, and acts on us; and every thing, even the slightest collateral point in it, shows the transparency, the equality of the mind from which the whole has flowed. . . . How have you succeeded in combining in one, so vast

a circle of persons and events? It looks like some fair coherent planetary system, and only the Italian figures, like comet shapes, and, fearful like them, connect this system with another higher and more distant: all these forms, too, as well as those of Mariana and Aurelia, detach themselves, like heterogeneous beings, from the system, as soon as they have served to give it a poetical impulse. . . . If I were to express the goal at which Wilhelm arrives after a long course of wanderings, I would say, he moves from the sphere of a vague and indefinite ideal, into a definite and active life, but without sacrificing his idealizing power. The two opposite erroneous paths which mislead him from this desirable consummation, are indicated in the romance, in every possible shade and degree. From that unfortunate expedition, when he is going to bring out a play without having thought on the subject, to the moment when he chooses Theresa for his wife, he has run through the whole circle of humanity;—these two extremes, are the two highest contrasts of which such a character is capable. That he is now under the cheerful guidance of nature, (through Felix,) led back from the ideal to the real, from longing effort to action, and the knowledge of the actual, and yet without sacrificing what was real in his first period of endeavour;—that he learns how to bound his views, yet in this very restraint preserves a passage into the infinite;—this I call the crisis of his life, the end of his apprenticeship; and towards this, all the preparations in the work appear to me most perfectly to unite;—the tender relation of nature towards his child, the union with Natalia's noble and feminine excellence, secure the preservice of his mental health, and we perceive that we part from him on a road that will lead to infinite perfection.

‘The manner in which you express yourself as to your idea of the “apprenticeship” and “mastership,” seems to assign to both too narrow bounds. You seem to understand under the first, merely the error of seeking beyond ourselves, what the internal man can himself bring forth: under the second, the conviction of this internal power, and of the necessity of self-production. But will the whole life of Wilhelm, as it lies before us in the work, be explained by this formula? or will this development arise naturally, merely from the development of paternal affection in his heart, as is done in the seventh book? What I would wish is, that the bearing of all the scattered limbs of the work upon this philosophical conception, were rendered a little more obvious. The fable, I would say, is perfectly true;—so is the moral of the fable, but their relation to each other is not made sufficiently palpable. . . . I would also wish that the meaning and bearing of your machinery were made a little plainer to the reader. This should always be obvious in the economy of the whole, though it may be concealed from the actors. Many readers, I am afraid, will perceive, in the secret impulses to which Wilhelm is subjected, nothing but a theatrical display, and an artifice to increase the complexity of the fable, to awaken surprise, and so forth. The 8th book, it is true, gives a historical explanation of the different events which have been brought about by this machinery; but an æsthetical explanation of the internal spirit

and poetical necessity of these preparations, is not satisfactorily given; I myself only came to appreciate them on a second or third reading.

‘If I have any thing to object to on the whole, it is this;—that amidst the deep earnestness which reigns in the poets, and by means of which they operate so strongly, the imagination seems to play rather too freely with the whole. I think you have pushed the free grace of movement a little farther than was consistent with poetical seriousness, and, in your just anxiety to avoid the exaggerated, methodical, and stiff, have rather run into the opposite extreme. I think I can perceive that a certain condescension towards the weak side of the public, has induced you to adopt a more theatrical purpose, and more theatrical means, than are suitable to a romance. If ever a poetical tale could dispense with the assistance of the wonderful or surprising, it is your romance, and that which is not necessary to the work may very easily be injurious to it. It may thus happen, that the attention is directed to the accidental, rather than to the essential, and wastes in solving riddles that which should have been concentrated in the internal spirit of the work.’

Though Schiller here puts his objections to the romance delicately enough, and even represents them as only likely to occur to the mass of readers, it seems plain that he, too, had his doubts as to this singular book, and desiderated a little more of plain every-day life in it—not the life of a company of stage-players, nor those *coups de théâtre* which Goethe pretty unsparingly employs in this romance—but common feelings dwelt on with some earnestness, some warmth and permanency, and where the supposed philosophical or æsthetic mortal was kept a little more in the back ground. He suggested to him, too, the necessity of a pendant to the apprenticeship,—viz. a picture of Wilhelm’s mastership; an idea which Goethe has since realized to a certain extent, in his fragment of the ‘Wanderjahre;’ though that work certainly does not show that Schiller’s advice as to the defects of the first had made any serious impression, since it is, if possible, more shadowy and unreal than its predecessors, and in its general bearing seems to have no more relation to the things of this earth, than to the New Jerusalem, as imaged forth in the visions of Swedenborg.

While Goethe was thus engaged, Schiller was not less active, in as far as the state of his health, which was latterly affected by every change of weather, would allow. During the first five years to which these letters refer, he was engaged in the composition of his great historical play, or rather series of plays, on the subject of Wallenstein, and many interesting particulars relative to the progress of the work may be gleaned from the correspondence. The care with which the whole was studied and arranged, is almost inconceivable. With the subject itself, he had made himself intimately acquainted in a historical point

of view, while preparing his history of the Thirty Years' War : But the adaptation of it to tragical purposes was found, from its vastness, to be a very difficult task. He prepared himself for it, by a diligent study of the historical plays of Shakspeare, particularly those relating to the wars of the Roses. Of these, and in particular of Richard III., he expresses the warmest approbation. No play of Shakspeare's, he says, reminded him so much of the Greek drama. The play of Wallenstein, or at least all the substance of the dialogue, was at first composed in prose, and afterwards versified. In doing this, the subject naturally changed its aspects ; not only ideas, but motives of action, which appeared satisfactory enough when conveyed in prose, were found unsuitable or common when the expression was elevated into iambics, and were rejected ; and versification, though it had a tendency to condense or shorten the mere expression, leads us, as Schiller justly observes, into a diffuseness in the general mode of treating the subject. In this way the work swelled upon him to an extent he had not in the least anticipated, and new changes in the general arrangement of the parts became necessary. The materials for the astrological scenes were carefully and laboriously collected from a Hebrew work which he found in the library at Jena ; as to which he observes, in a letter to Goethe, ' The mixture of chemical, mythological, and astronomical matters, seems well adapted for poetical purposes. There are some wonderfully ingenious comparisons of the planets to the human members, which I shall transcribe for you ; and I am not without hope of being able to give a poetical dignity to this astrological subject.' This system of cautious preparation, indeed, Schiller never neglected, even in his slightest ballads, of which many proofs occur in these volumes. His American song was the result of a careful perusal of Carver's Travels ; before writing the song of the Bell, he, in like manner, studied the subject in Krunichen's Encyclopedia ; and with the same anxiety to preserve the truth of painting, he requests Goethe, while in Switzerland, to take an opportunity of examining an iron foundery, that he might know whether his admirable description in Fridolin was correct or not.

The part of the subject which embarrassed him most, was the connexion of the episode of Max and Thekla with the main plot ; nor did he seem to think, even at the last, that he had altogether reconciled the conflicting materials of disinterested and devoted attachment, and of selfishness and ambition. The union, however, seems sufficiently complete for dramatic purposes ; and unquestionably every one must feel that the barrenness of a military and political interest required to be refreshed

by some such spirit of humane and kindly feeling. These letters show also that the Capuchin Sermon in the camp, (an anthology from the sermons of the Jesuit Santa Clara,) which has (probably from its humour) been often attributed to Goethe, was really the work of Schiller himself.

There is something exceedingly touching in the manner in which Schiller speaks of the task, when the drama at last came to a close. His feeling was the same as that which Byron has put into the mouth of Tasso on finishing his Jerusalem :

‘ — his pleasant task was done,
His long sustaining friend of many years!’

‘ I have long been afraid,’ says he, ‘ of the moment for which I once wished so much, when I should be rid of my work : and, in truth, I find myself more uncomfortable in my present freedom than in my former slavery. The mass to which I formerly clung is gone at once, and it seems as if I were left without an object. I feel as if it were impossible for me to produce any thing again ; nor shall I be at ease till I am able to direct my thoughts with hope and inclination to another subject. If I once had an object in view, I should be freed from this restlessness, which at present renders me incapable of small undertakings. Inclination and necessity equally lead me to an imaginary, not a historical subject, and to a merely passionate and human interest ; for at present I am heartily sick of soldiers, heroes, and generals.’ This intention, however, was not fulfilled ; for his very next drama, *Mary Stuart*, was also on a subject of historical and political interest.

It is rather singular that the subject of Schiller’s other great work, *William Tell*, should have at first occurred, not to him, but to Goethe. In a tour which Goethe made, in 1797, through the lesser cantons of Switzerland, the impression produced upon his mind by the splendid scenery of the lake of Lucerne, *Alt-sorf*, *Schwytz*, and *Flüelen*, was so strong, that the idea of peopling these scenes anew with the heroes of the past, occurred irresistibly to his fancy. But an epic, not a dramatic form, was what first suggested itself to him. This project he had communicated at the time to Schiller, who replied, ‘ The idea of *William Tell* is excellent ; and, after *Meister* and *Hermann*, perhaps the only style of subject which you could treat with the peculiar originality and freshness of your genius. The interest arising from a characteristic and strongly circumscribed locality, and a certain historical connexion, is perhaps the only one not exhausted in these two previous works. They are in their subject perfectly free ; and though in both the locality appears sufficiently united with the characters, still it is a

‘poetical country, and represents a whole world. But with ‘Tell, the task will be quite different. From the very narrowness of the subject, it will derive additional life, and the reader will be more deeply and intensely moved and agitated.’ Goethe afterwards appears to have got altogether tired of the subject, and no longer intending to avail himself of it for his own purposes, he suggested it as the groundwork of a drama to Schiller. One valuable idea, too, he certainly appears to have communicated to him, namely, his own conception of the character of Tell. With the exception of Schiller, all dramatists who have attempted this theme, have painted him too much as a sentimental reformer. But Goethe saw that the true dramatic capability of the character lay in his simplicity both of feeling and expression; in representing him as he was, a rude dweller upon the mountains, leading a life of labour, and never thinking of political freedom or slavery, till oppression penetrated even to his own fireside; and even then only anxious at first to escape the evil as he best might, till, step by step, he is led on to the death of Gessler, as the only means of preserving his own existence and that of his family. And thus, too, Schiller has represented him, as a man of iron nerves, with all the homeliness of an Alpine shepherd, an affectionate father and husband, a being naturally of a soft and gentle heart, who, even when driven at last to the death of his enemy, and watching, from his rocky cover, the advance of the Governor along the lonely valley, shudders at the prospect that his hands, which have hitherto been only dyed with the blood of the chamois, are now to be steeped in that of his fellow man. Accordingly, as might have been expected, the success of this living picture on the stage was complete.

Theatrical matters, as may be supposed, occupy a very prominent place in these volumes; the direction of the Weimar theatre being in the hands of Goethe. This, notwithstanding the many inconveniencies with which it must have been accompanied, seems always to have been a labour of love to Goethe, who devoted himself to the task, until the introduction of the dog in the Forest of Bondy proved too much for his patience. As a specimen of the sort of duty which he had occasionally to perform, we may refer to the following directions for getting up *Macbeth*, which emanated from his pen, and the *Sylvester Daggerwood* style of which is amusing enough.

Act I.

‘Some persons should enter along with *Macbeth* and *Banquo*, to enable the latter to ask, “How far is’t called to *Forres*?”

Act II.

‘“The bell invites me.” No ringing of bells here, but the stroke of a clock heard.

Act III.

‘ Macbeth’s boy should be better dressed, somewhat in the style of a page.

‘ Eilenstein’s mantle is too scanty ; a piece should be added to it.

‘ The fruits on the table should be painted red.

‘ Banquo’s ghost looks too prosaic in a coat. And yet I don’t very well know what else we can give him.

Act V.

‘ The shields to be repainted.

‘ No fighting in ermine mautles.’

No wonder if Goethe was able to paint the theatrical scenes of Wilhelm with force and truth, for he, too, ‘ had been in Arcadia,’ and had seen enough of the wild life of a player to enable him to trace it in all its varieties.

Towards the close of these volumes, there is a good deal of correspondence between the friends on the subject of Madame de Stael’s visit to Weimar, in 1803. It seems pretty obvious, that, with all their respect for her talents, they were tired of her egotism, her vanity, and want of tact. Indeed, it could not be well otherwise with a person who coolly told Goethe she intended to *print* as much of his conversation as she could carry away. Schiller’s estimate of her character is thus given in a letter to Goethe, and it represents with much truth both the strength and weakness of her character.

‘ Madame de Stael will appear to you exactly as you have anticipated before hand ; she is all of a piece, with no foreign or false feature in her character ; consequently, notwithstanding immense differences of nature and ways of thinking, one always feels at home with her, can say any thing to her, or hear any thing from her. She is a fine and highly interesting representation of French spiritual culture. In all which we call philosophy, consequently in all ultimate results, we are at issue, and remain so, notwithstanding all her oratory. But her natural constitution and feelings are better than her metaphysics, and her fine understanding almost elevates itself into genial power. With her every thing must be explained, seen through, and measured ; she will tolerate nothing dark, nothing inaccessible ; wherever her own torch cannot enlighten the way, she will not take the trouble of walking farther. She has consequently a great horror of our ideal philosophy, which, in her opinion, leads only to mysticism and superstition, and in that atmosphere she cannot exist. For what we call poetry, she has no turn ; in such works she can sympathize only with what is passionate, rhetorical, and general ; but though she is not alive to the beauty of true poetry, she on the other hand is not misled by the false.

‘ From these few words you will perceive, that the clearness, precision, and intellectual activity of her nature, cannot but produce a favourable impression. *The worst thing about her is the altogether extraordinary rapidity of her tongue; for, in order to follow her, one must absolutely convert himself wholly into an organ of hearing.* In this way I, who do not speak French fluently, come very poorly off with her, but you, from your greater facility, may get on better.’

Goethe was at this time engaged in important business at Jena, and it was not till the beginning of 1804 that he returned to Weimar, and had an opportunity of verifying the truth of this portrait of Madame de Stael. Almost on their first meeting, too, a circumstance occurred, which by no means tended to place them in the most confidential relation to each other. He had just been reading a French work, a correspondence between Rousseau and two French ladies, who had succeeded in drawing the shy sentimentalist into this correspondence, and then published his letters. Goethe, who had suffered a little from similar acts of literary swindling, happened to express his disapprobation of this proceeding in pretty strong terms; when, to his astonishment, Madame de Stael not only defended the conduct of her countrywomen, but plainly avowed, that, in similar circumstances, she would have done the same. ‘ Nothing more,’ says Goethe, ‘ was necessary to make me cautious and reserved, and ‘ in some measure to shut myself up.’ In another place, he does ample justice to her general ability and merit, while he points out what appeared to him the prevailing errors of her mind.*

‘ Her objects were numerous; she wished to become acquainted with Weimar, in its moral, social, and literary aspect; at the same time she wished to be known herself, and laboured for this purpose with as much perseverance as she did to make herself acquainted with our manner of thinking. But she could not rest contented with that; she wished to make an impression at once on the senses, the feelings, and the intellect, and to excite us to a certain activity, with the want of which she reproached us. As she had no proper conception of what we call duty, or of that quiet composure of view by which every one actuated by it is guided, she was all for immediate momentary action, just as her ideal of society consisted in constant conversation and discussion.

‘ Madame de Stael was equally anxious to gain laurels in read-

* Goethe's Works, vol. xxxi. p. 107. *et seq.* last edition.

‘ing and declamation. I excused myself one evening, when she
‘represented Phedra, and when she was by no means satisfied
‘with the moderate approbation she received.

‘To philosophize in company, is to speak with liveliness about
‘problems which are inexplicable. This was her peculiar plea-
‘sure and passion, and her philosophizing spirit was carried, in
‘the heat of talking, into matters of thought and sentiment, which
‘are only fitted to be discussed between God and one’s own
‘heart. Besides this, like a woman and a Frenchwoman, she
‘adhered obstinately to her own positions, and shut her ears
‘against the greater part of what was said by others.

‘All this had a tendency to rouse the evil spirit within me, so
‘that I generally received with objections and contradictions
‘every thing she brought forward, and sometimes, by my deter-
‘mined opposition, drove her to despair. In this situation,
‘indeed, she generally appeared most amiable, and displayed in
‘a striking light her quickness in thought and power of reply.
‘I had several continuous *tête-à-tête* conversations with her, in
‘which, in her usual style, she was tiresome enough; for she
‘never would allow a moment’s reflection even on the most im-
‘portant suggestions, but would have had the most profound and
‘interesting matters discussed with the same rapidity, as if we
‘had been merely employed in keeping up a racket-ball.

‘One anecdote of this kind may find a place here. One even-
‘ing at the court, Madame de Stael advanced to me, and said,
‘with lively feeling, “I have important news for you; Moreau
‘has been arrested, along with some others, and accused of treach-
‘ery to the Tyrant.” I had, like others, for a long time taken
‘much interest in the personal concerns and actions of that noble
‘man; I now recalled the past to my remembrance, in order, in
‘my own way, to examine the present, and to draw some conclu-
‘sion as to the future. The lady changed the subject, directing
‘her conversation to a thousand indifferent matters; and when
‘she perceived that I, wrapped up in my own meditations, was
‘not answering her with much interest, she assailed me again
‘with her usual reproach, that I was sulky, as usual, this even-
‘ing, and no cheerful talk to be had with me. I got a little
‘angry, and told her she was incapable of real sympathy—that
‘she might as well break into my house, give me a box on the
‘ear, and then tell me to go on with my song, as dance from
‘one topic to another. This burst was quite after her own heart;
‘she wished to excite passion, no matter what. In order to pacify
‘me, she described to me the whole particulars of the accident,
‘and in doing so, displayed her deep acquaintance with the situa-

‘tion of affairs as well as character. Her intercourse with society
‘in Germany has, in its results, been of deep importance and
‘influence. Her work on Germany, which owes its origin to such
‘social conversations, has been like the march of a powerful
‘expedition, by which a breach has been effected in the Chinese
‘wall of those antiquated prejudices which separated us from
‘France, and been the means of extending a knowledge of us
‘over the Rhine, and even across the Channel, and of spreading
‘our influence into the distant West.’

In 1805, the correspondence before us was closed for ever by the seal of death. Schiller’s indisposition, never entirely overcome, had, in consequence of a violent cold caught during the inclement spring of that year, gradually become worse, till, on the 9th of May, it reached a crisis. He had been delirious towards the morning of that day, but the paroxysm abating towards noon, he fell into a sound sleep. Once more before his death his mind resumed its customary serenity and resignation. Tranquilly and touchingly he took farewell of his friends, and gave directions for his funeral. Some one enquiring how he felt, he said, ‘Calmer and calmer.’ Soon after, he sunk again into a slumber, which gradually deepened into death.

During this time Goethe was himself the victim of sickness. When he had last parted with Schiller, he had found him about to go to the theatre, to which Goethe had been unable to accompany him. ‘And so we parted at his door,’ says he, ‘never to meet again. In the situation, mental and bodily, in which I was, no one ventured to bring me the news of his death. He had expired upon the 9th, and thus all my evils and sufferings fell upon me with treble weight.’ In conclusion, we may express our hope, that the venerable editor, now the ‘ultimus Romanorum,’ who has lived to chant the dirge over almost every youthful brother of the lyre, may long survive as a monument of literary activity, and untiring sympathy with all that is calculated to instruct or better mankind, and a bright connecting link between the present age and the past.

ART. V.—1. *Cain the Wanderer, and other Poems*. 8vo. London : 1830.

2. *The Revolt of the Angels, and the Fall from Paradise. An Epic Drama*. By Edmund Reade, Esq., Author of *Cain the Wanderer*. 8vo. London : 1830.

PERHAPS there never has been a time since the prosaic days of Whitehead and Hayley, in which so little good poetry has issued from the press, as during the last two years. That some meritorious poems have been published within this period, we do not deny—but we think that even they who look with partially indulgent eyes on the efforts of contemporary poets, will scarcely venture to affirm, that any poetical works have lately appeared which have made much impression on the public taste, or have the slightest prospect of permanent popularity. Yet, with the exception of one or two great names, we still possess all those eminent writers who have made the first twenty years of the present century as distinguished in the annals of our poetry, as the days of Elizabeth and Anne. Scott, Moore, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Campbell, Crabbe, Milman, Rogers, Bowles, and others whom the recollection of our readers can easily supply, are still living among us, and in the full enjoyment of their poetical powers. But they write no poetry; and, what is perhaps stranger—we do not expect it. We are content, even when fresh from the re-perusal of their former poems, to receive from their hands only prose; and ‘prose by a poet,’ instead of being an object of foolish and distrustful wonder, is now almost the one thing sought. Whence, we may ask, does this arise, at a time when the activity of the public press exceeds all that has been ever known in this or any other country—when education is more diffused—the thirst for information greater—and the means to satisfy it more abundant than perhaps at any former period of our literary history? Various causes may be assigned for this phenomenon. It may be said, that an excess of poetry, and an abundance of that which was really excellent, has produced satiety and fastidiousness. The public taste has been cloyed with dainties—and over-excitement is succeeded by indifference. This may be true to some extent; but there are other causes which have no reference to our recent abundance of poetical treasure. The spirit of the age is not eminently favourable to poetry. We say this not in disparagement, either of the spirit of the present age, or of poetry. Our observation is strictly compatible with praise of both. The circumstance we have noticed, arises from the greater spread of

knowledge and thirst for information, and from a more just appreciation of the powers of poetry, and that relative place and importance which it ought to occupy in literature. We now say more generally, as Horace did, 'Non satis est pulchra esse poemata, dulcia sunt.' We regard poetry not as our daily mental food, but as a sweet and costly fruit, of which, though we derive from it greater pleasure, we partake more sparingly, and less often, than of the homely prose which constitutes the staple aliment of our minds. We more judiciously assign to poetry that which is its peculiar office. We require not so much that it shall instruct, as that it shall interest and delight us. We require that it shall appeal to our imagination and our feelings, rather than to our judgment. It is true, it may be rendered a vehicle for conveying information, and frequently was so rendered in early times; and even so were the painted scrolls of the Mexicans, in the infancy of their civilisation, employed as a substitute for writing; but instruction is not more an essential quality in a poem than in a picture. There are many who will protest against any such limitation of the powers of poetry; and, like the currier in the homely adage, who would propose to fortify a town with leather, claim for it a capability of doing not only that which is its peculiar province, but any thing else that is good and desirable. Laws, history, and ethics, were promulgated by the aid of poetry in that infancy of literature when the judgment could scarcely be appealed to, except through the medium of the imagination; but not only is that early time long past, but also that comparatively recent period, when verse was considered good *as* verse—and poetry was thought little more than metre—and almost all subjects were held to be susceptible of treatment in a metrical form. Then flourished the didactic poem, which, under the fallacious promise of amusement, told only that in verse which could have been better told in prose, and which, if so told, we should never have sought for the entertainment of our more vacant hours, or for the improvement of our feelings and our tastes. Then was the public expected to admire among the foremost efforts of the contemporary Muse—'The Fleece,' by Dyer, and 'The Sugar Cane,' by Grainger, where they were taught how wool was converted into broad cloth, and made conversant with the mysteries of muscovado and molasses. We now turn with some degree of surprise as well as of mirth to the last mentioned poem. We read in the 'argument,' at the head of one of its 'books,' such promises of poetical recreation as the following:—'The necessity of a strong clear fire in boiling.'—Planters 'should always have a spare set of vessels, because the 'iron furnaces are apt to crack, and copper vessels to melt.—

‘ Sugar, an essential salt—what retards its granulation—good muscovado described.—When the sugar is of too loose a grain, and about to boil over the teache, or last copper, a little grease settles it, and makes it boil closer.—Of the skimmings—their various uses.—Of rum.’ Such were once considered fit subjects for poetry, and such subjects were thus treated—

‘ But chief, thy lime the experienced boiler loves,
Nor loves ill-founded ; when no other art
Can bribe to union the coy floating salts,
A proper portion of this precious dust
Cast in the wave, (so showers alone of gold
Could win fair Danae to the god’s embrace,)
With nectar’d muscovado soon will charge
Thy shelving coolers, which severely press’d
Between the fingers not resolves, and which
Rings in the cask ; and or a light-brown hue,
Or thine, more precious silvery grey, assumes.’

When verses like these were written seriously, and as seriously admired, it is evident, not only that the poetical standard was low, but that verse was respected *as* verse, no matter how deficient in superior qualities, and that to read such productions was not so much the pleasure as the duty of all who claimed to be well educated and accomplished, and to possess a competent acquaintance with the *Belles Lettres*. The times are changed. Education has become less superficial, and we are in less danger of taking the ornamental for the essential—the fringe and embroidery for the clothing—the foliage on the capital for that which gives strength and stability to the edifice. It is not that we less admire the beautiful, but we are less prone to confound it with that which is useful. We observe more strictly that division of labour, which, in mental as in mechanical operations, is highly conducive to the perfection of the result. We turn to prose for information ; from poetry we require that it shall interest our feelings, and excite our imagination. To this assignment of poetry to its proper place, to this treatment of it as a literary luxury, we may, among other reasons, attribute the small share which it occupies in the *reading* of the present day. The more we are disposed to look to poetry for the highest and most delightful species of mental excitement, and the more exquisite the gratification to our taste which we expect from this source, the less shall we be satisfied with any, of which the inferior excellence prevents its producing a powerful impression. Towards mediocrity in poetry, the public is becoming every day less tolerant. Few poems have a chance of being much read, unless their merits are of a very high order, or there is something

strange, novel, and attractive in their subject. The public taste seems also to have decided that a poem must not be long. The pleasurable excitement which ought to arise from the perusal of poetry is, like that produced by music or painting, necessarily of short duration. We know it is impossible for the most ardent admirer of those arts to listen very long to the most exquisite music, or gaze long upon the finest paintings, without some sensation of fatigue—not merely fatigue to the organs of sense, but lassitude and satiety succeeding to the prolonged excitement of the feelings and imagination. Such is also the effect of poetry, if read, not tamely and without interest, but with that intense and lively satisfaction, which it is comparatively valueless if it does not produce.

The consequence of our treating poetry differently,—of our demanding from it a much higher species of gratification than that with which our forefathers were content, is very naturally this, that we read less poetry, and only such as is of the highest stamp. This is the consequence as regards the readers; as for the writers, it follows naturally that there should be fewer, as compared with those who engage in other departments of literature. It has become inadvisable (to use an agricultural metaphor) to pursue a species of husbandry in which none but the best soils will yield a remunerating produce. Even they whose poetical powers are of acknowledged excellence, are fearful of encountering failure, and disappointing a public to which they cannot always afford novelty and originality, and which they might chance to weary by producing only imitations of their former successful efforts. Another consequence of the present feeling with regard to poetry is, that it is now more expressly calculated to administer that excitement which we expect from it. There has been a gradual change from the tame and didactic, to poetry the most stirring, romantic, and impassioned. The poetry of the last twenty years has been more the poetry of feeling than that of any other period. There have also been more striking and marvellous varieties of subject; more fresh soil has been broken up; there has been a louder call for originality; and, on the whole, a more exciting appeal, both to our emotions and to our love of novelty. Commending, on the whole, this change, we still cannot say that it is unmixed good. The alloying qualities which we encounter are, eccentricity and exaggeration,—a false and feverish view of nature,—a proneness to mystify and distort,—a proneness, also, to travel out of the homely 'working-day world,'—to pass even the bounds of time and space in search of themes. One of the principal characteristics of the poetry of the last few years is, its choice of subjects,

with which none but the mightiest genius could effectively grapple, and in treating which the employment even of the mightiest genius is of questionable taste and wisdom. Pictures of other states of being are now familiarly set before us; we have Visions of Heaven, of Hell, and of Creation. The Revolt of the Angels, and the Field of Armageddon, must help us to beguile the listlessness of a vacant hour; half-fledged poets must try their wings beyond the narrow limits of the visible world; despising earthly standards of vicious grandeur, they adopt for their hero 'Satan,' and talk as familiarly of the 'crack of doom,' 'as maids of fifteen do of puppy dogs.'

Of this class is the gentleman on whose high-sounding works we have undertaken to comment. The titles of the poems in his first publication are, 'Cain the Wanderer,' 'A Vision of Heaven,' 'Darkness,' and 'On Deity:': in his second, 'The Revolt of the Angels,' 'The Fall from Paradise,' and 'A Vision of Creation.' The selection of such subjects by a hitherto unknown poet, for his earliest efforts, may be thought to savour of boldness, if not of presumption; but with this choice, perhaps, the age is a little chargeable, and Mr Reade must be in some sort absolved. A poet of moderate powers must, in order to be read and produce an effect, have recourse to something analogous to what in theatrical matters is called a clap-trap. The advantage of subjects such as those chosen by Mr Reade is, that they not only astonish by their sublimity, but create, *a priori*, a very favourable presumption of the powers of the author who has ventured to undertake them. There are many who think, that to treat a subject which presents to us another sphere and state of existence, must be immeasurably more difficult than to pourtray the scenes and occurrences of this world, and of beings constituted like ourselves. This, however, we doubt, and for several reasons. The writer who undertakes such subjects, can revel undisturbed in the most unbounded license. There are no troublesome tests by which the truth of his delineations can be tried. No charge of inconsistency, of improbability, of defective description, can easily be advanced against him. He absolves himself from almost all those rules to which authors are usually amenable. Every one who has tried must know, that it is not at all an easy matter to represent nature as it is; and that it is much easier to set up a nature of one's own, and to attend only to the promptings of one's own imagination. One must be careful, in drawing the characters of men, to make them conformable to the principles of human nature; but the demi-god and the demon may be made to pursue any course of sentiment

or action, without its being easy to demonstrate the impropriety. It is easy, too, for writers whose ideas are not very distinctly defined, to turn even this defect to some account in the treatment of such subjects, by enveloping them with a sort of misty vagueness, which, acting like the natural mist on external objects, invests them with an apparent grandeur, which the idea, if more clearly conveyed, would not be found to possess.

Mr Reade has not only selected subjects on which, though it may be easy to write something, it is extremely difficult to write any thing good, but has boldly measured his strength against Milton and Byron. Those who have read the powerful drama 'Cain,' may have the pleasure of reading a continuation from the pen of Mr Reade. Lord Byron's 'Darkness' is well known—Mr Reade has also written a poem on Darkness. A new survey of the ground which we thought had been left to Milton, is presented in Mr Reade's second publication, wherein we find the 'Revolt of the Angels,' and the 'Fall from Paradise.' It is but justice to the former of these poems to say, that there is nothing in it which is very like Milton's; and that, in the latter, our author is effectually prevented from clashing with him, by a happy departure from the history which we find in Genesis. Availing himself of a suggestion of Goethe's, he makes Lucifer the creator of Adam, and leaves to the Deity only the task of creating Eve!

The longest and most elaborate of Mr Reade's productions is 'Cain the Wanderer,' which, he tells us, he surrenders 'to candour and time, with *a calm confidence*; knowing that they 'are the tests which, sooner or later, pass a *just* and impartial judgment on all things.' In the dialogue which serves as a preface to 'Cain,' he very properly professes an aversion to puffs. 'Not one puff,' says he, 'shall my book have, if I can help it. I will have no articles written for it by friends, or write any myself. I do not remember that our old standard poets ever flew to these pitiful resources;—neither will I.' The determination is worthy of a man conscious of genius. But favourable criticisms must not be stigmatized as 'puffs;' and it is therefore quite compatible with the above to say, in the preface to his second publication, 'If the opinions passed on it' (*i. e.* 'Cain the Wanderer') 'by the "fit audience though few," were the objects of my ambition, and for which I wrote, as they certainly were, then, that my point was gained, will best appear by a few of the chief public testimonies respecting it, *which I have retained in this volume*,—not from motives of vanity and self-love, but as sterling proofs, which I can turn to with

‘an honest satisfaction, to show that *I fully succeeded* in the ‘hazardous subject I undertook.’ We turn to these ‘public ‘testimonies’ ‘retained in this volume,’ and collect from a rich banquet of daily, hebdomadal, and monthly criticisms, that Cain is ‘written in the very tone and spirit of Lord Byron, and in ‘execution equal,’—that it is ‘equally nervous, equally close, ‘equally argumentative,’—that ‘we have had nothing in poetry ‘at once so high and so pure for many years,’—that ‘in depth ‘of thought and power of imagination it has scarcely an equal,’—that it is ‘beyond all comparison the finest poem that has been ‘published since the days of Byron,’—and that ‘for loftiness ‘of conception, boldness and magnificence of imagery, depth of ‘feeling, variety and extent of thought, we should be puzzled ‘to find its equal.’ It is difficult to approach a work so praised with that cool judgment and moderated expectation with which we ought to apply ourselves to the task of criticism; but we will try. As for the object and tendency of the drama, to avoid mistakes we will let the author speak for himself:—

‘I have endeavoured to developé Cain as a powerful and daring mind, of which pride is the basis, as it is that of almost all strong minds; mistaking his own impulses and acts of passion as predestinations of Deity, instead of the natural effects of unformed and unthwarted principles. From hence arises the struggle to oppose such supposed influence, and cling to good, not from feeling the beauty of its nature, but from the same opposition of pride which would blindly set itself against the decrees of Providence, and act according to its own. Consequently from this are doubts, questionings, and wavering faith, which, though fed and strengthened by the Tempter, by argument, and visible signs, are never wholly overthrown. To escape from this state of restlessness, he seeks and obtains a temporary forgetfulness in a higher realm of sense and imagination; the cup is exhausted, and then nothing is left to fly to; and, the wreck of himself, he stands an example, that happiness, which is peace and tranquillity of mind, cannot be founded on baseless pride or on the senses, but stands on the purity and fixedness of early-instilled principles, on faith, on hope, and, on content; and, these overthrown, is lost for ever. In short, in Cain I have developed man as he is; his early thoughts, and hopes, and trials, and yieldings, and wrestlings, and his despair; perhaps, too, here and there, to quote the words of poor Schutze—

“The bliss, the bale, through which my heart hath run,
Are mirrored in the story’s mystic wave.”

The Drama has a Prologue, which is a sort of paraphrase of the commencement of the Book of Job. It opens with ‘The ‘Lord and the Host of Heaven,’ to whom enters Lucifer, and says,—

‘Therefore do I come;
To prove supremacy with him on clay
Where he hath stamped his impress: let Cain be

The mark of trial between us, and do ye
 Look on, and the superior power obey.
 Evil and good already he hath known :
 One he hath tried, rejected, the other's fruit
 Is bitter : he hath prayed, although now mute
 In his despair, and shall again, and own
 Him as his god who then will hear and aid.
 Mark him, ye seraphs ! and in him behold
 If man, the dust-formed, can be happy there :
 If soul mixed up with baser mould,
 Waging against it an unequal strife
 With petty wants and lusts, which yielded, bless
 The craving appetite, and then depress,
 Leaving a lead-like weight, a sickening sense
 Of pain and weariness, and a despair
 Heavier on the heart, from the intense
 Feeling of having yielded to forbidden
 Passion ; and yet which checked, like a flame hidden,
 Preys on the sands of life,
 Too brief, too frail, even in their natural course !
 Can man be happy thus ? regret, remorse,
 Fear, which is hate disguised, shall still be his.'

Lucifer says much more, but we forbear quoting the rest of his speech, for we do not think he is made quite so eloquent as he ought to have been. The opening scene brings before us Cain, Ada his wife, and their son Enoch. Cain awakes, and describes to Ada a vision which was '*not a vision,*' and which description will afford a fair and favourable specimen of the author's style.

CAIN.

'It was *not* a vision,
 But a reality as distinct as thee
 I look on now. I stood upon the heath :
 'P the distance stretched our father's tents ; before me
 The spot where Abel—it was night, but starless :
 I looked back to the pleasant home I had left,
 I heard their evening hymn, and my heart swelled
 With half-forgotten memories ! I envied
 Their quiet happiness ; I felt that I
 Might have been happy ! when methought I heard
 The voice of Abel calling me as wont.
 I turned and saw—

ADA.

Whom ?

CAIN.

Him, the Fallen One !

I gazed and stood in fascination fixed :
 I could not move away, I felt his power.
 I knew, as from instant prescience, he was

The inspirer of my thoughts, which but for him
 Perchance had never been; that he stood there
 The ruler of my destiny. I saw
 He was inferior to One; for the pride
 And sullen majesty on his dark brow showed
 He was not what he would be; he seemed shorn
 Of the lightning splendours he might once have walked in,
 But, like the sun, he drew towards him more
 In his setting glory! His vast wings were furled:
 But intense light from his grand presence shone,
 Making the darkness visible; one hand
 He stretched towards me, motioning me on:
 The other, uplifted, pointed into space,
 Which, as the clouds rolled surging back, I saw
 Sparkling with distant worlds. "Why, Cain," (his voice,
 Methinks, thrills through me still)—"why on the earth
 Dwell'st thou an outcast? Follow me, if still
 The same high spirit is in thee to be free,
 And strive against a nature which would else
 Obscure its essence, grovelling like thy kindred
 In dust and blindness; shake off thy bonds of clay,
 And 'midst yon worlds thou shalt be happy yet.
 Thou know'st, thou *feelest* who I am—arise,
 And follow me.'

ADA.

And thou——

CAIN.

I followed him!

Cain leaves his wife and child, and sets forth alone on his wanderings. In this his solitude, Lucifer appears to him; and then follows a great deal of very abstruse disquisition, in which it appears to be Lucifer's object to mystify and puzzle Cain, and in which he seems to be as successful as his skill deserved. Cain is then taken by the Tempter through various scenes; first, to 'the centre of the earth,' where he sees 'masses of glorious shapes, all indistinct!' and is told to 'behold the elements in their central force, which formed the whole around them, and are here renewing ever.' He asks where a stream of fire leads, and is told—

'To the great heart of the earth, whence it reflows,
 Veining her arid breast with life and vigour,
 Ebbing again, to be again renewed.'

Cain again asks—

'What are these broken masses near us, rounded
 As the trunks of trees, but of a dazzling whiteness,
 And stamped with unknown *imagings*?'

They are, replied Lucifer,

‘ The pillars of the dwellings of earth’s kings,
Built to *eternize* them as they hoped on earth.’

Lucifer next transports his victim to what Mr Reade calls ‘ the void of space,’ when Cain, whose ‘ brain reels,’ looks round at the stars, and exclaims—

‘ Oh, that I were the Maker of them all !
Oh, that I were a god ! a being unknowing
Or time or grief or change ! that I might sit
Throned ’midst this infinity of starry worlds,
Of all their wonders, men, or gods, and climes,
Magnificent Creator !’

After this wild and exorbitant wish, which the Devil’s superior sense of propriety induces him to chide, Cain is taunted with an ignoble desire to return to the earth which he had left. He answers—

‘ Never, spirit, never ! what ? revisit
The places where I walked in ignorance
And agony ; stained too with guilt, and horror,
And vain remorse ? To see the averted eyes
Of my father and Eve, and perhaps hear their curses ?
My Áda, too ; no—she would not reproach me ;
It was not in her gentle nature ! but
She would *look* on me, and that look would
Have more of power than any of their words.
O never will I prove this, living ; my dust
May flee there as thou say’st, but I as now,
No more !’

Upon which Lucifer rejoins—

‘ Thou art deceived by a seeming strength
Of will and purpose, which exist not in thee.
What fixed principle hast thou to oppose,
And model elements that are your life ?
Where was this will, self, thought, and consciousness,
When they met and formed ye ? They were impulses
That dwelt apart, innate in each, until
They joined in thee their breathing compound, from whence
They shall separate, and unmake thee, in despite
This fantasy of a self apart which rules them.
To will—that *self* should be unchangeable,
With power to reject the senses’ every impulse,
On which thy very life depends ; to be
Uninfluenced by motive, choice, or aim,
Or end, or any passion, blind, and motionless ;
To be insensate, which is not to be.
And is it so ? Do ye not still look back
In your brief being, and marvel how most fixed

Resolves were broken and contemned? but once
 Imagined as unchangeable as are
 Thy present impresses; still unaware,
They are already hastening to join them,
 Urged on by others growing, and impelling thee
 Still forward unresistingly. So that
 Will, thought, and passion, are as straws, borne on
 The surface of being, dependant and blown by
 The breath of circumstance; the current changing,
 But the elements of nature still the same.'

After this, Lucifer shows to Cain two other scenes—'the world
 'in warfare,' and 'the world in deluge,' which last is among the best
 in the drama. He is then conducted to the paradise of an imaginary
 being, half woman half angel, called 'Heilel,' where he is steeped
 in pleasures which prove unsatisfactory; and, tired of the rather
 scandalous life which he is living in the society of Heilel, he
 bethinks him of his deserted wife; and, quitting the mistress of
 whom he had grown weary, revisits his former home. Ada has
 died in his absence,—he finds her grave, and throws himself upon
 it,—laments a while, and then rises to seek his father Adam. The
 last scene is in Adam's tent, and the catastrophe is thus told:

'ENOCH (*from without.*)

Help!—save me, save me!

He is coming—is upon me!

[ENOCH *rushes in from behind, and hides himself
 behind ADAM.*

ADAM.

Heedless boy!

Why break'st thou thus into the house of mourning?

ZILLAH.

Take breath and speak—what is it frights thee, Enoch?

ENOCH.

I was bearing fresh flowers to strew my mother's bed,
 When a shape I had never seen sprung hastily
 From the grass, and stretched his arms out and pursued me:
 I looked not in my fear, but fled, and flying,
 Shot back my arrow as my father taught me,
 And—hark! there is a heavy tread!

ADAM.

A fall!

[ADAM *opens the door of the tent, and the body of
 CAIN falls within.*

EVE.

The hand of God is over us! Behold

THE WANDERER RETURNED!

Our readers will now be enabled to form some opinion of the
 style of Mr Reade. It is on his *style* alone that we shall animadvert;
 for we have no wish to enter at present into any discussion on the

tendency of his works, and his selection and treatment of scriptural subjects. He is skilled in ambiguity; and can give a seeming force and value to even ordinary expressions, by employing them in unusual modes, and so connecting them as to destroy their common acceptation, and leave only a mysterious no-meaning, so exquisitely metaphorical, that, in our difficulty to comprehend it thoroughly, we are glad, if possible, to think it fine. A rich cluster of poetical terms, when involved with tolerable intricacy, will frequently pass current with a great majority of readers, who rest satisfied with a general impression that what they have been perusing must be something very beautiful and sublime, but without being able to collect any one distinct image. There is much of this specious incorrectness in the poems before us; and it is only necessary to analyse any of the most seemingly high-wrought passages to discover it. Take the following, for instance, over which we have no doubt many a fair reader may have murmured 'beautiful!'

' Her lips are parted, and move like rose-leaves opening
To the invisible airs. Her hair, how lightly
Doth its pale golden wreaths in tangled
Luxuriance cluster down that neck, and rest
On her white bosom, where the violet vein
Sheds a dim lustre !'

What a store of poetical phrases is here! 'Opening rose-leaves'—'golden wreaths'—'tangled luxuriance'—'white bosom'—'violet vein'—'dim lustre!' But let us try how they hang together. The likening of lips to rose-leaves is a very reasonable but commonplace simile, if nothing were adverted to but their colour; but, in order to make it not commonplace, the author has made it nonsense—lips must not only look but 'move' like rose-leaves, and like rose-leaves 'opening to the invisible airs.' By this we presume is meant, (or the word 'opening' deceives us,) not rose-leaves moved by the wind, but a rose-bud slowly expanding. Now, we are not aware that the motion of an expanding rose-bud is perceptible to the human eye, more than any other process of vegetation. Cain, however, in the passage above quoted, is describing what he sees. He sees the motion of her lips, and he is made to compare it to a motion which neither he nor any one else could see. We may next enquire what is the peculiar novelty and beauty of the epithet 'invisible,' as applied to 'airs.' In the following sentence we find two words which neutralize each other's meaning—'lightly,' and 'cluster.' The word 'cluster,' implies thickness and heaviness, and hair which seems to fall lightly, cannot with propriety be said to cluster at all. Then we have a *violet* vein shedding a dim lustre on a white

bosom. Now, the vein is darker than the bosom; and when a dark object is upon a light one, we conceive that the 'lustre,' whether 'dim' or otherwise, must proceed from the latter.

A few words now on the versification of these poems, and more particularly of Cain, of which, in the prefatory dialogue, the author thus speaks:

'C. Your verses are often rugged, and—

'A. Ah! so were "glorious John's."* From the age of fourteen we steep ourselves, as it were, in the mellifluousness of Pope; but seven or eight years afterwards, one sickens of honey, of the eternal "smooth-shaven green," and longs for and loves the rough energy, and rude but often grand harmony of glorious old Dryden,

"The long resounding march, and energy divine,"

as it has been owned by Pope himself. If in imitating a little his ruggedness, I have now and then caught a touch of his vigour, I shall be well satisfied.'

Is it then on the authority of Dryden that we are to accept such lines as the following?

Shall be levelled by them; why he is, and was—
 In vain repinings, which is weakness, not strength—
 Looking as enduring: I heard voices in—
 Thou art mighty in punishment—oh! be mightier in—
 Me whom till now thou hast ever turned to, in—
 Dying before me daily, and I looking on—
 And was happy because alone, and my heart opened—
 Of my father and Eve, and perhaps hear their curses—
 Who made ye, and none could look on ye and be—
 Feeling and knowing themselves slaves to—
 Of blindness withdrawn, and your eyes opened to—

The English heroic verse consists properly of ten, sometimes of eleven syllables; but it does not therefore follow that prose chopped into portions of ten or eleven syllables, should be entitled to be called verse—much less that portions of nine, twelve, thirteen, and fourteen syllables, should have any pretensions to such a name. We had understood that rhythm and accent are a little to be attended to, and that it is by no means easy to write harmonious blank verse. But, according to Mr Reade's system, nothing can be easier. All that seems requisite is to dispose the words in lines, containing from nine to fourteen syllables, with only this restriction, that every line shall consist of entire words, and that they shall not be divided on the ultra-liberal plan exhibited in 'The Anti-Jacobin'—

'Thou wert the daughter of my tu-
 Tor, law professor at the U-, &c.

* See *The Pirate*.

There is often as much of affectation as of ignorance in this love of 'ruggedness,' this contempt of polish. Of all literary coxcombs it is one of the most disgusting. It is a tacit profession of being occupied only with the higher requisites of poetry, and of unwillingness to condescend to the cultivation of minor graces—it is one mode of pretending to have written with ease and rapidity—it is an assumption of such superior merit, as must make minor blemishes of no importance,—mere specks in the sun, dust in the balance, when weighed against the author's manifold perfections, and which readers ought to disregard. With this pitiful affectation we do not say that Mr Reade is chargeable. The 'ruggedness' of his lines may perhaps proceed from an inability to distinguish what is or is not harmonious in verse. If so, we are sorry for it; for he is deficient in one of those qualities, without which no man can aspire to the character of a poet.

We cannot close this article without adverting to Mr Reade's allusions to two distinguished contemporaries. Is it wise, or modest, for a young and unknown poet, to usher in his first work with the following quotation, as an apology for writing?

'When Southey's read, and Wordsworth understood,
I can't help putting in my claim for praise.'

It is perhaps to be regretted, that Lord Byron should have made so flippant an attack. But that which in Lord Byron was only arrogant and discourteous, becomes the height of absurdity when proceeding from Mr Reade. It is well known to our readers, that we are not to be classed among the enthusiastic admirers of the poetry either of Mr Wordsworth or Mr Southey; but we cannot on that account be insensible to Mr Reade's presumption. Mr Southey, whatever may be his defects of taste and judgment, occupies a very distinguished place among the poetry of his country, and has gained, both by the strength and variety of his talents, a celebrity to which we do not expect that Mr Reade is ever likely to attain. But we shall see that Mr Reade claims more than equality with Mr Southey. In one of the notes in the volume containing 'Cain the Wanderer,' we find the following passage:—'How dared Southey, of all men, to set himself up as his [*i. e.* Shelley's] judge? Was he so superior to him in talent? I am of opinion,' &c. And then he proceeds to deliver his judgment upon Shelley, claiming for his own superior talent the privilege which he denies to Southey. In another note, he speaks of 'poor Milman, struggling for once to say something out of the common.' It is unnecessary to comment on these passages; to quote them is to expose them.

In taking leave of Mr Reade we shall bestow a word of advice, which we should not offer if we did not think that his works evinced a misdirection and abuse, rather than a deficiency of talent. We believe him capable of better things; but it is necessary that he should select subjects more suited to his powers,—that he should entertain a humbler opinion of his own abilities,—that he should abstain from exaggeration,—that he should cultivate a purer style,—should study to express more clearly his meaning,—and should become more grammatical in his construction, and less rugged in his metre.

ART. VI.—*The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*. By C. O. MÜLLER, Professor in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the German, by HENRY TUFNELL, Esq., and GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford: 1830.

IT is the common, and perhaps inevitable, defect of ordinary teachers, to fall very soon into a dull routine, to adopt a limited course of instruction, which has usually been transmitted from their predecessors, and not merely to repeat it without addition or improvement, but often, through a continually increasing languor and oscitancy, to detract somewhat from its original merit at each succeeding repetition. The listless monotony sometimes threatens to extinguish curiosity, and to annihilate utterly and for ever all literary emulation; but the occasional appearance of an instructor, endued with talents and originality, reanimates the sluggish listener, and infuses new life and vigour into an expiring science.

We may include historians amongst the most important teachers, and we may justly accuse them of participating largely in the defect of which we have briefly spoken; they are peculiarly liable to the charge of rendering their precious lessons so tasteless, that if they do not create disgust, they fail egregiously in stimulating the appetite of those who should feed on them. In proportion as the matter related is intrinsically important, the history is commonly jejune and impotent in execution; if the narrative is pregnant with political wisdom, and fertile in examples of public and private virtue, the style of the narrator is most probably repulsive, and his work void, and without form or comeliness. The wonderful tale is passed from the lips of one sloven to another, until, through the insipidity of the successive messengers, it becomes itself insipid, although a message of high import; the statement of startling

events is transcribed fully, or in an abridgement, carelessly, or correctly, but with so cold a hand, that attention is at last benumbed, and even the sedulous read only with the eyes, and not with the mind. The fortunes of Greece and of Rome claim the pre-eminence over the chronicles of other nations; their claim is universally acknowledged, and accordingly their annals have long been consigned to the most vapid and frigid of writers, who have laboured with much success to wean students from themes that are in themselves so attractive. Those who love exaggeration affirm, that had the monopoly of dullness been secure from invasion a little longer, although the memory of the Greeks and Romans might have slumbered securely in unopened volumes, it would soon have ceased to live, and to kindle active thoughts in the moving fancies of mankind.

If we take the most sober view of the consequences, and estimate at the lowest rate the effects of the great phenomena that sometimes arise in the world of letters, we must still attribute vast influence to the productions of master-minds, that at once rouse large classes of scholars from a long and deep sleep. By his *Roman History*, the incomparable Niebuhr gave an astonishing impulse throughout Europe to the cultivation of that department of letters. A stimulus, the same in kind, but inferior in degree, has been conveyed by Professor Müller; the publication of his *History of the Dorians* has directed the attention of the learned to the investigation of the *History of Greece*, and has shaken off whatever languor lately oppressed that pursuit, in consequence of the lifeless and wearisome repetitions of transcribers and compilers. We must express our regret and mortification, that although our means of reward are great, and indeed almost boundless, there should be no encouragement to produce original works that would rival the erudite volumes of which we speak; but it is a slight consolation to find, that they have been rendered accessible to our countrymen through faithful and accurate translations. We accordingly propose to give some account of the *History of the Dorians*, generally, and after the manner of journalists, with due regard to the patience of our readers, and to the just claims of others, not particularly and according to the erudition and merits of the work, for a space nearly equal to the bulk of the history itself, would be required to allow us to afford a critical examination of the numerous questions that the abundant learning and ingenuity of the author have raised. By refusing the ordinary and long-accepted materials of history, and by attempting to build up the Roman edifice without them, and in spite of them, and by means of the discussions that necessarily flowed from such a course, Niebuhr was

enabled to give an impulse, not less vivid than the electric shock, to the study of Roman antiquities. By a proceeding equally novel, and scarcely less bold, has Professor Müller endeavoured to infuse fresh life into Grecian Archæology. He has composed a history, not of Greece, but of one of the principal races of Greeks; and he has laboured to demonstrate, in opposition to the received opinions, that the people of this favourite race were the bravest, the best, the wisest, and the happiest; in one word, if we may allow ourselves such a mode of expression, the most Greek of the Greeks. Such is the position, or paradox, of the learned historian of Göttingen. The scheme of writing the history of a portion of the Greeks, as a distinct race, possesses many advantages; and we ought not to grudge the legitimate recompense of his toils to the meritorious historian—the liberty of displaying a marked partiality for the favoured race.

The Dorians, it is said, a people of Hellenic origin, had formerly inhabited the country at the foot of the mountains Ossa and Olympus. Afterwards, however, being driven out by the pressure of some northern hordes, as Müller supposes, they migrated to the south, and dwelt under Mount Pindus. Their early habitations, therefore, were those very spots which have long been consecrated to poetry. When we contemplate that scanty strip of land which is inscribed Doris on the map of Greece, comprehending a small portion of mountain, and a very few miles in length of the upper part of the valleys formed by the two celebrated streams Pindus and Cephissus, we are astonished at the diminutive district that once contained a nation which has filled the world with its fame. For many ages the Doric name has been famous throughout every civilized region; many centuries after they quitted the narrow vale of Pindus, the inhabitants of the opposite extremity of Europe are striving to do them honour. At the remote Göttingen, one of the most learned men of his day is glad to devote all his talents and erudition, and a considerable portion of his life, to display their claims to the admiration and gratitude of their species; and if he errs in the execution of his undertaking, it is only through an excessive zeal and eagerness to vindicate their excellence. All the scholars of Germany are animated by the example; in Britain the laudatory work is immediately translated; and we are glad to commend such an application of learning and ingenuity, and to invite the attention of the studious to the green and flourishing fame of the Dorians. In the other countries of Europe, we doubt not that other translators and other critics are equally active in diffusing, in their respective languages, the tidings of Doric glory. This famous nation,

nevertheless, was originally contained within the limits of a parish, not very extensive, and most probably not very populous. Can we suppose that three thousand years hence the learned men, who shall then give a saving grace and an intellectual value to the world, will vie with each other in celebrating the name of some parish, which includes a part of one of our Scottish glens and a portion of the mountain—the quiet, rustic people tilling the strip of fertile land that skirts the pleasant stream, and feeding their cattle on the barren uplands? Every man, whether learned or unlearned, gentle or simple, if the strange question were proposed to him, would at once answer, the thing is impossible! Yet it has been, and such a consideration alone is sufficient to give a lively interest to the History at present before us.

The Dorians, we are told, were a restless race, a people much addicted to wandering. According to Herodotus, after a migration to Dryopis, they passed into the Peloponnese. This expedition of the Dorians has received the traditional name of the return of the descendants of Hercules, ἡ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν κἀθοδος, and it is enveloped in mystery and fables. Of their new country Müller speaks thus:—‘ So wonderful is the physical organization of Greece, that each of its parts has received its peculiar destination, and a distinct character; it is like a body whose members are different in form, but amongst which a mutual connexion and dependence necessarily exists. The northern districts, as far as Thessaly, are the nutritive organs, which, from time to time, introduced fresh and vigorous supplies; as we approach the south, its structure assumes a more marked and decided form, and is impressed with more peculiar features. Attica and the islands may be considered as extremities, which, as it were, served as the active instruments for the body of Greece, and by which it was kept in constant connexion with others; while the Peloponnese, on the other hand, seems formed for a state of life, included in itself, occupied more with its own than external concerns, and whose interests and feelings centred in itself. As it was the extremity of Greece, there also appeared to be an end set by nature to all change of place and habitation; and hence the character of the Peloponnesians was firm, steady, and exclusive. With good reason, therefore, was the region where these principles predominated, considered by the Greeks as the centre and acropolis of their countries; and those who possessed it were universally acknowledged to rank as first in Greece.’ This short and fanciful passage will show more

plainly, and perhaps also more briefly, than we could have stated them, many of the peculiarities of the present work; it proves that the erudition of the author has not chilled, as is but too common, his imagination, but has rather warmed and excited it; it proves likewise that many most felicitous illustrations and allusions may be drawn from the geographical aspect of the country, if the historian will take the trouble to form in his mind an accurate image of its features and structure. The warmth of his affection, and his extreme partiality for the people of whom he discourses, are distinctly manifested; and the Professor declares his dislike of all change, and his admiration of a character and of institutions that are 'firm, steady, and exclusive.' The Doric invaders of the Peloponnese sent forth settlers in every direction, who founded numerous and important colonies: from the history of these establishments and of the mother countries, and especially of the most remarkable of the nations of the Peloponnese, the Spartans, Müller presents to the reader an extract of whatever he considers most instructive respecting the condition of the Doric race, and not a continuous and general narration of facts. His history concludes with the end of the Peloponnesian war, because he is of opinion, that 'the honesty and openness of the Doric character, the noble simplicity of the ancient times of Greece, soon disappeared in that tumultuous age. Sparta and the Peloponnesians emerged from the contest, altered, and, as it were, reversed; and, even before its termination, appeared in a character of which they had before probably contained only the first seeds.' In proportion as the one end of the poised plank is raised, it is necessary that the other should sink; and if we seek to elevate one party, we must depress the credit of its rivals and competitors. The candidates for pre-eminence in ancient Greece were the Lacedemonians and the Athenians; the former were migratory Hellenic Dorians, the latter aboriginal Pelasgic Ionians; and the learned advocate for the superiority of the Doric blood, naturally strives to diminish the glory of their more renowned opponents, the maritime inhabitants of Athens. His favourite race he identifies with the principle of permanence, and he finds in their rivals that of 'novelty, the Ionic spirit of innovation,'—a spirit which the learned professor deems peculiarly evil, and he seems to rejoice 'that every person arriving at Locri was punished who enquired after novelties.' Thus the traveller visiting Göttingen, and asking at the circulating library for the newest novel, or perhaps even for the last edition of the *History of the Dorians*, might expect, if the genuine Doric character could happily be revived there, to ex-

piate his offence in the stocks, or under the lash of the beadle of the university !

A portion of the zeal that is displayed in upholding the advantages of permanent institutions over frequent innovations, may be ascribed to the patriotic feelings of the author, who sees his countrymen in the Dorians, and feels, that in depreciating their political enemies, he confirms the unfavourable opinion of the French, that prevails in Germany. The generous glow of modern passions, although not strictly philosophical, is advantageous in reanimating and infusing warmth and interest into the pages of ancient history, which are too commonly chilled with languor and indifference. 'The true Doric characteristics were retained in Rhodes for a longer time than in most other Doric states, viz. courage, constancy, patriotism, with a haughty sternness of manners, and a certain temperance, which was, indeed, in some manner, contrasted with their magnificence in meals, buildings, and all arts.' The Ionic elegance may often be found at a French table; but that solidity which is essential to magnificence in all other works of art, as well as in meals, is certainly predominant at a German banquet. 'The Corcyreans,' he adds soon afterwards, 'were active, industrious, and enterprising; good sailors, and active merchants; but the stability and noble features of the Doric character they had entirely lost. In absence of all modesty, they even exceeded the Athenians, among whom the very dogs, as a certain philosopher said, were more impudent than in any other place.' When a writer indulges in such a vivacious partiality, it is impossible for the reader to withhold his attention, although he may often refuse his assent. It is only in Paris, the patriotic professor might have continued, that a modern Ionian, with the aid of a pair of shears, will attempt to transmute a shock-dog into a lion; an unchanging Spartan, or a sincere Hanoverian, would scorn the paltry deceit. It was peculiarly incumbent on a historian, who would exalt the character of the Lacedæmonians, to slur over their coolness respecting the general interests of Greece in the Persian war: he says calmly, concerning that selfishness which is not uncommonly found in persons of prudish, old-fashioned manners, who love ancient usages, and abhor all change, in language borrowed from Thucydides, 'that Sparta wished to avoid any farther war with the Persians, thinking that Athens was better fitted to carry it on than herself.' With that extreme partiality, in which very candid men sometimes choose to indulge, he dismisses the testimony of Isocrates, whenever it is disadvantageous to his clients. A servile writer, who sought to discredit the free citizens of Athens

and their freedom, without a tenth part of the learning that is needed for the successful defence of a paradox, strove with bad faith, and a worse design, to demonstrate that the panegyric orations of Isocrates are, as he somewhat coarsely expressed it, 'one great lie.' The superior scholarship of Müller would not permit the like senseless audacity; but he certainly gives the orator the slip when he imputes to the Spartans a neglect of the general interests of Greece during the Persian invasion; and although he wants the erudite effrontery of the admirable Niebuhr, he now and then unscrews the historians of antiquity, takes them in pieces, and puts them to rights, insinuating, as the Germans are wont, that he is better acquainted with past events than purblind contemporaries, and shortsighted eye-witnesses.

The history and antiquities of the Doric race is divided into four books: the history of the Doric race, from the earliest times to the end of the Peloponnesian war, is dispatched in the first book, which is comprehended in nine chapters. The second book is divided into twelve chapters. It treats 'of the religion and mythology of the Dorians.' The religious worship of a nation is an infallible criterion of its origin, unless the conversion of the people to a new religion, of which the ancient world furnishes no example, has changed the original aspect of their sacred polity, and has obliterated the strongest traces of identity. No one, for example, who has witnessed the ceremonies of the Passover, as that festival is celebrated by the Jews at this day, can doubt that they are the sequels of the people who formerly fled from Egypt with similar rites. Nor can those, who have observed the ceremonies of the Parsees, deny that they are the living representatives of the ancient Persians, and so with many other races. That division of the work, which, as the first step in the consideration of the intellectual existence of the Dorians, proceeds to enquire into their religion, and to analyse and resolve it into the various worships and ceremonies of which it was composed, and to trace the origin and connexion of these usages as they successively arose, is marvellously elaborate, and beautifully exegetic. Nevertheless, it will be fully intelligible to those only who are profoundly versed in the mythology of antiquity: doctrines, which had formerly an extensive and powerful sway, are now viewed dimly, and from a distance, by a few. To studious and contemplative persons, it will doubtless always be agreeable slowly to trace the mystic course of mythic fables, although such pursuits do not accord with the drastic impatience of practical men, who look only towards ends, and delight in action.

Apollo and Diana were the principal deities of the Dorians. Müller affirms that a Doric origin may safely be ascribed to that people, among whom there were considerable institutions dedicated to the worship of Apollo. It is not easy to concede, although the learned professor strenuously insists upon it, that this worship was never elemental;—that these deities were not the sun and the moon, the year and the month. A short extract, however, from the second book, as a sample of the manner in which this portion of the work is handled, will be more instructive than the discussion of any mythological question.

‘ Before we proceed to consider the heroic mythology of the Dorians, which is chiefly confined to Hercules, we will first attempt to sketch the principal features of their religious character, as seen in the several worships already enumerated. Both in the development of modes of religion peculiar to that race, and in the adoption and alteration of those of other nations, an ideal tendency may be perceived, which considered the deity not so much in reference to the works or objects of nature, as to the actions and thoughts of men. Consequently, their religion had little of mysticism, which belongs rather to elemental worships; but the gods assume a more human and heroic form, although not so much as in epic poetry. Hence the piety of the Doric race had a peculiarly energetic character, as their notions of the gods were clear, distinct, and personal; and it was probably connected with a degree of cheerfulness and confidence, equally removed from the exuberance of enthusiasm, and the gloominess of superstition. Funeral ceremonies and festivals, with violent lamentations, as well as enthusiastic orgies, were not suited to the character of the Dorians, although their reverence for antiquity often induced them to adopt such rites when already established. On the other hand, we see displayed in their festivals and religious usages, a brightness and hilarity, which made them think that the most pleasing sacrifice which they could offer to their gods was to rejoice in their sight, and use the various methods which the arts afforded them of expressing their joy. With all this, their worship bears the stamp of the greatest simplicity, and, at the same time, of warmth of heart. The Spartans prayed the gods “to give them what was honourable and good;” and although they did not lead out any splendid processions, and were even accused of offering scanty sacrifices, still Jupiter Ammon declared, that “the calm solemnity of the prayers of the Spartans, was dearer to him than all the sacrifices of the Greeks.” We would endeavour to trace the influence of the worship of Apollo on the policy and philosophy of Greece, if the question did not embrace so wide a field, lying as it does, in a great measure, beyond the confines of history. We may however select, from what has been already said, as proofs of the influence of this worship on political concerns, the armistice connected with the festivals of Apollo, the truce observed in the sacred places and roads, the soothing influence of the purifications for murder, together with the idea of the

punishing and avenging god, and the great influence of the oracles in the regulation of public affairs. It has, moreover, been frequently remarked how, by its sanctity, by the dignified and severe character of its music, by all its symbols and rites, this worship endeavoured to lull the minds of individuals into a state of composure and security, consistently, however, with an occasional elevation to a state of ecstatic delight.

The second volume of the work will be the most attractive to the general reader. It opens with the third book, which discourses, in twelve chapters, of the political institutions of the Dorians. This book may be selected as the most remarkable part of a work of great learning and talent; and as the author's political sentiments are peculiar, it is just to premise his own anticipation, that many of his readers will probably dissent from them. 'We moderns,' the professor writes, 'on account of our preconceived notions with respect to the advancement of civilisation, do not read without partiality the lessons which history affords us; we refuse to recognise the most profound political wisdom in an age which we believe to have been occupied in rude attempts after the formation of a settled form of government.' Deeply impressed with a profound veneration for the political wisdom of antiquity, he discourses of the origin, essence, and object of a state, and teaches us to set aside all modern ideas, which consider it merely as an institution for protecting the persons and property of the individuals contained in it, and to accept the ancient notion, that by recognition of the same opinions and principles, and the direction of actions to the same ends, the whole body politic should become, as it were, one moral agent. This unity of opinion and actions, was in general more complete among the Greeks than among modern nations, and it was perhaps nowhere so strongly marked as in the Dorian states, whose national views, with regard to political institutions, were most strongly manifested in the government of Sparta. The greatest freedom of the Spartan, as well as of the Greeks in general, was only to be a living member of the body of the state; whereas, that which in modern times commonly receives the name of liberty, consists in having the fewest possible claims from the community; or, in other words, in dissolving the social union to the greatest degree possible, as far as the individual is concerned. What the Dorians endeavoured to obtain in a state, was good order, or *Κόσμος*, the regular combination of different elements. The Doric races had, of all the Grecians, the greatest veneration for antiquity; and 'not to degenerate from their fathers, was the strongest exhortation which a Spartan could hear.' The Ionians, on the other hand, were in

every thing fond of novelty, and delighted to excess in foreign communication.—‘a government of a strictly aristocratical character, the animating soul of which was the Doric spirit of fear and respect for ancient and established laws, and the judgment of older men;’ ‘the spirit of implicit obedience towards the state and the constituted authorities, strict discipline, and a wise restriction of actions;’ ‘an austere and aristocratical polity;’ ‘a very serious character;’ ‘a certain loftiness and severity of character;’ ‘to draw in with greater closeness the iron bond of custom, and to maintain the government of the wise against the dominion of the unrestrained multitude:’ these expressions, and the like, point out the species of government which Müller deems the most desirable,—‘an unmixed and Doric aristocracy.’ It would be easy, of course, to cite many passages which prove his aversion to democracy; his want of sympathy with ‘the spirit of times which aim at great liberty and excitement—the very contrary of the settled composure of the Dorians.’ It would be equally easy also to show, in the same manner, that he abhors not less than ochlocracy—than the arbitrary will of a turbulent populace—the despotism of a tyrant, which springs out of the bosom of anarchy. He is, moreover, the enemy of unmixed democracy, chiefly through an intense dread and hatred of tyranny; for he says of Clearchus, ‘Instead of protecting the dignity of those who had called him in, he became a leader of the people, and what in fact he is already, who sets the blind fury and physical force of the multitude in action against justice and good order—a tyrant.’

The ‘pure aristocracy,’ however, for which Müller so strenuously contends, does not signify, for such is the sense which is now ordinarily attached to the term, an oligarchy, the uncontrolled dominion of the privileged few; a form of government not less unjust than the rule of an absolute monarch, or of the insensate rabble: he desires that a few should wield the powers of state, but adhering strictly to the etymology of the word, *aristocracy*, he stipulates that these few should be the wisest and the best. That the wise and good should possess exclusive sway over every department of civil polity, is undoubtedly desirable, and it is unfortunately but too certain, that the number of such persons will always be small. It would be highly expedient to intrust power to the hands of no others than true philosophers; but if we enquire into what is practicable, not what is merely to be wished, this favourite project of Plato and of antiquity, will appear to be altogether Utopian. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* what philosopher will nominate the philosophers? what eminently wise and good man will select the wisest and

the best, who are to form the Platonic cabinet, the Socratic administration, or rather the supreme authority of the state, which, notwithstanding, would not be supreme, for it would be subordinate to that paramount piece of perfection, that monster of wisdom and virtue, in whom the power of selection was vested? If some superior being, some angel, or spirit, would appear at convenient seasons, and choose those who ought to govern the world, and would compel mankind to acquiesce in the supernatural decision; the true Doric aristocracy might be established, otherwise it will prevail only in the ingenious lucubrations of German professors.

Since health is so precious, and the injudicious treatment of disease so mischievous, and sometimes fatal, would it not be advantageous that none, save the wisest and the best, should exercise the art of healing? If Æsculapius would name in person such of his sons as he may deem qualified to practise for the benefit of the community—if the Dorian Apollo would grant licenses to the philosophical physicians alone, and would fall upon the unlicensed and unphilosophical interlopers, and would kill them off with his mild arrows, the sanitary praxis would be restored to a state of perfect health. But will a select and irresponsible body ever cease to want honesty? will the uninstructed multitude ever possess understanding? If a small college, whether composed of Dorians or Ionians, or perhaps even of Æolians, were authorized to permit those to heal, or rather to attempt to heal, the sick of whom they should approve, and were enabled absolutely and effectually to prevent all other citizens from endeavouring to cure, and even from curing maladies, is it certain that the incorporated licensers would never bestow a share in the gainful monopoly, on account of favour or consanguinity, or for a bribe; that it would always be fairly granted or withheld? If, on the other hand, the populace were permitted to choose their own Machaons, might not the enlightened citizen of a free state, in culling a saviour, sometimes unconsciously pluck an executioner? If the appointment of apothecaries rested solely with the virtuous rabble, even if their choice were guarded, as certain well-meaning, but mistaught and mistaken writers recommend in cases of greater difficulty, by universal suffrage and the ballot, would not those impostors who acquire notoriety by chalking their praises upon the walls, and by less respectable arts, be esteemed by their constituents precisely in the ratio of the chalk consumed, and the infamy incurred, and be uniformly preferred to men of worth, of learning, and of experience? If it be impossible, in the

government and regulation of that most beautiful art of medicine, (to be fully sensible of its beauties, we ought to contemplate the end proposed, and not that which is commonly attained, or the means of attaining it,) to form and maintain an aristocracy of the wisest and best, we may fear that, in the entire government and regulation of a state, it would be still more impracticable. But our limits will not permit us to discuss the many important and curious questions respecting the science of government, to which this learned work invites attention.

In the language of ardent admiration, Müller describes very amply the celebrated and singular institutions of Sparta; but if he does not annihilate their renowned founder, by reducing him to the hero of a fable, 'of a fiction possessing the spirit of 'a moral tale,' he maintains at least, that he only restored and renewed the ancient Doric polity, which was founded upon immemorial custom, so that the legislator had little opportunity for fresh enactments. 'Lycurgus, of whose real or imaginary 'existence we have already spoken, must, at the time of Herodotus, have been considered a mythological personage, as he 'had a temple, annual sacrifices, and in fact a regular worship. Now, it is the tendency of mythological narration to 'represent accordant actions of many minds at different times, 'under the name of one person; consequently, the mere name 'of an institution of Lycurgus says very little respecting its 'real origin and author.' The curious will find the discussions respecting 'the real or imaginary existence' of this illustrious lawgiver in the first book, (chapter vii.); and, having examined the arguments that are adduced on the subject, they will possibly anticipate that posterity may hereafter be employed in speculating, in like manner, about the real or mythological existence of Professor C. O. Müller, and whether his truly learned work be really the composition of that author, or represents the accordant contributions of many minds at different times, under the name of one person.

The Indian institution of castes subsisted in some degree in Lacedæmon; almost all trades and occupations were hereditary, and the hereditary transmission of employments greatly favoured the maintenance of ancient customs. One inheritance was very singular;—the art and mystery of cooking were hereditary. The notion of employing a cook, who took his trade by descent, is certainly not very palatable, but the excellent Müller is in the humour to be pleased. 'In fact, Sparta would not have so long 'remained contented with her black broth, either if her cooks 'had not learnt the art of dressing it from their youth upwards,

‘ and continued to exercise their craft after the manner of their fathers, or if this office could have been assigned at will to those who were able by their art to gratify the palate.’ He decides, however, afterwards, that it is not probable that any of these cooks in tail-male were of Doric origin.

Their severity towards the unhappy, degraded Helots, is the darkest shade of Spartan story; and the ingenious advocate for Lacedæmon endeavours, with much zeal and ability, to lighten the heavy reproach. He complains, on behalf of his clients, ‘ that the rhetorical spirit with which later historians have embellished their philanthropic views, joined to our own ignorance, has been productive of much confusion and misconception;’ and he labours to explain away the specific and distinct charges that have been brought against them. ‘ But are we not labouring in vain,’ the historian asks, ‘ to soften this bad impression, since the fearful word *crypteia* is of itself sufficient to show the unhappy fate of the Helots, and the cruelty of their masters? By this word is generally understood a chase of the Helots, annually undertaken at a fixed time by the youth of Sparta, who either assassinated them by night, or massacred them formally in open day, in order to lessen their numbers and weaken their power. It was a regularly legalized massacre, and the more barbarous, as its periodical arrival could be foreseen by the unhappy victims.’ Such is the accusation; for the defence we must refer to the third chapter of the third book. Notwithstanding the skilful reasoning or sophistry of generous partisans, historical verity constrains us to declare, that however beneficial the pure Doric aristocracy might be for the aristocrats themselves, the behaviour of the Spartans, during a long period, towards the Helots and Periæci, whom they had subdued, reminds us forcibly of the treatment which the English experienced at the hands of the Normans, during the century that followed the conquest. It must be conceded, nevertheless, that if the Spartans demeaned themselves somewhat harshly towards their vanquished enemies, they are entitled to the signal and rare credit of usually treating their friends as friends; an obvious rule of policy that is seldom observed, and upon which the stability and health of all states and parties mainly depends; yet blind vanity, and an inordinate self-conceit, mislead the prosperous, and, believing that they have risen, and can maintain themselves by their own unaided exertions, they soon find, that in their solitary might it is easy at least to fall alone.

The tenth chapter contains some curious information respecting the public or political economy of the Doric states. In the

following passage, we find a currency analogous to paper-money. 'In Sparta, the state was the sole possessor of the precious metals, at least in the shape of coin, which it used in the intercourse with foreign nations. The individual citizens, however, who were without the pale of this intercourse, only required and possessed iron coin, in a manner precisely similar to that proposed by Plato in the laws; viz. that the money generally current should be at the disposal of the state, and should be given out by the magistrates for the purposes of war and foreign travel; and that within the country should be circulated a coinage in itself worthless, which derived its value from public ordinance.' It is plain, therefore, that the worthless iron coinage which the Spartans used, and Plato proposed, was very like our bank notes in its effects, and that these worthy Dorians were in the full perception of all the benefits, whatever they may be, which result to the commerce and industry of a country from displacing those costly and inconvenient instruments of exchange, the precious metals, by a cheap and commodious substitute, and from sending abroad a great part of the gold and silver.

The eleventh chapter treats of the laws of the Doric states. 'The laws,' it is said, 'exhibit strong marks of the early time at which they originated, and it is impossible not to recognise in them a certain loftiness and severity of character.' The ingenious professor is less hostile to our English common law, to judge-made law, and appears to anticipate less salutary effects from a complete code of written laws, than certain autoschediastic teachers of a science, which they have not yet learnt themselves. 'To later politicians,' he asserts, 'it appeared still more dangerous that the councillors of Sparta acted upon their own judgment, and not according to written laws; but only because they did not take into account the power of custom and of ancient habit, which have an absolute sway, so long as the internal unity of a people is not separated and destroyed. Upon unwritten laws, which were fixed in the hearts of the citizens, and were there implanted by education, the whole public and legal transactions of the Spartans depended: and these were, doubtless, most correctly delivered through the mouths of the experienced old men, whom the community had voluntarily selected as its best citizens. Thousands of written laws always leave open a door for the entrance of arbitrary decision, if they have not by their mutual connexion a complete power of supplying what is deficient; this power, however, is alone possessed by the law, connate with the people, which in the ancient simple times, when national habits are

‘ preserved in perfect purity, is better maintained by custom, fixed under the inspection of the best men, than by any writing. To me, therefore, the Doric council of elders appears to be a splendid monument of early Grecian customs : and by its noble openness, simple greatness, and pure confidence, shows that it was safe to build upon the moral excellence and paternal wisdom of those who had experienced a long life, and to whom, in this instance, the people intrusted its safety and welfare.’ The last chapter of this book illustrates the military system of the Spartans, and that celebrated quality, concerning their title to which there is no dispute, cool courage in battle, characterised by great composure and subdued strength.

We have now reached that division of the work, which will be most engaging to the general reader : the fourth book is devoted to the domestic institutions, arts, and literature of the Dorians. Whoever has made a pilgrimage to the solitary Pæstum, and has gazed on the majestic proportions of the temple of Neptune, must be deeply sensible of the wonderful power of the Doric style of architecture. Müller finds a sentiment in this department of creative art. ‘ It is the essence of this art,’ he writes, ‘ to connect, by the varieties of form and proportion, a peculiar association of ideas with works intended merely for purposes of necessity. The Doric character, in short, created the Doric architecture. Thus, in this creation of art, we find expressed the peculiar bias of the Doric race to strict rule, simple proportion, and pure harmony.’ With reference to his favourite theory, that the Dorians were entirely and purely Greeks, and the Ionians but Asiatic Greeks, he says of this art in a former work, ‘ Ionicum architecturæ genus cum a Dorico tant opere distet, ut ex eadem origine utrumque provenisse negandum sit, Ionibus non nisi populorum Asiæ commercio traditum esse potest, a quibus eos item vestitum et victum atque omnem fere corporis cultum mutuatos esse constat.’ A peculiar taste, we are told, was displayed in the mode of clothing in use among the Dorians ; an ancient decorum and simplicity, equally removed from the splendour of Asiatics and the uncleanness of barbarians. The famous *syssitia*, or public tables, receive due attention ; the Spartans, the Cretans, and other Dorian nations, used to dine, like the Germans, at *tables d’hôte* : Müller considers it an ancient Greek usage to eat together at the cost of the community. Travellers on the continent have experienced the convenience of the round tables which prevail in many countries ; in our own, the military mess furnishes to persons of moderate resources a comfortable, and often a luxurious, meal ; and the squalid commons in the halls of our inns of

court, present a proof of the injustice of sacrificing the decent refection of the many to the indulgence or the caprice of a few. In discoursing of the domestic life—an engaging subject; for it is this sweet reward which tempts wise men to endure the miseries of public life—of the Dorians, the historian displays his partiality without reserve. He cites with evident satisfaction the satirical remark of ‘the supposed’ Lycurgus, to one who desired to found a democratical state, ‘first make a democracy ‘in thine own house;’ and informs us, that within the door of his court the master of the house ruled as lord on his own ground. He finds in the equality and simplicity of Sparta, a singular modesty; ‘the youths,’ according to Xenophon, ‘resembling statues in their silence, and in the immovability of their eyes, and more modest than virgins in the bridal chamber.’ Among the Dorians alone was true love to be found: ‘it was very possible at Sparta, that affection and love should take possession of the heart; but at Athens, as far as my recollection goes, we have not a single instance of a man having loved a free-born woman, and marrying her from any strong affection, whilst a single narrative of Herodotus contains two love stories at Sparta.’ He alludes to the matters related in chapters 61–63 of the book inscribed Erato.

The treatment of women among the Dorians, we are told, was indulgent: ‘among the Ionic Athenians they were merely considered in an inferior and sensual light; and though the Æolians allowed their feelings a more exalted tone, as is proved by the amatory poetesses of Lesbos, the Dorians, as well at Sparta as in the south of Italy, were almost the only nation who esteemed the higher attributes of the female mind as capable of cultivation.’ To a scoffing world any man, who is much in earnest, will too often appear ridiculous. With every desire to view even trifles in a serious light, we must confess, that the following proof of national superiority is somewhat ludicrous: ‘Amongst the Dorians of Sparta, the wife was honoured by her husband with the title of mistress, *δέσποινα*, a gallantry which was used neither ironically nor unmeaningly.’ Our stage coachmen are probably a Doric race, for whenever one of the rosy brotherhood of the whip speaks of his wife, he styles her ‘my mistress,’ and this neither ironically nor unmeaningly; yet, with all deference for the good professor, we are inclined to doubt, whether he be therefore necessarily wiser or better than the less gallant passenger who happens to share the box with him. With sincere respect for that extreme partiality, in which very candid men can alone venture to indulge, we believe the truth to be, that all the Greeks, whether Doric,

Ionic, or Æolic, whether Hellenic, or Pelasgic, were most exemplary in their domestic relations. The tragic poets abound with lovely passages, which demonstrate to the entire conviction of the heart, their unequal fondness for their homes, and the genial warmth of family affections. Nothing was more dreaded by the early Greeks than the extinction of the family, and the destruction of the house, by which the dead lost their religious honour, the household gods their sacrifices, the hearth its flame, and the ancestors their name among the living. Every virtue that conduces to the wellbeing of a state, is needed for the preservation and hereditary transmission of a family—but these considerations would lead us too far from our assigned task.

In such a state as Sparta, education was more necessary than the laws; and it was conducted on a very artificial system. The exposition of this system is well worthy of attention. There is one branch of Doric institution, which is no longer considered a part of polite education, or rather, whenever the liberal youth of our populous cities would revive the ancient lessons, their attempts are noticed with very marked disapprobation;—we allude to the venerable practice of stealing: with much ingenuity Müller essays to afford a rational explanation of the laconic larceny. Among the Greeks, as is well known, music was deemed a most important ingredient in education; in the schools of convents and cathedrals the old pagan course has been handed down by unbroken tradition, and is still retained in this respect with beneficial effects; but although this agreeable art is much cultivated with us, it is considered rather as an ornamental addition to, than an useful member of, the mental fabric. The Doric style of music was very famous in the ancient world, and bore a close affinity to the character of a nation proud of their natural loftiness of character and vigour of mind. The ancients attributed to this style something solemn, firm, and manly, calculated to inspire fortitude in supporting misfortunes and hardships, and to strengthen the mind against the attacks of passion. They discovered in it a calm sublimity, and a simple grandeur, which bordered upon severity, equally opposed to inconstancy and enthusiasm; and this is precisely the character we find so strongly impressed on the religion, arts, and manners of the Dorians.

In the study of music, as well as in every thing else, the Spartans were uniformly the friends of antiquity; the story is familiar to all, of the musician who played at a festival with a lyre that had two strings more than the allowed number, which the magistrates observing immediately cut them off. Müller doubts the truth of the tale, and the authenticity of the

Spartan decree, respecting this transaction, which exists in an excessively Doric idiom. The decree is as follows:—‘Whereas, Timothy of Miletus, despising the harmony of the seven-stringed lyre, poisoned the ears of the young men, by increasing the number of strings, and introducing a new and effeminate species of melody; and having been invited to perform at the festival of the Eleusinian Ceres, he exhibited an indecent representation of the holy rites, and most improperly instructed the young men in the mystery of the labour-pains of Semele; it is decreed that the kings and ephori should reprimand the said Timothy, and compel him to reduce the number of strings on his lyre to seven; in order that every person in future, being conscious of the dignity of the state, might beware of introducing improper customs into Sparta, and the fame of the contests be preserved unsullied.’ If this document be not authentic, it is at least whimsical. It would seem strange in these days were the House of Commons to direct our eloquent and accomplished Attorney-General to prosecute a blind beggar and his dog, although the one were named, as of yore, Timothy, and the other Tim, for feloniously playing Maggy Lauder, in Smithfield, on the festival of St Bartholomew, upon a fiddle with five strings, whereby the morals of the hearers suddenly became corrupt and of no use, in contempt of the king and his laws, and of all loyal four-stringed fiddles. In the valley of the Eurotas, it is evident that their frequent improvements in the construction of the piano-forte would not have brought Messrs Broadwood and Clementi to opulence, as in the valley of the Thames, but to a disgraceful end: they would have suffered death, as murderers, for administering to young maidens the sweet poison of soft pedals and additional keys. If, however, we may suppose that music was connected with religion,—that the integrity of the Doric measure, and the simplicity of the Spartan guitar, were held to be essential to orthodoxy,—we shall cease to wonder at the severe animadversions upon the heretical innovations of the minstrel; for the question, whether any musical instrument, even the most solemn, the organ, may be safely used in religious worship, has given occasion to far stronger measures than the excision of two additional strings.

The Doric literature is a large subject, but we can only treat of it very slightly. The national and original poetry of the Dorians was not the epic, but the lyric, nor did they cultivate history; but for the Ionic Athenians, therefore, we should have known very little about this ancient race: their glory would have been lost, and their panegyrist mute. Herodotus, as his style is Ionic, so Müller concedes that he can hardly

he considered a real Dorian, 'unless his religious turn, and 'a certain infantine simplicity, are traces of a Doric character.' Nor were the arts of rhetoric and logic cultivated: instead of pointed and logical reasoning, the Dorians expressed themselves by sententious and concise sayings, conveying as much meaning in a few words as possible. Great brevity of speech was the characteristic of the race, and formed a remarkable contrast with the copious and headlong torrent of eloquence which distinguished the Athenians. 'Of all the philosophical 'systems of Greece,' says Socrates in the *Protagoras* of Plato, 'that established in Crete and Lacedemon was the most ancient 'and copious, and there the sophists were most numerous; but 'they concealed their skill, and pretended to be ignorant. And 'hence, on conversing with the meanest Lacedemonian, at first 'indeed he would appear awkward in his language, but when he 'perceived the drift of the conversation, he would throw in, like 'a dexterous lancer, some short and nervous remark, so as to 'make the other look no better than a child. Nor in these cities 'is such a manner of speaking confined to the men, but it extends also to the women.' The art of conversing well was much cultivated in Sparta; boys were taught to give ready and pointed answers, and to impart a peculiar sharpness and brilliancy to their sayings. Their fondness for a condensed and high-pressure style, for the concentrated essence of speech, would find satisfaction in the enigmatical compression of the ode: the productions of Pindar, the master of Dorian lyric poetry, are not poems, but riddles, and such are frequently the choral portions of the Attic tragedy; but the magicians of Greece could extract beauty from any materials, even out of a marvellous obscurity. 'A general history of the lyric poetry of the Greeks,' says Müller, 'is the subject at once the most attractive and 'most difficult which remains for the industry of the present 'age.' We shall be happy to discuss this department of Doric literature, when such a historian of the lyric muse shall arise. The original foundations of tragedy, the choral songs which anciently treated only of the passion, or sufferings and exploits of Bacchus, were always written in the Doric dialect.

The learned professor often speaks with evident satisfaction of the extreme seriousness of the Dorians; he acknowledges, however, that we now and then discover a ray of levity or mirth piercing the gravity of their nature. He refutes the notion, that life at Sparta was one unvaried scene of gloominess and melancholy, and maintains that it was diversified, cheerful, and by no means unattractive. Nor will the Doric gravity be objectionable even to the most lively, if they consider it as a solid foundation,

that was laid with much care to prevent the failure of the joke which was to be erected upon it: they were only sad that they might be merry; grave to be more gay. ‘The strictest gravity
 ‘was found closely united with the most unrestrained jocularity
 ‘and mirth; for as every real jest requires for a foundation a
 ‘firm, rigorous, and grave disposition of mind, so moral indiffer-
 ‘ence, and a frivolous temperament, not only destroy the contrast
 ‘between gravity and jest, but annihilate the spirit of both.’ How we should rejoice to find in a Palimpsest MS., under an appropriate commentary upon the Lamentations of Jeremiah, one of the Doric comedies of Epicharmus. The dramatic style of this poet is allowed to have been perfect, in its kind, and his views elevated and philosophic, which enabled him to satirize mankind, without disturbing the calmness and tranquillity of his thoughts; while at the same time his scenes of common life were marked with the acute and penetrating genius which characterised the Sicilians. Nor would a specimen of the celebrated Mimes of Sophron be a less welcome accession to the remains of Doric letters. Plato himself admired these works, and found the study of them serviceable in the composition of his dialogues; they were not only distinguished by their faithful imitation of manners, even of the vulgar, for copying exactly the rude dialect of the common people, and for a rich store of proverbial expressions; but they displayed the skill of the author, in seizing the more delicate shades and turns of feeling, and in preserving the unity and consistency of his characters.

Although Pythagoras was a native of the Ionic Samos, Müller maintains that he was a Dorian by descent, and that his system ought to be considered as the Doric philosophy. Whenever this philosopher is introduced into the facetious dialogues of Lucian, his speech is exceedingly and most comically Ionic. We read, on the other hand, that Porphyry, in his life of Pythagoras, mentions certain commentaries of the Pythagoreans, which, whether genuine or spurious, were written in the Doric dialect, of the obscurity of which he complains:—*ἔπειτα δὲ τὸ καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα Δωρίδι γεγράφθαι ἔχουσι τι καὶ ἀσαφές τῆς διαλέκτου.* The Pythagorean philosophy is considered as Doric, because, in its political doctrines, it followed Doric principles, and with the Doric religion it was united both externally and internally. The recondite principle of this philosophy always is, that the essence of things lies in their due measure and proportion, their system and regularity; that every thing exists by harmony and symmetry alone; and that the world itself is an union of all these proportions. But we forbear to enquire further at present into the claims of the Dorians to this wonderful personage.

After Anacharsis the Scythian had visited the different states of Greece, and lived among them all, he is reported to have said, that all wanted leisure and tranquillity for wisdom, except the Lacedemonians, for that these were the only persons with whom it was possible to hold a rational conversation. The life of all the other Greeks had, doubtless, appeared to him as a restless and unquiet existence, as a constant struggle and effort, without any object. It is not only to the Greeks that the want of leisure to be wise may be imputed. The severity of the Spartan discipline is apt to inspire a prejudice against them; we are sometimes disposed to consider them as Moravians militant, or a sect of warlike Quakers, if the earth, now languid through old age, could conceive such monsters; nevertheless, besides the love of ease and tranquillity, they had many great and estimable qualities. We will terminate our notice of this remarkable work, by extracting the learned historian's summary of the national character of the Dorians in general:—

‘ The first feature in the character of the Dorians which we shall notice, is one that has been pointed out in several places, viz. their endeavour to produce uniformity and unity in a numerous body. Every individual was to remain within those limits which were prescribed by the regulation of the whole body. Thus, in the Doric form of government, no individual was allowed to strive after personal independence, nor any class or order to move from its appointed place. The privileges of the aristocracy, and the subjection of the inferior orders, were maintained with greater strictness than in other tribes; and greater importance was attached to obedience, in whatever form, than to the assertion of individual freedom. The government, the army, and the public education, were managed on a most complicated, but most regular succession and alternation of commanding and obeying. Every one was to obey in his own place. All the smaller associations were also regulated on the same principle: always we find gradation of power, and never independent equality. But it was not sufficient that this system should be complete and perfect within; it was fortified without. The Dorians had little inclination to admit the customs of others, and a strong desire to disconnect themselves with foreigners. Hence, in later times, the blunt and harsh deportment of those Dorians who most scrupulously adhered to their national habits. This independence and seclusion would, however, sometimes be turned into hostility; and hence the military turn of the Dorians, which may also be traced in the development of the worship of Apollo. A calm and steady courage was the natural quality of the Dorians. As they were not ready to receive, neither were they to communicate, outward impressions; and this, neither as individuals, nor as a body. Hence, both in their poetry and prose, the narrative is often concealed by expressions of the feelings, and tinged with the colour of the mind. They endeavoured always to condense and concentrate their thoughts, which was the cause of the great brevity and obscurity of their lan-

guage. Their desire of disconnecting themselves with the things and persons around them, naturally produced a love for past times; and hence their great attachment to the usages and manners of their ancestors, and to existing institutions. The attention of the Doric race was turned to the past rather than to the future. And thus it came to pass, that the Dorians preserved most rigidly, and represented most truly, the customs of the ancient Greeks. Their advances were constant, not sudden; and all their changes imperceptible. With the desire to attain uniformity, their love for measure and proportion was also combined. Their works of art are distinguished by this attention to singleness of effect, and every thing discordant or useless was pruned off with an unsparing hand. Their moral system also prescribed the observance of the proper mean; and it was in this that the temperance, *σωφροσύνη*, which so distinguished them consisted. One great object of the worship of Apollo, was to maintain the even balance of the mind, and to remove every thing that might disquiet the thoughts, rouse the mind to passion, or dim its purity and brightness. The Doric nature required an equal and regular harmony, and, preserving that character in all its parts, dissonances, even if they combined in harmony, were not suited to the taste of the nation. The national tunes were, doubtless, not of a soft or pleasing melody; the general accent of the language had the character of command or of dictation, not of question or entreaty.

‘The Dorians were contented with themselves, with the powers to whom they owed their existence and happiness; and therefore they never complained. They looked not to future, but to present existence. To preserve this, and to preserve it in enjoyment, was their highest object. Every thing beyond this boundary was mist and darkness; and every thing dark they supposed the deity to hate. They lived in themselves, and for themselves. Hence man was the chief and almost only object which attracted their attention. The same feelings may also be perceived in their religion, which was always unconnected with the worship of any natural object, and originated from their own reflection and conceptions. And to the same source may, perhaps, be traced their aversion to mechanical and agricultural labour. In short, the whole race bears generally the stamp and character of the male sex; the desire of assistance and connexion, of novelty and of curiosity, the characteristics of the female sex being directly opposed to the nature of the Dorians, which bears the mark of independence and subdued strength.’

Besides the Spartans and the other Dorians of the Peloponnese, including Corinth, were many important colonies;—Crete, into which island the Doric migrations preceded the invasion of the Peloponnese, and the various settlements of the Peloponnesian Dorians,—as Rhodes, Syracuse, Cyrene, Crotona, Tarentum, and Byzantium, a city only less renowned than Rome itself. Müller says, with some malice, that the Syracusans were most like the Athenians in their customs and disposition. The large plenty of Byzantium suffered in almost every age, that the law of the

city, 'whatever I please,' should prevail; and that the well-fed populace should obey their own will, and that of their demagogues. The Doric character in different states was modified by situation and circumstances; commerce introduced splendour and magnificence, the graces and refinements of luxury, debauchery, vice, and effeminacy: and it seems, that when the serious, regular Dorians ran to seed, they were more dissolute than those who had been brought up with less severe and formal strictness.

This work is illustrated by two excellent maps, which present an exact picture of the face of the country: in a region so mountainous as Greece, this kind of delineation is peculiarly desirable. An appendix contains various disquisitions—on the origin and early history of the Macedonians, on the mythology of Hercules, on the geography of the Peloponnese and of Northern Greece, and on the Doric dialect; a form of speech, which, with our pronunciation, and to our ears, is certainly less agreeable than the Ionic Greek. It comprehends also chronological tables and some other matters. As is common with German works, the index is unfortunately scanty and ill-conditioned; nor have the translators supplied this defect.

With respect to the translation, the two learned and ingenious gentlemen who effected it, had already done good service to the republic of letters, by rendering from the German 'Bocckh's 'Public Economy of Athens,'—a work of great and curious erudition. In some particulars, their interpretation of the history of the Dorians is not merely a faithful translation, but may claim the authority of an original work. We must lament that, in any instance, any change, however inconsiderable, should have been made; for the principal advantage of literary communications with foreign countries indisputably is, that the different opinions on many important subjects, which are generally prevalent among the one people, should be fully known, and freely ventilated among the other. It is fit, however, that the very intelligent and praiseworthy translators should speak for themselves: 'At a time when a large part of the present translation had been completed, the translators communicated by letter to Professor Müller, their intentions with regard to his work on the Dorians, and requested him to read the MS. of their translation, before it was printed, in case they should have anywhere committed any errors, or failed to catch the import of his words. To this request, Mr Müller, though not personally known by either of the translators, not only acceded, but with an unexpected, and indeed unhopèd for liberality, expressed his willingness to contribute to our translation all the alterations and additions

‘ which his reading had suggested since the appearance of the original work. The MS. was accordingly transmitted and carefully revised, corrected, and enlarged by the author. Of the value of these changes, it would, perhaps, be improper that we should speak in the terms which they seem to us to deserve : of their number, however, as this can be brought to a certain test, we will venture to assert, that few books undergo so great changes after their first publication ; and that the present work may be in strictness considered, not only a translation, but a new edition of the original. In making these changes, it was also the author’s wish to clear up ambiguities or obscurity of meaning, either by a change in the expression, or a fuller developement of the thought : and we cannot help hoping, that even to a person acquainted with the German, our translation will thus be found in many places more explicit and satisfactory than the original text.’

‘ After the printing of the whole work (with the exception of the appendix) had been completed, the sheets were sent to Mr Müller, by which means, not only the translation of the original, but also of the MS. additions, have received the approbation of the author. Any discrepancies, therefore, which may appear between the translation and the original, must be considered as sanctioned by the author. The translators, at the same time, think it right to state, in case Mr Müller should be exposed to any misrepresentations in his own country, that in making their translation, they did not consider themselves bound to follow the letter of the original, and have sometimes indulged in a free paraphrase ; while in some places they suggested more considerable changes, on account of the difference between the opinions on many important subjects which generally prevail in England and Germany.’

ART. VII.—*The Siamese Twins. A Satirical Tale of the Times.*
By the Author of *Pelham*, &c. 8vo. London : 1831.

WE have two reasons for noticing this poem ; first, that though it is the work of one who has greatly distinguished himself as a novelist, it yet seems generally to be considered a failure of a conspicuous kind ; and secondly, because, while we see no reason to dispute the verdict of the public in regard to the ‘ Twins’ themselves, and feel no great inclination to interfere with the course of justice as to them, we must venture a recommendation to mercy on behalf of some of their companions, who have been, we think, somewhat unjustly involved in the

same sentence, for no other reason, apparently, than that they have been found in rather suspicious company.

The fate of Mr Bulwer's poem, (for we presume we may now lay aside the Waiter and bring forward the Knight Templar,) reminds us of the unfortunate issue of the mechanist's display (in Rasselas) of his flying apparatus, when, after summoning the prince to witness the triumph of his infallible invention, and pointing out most convincingly wherein the errors of his predecessors lay, he took his flight from the rock, and was fished up the next minute, half drowned and wholly disconcerted, from the lake. Mr Bulwer, in the same way, after discoursing scholarly and wisely of the causes which occasion the present indifference to poetry, and the erroneous views of his predecessors, and hinting intelligibly enough, that he thinks he has hit upon the right path himself, takes his flight with equal gallantry, 'sheer o'er the crystal battlements,' and the next intelligence which his friends receive is, that he has been picked up like Mulciber on Lemnos, much stunned by his descent, and considerably bruised by the harsh treatment he had received from the inhospitable critics among whom he fell. The attempt, in short, has been singularly unsuccessful; and yet 'the man is, notwithstanding, *sufficient*.' In prose fiction he has unquestionably displayed powers of a high and varied order; and even in poetry, there are portions of this volume which would induce us, on a future occasion, without much hesitation, 'to take his bond.'

The fact is, this failure has been owing to no want of poetical ability on the part of the author, but to his selection of a subject the most intractable and inapplicable to the purpose to which it has been turned, that we can well imagine. Mr Bulwer was wrong, in the first place, in thinking either that his forte lay in humour, or that a humorous poem was likely to interest the public mind in its present state of feeling; and secondly, in thinking that the particular subject which he has selected, was well adapted to the style of poetry he had chosen.

In an imaginary thesis which he maintains in his preface against an ideal bibliopole, he states his opinion, that the present indifference to poetry arises from the propensity which exists on the part of our poets to multiply and reproduce sentiments and feelings which are no longer those of the age;—to be gloomy when the public wish rather to be gay;—sentimental and mystical when they want to be practical and plain;—in short, to a want of any proper or efficient 'representation,' as it were, of the popular mind. But he holds, that by a judicious selection of a theme and manner, more analogous to the existing wants and poetical ne-

ecessities of the time, Poetry, purified from her present errors, will regain her ancient interest and ascendancy. And accordingly, as if with the view of avoiding as much as possible that melancholy channel in which, since the death of Byron, he is of opinion that the current of poetry has flowed too exclusively, he has sought his principle of regeneration in the introduction of the humorous, and has endeavoured to excite our interest by a poem 'chiefly of a comic and lightly satiric nature,' addressing 'itself rather to the humours than the passions of men.'

Now, it is quite true, that when a well-graced actor like Byron leaves the stage, the prattle of his successors is apt to be tedious. Nature is not prodigal of her great men; and after such an event it is to be expected that the sceptre will for a time be put in commission;—that the provinces of poetry, once united under one strong rule, must for a time be parcelled out among the successors of Alexander. Imitations, either swelling into extravagance, or sinking into utter feebleness, gradually disgust the public even with what it had once admired, till at last all poetry is viewed with a suspicious eye. But still it is not to poetry itself that we become indifferent; once more let a true poet arise, and even now, in the midst of all the noisy interests of the day, he will find fit audience, though few, and, as when a prophet spoke of old, there will be a silence in the assembly.

But we feel perfectly satisfied, that Mr Bulwer is completely in error when he expects that such a result could be produced by a poem of a satirical kind, addressing itself chiefly to the humours of men. It is by passion, not by humour, that poetry, and particularly at the present day, must ultimately stand;—by dealing with what is permanent and universal, not what is local and variable. If we are likely to be roused from our lethargy, it must be by the voice of one speaking to us with earnestness and solemnity;—not indeed merely repeating over again what we have heard too often before, but still appealing to the deeper feelings and more serious interests of life;—not dwelling in the regions of the fancy, and launching his quips and cranks, or his more pointed invectives, from behind the veil of a fantastic and improbable fable. Doubtless, to be influential, poetry must deal with and reflect the present; but it is with its loftier interests, its more vital opinions, its virtues, its crimes, —not with its mere follies, affectations, or petty vices, that we have to do. The poem which aspires only to the exposure of the latter, fulfils its destiny when it is read, laughed at, and forgotten; and to expect that the generation which follows should take any great interest in such productions, seems almost

as unreasonable as to suppose they should be interested by the advertisements in an old newspaper. In poetry, as in every thing else, the elevated and the serious only, can be of extensive and permanent operation.

Satire, and especially that which addresses itself to errors of taste and sentiment, to the extravagances of fashion, or of political opinion, is at the best, then, no very elevated department, and little likely to revive that worship of true poetry, which, from the numerous idolatrous imitations that have for some time past been imposed on the public, has so generally declined. But it is attended also with another evil, and, to minds of refined and kindly feelings, no trifling one;—the necessity which it too often imposes of becoming personal, in order to be pointed, and of violating, in some degree, that neutrality, to the preservation of which society owes most of its attractions. It is not to every one, neither, that the public will readily accord such a dispensation from the common decencies and usages of society, as to entitle him to appear as a public prosecutor of private follies; and the satirist, who steps forth as a literary Ishmaelite, had better look well to his own crest, and examine the rivets of his own armour, before he levels his lance at another.

For many reasons, then, we wish that Mr Bulwer had come forward in a less questionable shape than that of a satirist; but the singular part of the business is, that, after all, he has not written a satirical and humorous poem, but one which contains an extraordinary mixture of the very style which he inveighs against, with that lighter and more *riant* vein which he professes to substitute in its room. He seems, in fact, to have seen, that without an occasional substratum of seriousness, and more powerful emotion, his poem was not likely to rouse the long-slumbering public; and, in endeavouring to avoid this, he has produced a strange jumble of the tragic and the comic, the probable and the impossible. The antics of Ching, the lively brother, are opposed to the gloom of Chang, a legitimate descendant of the school of Byron; the gaieties of Almack's are contrasted with the horrors of a necromancer's cave; and the airy gambols of Mr Hodges, in the blanket at Bancoek, with scenes of love most musical, most melancholy, in London. But the misfortune is, that these varieties alternate, but do not blend with each other; like the Twins themselves, there is nothing but a slender and unnatural link between them; and the author passes from grave to gay, apparently on no more profound or satisfactory principle than that which regulated Mr Puff's transitions from the terrible to the plaintive.

' PUFF—Have ye any more cannon to fire ?

PROMPTER—No, sir.

PUFF—Now then for soft music !'

Thinking, then, as we do, that Mr Bulwer has been exquisitely unsuccessful in the choice of a subject, and in the contrasts of his cannon and soft music, we naturally feel little inclination to analyze the execution of what, in the hands of any one, could not be otherwise than startling and disagreeable. Even in minuter details, it would be very easy to point out instances where the humour is far from successful, and some in which the satire is applied to individuals either undeserving of the attack from any one, or, at all events, from Mr Bulwer. On the other hand, it would be still easier, and far more agreeable for us, to point out many passages, both in a serious and comic vein, in which he has been extremely successful ; but we prefer leaving this poem, and passing at once to one of the shorter pieces which are appended to it, and which, we think, have been rather unfairly included in the censure or neglect which has attended their more lengthened predecessor.

These poems are of a higher mood. Mr Bulwer may be assured that, in poetry at least, (and we confess we entertain much the same opinion also as to his prose,) it is when he lays open his heart to the gentler, deeper, and more melancholy or enthusiastic impressions, rather than to the influence of the sarcastic or the witty, that he appears to the greatest advantage. In the latter, his success is often questionable ; in the former, he is almost uniformly natural and touching. If he had only bestowed half the pains which he has expended upon these unlucky Twins, in bringing forward the other legitimate children of his fancy to advantage, he would have had far less reason to complain of the success of his volume. There is, in particular, one poem—' Milton,' which is alone sufficient to entitle Mr Bulwer to no mean rank in poetry. It is a series of fragments, founded on the old anecdote of the Italian Lady, who, finding the youthful poet asleep in the fields, and attracted by his beauty, left by his side Guarini's epigram, ' *Oechi stelli mortali.*' Mr Bulwer has prolonged through some additional scenes this fragment of romance. Milton seeks the lady of his dreams in Italy ; and brief glimpses are exhibited to us of the poet at three successive periods—in the fire of youth—the fulness of manhood—and the decline of age ; the void between the successive scenes being left to be filled up by the imagination of the reader, with all the trials and sufferings, the triumphs, hopes, or patient endurance, which had chequered the lot of the lovers. There is a peculiar air of tranquil beauty, we think, in the following lines,

descriptive of one of those Italian fetes that remind us of the scenes in the 'Decameron,' and at which Milton unexpectedly meets the object of his search.

'It was the evening—and a group were strewn
 O'er such a spot as ye, I ween, might see,
 When basking in the Summer's breathless noon,
 With upward face beneath the murmuring tree ;
 While in a vague and floating sleep arise
 Sweet shapes and fairy knolls to the half-conscious eyes.
 It was the evening—still it lay, and fair,
 Lapp'd in the quiet of the hulling air.
 Still—but how happy ! like a living thing,
 All love itself—all love around it seeing ;
 And drinking from the earth, as from a spring,
 The hush'd delight and essence of its being.
 And round the spot—a wall of glossy shade—
 The interlaced and bowering trees reposed ;
 And through the world of foliage had been made
 Green lanes and vistas, which at length were closed
 By fount, or fane, or statue, white and hoar,
 Startling the heart with the fond dreams of yore.
 And near, half glancing through its veil of leaves,
 An antique temple stood in marble grace ;
 Where still, if fondly wise, the heart believes,
 Lingers the pining Spirit of the Place,
 Seen wandering yet perchance at earliest dawn
 Or greyest eve—with Nymph or bearded Faun.'

A party like that which Bocaccio has painted in the gardens of the villa Pamfili, was here assembled round a fountain in the midst ; and among these, the English guest, the youthful Milton, is the cynosure of neighbouring eyes. When the festival is over, he lingers in the twilight in the gardens, and then the form which had so long haunted his fancy, suddenly makes its appearance, emerging from one of the walks. Their feelings at first meeting Mr Bulwer passes over ; but their subsequent attachment is thus finely painted :

'They met again, and oft ! what time the Star
 Of Hesperus hung his rosy lamp on high ;
 And the Witch Night shook from her solemn car
 A liquid magic o'er the breathless sky.
 And Mystery o'er their lonely meeting threw
 A charm earth's common ties can ne'er bestow—
 Her name, her birth, her home, he never knew ;
 And she—*his* love was all she sought to know.

* * * * *

So worshipped he in silence and sweet wonder
 The unknown Egeria of his haunted soul ;

And Hope—life's chequering moonlight—smiled asunder
 The doubts that cloud-like o'er him sought to roll.
 And thus his love grew daily, and, perchance,
 Was all the stronger circled by romance.
 He found a name for her, if not her own,
 Haply as soft, and to her heart as dear—
 His life—his "Zoe"—Ah! of all names, none
 Makes so divine a music to the ear
 As that by lovers coined—the child-like art
 That breathes to vulgar words the fond thoughts of the heart!
 Creep slowly on, thou grey and wizard Time—
 Thou grey and wizard Time, creep slowly on—
 Ev'n I would linger in my truant rhyme,
 Nor tell too soon how soon those hours were gone.
 Flowers bloom again—leaves glad once more the tree,—
 Poor life, there comes no second spring to thee!

The progress of events at home recalls Milton to England.
 And after a long conflict with himself, he breaks the news to his
 mistress, and urges her to share her fortunes with him:

' " Come, then, my Zoe, on this pilgrimage,
 This high and noble travail of the soul;
 Come, be my guide, my partner, and my staff,
 My hope in youth, my haven in my age,—
 Come, if the world forsake, or fate control,
 Or Fortune leave me—and the bitter rage
 Of Foes in love with Fetters, make me quaff,
 Ev'n to the last, the hemlock of the bowl,
 Reserv'd for those, who, vanquish'd, chafe the tide
 Of Custom's ire, its passions, and its pride,—
 Come—be my spendthrift-heart's last lonely hoard,
 My wealth, my world—my solace, my reward.
 Come—though from marble domes and orange bowers—
 Come to a humble roof, a northern sky;
 Love's fairy halls and temples shall be our's,
 And our heart's sun the ice of earth defy.
 Trust me, though fate may turn each hope to gall,
 Thou at thy choice, belov'd, shalt ne'er repine;
 Trust me, whatever storm on me may fall,
 My breast shall ward the blast, the bolt, from thine!
 Yes! as the bird on yonder oak, which breathes
 Soul into night, thy love shall be to me!
 Yes! I will be that oak, which ever wreathes
 Its boughs, though leafless, into bowers for thee!
 And when the sunshine of thy life be set,
 And beams, and joy, and pomp, and light depart,
 There is one shelter that will shield thee yet,
 Thy nest, my bird—thy refuge in my heart! " '

' He ceased ; and drew her closer to his breast ;
 Wildly her bosom heaved beneath his own ;
 From her sweet lips beneath his kisses prest,
 Gush'd her heart's fulness in a murmur'd tone ;
 And o'er her bent her lover ; and the gold
 Of his rich locks with her dark tresses blended ;
 And still, and soft, and tenderly, the lone
 And mellowing night upon their forms descended ;
 And thus amid the ghostly walls of old,
 And curtain'd by the blue and starry air,
 They seem'd not wholly of an earth-born mould,
 But suited to the memories breathing there—
 Two Genii of the mixt and tender race,
 From fairest fount or tree, their homes who singled—
 Last of their order doom'd to haunt the place,
 And bear sweet being interfused and mingled.'

A sudden noise, the cause of which is left unexplained, startles the fond pair ; Zoe springs from his side, and the lovers are for ever parted by—eight lines of unrelenting asterisks.

We can make room only for one other extract, which paints the poet in the evening of his days, fallen on evil tongues and evil times, but still consoled by the thought that future ages would discharge that debt of gratitude to his memory which his own had denied.

' There sate an old man by that living tree
 Which bloom'd his humble dwelling-place beside—
 The last dim rose which wont to blossom o'er
 The threshold, had that morning droop'd and died,
 Nipp'd by the withering air ; the neighbouring door
 Swung on its hinge—within you well might hear
 The clock's low murmur bickering on the ear—
 And thro' the narrow opening you might see
 The sand which rested on the uneven floor,
 The dark-oak board—the morn's untasted fare,
 The scatter'd volumes, and the antique chair
 Which—worn and homely—brought a rest at last
 Sweet after all life's struggles with the past.
 The old man felt the fresh air on him blowing,
 Waving the thin locks from his forehead pale,
 He felt above the laughing sun was glowing,
 And heard the wild birds hymning in the gale,
 And scented the awakening sweets which lay
 Conch'd on the bosom of the virgin day—
 And felt thro' all—and sigh'd not—that for him
 The earth was joyless, and the heaven was dim,
 Creation was a blank—the light a gloom,
 And life itself as changeless as the tomb.

High—pale—still—voiceless—motionless—alone—
 He sate—like some wrought monumental stone—
 Raising his sightless balls to the blue sky ;
 Life's dreaming morning and its toiling day
 Had sadden'd into evening—and the deep
 And all august repose—which broods on high
 What time the wearied storms have died away,
 Mighty in silence—like a giant's sleep—
 Made calm the lifted grandeur of his brow.'

In this state he is seen by her whom he had loved in youth ; seen, but in silence—for no interview takes place. Once again only she comes, and disappears like a vision.

' Beneath a church's chancel there were laid
 A great Man's bones,—and when the crowd was gone,
 An aged woman, in black robes arrayed,
 Lingered and wept beside the holy stone.
 None knew her name or land ; her voice was sweet,
 With the strange music of a foreign tongue :—
 Thrice on that spot her bending form they meet,
 Thrice on that stone are freshest garlands hung.
 On the fourth day she came not, and the wreath,
 Look'd dim and withered from its odorous breath ;
 And, if I err not wholly, on that day
 A soul that loved till death, had pass'd away !'

No one, we think, who reads these beautiful fragments, can doubt that Mr Bulwer has in him the feeling and imagination of a poet ;—a fine ear for versification, and no limited compass of forcible and poetical expression. Their principal fault is an occasional obscurity or inversion of construction, which sometimes, as in Campbell's ' Gertrude,' renders it necessary to read the stanza three or four times over, before we can be certain of the meaning. Elevation thus gained at the expense of perspicuity, is never an advantage ; the plainer the meaning, the more direct and immediate is its influence on the feelings and the heart.

In conclusion, we repeat, we have no wish to meet Mr Bulwer again in the field of satirical poetry ; and think it would have been as well, if he had done with his *Twins* what people generally do with any disagreeable *lusus naturee*—kept them carefully under lock and key, for the inspection of the curious in monsters alone. But let him come forward with such poems as that of ' Milton,' not in the shape of fragments, but with a connected interest, and we will venture to promise his next volume a very different reception from the present. Though Milton is said, notwithstanding the opinions of his friends, to have maintained to the last that his *Paradise Regained* was

much superior to his *Paradise Lost*, we trust Mr Bulwer is a little more open to conviction as to the comparative merits of his serious and comic performances; and that, eschewing satire, he will in future devote himself, in his poetical exercises, to that department in poetry, for which, notwithstanding his sneers at the melancholy and gentlemanlike school of versifiers, he is by nature adapted.

We may as well add here, that we had hoped to be able before now to notice Mr Bulwer's Novels, which, though chargeable with some considerable blemishes and misapplications of talent, are yet in many respects vastly superior to most others of their class that have lately appeared; but we have not hitherto found leisure to re-peruse so many works, read eagerly on their first appearance for amusement only, with the attention requisite for a critical view of their contents.

ART. VIII.—*Historic Survey of German Poetry, interspersed with various Translations.* By W. TAYLOR, of Norwich. 3 vols. Svo. London: 1830.

GERMAN Literature has now for upwards of half a century been making some way in England; yet by no means at a constant rate, rather in capricious flux and reflux,—deluge alternating with desiccation: never would it assume such moderate, reasonable currency, as promised to be useful and lasting. The history of its progress here would illustrate the progress of more important things; would again exemplify what obstacles a new spiritual object, with its mixture of truth and of falsehood, has to encounter from unwise enemies, still more from unwise friends; how dross is mistaken for metal, and common ashes are solemnly labelled as fell poison; how long, in such cases, blind Passion must vociferate before she can awaken Judgment; in short, with what tumult, vicissitude, and protracted difficulty, a foreign doctrine adjusts and locates itself among the homeborn. Perfect ignorance is quiet, perfect knowledge is quiet; not so the transition from the former to the latter. In a vague, all-exaggerating twilight of wonder, the new has to fight its battle with the old; Hope has to settle accounts with Fear: thus the scales strangely waver; public opinion, which is as yet baseless, fluctuates without limit; periods of foolish admiration and foolish execration must elapse before that of true enquiry and zeal according to knowledge, can begin.

Thirty years ago, for example, a person of influence and understanding thought good to emit such a proclamation as the fol-

lowing: 'Those ladies who take the lead in society, are loudly called upon to act as guardians of the public taste as well as of the public virtue. They are called upon, therefore, to oppose, with the whole weight of their influence, the irruption of those swarms of Publications now daily issuing from the banks of the Danube, which like their ravaging predecessors of the darker ages, though with far other and more fatal arms, are overrunning civilized society. Those readers whose purer taste has been formed on the correct models of the old classic school, see with indignation and astonishment the Huns and Vandals once more overpowering the Greeks and Romans. They behold our minds, with a retrograde but rapid motion, hurried back to the reign of Chaos and old Night, by distorted and unprincipled Compositions, which in spite of strong flashes of genius, unite the taste of the Goths with the morals of Bagshot.'—'The newspapers announce that Schiller's *Tragedy of the Robbers*, which inflamed the young nobility of Germany to enlist themselves into a band of highwaymen, to rob in the forests of Bohemia, is now acting in England by persons of quality!'

Whether our fair Amazons, at sound of this alarm-trumpet, drew up in array of war to discomfit those invading Compositions, and snuff out the lights of that questionable private theatre, we have not learned; and see only that, if so, their campaign was fruitless and needless. Like the old Northern Immigrators, those new Paper Goths marched on resistless whither they were bound; some to honour, some to dishonour, the most to oblivion and the impalpable inane; and no weapon or artillery, not even the glances of bright eyes, but only the omnipotence of Time, could tame and assort them. Thus, Kotzebue's truculent armaments, once so threatening, all turned out to be mere Fantasms and Night-apparitions; and so rushed onwards, like some Spectre Hunt, with loud howls indeed, yet hurrying nothing into Chaos but themselves. While again, Schiller's *Tragedy of the Robbers*, which did not inflame either the young or the old nobility of Germany to rob in the forests of Bohemia, or indeed to do any thing, except perhaps yawn a little less, proved equally innocuous in England, and might still be acted without offence, could living individuals, idle enough for that end, be met with here. Nay, this same Schiller, not indeed by *Robbers*, yet by *Wallensteins*, by *Maids of Orleans*,

* *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education.* By Hannah More. The Eighth Edition, p. 41.

and *Wilhelm Tells*, has actually conquered for himself a fixed dominion among us, which is yearly widening; round which other German kings, of less intrinsic prowess and of greater, are likewise erecting thrones. And yet, as we perceive, civilized society still stands in its place; and the public taste, as well as the public virtue, lives on, though languidly, as before. For, in fine, it has become manifest that the old Cimmerian forest is now quite felled and tilled; that the true Children of Night, whom we have to dread, dwell not on the banks of the Danube, but nearer hand.

Could we take our progress in knowledge of German Literature since that diatribe was written, as any measure of our progress in the science of Criticism, above all, in the grand science of national Tolerance, there were some reason for satisfaction. With regard to Germany itself, whether we yet stand on the right footing, and know at last how we are to live in profitable neighbourhood and intercourse with that country; or whether the present is but one other of those capricious tides which also will have its reflux, may seem doubtful: meanwhile, clearly enough, a rapidly growing favour for German Literature comes to light; which favour too is the more hopeful, as it now grounds itself on better knowledge, on direct study and judgment. Our knowledge is better, if only because more general. Within the last ten years, independent readers of German have multiplied perhaps a hundred fold; so that now this acquirement is almost expected as a natural item in liberal education. Hence, in a great number of minds, some immediate personal insight into the deeper significance of German Intellect and Art;—everywhere at least a feeling that it has some such significance. With independent readers, moreover, the writer ceases to be independent, which of itself is a considerable step. Our British Translators, for instance, have long been unparalleled in modern literature, and, like their country, ‘the envy of surrounding nations:’ but now there are symptoms that even in the remote German province, they must no longer range quite at will; that the butchering of a *Faust* will henceforth be accounted literary homicide, and practitioners of that quality must operate on the dead subject only. While there are Klingemanns and Claurens in such abundance, let no merely ambitious, or merely hungry Interpreter, fasten on Goethes and Schillers. Remark, too, with satisfaction, how the old-established British Critic now feels that it has become unsafe to speak delirium on this subject; wherefore he prudently restricts himself to one of two courses: either to acquire some understanding of it, or, which is the still surer course, altogether to hold his peace. Hence

freedom from much babble that was wont to be oppressive: probably no watch-horn with such a note as that of Mrs More's can again be sounded, by male or female Dogberry, in these Islands. Again, there is no one of our younger, more vigorous Periodicals, but has its German craftsman, gleaning what he can: we have seen Jean Paul quoted in English Newspapers. Nor, among the signs of improvement, at least of extended curiosity, let us omit our British Foreign Reviews, a sort of merchantmen that regularly visit the Continental, especially the German ports, and bring back such ware as luck yields them, with the hope of better. Last, not least, among our evidences of Philo-Germanism, here is a whole *Historic Survey of German Poetry*, in three sufficient octavos; and this not merely in the eulogistic and recommendatory vein, but proceeding in the way of criticism, and indifferent, impartial narrative: a man of known character, of talent, experience, penetration, judges that the English public is prepared for such a service, and likely to reward it.

These are appearances, which, as advocates for the friendly approximation of all men and all peoples, and the readiest possible interchange of whatever each produces of advantage to the others, we must witness gladly. Free literary intercourse with other nations, what is it but an extended Freedom of the Press; a liberty to read (in spite of Ignorance, of Prejudice, which is the worst of Censors) what our foreign teachers also have printed for us?—ultimately, therefore, a liberty to speak and to hear, were it with men of all countries and of all times; to use, in utmost compass, those precious natural organs, by which not Knowledge only, but mutual Affection, is chiefly generated among mankind. It is a natural wish in man to know his fellow-passengers in this strange Ship, or Planet, on this strange Life-voyage: neither need his curiosity restrict itself to the cabin where he himself chances to lodge; but may extend to all accessible departments of the vessel: In all he will find mysterious beings, of Wants and Endeavours like his own; in all he will find Men; with these let him comfort and manifoldly instruct himself. As to German Literature, in particular, which professes to be not only new, but original, and rich in curious information for us; which claims, moreover, nothing that we have not granted to the French, Italian, Spanish, and in a less degree to far meaner literatures, we are gratified to see that such claims can no longer be resisted. In the present fallow state of our English Literature, when no Poet cultivates his own poetic field, but all are harnessed into Editorial teams, and ploughing in concert, for Useful Knowledge, or Bibliopolic

Profit, we regard this renewal of our intercourse with poetic Germany, after twenty years of languor or suspension, as among the most remarkable and even promising features of our recent intellectual history. In the absence of better tendencies, let this, which is no idle, but, in some points of view, a deep and earnest one, be encouraged. For ourselves, in the midst of so many louder and more exciting interests, we feel it a kind of duty to cast some glances now and then on this little stiller interest: since the matter is once for all to be enquired into, sound notions on it should be furthered, unsound ones cannot be too speedily corrected. It is on such grounds that we have taken up this *Historic Survey*.

Mr Taylor is so considerable a person, that no Book deliberately published by him, on any subject, can be without weight. On German Poetry, such is the actual state of public information and curiosity, his guidance will be sure to lead or mislead a numerous class of inquirers. We are therefore called on to examine him with more than usual strictness and minuteness. The Press, in these times, has become so active; Literature—what is still called Literature—has so dilated in volume, and diminished in density, that the very Reviewer feels at a non-plus, and has ceased to review. Why thoughtfully examine what was written without thought; or note faults and merits, where there is neither fault nor merit? From a Nonentity, embodied, with innocent deception, in foolscap and printers' ink, and named Book; from the common wind of Talk, even when it is conserved by such mechanism, for days, in the shape of Froth,—how shall the hapless Reviewer filter aught in that once so profitable colander of his? He has ceased, as we said, to attempt the impossible—cannot review, but only discourse; he dismisses his too unproductive Author, generally with civil words, not to quarrel needlessly with a fellow-creature; and must try, as he best may, to grind from his own poor garner. Authors long looked with an evil envious eye on the Reviewer, and strove often to blow out his light, which only burnt the clearer for such blasts; but now, cunningly altering their tactics, they have extinguished it by want of oil. Unless for some unforeseen change of affairs, or some new-contrived machinery, of which there is yet no trace, the trade of Reviewer is well nigh done.

The happier are we that Mr Taylor's Book is of the old stamp, and has substance in it for our uses. If no honour, there will be no disgrace in having carefully examined it; which service, indeed, is due to our readers, not without curiosity in this mat-

ter, as well as to the Author. In so far as he seems a safe guide, and brings true tidings from the promised land, let us proclaim that fact, and recommend him to all pilgrims: if, on the other hand, his tidings are false, let us hasten to make this also known; that the German Canaan suffer not, in the eyes of the fainthearted, by spurious samples of its produce, and reports of bloodthirsty sons of Anak dwelling there, which this harbinger and spy brings out of it. In either case, we may hope, our Author, who loves the Germans in his way, and would have his countrymen brought into closer acquaintance with them, will feel that, in purpose at least, we are co-operating with him.

First, then, be it admitted without hesitation, that Mr Taylor, in respect of general talent and acquirement, takes his place above all our expositors of German things; that his book is greatly the most important we yet have on this subject. Here are upwards of fourteen hundred solid pages of commentary, narrative, and translation, submitted to the English reader; numerous statements and personages, hitherto unheard of, or vaguely heard of, stand here in fixed shape; there is, if no map of intellectual Germany, some first attempt at such. Farther, we are to state that our Author is a zealous, earnest man; no hollow dilettante hunting after shadows, and prating he knows not what; but a substantial, distinct, remarkably decisive man; has his own opinion on many subjects, and can express it adequately. We should say, precision of idea was a striking quality of his: no vague transcendentalism, or mysticism of any kind; nothing but what is measurable and tangible, and has a meaning which he that runs may read, is to be apprehended here. He is a man of much classical and other reading; of much singular reflection; stands on his own basis, quiescent yet immovable: a certain rugged vigour of natural power, interesting even in its distortions, is everywhere manifest. Lastly, we venture to assign him the rare merit of honesty: he speaks out in plain English what is in him; seems heartily convinced of his own doctrines, and preaches them because they are his own; not for the sake of sale but of truth; at worst, for the sake of making proselytes.

On the strength of which properties, we reckon that this *Historic Survey* may, under certain conditions, be useful and acceptable to two classes. First, to incipient students of German Literature in the original; who in any History of their subject, even in a bare catalogue, will find help; though for that class, unfortunately, Mr Taylor's help is much diminished in value by several circumstances; by this one, were there no

other, that he nowhere cites any authority: the path he has opened may be the true or the false one; for farther researches and lateral surveys there is no direction or indication. But, secondly, we reckon that this Book may be welcome to many of the much larger miscellaneous class, who read less for any specific object than for the sake of reading; to whom any book, that will, either in the way of contradiction or of confirmation, by new wisdom, or new perversion of wisdom, stir up the stagnant inner man, is a windfall; the rather if it bring some historic tidings also, fit for remembering, and repeating; above all, if, as in this case, the style with many singularities have some striking merits, and so the book be a light exercise, even an entertainment.

To such praise and utility the work is justly entitled; but this is not all it pretends to; and more cannot without many limitations be conceded it. Unluckily the *Historic Survey* is not what it should be, but only what it would be. Our Author hastens to correct in his Preface any false hopes his Titlepage may have excited: 'A complete History of German Poetry,' it seems, 'is hardly within reach of his local command of library: 'so comprehensive an undertaking would require another residence in a country from which he has now been separated more 'than forty years;' and which various considerations render it unadvisable to revisit. Nevertheless, 'having long been in the 'practice of importing the productions of its fine literature,' and of working in that material, as critic, biographer, and translator, for more than one 'periodic publication of this country,' he has now composed 'introductory and connective sections,' filled up deficiencies, retrenched superfluities; and so, collecting and remodelling those 'successive contributions,' cements them together into the 'new and entire work' here offered to the public. 'With fragments,' he concludes, 'long since hewn, as it 'were, and sculptured, I attempt to construct an English Temple of Fame to the memory of those German Poets.'

There is no doubt but a Complete History of German Poetry exceeds any local or universal command of books which a British man can at this day enjoy; and, farther, presents obstacles of an infinitely more serious character than this. A History of German, or of any national Poetry, would form, taken in its complete sense, one of the most arduous enterprises any writer could engage in. Poetry, were it the rudest, so it be sincere, is the attempt which man makes to render his existence harmonious, the utmost he can do for that end: it springs therefore from his whole feelings, opinions, activity, and takes its character from these. It may be called the music of his whole man-

ner of being ; and, historically considered, is the test how far Music, or Freedom, existed therein ; how far the feeling of Love, of Beauty and Dignity, could be elicited from that peculiar situation of his, and from the views he there had of Life and Nature, of the Universe, internal and external. Hence, in any measure to understand the Poetry, to estimate its worth, and historical meaning, we ask as a quite fundamental enquiry : What that situation was ? Thus the History of a nation's Poetry is the essence of its History, political, economic, scientific, religious. With all these the complete Historian of a national Poetry will be familiar ; the national physiognomy, in its finest traits, and through its successive stages of growth, will be clear to him : he will discern the grand spiritual Tendency of each period, what was the highest Aim and Enthusiasm of mankind in each, and how one epoch naturally evolved itself from the other. He has to record this highest Aim of a nation, in its successive directions and developements ; for by this the Poetry of the nation modulates itself, this *is* the Poetry of the nation.

Such were the primary essence of a true History of Poetry ; the living principle round which all detached facts and phenomena, all separate characters of Poems and Poets, would fashion themselves into a coherent whole, if they are by any means to cohere. To accomplish such a work for any Literature would require not only all outward aids, but an excellent inward faculty : all telescopes and observatories were of no avail, without the seeing eye and the understanding heart.

Doubtless, as matters stand, such models remain in great part ideal ; the stinted result of actual practice must not be too rigidly tried by them. In our language, we have yet no example of such a performance. Neither elsewhere, except perhaps in the well-meant, but altogether ineffectual, attempt of Denina, among the Italians, and in some detached, though far more successful, sketches by German writers, is there any that we know of. To expect an English History of German Literature in this style were especially unreasonable ; where not only the man to write it, but the people to read and enjoy it are wanting. Some *Historic Survey*, wherein such an ideal standard, if not attained, if not approached, might be faithfully kept in view, and endeavoured after, would suffice us. Neither need such a Survey, even as a British Surveyor might execute it, be deficient in striking objects, and views of a general interest. There is the spectacle of a great people, closely related to us in blood, language, character, advancing through fifteen centuries of culture ; with the eras and changes that have distinguished the like career in other nations. Nay, perhaps, the intellectual

history of the Germans is not without peculiar attraction, on two grounds: first, that they are a separate unmixed people; that in them one of the two grand stem-tribes from which all modern European countries derive their population and speech, is seen growing up distinct, and in several particulars following its own course; secondly, that by accident and by desert, the Germans have more than once been found playing the highest part in European culture; at more than one era the grand Tendencies of Europe have first embodied themselves into action in Germany, the main battle between the New and the Old has been fought and gained there. We mention only the Swiss Revolt, and Luther's Reformation. The Germans have not indeed so many classical works to exhibit as some other nations; a Shakspeare, a Dante, has not yet been recognised among them; nevertheless, they too have had their Teachers and inspired Singers; and in regard to popular Mythology, traditionary possessions and spirit, what we may call the *inarticulate* Poetry of a nation, and what is the element of its spoken or written Poetry, they will be found superior to any other modern people.

The Historic Surveyor of German Poetry will observe a remarkable nation struggling out of Paganism; fragments of that stern Superstition, saved from the general wreck, and still amid the new order of things, carrying back our view, in faint reflexes, into the dim primeval time. By slow degrees the chaos of the Northern Immigrations settles into a new and fairer world; arts advance; little by little, a fund of Knowledge, of Power over Nature, is accumulated for man; feeble glimmerings, even of a higher knowledge, of a poetic, break forth; till at length in the *Swabian Era*, as it is named, a blaze of true though simple Poetry bursts over Germany, more splendid, we might say, than the Troubadour Period of any other nation; for that famous *Nibelungen Song*, produced, at least ultimately fashioned in those times, and still so significant in these, is altogether without parallel elsewhere.

To this period, the essence of which was young Wonder, and an enthusiasm for which Chivalry was still the fit exponent, there succeeds, as was natural, a period of Enquiry, a Didactic period; wherein, among the Germans, as elsewhere, many a Hugo von Trimberg delivers wise saws, and moral apophthegms, to the general edification: later, a Town-clerk of Strasburg sees his *Ship of Fools* translated into all living languages, twice into Latin, and read by Kings; the Apologue of *Reynard the Fox* gathering itself together, from sources remote and near, assumes its Low-German vesture; and becomes the darling of high and low—nay still lives with us, in rude genial vigour, as one of the

most remarkable indigenous productions of the Middle Ages. Nor is acted Poetry of this kind wanting; the Spirit of Enquiry translates itself into Deeds which are poetical, as well as into words: already at the opening of the fourteenth century, Germany witnesses the first assertion of political right, the first vindication of Man against Nobleman; in the early history of the German Swiss. And again, two centuries later, the first assertion of intellectual right, the first vindication of Man against Clergyman; in the history of Luther's Reformation. Meanwhile the Press has begun its incalculable task; the indigenous Fiction of the Germans, what we have called their inarticulate Poetry, issues in innumerable *Volks-bücher* (People's-Books), the progeny and kindred of which still live in all European countries: the People have their Tragedy and their Comedy; *Tyll Eulenspiegel* shakes every diaphragm with laughter; the rudest heart quails with awe at the wild mythus of *Faust*.

With Luther, however, the Didactic Tendency has reached its poetic acme; and now we must see it assume a prosaic character, and Poetry for a long while decline. The Spirit of Enquiry, of Criticism, is pushed beyond the limits, or too exclusively cultivated: what had done so much, is supposed capable of doing all; Understanding is alone listened to, while Fancy and Imagination languish inactive, or are forcibly stifled; and all Poetic culture gradually dies away. As if with the high resolute genius, and noble achievements, of its Luthers and Huttens, the genius of the country had exhausted itself, we behold generation after generation of mere Prosaists succeed those high Psalmists. Science indeed advances, practical manipulation in all kinds improves; Germany has its Copernics, Hevels, Guericques, Keplers; later, a Leibnitz opens the path of true Logic, and teaches the mysteries of Figure and Number: but the finer Education of mankind seems at a stand. Instead of Poetic recognition and worship, we have stolid Theologic controversy, or still shallower Freethinking; pedantry, servility, mode-hunting, every species of Idolatry and Affectation, holds sway. The World has lost its beauty, Life its infinite majesty, as if the Author of it were no longer divine: instead of admiration and creation of the True, there is at best criticism and denial of the False; to Luther there has succeeded Thomasius. In this era, so unpoetical for all Europe, Germany torn in pieces by a Thirty Years' War, and its consequences, is pre-eminently prosaic; its few Singers are feeble echoes of foreign models little better than themselves. No Shakspeare, no Milton appears there; such, indeed, would have appeared earlier, if at all, in the current of German history: but instead, they have only at best Opitzes,

Flemmings, Logans, as we had our Queen Anne Wits; or, in their Lohensteins, Gryphs, Hoffmannswaldaus, though in inverse order, an unintentional parody of our Drydens and Lees.

Nevertheless from every moral death there is a new birth; in this wondrous course of his, man may indeed linger, but cannot retrograde or stand still. In the middle of last century, from among Parisian Erotics, rickety Sentimentalism, Court aperies, and hollow Dulness, striving in all hopeless courses, we behold the giant spirit of Germany awaken as from long slumber; shake away these worthless fetters, and by its Lessings and Klopstocks, announce, in true German dialect, that the Germans also are men. Singular enough in its circumstances was this resuscitation; the work as of a 'spirit on the waters,'—a movement agitating the great popular mass; for it was favoured by no court or king: all sovereignties, even the pettiest, had abandoned their native Literature, their native language, as if to irreclaimable barbarism. The greatest king produced in Germany since Barbarossa's time, Frederick the Second, looked coldly on the native endeavour, and saw no hope but in aid from France. However, the native endeavour prospered without aid: Lessing's announcement did not die away with him, but took clearer utterance, and more inspired modulation from his followers; in whose works it now speaks, not to Germany alone, but to the whole world. The results of this last Period of German Literature, are of deep significance, the depth of which is perhaps but now becoming visible. Here too, it may be, as in other cases, the Want of the Age has first taken voice and shape in Germany; that change from Negation to Affirmation, from Destruction to Re-construction, for which all thinkers in every country are now prepared, is perhaps already in action there. In the nobler Literature of the Germans, say some, lie the rudiments of a new spiritual era, which it is for this, and for succeeding generations to work out and realize. The ancient creative Inspiration, it would seem, is still possible in these ages; at a time when Scepticism, Frivolity, Sensuality, had withered Life into a sand desert, and our gayest prospect was but the *false mirage*, and even our Byrons could utter but a death-song or despairing howl,—the Moses'-wand has again smote from that Horeb refreshing streams, towards which the better spirits of all nations are hastening, if not to drink, yet wistfully and hopefully to examine. If the older Literary History of Germany has the common attractions which in a greater or a less degree belong to the successive epochs of other such Histories; its newer Literature, and the historical delineation of this, has an interest such as belongs to no other.

It is somewhat in this way, as appears to us, that the growth of German Poetry must be construed and represented by the historian: these are the general phenomena and vicissitudes, which, if elucidated by proper individual instances, by specimens fitly chosen, presented in natural sequence, and worked by philosophy into union, would make a valuable book; on any and all of which the observations and researches of so able an enquirer as Mr Taylor would have been welcome. Sorry are we to declare that of all this, which constitutes the essence of any thing calling itself *Historic Survey*, there is scarcely a vestige in the book before us. The question, What is the German mind; what is the culture of the German mind; what course has Germany followed in that matter; what are its national characteristics as manifested therein? appears not to have presented itself to the author's thought. No theorem of Germany and its intellectual progress, not even a false one, has he been at pains to construct for himself. We believe, it is impossible for the most assiduous reader to gather from these three Volumes any portraiture of the national mind of Germany,—not to say in its successive phases and the historical sequence of these, but in any one phase or condition. The work is made up of critical, biographical, bibliographical dissertations, and notices concerning this and the other individual poet; interspersed with large masses of translation; and except that all these are strung together in the order of time, has no historical feature whatever. Many literary lives as we read, the nature of literary life in Germany—what sort of moral, economical, intellectual element it is that a German writer lives in and works in—will nowhere manifest itself. Indeed, far from depicting Germany, scarcely on more than one or two occasions does our Author even look at it, or so much as remind us that it were capable of being depicted. On these rare occasions, too, we are treated with such philosophic insight as the following: 'The Germans are not an imitative, but they are a listening people: they can do nothing without directions, and any thing with them. As soon as Gottsched's rules for writing German correctly had made their appearance, every body began to write German.' Or we have theoretic hints, resting on no basis, about some new tribunal of taste which at one time had formed itself 'in the mess-rooms of the Prussian officers!'

In a word, the 'connecting sections,' or indeed by what alchemy such a congeries could be connected into a *Historic Survey*, have not become plain to us. Considerable part of it consists of quite detached little Notices, mostly of altogether insignificant men; heaped together as separate fragments; fit, had they

been unexceptionable in other respects, for a Biographical Dictionary, but nowise for a *Historic Survey*. Then we have dense masses of Translation, sometimes good, but seldom of the characteristic pieces; an entire *Iphigenia*, an entire *Nathan the wise*; nay worse, a *Sequel to Nathan*, which when we have conscientiously struggled to peruse, the Author turns round, without any apparent smile, and tells us that it is by a nameless writer, and worth nothing. Not only Mr Taylor's own Translations, which are generally good, but contributions from a whole body of labourers in that department, are given: for example, near sixty pages, very ill rendered by a Miss Plumtre, of a *Life of Kotzebue*, concerning whom, or whose life, death, or burial, there is now no curiosity extant among men. If in that 'English Temple of Fame,' with its hewn and sculptured stones, those Biographical-Dictionary fragments and fractions are so much dry rubble-work of whinstone, is not this quite despicable *Autobiography of Kotzebue* a rood or two of mere turf, which, as ready-cut, our architect, to make up measure, has packed in among his marble ashlar; whereby the whole wall will the sooner bulge? But indeed, generally speaking, symmetry is not one of his architectural rules. Thus, in volume First, we have a long story translated from a German Magazine, about certain antique Hyperborean *Baresarks*, amusing enough, but with no more reference to Germany than to England; while in return the *Nibelungen Lied* is dispatched in something less than one line, and comes no more to light. Tyll Eulenspiegel, who was not an 'anonymous Satire, entitled the *Mirror of Owls*,' but a real flesh-and-blood hero of that name, whose tombstone is standing to this day near Lubeck, has some four lines for his share; *Reineke de Vos* about as many, which also are inaccurate. Again, if Wieland have his half-volume, and poor Ernst Schulze, poor Zacharias Werner, and numerous other poor men, each his chapter; Luther also has his two sentences, and is in these weighed against—Dr Isaac Watts. Ulrich Hutten does not occur here; Hans Sachs and his Master-singers escape notice, or even do worse; the Poetry of the Reformation is not alluded to. The name of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter appears not to be known to Mr Taylor; or, if want of rhyme was to be the test of a Prosaist, how comes Salomon Gcsner here? Stranger still, Ludwig Tieck is not once mentioned; neither is Novalis; neither is Maler Müller. But why dwell on these omissions and commissions? is not all included in this one wellnigh incredible fact, that one of the largest articles in the Book, a tenth part of the whole *Historic Survey of German Poetry*, treats of that delectable genius, August von Kotzebue?

The truth is, this *Historic Survey* has not any thing historical in it; but is a mere aggregate of Dissertations, Translations, Notices and Notes, bound together indeed by the circumstance that they are all about German Poetry, 'about it and about it;' also by the sequence of Time, and still more strongly by the Bookbinder's packthread; but by no other sufficient tie whatever. The authentic title, were not some mercantile varnish allowable in such cases, might be: 'General Jail-delivery of 'all Publications and Manuscripts, original or translated, composed or borrowed, on the subject of German Poetry; by' &c.

To such Jail-delivery, at least when it is from the prison of Mr Taylor's Desk at Norwich, and relates to a subject in the actual predicament of German Poetry among us, we have no fundamental objection: and for the name, now that it is explained, there is nothing in a name; a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. However, even in this lower and lowest point of view, the *Historic Survey* is liable to grave objections: its worth is of no unmixed character. We mentioned that Mr Taylor did not often cite authorities; for which doubtless he may have his reasons. If it be not from French Prefaces, and the *Biographie Universelle*, and other the like sources, we confess ourselves altogether at a loss to divine whence any reasonable individual gathered such notices as these. Books indeed are scarce; but the most untoward situation may command Wachler's *Vorlesungen*, Horn's *Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, Meister's *Characteristiken*, Koch's *Compendium*, or some of the thousand and one compilations of that sort, numerous and accurate in German, more than in any other literature: at all events, Jörden's *Lexicon Deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*, and the world-renowned Leipzig *Conversations-Lexicon*. No one of these appears to have been in Mr Taylor's possession;—Bouterweck alone, and him he seems to have consulted perfunctorily. A certain proportion of errors in such a work is pardonable and unavoidable; scarcely so the proportion observed here. The *Historic Survey* abounds with errors, perhaps beyond any book it has ever been our lot to review. Of these many, indeed, are harmless enough: as, for instance, where we learn that Görres was born in 1804, (not in 1776,) though in that case he must have published his *Shah-Nameh* at the age of three years; or where it is said that Werner's epitaph 'begs Mary Magdalene to pray for his soul,' which it does not do, if indeed any one cared what it did. Some are of a quite mysterious nature; either impregnated with a wit which continues obstinately latent, or indicating that, in spite of Railways and Newspapers, some portions of this Island are still impermeable. For example, 'It (*Goetz von Berlichingen*)

‘ was admirably translated into English, in 1799, at Edinburgh, ‘ by *William Scott*, Advocate; no doubt, the same person who, ‘ under the poetical but assumed name of *Walter*, has since ‘ become the most extensively popular of the British writers.’—Others again are the fruit of a more culpable ignorance; as when we hear that Goethe’s *Dichtung und Wahrheit* is literally meant to be a fictitious narrative, and no genuine Biography; that his *Stella* ends quietly in Bigamy, (to Mr Taylor’s satisfaction,) which, however the French Translation may run, in the original it certainly does not. Mr Taylor likewise complains that his copy of *Faust* is incomplete: so, we grieve to state, is ours. Still worse is it when speaking of distinguished men, who probably have been at pains to veil their sentiments on certain subjects, our author takes it upon him to lift such veil, and with perfect composure pronounces this to be a Deist, that a Pantheist, that other an Atheist, often without any due foundation. It is quite erroneous, for example, to describe Schiller by any such unhappy term as that of Deist: it is very particularly erroneous to say that Goethe anywhere ‘ avows himself an Atheist,’ that he ‘ is a Pantheist;’—indeed, that he is, was, or is like to be any *ist* to which Mr Taylor would attach just meaning.

But on the whole, what struck us most in these errors, is their surprising number. In the way of our calling, we at first took pencil, with intent to mark such transgressions; but soon found it too appalling a task, and so laid aside our blacklead and our art (*caestus artemque*). Happily, however, a little natural invention, assisted by some tincture of arithmetic, came to our aid. Six pages, studied for that end, we did mark; finding therein thirteen errors: the pages are 167—173 of Volume Third, and still, in our copy, have their marginal stigmas, which can be vindicated before a jury of Authors. Now if 6 give 13, who sees not that 1455, the entire number of pages, will give 3152, and a fraction? Or, allowing for Translations, which are freer from errors, and for philosophical Discussions, wherein the errors are of another sort; nay, granting with a perhaps unwarranted liberality, that these six pages may yield too high an average, which we know not that they do,—may not, in round numbers, Fifteen Hundred be given as the approximate amount, not of Errors, indeed, yet of Mistakes and Mistatements, in these three octavos?

Of errors in doctrine, false critical judgments, and all sorts of philosophical hallucination, the number, more difficult to ascertain, is also unfortunately great. Considered, indeed, as in any measure a picture of what is remarkable in German

Poetry, this *Historic Survey* is one great Error. We have to object to Mr Taylor on all grounds; that his views are often partial and inadequate, sometimes quite false and imaginary; that the highest productions of German Literature, those works in which properly its characteristic and chief worth lie, are still as a sealed book to him; or, what is worse, an open book that he will not read, but pronounces to be filled with blank paper. From a man of such intellectual vigour, who has studied his subject so long, we should not have expected such a failure.

Perhaps the main principle of it may be stated, if not accounted for, in this one circumstance, that the *Historic Survey*, like its Author, stands separated from Germany by 'more than forty years.' During this time Germany has been making unexampled progress; while our Author has either advanced in the other direction, or continued quite stationary. Forty years, it is true, make no difference in a classical Poem; yet much in the readers of that Poem, and its position towards these. Forty years are but a small period in some Histories, but in the History of German Literature, the most rapidly extending, incessantly fluctuating object even in the spiritual world, they make a great period. In Germany, within these forty years, how much has been united, how much has fallen asunder! Kant has superseded Wolf; Fichte, Kant; Schelling, Fichte; and now, it seems, Hegel is bent on superseding Schelling. Baumgarten has given place to Schlegel; the *Deutsche Bibliothek* to the Berlin *Hermes*: Lessing still towers in the distance like an Earth-born Atlas; but in the poetical Heaven, Wieland and Klopstock burn fainter, as new and more radiant luminaries have arisen. Within the last forty years, German Literature has become national, idiomatic, distinct from all others; by its productions during that period, it is either something or nothing.

Nevertheless it is still at the distance of forty years, sometimes we think it must be fifty, that Mr Taylor stands. 'The fine Literature of Germany,' no doubt, he has 'imported;' yet only with the eyes of 1780 does he read it. Thus Sulzer's *Universal Theory* continues still to be his roadbook to the temple of German taste; almost as if the German critic should undertake to measure *Waverley* and *Manfred* by the scale of Blair's *Lectures*. Sulzer was an estimable man, who did good service in his day; but about forty years ago, sunk into a repose, from which it would now be impossible to rouse him. The superannuation of Sulzer appears not once to be suspected by our Author; as indeed little of all the great work that has been done or undone, in Literary Germany within that period, has become clear to him. The far-famed *Xenien* of Schiller's *Musenalmannach*

are once mentioned, in some half-dozen lines, wherein also there are more than half-a-dozen inaccuracies, and one rather egregious error. Of the results that followed from these *Xenien*, of Tieck, Wackenroder, the two Schlegels, and Novalis, whose critical Union, and its works, filled all Germany with tumult, discussion, and at length with new conviction, no whisper transpires here. The *New School*, with all that it taught, untaught, and mistaught, is not so much as alluded to. Schiller and Goethe, with all the poetic world they created, remain invisible, or dimly seen: Kant is a sort of Political Reformer. It must be stated with all distinctness, that of the newer and higher German Literature, no reader will obtain the smallest understanding from these Volumes.

Indeed, quite apart from his inacquaintance with actual Germany, there is that in the structure or habit of Mr Taylor's mind, which singularly unfits him for judging of such matters well. We must complain that he reads German Poetry, from first to last, with English eyes; will not accommodate himself to the spirit of the Literature he is investigating, and do his utmost, by loving endeavour, to win its secret from it; but plunges in headlong, and silently assuming that all this was written for him and for his objects, makes short work with it, and innumerable false conclusions. It is sad to see an honest traveller confidently gauging all foreign objects with a measure that will not mete them; trying German Sacred Oaks by their fitness for British shipbuilding; walking from Dan to Beersheba, and finding so little that he did not bring with him. This, we are too well aware, is the commonest of all errors, both with vulgar readers, and with vulgar critics; but from Mr Taylor we had expected something better; nay, let us confess, he himself now and then seems to attempt something better, but too imperfectly succeeds in it.

The truth is, Mr Taylor, though a man of talent, as we have often admitted, and as the world well knows, though a downright, independent, and to all appearance most praiseworthy man, is one of the most peculiar critics to be found in our times. As we construe him from these Volumes, the basis of his nature seems to be Polemical; his whole view of the world, of its Poetry, and whatever else it holds, has a militant character. According to this philosophy, the whole duty of man, it would almost appear, is to lay aside the opinion of his grandfather. Doubtless, it is natural, it is indispensable, for a man to lay aside the opinion of his grandfather, when it will no longer hold together on him; but we had imagined that the great and infinitely harder duty was—To turn the opinion that does hold together

to some account. However, it is not in receiving the New, and creating good with it, but solely in pulling to pieces the Old, that Mr Taylor will have us employed. Often, in the course of these pages, might the British reader sorrowfully exclaim: 'Alas! is this the year of grace 1831, and are we still *here*? 'Armed with the hatchet and tinder-box; still no symptom of 'the sower's-sheet and plough?' These latter, for our Author, are implements of the dark ages; the ground is full of thistles and jungle; cut down and spare not. A singular aversion to Priests, something like a natural horror and hydrophobia, gives him no rest night nor day: the gist of all his speculations is to drive down more or less effectual palisades against that class of persons; nothing that he does but they interfere with or threaten; the first question he asks of every passer-by, be it German Poet, Philosopher, Farce-writer, is, 'Arian or Trinitarian? Wilt 'thou help me or not?' Long as he has now laboured, and though calling himself Philosopher, Mr Taylor has not yet succeeded in sweeping his arena clear; but still painfully struggles in the questions of Naturalism and Supernaturalism, Liberalism and Servilism.

Agitated by this zeal, with its fitful hope and fear, it is that he goes through Germany; scenting out Infidelity with the nose of an ancient Heresy-hunter, though for opposite purposes; and, like a recruiting sergeant, beating aloud for recruits; nay, where in any corner he can spy a tall man, clutching at him, to crimp him or impress him. Goethe's and Schiller's creed we saw specified above; those of Lessing and Herder are scarcely less edifying; but take rather this sagacious exposition of Kant's Philosophy:

'The Alexandrian writings do not differ so widely as is commonly apprehended from those of the Königsberg School; for they abound with passages, which, while they seem to flatter the popular credulity, resolve into allegory the stories of the gods, and into an illustrative personification the soul of the world; thus insinuating, to the more alert and penetrating, the speculative rejection of opinions with which they are encouraged and commanded in action to comply. With analogous spirit, Professor Kant studiously introduces a distinction between Practical and Theoretical Reason; and while he teaches that rational conduct will indulge the hypothesis of a God, a revelation, and a future state, (this, we presume, is meant by calling them *inferences of Practical Reason*;) he pretends that Theoretical Reason can adduce no one satisfactory argument in their behalf: so that his morality amounts to a defence of the old adage, "Think with the wise, and act with the vulgar;" a plan of behaviour which secures to the vulgar an ultimate victory over the wise. * * Philosophy is to be withdrawn within a narrower circle of the initiated; and these must

be induced to conspire in favouring a vulgar superstition. This can best be accomplished by enveloping with enigmatic jargon the topics of discussion; by employing a cloudy phraseology, which may intercept from below the war-whoop of impiety, and from above the evulgation of infidelity; by contriving a kind of "cipher of illuminism," in which public discussions of the most critical nature can be carried on from the press, without alarming the prejudices of the people, or exciting the precautions of the magistrate. Such a cipher, in the hands of an adept, is the dialect of Kant. Add to this, the notorious Gallicanism of his opinions, which must endear him to the patriotism of the philosophers of the Lyceum; and it will appear probable that the reception of his forms of syllogizing should extend from Germany to France; should completely and exclusively establish itself on the Continent; entomb with the Reasonings the Reason of the modern world; and form the tasteless fretwork which seems about to convert the halls of liberal Philosophy into churches of mystical Supernaturalism.'

These are, indeed, fearful symptoms, and enough to quicken the diligence of any recruiting officer that has the good cause at heart. Reasonably may such officer, beleaguered with 'witchcraft and demonology, trinitarianism, intolerance,' and a considerable list of *etceteras*, and, still seeing no hearty followers of his flag, but a mere Falstaff regiment, smite upon his thigh, and, in moments of despondency, lament that Christianity had ever entered, or, as we here have it, 'intruded' into Europe at all; that, at least, some small slip of heathendom, 'Scandinavia, for instance,' had not been 'left to its natural course, unmisguided by ecclesiastical missionaries and monastic institutions. Many superstitions, which have fatigued the credulity, clouded the intellect, and impaired the security of man, and which, alas! but too naturally followed in the train of the sacred books, would there, perhaps, never have struck root; and in one corner of the world, the enquiries of reason might have found an earlier asylum, and asserted a less circumscribed range.' Nevertheless, there is still hope, preponderating hope. 'The general tendency of the German school,' it would appear, could we but believe such tidings, 'is to teach French opinions in English forms.' Philosophy can now look down with some approving glances on Socinianism. Nay, the literature of Germany, 'very liberal and tolerant,' is gradually overflowing, even into the Slavonian nations, 'and will found, in new languages and climates, those latest inferences of a corrupt but instructed refinement, which are likely to rebuild the morality of the Ancients on the ruins of Christian Puritanism.'

Such retrospections and prospections bring to mind an absurd rumour which, confounding our author with his namesake, the celebrated translator of Plato and Aristotle, represented him as

being engaged in the repair and reestablishment of the Pagan religion. For such rumour, we are happy to state, there is not, and was not, the slightest foundation. Wieland may, indeed, at one time, have put some whims into his disciple's head; but Mr Taylor is too solid a man to embark in speculations of that nature. Prophetic daydreams are not practical projects; at all events, as we here see, it is not the old Pagan gods that we are to bring back, but only the ancient Pagan morality, a refined and reformed Paganism;—as some middle-aged householder, if distressed by tax-gatherers and duns, might resolve on becoming thirteen again, and a bird-nesting schoolboy. Let no timid Layman apprehend any overflow of Priests from Mr Taylor, or even of Gods. Is not this commentary on the hitherto so inexplicable conversion of Friedrich Leopold, Count Stolberg, enough to quiet every alarmist?

‘On the Continent of Europe, the gentleman, and Frederic Leopold was emphatically so, is seldom brought up with much solicitude for any positive doctrine: among the Catholics, the moralist insists on the duty of conforming to the religion of one's ancestors; among the Protestants, on the duty of conforming to the religion of the magistrate; but Frederic Leopold seems to have invented a new point of honour, and a most rational one, the duty of conforming to the religion of one's father-in-law.

‘A young man is the happier, while single, for being unencumbered with any religious restraints; but when the time comes for submitting to matrimony, he will find the precedent of Frederic Leopold well entitled to consideration. A predisposition to conform to the religion of the father-in-law, facilitates advantageous matrimonial connexions; it produces in a family the desirable harmony of religious profession; it secures the sincere education of the daughters in the faith of their mother; and it leaves the young men at liberty to apostatize in their turn, to exert their right of private judgment, and to choose a worship for themselves. Religion, if a blemish in the male, is surely a grace in the female sex: courage of mind may tend to acknowledge nothing above itself; but timidity is ever disposed to look upwards for protection, for consolation, and for happiness.’

With regard to this latter point, whether Religion is ‘a blemish in the male, and surely a grace in the female sex,’ it is possible judgments may remain suspended: Courage of mind, indeed, will prompt the squirrel to set itself in posture against an armed horseman; yet whether for men and women, who seem to stand, not only under the Galaxy and Stellar system, and under Immensity and Eternity, but even under any bare bodkin or drop of prussic acid, ‘such courage of mind as may tend to acknowledge nothing above itself,’ were ornamental or the contrary; whether, lastly, Religion is grounded on Fear, or

on something infinitely higher and inconsistent with Fear,—may be questions. But they are of a kind we are not at present called to meddle with.

Mr Taylor promulgates many other strange articles of faith, for he is a positive man, and has a certain quiet wilfulness; these, however, cannot henceforth much surprise us. He still calls the Middle Ages, during which nearly all the inventions and social institutions, whereby we yet live as civilized men, were originated or perfected, ‘a Millennium of Darkness;’ on the faith chiefly of certain long-past Pedants, who reckoned every thing barren, because Chrysolaras had not yet come, and no Greek Roots grew there. Again, turning in the other direction, he criticises Luther’s Reformation, and repeats that old, and indeed quite foolish, story of the Augustine Monk’s having a merely commercial grudge against the Dominican; computes the quantity of blood shed for Protestantism; and, forgetting that men shed blood, in all ages, for any cause and for no cause, for Sans-culottism, for Bonapartism, thinks that, on the whole, the Reformation was an error and failure. Pity that Providence (as King Alphonso wished in the Astronomical case) had not created its man three centuries sooner, and taken a little counsel from him! On the other hand, ‘Voltaire’s Reformation’ was successful; and here, for once, Providence was right. Will Mr Taylor mention what it was that Voltaire *reformed*? Many things he *de-formed*, deservedly and undeservedly, but the thing that he *formed* or *re-formed* is still unknown to the world.

It is perhaps unnecessary to add, that Mr Taylor’s whole Philosophy is sensual; that is, he recognises nothing that cannot be weighed, measured, and, with one or the other organ, eaten and digested. Logic is his only lamp of life; where this fails, the region of Creation terminates. For him there is no Invisible, Incomprehensible; whosoever, under any name, believes in an Invisible, he treats, with leniency and the loftiest tolerance, as a mystic and lunatic; and if the unhappy crackbrain has any handicraft, literary or other, allows him to go at large, and work at it. Withal he is a great-hearted, strong-minded, and, in many points, interesting man. There is a majestic composure in the attitude he has assumed; massive, immovable, uncomplaining, he sits in a world of Delirium; and for his Future looks with sure faith—only in the direction of the Past. We take him to be a man of sociable turn, not without kindness; at all events, of the most perfect courtesy. He despises the entire Universe, yet speaks respectfully of Translators from the German, and always says that they ‘English beautifully.’ A certain

mild Dogmatism sits well on him; peaceable, incontrovertible, uttering the palpably absurd, as if it were a mere truism. On the other hand, there are touches of a grave, scientific obscenity, which are questionable. This word Obscenity we use with reference to our readers, and might also add Profanity, but not with reference to Mr Taylor; he, as we said, is scientific merely; and where there is no *cœnum* and no *fanum*, there can be no obscenity and no profanity.

To a German we might have compressed all this long description into a single word: Mr Taylor is simply what they call a *Philister*; every fibre of him is Philistine. With us such men usually take into Politics, and become Code-makers and Utilitarians: it was only in Germany that they ever meddled much with Literature; and there worthy Nicolai has long since terminated his Jesuit-hunt; no Adelung now writes books, *Ueber die Nützlichkeit der Empfindung* (On the Utility of Feeling). Singular enough, now, when that old species had been quite extinct for almost half a century in their own land, appears a native-born English Philistine, made in all points as they were. With wondering welcome we hail the Strongboned; almost as we might a resuscitated Mammoth. Let no David choose smooth stones from the brook to sling at him: is he not our own Goliath, whose limbs were made in England, whose thews and sinews any soil might be proud of? Is he not, as we said, a man that can stand on his own legs without collapsing when left by himself? in these days one of the greatest rarities, almost prodigies.

We cheerfully acquitted Mr Taylor of Religion; but must expect less gratitude when we farther deny him any feeling for true Poetry, as indeed the feelings for Religion and for Poetry of this sort are one and the same. Of Poetry Mr Taylor knows well what will make a grand, especially a large, *picture* in the imagination: he has even a creative gift of this kind himself, as his style will often testify; but much more he does not know. How indeed should he? Nicolai, too, 'judged of Poetry as he 'did of Brunswick Mum, simply by *tasting* it.' Mr Taylor assumes, as a fact known to all thinking creatures, that Poetry is neither more nor less than 'a stimulant.' Perhaps above five hundred times in the *Historic Survey* we see this doctrine expressly acted on. Whether the piece to be judged of is a Poetical Whole, and has what the critics have named a genial life, and what that life is, he enquires not; but, at best, whether it is a Logical Whole, and for most part, simply, whether it is stimulant. The praise is, that it has fine situations, striking scenes, agonizing scenes, harrows his feelings, and the like. Schiller's *Robbers* he finds to be stimulant; his *Maid of Orleans* is not

stimulant, but 'among the weakest of his tragedies, and composed apparently in ill health.' The author of *Pizarro* is supremely stimulant; he of *Torquato Tasso* is 'too quotidian to be stimulant.' We had understood that alcohol was stimulant in all its shapes; opium also, tobacco, and indeed the whole class of narcotics; but heretofore found Poetry in none of the Pharmacopœias. Nevertheless, it is edifying to observe with what fearless consistency Mr Taylor, who is no half-man, carries through this theory of stimulation. It lies privily in the heart of many a reader and reviewer; nay, Schiller, at one time, said that 'Molière's old woman seemed to have become sole Editress of all Reviews;' but seldom, in the history of Literature, has she had the honesty to unveil, and ride triumphant, as in these volumes. Mr Taylor discovers that the only Poet to be classed with Homer is Tasso; that Shakspeare's Tragedies are cousins-german to those of Otway; that poor, moaning, monotonous Macpherson is an epic poet. Lastly, he runs a laboured parallel between Schiller, Goethe, and Kotzebue; one is more this, the other more that; one strives hither, the other thither, through the whole string of critical predicables; almost as if we should—compare scientifically Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the *Prophecies of Isaiah*, and Mat Lewis's *Tales of Terror*.

Such is Mr Taylor; a strong-hearted oak, but in an unkindly soil, and beat upon from infancy by Trinitarian and Tory South-westers: such is the result which native vigour, wind-storms, and thirsty mould have made out among them; grim boughs dishevelled in multangular complexity, and of the stiffness of brass; a tree crooked every way, unwedgeable and gnarled. What bandages or cordages of ours, or of man's, could straighten it, now that it has grown there for half a century? We simply point out that there is excellent tough *knee-timber* in it, and of straight timber little or none.

In fact, taking Mr Taylor as he is and must be, and keeping a perpetual account and protest with him on these peculiarities of his, we find that on various parts of his subject he has profitable things to say. The Göttingen group of Poets, 'Bürger and his set,' such as they were, are pleasantly delineated. The like may be said of the somewhat earlier Swiss brotherhood, whereof Bodmer and Breitingen are the central figures; though worthy, wonderful Lavater, the wandering Physiognomist and Evangelist, and Protestant Pope, should not have been first forgotten, and then crammed into an insignificant paragraph. Lessing, again, is but poorly managed; his main performance, as was natural, reckoned to be the writing of *Nathan the Wise*; we have no original portrait here, but a pantagraphical reduced copy of

some foreign sketches or scratches, quite unworthy of such a man, in such a historical position, standing on the confines of Light and Darkness, like Day on the misty mountain tops. Of Herder also there is much omitted; the *Geschichte der Menschheit* scarcely alluded to; yet some features are given, accurately and even beautifully. A slow-rolling grandiloquence is in Mr Taylor's best passages, of which this is one: if no poetic light, he has occasionally a glow of true rhetorical heat. Wieland is lovingly painted, yet on the whole faithfully, as he looked some fifty years ago, if not as he now looks: this is the longest article in the *Historic Survey*, and much too long; those Paganizing *Dialogues* in particular had never much worth, and at present have scarcely any.

Perhaps the best of all these Essays is that on Klopstock. The sphere of Klopstock's genius does not transcend Mr Taylor's scale of poetic altitudes; though it perhaps reaches the highest grade there; the 'stimulant' theory recedes into the background; indeed there is a rhetorical amplitude and brilliancy in the *Messias* which elicits in our critic an instinct truer than his philosophy is. He has honestly studied the *Messias*, and presents a clear outline of it; neither has the still purer spirit of Klopstock's *Odes* escaped him. We have English Biographies of Klopstock, and a miserable Version of his great Work; but perhaps there is no writing in our language that offers so correct an emblem of him as this analysis. Of the *Odes* we shall here present one, in Mr Taylor's translation, which though in prose, the reader will not fail to approve of. It is perhaps the finest passage in this whole *Historic Survey*:

THE TWO MUSES.

' I saw—tell me, was I beholding what now happens, or was I beholding futurity?—I saw with the Muse of Britain the Muse of Germany engaged in competitory race—flying warm to the goal of coronation.

' Two goals, where the prospect terminates, bordered the career: Oaks of the forest shaded the one; near to the other waved Palms in the evening shadow.

' Accustomed to contest, stepped she from Albion proudly into the arena; as she stepped, when, with the Grecian Muse and with her from the Capitol, she entered the lists.

' She beheld the young trembling rival, who trembled yet with dignity; glowing roses worthy of victory streamed flaming over her cheek, and her golden hair flew abroad.

' Already she retained with pain in her tumultuous bosom the contracted breath; already she hung bending forward towards the goal;

already the herald was lifting the trumpet, and her eyes swam with intoxicating joy.

‘ Proud of her courageous rival, prouder of herself, the lofty Britoness measured, but with noble glance, thee, Tuiskone : “ Yes, by the bards, I grew up with thee in the grove of oaks :

“ But a tale had reached me that thou wast no more. Pardon, O Muse, if thou beest immortal, pardon that I but now learn it. Yonder at the goal alone will I learn it.

“ There it stands. But dost thou see the still further one, and its crowns also ? This repress courage, this proud silence, this look which sinks fiery upon the ground, I know :

“ Yet weigh once again, ere the herald sound a note dangerous to thee. Am I not she who have measured myself with her from Thermopylae, and with the stately one of the Seven Hills ?”

‘ She spake : the earnest decisive moment drew nearer with the herald. “ I love thee,” answered quick, with looks of flame, Teutona, “ Britoness, I love thee to enthusiasm ;

“ But not warmer than immortality and those Palms : touch, if so wills thy genius, touch them before me ; yet will I, when thou seizest it, seize also the crown.

“ And, O how I tremble ! O ye Immortals, perhaps I may reach first the high goal : then, O then, may thy breath attain my loose-streaming hair !”

‘ The herald shrilled. They flew with eagle-speed. The wide career smoked up clouds of dust. I looked. Beyond the Oak billowed yet thicker the dust, and I lost them.’

‘ This beautiful allegory,’ adds Mr Taylor, ‘ requires no illustration ; but it constitutes one of the reasons for suspecting that ‘ the younger may eventually be the victorious Muse.’ We hope not ; but that the generous race may yet last through long centuries. Tuiskone has shot through a mighty space, since this Poet saw her : what if she were now slackening her speed, and the Britoness quickening hers ?

If the Essay on Klopstock is the best, that on Kotzebue is undoubtedly the worst, in this book, or perhaps in any book written by a man of ability in our day. It is one of those acts which, in the spirit of philanthropy, we could wish Mr Taylor to conceal in profoundest secrecy ; were it not that hereby the ‘ stimulant’ theory, a heresy which still lurks here and there even in our better criticism, is in some sort brought to a crisis, and may the sooner depart from this world, or at least from the high places of it, into others more suitable. Kotzebue—whom all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, and peoples, his own people the foremost, after playing with him for some foolish hour, have swept out of doors as a lifeless bundle of dyed rags,—is here scientifically examined, measured, pulse-felt, and pronounced to

be living, and a divinity. He has such prolific 'invention,' abounds so in 'fine situations,' in passionate scenes, is so soul-harrowing, so stimulant. The *Proceedings at Bow Street* are stimulant enough, neither is prolific invention, interesting situations, or soul-harrowing passion wanting among the Authors that compose there; least of all if we follow them to Newgate, and the gallows: but when did the *Morning Herald* think of inserting its *Police Reports* among our Anthologies? Mr Taylor is at the pains to analyze very many of Kotzebue's productions, and translates copiously from two or three: how the Siberian Governor took on when his daughter was about to run away with one Benjowsky, who, however, was enabled to surrender his prize, there on the beach, with sails hoisted, by 'looking at 'his wife's picture;' how the people 'lift young Burgundy from 'the Tun,' not indeed to drink him, for he is not wine but a Duke; how a certain stout-hearted West Indian, that has made a fortune, proposes marriage to his two sisters, but finding the ladies reluctant, solicits their serving-woman, whose reputation is not only cracked, but visibly quite rent asunder, accepts her nevertheless, with her thriving cherub, and is the happiest of men;—with more of the like sort. On the strength of which we are assured that, 'according to my judgment, Kotzebue is 'the greatest dramatic genius that Europe has evolved since 'Shakspeare.' Such is the table which Mr Taylor has spread for pilgrims in the Prose Wilderness of Life: thus does he sit like a kind host, ready to carve; and though the viands and beverage are but, as it were, stewed garlic, Yarmouth herrings, and *blue-ruin*, praises them as 'stimulant,' and courteously presses the universe to fall to.

What a purveyor with this palate shall say to Nectar and Ambrosia, may be curious as a question in Natural History, but hardly otherwise. The most of what Mr Taylor has written on Schiller, on Goethe, and the new Literature of Germany, a reader that loves him, as we honestly do, will consider as unwritten, or written in a state of somnambulism. He who has just quitted Kotzebue's Bear-garden, and Fives-court, and pronounces it to be all stimulant and very good, what is there for him to do in the Hall of the Gods? He looks transiently in; asks with mild authority; 'Arian or Trinitarian? Quotidian or 'Stimulant?' and receiving no answer but a hollow echo, which almost sounds like laughter, passes on, muttering that they are dumb idols, or mere Nürnberg waxwork.

It remains to notice Mr Taylor's Translations. Apart from the choice of subjects, which in probably more than half the cases is unhappy, there is much to be said in favour of these. Com-

pared with the average of British Translations, they may be pronounced of almost ideal excellence; compared with the best Translations extant, for example, the German *Shakspeare*, *Homer*, *Calderon*, they may still be called better than indifferent. One great merit Mr Taylor has: rigorous adherence to his original; he endeavours at least to copy with all possible fidelity the turn of phrase, the tone, the very metre, whatever stands written for him. With the German language he has now had a long familiarity, and, what is no less essential, and perhaps still rarer among our Translators, has a decided understanding of English. All this of Mr Taylor's own Translations: in the borrowed pieces, whereof there are several, we seldom, except indeed in those by Shelley and Coleridge, find much worth; sometimes a distinct worthlessness. Mr Taylor has made no conscience of clearing those unfortunate performances even from their gross blunders. Thus, in that 'excellent version by Miss Plumtre,' we find this statement: Professor Müller could not utter a period without introducing the words *with under*, 'whether they had business there or not;' which statement, were it only on the ground that Professor Müller was not sent to Bedlam, there to utter periods, we venture to deny. Doubtless, his besetting sin was *mitunter*, which indeed means *at the same time*, or the like, (etymologically, *with among*,) but nowise *with under*. One other instance we shall give, from a much more important subject. Mr Taylor admits that he does not make much of *Faust*: however, he inserts Shelley's version of the *Mayday Night*; and another scene, evidently rendered by quite a different artist. In this latter, Margaret is in the Cathedral during High-Mass, but her whole thoughts are turned inwards on a secret shame and sorrow: an Evil Spirit is whispering in her ear; the Choir chant fragments of the *Dies iræ*; she is like to choke and sink. In the original, this passage is in verse; and, we presume, in the translation also,—founding on the capital letters. The concluding lines are these:

' MARGARET. I feel imprison'd. The thick pillars gird me.
The vaults low'r o'er me. Air, air, I faint.

EVIL SPIRIT. Where wilt thou lie concealed? for sin and shame
Remain not hidden—woe is coming *down*.

THE CHOIR. *Quid sum miser tum dicturus?*
Quem patronum rogaturus?
Cum vix justus sit securus.

EVIL SPIRIT. From thee the glorified avert their view,
The pure forbear to offer thee a hand.

THE CHOIR. *Quid sum miser tum dicturus?*

MARGARET. Neighbour, your——'

—Your what?—Angels and ministers of grace defend us!—
'Your Drambottle.' Will Mr Taylor have us understand, then, that 'the noble German nation,' more especially the fairer half thereof, (for the 'Neighbour' is *Nachbarin*, Neighbouress,) goes to church with a decanter of brandy in its pocket? Or would he not rather, even forcibly, interpret *Fläschken* by *vinegrette*, by *volatile-salts*?—The world has no notice that this passage is a borrowed one; but will, notwithstanding, as the more charitable theory, hope and believe so.

We have now done with Mr Taylor; and would fain, after all that has come and gone, part with him in good nature and good will. He has spoken freely, we have answered freely. Far as we differ from him in regard to German Literature, and to the much more important subjects here connected with it; deeply as we feel convinced that his convictions are wrong and dangerous, are but half true, and, if taken for the whole truth, wholly false and fatal, we have novise blinded ourselves to his vigorous talent, to his varied learning, his sincerity, his manful independence and self-support. Neither is it for speaking out plainly that we blame him. A man's honest, earnest opinion is the most precious of all he possesses: let him communicate this, if he is to communicate any thing. There is, doubtless, a time to speak, and a time to keep silence; yet Fontenelle's celebrated aphorism, *I might have my hand full of truth, and would open only my little finger*, may be practised also to excess, and the little finger itself kept closed. That reserve, and knowing silence, long so universal among us, is less the fruit of active benevolence, of philosophic tolerance, than of indifference and weak conviction. Honest Scepticism, honest Atheism, is better than that withered lifeless Dilettantism and amateur Eclecticism, which merely toys with all opinions; or than that wicked Machiavelism, which in thought denying every thing, except that Power is Power, in words, for its own wise purposes, loudly believes every thing: of both which miserable habitudes the day, even in England, is wellnigh over. That Mr Taylor belongs not, and at no time belonged, to either of these classes, we account a true praise. Of his *Historic Survey* we have endeavoured to point out the faults and the merits: should he reach a second edition, which we hope, perhaps he may profit by some of our hints, and render

the work less unworthy of himself and of his subject. In its present state and shape, this English Temple of Fame can content no one. A huge, anomalous, heterogeneous mass, no section of it like another, oriel-window alternating with rabbit-hole, wrought capital on pillar of dried mud; heaped together out of marble, loose earth, rude boulder-stone; hastily roofed in with shingles—such is the Temple of Fame; uninhabitable either for priest or statue, and which nothing but a continued suspension of the laws of gravity can keep from rushing ere long into a chaos of stone and dust. For the English worshipper, who in the meanwhile has no other temple, we search out the least dangerous apartments; for the future builder, the materials that will be valuable.

And now, in washing our hands of this all-too sordid but not unnecessary task, one word on a more momentous object. Does not the existence of such a Book,—do not many other indications, traceable in France, in Germany, as well as here, betoken that a new era in the spiritual intercourse of Europe is approaching; that instead of isolated, mutually repulsive National Literatures, a World-Literature may one day be looked for? The better minds of all countries begin to understand each other, and, which follows naturally, to love each other, and help each other; by whom ultimately all countries in all their proceedings are governed.

Late in man's history, yet clearly at length, it becomes manifest to the dullest, that mind is stronger than matter, that mind is the creator and shaper of matter; that not brute Force, but only Persuasion and Faith is the king of this world. The true Poet, who is but the inspired Thinker, is still an Orpheus whose Lyre tames the savage beasts, and evokes the dead rocks to fashion themselves into palaces and stately inhabited cities. It has been said, and may be repeated, that Literature is fast becoming all in all to us; our Church, our Senate, our whole Social Constitution. The true Pope of Christendom is not that feeble old man in Rome; nor is its Autocrat the Napoleon, the Nicolas, with his half million even of obedient bayonets: such Autocrat is himself but a more cunningly-devised bayonet and military engine in the hands of a mightier than he. The true Autocrat and Pope is that man, the real or seeming Wisest of the past age; crowned after death; who finds his Hierarchy of gifted Authors, his Clergy of assiduous Journalists; whose Decretals, written not on parchment, but on the living souls of men, it were an inversion of the Laws of Nature to disobey. In these times of ours, all Intellect has fused itself into Literature: Literature, Printed

Thought, is the molten sea and wonder-bearing Chaos, into which mind after mind casts forth its opinion, its feeling, to be molten into the general mass, and to work there; Interest after Interest is engulfed in it, or embarked on it: higher, higher it rises round all the Edifices of Existence; they must all be molten into it, and anew bodied forth from it, or stand unconsumed among its fiery surges. Woe to him whose Edifice is not built of true Asbest, and on the everlasting Rock; but on the false sand, and of the drift-wood of Accident, and the paper and parchment of antiquated Habit! For the power, or powers, exist not on our Earth, that can say to that sea, roll back, or bid its proud waves be still.

What form so omnipotent an element will assume; how long it will welter to and fro as a wild Democracy, a wild Anarchy; what Constitution and Organization it will fashion for itself, and for what depends on it, in the depths of Time, is a subject for prophetic conjecture, wherein brightest hope is not unmingled with fearful apprehension and awe at the boundless unknown. The more cheering is this one thing which we do see and know—That its tendency is to a universal European Commonweal; that the wisest in all nations will communicate and co-operate; whereby Europe will again have its true Sacred College, and Council of Amphictyons; wars will become rarer, less inhuman, and, in the course of centuries, such delirious ferocity in nations, as in individuals it already is, may be proscribed, and become obsolete for ever.

ART. IX.—*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum, aliaque ævi decimi sexti monimenta rarissima.*—*Die Briefe der Finsterlinge an Magister Ortuinus von Deventer, nebst andern sehr seltenen Beytraegen zur Litteratur-Sitten-und Kirchengeschichte des Sechzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Herausgegeben und erlaeutert durch DR ERNST MUENCH. 8vo. Leipzig: 1827.

WITH the purest identity of origin, the Germans have shown always the weakest sentiment of nationality. Descended from the same ancestors, speaking a common language, unconquered by a foreign enemy, and once the subjects of a general government, they are the only people in Europe who have passively allowed their national unity to be broken down, and submitted, like cattle, to be parcelled and reparcelled into flocks, as suited the convenience of their shepherds. The same unpatriotic

apathy is betrayed in their literary as in their political existence. In other countries taste is perhaps too exclusively national; in Germany it is certainly too cosmopolite. Teutonic admiration seems, indeed, to be essentially centrifugal; and literary partialities have in the Empire inclined always in favour of the foreign. The Germans were long familiar with the literature of every other nation, before they thought of cultivating, or rather creating, a literature of their own; and when this was at last attempted, *θαυμασὸν τῶν ἀπόντων* was still the principle that governed in the experiment. It was essayed, by a process of foreign infusion, to elaborate the German tongue into a vehicle of pleasing communication; nor were they contented to reverse the operation, until the project had been stultified by its issue, and the purest and only all-sufficient of the modern languages degraded into a Babylonish jargon, without a parallel in the whole history of speech. A counterpart to this overweening admiration of the strange and distant, is the discreditable indifference manifested by the Germans to the noblest monuments of native genius. To their eternal disgrace, the works of Leibnitz were left to be collected by a Frenchman; while the care denied by his countrymen to the great representative of German universality, was lavished, with an eccentric affection, on the not more important speculations of Giordano Bruno, Spinoza, and Cudworth. But no neglect, even by their own confession, has weighed so long or so heavily against the Germans, as the want of a collective edition of the works of their great national patriot, Ulric von Hutten, and of a critical and explanatory edition of their great national satire, the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*. This reproach has, in part, been recently removed. Dr Muench has accomplished the one, and attempted the other; we wish we could say accomplished well, or attempted successfully. We speak at present only of the latter; and, as an essay towards (what is still wanting) an explanatory introduction, shall premise a rapid outline of the circumstances which occasioned this celebrated satire—a satire which, though European in its influence, has yet, as Herder justly observes, ‘effected for Germany incomparably more than Hudibras for England, or Garagantua for France, or the Knight of La Mancha for Spain.’ It gave the victory to Reuchlin over the Begging Friars, and to Luther over the Court of Rome.

The Italians excepted, no people took so active a part in the revival of ancient literature as the Germans; yet in no country did the champions of the new intelligence obtain less adventitious aid in their exertions, or encounter so formidable a resistance from the defenders of the ancient barbarism. Germany did not,

like Italy and France, allure the learned fugitives from Constantinople to transplant into her seminaries the language and literature of Greece; and though learning was not here deprived of all liberal encouragement, still the princes and nobles of the empire did not, as the great Italian families, emulate each other, in a munificent patronage of letters. But what in Germany principally contributed to impede the literary reformation, was the opposition which it met with in the great literary corporations themselves. In the other countries of Europe, especially in France and England, the first sparks of the rekindled light had been fostered in the universities;* these were in fact the centres from whence the new illumination was diffused. In Germany, on the contrary, the academic walls contained the most resolute enemies of reform, and in the universities were found the last strongholds of an effete, but intolerant scholasticism. Some, indeed, of the restorers of polite letters, taught as salaried or extraordinary instructors (*professores conducti*) in the universities of Germany; but the influence which they exerted was personal, and the toleration they obtained precarious. Dependent always on the capricious patronage of the Prince, they were viewed as intruders by those bodies who constituted and governed these institutions. From them they encountered, not only discouragement, but oppression; and the biography of the first scholars who attempted, by public instruction, to disseminate a taste for classical literature in the great schools of Germany, exhibits little else than a melancholy series of wanderings and persecutions—abandoning one university only, in general, to be ejected from another.

The restoration of classical literature, (and classical literature involved literature in general,) was in Germany almost wholly accomplished by individual zeal, aided principally by one private institution. This institution was the conventual seminary of St Agnes, near Zwoell, in Westphalia, founded by the pious Thomas à Kempis; from whence, immediately or mediately, issued nearly the whole band of those illustrious scholars who, in defiance of every opposing circumstance, succeeded in rapidly elevating Germany to a higher European rank in letters, than (rebarbarized by polemical theology and religious wars) she was again able to reach for almost three centuries thereafter.

* No thanks, however, to the universities: they, *of course*, resisted the innovation. A king and a minister, Francis and Wolsey, determined the difference; but for them, Budaeus and Colet might have been persecuted like Buschius and Reuchlin.

Six schoolfellows and friends, Count Maurice von Spiegelberg, Rudolph von Lange (Langius), Alexander Hegius, Lewis Dringenberg, Antonius Liber, and Rodolphus Agricola, all trained in the discipline of à Kempis, became, towards the end of the 15th century, the apostles of this reformation in literature and education, which, mainly by their exertions and those of their disciples, was, in a few years, happily accomplished throughout the empire. The two first, (we neglect chronology,) noblemen of rank and dignitaries in the church, co-operated to this end, by their liberal patronage of other scholars, and more especially by the foundation of improved schools; the four last, by their skill and industry as practical teachers, and by the influence of their writings.*

After their return from Italy, where they had studied under Trapezuntius and Gaza, and enjoyed the friendship of Philelphus, Laurentius Valla, and Leonardus Aretinus, Von Lange was nominated Dean of Munster, and Count Spiegelberg, Provost of Emmerich. Through the influence of the former, himself a Latin poet of no inconsiderable talent, the decayed school of Munster was revived; supplied with able masters, among whom Camener, Cæsarius, and Murmellius, were distinguished; and, in spite of every opposition from the predicant friars and university of Cologne, the barbarous schoolbooks were superseded, and the heathen classics studied, as in the schools of Italy and France. From this seminary, soon after its establishment, proceeded Petrus Nehemius, Josephus Horlenius, (the master of

* An account of the *Fratres Hieronymici* would be an interesting piece of literary history. The scattered notices to be found of this association are meagre and incorrect. We may observe, that the celebrated Frieslander, John Wessel of Gansfurt, an alumnus also of the College of St Agnes, preceded the six confederates, enumerated in the text, as a restorer of letters in Germany. Before Reuchlin, (whom he initiated in Hebrew,) he conjoined a knowledge of the three learned languages; these, which he had cultivated in Greece, Italy, and France, he taught, at least privately, on his return to Germany, in the universities of Cologne, Heidelberg, and Basle. His erudition, his scholastic subtlety, with his contempt for scholastic authority, obtained for him the title of *Lux Mundi* and *Magister Contradictionum*. In religious opinions, he was the forerunner of Luther. He is not to be confounded (as has been done) with the famous preacher, *Joannes*, variously called *Wesalius*, *de Wessalia*, and even *Wesselus*, accused by the Dominicans of suspicious intercourse with the Jews, and, through their influence, unjustly condemned for heresy in 1479, by the Archbishop of Mentz.

Mosellanus,) Ludolphus Heringius, Alexander Moppensis, Tilemannus Mollerus, (the master of Rivius,) &c., who, as able schoolmasters, propagated the improvement in education and letters throughout the north of Germany.

A similar reform was effected by Count Spiegelberg in the school of Emmerich.

Hegius, a man of competent learning, but of unrivalled talents as a practical instructor, became rector of the school of Daventer; and he can boast of having turned out from his tuition a greater number of more illustrious scholars than any pedagogue of modern times. Among his pupils were, Desiderius Erasmus, Hermannus Buschius, Joannes Cæsarius, Joannes Murmellius, Joannes Glandorpius, Conradus Mutianus, Hermannus Torrentinus, Bartholomæus Colonicensis, Conradus Goclenius, Joannes and Serratius Aedicollius, Jacobus Montanus, Joannes Peringius, Timannus Camenerius, Gerardus Lys-trius, Matthæus Frissemius, Ludolphus Geringius, &c. Nor must Ortuinus Gratius be forgotten.

Dringenberg transplanted the discipline of Zwoll to Schlechtstadt in Alsace; and he effected for the south of Germany what his colleagues accomplished for the north. Among his pupils, who almost rivalled in numbers and celebrity those of Hegius, were Conradus Celtes, Jacobus Wimphelingius, Beatus Rhenanus, Joannes Sapidus, Bilibald Pirkheimer, John von Dalberg, Franciscus Stadianus, George Simler, (the master of Melancthon,) and Henricus Bœbelius, (the master of Brassicanus and Heinrichmann.)

Liber taught successively at Kempten and Amsterdam; and, when driven from these cities by the partisans of the ancient barbarism, he finally established himself at Alcmarr. The most celebrated of his pupils were Pope Hadrian VI., Nicolaus Cle-nardus, Alardus of Amsterdam, Cornelius Crocus, and Christophorus Longolius.

The genius of Agricola displayed the rarest union of originality, elegance, and erudition. After extorting the reluctant admiration of the fastidious scholars of Italy, he returned to Germany, where his writings, exhortation, and example, powerfully contributed to promote the literary reformation. It was only, however, in the latter years of his short life, that he was persuaded by his friend, Von Dalberg, Bishop of Worms, to lecture publicly (though declining the status of Professor) on the Greek and Roman authors; and he delivered, with great applause, a few courses—alternately at Heidelberg and Worms. Celtes and Buschius were among his auditors. There is no hyperbole in his epitaph by a great Italian,

‘ Scilicet hoc uno meruit Germania, laudis
Quicquid habet Latium, Graecia quicquid habet.’

The first restorers of ancient learning in Germany were thus almost exclusively pupils of à Kempis or of his disciples. There was, however, one memorable exception in John Reuchlin (Joannes Capnio), who was not, as his biographers erroneously assert, a scholar of Dringenberg at Schlechtstadt.* Of him we are again to speak.

We have been thus particular, in order to show that the awakened enthusiasm for classical studies did not in Germany originate in the universities; and it was only after a strenuous opposition from these bodies that ancient literature at last conquered its recognition as an element of academical instruction. At the period of which we treat, the lectures and disputations, the examinations and honours, of the different faculties, required only an acquaintance with the barbarous Latinity of the middle ages. The new philology was thus not only a *hors d'œuvre* in the academical system, or, as the Leipsic masters expressed it, a ‘ fifth wheel in the chariot;’ it was abominated as a novelty, that threw the ancient learning into discredit, diverted the studious from the universities, emptied the schools of the Magistri, and the bursæ or colleges over which they presided, and rendered contemptible the once honoured distinction of a degree.†

* His connexion with Zwoll and the *Brethren of St Jerome* may, however, be established through John Wessel, from whom he learned the elements of Hebrew.

† ‘ Attamen intellexi,’ writes Magister Unkenbunck to Magister Gratius, ‘ quòd habetis paucos auditores, & est querela vestra, quòd Buschius & Cæsarius trahunt vobis scholares & supposita abinde, cùm tamen ipsi non sciunt ita exponere Poëtas allegoricè, sicut vos, & superallegare sacram scripturam. Credo quòd diabolus est in illis Poëtis. Ipsi destruunt omnes Vniuersitates, & audiui ab vno antiquo Magistro Lipsensi, qui fuit Magister 36. annorum, & dixit mihi, quando ipse fuisset iuuenis, tunc illa Vniuersitas bene stetit: quia in viginti milliaribus nullus Poëta fuisset. Et dixit etiam, quòd tunc supposita diligenter compleuerunt lectiones suas formales & materiales, seu bursales: & fuit magnum scandalum, quòd aliquis studeus iret in platea, & non haberet Petrum Hispanum, aut Parna Logicalia sub brachio. Et si fuerunt Grammatici, tunc portabant Partes Alexandri, vel Vade Mecum, vel Exercitium Pnerorum, aut Opus Minus, aut Dicta Ioan. Sinthen. Et in scholis aduertebant diligenter, & habuerunt in honore Magistros Artium, & quando viderunt vnum Magistrum, tunc fuerunt perterriti quasi viderent vnum Diabolum. Et dixit etiam,

In possession of power, it is not to be supposed that the patrons of scholasticism would tamely allow themselves to be stripped of reputation and influence; and it did not require the ridicule with which the 'Humanists,' or 'Poets,' as they were styled, now assailed them, to exasperate their spirit of persecution. Greek in particular, and polite letters in general, were branded as heretical;* and, while the academical youth hailed the first lecturers on ancient literature in the universities, as 'messengers from heaven,'† the academical veterans persecuted

quòd pro tunc quater in anno promouebantur Baccalaurii, & semper pro vna vice sunt sexaginta aut quinquaginta. Et illo tempore Vniuersitas illa fuit multum in flore, & quando vnus stetit per annum cum dimidio, fuit promotus in Baccalaurium, & per tres annos aut duos cum dimidio in Magistrum: & sic parentes eorum fuerunt contenti, & libenter exposuerunt pecunias. Quia videbant, quòd filii sui venerunt ad honores. Sed nunc supposita volunt audire Virgilium & Plinium, & alios nouos autores, & licèt audiunt per quinque annos, tamen non promouentur. Et dixit mihi amplius talis Magister, quòd tempore suo fuerunt duo millia studentes in Lyptzick, & Erfordiae totidem. Et Viennae quatuor millia, & Coloniae etiam tot, & sic de aliis. Nunc autem in omnibus Vniuersitatibus non sunt tot supposita, sicut tunc in vna, aut duabus. Et Magistri Lipsenses nunc valde conqueruntur de paucitate suppositorum, quia Poetae faciunt eis damnum. Et quando parentes mittunt filios suos in bursas, & collegia, non volunt ibi manere, sed vadunt ad Poetas, & student nequitiis. Et dixit mihi, quòd ipse Liptzick olim habuit quadraginta domicellos, & quando iuit in ecclesiam, vel ad forum, vel spaciatum in rubetum, tunc iuerunt post eum. Et fuit tunc magnus excessus, studere in Poëtria. Et quando vnus confitebatur in confessione, quòd occultè audiuit Virgilium ab vno Baccalaurio, tunc Sacerdos imponebat ei magnam pœnitentiam, videlicet, ieiunare singulis sextis feriis, vel orare quotidie septem Psalmos pœnitentiales. Et iuravit mihi in conscientia sua, quòd vidit, quòd vnus magistrandus fuit reiectus, quia vnus de examineribus semel in die festo vidit ipsum legere in Terentio. Utinam adhuc staret ita in Vniuersitatibus! ets.—*Epist. Obsc. Vir.*—Vol. II. ep. 46.—See also, among others, Vol. II. ep. 58 and 63. We quote these epistles by number, though this be marked in none of the editions.

* 'Hæresis,' says Erasmus, speaking of these worthies,—'hæresis est polite loqui, hæresis Græce scire, quicquid ipsi non intelligunt, quicquid ipsi non faciunt, hæresis est. Inunum Capnionem clamatur, quia linguas callet.'—*Opera* III. c. 517. ed. Clerici. See also Pentinger in *Epist. ad Reuchl.* A ii. and Hutten, *Praef. Neminiis*.

† 'Omnino fervebat opus,' says Cruciger, 'et deserebantur tractationes prioris doctrinae atque futilis, et nitor elegantiaque disciplinae politoris expetebantur. Tunc Lipsiam Ricardus Crocus, Bri-

these intruders as ‘preachers of perversion,’ and ‘winnowers of the devil’s chaff.’* Conradus Celtus, Hermannus Buschius, and Joannes Rhagius Aesticampianus, were successively expelled from Leipsic;† other universities emulated the example. The great University of Cologne stood, however, ‘proudly

tannus, qui in Gallia auditor fuerat Hieronymi Alexandri [Aleandri] venit anno Chr. MDXV [MDXIV] professusque doctrinam Græcarum litterarum, omnium amorem favoremque statim est maximum consecutus: quod hujus linguæ non primordia, ut aliqui ante ipsum, sed integram atque plenam scientiam illius afferre, et posse hanc totam explicare, docereque videretur. Negabat meus pater, credibile nunc esse id, quod ipse tunc cognoverit. Tanquam *cœlitus demissum*† *Crocum omnes veneratos esse* aiebat, unumquemque se felicem judicasse, si in familiaritatem ipsius insinuaretur: docenti vero et mercedem, quæ postularetur, persolvere; et quocumque loco temporeque præsto esse, recusavisse neminem; si concubia nocte se conveniri, si quamvis longe extra oppidum jussisset, omnes libenter obsecuti fuissent.—Loc. Comm. Among the Declamations of Melanchthon, see Orat. de Initiis, &c. and Orat. de Vita Trocedorfii, also Joach. Camerarius, (the pupil of Croke,) in the Preface to his Herodotus, and in his Life of Melanchthon. Dr Croke (afterwards public orator of Cambridge) was the first professor of Greek in Leipsic, and the first author of a grammar of that language, published in Germany; he founded that school which, under his successor, Sir Godfrey Hermann, is now the chief fountain of Hellenic literature in Europe. His life ought to be written. Sir Alexander Croke, in his late splendid history of the family, has collected some circumstances concerning this distinguished scholar; but a great deal of interesting information still remains ungathered among the writings of his contemporaries. We could fill a page with mere references.

* *Buschii Vallum Humanitatis*, ed. Burckhardi, p. 15. In Leipsic humane letters were styled by the theologians, *Dæmonum cibus*, *Dæmonum opsonium*, *Aegyptiæ ollæ*, *virulentæ Aegyptiorum dapes*.—*Pænegyricum Lipsiensis Theologi*.—Præf. Lipsiæ, 1514.

† We have before us an oration of Aesticampianus, delivered in 1511, on his departure from Leipsic, after the *public schools* had been closed against him by the faculty of arts. We extract one passage—‘*Quem enim poetarum eloquentium non sunt persecuti patres vestri, et quem vos ludibrio non habuistis, qui ad vos expoliendos, quasi cœlitus sunt demissi? Nam, ut e multis paucos referam, Conradum Celtin pene hostiliter expulistis; Hermannum Buschium diu ac multum vexatum ejecistis; Joannem quoque Aesticampianum variis machinis oppugnatum, tandem evertitis. Quis tandem Poetarum ad vos venit? Nemo hercle, nemo. Inculti ergo jejunique vivetis, fedi animis et inglorii, qui vel nisi pœnitentiam egeritis, damnati omnes immoriemini.*’

'eminent' in its hostility to the new intelligence; for improvement was there opposed by the united influence of the monks and masters. When Von Lange commenced his reformation of the school of Munster, a vehement remonstrance was transmitted from the faculties of Cologne to the bishop and chapter of that see, reprobating the projected change in the schoolbooks hitherto in use, and remonstrating against the introduction of pagan authors into the course of juvenile instruction. Foiled in this attempt, the obscurants of that venerable seminary resisted only the more strenuously every effort at a reform within Cologne itself. They oppressed and relegated, one after another, Bartholomæus Coloniensis, the two Aedicollii (Joannes and Serratus), Joannes Murmellius, Joannes Cæsarius, and Hermannus Buschius, as dangerous innovators, who corrupted the minds of youth by mythological fancies, and the study of unchristian authors. Supported, however, by Count Nuenar, dean of the canonical chapter, and by the influence of his rank, Buschius, a nobleman by birth, the scholar of Hegius, and friend and schoolfellow of Erasmus, stood his ground even in Cologne, against the scholastic zealots; and, though thrice compelled to abandon the field of contest, he finally succeeded in discomfiting, even in their firmest stronghold, the enemies of light. Pliny and Ovid were read along with Boethius and Sedulius; the ancient schoolbooks—the *Doctrinale* of Alexander, the *Disciplina Scholarum*, the *Catholicon*, the *Mammaetractus*, the *Gemma Gemmarum*, the *Labyrinthus*, the *Dormisecure*, &c. &c., were at last no longer, even in Cologne, recognised as of exclusive authority; and, within a few years after their disgrace in this fastness of prescriptive barbarism, they were exploded from all the schools and universities throughout the empire. In this difficult exploit Buschius was aided by Erasmus, Ulric von Hutten, Melanchthon, Torrentinus, Bebelius, Simler, &c.

This was, however, but a skirmish, compared with another kindred and simultaneous contest; and the obstinacy of Buschius, in defence of classical Latinity, only exasperated the theologians of Cologne to put forth all their strength in opposition to Reuchlin, a still more influential champion of illumination, and in suppression of the more obnoxious study of Hebrew.

The character of Reuchlin is one of the most remarkable in that remarkable age; it exhibits, in the highest perfection, a combination of qualities which are in general found incompatible. At once a man of the world and of books, he excelled equally in practice and speculation; was a statesman and a philosopher, a jurist and a divine. Nobles, and princes, and emperors,

honoured him with their favour, and employed him in their most difficult affairs; while the learned throughout Europe looked up to him as the ‘trilingue miraculum,’ the ‘phœnix litterarum,’ the ‘eruditorum ἀλφα.’ In Italy, native Romans listened with pleasure to his Latin declamation; and he compelled the jealous Greeks to acknowledge that ‘Greece had overflowed the Alps.’ Of his countrymen, he was the first to introduce the study of ancient literature into the German Universities; the first who conquered the difficulties of the Greek language; the first who opened the gates of the east, unsealed the word of God, and unveiled the sanctuary of Hebrew wisdom. Agricola was the only German of the fifteenth century who approached him in depth of classical erudition; and it was not till after the commencement of the sixteenth, that Erasmus rose to divide with him the admiration of the learned. As an Oriental scholar, Reuchlin died without a rival. Cardinal Fisher, who ‘almost adored his name,’ made a pilgrimage from England for the sole purpose of visiting the object of his worship; and that great divine candidly confesses to Erasmus, that he regarded Reuchlin as ‘bearing off from all men the palm of knowledge, especially in what pertained to the hidden matters of religion and philosophy.’ At the period of which we speak, Reuchlin, withdrawn from academical tuition to the conduct of political affairs, was not, however, unemployed in peaceably promoting by his writings the cause of letters; when suddenly he found himself, in the decline of life, the victim of a [formidable persecution, which threatened ruin to himself, and proscription to his favourite pursuits.

The alarming progress of the new learning had at last convinced the theologians and philosophers of the old leaven, that their credit was only to be restored by a desperate and combined effort—not against the partisans, but against the leaders of the literary reformation. ‘The two eyes of Germany’ were to be extinguished; and the theologians of Cologne undertook to deal with Reuchlin, while Erasmus was left to the mercies of their brethren of Louvain. The assailants pursued their end with obstinacy, if not with talent; that they did not succeed, showed that the spirit of the age had undergone a change—a change which the persecutions themselves mainly contributed to accomplish.

It was imagined that Hebrew literature, and the influence of Reuchlin, could not be more effectually suppressed, than by rendering both the objects of religious suspicion. In this attempt, the theologians of Cologne found an appropriate instru-

ment in John Pfefferkorn, a Jew, who had taken refuge in Christianity from the punishment which his crimes had merited at the hands of his countrymen.* In the course of the years 1508 and 1509, four† treatises (three in Latin, one in German) were published under the name of the new convert; the scope of which was to represent the Jewish religion in the most odious light. The next step was to obtain from the emperor an edict, commanding that all Hebrew books, with exception of the Bible, should be searched for, and burned, throughout the empire; on the ground, that Jewish literature was nothing but a stock of libels on the character of Christ and Christianity. The cultivation of Hebrew learning would thus be rendered impossible, or at least discouraged; and, at the same time, it was probably expected that the Jews would bribe liberally to evade the execution of the decree. Maximilian was, in fact, weak or negligent enough to listen to the misrepresentation, and even to bestow on Pfefferkorn the powers necessary to carry the speculation into effect; but some informality having been discovered in the terms of the commission, the Jews had interest to obtain a suspension of the order; and previous to its renewal, a mandate was issued, requiring, among other opinions, that of Reuchlin, as to the nature and contents of the Jewish writings. Of the referees, Reuchlin alone complied with the requisition. He showed that, to extirpate Hebrew literature in the mass, was not only unjust, but inexpedient; that a large proportion of the Rabbinic writings was not of a theological character at all, and consisted of works not only innocent, but highly useful; and that the religious books themselves, while not, in general, such as they had been malevolently represented, were of the greatest importance to Christianity, as furnishing, in fact, the strongest arguments in refutation of the doctrine they defended.

This was precisely what the obscurants of Cologne desired.

* Maius, in his *Vita Reuchlini*, Jacobus Thomasius, in the *Observationes Hallenses*, Dupin in his *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, and many others, confound this John Pfefferkorn with a relapsed Jew of the same name, who was burned for blasphemy at Halle in 1514. The *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, and the *Pocmata* of Hutten, might have kept them right.

† These tracts are extremely rare. Meiners (to say nothing of Muench) was acquainted only with three. In our collection there is a fourth, entitled *Hostis Judæorum*, etc. with the *Epigramma politum* of Ortuinus against the Jews, in the titlepage, which was reprinted in his *Lamentationes Obscurorum Virorum*.

Pfefferkorn, with their assistance, published, (1511,) under the name of 'Handglass' (Handspiegel), a tract in which Reuchlin was held up to religious detestation, as the advocate of Jewish blasphemy, and as guilty of many serious errors in the faith. Reuchlin condescended to reply; and his 'Eyeglass' (Augenspiegel) exposed the ignorance and falsehood of his contemptible adversary. The principals now found it necessary to come forward. Arnold Tungern, as Dean of the Theological Faculty of Cologne, undertook to sift the orthodoxy of the Eyeglass; forty-three propositions 'de Judaico favore nimis suspectæ,' were extracted and published; and Reuchlin summoned to an open recantation, (1512.) In his 'Defensio contra calumniatores Colonienses,' (1513,) Reuchlin annihilated the accusation, and treated his accusers with the unmitigated severity which their malevolence and hypocrisy deserved. These were, James Hoogstraten, a man of no inconsiderable ability, and of extensive influence, as member of the Theological Faculty of Cologne, as Prior of the Dominican Convent in that city, and as 'Inquisitor hæreticæ pravitatis,' for the dioceses of Cologne, Mentz, and Treves,—Arnold of Tungern (or Luyd), Dean of the Theological Faculty, and head of the Burse of St Lawrence,—and Ortuinus Gratius (Ortwin von Graes), a pupil of Hegius, and now a leading member of the Faculty of Arts, a sycophant, who, in hopes of preferment, prostituted talents in subservience to the enemies of that learning in which he was himself no contemptible proficient.

Reuchlin was not ignorant of the enemies with whom he had to grapple. The *Odium Theologicum* has been always proverbial; the Dominicans were exasperated and leagued against him; no opposition had hitherto prevailed against that powerful order, who had recently crushed Joannes de Wesalia, for a similar offence, by a similar accusation; while a contemporary pope emphatically declared, that he would rather provoke the enmity of the most formidable sovereignties, than offend even a single friar of those mendicant fraternities, who, under the mantle of humility, reigned omnipotent over the Christian world. Reuchlin wrote to his friends throughout Europe, entreating their protection and interest in obtaining for him new allies. He received from all quarters the warmest assurances of sympathy and co-operation. Not only in Germany, but in Italy, France, and England, a confederation was organized between the friends of humane learning.* The

* England, for example, sent to the 'army of the Reuchlinists,' More, Fisher, Lynaere, Grocyn, Colet, Latimer, Tunstall, and Ammo-

cause of Reuchlin became the cause of letters; Europe was divided into two hostile parties; the powers of light stood marshalled against the powers of darkness. So decisive was this struggle regarded for the interests of literature, that the friends of illumination saw, in its unexpected issue, the special providence of God;* and so immediate were its consequences in preparing the religious reformation, that Luther acknowledges to Reuchlin, that he only followed in his steps—only consummated his victory in breaking the teeth of the Behemoth.† It was this contest, indeed, which first proved that the nations were awake, and public opinion again the paramount tribunal. In this tribunal the cause of Reuchlin was in reality decided, and his triumph had been long complete before it was formally ratified by a papal sentence. Reuchlin's victory, in public opinion, was accomplished by a satire; and the anathema on its publication by the holy see, only gave intensity to its effect. But to return.

Hoogstraten now cited Reuchlin before the court of Inquisition at Mentz, (1513.) Reuchlin declined Hoogstraten as a judge; he was his personal enemy, and not his provincial; and when these objections were overruled he appealed to the pope. This appeal, notwithstanding, and in contempt of a sist on the proceedings by the Elector of Mentz, Hoogstraten and his theological brethren of Cologne condemned, and publicly burned the writings of Reuchlin, as 'offensive, dangerous to religion, and savouring of heresy;' and to enhance the infamy, they obtained from the Sorbonne of Paris, and the theological faculties of Mentz, Erfurth, and Louvain, an approval of the sentence. Their triumph was wild and clamorous, but it was brief. On Reuchlin's appeal, the pope had delegated the investigation to the Bishop of Spire; and that prelate, without regard to the determinations of the reverend faculties, decided summarily in favour of Reuchlin, and condemned Hoogstraten in the costs of process, (1514.) It was now the Inquisitor's turn to appeal. The cause was referred by Leo to a body of commissioners in Rome; and Hoogstraten, amply furnished with money, proceeded to that capital. The process thus protracted, every mean was

nus of Lucca; 'omnes,' says Erasmus to Reuchlin, 'Græce docti præter Coletum.' (*Epist. ill. Vir. ad Reuchl.* L. II. Ti.) We may notice that this rare and interesting collection has *five letters* of Erasmus, not to be found in any edition of his works.

* Jo. Cæsarius (*Ep. ad Reuchl.* Lib. II. X iii.) and Eobanus Hessus (*ibid.* Z i.)

† *Epist. ad Reuchl.* Lib. II. C i.

employed by the Dominicans to secure a victory. In Rome, they assailed the judges with bribes and intimidation. In Germany, they vented their malice, and endeavoured to promote their cause by caricatures and libels, among which last the *Toesin* (Sturm-glock), ostensibly by Pfefferkorn, was conspicuous; while the pulpits rang with calumnies against their victim.

Amid this impotent discharge of squibs, there was launched, from an unknown hand, a pasquil against the persecutors of Reuchlin; it fell among them like a bomb, scattering dismay and ruin in its explosion. This tremendous satire was the ‘*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum ad venerabilem virum Magistrum Ortuinum Gratium.*’ Its purport is as follows:—Before the commencement of his persecution, Reuchlin had published a volume of letters from his correspondents; and Reuchlin’s enemy, Ortuinus, is now, in like manner, supposed to print a volume of the epistles addressed to him by his friends. But while the correspondents of Ortuinus were, of course, any thing but less distinguished than those of Reuchlin, the former is supposed to entitle his collection *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum ad Ortuinum*, in modest ridicule of the arrogance of Reuchlin and his *Epistolæ Illustrium Virorum*.* The plan of the satire is thus extremely simple—to make the enemies of Reuchlin and of polite letters represent themselves; and the representation is managed with a truth of nature only equalled by the absurdity of the postures in which the actors are exhibited. Never were unconscious barbarism, self-glorious ignorance, intolerant stupidity, and sanctimonious immorality, so ludicrously delineated; never did delineation less betray the artifice of ridicule. The *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are at once the most cruel and the most natural of satires; and as such, they were the most effective. They converted the tragedy of Reuchlin’s persecution into a farce; annihilated in public consideration the enemies of intellectual improvement; determined a radical reform in the German universities; and even the friends of Luther, in Luther’s lifetime, acknowledged that no other writing had contributed so power-

* See E. O. V. Vol. II. Ep. I. Dr Mueuch is wrong in supposing that “*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*,” means “*Briefe der Finsterlinge.*” The original title does not, perhaps, sufficiently conceal the satire; the translated openly declares it.

† ‘Nescio,’ says Justus Jonas, ‘an ullum hujus sæculi scriptum sic papistico regno nocuerit, sic omnia papistica ridicula reddiderit, ut hæc *Obscurorum Virorum Epistolæ*, quæ omnia minima, maxima, clericorum vitia verterint in risum.’—*Epist. Anonymi ad Crotum.*

fully to the downfall of the papal domination.† ‘Veritas non est de ratione faceti;’ but never was argument more subservient as to the cause of truth.

Morally considered, indeed, this satire is an atrocious libel, which can only be palliated on the plea of retaliation, necessity, the importance of the end, and the consuetude of the times. Its victims are treated like vermin; hunted without law, and exterminated without mercy. What truth there may be in the wicked scandal it retails, we are now unable to determine.

Critically considered, its representations may, to a mere modern reader, appear to sacrifice verisimilitude to effect. But by those who can place themselves on a level with the age in which the *Epistolæ* appeared, their ridicule (a few passages excepted) will not be thought to have overshot its aim. So truly, in fact, did it hit the mark, that the objects of the ridicule themselves, with the exception of those who were necessarily in the secret, read the letters as the genuine product of their brethren, and even hailed the publication as highly conducive to the honour of scholasticism and monkery. In 1516, immediately after the appearance of the first volume, thus writes Sir Thomas More: ‘*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* operæ pretium est videre quantopere placent omnibus, et doctis joco, et indoctis serio, qui, dum ridemus, putant rideri stylum tantum, quem illi non defendunt, sed gravitate sententiarum dicunt compensatum, et latere sub rudi vagina pulcherrimum gladium. Utinam fuisset inditus libello alius titulus! profecto intra centum annos homines studio stupidi non sensissent nasum quanquam rhinocerotico longiorem.’—‘Pessime consuluit,’ says Erasmus in 1518, ‘rebus humanis, qui titulum indidit *Obscurorum Virorum*: quod ni titulus prodidisset lusum, et hodie passim legerentur illæ Epistolæ, tanquam in gratiam Prædicatorum scriptæ. Adest hic Lovanii Magister noster, priorem Prior apud Bruxellas, qui viginti libellos coemerat, gratificaturus amicis, paulo antequam Bulla illa prodiret, quæ effulminat eum libellum. Primum optabam non editum eum libellum, verum ubi fuerat editus, optabam alium titulum.’—And again, in a letter twenty years thereafter,—‘Ubi primum exissent *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, miro Monachorum applausu exceptæ sunt apud Britannos a Franciscanis ac Dominicanis, qui sibi persuadebant eas in Reuchlini contumeliam, et Monachorum favorem, serio proditas: quumque quidam egregie doctus, sed nasutissimus, fingeret se nonnihil offendi stylo, consolati sunt hominem. Ne spectaris, inquiunt, ô bone, orationis cutem, sed sententiarum vim. Nec hodie deprehendissent, ni quidam, addita epistola, lectorem admonuisset rem non esse seriam.’ [Erasmus refers to the penult letter of the

second volume, in which Ortuinus is addressed as *Omnium Barbarorum defensor, qui clamat more asinino, &c.*] ‘Post in ‘Brabantia, Prior quidam Dominicanus et Magister noster ‘volens innotescere patribus, coemit acervum eorum libellorum, ‘ut dono mitteret ordinis Proceribus, nihil dubitans quin in ‘ordinis honorem fuissent scriptæ. Quis fungus possit esse ‘stupidior?’

Quis fungus possit esse stupidior! Erasmus would have wondered less at the stupidity of the sufferers, and more, perhaps, at the dexterity of the executioner, could he have foreseen that one of the most learned scholars of England, and the most learned of her bibliographers, should have actually *republished* these letters as a serious work; and that one of our wittiest satirists should have *reviewed* that publication, without even a suspicion of the lurking Momus. And what is almost equally astonishing, the misprision has never been remarked. In 1710,* there was printed in London the most elegant edition that has yet appeared of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, which the editor, Michael Maittaire, gravely represents as the production of their ostensible authors, and takes credit to himself for rescuing, as he imagines, from oblivion, so curious a specimen of conceited ignorance, and unconscious absurdity. The edition he dedicates ‘*Isaaco Bickerstaff, Armigero, Magnæ Britannicæ Censori;*’ and Steele, in a subsequent number of the *Tatler*, after acknowledging the compliment, thus notices the book itself: ‘The ‘purpose of the work is signified in the dedication, in very elegant language, and fine raillery. It seems this is a collection ‘of letters, which some profound blockheads, who lived before ‘our times, have written in honour of each other, and for their ‘mutual information in each other’s absurdities. (!) They are ‘mostly of the German nation, whence, from time to time, ‘inundations of writers have flowed, more pernicious to the ‘learned world than the swarms of Goths and Vandals to the ‘politic. (!!) It is, methinks, wonderful, that fellows could be ‘awake, and utter such incoherent conceptions, and converse ‘with great gravity like learned men, without the least taste of ‘knowledge or good sense. It would have been an endless ‘labour to have taken any other method of exposing such im-

* A re-impression of this edition, and by the same bookseller (Clements), appeared in 1742. We know not on what grounds Herr Ebert (the highest bibliographical authority certainly in Europe) asserts that this re-impression was, in reality, published in Switzerland. The paper and print seem decidedly English.

‘pertinencies, than by an edition of their own works, where ‘you see their follies, according to the ambition of such virtuosi, in a most correct edition.’ (!!!) And so forth. The monks are no marvel after this.

These letters have been always, however, a stumbling-block to our English critics and historians. A late accomplished author asserts, that they were written in imitation of Arias Montanus’s version of the Bible. That learned Spaniard was born some ten years subsequent to the supposed parody of his *Interpretatio Literalis*.

Jortin has made an amusing book out of the life of Erasmus, though but superficially versed in the literary history of the sixteenth century. He has blundered hardly less in regard to the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, than in regard to their great author, Ulric von Hutten. He rarely ventures, indeed, beyond the text of Erasmus and Le Clerc, without stumbling. The Jew, Pfefferkorn, he knows only as a writer against the *Epistolæ*, and is wholly ignorant that these were written, among others, against him. The *Epistolæ* themselves, which he could never possibly have perused, but with which, of all works, the historian of Erasmus ought to have been familiar, he supposes to have been ‘a piece of harmless wit.’ Finally, in utter unacquaintance with the *Fasciculus* of Ortuinus, though himself an historian of the church, and that remarkable work in ecclesiastical history, republished in England by an English divine, he conceives it to be only a collection of ‘*Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum*,’ a counterpart and precursor, it would appear, to the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, published twenty years before, confusing it probably with the *Epistolæ illustrium virorum ad Reuchlinum*.

The only other notice in English literature of this celebrated satire that occurs to us, is an article on the subject, which appeared a few years ago in the *Retrospective Review*. We recollect it only as a meagre and inaccurate compilation from the most superficial authorities.

No question in the history of letters has been more variously determined than that touching the conception and authorship of these celebrated epistles. They have been regarded as the work of an *individual*—of a *few*—and of *many*. Of an *individual*—Jovius, Valerius Andreas, Koch, Opmeer, Maius, Naudé, Gehres and others, hold *Reuchlin* himself to have been sole author; Caspar Barthius, J. Thomasius, Morhof, Weislinger, and Schurzfleisch, attribute them exclusively to *Hutten*; Justus Jonas and Olearius to *Crotus*. Some have given them to *Eobanus Hessus*; others to *Erasmus*; and others to *Euricius Cordus*; while Goldastus refers them to *Brussianus*; and Gisbert Voetius

to the poet-laureate *Glareanus*. Of a *few*—Gundling views *Reuchlin* as the exclusive writer of the first part, assisted by *Erasmus* and *Hutten* in the second. In both volumes, *Hutten* has been regarded as the principal, *Crotus* as the assistant, by *Veller*, *Meiners*, *Panzer*, and *Lobstein*; while *C. G. Mueller* and *Erhard* view *Crotus* as sole author of the first volume, and *Hutten*, perhaps *others*, as his coadjutors in the second. *Angst*, as deviser of the whole, and exclusive writer of the first volume, and, with the aid of *Hutten*, *Crotus*, and *others*, as principal author of the second, has found an advocate in *Mohnicke*. By some anonymous writers *Hutten* and *Eobanus Hessus* have been viewed as joint authors of both volumes. Of *many*—*Hamelmann* bestows the joint honour, among *others*, on *Count Nuenar*, *Hutten*, *Reuchlin*, and *Buschius*; to whom *Reichenberg* adds *Erasmus*, and *Cæsarius*; while *Freitag* divides it between *Crotus*, *Hutten*, *Buschius*, *Aesticampianus*, *Cæsarius*, *Reuchlin*, *Pirkheimer*, *Glandorpius*, and *Eobanus*. *Burekhard* originally gave the authorship of the whole to *Hutten*, *Nuenar*, *Reuchlin*, *Buschius*, and *Cæsarius*, with *Stromer* and *Pirkheimer* as probable coadjutors; but after the publication of the *Epistola Anonymi ad Crotum*, to *Hutten* and *Crotus*, as inventors and principal writers of both volumes, assisted by *Nuenar*, *Aesticampianus*, *Buschius*, *Cæsarius*, *Reuchlin*, *Pirkheimer*, and possibly *Eobanus*. *Niceron* gives them to *Hutten*, *Reuchlin*, *Nuenar*, *Crotus*, and *others*. *Stoll* and *Heumannus* regard *Hutten* as the chief author, aided by *various* friends, among whom the latter particularizes *James Fuchs*. By *Meusel*, *Crotus* is supposed to have conceived the plan, and, along with *Hutten*, to be the principal writer of the first part, not unaided, however, by *Buschius* and *Aesticampianus*; to the composition of the second, *Count Nuenar*, *Pirkheimer*, *Fuchs*, and perhaps *others*, contributed their assistance. *Ruhkopf* assumes as authors, *Reuchlin*, *Hutten*, *Eobanus*, *Cordus*, *Crotus*, *Buschius*, &c. *Wachler* holds *Crotus* to be the writer of the first volume, *Hutten* and *others* to be authors of the second. Finally, *Dr Muench* considers *Hutten* and *Crotus* as principals, assisted more or less by *Eobanus Hessus*, *Aesticampianus*, *Buschius*, *Cæsarius*, *Pirkheimer*, *Angst*, *Franz von Sickingen*, and *Fuchs*.

The preceding summary, which affords a far more complete enumeration than has yet been given of the various opinions on this question, shows how greatly any adequate criticism of the different hypotheses would exceed our limits. Our observations (*φωρᾶντα συνετόισι*) shall only be in supplement to what is already known. Suffice it to say, that as yet there has been adduced no evidence of any weight to establish the co-operation of other

writers in these letters besides Ulric von Hutten and Rubianus Crotus ; and, independent of the general presumption against an extensive partnership, there is proof sufficient to exclude many of the most likely of those to whom the work has been attributed—in particular, Reuchlin, Erasmus, and Eobanus. We propose to show that Hutten, Crotus, and Buschius are the joint authors ; and this, in regard to the first and last, by evidence not hitherto discovered.

The share of Crotus is, we conceive, sufficiently established by the anonymous letter addressed to him by a friend on his return to the Catholic church, and which, there is every reason to believe, was the production of Justus Jonas. His co-operation we assume.

Doubts have been of late thrown on Hutten's participation, at least in the first volume of the *Epistolæ*, founded on his two letters to Richard Croke, discovered and published by C. G. Mueller in 1801. More might be added to what Dr Muench has acutely alleged in disproof of the inference which Mueller has deduced from these ;* but we shall not pause to show that Hutten *could* have been a writer of the volume in question ; we shall at once demonstrate that he *must*.

The middle term of our proof is the *Triumphus Capnionis*. This must, therefore, be vindicated to Hutten. Mohnicke has, with considerable ingenuity, recently attempted to invalidate the grounds on which Hutten had been hitherto recognised as the author of this poem. Added, however, to the former evidence, the proof which we shall now adduce appears to us decisive in favour of the old opinion. A letter of Erasmus to Count Nuenar, in August 1517, to say nothing of the twenty-fifth letter of the first volume of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, proves that the *Triumphus Capnionis* was ready for publication *two years before*, and that at his instance it had been then suppressed. In point of fact, it was only printed in 1519. This being understood, the following coincidence of thought and expression between letters of Hutten, all written one, two, or three years before the publication of the *Triumphus*, and the *Triumphus* it-

* *e. g.* Mueller (with Boehmius, indeed, and all others, as to the former) is wrong in regard to two essential points. 1. Croke did not first come to Leipsic in 1515. 'Crocus regnat in Academia Lipsiensi, publice docens Græcas literas,' says Erasmus in a letter to Linacer, June 1514.—Op. iii. c. 136. 2. The first edition of the *Erasmian Testament* appeared in March 1516 (*Wetstein Proleg.*), and the Letter of Erasmus to Leo X., relative thereto, is Aug. 1515, not 1516, as alleged by Mueller.

self, can be rationally explained only on the hypothesis that both were the productions of the same mind.

In the Letter to Nuenar, April 1518, speaking of the *Dominicans*, and their persecution of true learning and religion, Hutten says, 'Quodsi me audiat Germania, quanquam inferre *Turcis* bellum necesse est hoc tempore, prius tamen huic intestino malo remedium opponere quam de Asiatica expeditione cogitare iussero,' etc.; then *immediately follows* a mention of the famous imposture of the Dominicans of Berne, which he calls the '*Bernense Scelus.*' In the Preface of the Triumphus, on the other hand, *immediately after* noticing, in the same words, the '*Bernense Scelus,*' the author adds, in reference also to the *Dominicans* and their hostility to polite letters and rational theology, 'Quippe *Turcos* nego aut ardentiori dignos odio, aut majori oppugnandos opere,' etc. Again, in the same Letter, Hutten writes, 'In *Italia* certe nostri me puduit quoties de Capnionis afflictione, orto cum Italis sermone, illi percontarentur, *tantum licet in Germania fratribus?*' In the Preface to the Triumphus, the author says, 'Memini opprobratam nobis in *Italia* hominis (Hogostrati sc.) insolentiam. *Tantum*, inquit aliquis, *licet in Germania fratribus?*' Again, in the same Letter, Peter Mayer and Bartholomew Zehender, are vituperated *in conjunction*: so also in the Triumphus. Again, in the Letter it is said, '*Petrus Mayer indoctissimus . . . audax tamen.*' In the Triumphus, the marginal title is '*Petrus Mayer indoctissimus,*' and in the text '*nemo est ex vulgo indoctior ipso, Audax nemo magis,*' (v. 824.) Again, in the Letter, it is said of '*Bartholomæus qui Decimator,*' '*simile quid scorpionibus habet.*' In the Triumphus '*Bartholomæus Zehender qui et Decimator,*' as he is styled in the running title, is thus addressed in the text, (v. 772,) '*Mitte huc te Vipera.*' Again, in his Letter to Gerbellius, August 1516, Hutten extols Reuchlin and Erasmus, '*per eos enim barbara esse desinit hæc natio (Germania sc.)*' So in the Triumphus, (v. 964,) *Germania* lauds Reuchlin, '*per te ne barbara dicar Aut rudis effectum est.*' Again, in the conclusion of Hutten's letter to Pirkheimer, (August 1518,) we find '*accipe laqueum barbaries,*' and in the address to the '*Theologistæ,*' closing the Triumphus, we have '*proinde laqueum sumite,*' and '*obscuris viris laqueum præbens;*' and in both, this expression follows an animated picture of the rapid progress of polite literature. In like manner, compare what is said in Hutten's Letter to Croke, August 1516, '*Sententia non jam de Capnione, sed de nostris communibus studiis lata,*' with the text of the Triumphus, (too long to quote,) of which the marginal summary is, '*Capnion communis libertatis assertor,*' (v. 917;); also the same catalogue of crimes imputed to the Predicant Friars, raked up,

in the same manner, in Hutten's *Intercessio pro Capnione*, and in two places in the *Triumphus* (v. 305, ets. and v. 400, ets.) Though less remarkable, we may likewise adduce the expression, '*rumpantur ilia*,' applied to the Friars, both in Hutten's Letter to Erasmus, (July 1517,) and Preface to the *Nemo*, and in the *Triumphus*, (v. 378;) while the '*Jacta est alea*' in the final address of the *Triumphus*, was subsequently Hutten's motto in his various polemical writings against the court of Rome. The occurrence also of the unusual proverbial allusion, '*herbam porrigens*,' in Hutten's Preface to the *Nemo*, and '*herbam sumemus*,' in the conclusion of the *Triumphus*, is not without its weight. It may also be observed, that the author of the *Triumphus* and Hutten agree in always using the form *Capnion* and not *Capnio*, and in the employment (*usque nauseam*) of the terms *Theologistae*, *Sophistae*, &c.

Hutten, thus proved the author of the *Triumphus*, *Capnionis* is, by a similar comparison of that work with the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, shown to be a writer of the first, no less than of the second, volume of these letters. The *Triumphus*, be it remembered, was ready for publication before the first volume of the *Epistolæ*, in the twenty-fifth letter of which it is, indeed, spoken of as already written. Thus, no allusion occurs in the *Triumphus* to the *Epistolæ*; but the expression, *obscuri viri*, in the peculiar signification of the *Epistolæ*, which is employed at least five times in the *Triumphus*, argues strongly for the common origin of both. The following are, however, far more signal coincidences. In the *Triumphus*, (v. 309, ets.) speaking of the crimes of the Dominicans, the marginal title bears '*Henricus Imp. sacramento intoxicatus*.' In the *Epistolæ*, (vol. 1, ep. 35,) speaking, in like manner, of the crimes of the same order, Magister Lyra reports that it is written from Rome, that, as a punishment for their falsification of Reuchlin's *Eyeglass*, these friars are to be condemned to wear a pair of white spectacles on their black cowls, (in allusion to the name of that pamphlet, and on the titlepage of which a pair of large black spectacles appear,) '*sicut jam etiam debent pati unum scandalum in celebratione missali, propter intoxicationem alicujus Imperatoris*.' The allusion to the poisoning of Henry VII. in both, is remarkable; but the coincidence is carried to its climax, by the employment, in each, of so singular, and so unlikely a barbarism (at least in the *Triumphus*) as *intoxicatus* and *intoxicatio*—terms unknown even in the iron age of Latinity. An equally striking conformity is found between a passage in the *Triumphus*, (v. 269—302,) where Hutten asserts, *first*, the superiority of Reuchlin's theological learning as contrasted with that of his persecutors, and

secondly, his equal participation with them in the gift of the Holy Spirit—and a passage in the fifth letter of the first volume of the *Epistolæ*, in which the same attributes are affirmed of the same persons, in the same relation, and in the same consecution. Hutten's co-operation in the first volume is thus evinced; and his co-operation, to any extent, is proved by establishing his co-operation at all.

Hutten's participation in the second volume has been less disputed than his share in the first. Besides the evidence already stated by others, we may refer to the intended persecution of Erasmus for his edition of the New Testament, as stated in the letter of Hutten to Pirkheimer, from Bologna, June 1517, and in the forty-ninth letter of the second volume of the *Epistolæ*; also to the '*conjuratio*' and '*conjurati*' (a remarkable expression) in favour of Reuchlin against the theologians, in the address appended to the *Triumphus*, and in the ninth letter of the latter part of the *Epistolæ*.

The parallelisms we have hitherto adduced are sufficiently convincing in themselves; but they are far more conclusive when we consider, 1. how narrow is the sphere within which they are found, and 2. that similar repetitions are frequent in the undoubted works of Hutten. As to the former, the letters of Hutten, belonging to the period, and the *Triumphus*, extend only to a few pages; and we defy any one to discover an equal number of equally signal coincidences (plagiarism apart) from the works of any two authors, allowing him to compare as many volumes as, in the present case, we have collated paragraphs. As to the latter, nothing but a fear of trespassing on the patience of the reader prevents us from adducing the most ample evidence of the fact.

We now proceed to state the grounds on which we contend that there were three principal, or rather, perhaps, three exclusive authors of the work in question; and that the celebrated Hermann von dem Busche, or, as he is more familiarly known to scholars, Hermannus Buschius, completed, with Hutten and Crotus, this memorable triumvirate.

Ortuinus Gratius, who may be allowed to have had a shrewd guess at his tormentors, not only in his *Lamentationes Virorum Obscurorum*,* immediately after the appearance of the *Epistolæ*,

* P. 116, ed. 1649.—It has been doubted whether Ortuinus was the real author of the *Lamentationes*, and whether that silly rejoinder was the work of an Anti-Reuchlinist at all. The affirmative we could fully establish by passages from the works of Hutten and Erasmus which have been wholly overlooked.

but, what has not been observed, twenty years thereafter in his *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum*,* asserts that the *Epistolæ* were the work of several authors, and states, even in the former, that their names were known. Erasmus, who enjoyed the best opportunities of information,† and in circumstances under which it was no longer a point of delicacy to dissemble his knowledge, asserts that the authors of the *Epistolæ* were *three*. ‘*Equidem non ignorabam auctores. Nam tres fuisse ferebantur. In ne-minem derivavi suspicionem.*’‡ This testimony is at once the most cogent and most articulate that exists; so strong is it, that we at once accept it, even against the presumption that an effusion of so singular a character, of such uniform excellence, and rising so transcendently above the numerous attempts at imitation, could have emanated only from a single genius. To suppose the co-operation of a plurality of minds, each endowed with the rare ability necessary for such a work, is in itself improbable, and the improbability rises in a geometrical ratio to the number of

* T. I., p. 479, Brown’s edition. Dr Muench and others conceive, that this work is palpably pseudonymous. He could hardly have read what Clement (*Bibl. Cur.* t. viii. p. 244, etc.) has said upon this subject; and in addition to the observations of that acute bibliographer we may notice, that the *Fasciculus* is not hostile to Catholicism; its purport is only to maintain that for which the Universities in general, and Paris and Cologne in particular, had always strenuously contended,—that a council was paramount to the pope, and that a council was the only mean, at that juncture, of reconciling the dissensions in religion. Ortuinus’s zeal in the cause was probably any thing but allayed by the papal decision in the case of Reuchlin. N.B. The marginal notes in the English edition are, for the greater part, by the protestant editor; an ignorance of this may have occasioned the misapprehension.

† He was the familiar friend of the whole circle of those who either wrote the work, or knew by whom it was written—of Hutten, Buschius, Nuenar, Cæsarius, Pirkheimer, Eobanus, Angst, Stromer, &c. Some of the *Epistolæ* were even communicated to him before publication, and the design and execution vehemently applauded. They were copied by him, and dispatched to his correspondents, committed to memory, and recited in company; nay, are said to have cured an imposthume on his face by the laughter they excited. He was thus manifestly not only able to discover the history of the composition, but strongly interested in the discovery. The selfishness and caution of his own character are slyly hit off in the second volume—‘*Erasmus est homo pro se;*’ and we should be disposed to attribute the clamour of his subsequent disapprobation to personal pique, as much, at least, as to virtuous indignation, or even timidity.

‡ *Spongia adv. asp. Hutteni* (*Opera*, t. x. c. 1640, ed. Clerici.)

such minds which the hypothesis assumes. In the present case, the weight of special evidence in favour of plurality is sufficient to counterbalance, to a certain extent, the general presumption in favour of unity. But gratuitously to postulate, as has been so frequently done, all and sundry not disinclined to Reuchlin, to have been able to write, and actually to have assisted in writing this master-piece of wit, is of all absurdities the greatest. The law of parsimony is overcome by the irrecusable testimony of Ortuinus and Erasmus, so far as to compel us to admit a plurality of authors, and that to the amount of three; but philosophical presumption, and historical evidence, combine in exploding the supposition of a greater number.

Of these three authors, two are already found. We could prove, we think, by exclusion, that no other, besides Buschius, was at all likely to have been the third. But as this negative would be tedious, we shall only attempt the positive, by showing that every circumstance concurs in pointing out that distinguished scholar as the colleague of Hutten and Crotus. The name of Buschius has once and again been mentioned, among the other wellwishers of Reuchlin, as a possible author of this satire; but whilst no evidence has yet been led to show that his participation in that work was probable, grounds have been advanced, and still remain unanswered, which would prove this participation to have been impossible.

We must therefore refute, as a preliminary, this alleged impossibility. ‘Hamelmann,’ says Meiners, whose authority on this question is deservedly the highest, ‘believes that Hermann von dem Busche had a share in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*. This supposition is contradicted by the chronology of these letters, which were written and printed previously to the return of Von dem Busche to Germany.’* This objection, of which Muench was not aware, is established on Hamelmann’s biography of Buschius; and, if true, it would be decisive. We can prove, however, that Buschius was not only in Germany, but resident at Cologne for a considerable time previous to the printing of the first volume of the *Epistolæ*, and continued to reside there, until about the date of the publication of the second.† Buschius was teaching in the University of Cologne, soon after the publication of the *Prænotamenta* of Ortuinus, in 1514, as is proved by the

* *Lebensbeschr. ber. Maenner*, II. p. 380.

† Meiners, it may be observed, makes the appearance of the first volume of the *Epistolæ* a year too late; it was in 1515, or, at latest, in the beginning of 1516; while the second volume was published towards the end of 1516, or early in 1517.

letter of Magister Hipp, the 17th in the first volume of the *Epistolæ*. In the 19th letter of the second volume, Magister Schlauraff, at the commencement of his peregrination, leaves Buschius at Rostoch, but at its termination finds him teaching at Cologne; while the 46th of the same volume speaks of him as then (*i. e.* 1516) a rival of Ortuinus in that school. Glareanus, in his Epistle to Reuchlin, dated from Cologne, January 1514, speaks of Buschius as resident in that city. (Ill. Vir. Ep. ad Reuchl. X iii.) The letter of Buschius himself to Reuchlin, written in *October*, 'from his own house in Cologne,' is checked by the events to which it alludes to the year 1515, (*Ibid.* Y i.); and, finally, we find him addressing to Erasmus a poetical congratulation on his entry into that city in 1516, (*Erasmi Opera* III. c. 198 and c. 1578, ed. Clerici.) Buschius could not thus have left Cologne, before the middle or end of the year 1516, (his absention at that juncture is significant;) and when recalled from England to Cologne in 1517, by Count Nuenar, Dean of the Canonical Chapter, that nobleman, with all his influence, was unable to support him against the hostility of the Monks and Magistri Nostri, Hoogstraten, Ortuinus & Co., to whom, if a known or suspected contributor to the *Epistolæ*, he would now have become more than ever obnoxious. Erasmus found him at Spire in 1518. So far, therefore, from being placed beyond the sphere of co-operation during the concoction of the *Epistolæ*, he was for the whole period at its very centre.

But his participation is not simply possible—it is highly probable. In the first place, his talents were not only of the highest order, and his command over the Latin tongue in all its applications almost unequalled, but his genius and character in strict analogy with the work in question. The *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are always bitterly satirical, and never scrupulously decent.* The writings of Buschius—his *Œstrum*, his *Epistola pro Reuchlino*, his *Concio ad Clerum Coloniensem*, his *Vallum Humanitatis*, to say nothing of others—are just a series of satires, and satires of precisely the same tendency as that *pasquil*. The *Vallum*, by which he is now best known to scholars, Erasmus pre-

* This excludes Eobanus Hessus, of whom we know from Erasmus, Joachim Camerarius, and Melchior Adamus, (to say nothing of the negative evidence of his own writings,) that he was morbidly averse from satire and obscenity. Muench, who comprises Eobanus (he has it uniformly Erban) in his all-comprehensive hypothesis of authorship, makes him writer of the tract *De Fide Meretricum*. He was not; and if he were, the author of that wretched twaddle, was certainly no author of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*.

veiled on him to soften down; it still remains sufficiently caustic. His Epigrams show that, in his writings, he did not pique himself on modesty; while the exhortation of the worthy Abbot Trithemius, ‘*ut ita viveret ne moribus destrueret eruditionem,*’ proves that he was no rigorist in conduct.

In the second place, in *thus* maintaining the cause of Reuchlin he was most effectually maintaining his own.

In the third place, Ortuinus Gratius, to whom the *Epistolæ Virorum Obscurorum* are addressed, is the principal victim of this satire, though not the most obnoxious enemy of Reuchlin—far less of Hutten and Crotus; but he was the literary opponent, and personal foe of Buschius. Westphalians by birth, Ortuinus and Buschius were countrymen; they had also been schoolfellows at Daventer, under the celebrated Hegius. But as they were not allies, their early connexion made them only the more bitter adversaries. Buschius, the champion of scholastic reform, was opposed by Ortuinus, with no sincerity of conviction, but all the vehemence of personal animosity, in his endeavours to exterminate the ancient grammars, which, having for ages perpetuated barbarism in the schools and universities, were now loathed as philological abominations by the restorers of ancient learning. Buschius had thus not only general reasons to contemn Ortuinus, as a renegade from the cause of illumination, but private motives to hate him as an hypocritical and malevolent enemy. The attack of Ortuinus is accordingly keenly retorted by Buschius in the preface to his second edition of *Donatus*, as it is also ridiculed in the 9th and 32d letters of the first volume of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*.

In the fourth place, the scandal about the family and parentage of Ortuinus, (and he is the only one of the Obscure whose birth is satirized,) seems to indicate the information of a countryman; and with every allowance for exaggeration, still even the contradictions of his sacerdotal filiation, which Ortuinus found it necessary to publish in his various works subsequent to the *Epistolæ*, preserve always a suspicious silence touching his mother.

In the fifth place, Buschius was the open and strenuous partisan of Reuchlin, in whose cause he published, along with Nuenar and Hutten, a truculent invective against the *Apologia* of Hoogstraten. He is always, indeed, found enumerated among the most active and prominent of the Reuchlinists. In evidence of this, we regret that we cannot quote from the *Epistolæ illustrium Virorum ad Reuchlinum*, the letters of Nuenar (T iii.), of Glareanus (X iii.), and of Eobanus (Y iii.), and,

from the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, the 59th letter of the second volume; in all of which, the mention made of Buschius is on various accounts remarkable.

In the sixth place, Buschius was also the intimate friend of Crotus and Hutten; and among the letters to which we last referred, those of Nuenar and Eobanus significantly notice his co-operation in aid of Reuchlin with these indubitable authors of the work in question. His attachment to Hutten was so strong, that it lost him, in the end, the friendship of his schoolfellow Erasmus.

In the seventh place, Cologne and Leipsic are the universities prominently held up to ridicule throughout the *Epistolæ*. We see why in the cause of Reuchlin the *Magistri Nostri* of Cologne should be especial objects of attack;—but why those of Leipsic? Leipsic was not even one of the universities which had concurred with Cologne in condemning the *Augenspiegel* of Reuchlin. With the Leipsic regents, neither Hutten nor Crotus had any collision; nor, as far as we are aware, any intercourse. They are assailed, however, with a perseverance and acrimony betraying personal rancour, and with a minuteness of information competent only to one who had been long resident among them. The problem is at once solved, if we admit the participation of Buschius. This scholar had grievous injuries to avenge, not only on the obscurants of Cologne, but on those of Leipsic. The influence of Hoogstraten, Tungern, and their adherents, had banished him from Cologne about the year 1500; and on both his subsequent returns to that university, he remained at open war with its Theologians and ‘Artists.’* After his first expulsion from Cologne, he had, for six years, taught in Leipsic with the greatest reputation; but the jealousy of the barbarians being roused by the preponderance which he had given to the study of polite letters, he was constrained by their vexations to abandon that university in 1510, and the extrusion of his friend Aesticampianus was adjourned only until the following year. The letter of Magister Hipp, in the first volume of the *Epistolæ*, (Ep. 17,) in which the persecution of Aesticampianus by the Leipsic masters is minutely described, and that of Buschius wholly overpast, betrays the hand of Buschius himself. Throughout these letters indeed, the notices of Von dem Busche, as of Hutten and Crotus, harmonize completely with the hypothesis of authorship.

* How fond Buschius was of every joke against Hoogstraten, may be seen from his correspondence with Erasmus. (*Erasmi opera*, t. iii. cc. 1682, 1683.)

But, in the eighth place, we are not altogether left to general probabilities. The single letter of Buschius to Reuchlin, compared with some of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, supplies conformities, that go far of themselves to establish an identity of authors. (Ep. ad Reuchl. L. ii. Y.) Among other parallelisms, compare, in the former, the threat of the Anti-Reuchlinists, in the event of the pope deciding against them, to effect a schism in the church, with the same in the 57th Epistle of the second volume of the latter;—their menace, in the former, of appealing to a council, with the same in the 12th Epistle of the first volume of the latter;—and their disparagement of the pope, and a papal sentence, in the former, with the same in the 11th and 12th Epistles of the first volume of the latter.

We do not pretend that the circumstantial evidence now adduced amounts to complete certainty. It affords, however, a very strong probability; and is at least sufficient, in the present state of the question, to vindicate, against every other competitor, the claim of Buschius to the third place in the triumvirate to whom the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are to be ascribed.

It now remains to say a few words on Dr Muench's performances as editor. A satisfactory edition of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* required, 1. A history of the circumstances which determined the appearance and character of the satire, including an enquiry into its authors; 2. A critical discussion of the various editions of the work; 3. A correct text founded on a collation of all the original editions, the omissions, interpolations, and variations of each being distinguished; and, 4. A commentary on the frequent allusions to things and persons requiring explanation.

In regard to the first of these conditions, Dr Muench has added nothing—and not a little was wanting. To explain the general relations of the satire, it was not sufficient to narrate the steps of the Reuchlinian process as an isolated event; nor in compiling this narrative, (for it shows no original research,) has he even copied his predecessors without inaccuracy. His disquisition touching the origin of the work, from his omission of all references, can only be understood by those who are already conversant with the discussion; his statement of the different opinions in regard to the authorship, is at second hand, and very incomplete; and his own hypothesis on the subject good for nothing.

In regard to the second condition, Dr Muench has committed a momentous blunder relative to the appendix of seven, or more properly six, letters which were added to the *third* edition of the first volume,—an edition which probably appeared within a year

after the first edition of the first volume, and almost certainly before the publication of the second volume. With Panzer (whom he makes of *Leipsic!*) and Ebert—nay even with what he himself has transcribed from these bibliographers, before his eyes, his blunder is inconceivable. From a note to the first of these additional letters, (p. 146,) compared with his account of the fourth edition, that of 1556, (p. 70,) he evidently imagines these six letters to have been first published and appended in that edition along with the *Epistola imperterriti fratris*, &c. ‘The following letters,’ he says, ‘are added only in the later editions, and their author, as well as the occasion of their composition, unknown. In all probability they were the work of the *still living* authors of the first and second volumes.’ Some lesser errors under this head we overpass, as Muench is here only a copyist.

The third condition, though of primary importance, and comparatively easy, our editor has not fulfilled. He professes to have printed the first volume from its second edition; he does not inform us from what edition he printed the second volume, or the appendix to the first. He has instituted no collation of the original editions: and nothing can exceed the negligence, we shall not say ignorance, which even this uncollated text displays. It was the primary duty of an editor to have furnished a text, purified at least from the monstrous typographical errors with which all former editions abound. The present edition only adds new blunders to the old.* These errata we should refer to a culpable negligence, were it not that Dr Muench is occasionally guilty of blunders, which can only be explained by a defective scholarship, and an ignorance of literary history. Thus, in his introduction, (pp. 55, 56,) he repeatedly adduces a passage from one of Hutten’s letters, beginning *rumpantur utilia*, though every schoolboy would at once read *rumpantur ut ilia*.

To the accomplishment of the fourth condition, Dr Muench has contributed little or nothing. No work more required, as none better deserved, a commentary, than the *Epistolæ*. Our

* Dipping here and there at random, we notice, p. 158, *Wesatio* for *Wesalio*, an old and important erratum; p. 192, *positionem* for *potionem*, old error; p. 132, *Stulteti* for *Sculteti*, ditto; p. 133, *succo taphaniana drachmas iii.*, for *succo raphani ana drachmas iii.*; p. 88. *nostrum*. *Petrum* for *nostrum*, *P.* old error; p. 98, *quot libeta* for *quodlibeta*; p. 138, *praeputiati* for *non praeputiati*; *ibid.*, *non praeputiati* for *praeputiati*, old error; p. 139, *fuit promotus* for *fui promotus*, old error; p. 203, *cum contra semel articulos habuit Petrum*, &c., for *c. h. s. a. c. P.*; p. 204, *parem* for *patrem*; p. 137, *indoxicationem* for *intoxicationem*; pp. 162, 163, *solarium* for *salarium*, old error, &c. &c.

editor has, however, attempted no illustration of the now obscure allusions with which they everywhere abound—no difficult undertaking to one versed in the scholastic philosophy, and the general literature of the period; but the biographical notices he has ventured to append, of a very few of the persons mentioned in the text, significantly prove his utter incompetence to the task. These meagre notices are gleaned from the most vulgar sources, and one or two examples will afford a sufficient sample of their inaccuracy.

The celebrated poet Joannes Baptista (*Hispaniolus*, Spagnoli) Mantuanus, General of the Carmelites, who died in March 1516,* he mistakes, and in the very face of the *Epistolæ*, for the obscure physician Baptista *Fiera* (he writes it *Finra*) Mantuanus, who died at a much later period.

Every tyro in the literary history of the middle ages, and of the revival of letters, is familiar with the name, at least, of Alexander de Villa Dei or Dolensis, whose Latin Grammar, the *Doctrinale Puerorum*, reigned omnipotent throughout the schools of Europe, from the beginning of the 13th to the beginning of the 16th century. The struggle for its expulsion was one of the most prominent events in the history of the restoration of classical studies in Germany; and the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are full of allusions to the contest. Yet Dr Muench knows nothing of Alexander. ‘*Gallus Alexander*,’ says he, ‘as it appears, an able grammarian of the *fifteenth* century, an experienced *casuist*,’ &c.—all utterly wrong, even to the name.

Of the notorious Wigand Wirt, Dr Muench states that he was one of the Dominicans executed at Berne, for the celebrated imposture, in 1509. Though probably the deviser of that fraud, he was not among its victims: and had Dr Muench read the *Epistolæ* he edits, with the least attention, he would have seen that Wigand is in them accused of being the real author of the *Sturmglöck*, written against Reuchlin, in 1514, and that he is living in 1516. (Vol. I. App. Ep. 6.)

Our editor confounds Bartholomew Zehender or Decimator of Mentz, with Bartholomæus Coloniensis of Minden. The former was one of the most ignorant and intolerant of the Anti-Reuchlinists; the latter, the scholar of Hegius, the friend of Erasmus, (who styles him, *vir eruditione singulari*,) and the ally of Bus-

* The allusion to the death of Mantuanus, in the twelfth letter of the second volume of the *Epistolæ*, thus checks, to a certain point, the date of its composition, and would prove that it was written in Italy, consequently by Hutten. This, which has not been observed, is important.

chius, Aesticampianus, and Cæsarius, had been banished from his native city, for his exertions in the cause of classical Latinity, by the persecutors of Reuchlin themselves.

What we have said will suffice to show that these Letters still await their editor.* Let the Germans beware. The work is of European interest; and, if they are not on the alert, the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* may, like the poems of Lotichius, find a foreign commentator. Will Mr Ebert not execute the task?

ART. X.—*Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Behring's Strait, to co-operate with the Polar Expeditions: performed by his Majesty's ship Blossom, under the command of Captain F. W. BEECHEY, Royal Navy, F.R.S., F.R.A.S., and F.R.G.S., in the years 1825, 26, 27, 28. Published by authority of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. Two vols. 4to. London: 1831.*

‘IN this voyage,’ says Captain Beechey, ‘which occupied three years and a half, we sailed seventy-three thousand miles, and experienced every vicissitude of climate.’ Such an achievement is not of every day performance. It is a work of labour, and toil, and perseverance, which, of itself, constitutes a certain title to distinction; nor is it possible for any man, however unobservant and incurious he may be, to travel so great a distance on the earth’s surface, and under every variety of climate, without picking up in his transit some valuable information, and contributing towards the enlargement or correction of the knowledge previously acquired. But the misfortune is, that, in our country, contributions of this nature are, for the most part, made in a shape and form which render them nearly, if not altogether, inaccessible to the great mass of the public; that an aristocra-

* Another edition of these Epistles, by Rotermund, we see announced in the Leipsic Mass-Catalogue for Easter 1830; and have been disappointed in not obtaining it for this article. The editor, whom we know only as author of the Supplement to Jocher’s Biographical Lexicon, professes, in the title, to give merely a reprint of the London edition of 1710, (*i. e.* a text of no authority, and swarming with typographical blunders,) a preface explanatory of the origin of the satire, and biographical notices of the persons mentioned in it. As there seems no attempt at a commentary, we do not surmise that Rotermund has performed more in Latin than Muench had attempted in German; and the small price shows that there can be little added to the text.

tial taste predominates, even in the 'getting up' of books; that utility is frequently sacrificed to splendour—the improvement of the many to the gratification of the few; and that instead of a cheap octavo, which any body might buy, and a great number would undoubtedly read, there comes forth a brace of costly quartos, in all the magnificence of graphical and typographical embellishment, which the affluent alone can afford to purchase. An exclusive spirit seems to preside over the manufacture of all such productions. The people are graciously allowed the honour of defraying the expense of every expedition, wise or foolish, which their rulers from time to time think proper to send out; but when the period arrives for communicating the results, whatever these may be, to the public, care is taken that this shall be done in such a way as to render the communication of little or no avail.

The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are systematic offenders in this respect. We have no disposition to call in question either their patriotism or their love of science; and it is certainly not the fault of their lordships, if the voyagers and travellers employed by them have failed to reach the Pole, and discover the north-west passage. But whether an expedition of this nature partially succeed, or prove altogether abortive, there is one result which invariably follows; namely, the publication of an expensive, and sometimes ill-digested book, which seems to be considered an atonement for all errors, and a compensation for all failures. The intrinsic value of the materials, and the style of the embellishments, bear no reasonable proportion to each other; or rather, perhaps, the one bears an inverse relation to the other. Every thing that is of the least importance in the work before us, for instance, might have been advantageously comprised in an ordinary-sized octavo volume; instead of which we are presented with a couple of quartos, printed on paper of the finest quality, with a suitable amplitude of margin, and accompanied with a profusion of illustrations, which make a serious addition to the cost of the book, without in any degree enhancing its value. The narrative of the voyage is, upon the whole, instructive and interesting; but it is exceedingly diffuse, and frequently deformed by faults of diction and style; upon which, however, we do not feel ourselves called upon, in a work of this kind, particularly to animadvert.

Government having resolved that another attempt should be made to explore a north-west passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific, by the way of Prince Regent's Inlet, an expedition (the last which sailed on this difficult and hazardous service) was accordingly fitted out in the year 1824, and the com-

maud of it again conferred upon Captain Parry; while, in order to connect the discoveries of Captain Franklin at the mouth of the Coppermine River with the furthest known point on the western side of America, and thus to ascertain the configuration of the northern boundary of that continent, a land expedition, under the intrepid officer just named, was at the same time sent out, with instructions to descend the Mackenzie River to its *embouchure*, and, there separating, to coast the northern shore in opposite directions towards the two points previously discovered; one party, under Dr Richardson, proceeding to the eastward, in order to determine the line of coast between the mouths of the Mackenzie and Coppermine Rivers; and the other, under the immediate command of Captain Franklin, proceeding to the westward, for the purpose of exploring that portion of the northern limit of the American continent which is situated between the *embouchure* of the Mackenzie River and Icy Cape, and, finally, to rendezvous, if possible, in Kotzebue Sound. But as it was next to certain, from the extent and difficulty of the services to be respectively performed, that both the naval and land expeditions, even if successful, would reach the open sea, on the western coast of America, nearly if not altogether exhausted of resources and provisions, it was also resolved, in the view of obviating these anticipated difficulties, to send a ship to Behring's Strait, there to await their arrival, to supply their wants, and to provide for their safe return to Great Britain. For this purpose, the Blossom, of twenty-six guns, but on the present occasion mounting only sixteen, was put in commission, and the command of her conferred on Captain F. W. Beechey, who had served with distinction, under Captain Parry, in the preceding northern expeditions. She was liberally provided with every thing necessary for the voyage; and as the vessel, in her course, would have to traverse a portion of the globe hitherto but imperfectly explored, while, on the other hand, a considerable period must intervene before her presence would be required in Behring's Strait, it was judiciously decided to employ her, during the interval, in surveying such parts of the Pacific as lay within the route prescribed for her, and were judged of most consequence to the interests of navigation.

The Blossom sailed from England on the 19th of May, 1825, and, after touching at Santa Cruz, in the island of Teneriffe, reached Rio Janeiro on the 11th July. She remained there till the 13th August, when she took her departure for the Pacific, and doubled Cape Horn without encountering any of those gales which appear so formidable in the accounts of the early navigators. Since the days of Anson, in fact, the stormy spirit

of this celebrated promontory has been in some measure laid; in other words, the improvement of the art of navigation has instructed mariners as to the time and way best suited for effecting the passage with safety, and thus enabled them to avoid the dangers to which their less skilful predecessors unnecessarily exposed themselves. From the experience of two passages, however, Captain Beechey is of opinion that a ship bound to the Pacific should pass inside the Falkland Islands, and round Staaten Land, as closely as possible; in which case, she will most probably encounter south-west winds, as soon as the Pacific opens to her. On the 6th of October, the Blossom made Mocha Island, on the coast of Chili, and two days after anchored at Talcahuana, the seaport of Conception, from which it is distant three leagues. Having taken in a supply of fresh beef, poultry, water, vegetables, and wood, at Conception, which, as a place of refreshment, fully answered Captain Beechey's expectations, the Blossom proceeded to Valparaiso, and thence, taking leave of the coast, stood away to the westward across the Pacific. It had been Captain Beechey's intention to pass within sight of Juan Fernandez, with the view of ascertaining its exact position. But the wind proving unfavourable for his purpose, he bent his course for the island of Sala-y-Gomez, which he closed in with on the 14th November, and found much smaller in extent than had been previously supposed, being, in fact, little else than a heap of rugged stones, apparently thrown together by the elements, and scarcely distinguishable amidst the spray which continually breaks over them. After sailing about for some time under the lee of this island, the ship bore away still to the westward, and soon reached Easter Island, which is inhabited by a race of the greatest thieves in the Pacific. The natives were for the most part naked, and only here and there could the covering called a maro be discerned. Almost all of them had their faces painted with some colour, or variety of colours, in the manner practised by our buffoons; and two demon-like figures were observed, painted entirely black. Tattooing is also practised to a great extent, especially by the females, who stain their skin in imitation of blue breeches, doubtless from observing sailors in the act of passing through water with their trowsers tucked up to the knee, and consequently present a very ludicrous appearance. They are at once deceitful and dishonest, and, being of a warlike temperament, prone to violence when detected or opposed in their depredations. The population of Easter Island is roughly estimated at about 1500, on what ground or data we know not. From various circumstances, however, it would appear to have been originally

inhabited by a race much less barbarous than that by which it is at present occupied. The colossal busts which excited the surprise of the early navigators have, it is true, nearly disappeared, either from the perishable nature of the materials, or from the destructive propensities of the present occupants; but these, and some other indications, afford proof of that migratory tendency which seems more or less to characterise all the inhabitants of Polynesia.

Quitting Easter Island without reluctance, the Blossom bore away for the next island on the chart, which was Ducie's, and then proceeding to the westward, on the 4th December reached Pitcairn Island, which has been so famous as the asylum chosen by the mutineers of the *Bounty*. Captain Beechey's account of the mutiny, which is confessedly drawn up from information supplied by Adams, the only survivor of the mutineers, we shall not enter into; first, because the subject has so long been familiar to the public, that it has now lost all its attractions; and, next, because we are not much disposed to confide in the accuracy of communications made by a person situated like Adams, who had a deep interest in representing his own conduct in the most favourable light, and who, his companions being all dead, might tell whatever story he pleased, without fear of contradiction. At the same time, many of the particulars which Captain Beechey has collected, respecting the proceedings of the mutineers, seem to be new, and some of them are highly instructive, as showing how naturally, or rather inevitably, crime begets crime, and one offence leads to the commission of others, which, at the commencement of his guilty career, the offender himself would have shrunk from with horror and dismay.

The Blossom quitted Pitcairn Island about the middle of December, and resumed her course to the north-westward, in order to examine, as minutely as circumstances would admit of, the numerous clusters of coral islands and formations with which this portion of the Pacific is so thickly studded; a task which, it is no more than justice to say, Captain Beechey appears to have performed with equal ability and success. Of these islands, thirty-two were fully explored, and their respective positions determined by accurate observations. The largest was about thirty miles in diameter, and the smallest less than a mile. Their configuration is various, and all are composed of living coral, except Henderson's Island, which is partly surrounded by it; but their dimensions appear to be increasing, in consequence of the active operations of the lithophytes in extending their wonderful structures, and working the immersed portions gradually

up towards the surface. Of the above number, twenty-nine had lagoons in the centre; in other words, they were composed of an exterior girdle or bulwark, enclosing a space varying in dimensions; and, when the whole fabric is raised above the surface of the water by means of volcanic agency, or some enormous force acting upwards, effecting the complete insulation of that space, and thus, in the first instance, forming these central lagoons. And this seems to have been the original formation of all coral islands, however much their subsequent appearance may have changed from the operation of natural causes in gradually reducing the height of the exterior rampart, and, at the same time, filling up the interior hollows or cavities. The invariable instinct of the corallines, or lithophytes, leads them to construct these bulwarks in the first instance; for what precise purpose it is not easy to say. But, as the form or shape of each structure is different, it has been supposed by some that they have their foundations upon submarine mountains, or extinguished volcanoes; that, consequently, the figure of the base determines that of the superstructure; and that the lagoons, which are found in every coral formation, may be occasioned by the shape of the crater;—suppositions which appear to be countenanced by the remarkable fact that all the coral islands, without exception, exhibit traces of volcanic agency, and that their elevation above the surface of the water, which forms the upper limit of the labours of the lithophytes, is unquestionably the result of an expansive subterranean force, acting upwards, or in the direction of least resistance. At the same time, it is known that the corallines work laterally as well as vertically, and this circumstance, which seems incompatible with the hypothesis just mentioned, has led some to imagine that the coral formations spring originally from small bases, extending themselves horizontally as they rise perpendicularly towards the surface of the sea; and that the primary construction of the exterior girdle is to be ascribed solely to the peculiar instinct of the lithophytes, which unerring nature has thus directed to execute, first of all, the most important and essential portion of their labours. Mr Foster, who accompanied Captain Cook, and first directed the attention of scientific men to the subject of coral formations, was of opinion that the animalcules forming the reefs began with the construction of an outer ledge, in order to shelter their habitation from the impetuosity of the winds, and the power of the ocean. But this notion appears to be ill founded, inasmuch as the force of the wind, and the agitation of the ocean, are not felt at any considerable depth below the surface, whereas the coral animalcules appear to commence their operations at very

great depths, and, consequently, must be engaged in them long before the structures they form attain sufficient elevation to reach the lowest limit of commotion which the power of the wind can possibly produce. In fact, none of the theories which have hitherto been proposed are sufficient to explain or to connect the phenomena exhibited by these interesting formations; nor have any data as yet been furnished from which the average rate of their progressive increase may be inferred, or the laws which regulate it deduced.

Of the thirty islands visited in succession by Captain Beechey, only twelve, including Pitcairn Island, are inhabited; and the total amount of their population, he thinks, cannot much exceed three thousand souls, of which one thousand belong to the Gambier group, and twelve hundred to Easter Island, leaving only between eight and nine hundred for the remainder. Several of the inhabited islands, particularly the two last mentioned, bear evident marks of prior occupation by a race different from that by which they are at present possessed; and in many of those which are now unoccupied, especially in the low archipelago, Captain Beechey discovered traces of their having been formerly inhabited. These are curious circumstances, and, considering the distances which intervene between some of the islands occupied by people of the same race and language, explicable only on the assumption that migrations are frequent and extensive, notwithstanding the apparent impracticability of performing long voyages in open and slender canoes. Nor does this assumption rest on a mere hypothesis. The fact of the natives frequently undertaking voyages of several hundred miles, is incontestably established; and accident threw in the way of Captain Beechey some people of Chain Island, who, having planned a voyage to Otaheite, situated about three hundred miles to the westward, were forced out of their course by a gale of wind, which they encountered two days after their departure, and driven six hundred miles in a direction contrary to the trade wind. An occurrence like this is of itself sufficient to explain the whole mystery as to the distribution of population amongst the islands of the Pacific; for, although the instances previously met with, have mostly been in one direction, and have rather favoured the opinion of migration from the eastward, or in the direction of the trade wind, yet there is no reason to believe the case of the Chain Islanders a solitary, or even a rare one. Many other canoes may have experienced the same fortune as that which carried Tuwarri and his companions, male and female; and of the thousands which have, at different times, been committed to the bosom of the Pacific and the mercy of the winds,

‘some few may have drifted to the remotest islands of the archipelago, and thus peopled them.’ On a question of this sort, we are not to consider probabilities, but facts, and to draw such conclusions only as the latter seem to warrant. Were we to reason on general principles, we should undoubtedly come to the conclusion, that migrations such as those we have described were in the very highest degree improbable. It would seem next to impossible that the most reckless and daring adventurers could plan and perform voyages of three hundred miles, in a frail canoe, without the aid of either compass or chart. But the fact of such voyages having been actually performed being attested by incontrovertible evidence, there is an end at once to the question of probability; and all that we have to consider is, whether the distribution of population among the Polynesian archipelagoes has been primarily owing to these extraordinary migrations. And that it really has been so, seems to admit of little doubt; more especially as there is no other known or ascertained mode in which this could have been effected.

Having completed his survey and examination of the coral islands, Captain Beechey proceeded to Otaheite, which he reached on the 18th of March, 1826. This fine romantic island appears, morally speaking, to be in a most deplorable condition. The missionaries have managed to obtain an entire ascendancy; but their labours, we fear, have as yet been productive of little good. They have overshot the mark which they ought to have aimed at, and by attempting too much, have failed in that which, with more patience and less ambition, they might have accomplished. They have ostensibly succeeded in Christianizing nearly the whole population, who have generally been inspired with a disbelief of, and contempt for, their former superstitions. But unhappily, in eradicating idolatry, the missionaries, from whatever cause, have failed to substitute any better principle in its stead; and the only effect of the change produced has been, to degrade Christianity to the level of the most brutish idolatry, without making one step towards raising these miserable idolaters to the rank of Christians. The people, consequently, are as much barbarians and savages as ever,—or rather, they are worse; for they have borrowed from civilisation nothing but the vices by which it is dishonoured, and exhibit in their character a deplorable union of all that is most corrupt and profligate in the two opposite states of society which are here brought into juxtaposition. Hence, the immorality which prevails among these unfortunate islanders is hideous and revolting. Drunkenness is universal. The late king, Pomarree the Second, died of intoxication; and numbers of the degraded and brutalized people

terminate their existence in the same way. The effects of this vice upon savage natures, and the scenes to which it gives rise, may easily be imagined. They are of daily, nay, hourly occurrence, when the natives succeed in procuring ardent spirits, which they are ever ready to purchase, at any price and at any sacrifice. Another of their predominant characteristics is laziness. They have an unconquerable aversion to labour of any kind; and the only pleasure they seem to take, consists in being idle, and getting intoxicated as often as they can. The immediate consequence is, the most abject wretchedness, together with the vices which invariably belong to the lowest condition of human existence. The first step towards civilizing a people is, to try to form them to habits of industry, and, if possible, to create in their minds a desire to better their condition. But nothing of this kind has, as yet, been seriously attempted. The *missi-narees*, as the natives denominate them, seem much more disposed to enact the part of legislators, than instructors of the Otaheitans. They have been at infinite pains to get up a mock Parliament, and to perpetrate other analogous follies; but as yet they appear to have found no leisure for the more obscure and humble labours, which alone can prepare a people for receiving political institutions. We should have thought better of them, and entertained some hopes of the future improvement of these unhappy islanders, had they striven to confer upon them some of the substantial benefits of civilisation, instead of wasting their time in fantastical experiments. But the radical, and, we fear much, incurable vice, which eats into the very core of society in this island, is the gross and unblushing licentiousness which prevails among all classes. Otaheite, in fact, may be described as one vast brothel; in which, as in other places of the same description, the women are, if possible, still more profligate than the men. Here, notwithstanding the laws (as they are called) attach severe penalties to breaches of decorum, Captain Beechey assures us, we have no doubt with perfect truth, 'that, if opportunity offered, there is no favour which might not be obtained from the females of Otaheite, for the trifling consideration of a Jew's harp, a ring, or some other bauble.' He describes, or rather we should say, hints at, a scene which occurred on the occasion of a visit he made, somewhat unexpectedly, to the royal palace; and which afforded ocular demonstration of the melancholy fact, that the highest class rivals the lowest in the most shameless and abandoned profligacy. When he entered the sleeping apartment, Pomarree, the heir apparent to the sovereignty, 'led forward his young princess, Aimatta, and extended his politeness much beyond

‘ what could possibly have been anticipated from so young a husband.’

Matters are not so bad in the Sandwich Islands, which Captain Beechey next visited, having reached Woahoo early in May. Here, owing to some favourable circumstances, aided, of course, by the natural superiority of the native character, civilisation and the arts of life have really attained considerable advancement. The framework of society has been put together; civil institutions have been founded; laws have been enacted and enforced; towns have been built and laid out with a regard both to elegance and comfort; means of defence have been provided, at least for Honoruru, the capital; a flotilla, consisting of several brigs of war and smaller vessels, has been collected; and a considerable trade is carried on, principally in sandalwood, the most valuable product of these islands. Honoruru is composed chiefly of wooden houses, laid out in squares, intersected at regular intervals by streets properly fenced in; and the general appearance of the people, although at first sight rather repulsive, owing to their dark complexions, and a certain wildness of expression in their countenances, shows a manliness of character, which contrasts favourably with the licentious effeminacy of the Otaheitans. In short, a wonderful change has been produced on the habits, manners, and condition of the people, since these islands were visited by Captain Cook;—a change, the sole merit of which belongs to King Tamelameha, and his minister Krimakoo, otherwise called Pitt, because contemporary with the English statesman; two persons singularly adapted to each other, with minds of that bold and original cast, which, rising superior to every thing local and present, anticipate the wisdom of ages to come, and apparently raised up by Providence for the special purpose of giving the first vigorous impulse to improvement in that hitherto benighted region of the globe.

But the picture has its shadows as well as its lights. The staple product of these islands is the odoriferous wood already mentioned, which is in great demand in China and other countries of the East, where it is burnt as incense to their idols. But this wood requires many years to arrive at a state fit for the market; and, with the usual improvidence of men who are still more than three parts barbarians, the quantity cut down has greatly exceeded that which a negligent cultivation can supply, and, consequently, the article has become scarce; while, in point of quality, it is inferior to that produced in India and Ceylon. In the meanwhile, expensive habits have been formed, a taste for luxuries diffused, and heavy debts contracted; all

which circumstances tend still further to drain the immediate and only resources of these islands, and to reduce the inhabitants to a state of wretchedness, which cannot fail to retard, if not wholly to stop, the course of improvement so happily commenced. We also learn from Captain Beechey, that education 'has made much slower progress than every wellwisher of the country could desire.' A few individuals, whose good fortune it has been to receive continued instruction, seem to have acquired a limited knowledge of the Scriptures; but the great majority remain ignorant even of the prayers which they are taught to repeat, and, in other respects, are entirely uninstructed. 'The missionaries,' says Captain Beechey, 'appear to be very anxious to diffuse a knowledge of the tenets of the gospel among all the inhabitants, and have laboured much to accomplish their praiseworthy purpose; but the residents in Honoruru well know what little effect their exertions have produced, probably on account of the tutors having mistaken the means of diffusing education.'

Captain Beechey left Woahoo on the 31st May, and standing away to the north-westward, almost in a direct course, arrived, on the 26th June, off Petrapaulski, in Kamtschatka, where he found dispatches awaiting him, communicating the return of the expedition under Captain Parry, and desiring him to cancel that part of his instructions which had been framed with reference to the assumed case of the north-west passage being actually effected. On the 5th of July, he weighed anchor, and proceeding to Behring's Strait, entered Kotzebue Sound on the 22d, and reached the appointed rendezvous at Chamisso Island on the 25th July; five days later than had been arranged, but quite early enough, as no traces of Captain Franklin and his party were discovered, nor, in point of fact, as our readers know, did they succeed in penetrating to the western side of America. With regard to Captain Beechey's proceedings during his stay in the Strait, we defer entering into any detail, or indulging in any observation, until we come to notice his return the following season. Suffice it then for the present to say, that, having remained exploring the American coast to the northward, until the 14th of October, when the approach of winter and the appearance of the ice rendered it perilous to delay longer his departure, Captain Beechey weighed anchor, quitted the Sound, repassed the Strait, and proceeded to the southward, through the Oonemak channel in the Aleutian Islands, making the best of his way to San Francisco, in California, which he reached on the 7th November, 1826.

During a stay of six weeks at San Francisco, Captain Beechey

collected a good deal of information respecting the state of California generally; and, in particular, concerning the missions which have been established in different parts of that country for the conversion of the Indians. Of these, there are five in the jurisdiction of San Francisco, four in that of Monterey, and six to the southward of Soledad. The missions of San Francisco and Monterey, have together about 7000 Indian converts, while those to the southward are said to contain as many as 20,000 proselytes. Each mission has fifteen square miles of territory attached to it, with a set of buildings, including a church, more or less extensive according to the number of converts it is destined to receive. The church is generally a respectable edifice, highly decorated in the interior, and provided with costly vestments for processions; doubtless in the view of impressing the imaginations of the Indians through the medium of their senses. The other buildings are variously laid out, and adapted to the number of Indians they contain. But how are converts in the first instance procured, or, in other words, by what means are the Indians induced to forego the wild independence of their native forests, and immure themselves in these establishments? This is a question to which no direct answer has been given; but, from sundry hints thrown out by Captain Beechey, we are led to conjecture that Californian Indians are made converts in the same way precisely as the Highlanders of Scotland were formerly made volunteers, that is, without their own consent. But even supposing this to be true, the first step of the process is by far the most objectionable. Received within the walls of the mission establishments, they are upon the whole kindly treated, especially after baptism,—a rite, the administration of which the Indians have tact enough to court rather than to shun; more especially, as obstinacy is said to subject the recalcant to confinement, than which no punishment is more dreaded by a race accustomed to the exercise of unbounded freedom. As soon as they become Christians, some are put to trades, and become weavers, tanners, shoemakers, bricklayers, carpenters, blacksmiths, or artificers of a higher grade; others, again, are taught husbandry, and the rearing of horses and cattle; while a few who have good voices, are instructed in music, and form part of the choir of the church. The females card, clean, and spin wool, weave and sew; and such of the men as are married, attend to their domestic concerns. In requital of these benefits, the services of the Indian for life belong to the mission; but this unjust and impolitic pretension is not rigorously insisted in. At the same time, should any neophyte repent of his conversion, and desert to the woods, an armed force is instantly dispatched in pursuit of him,

and, when recaptured, he is dragged back to undergo a punishment apportioned to the measure of his offence, and the greater or less enormity of his apostacy. But occurrences of this kind are comparatively rare; for, as the wild Indians have a supreme aversion for those who have entered the missions, and not only refuse to readmit them to their tribe, but frequently discover to the pursuers the hiding-places of the fugitives, this animosity acts as a powerful check on desertion; and, at the same time, serves as a defence against the wild tribes, when disposed to resent the invasion of their territory, and the kidnapping expeditions of the missionaries. Such are the mission establishments of California, the merits and defects of which seem equally obvious.

The ship's company having completely recruited their health, which had suffered severely from fatigue and other causes, Captain Beechey took leave of San Francisco on the 28th December, and proceeded to Monterey, where he arrived on the 1st January, 1827; and having taken on board some supplies which he had provided, shaped his course to the southward for the Sandwich Islands. On the 25th, he again anchored in the Harbour of Honoruru, where he procured a seasonable supply of salt provisions, the beef corned in California having proved so bad, that it was found necessary to throw the whole overboard. Other stores were also obtained at this port; but as these were still insufficient, and as no medicines were to be had at Honoruru, Captain Beechey resolved to proceed to China. Accordingly, on the 4th March, the *Blossom* put to sea, and arrived at Macao on the 10th April. Here some difficulties and obstructions were at first encountered; but, by the 30th, the requisite supplies were got on board, and the ship immediately commenced her voyage to the northward. On the 15th May, she reached the Island of Loochoo, where she remained till the 25th, and then resumed her course for Behring's Strait.

Captain Beechey's account of Loochoo and its inhabitants, we are inclined to consider as, in some respects, the most important, if not the most interesting, part of his work; and, although we are somewhat at a loss to discover the precise nature of his own particular views respecting the character of the people by whom this island is inhabited, there can be no doubt that he has said enough to expose the misconceptions of Captain Hall and Dr Macleod on the subject. We have been hitherto reading romances on Loochoo, the scene of which merely is laid in that island. The commander of the *Blossom* has broken the spell and dissolved the charm by a plain matter-of-fact statement, which has certainly nothing but its truth to

recommend it. Let us see what he makes of this little fairyland of the Yellow Sea.

The great puzzle in the character of these people, is conceived to be the readiness with which they supply to ships whatever may be required, without asking or receiving any equivalent in return. The riddle, however, is not of very difficult solution. For, in the first place, from the facts stated by Captain Beechey, it is manifest that their liberality is more apparent than real. He found them ready enough not only to receive presents, but to beg for them, when they could do so without being observed, and he further discovered that they could steal, when occasion offered, with very tolerable dexterity. A registering thermometer having been abstracted from the deck, Captain Beechey mentioned the circumstance to Captain Hall's friend the linguist. The latter affected much distress on hearing of the theft, and said he would make every enquiry about the missing article on shore; adding, however, with great *naïveté*, 'Plenty Loo Choo man 'teef, plenty mans teef,' and advising the captain to look well after his handkerchiefs, watches, and particularly any of the instruments that might be taken on shore. Every circumstance, indeed, leads to the conclusion, that the ostensible liberality of these people is the result of policy, rather than native generosity of disposition. Cunning and craftiness are the arms which the weak employ against the strong. Conscious alike of their exposed position, and of their inability, in the event of actual aggression, to repel force by force, the Loochooans naturally avail themselves of the only effectual means of defence they possess, and seek to coax and bribe off visitors with whom it might be dangerous to quarrel, and fatal to come to blows. They are by no means of a bold and warlike disposition, but rather the reverse; and their intercourse with Europeans must have convinced them that policy afforded the surest, as well as the most congenial means of protection. Accordingly, they are consummate adepts in all the arts of dissimulation; smooth, hypocritical, false, and at the same time jealous and watchful in a high degree; always attempting to accomplish their object, and commonly succeeding, by means of cunning, cozenage, and deceit, lackered over with an outer coating of fair-seeming, urbanity, and plausibility, which seldom fail to impose on those with whom they have to deal. Thus, in their very weakness they have found, if we may so express it, an element of strength. But to represent such a people as paragons of every human virtue, and as strangers to all the evils, and vices, and crimes, which afflict society in other parts of the earth, is to take them rather too literally at their word, and to exhibit the external varnish,

without giving us a glimpse of the coarse or corrupt material within, which it serves to smooth and gloss over to the eye of a distant observer. Captain Beechey has rendered an essential service to the cause of truth, by details exposing several of the more prominent mistakes which have been committed in regard to the Loochooans.

First, it was said that this people were possessed of no arms, either offensive or defensive; an assertion which excited considerable surprise at the time when it was originally made, and which Napoleon, on its being repeated to him, instantly declared his unqualified disbelief of. Captain Beechey, however, saw no arms in the possession of the natives. But the mandarins and others stated that there were both cannon and muskets in the island; An-yah affirmed that twenty-six cannon were distributed among the junks belonging to Loochoo; the fishermen, and indeed all classes at Napa, showed themselves familiar with the use of cannon, when they came on board the Blossom, and particularly noticed the improvement of the flintlock upon the matchlock: on the panels of the joshouse, or temple, are painted figures seated upon broadswords, and bows and arrows; and, what is still more conclusive than all, the harbour of Napa is defended by three square stone forts, one on each side of the entrance, and the other on a small island, so situated as to rake a vessel entering the port,—and these forts, besides being loop-holed, are provided with platforms and parapets. Further, Captain Beechey presented a mandarin with a pair of pistols, which he thankfully accepted; and the arms were taken charge of by his attendants, without exciting any unusual degree of curiosity. Upon questioning Captain Hall's friend the linguist as to where the Loochooans procured gunpowder, Captain Beechey immediately received for answer, 'From Fochien.' Besides, both China and Japan have repeatedly fitted out expeditions against Loochoo, and civil wars have occasionally prevailed in the island; occurrences, we presume, which will scarcely be considered compatible with an ignorance of war and of the use of arms.

Secondly, we were also told that the Loochooans had no money, and were wholly unacquainted with the use of it. This, as the newspapers say, would have been important, if true. But, unfortunately for the accuracy of those who promulgated this statement, Captain Beechey not only saw money in circulation on the island, but has some of it now in his possession! The coin is similar to the *cash* of China. From the authorities which our author has quoted, it also appears that money has long been known to, if not in use among, the Loochooans; probably since the middle of the fifteenth century.

Thirdly, so effectually had these smooth hypocrites imposed on the good-nature of Captain Hall, that we were led, on his authority, to believe that the heaviest penalty attached to the commission of a crime in Loochoo was a gentle tap with a fan. We were also informed that the conduct of the superior orders in Loochoo towards their inferiors, was characterised by a mildness and forbearance worthy of the primitive ages. Captain Beechey's surprise may therefore be conceived, when the first mandarin who came on board the Blossom proceeded, on some slight provocation, to bamboo the *canaille* that had accompanied him, with an energy and vigour which astonished both the commander and the crew, and proved that the buttoned functionary was no mean proficient in the use of the Chinese instrument of government. The cowardly, however, are always cruel. Upon further enquiry, it turned out that the punishments inflicted in Loochoo are nearly the same as those practised in China, which has always been famous for the sanguinary character of its penal code. For great crimes, the punishment awarded is death, by strangulation on a cross, and sometimes under protracted torments; while, for less aggravated offences, the body is loaded with iron chains,—or the neck is locked into a heavy wooden frame,—or the person is enclosed in a case, leaving out the head of the culprit, which is shaven, and exposed to the scorching rays of the sun,—or, finally, the hands and feet are bound, and quicklime thrown into the eyes. It appears, also, that confession is sometimes extorted by dividing the joints of the fingers alternately, and clipping the muscles of the legs and arms with scissers; and several individuals at Potsoong assured Captain Beechey that they had seen an unfortunate wretch expire under this horrid species of torture. One is almost tempted to believe that the devil or an inquisitor had invented these atrocities; there being scarcely any other supposition on which we can account for a refinement in cruelty such as that which is at length found to prevail among the people of Loochoo, and which, unquestionably, would reflect no discredit either on the place of punishment below, or on the best imitation of it that has ever been got up above. Such are the gentle doves who cooed so softly in the ear of Captain Hall, persuading him that the golden age was, after all, no poetical chimera, and filling his imagination with some of the most absurd fantasies ever palmed on good-natured credulity.

Captain Beechey quitted the Elysium of the Yellow Sea on the 25th May, and making the best of his way to the northward, arrived in Awatska Bay, in Kamtschatka, on the 2d of July, whence, on the 18th, he sailed for Behring's Strait, and reached

the old rendezvous on the 16th of August. We shall now endeavour, as briefly as possible, to state the general results of Captain Beechey's proceedings in the Strait during both seasons.

He explored and carefully examined the whole of Kotzebue Sound, rectifying several mistakes which had been committed by the navigator whose name it bears, and discovering Hotham Inlet and the Buckland River. He also examined, though we scarcely think with much address, the remarkable cliffs at Elephant Point, in Eschscholtz Bay, which Kotzebue had supposed to be a stranded iceberg, from having found them covered with a thick coating of ice, but which were, in reality, composed of mud and gravel in a frozen state, the glacial facing having partly melted away; while, amidst the debris and sand at or near the base of these remarkable cliffs, were disinterred several tusks, bones, and grinders of elephants and other animals, in a fossil state. He then surveyed the line of coast to the northward, and, in autumn 1826, succeeded, by means of the barge, in adding about 70 miles of coast to the geography of the Arctic regions. Captain Beechey proceeded in the *Blossom* as far as Icy Cape, where he found the sea quite open, and felt the greatest desire to advance; but having received positive orders to avoid the hazard of being beset in the ship, and being provided with a decked launch, well adapted by her size to prosecute an inshore survey, he lost no time in dispatching her on this service, which proved one of considerable danger, the return of the boat being nearly cut off by the sudden accumulation of the ice. Proceeding to the north-eastward, however, she succeeded in exploring the line of coast as far as Barrow Point, 126 miles beyond Icy Cape, or 70 miles farther than any preceding navigator had advanced, and 146 miles from the extreme point reached by Captain Franklin in his progress westward, from Mackenzie River. By this approximation, therefore, little room is left for further speculation as to the northern limits of the American continent. From Icy Cape to Barrow Point, which is situated in about $71\frac{1}{2}$ deg. of latitude, the coast trends constantly to the eastward, and probably, at no point, extends much farther north than that reached by the *Blossom's* barge; wherefore, combining this circumstance with the general direction of the coast from the Mackenzie River to Captain Franklin's Extreme, as it is called, the general outline of the part yet unexplored may be conjectured with tolerable certainty. The extreme points of discovery, however, do not approximate so closely on the eastern as on the western side of America; since, from the spot in Prince Regent's Inlet where the *Fury* was wrecked in 1825, to Point Turnagain, is a distance of 385 miles, being nearly

thrice as great as that intercepted, on the western side, between Point Beechey and Barrow Point.

But we hope, though we can scarcely say we expect, that our enterprising countryman, Captain Ross, will be able to complete the solution of this great geographical problem, by means of his steam-vessel, which is certainly better adapted to the navigation of the Arctic Seas, during the brief period they are partially open, than sailing-vessels can possibly be. His intention is understood to have been, to proceed down Prince Regent's Inlet, and then to try to make his way along the northern coast of America to Behring's Strait, to pass through, land in Kamtschatka, and, there leaving the vessel to be conducted home by his nephew, who accompanies him, to travel across Siberia to Petersburg.

In 1827, Captain Beechey found it impracticable to advance as far to the northward as in 1826, owing to the earlier accumulation of the ice, and its progress to the southward. Nothing, in fact, can be more uncertain and variable than the state of the Arctic Seas. One year they are almost entirely open, with comparatively little ice, and the next they are so completely blocked up, as to present an insurmountable barrier to navigation; nay, a few weeks, or even days, are sometimes sufficient to produce this transformation. Hence, if the north-west passage were entirely explored, of which, indeed, we see but small chance, commerce would in no degree profit by the discovery. Our maps of America would be improved, and nothing else.

From what has been stated, it appears that, upon the whole, Captain Beechey employed his time advantageously while in Behring's Strait. But there are, nevertheless, some subjects of great interest, both to science and navigation, which, although they lay fairly within the scope of his researches, he seems to have, in a great measure, neglected. One of these is the subject of currents, and, in connexion with it, that of driftwood, which 'was everywhere abundant.' In regard to the current which is generally understood to prevail in Behring's Strait, setting into the Polar Sea round Icy Cape, Captain Beechey gives us little information, and that little is not very consistent; for, in one place, (p. 266,) he seems disposed to question the existence of any such current; while, in another, (p. 376,) he comes to the conclusion, 'that a current prevails in a northerly direction,' although he confesses himself unable to determine its rate with any degree of precision, and expresses an opinion that it sets in during only one season of the year. Nor is he in any degree more satisfactory on the subject of driftwood, which he has evidently not examined with the attention which it deserved. Combating the opinion that this wood comes from the southward, he says loosely,

‘It is more probable that it is brought down the rivers from the ‘interior of America.’ But where are the rivers on this coast, which can possibly communicate with the interior of America? None such have yet been discovered; and even if the case had been otherwise, the existence of rivers communicating with the interior of America, would scarcely have accounted for the fact of so many floating trees being met with at sea to the southward of Kamtschatka. This wood is of almost all kinds, although pine and birch predominate, and is found in almost all states upon the coast. Why were the different varieties not examined, and their respective habitats, if possible, ascertained? The subject is one where minute investigation was obviously required, and where it might have led to important results.

Again, we are by no means satisfied with Captain Beechey's proceeding at Elephant Point. The cliff from which the fossil bones, collected by Mr Collie, appear to have been detached, has undergone a great change since it was visited by Kotzebue, and supposed by him to be an entire formation of ice; nay, in the short interval of five weeks, during the autumn of 1826, the edge of the cliff in one place had broken away four feet, and in another two feet and a half, while a further portion was on the eve of being precipitated on the beach. Might it not, then, have occurred to Captain Beechey to try the effect of a few cannon-shots on this brittle mass of frozen gravel and mud? Had he done so, there is every probability, we think, that a large portion of the cliff might have been brought down by the concussion, and some interesting discoveries effected. Blasting with gunpowder is another expedient which might have been resorted to, with certainty as to the result, and the greater part of the cliff might thus have been disrupted. There can be little doubt that the bones found on the beach were primarily embedded in this frozen mud, from which they were afterwards detached by the falling down of part of the cliff. But it would have been more satisfactory, had some been discovered in their original situation; and it cannot be denied that there *might* have been a chance of this, had Captain Beechey employed the means which he had in his power. Lastly, no experiments seem to have been made by Captain Beechey while in the Arctic Seas, on the relative intensity of light, which it would have been so desirable to ascertain by a series of accurate and continuous observations. If he was provided with a photometer, and made no use of it, he is very much to blame; if he was not, the omission reflects but small credit on those chargeable with it.

The most valuable portion of the present work, in a scientific point of view, is Professor Buckland's able paper, inserted in

the Appendix, 'on the occurrence of the remains of elephants, and other quadrupeds, in the cliffs of frozen mud, in Eschscholtz Bay, within Behring's Strait, and in other distant parts of the shores of the Arctic seas.' In this contribution, which, of itself, would require an article for the adequate development of the interesting matter it contains, Professor Buckland—after arranging and describing these animal remains—examining the condition, circumstances, and situation in which they were discovered—and comparing both with the state and position of analogous remains which have, from time to time, been found in other remote parts of the Arctic seas—proceeds to consider the important question as to the climate of this portion of the globe, at the time when it was inhabited by animals now so foreign to it as the elephant and rhinoceros; and also as to the manner in which not only their teeth, and tusks, and dislocated portions of their skeletons, but the entire carcasses of these animals, with their flesh and skin still perfect, became entombed in ice, or in frozen gravel and mud, over such extensive and distant tracts in the northern hemisphere. We have no room for attempting even the most meagre abridgement of the details into which Professor Buckland enters; but we may observe that, in our opinion, the key to the solution of this interesting question is furnished by the condition and circumstances in which the great fossil elephant of the Lena was discovered.

'Of all the fossil animals that have been ever discovered,' (says Professor Buckland,) 'the most remarkable is the entire carcass of a mammoth,* with its flesh, skin, and hair, still fresh and well preserved,

* 'The term mammoth,' (says Professor Buckland,) 'has been applied indiscriminately to all the largest species of fossil animals, and is a word of Tartar origin, meaning simply "animal of the earth." Not being acquainted with any of the Tartar languages, otherwise than through the medium of the works of MM. Abel Rémusat and Klaproth, we cannot take it upon ourselves to affirm that this etymology is erroneous, although we strongly suspect that such is the case. The word 'mammoth,' we conceive to be a corruption in the first syllable of 'behemoth,' from the Hebrew בְּהֵמָה and בְּהֵימָה, *bestia, pecus, jumentum*, the plural of which, בְּהֵמוֹת, *behemoth*, 'etiam singulariter capitur' (says Buxtorf) 'pro *Elephante*, propter ingentem magnitudinem, quâ instar plurium est;' and we are confirmed in this opinion by the collocation which occurs in *Isaiah* vxiii. 6, where we meet with the very words, בְּהֵמַת הָאָרֶץ, *bestia terre*, 'animal of the earth,' by which Professor Buckland explains the supposed Tartar term, 'mammoth.' Bochart, followed by Scheuscher, Shaw, and others, contends that the 'behemoth'

which in the year 1803 fell from the frozen cliff of a peninsula in Siberia, near the mouth of the Lena. Nearly five years elapsed between the period when this carcass was first observed by a Tongusian in the thawing cliff, in 1799, and the moment when it became entirely disengaged, and fell down upon the strand, between the shore and the base of the cliff. Here it lay two more years, till great part of the flesh was devoured by wolves and bears: the skeleton was then collected by Mr Adams, and sent to Petersburg. Many of the ligaments were perfect, and also the head, with its integuments, weighing 414 pounds without the tusks, whose weight together was 360 pounds. Great part of the skin of the body was preserved, and was covered with reddish wool and black hairs: about 36 pounds of hair were collected from the sand, into which it had been trampled by the bears.—P. 607.

Now, from the circumstances here detailed as to the condition in which this carcass was found, one thing seems tolerably certain, viz. that the Siberian mammoth became imbedded in the matrix of ice or frozen mud, from which it was not long ago disengaged in the manner here described, recently after its death, or at least before its flesh had undergone any sensible decay; and that, ‘whatever may have been the climate of the coast of Siberia in antecedent periods, not only was it intensely cold within a few days after the mammoth perished, but it has also continued cold from that time to the present hour.’ But the elephant, and the rhinoceros, the remains of which are nearly co-extensive in these northern regions, could never have existed in a living state under a climate so intensely cold as that of Siberia has been from the time when this carcass was first embedded in its matrix of ice to the present day. They are animals native to the torrid zone, and could only have lived under a temperature equal to that which prevails within or near the modern tropics. Hence, we must either suppose, with Pallas, that these carcasses were drifted northward from the southern regions by means of some violent and sudden aqueous catastrophe; or adopt the more modified opinion of Professor Buckland, that, in remote periods, when the earliest strata were deposited, the temperature of a great portion of the northern hemi-

of Scripture is the *hippopotamus*, or river-horse; a notion which could never have been for an instant entertained, had these learned persons attended to the words of Job, xl. 15, ‘Behold now *behemoth*, which I made with thee; *he eateth grass as an ox.*’ As far as we know, it has never been understood that river-horses are graminivorous animals; and, accordingly, Schultens, Buxtorf, and all the more recent lexicographers and commentators, without exception, render ‘*behemoth*’ *elephant*.

phere equalled or exceeded that of the modern tropics, and that it has been reduced to its present state by a series of successive changes. In support of the former hypothesis, as well as in proof of the violence and suddenness of the catastrophe, Professor Pallas instances the phenomenon of an entire rhinoceros found with its skin, tendons, ligaments, and flesh, preserved in the frozen soil of the coldest part of Eastern Siberia; while, according to Professor Buckland, the evidence of the high temperature, and the successive changes which he supposes, consists in the regular and successive variations in the character of extinct plants and animals which we find buried one above another in the strata which compose the crust or shell of the globe. But these opinions are in reality less divergent than on a first consideration might appear; although Professor Buckland has complicated his hypothesis by the introduction of elements which seem foreign to the precise point to be determined. It is admitted, on all sides, that the elephant and the rhinoceros could not exist under the present climate of Siberia. It appears demonstrably certain that that climate has undergone no material change since the carcasses of these animals were first embedded in their matrices of ice or frozen mud. And, from the state in which these carcasses were found, it seems equally manifest that they must have been frozen up into the masses of ice and congealed mud, whence they have been latterly detached, *very soon* after they had perished, and before the skin, flesh, and ligaments had undergone decomposition. The question which here arises, therefore, does not embrace a succession of changes, but only one change; and that change, as Professor Pallas assumes, must have been violent and sudden—from a very high to a very low temperature. Professor Buckland candidly admits, it would be a ‘violation of existing analogies to suppose that any extinct elephant or rhinoceros was more tolerant of cold than extinct corallines or turtles;’ and hence, even if this northern region of the globe had really undergone successive changes, it is only with the last of these that the extinction of the mammoth must have been contemporaneous. But how was this last change produced? Sudden and violent it must have been; and such revolutions are not conformable to the ordinary laws which regulate physical changes on the surface of the globe. The assumption of an alteration in the earth’s axis of rotation, however occasioned, appears to us, we confess, rendered almost inevitable by the terms of the question, no less than by the consideration that such an hypothesis would serve to explain the greater part of the phenomena, and to reconcile the jarring theories to which we have thus shortly directed the attention of our readers.

ART. XI.—*Corrected Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable the Lord Advocate of Scotland, upon the motion of Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, on the 1st of March, for Reform of Parliament.* 8vo. London: 1831.

SINCE we last had occasion to discuss the great questions which agitate this country with regard to its domestic affairs, an event has happened, which we may, without any exaggeration, say, has given to them a new aspect. The honest and able Ministers to whom the King has intrusted the affairs of these realms have, upon mature consideration of the whole subject, deemed it expedient to redeem the pledge given by them upon taking office, and to bring forward a plan of Parliamentary Reform at once bold, comprehensive, and judicious.

The public expectation had been kept intensely fixed upon this measure ever since it was announced. The veil of mysterious secrecy which enveloped it, has now been penetrated. It was only known to the country that the government had for some time been actively engaged in maturing a plan, which would, before long, be proposed to Parliament. As early as could reasonably be expected—we believe, somewhat earlier than any one did expect—it was formally intimated, that on the First of March the measure would be laid before the Legislature. The attention of the country was kept anxiously directed towards the subject. Every quarter of the kingdom was agitated with meetings to petition, and the prayers of the people for an effectual reform of the Representation poured in from every corner. As the petitions were severally presented, slight discussions arose, and various attempts were made to obtain information from the Ministers which might throw some light upon the nature of their design. Not the least approach, however, was made to any such discovery. The statesmen who preside at the helm, knew too well their duty, and were too well aware of the mischiefs which must result from premature and partial disclosures, to give the least information of their intentions. They went on to digest their plan, and reduced it into the shape of Bills for the three several kingdoms that compose this Empire; and both in their places in Parliament, and in their offices, they so arranged matters as to defy the invasions of the most prying curiosity. Nothing, we will venture to say, was ever more admirable than the effectual secrecy which was maintained upon every part of this great measure.

Not only the details were utterly unknown, but the general outline was as much kept in the dark as the most minute of the shadings and fillings up. No man could tell in what direction

it went, or to what extent. That the Great Towns would be endowed with the elective franchise, and that something would be done with some of the decayed corporations, and something attempted to lessen the cost of elections, was, no doubt, very confidently expected; but only because all possible plans of reform included those heads—they were common to all schemes that could be devised. But even if the Ministers had announced that their plan went to those points, they would have conveyed no information which was not conveyed by the use of the word *reform*; and as it is certain that there was no more known of it before the First of March, so it is plain that all that the country knew of the scheme was, that they knew nothing. This concealment was manifestly necessary, to give the project a fair chance of success, both with the friends and with the enemies of reform. But the unexampled secrecy in which the measure was wrapt up, to the very moment when Lord John Russell rose to detail the provisions of the Bills, has been dwelt upon in this place less with a view to the mere curiosity and singularity of the fact, than because it proves the entire cordiality with which all the parties to the plan co-operated in furthering its progress. Among all those to whom the whole details were, of necessity, intrusted, there was not found one who had betrayed, by a word, a look, or a gesture, the slightest indication not only of their nature, but of opinion and feeling upon the subject. Had any one of known opinions shown the least symptom of his satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the measure, a slight degree of reflection would have led to a pretty accurate notion at least of the extent to which it went. Now it is certain that no one had the least knowledge even whether the plan was a large and sweeping, or a moderate, or an imperfect kind of reform. If the prevailing opinion was, that it would be found much less complete than it proved to be, this was assuredly owing to no positive information which any one possessed, but solely to the fears felt by all good reformers, that the obstacles to the fulfilment of their wishes were likely to prove insuperable in all events, and among all Ministries.

At length the important period of disclosure arrived; and as it would be in vain to deny that while all were in suspense, a more deep and general interest was excited than has ever been felt by the people on any former occasion, so it would be equally absurd to doubt, that the communication of the plan produced a more universal and a more heartfelt satisfaction, than ever yet attended the promulgation of any measure. Men forgot their ancient jealousies—forgot their habitual differences of opinion, and laid aside their past and present animosities, so that they

might join in doing justice to the grandeur and comprehensiveness—the consistency and simplicity of the masterly scheme which was submitted to their consideration. Whatever might be their opinions upon the general question, all agreed that the Ministers had redeemed their pledges, and produced a measure of real and effectual Parliamentary Reform. Even the enemies of all change admitted, that from the worst of accusations this plan was wholly exempt; no man could charge it with incurring the risk of innovation, without securing the benefits of effective improvement; no man could say that the present state of things was put in peril, without obtaining the advantages of representation.

The first remarkable effect produced by the promulgation of the measure, was the complete reconciliation and union of all classes of reformers. Their mutual differences had long been the theme of ridicule, and the source of triumph to the common enemy. They were said to be agreed upon nothing—to have no views and designs in common; and it was inferred that, as reformers dissented fully more from each other than any of them did from the adversaries of all reform, there was no use whatever in allowing the general question to be carried; inasmuch as you could not tell what might follow, or indeed what had been done when the question was carried. Add to this, the discredit brought on the cause by the injudiciousness and extravagance of certain doctrines rashly taken up by very enlightened and zealous reformers, as well as by men of a very different description, which, it was said, were inseparable from the subject, and must be adopted by all who would give any thing like general satisfaction. Of such topics, there has been an end ever since the memorable First of March. The new plan has effected an entire cessation of all differences—a complete and cordial union among all reformers. It proceeded manifestly from a desire to give a real and substantial reform, and not a mere shadow, which might serve to redeem nominally the pledges of the Ministry;—it was so plainly the result of an honest determination to meet the question, and not to evade it, that all real friends of reform embraced it in the honest sincerity with which it was offered to them; and those few who had made reform a cloak for other designs, were fain to join the universal current, and conceal any jarring feelings they might entertain.

The next consequence was, the ‘uniting and knitting together of the hearts of all classes of the people;’—that consummation which, we believe, both Houses of Parliament daily pray for, as the most choice blessing which Divine Providence can shower down upon the labours of the lawgiver. What a

prodigious change, indeed, has all at once been wrought in the feelings of the whole community! No man can believe that it is the same nation he now surveys. What more distracted with faction—more sullenly mistrustful of their rulers—more discontented with all about them—more sensitively jealous even of whatever was done for them—more hopeless in their prospects of the future—more prepared for the worst emergencies, than the people of England, and still more of Ireland, a few short weeks ago? If ever country seemed on the verge of troublous times, it was that country which the anti-reform faction now describes as perfectly happy, peaceful, and contented, under the well-working system of abuse they cleave to, and commiserates as likely to be plunged into anarchy and revolution by the measure that has healed all our pains, and made the nation once more united and loyal. It is lamentable to reflect upon the universal alienation of the body of the people from the government, in the largest acceptation of the word, which had been daily increasing of late years, and had, moreover, made a sensible stride at each refusal of redress, and each new infliction of injury perpetrated by our rulers. How long is it since any Ministry durst leave to a common jury the trial of a Government prosecution? How long since any Minister durst show himself on the hustings at a popular election? How long since even the more select bodies of the people—those nearer the aristocracy—have ever thought of showing favour to a man in place? How long since an official character, whatever he might expose himself to from sense of duty, and fear of being thought a coward, was at all ready to frequent any kind of meeting more secular than a Bible Society, more controversial than a Charity Dinner, more popular and promiscuous than a Pitt Club? The very names of Patriot and Minister were become natural enemies; place and popularity were, as of course, used as antithetical alliterations; to enjoy the King's favour, and incur the hatred of the country, were synonymous expressions. Not the members of the government merely, but all connected in any way with any office, or even any of the institutions of the country in Church or in State, were exposed to the same suspicions, and had habitually to encounter the same odium. It extended to rank and to wealth, as well as to place; and an ample share of it was at all times reserved for both Houses of Parliament, liberally as it was dealt out to the servants of the Crown. To incur the censures of the people's representatives, was the shortest and surest way to the people's affections. How many generations have come up and passed since either House has ventured to assert its undeniable privileges, and since the country has

ceased to sympathize with the insulted, and habitually taken a part with the aggressor? A gentleman of talents and accomplishments publishes a pamphlet, describing the House of Commons as of the nature of a public nuisance, and suggests the expediency of the people proceeding to abate it, by taking its members and throwing them into the river which runs at so convenient a distance for this fit and necessary operation. He is sent to prison, and the people, 'for whom alone those privileges are given,' not being as yet ready to follow his advice, reward him by returning him to Parliament—an honour, which they had a few months before his breach of privilege, refused to bestow upon him! In a word, if ever people were severed from their rulers and their superiors in station, it was the English people; if ever country was torn by faction, it was England; if ever a system of polity had totally lost the affections of those for whose happiness alone it was framed, it was the boasted Government of this country. Its praises, indeed, were, as much as ever, the theme of the preacher, the court poet, the youthful essayist, and the half-fledged orator; they served to round periods, and to lull congregations; the courtier, too, and the ancient dame, and the wealthy justice, and the gallant yeoman cavalier, went on as before, protesting that we were the best governed, freest, happiest, richest, contentedest, wisest, soberest, nation upon earth; that ours was the only free constitution; that we were the envy of all mankind; that all writers, from Tacitus to Montesquieu, were loud in our praises, and that no one could doubt the perfection of our institutions, who was not either out of his senses, or a traitor to his country. In the midst of all these panegyrics, however, the love of the people for the constitution and its ministers was entirely gone; and the sun rose not on so discontented a nation as the English. Other countries had far more to complain of, both in the theory and the administration of their government; they were, excepting America, incomparably behind ourselves. But then they knew no better; they had never been more free; and their political information was as low as their civil rights. We were ill governed, and imperfectly represented; yet we well knew, and justly appreciated, and ardently longed after our lost rights.

What a change has a few weeks effected in all these feelings!—all differences of sect and party, all shades and even contrasts of opinion, are lost in the blaze of triumph which has broke forth over the whole country. Delight at finding the plan of the government ample and complete; gratitude to the men who have so nobly redeemed their first pledge; exultation at the near prospect of a Parliament which they can 'love, cherish, and

‘obey,’ has filled every breast and inspired every tongue. The few who continue obdurate, are men who have a direct personal interest in the continuance of the rottenness about to be cut out from the system—the vermin who breed and fatten in its corruption. Even those honest men whose groundless alarms and perverse political prejudices have enlisted them against the ‘Great Measure,’ have frankly admitted that it has the universal and cordial assent of the country. At the time we are writing, twenty-four counties, including all those of any importance, have held meetings, and passed unanimous resolutions in its favour. The freemen of corporations, whose monopoly is destroyed by it, have yet joined in the general cry for ‘The Bill.’ The enthusiasm is not confined to the Whigs—the Tories in the most Tory counties have led the way. In Nottinghamshire, the resolutions were moved by Tories and seconded by Whigs. In Derbyshire, the requisition was signed by Tories alone. Two elections in England have accidentally taken place since the Bill was brought in; one at Durham, the other at Colchester, where the right being in freemen, the reform will deprive the voters of their exclusive privilege—let in the householders—cut off non-residents, and work the disfranchisement of the voters’ children for ever. Both these elections have gone in favour of the candidates who stood upon the Reform Bill, and those who affected to maintain the rights of the freemen, that is, of the voters, were defeated. Wherever an attempt was made at county meetings to get round the poorer classes, who are not included by the Bill, it usually failed. All the honest, but poor men to whom it was addressed, well knowing the quarter it came from, and recollecting that no anxiety for their rights had ever before betrayed itself here, rejected the trick with indignation. The Lord Chancellor remarked upon this manœuvre, that it was as old as the time of a well-known intriguer, some eighteen centuries ago, and quoted those verses from the gospel: ‘And Judas Iscariot said, why is not all this sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? Not that he cared any thing for the poor, but because he was a thief.’ The utmost hopes seem to have been conceived by the interested adversaries of the measure, that its provisions would divide reformers; but never were expectations so utterly disappointed. It has more than satisfied all who have not a personal interest in disliking it.

Hitherto we have been speaking of England. But Ireland, far more difficult to pacify, because labouring under more deep-seated mischiefs, of much longer standing—even Ireland has felt the blessed influence of this healing measure. Agitation has

ceased, at least for the present. The repeal of the Union is no longer the object of men's wishes, or the pretext of their clamours; and, while we write, the strange spectacle is exhibited of the 'great agitator' addressing his countrymen in favour of a candidate who resorts to their suffrages, having vacated his seat by accepting a high office under the Crown!

The Parliament has presented a marvellous, or rather let us say, a very natural and intelligible contrast to the rest of the community, upon this memorable occasion. An almost unanimous nation has been represented by a Parliament, divided in the proportion of 303 to 302—the greatest possible majority among that people has been declared by the smallest possible majority among their representatives. Those who speak the sense of the country, have deemed it just to their constituents to be as much as possible divided among themselves. The representatives of the people have performed their office, by playing a part the very reverse of what their constituents were, at the same moment, enacting.

The truth is, that the large minority was composed, partly of those who represented the rotten interests about to be disfranchised; partly of a few honest, but much misguided alarmists; and partly of party intriguers, who thought they perceived an opening for their return to a position from which they had but the other day been driven, or rather had fled, in the deep conviction of their incapacity to return to it. With the first class, —the burgh proprietors, and their delegates, or vendees, and tenants for a term of years, it is quite useless to reason. They labour in their vocation; and you might as well hope to convert the Pope from the errors of the Catholic faith, whereby he occupies the Vatican, as to weary them into a confession that rotten boroughs are not the profitable portions of the British constitution. Such concessions are far too romantic to be expected in real life. That noted senator, Mr Attwood, has, we are told, thought proper to say, he cares not by what narrow balance of votes the Bill may be flung out, or by how great a majority of the people out of doors it is supported—it cannot pass; and so this judicious senator flatters himself, if it be but beaten by one, it cannot, on that vote, pass! But pass it can, and will, and in defiance of such calculations, and such calculators as Mr Matthias Attwood.

Here let us pause for a moment, to reflect on the proud contrast, to such persons afforded by the real and high-minded aristocracy of England—the men of liberal minds, of generous feelings, of enlarged and disinterested spirits, whose cause, such persons as we have mentioned, would affect to support. Let

them look to those splendid examples given by the Dukes of Norfolk, and Devonshire, and Bedford, and Grafton, Lords Cleveland, and Lansdowne, and Radnor—and if this does not move them, let them turn their incredulous eyes to such men as Mr John Smith and Mr Russell, and at length be convinced that all are not alike sordid and grovelling !

The second class of Parliamentary adversaries to whom we have glanced,—the conscientious alarmists, come within a very different description. To such, we would only address a word of warning, and a word of comfort. Let them regard calmly the perils that surround our state, and calculate the chances of its escape without some change. Lord Wharncliffe, one of their most respectable and sensible coadjutors, has distinctly admitted, that the unanimous voice of the people is altogether ‘irresistible;’ and that some Reform, and that ‘no trifling, no paltry measure, but a considerable—a great Reform, must be given.’ Is it then the part of prudence and foresight to higgler about the amount, when that must be, at all events, large? Is it fitting in cautious men to withhold so much, as leaves what has been granted divested of all grace, and wholly incapable of giving satisfaction? The shock to existing things is the same, within a mere trifle; and the country being left as discontented as before, the peril of our situation is not lessened, and the additional hazard of the concession has been encountered for nothing. On the one hand, let the measure which unites all men’s vows be conceded, and we leave to the alarmed a consolation which they have never known since the American war dismembered our empire, and shook what remained to the foundation—in a word, since alarms began to haunt us;—the people will be contented and united; they will love the institutions of their country; they will take a pride in their prosperity, and in the solidity of the Government: the King will be *their* King—the Parliament *their* Parliament—the Aristocracy *their* leaders and patrons, and the ornaments of *their* nation. The people of England are naturally fond of Kings and Nobles; they are eminently a royalist and aristocratic race; nothing but a course of maladministration—abuses cherished carefully, and ardently defended—reforms sullenly and indiscriminately refused, could ever have created the separation between the upper and lower classes of the community, and made the one regard the other as their natural enemies. The effects of reform in restoring the former relations of things, are already apparent. Even at the Birmingham Union meeting, when allusion was made to Lord Grey’s expression about his ‘order,’ a loud cry,—the

only interruption of the proceedings,—was sent forth, ‘ We wont touch a hair of his order’s head !’

The last of the descriptions of antagonists to whom we alluded, comprises those who make this measure an engine of party attack. The very individuals who, having quitted the Ministry a few months ago, because they had lost all support, both from Parliament and People, and were convinced of their incapacity to continue in place, seem desirous of revisiting their more habitual haunts, and, to facilitate their return, of flinging the Government and the country into confusion; for it is needless to observe, that they are a great deal less capable of making an administration now, when to their known imbecility they have added an unprecedented load of popular odium. They assuredly would be more puzzled than ever were men before, if called upon to make a Government; but they possibly may reckon upon some sort of grotesque coalition, growing out of the anarchy into which a victory over the Reform Bill would, in the first instance, plunge the state. Their disappointment was unutterable—their vexation, beyond the art of healing, sore—their grief, passing all powers of consolation, bitter, when the measure of the government was disclosed. They had reckoned upon one thing as quite certain, That the Reform would be large enough to alienate the High Tory party, and far too small to satisfy the bulk of the people. They knew, that *any* Reform propounded by a Minister would alarm and offend the former; and they flattered themselves, that any reform which a Minister *could* propound, would fall greatly short of the desires of reformers. Hence, those cunning speculators made sure of such an alienation of their former allies, the ultra party, from the Ministry, as would reunite them with their own forces, and thus heal the fatal breach of 1829, while the Ministers would lose for ever all hold over the country. Unhappily for this calculation, it somehow or other turned out, that the Ministers had been considering the subject in the same point of view; and had found out how absurd it would be, even as a matter of prudence, and putting all principle and consistency out of the question, to risk the dislike of one class of men without securing the support of all others. We are stating the claims of those wise and honest Ministers very moderately, when we thus put them upon mere expediency: no one can have marked the unvarying honour and exalted principles which have guided Lord Grey’s course through life, from his entrance into Parliament, and into the principles of Reform, to his abandonment of power five-and-twenty years ago, for the sake of religious liberty, and his remaining out of all office during that long period solely because

of his principles, and not be thoroughly satisfied that his pledges to his country were to be above all things redeemed, and that the great measure was framed for their redemption. But we are speaking of a class of men who cannot comprehend such lofty principles of action; and in describing the feelings with which they received the announcement of the plan, we must employ a language that they, and such as they, can understand.

Therefore, great was the astonishment wherewith they were astonished, when, instead of a paltry and ineffectual Reform, calculated to offend many and to please none, a scheme was unfolded to their eyes—ample, vigorous, comprehensive; one which could hardly be less acceptable to the anti-reformers than the most piecemeal plan would assuredly have proved, but which was wholly free from the objection of being trivial, delusive, insignificant. In a word, they perceived that a large, substantial, real reformation, was brought forward by a united Cabinet, with the full sanction of a popular and patriot King. They perceived that their adversaries had most completely avoided all the snares and pitfalls which beset their path; and an instinctive feeling filled their minds, that the plan would become the darling of the people, and that thenceforth the Ministry was marked for the Nation's own. Still, in recovering from the stupor into which so unlooked for a blow had flung them, they had confident hopes of Parliament rejecting the measure. But here their evil genius bewildered and betrayed them. To throw it out, they had but one course—an instant division. The moment the trial of numerical strength was delayed, the Country was let into the strife, and the success of the Bill was secured. Every succeeding day has displayed more and more the bitter disappointment of the politicians we are alluding to; among whom we chiefly number the lesser retainers of the late Ministry; for we verily think the leaders have better sense, and sounder principles, than to desire events pregnant with nothing but mischief to the state.

One passage, however, we must pause upon as an apparent exception to our last remark. No one will readily accuse us, or at least easily find credit with the impartial if he does accuse us, of harbouring prejudices against Sir Robert Peel, to whom we have ever meted out our ample and very disinterested measure of justice. Nevertheless, that justice would be withholden from others, were we to draw a veil over one of the worst displays we ever remember in any public man. We speak in sorrow, rather than in anger, when we contrast the noble and, to use the Duke of Wellington's expression, 'chivalrous con-

‘duct’ of the present Ministers while in opposition, with the tactics of Sir Robert Peel and Mr Herries (it is a painful accuracy that compels us to associate such names) upon the Timber Trade. Who was it that enabled the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel to carry the Catholic Emancipation, upon which the existence of their Ministry was staked? Who came down to the House of Commons, and avowed their resolution to stand by the Ministers the day the late king, in a fit of resistance to concession, nearly resembling frenzy, had accepted the resignation of all his Cabinet, and resolved to throw himself upon their adversaries? Who afterwards abstained from all cavil at the provisions of the Bill—even at the silly spite that risked the peace of Ireland to gratify a personal spleen against an individual? Who waved all objection to the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, though, by resisting it, they would have at once preserved unimpaired their own consistency, and secured the destruction of their antagonists’ administration? Who lent certain individuals—we are interrogating Sir Robert Peel, and we need not name them—every succour and protection, when they stood in a position which, for hopeless abandonment, has perhaps no example? We have no occasion to whisper that it was the Opposition of 1829. But the opposition of Mr Herries in 1831 could not forego the short-lived triumph of throwing out their adversaries’ measure of Commercial Emancipation, although it was, strictly, their own measure—although they felt certain that the momentary advantage could by no possibility lead to the overthrow of a Cabinet alike the favourite of Prince and People—nay, although they felt, sorely felt, their own utter incapacity to form a government, if such an event were brought about. That Mr Herries, the same gentleman who made so conspicuous a figure at the opening of the session 1828, should be engaged in this piece of Parliamentary tactics, and should vote in a way that staggered the most devoted adherents of the Ministry he belonged to, surprised no one whose recollections went back a few years; but it grieves us to think that he did not stand alone upon that inauspicious occasion; and, we can only add, that we are willing to set the proceeding down to the score of temper, and passing aberration, not to premeditation and design.

Having mentioned the Timber Question, justice towards the cause of Reform compels us to notice the unfortunate effect produced by that division upon the subsequent one, when the Reform Bill was read a second time. Those are deeply answerable for the narrow majority on the latter occasion, and for whatever difficulties it may throw in the way of the great de-

sign, who forced on that question. Be the authors of this bad step Ministers, or be they Opposition chiefs, they have given a chance to the enemies of Reform, which they never but for that could have had. Whether it was the blunder of the one, or the factious stratagem of the other, the Bill has to thank the division upon Timber, needlessly and inexcusably forced on before the division upon the Reform—as if for the express purpose of defeating it, and not giving it fair play—for all the trouble which the Ministers will have now in carrying it through Parliament. We have never yet seen a person acquainted with the House of Commons, who doubted that the mischance we are speaking of, reduced the majority from forty or fifty to one vote. Truth demands this statement at our hands, and we are very indifferent whom it may affect. We are only anxious for the cause of Reform and Good Government, neither of which causes ever can flourish without the aid of a certain portion of prudence and common sense in the management of great state affairs.

The Bill, however, was read a second time; and the joy of the whole country was unbounded on receiving the grateful tidings. The anti-reformers are now driven to oppose it in the Committee; but no one doubts, that a single vote there, though nominally upon the details, would at once get rid of the whole measure. Let but the schedule of sixty close Boroughs wholly disfranchised be thrown out,—or even the other schedule of somewhat larger Boroughs, to be deprived of one member each, be rejected—and the Bill is gone. Nay, the people have adopted the whole Bill as it is—for that, they have given up all further views, all variations of plan—to that, then, the government are pledged—by that, Lord Grey avows that he is to stand or fall. ‘The Bill, the whole Bill, nothing but the Bill,’ is the watch-word—the rallying cry of all reformers; and therefore any change in its principle, or in its main parts, is destructive, and must cause an instant withdrawing of the measure, and appeal to the people. How this appeal will be answered, no man living affects to doubt. But we wish to say a word or two on the only other *possible* result of the defeat—the breaking up of the present Government; we believe it more strictly accurate to use this word than that of Administration.

Far be it from us to charge such men as the Duke of Wellington, and the more able and statesman-like of his colleagues in the late Ministry, with so headlong and unreflecting a party violence as would lead to confusion, for mere confusion’s sake. Their underlings, whose lives had been passed in preying upon the vitals of the country, and are, therefore, now embittered by

the novel situation of having to maintain themselves by their industry, or out of their private means, would, in all probability, embrace any cause that could shake the existing Ministry, under which they derive no supplies of sustenance from the public stores. To them, therefore, any thing which we may add upon the topic we have just touched, would be wholly out of place, and now, as at all times, out of season. A change, any change, all kinds of change, rather than the present desperate condition of affairs, is, of course, *their wish*. Reckless of all possible consequences, any leader can easily halloo them on to whatever acts may unsettle the Ministry which feeds them not. Worse than it is, it cannot be—any thing less cheering than their prospects, more gloomy than their whole horizon, in all directions, is impossible. They may gain, lose they cannot by any change; and they are willing to risk any confusion for the chance of better times. But we firmly believe that their Chiefs have different views. Their stake in the peace and prosperity of the country is greater, and their feelings and principles are of a higher cast. That they should hope to regain power, by the mere act of forcing the present Ministry to resign, in the only way in which they can deem that event possible—namely, by leading on the united forces of the Rotten Borough interests, and gaining a momentary advantage over the Crown and the Nation, as well as the Reform Bill, appears beyond all powers of belief. What drove these same men from the helm in November? The Duke of Wellington has spoken out frankly and honestly on this matter. The motion upon Reform, of which Mr Brougham had given notice, stood for Tuesday the 16th. That on Sir Henry Parnell's question had been carried against him the night before; and as he expected to be defeated again upon Reform, he preferred to quit office before that discomfiture. The preference does honour to his sagacity, as well as to his principles, conscientiously opposed as he was to the measure. But all this never could have happened, or happening, never could have broken up a Government, had it not been falling to pieces by its own imbecility, under the pressure of hostile attacks. The General Election had been quite decisive; but even before the event of that appeal to the people, the King's decease, and the determination of the Opposition to resume the offensive, had sealed the fall of a Ministry that existed only by the sufferance of its enemies. The cabinets of Lord Liverpool, Mr Perceval, and others, had defied far greater majorities, on questions much more important to a government, in a party point of view, than a Civil List Committee, or even a Reform, of an amount probably very limited. But the Govern-

ment of the Duke and Sir Robert Peel had no stamina, and the opening of the campaign was, as all men had foreseen, save one, its destruction.

Then, what has happened since to strengthen it? Has Sir Robert Peel reconciled the Tory party to himself? Has the country shown any disposition to receive the Duke and his colleagues again, and to overlook all their errors and deficiencies, in consideration of their perverse hatred of Reform? Or have their adversaries, who had only to commence their attack, in order to extinguish the Ministry of 1830, lost any thing of their *weight* by enjoying the firm support of the Sovereign—any thing of their *credit*, with reflecting men, by having restored tranquillity to all parts of the empire—any thing of their *character*, by having redeemed in Office every pledge given while in Opposition—any thing of their *influence* with the country, by the great measure which has made their popularity boundless and universal? It would, in very deed, be a strange sight to see a Government formed by the enemies of Reform, upon an unreforming principle, and facing an Opposition conducted by the talents of the present Ministers, upon the ground of Reform, and their favour with the country.

But it may be said—if a new Ministry were formed, the resistance to all Reform would not be the basis of their constitution, because no Ministry could attempt any thing so hopelessly extravagant; and, we verily do think, there are some folks now speculating upon a cabinet to be brought together on the principle of granting a *moderate reform*—that is, a Reform which shall enable some half dozen great towns to choose representatives, and shall only cut off an equal number of the most rotten of the boroughs. Whether such a scheme would satisfy Lord Wharncliffe, we need hardly ask; for he said, ‘no paltry Reform will now do!’ That it will discontent the country, even more than the present state of the representation, is abundantly clear; because it will be a scheme of delusion, pretext, and mockery. That it will offend many of the boroughmongers we do not say, because all who are spared will rejoice; but this we will add, that such of them as are endowed with any clearness of vision, will at once perceive they are only *respected*; and that any disfranchisement proposed by the Government, appoints all who are now spared to a certain and not very remote slaughter. Any such project, then, will give no one atom of support that is effectual to its puny authors, and will leave them to encounter powerful and popular adversaries, under an unexampled load of public execration. They will be held up to all the country as

the men who have stood between the people and the object of their most passionate desires—the responsibility of all that gives way will fall on them—and every disturbance of the general tranquillity will, even by their present allies, by the band of alarmists, be visited on their heads. There are borough-mongers, and there are political traders of a low stamp, who, to avert the doom of that rottenness in which they have been bred and fattened, would, we doubt not, have recourse to the last means of occupying the country, a foreign war. This time, we believe, that execrable device would signally fail, and would hurry its detestable contrivers to swift destruction. But we need not go so far in prying into the futurity of such a Government as we are fancying to be formed. There is a shorter solution of all doubts from a pretty obvious consideration.

The new Cabinet must either be built upon the principle of refusing all kind of Reform—on the ground of optimism promulgated by the Duke of Wellington,—that is, on the assertion that the present House of Commons is perfect to all practical purposes,—or it cannot admit that distinguished individual among its members. Well then, we are to have a Ministry with one gentleman able to take the lead of a party in the Commons, and no one, nor any thing like one, in the Lords. We suppose it is quite enough to dispose of the question, if we say, that the Ministry formed on the principle of thwarting the whole country, would be represented in the Upper House of Parliament, either by the Earl of Aberdeen or Lord Ellenborough. We fancy the times are not yet come when such a thing could be attempted. The Duke of Wellington once somewhat imprudently said, that Ireland had never been more than half conquered. But England and Scotland must be wholly conquered before it would be safe to exhibit such a sight as that.

Let it not, however, be supposed that we deem the case of the Ministry we are speculating upon, much more secure in the Commons. Since the Chancellor left that assembly, in an evil hour, as he said himself, for his own influence, Sir Robert Peel and others have been trying experiments which were previously very unusual with them. But it may prove a little dangerous to presume too far on the change occasioned by the removal of a single leader. New in office, and singularly modest, and even blamably distrustful of their powers, as some of the Ministers have shown themselves, it cannot be denied that they have not yet discovered the dangers of a merely defensive position in Parliamentary warfare. They have abundant strength for active and vigorous offensive operations, and the character of their enemy is impaired, and the whole country is loudly and heartily

with them. Who that looks to the eloquence, and the knowledge, and the talents for debate, which have of late been displayed by such men as the Attorney-General, the Stanleys, the Russells, the Macaulays, can hesitate on which side the victory must be, as long as it shall be given to the strongest? Hampered with official observances, encumbered with precedence and etiquette, these men have not yet brought their full force to bear upon the Opposition. Remove them to the adverse benches, and let them open their united fire upon Sir Robert Peel and Mr Goulburn,—we will venture to predict never contest was witnessed so unequal. The other chiefs whom the country have longer admired and known in Opposition, are only said to have been found deficient, because unused to office; and some of them are said to want readiness, as what is called ‘every day men.’ But with their transition to the other side of the House, this charge vanishes; and then the two ill-starred wights we have been planting on the Treasury benches, in our daydream, would have to bear the peltings of a storm, such as no Government ever yet withstood, under odds so heavy.

The position of Sir R. Peel and Mr Goulburn, in truth, is strange and disheartening, and they owe it entirely to themselves. Their principles on almost all subjects, save one, had long been liberal. Their commercial policy was of the new and approved school. In finance they had made very considerable improvements. On law reform they had shown excellent dispositions, and had actually done some good service. Their determined resistance to the Catholic claims, was that which alone separated them from the men composing the present cabinet—alone united them with the ultra party. When, happily for the peace of the empire, they abandoned this error, they had no longer a point of difference with their adversaries; but they quarrelled irreconcilably with a most respectable and powerful body of their supporters. Every dictate of good sense, of consistent principle, even of proper pride, should have moved them rather to approximate than to estrange themselves from men with whom their difference might really be said, in the language of the mathematicians, to be less than any assignable distance. They chose the opposite course; they evinced a perpetual hankering after the supporters they had lost; and spared no pains to keep the door open for a reconciliation with men who plainly showed a fixed determination never to forget, or forgive, or be appeased.

Next came the question of Reform. That seemed to hold out a last hope of bringing about the wished for reunion. For the moment, some such effect may have partially attended a tempo-

rary co-operation for an important and common object. But even already the price and the alliance betray symptoms of hollowness. Some of the most honest and distinguished of the High Tory party have openly embraced the cause of Reform; and others as openly avow, that their opposition to his Majesty's Government is confined to that question alone; while almost all are heard to say, 'Why should we once more trust ourselves with politicians who may at any moment declare for even radical Reform as readily as they did for Catholic emancipation?' They never can forget who those men were that went down to the House of Commons on the 5th of February 1829, at two P. M., ready to make the walls ring with the cry of, No Popery, and who, at five P. M. of the same day, hailed with equal plaudits an unconditional surrender of the Penal Code. They, at least, know that the members of the present cabinet are not wont to perform feats of agility like these. The rope, then, which may bind, or seem to bind, the different branches of the Opposition to the Reform Bill, is but a rope of sand.

But here a question naturally arises, How far the opponents of the measure have actually committed themselves against it? Suppose a division in the Committee were to fling it out, and the Ministers were to retire, how far are the converts to Catholic emancipation precluded from taking office on the footing, first, of a mitigated hostility to Reform; next, of a friendly feeling towards it? In a word, we must speak plainly on so momentous a question. After the clamour for the old constitution shall have served its purpose, and broken up the Government that would amend, and repair, and perpetuate that venerable fabric,—How far is it possible that the authors of the cry, and the antagonists of the present Bill, may relax in their dislike of it, and (we grieve to touch on so delicate a matter) may adopt, bring in themselves, as it were, that particular Bill for amending the representation of the people in Parliament? Certain it is that there be not a few observers of the late events who deem so droll a movement any thing rather than impossible.

These observers reason thus: 'We have lived in the years when Lord Grey and his friends were turned out of office, because they brought in a Bill to enable Catholic officers who, in Ireland, could hold commissions by law, to hold them when they came over to England. Yet the very men who raised, on no better foundation, the cry of No Popery, themselves passed the self-same bill into a law soon thereafter. Again, (add the same cynical kind of people,) we lived in 1817 and in 1829, and we saw politicians start upon the precise ground of

‘ refusing all concession to the Catholics, rewarded by high honours, civil and clerical, for becoming the champions of this faith, and all of a sudden quit it to embrace that of the opposite sect, the friends of unqualified concession—but not quit their places with their former principles. So now,’ (these reasoners proceed to argue,) ‘ the same political characters make a vast noise about Reform, and revolution, and the sweeping measure, and the dangerous plan—but, amidst it all, they do not distinctly tell us what degree of reform *they* would grant; nay, they won’t exactly say whether they agree or not with their plain, downright leader, who very intelligibly, if not very rationally, says—no reform is wanting—none can improve our situation—and is, therefore, decidedly against all change, the least as well as the greatest. This we can understand’ (pursue our observers): ‘ we may differ with the Duke—we may think him wrong, irrational, obstinate, what you will; but at least he is distinct and consistent, and there is a look of plain dealing about this way of committing himself which we don’t find in the vague, general, declamatory talk of the others, who won’t come to the point, and say, either that they are against all concession, or that they are for giving something;—nay, even those who say they are for giving something, take especial care not to say what they will give. So that,’ (add these reasoners,—a suspicious and churlish set, and extremely troublesome to a certain kind of political professors,) ‘ you never can be at all sure that at any given moment, when it suits their convenience, the men now bawling out most lustily against the measure, may not bring it in with their own hands, as they did the Catholic Relief bill.’—‘ Then, again’ (they conclude,) ‘ did we not see the fate of the Timber Duty bill—their own measure? And why may not people, who can so desert and expose their own progeny, take it into their heads to foster that of their adversaries, if any thing should turn up to make it worth their while.’*

Whether such views may or may not be well-founded, doubtless they fill men’s minds at this moment, and wholly destroy all confidence, even among the boroughmongers, in their pre-

* The elaborate speech of the late Solicitor-General, (a most experienced hand in borough transactions,) sounding the alarm of revolution, is cited as committing himself and his late colleagues. We nevertheless doubt not he would draw the Reform Bill were he again in place. Did ever man clamour more lustily against popery, yet who more sweetly swallowed the measure of 1829?

sent doughty champions of the last administration. In truth, there is an argument which never fails to exert a most powerful sway with political dealers,—we mean persons who devote themselves to the speculations of politics, and carry on a concern in that line of business. ‘The King *must*, on no account, be left without servants—the country *must* have some government.’ This is their leading maxim. Then, if the present Ministers were to retire, with all their plans, because they were vigorous, honest, and popular,—the difficulty would be great, no doubt, and the obstacles to forming a Ministry all but insuperable. ‘But, the Country and the King *must* not be abandoned—any thing is better than anarchy.’ So a kind of a Ministry is formed. Then it is on the point of being destroyed—for the measure is loudly demanded, for proposing which the last Government was broken up. What is to be done? ‘The country is, on no account, to be deserted.’ So, painful as is the necessity, the hated measure is adopted by its enemies, ‘lest the country should be abandoned to its fate—and because, bad as it is, anarchy would be worse.’ The experienced reader is aware, that *anarchy, abandonment, desertion, public ruin*, and such like varieties of expression, all mean the same thing—the loss of place of those who make use of them.

Another thing must be also reckoned upon in the prospects of these enemies of the bill. They have found by experience that the present ministers are utterly incapable of opposing, while excluded from office, the measures they had themselves recommended while in power. So that we verily do believe the men we are speaking of, if they entertain any serious thoughts of power, look forward to carry the Bill now in progress, if they can do no better, with the aid of the present Ministers—only changing sides in the two Houses of Parliament. Sure we are of this, that without some such calculation, they are worse than frantic if they attempt to break up the existing Government, wholly incapable as they are of forming any other, except by coming round to the principles of Reform.

But if such may be the very possible result of the Government being broken up on the Reform Question, we doubt if it is one which would give exceeding great joy to any portion of his Majesty’s subjects. The good people of England are not vehemently enamoured of mere unpopularity in any set of men—of mere notoriety for shifting and selfish politics—of the mere capacity of sticking to official station, and of the inveterate habit of sacrificing all opinions to their places. These form, with the reflecting part of the English nation, but moderate claims to public confidence and esteem. A lord, stung to the

quick by the prospects of Reform, has just addressed to his neighbours of St Albans—borough pure,

Like Liverpool and Retford,—

a strong dissuasive against the Ministerial Bill; and, among the proofs he urges of Parliamentary virtue, are, ‘the votes which ‘drove out the last Ministry because of its unpopularity, and ‘left the present in a minority because of its incapacity.’ Lord Verulam then must really despair of his country; for he can see no Government at all, unless Lord Liverpool should vouchsafe to come to us from those blessed regions where no House of Commons ever sits, and Committees of Inquiry cease to trouble, and the Press is at rest. But we may be permitted a remark on the ‘incapacity vote.’ Does any man living doubt that this vote was levelled at the Reform Bill? We venture to say Lord Verulam can no more deny it, than he can expound a page of the *Novum Organum*. This feat of Parliamentary virtue, therefore, upon which rests the claims of the present corrupt system to our protection, was a most flagrant instance of the tenacity of life which is possessed by the worst portion of the borough jobbers. They voted against the truly wise and politic measure, recommended by all parties,—the late government as well as the present,—merely that they might damage the Reform, and visit upon the heads of its authors the sin of having propounded it. But we observe that the heir to Lord Bacon’s *title* will not venture to ascribe any one qualification for office to the party now in opposition. He admits their unpopularity, and has no other claim to urge for them. In truth, he knows and feels that, excepting their *present* opposition to Reform, they have no one title even to the confidence of the borough party, who will full soon discover how slender a title even to *their* favour that trumpery line of conduct gives them.

As for the people of England, we are slow to believe that *they* would be gratified to see all at once an end of the present Ministry, and its wise and salutary measures—that *they* long for the day which shall restore to us the internal divisions and heart-burnings spread all over the land a few months ago—which shall cause the friends of Prince Polignac’s to revisit the Foreign Office—displace the sound financial reforms of Lord Althorpe and Sir Henry Parnell, and turn back the purifying stream which has been made to sweep through the Augean stables of Chancery. These items would constitute a somewhat high price to pay for the delights of the rotten-borough system, and the chance of those who changed all their opinions upon the Test and the Catholic question, (when, by persisting in them, they had driven the country to the verge of a civil war on reli-

gious grounds,) enacting the same part again upon the question of Parliamentary Reform, and adopting the measure of 1831, when, in 1832 or 1833, they had, by resisting it, shaken the whole frame of society in pieces, and made a remediless breach between the different orders of the community.

We will venture to predict, that no such prospect of convulsion ever was before this country, as will befall it should the great measure of the Government be rejected by the interested exertions of the Borough Party. In proportion to the union and delight which now prevails among all ranks and conditions of men, in every quarter, will be the bitter indignation of this exasperated people. Over the possible consequences we gladly draw a veil, to contemplate the days of tranquillity and boundless prosperity which this healing measure 'holds in its right hand,' and will shower down on our beloved country, should it pass into a law. The whole resources of the people will, for the first time, without let or hinderance, be brought into active exertion. Peace at home, and peace abroad, the grand corner-stones of all national prosperity, will bless us with their sure effects; and the times of discord and mutual distrust, which have preceded the happy change, will only be remembered to make the enjoyment of the present more grateful, and the determination to remain contented and united more firm.

ERRATUM.

Page 118, line 14 from bottom, for *poetry* read *poets*.

QUARTERLY LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

From January to March 1831.

ALGEBRA.

Foster's Examples in Algebra. 8vo. 4s.

Key to Jamieson's Algebra. 8vo. 8s.

ARCHITECTURE, ANTIQUITIES, AND THE FINE ARTS.

Harding's Subjects from Bonnington's Works. In stone. Atlas 4to, proofs, 3*l*, 8s.; prints, 2*l*, 10s.

Parsey on Miniature Painting. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Heath's Historical Illustrations, (Rob Roy.) 5s. 6d. Large, 12s.

Illustrations to Montgomery's Oxford. Prints, 8s.; Proofs, 10s. 6d.

Hamilton's English School of Painting. Vol. I. 12mo. 18s.

BOTANY.

Domestic Gardener's Manual. 8vo. 12s.

Loudon's Gardener's Magazine. Vol. VI. 8vo. 1*l*. 1s.

BIOGRAPHY.

Croly's Memoirs of George the Fourth. 8vo. 15s.

Northcote's Life of Titian. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 8s.

Banks' Life of Giovanni Finati. 2 vols. foolscap. 14s.

Newnham's (Mrs) Memoirs. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

Boaden's Life of Mrs Jordan. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 8s.

Munday's Life of Admiral Rodney. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 4s.

Military Memoirs of the Duke of Wellington, by Captain Sherer. Vol. I. (Forming the first vol. of Lardner's Cabinet Library.) 18mo. 5s.

Moore's Life of Lord Byron. 2 vols. 4to. 4*l*. 4s.

Stapleton's Life of Canning. 3 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 16s.

Currie's (Dr) Memoirs. By W. W. Currie. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 8s.

Annual Biography and Obituary for 1830. 8vo. 15s.

Paris's Life of Sir H. Davy, Bart. 4to. 3*l*. 3s.

Stebbing's Lives of Italian Poets. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l*. 11s. 6d.

Le Bas' Life of Bishop Middleton. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 6s.

Knowles' Life of Fuseli. 3 vols. 8vo. 2*l*. 2s.

Sinclair's (Sir John) Correspondence. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 8s.

Epps' Life of Dr J. Walker. 8vo. 12s.

EDUCATION.

Adams' Rudiments of Correct Reading. 12mo. 2s.

Major's Orestes of Euripides, with English Notes. Royal 12mo. 5s

Bloomfield's Thucydides. 3 vols. royal 12mo, with English Notes 1*l*. 7s.

Kenrick's Abridgement of Zumpt's Latin Grammar. 12mo. 3s.

Hincks' Greek-English Lexicon. Square 12mo. 10s. 6d.
 Trollope's Sallust, and Cicero's Four Orations, with Notes. 12mo.
 3s. 6d.

————— Excerpta ex Ovidio, with Notes. 12mo. 3s. 6d.
 Spencer's Syllabic Spelling. 18mo. 3s. 6d.
 Allen's Doctrina Copularum Linguæ Latinæ. 12mo. 5s.
 Morrison's General System of Mercantile Book-Keeping. 4to. 10s. 6d.
 Becker's German Grammar. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
 Key to Butler's Latin Praxis. 8vo. 6s.
 Rask's Anglo-Saxon Grammar, by Thorpe. 8vo. 15s. 6d.
 Prometheus of Æschylus, (English Notes.) Crown 8vo. 5s.
 André's French Teacher. 12mo. 7s.
 Burton on Classical Learning. 12mo. 3s.
 Brennan's Conjugator. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
 Rowbotham's Lessons in French Literature. 12mo. 6s.
 Guy's Geographia Antiqua. 18mo. 4s.
 Stocker's Herodotus. Vol. I. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.
 Klattoveskey's German Manual. 2 vols. 12mo. 17. 1s.
 Dunbar's Greek and English Lexicon. 8vo. 17. 5s.
 Sotheby's Homer's Iliad. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
 Mattaire's Greek Dialects, by Seager. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

HISTORY.

Crowe's History of France. Vols. I. and II. (Forming Vols. XII. and XV. of Lardner's Cyclopædia.) Foolscap. 6s. each.
 Turnbull's History of the French Revolution of 1830. 8vo. 16s.
 Emerson's Modern Greece. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 12s.
 History of the Western World. Vol. I.—United States of America. (Forming Vol. XIII. of Lardner's Cyclopædia.) Foolscap. 6s.
 James's History of Chivalry. (Forming Vol. IV. of the National Library.) 18mo. 6s.
 Lingard's England. Vol. VIII. 4to. 17. 15s.; or in two vols. 8vo. 17. 4s.
 Historical Interval. 12mo. 6s.
 Bell's History of the *First* Revolution in France. Vol. I. 8vo. 12s.
 Manning's Stories from the History of Italy. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Gleig's History of the Bible. 2 vols. (Forming Nos. III. and VI. of the National Library.) 18mo. 6s. each.
 Annual Retrospect of Public Affairs. Vol. I. (Forming Vol. III. of Lardner's Cabinet Library.) 18mo. 5s.
 Gore's Historical Traveller. 2 vols. foolscap. 14s.

LAW.

Grant's Advice to Trustees. 8vo. 6s.
 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Vols. XXIV. XXV. and XXVI. Royal 8vo. Each 17. 10s. boards; or 17. 13s. 6d. half-bound.
 Supplement to the Ninth Edition of Tidd's Practice. Royal 8vo. 12s.
 Statutes 11th George IV. and 1st William IV., with Notes, by Dowling. 12mo. 10s. 6d.
 ——— at large, 12 parts. 4to. 11th George IV. and 1st William IV. 20s.
 Surtees' Horseman's Manual and Law of Warrantry. 12mo. 5s.

- Statutes. 8vo. 11th George IV. and 1st William IV. 18s.
 Shaw's Domestic Lawyer. 12mo. 9s.
 Bennet's Practice in the Master's Office in Chancery. 8vo. 13s.
 Woodfall's Landlord and Tenant. By Harrison. Royal 8vo. 17. 11s. 6d.
 Chitty's Equity Index, corrected to 1831. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 37. 13s. 6d.
 Selwyn's Nisi Prius. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 27. 18s.
 Exchequer Practice Epitomised. 8vo. 6s.
 Dax's Exchequer Practice. 8vo. 16s.
 Burton's Practical Points in Conveyancing. 8vo. 16s.
 Deacon's Digest of the Criminal Law. 2 vols. 8vo. 27. 15s.

MEDICINE, SURGERY, AND ANATOMY.

- Howship on Spasmodic Stricture in the Colon. 8vo. 4s.
 Rennie on Asthma, Consumption, and Disorders of the Lungs. 8vo. 5s.
 Swan's Demonstrations of the Nerves. Post folio. 27. 2s.
 Liston's Elements of Surgery. Part I. 8vo. 9s.
 Thomson's History of Chemistry. (Forming Vol. III. of the National Library.) 18mo. 6s.
 Leach's Selection from Gregory's *Conspectus and Celsus*. 18mo. 7s.
 Scudamore on Consumption. 8vo. 4s.
 Mackintosh's Practice of Physic. Vol. II. 8vo. 14s.
 Plunbe on Vaccination. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
 Billing's First Principles of Medicine. 8vo. 6s.
 Combe on Mental Derangement. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Alison's Outlines of Physiology. 8vo. 12s.
 Thackrah on Employments as affecting Health. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
 Rose's Analytical Chemistry. 8vo. 16s.
 Long's (St John) Discoveries. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Reece's Medical Annual. 8vo. 5s.
 Caster's Manual of Surgery, by Fife. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Money's *Vade-Mecum of Morbid Anatomy*. 8vo. 17. 5s.
 Dr Johnson on the Change of Air. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
 Curtis' Treatise on the Ear. *Fifth edition*. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Paxton's Introduction to the Study of Anatomy. 8vo. 17. 1s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. III. Part I.
 Loudon's Illustrations of Landscape Gardening. Parts I. and II. 17. 1s. *each*, stitched.
 Classic Cullings and Fugitive Gatherings. Post 8vo. 9s.
 Putt's Essay on Civil Policy. 8vo. 14s.
 Stephens on West Indian Slavery. Vol. II. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Abercrombie on the Intellectual Powers. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Lynch's Feudal Dignities. royal 8vo. 17. 5s.
 Vines on Glanders and Farcy. 8vo. 12s.
 Launder on the Moray Floods. *Second edition*. 8vo. 14s.
 Internal Policy of Nations. 8vo. 6s.
 Davis' True Dignity of Human Nature. 12mo. 5s.
 Bulmer's Beauties of the Vicar of Llandovery. Foolscap. 5s.
 Pratt's History of Savings' Banks. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Child's Own Book. 18mo. 8s. 6d. half-bound, or 7s. 6d. boards.
 Hughes' Boscobel Tracts, 8vo, 14s.

- Pinkerton's Correspondence. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 12s.
 Dawson's Present State of Australia. 8vo. 14s.
 Evans's Rectory of Valehead. 12mo. 6s.
 Wanderings of Tom Starboard. 12mo. 7s. half-bound.
 Gentleman in Black, with Cruikshank's Designs. Foolschap. 7s. 6d.
 Biden's Naval Discipline. 8vo. 10s.
 Hamilton's Progress of Society. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Rubie's British Celestial Atlas. Royal 4to. 1*l.* 5s. half-bound.
 Greek Dramatists. Royal 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Bertini's New System of Learning Music. 4to. 10s. 6d. stitched.
 Bowles's Fortune's Reverses. 2 vols. 18mo. 7s. 6d. half-bound.
 Scenes in Our Parish. 12mo. 5s.
 Harte's System of the World, from La Place. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 4s.
 Du Bordieu on Fortifying Military Positions. Foolschap. 10s.
 Turner's Scarf, and Other Tales. 12mo. 4s. 6d. half-bound.
 Hobler's Exercises between an Attorney and his Clerk. 12mo. 6s.
 Shipp's Military Bijou. 2 vols. post 8vo. 15s.
 Combe's System of Phrenology. Third edition. 8vo. 15s.
 Cruikshank's Facetiæ. 2 vols. 18mo. 17s. half-bound.
 Betham's Feudal Dignities. Vol. I. 8vo. 15s.
 Nicolas' Observations on Historical Literature. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 ——— Household Book of Elizabeth of York. 8vo. 1*l.* 1s.
 Green's British Merchant's Assistant. Royal 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Assassins of the Paradise. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 John's (J. A. St.) Anatomy of Society. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.
 Müller's Dorians. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10s.
 Lover's Legends and Stories of Ireland. 12mo. 7s.
 Jameson's Modern Geography. 8vo. 18s.
 Wilson's Trigonometry. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Napier's War in the Peninsula. Vol. III. 8vo. 20s.
 Rose's Marchmont Papers. 3 vols. 1*l.* 16s.
 Jones on the Distribution of Wealth. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Godwin's Thoughts on Man. 8vo. 14s.
 Noble's Orientalist, or Letters of a Rabbi. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Smith's Description of his Patent Metallic Lining for Chimneys. Royal
 8vo. 4s.
 Lloyd on Light and Vision. 8vo. 15s.
 Extraordinary Black-Book. 8vo. 14s.
 Lawrence's Complete Cattle Keeper. 12mo. 4s.
 Campbell's Lays from the East. 12mo. 6s.
 Logan's Scottish Gael. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10s. Royal, 2*l.* 2s.
 Hawthorne on Ventilation. 12mo. 2s. 6d.
 Tales of a Grandfather. 4th Series. Stories from "France." 3 vols.
 18mo. 10s. 6d. half-bound.
 Horton's Causes and Remedies of Pauperism. 8vo. 12s.
 Bernay's German Prose Anthology. 12mo. 7s.
 Annals of My Village. Crown 8vo. 12s. cloth.
 Infants' Daily Sacrifice. 18mo. 5s. cloth.
 Oxley's Celestial Planisphere, or Astronomical Chart. 1 vol. 8vo. and
 10 folio plates. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.

- Worsdaile's Genethlaical Astronomy. 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Millingen's Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Thomas' Serious Poems. 12mo. 6s.
 Time's Telescope for 1831. 12mo. 9s.
 An Only Son, a Narrative. 12mo. 6s.
 Matthew on Naval Timber. 8vo. 12s.
 Alfred Dudley, a Tale. 12mo. 5s. half-bound.
 Percival's Ancient History. 12mo. 5s. half-bound.
 Witham's Observations on Fossil Vegetables. 4to. 15s.
 Modern Fanaticism Unveiled. 12mo. 5s.
 Temple of Melekartha. 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1*l.* 7s.
 Zevick and Schill's Calmuc Tartary. 12mo. 7s.
 Blakeway's Sheriffs of Shropshire. Folio. 2*l.* 2s.; large paper, 3*l.* 3s.
 Gunn's Cartonensia, or Raphael's Tapestries. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.
 Mitford's Stories of American Life. 3 vols. 18mo. 10s. 6d.
 Rich's Daughter of Herodias, a Tragedy. 8vo. 6s.
 Howitt's Book of the Seasons. 12mo. 10s. 6d.
 Spirit of Don Quixote. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Affair at Charlton Holt. 12mo. 4s. 6d. sewed.
 Crum on Primary Colours. Royal 8vo. 5s. 6d.
 Burke's Official Calendar for 1831. Post 8vo. 5s. 6d.

NOVELS, TALES, AND ROMANCES.

- Water Witch; or, Skimmer of the Sea. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts. 3 vols. post 8vo.
 1*l.* 1s.
 Chartley, the Fatalist. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 8s. 6d.
 Russell; or, the Reign of Fashion. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 8s. 6d.
 Maxwell. By the author of "Sayings and Doings." 3 vols. post 8vo.
 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Way of the World. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Persian Adventurer. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Bowdler's Pen Tamar. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Mitford's Stories of American Life. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Carne's Exiles of Palestine. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Atherstone's Sea-Kings of England. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Bray's Talba; or, Moor of Portugal. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 7s.
 Romance of History, "France." 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Vizier's Son. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 4s.
 Mothers and Daughters. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 The Turf. 2 vols. foolscap. 15s.
 Journal of a Nobleman at Vienna. 2 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 1s.
 Scenes of Life. 2 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 1s.
 Incognito (The). 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 7s.
 Navy at Home. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 1s.
 Tuileries, an Historical Romance. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Crotchet Castle. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Premier (The). 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.
 Society; or, Spring in Town. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 11s. 6d.

POETRY.

- Prowes' Poems. 12mo. 6s.
 Kennedy's Arrow and the Rose. 8vo. 6s.
 Bradfield's Tales of the Cyclades. Foolscap. 5s. 6d.
 Whitfield's Bereaved, and other Poems. Foolscap. 6s.
 Taylor's German Poetry. Vol. III. 8vo. 15s.
 Streangery's Messiah. A Poem. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Swain's Beauties of the Mind, and other Poems. Post 8vo. 6s.
 Rogers's Italy. A Poem. 8vo. New edition, with plates. 17. 8s.
 Hogg's (James) Songs. 12mo. 7s.
 Grant's Beauties of Modern Poetry. Foolscap. 7s. 6d.
 Bennett's Songs of Solitude. 12mo. 5s.
 Siamese Twins. A Satirical Poem. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Riddell's Songs of the Ark. Foolscap. 7s. 6d.
 Jones' Attempts in Verse, and Southey's Lives of Uneducated Poets. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Snowden's Moorish Queen. Post 8vo. 6s.
 Marshall's Byzantium, and other Poems. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
 Montgomery's Oxford. A Poem. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.

- Herschel's Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy. (Forming Vol. XIV. of Lardner's Cyclopædia.) Foolscap. 6s.

THEOLOGY.

- Clarke's (Dr A.) Sacred Literature, Vol. I. 8vo. 12s.
 Jebb's (Bishop) Piety without Asceticism. 8vo. 12s.
 Lee on Prophecy. 8vo. 14s.
 Watson's Family Prayers. 12mo. 5s. 6d.
 Norris's Sermons. 12mo. 6s.
 Gurney's Biblical Notes. Post 8vo. 12s.
 Doddridge's Expositor, edited by Redford. 2 vols. 12mo. 10s.
 Russell's Sermons on the Festivals. 12mo. 4s.
 Smith's Manual of the Rudiments of Theology. 12mo. 9s.
 Whateley on Romish Errors. 8vo. 10s.
 First Preaching of the Gospel. 18mo. 2s. 6d. half-bound.
 Harrison's Protestant Instructor. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
 Jones' Isaiah. 12mo. 5s.
 Collinson on the Preparation for the Gospel. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 View of the Four Gospels. 12mo. 7s.
 Massillon's Select Sermons from the French, by Morris. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Jones' (of Nayland's) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.
 Patroni Ecclesiarum; a List of Patrons of Church Dignities. Royal 8vo. 18s.
 Trial of the Unitarians, &c. 8vo. 8s.
 Rowlatt's Sermons at the Temple. 8vo. 12s.
 Jones' Sermons on the Sacraments and Sabbath. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
 Wirgman's Divarication of the New Testament, Part I. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
 Borthwick's Prophecies of Daniel, from Newton. 8vo. 10s.
 Parsons' (James) Sermons. 8vo. 12s.
 Dibdin's (Dr) Sunday Library. Vols. I. and II. 18mo. each 5s.

- Pillar of Divine Faith. 8vo. 6s.
 Barr's Help to Professing Christians. 12mo. 4s. 6d.
 Dewar on the Atonement. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
 Erskine's Brazen Serpent. 12mo. 2s. 6d.
 Scoresby's Discourses to Seamen. 12mo. 6s.
 Hinds on Inspiration of Scripture. 8vo. 6s.
 Sumner's (Bishop) Practical Exposition of St Matthew and Mark. 8vo. 9s.
 Andrew's (Bishop) Sermons on the Fasts and Festivals. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 Lachland's Agapæ, or Sacred Love Pledges. Foolscap. 10s. 6d.
 Payson's Sermons. 8vo. 15s.
 Treatise on Doubt in Religious Questions. 12mo. 5s.
 Warner's Anti-Materialist. 12mo. 4s.
 Nolan's Time of the Millennium. 8vo. 8s.
 Vincent's Explanation of Moral Rights. 8vo. 7s.
 Faith in Christ, of which the Genuine Fruit is Righteousness. 12mo. 2s. 6d.
 Mant's (Bishop) Scriptural Narratives. 8vo. 13s.
 Scott's Church History. Vol. III. 8vo. 12s.
- TOPOGRAPHY.
- Elme's Topographical Dictionary of London. 8vo. 12s.
 Gorton's ditto ditto ditto. Vol. I. 8vo. 20s., and 30s. coloured.
- VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.
- Kotzebue's New Voyage round the World in 1823, 1824, 1825, and 1826. 2 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 1s.
 Trant's Journey through Greece in 1830. 8vo. 16s.
 Picken's Travels of Eminent Missionaries. Royal 18mo. 7s. 6d.
 Head's Life and Travels of Bruce. (Forming No. XVII. of the Family Library.) 18mo. 5s.
 White's Naval Researches, &c. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
 Hay's (Major Leith) Narrative of the Peninsular War. 2 vols. 12mo. 21s.
 Marshall's Naval Operations in Ava. 8vo. 6s.
 Ellis's Polynesian Researches. Vol. I. (Forming Vol. I. of the Select Library.) 18mo. 6s.
 Burckhardt's Customs of the Modern Egyptians. 4to. 1l. 5s.
 Armstrong's Journal of Travels in the Seat of War in the East. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 A Year in Spain, by a Young American. 2 vols. post 8vo. 16s.
 Gilly's Waldensian Researches. 8vo. 21s.
 History of Maritime and Inland Discovery. Vol. III. (Forming Vol. XVI. of Lardner's Cyclopædia.) Foolscap. 6s.
 Beechey's Voyage to the Pacific. 2 vols. 4to. 4l. 4s.

No. CVI. will be published in June.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY,
PAUL'S WALK, CANONGATE.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW.

JUNE, 1831.

N^o. CVI.

- ART. I.—1. *A Letter on the Gifts of the Spirit.* By THOMAS ERSKINE, Esq. Advocate. Greenock: 1830.
2. *The Brazen Serpent, or Life coming through Death.* By THOMAS ERSKINE, Esq. Advocate. Edinburgh: 1831.
3. *Neglected Truths.* By the Rev. A. SCOTT. London: 1830.
4. *The Morning Watch, or Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, and Theological Review.* Nos. 8. and 9. (Art. by the Rev. EDWARD IRVING.) London: 1830, 1831.

HALF the world is said not to know how the other half is living. If this be true of the outside of life, it is much more so of the life within. Although most part of the knowledge which we possess of the moral and intellectual existence of each other, reciprocates in much smaller proportions than by halves, it might have been hoped that religion would be an exception; for of the common elements of our nature there is none, we believe, less seldom found wholly wanting in any individual than the religious principle. However, after all, a most unsatisfactory ambiguity hangs over the formation of this principle, as well as that of conscience. Every thing, in both instances, depends on the education which they receive. Fanaticism, indeed, may be satisfied with the identity of a name; for that answers the purposes of clamour. But if we seek to proceed farther, few are found possessed of the ability or the patience to analyze the various forms which the religious principle may assume, or to trace its probable nature and influence in particular cases. We soon tire of sifting out what it is our neighbours are really thinking and feeling on a mysterious question, complicated by an immensity and diversity of details.

The very same doctrines poured into minds of different strength and temper, combine and crystallize into very different

results. Not that there is any power of compression, which can keep the spirit of doctrines the same for long together; whatever sameness may be secured for the mere letterpress of a creed. The pride of orthodox unity of belief could never, in its most palmy state, reach farther than the shadow. The thing itself—the ‘entire, one solid shining diamond’ of the controversial poet, has, especially in our schismatical times, been shivered into sparkles so numerous and minute, that considerable ingenuity, as well as memory, is necessary to distinguish and collect them—much more personally to distribute them to their respective claimants. These differences admit of no assignable limit. Extremes provoke each other to fly apart still farther. The principle of religious variances, so infinite in the case of individuals, extends to the great moral movements of society, where the strata of human opinion rise, one above another, in distinct masses of successive growth. There are consequently philosophical systems of Christianity, which suppose that the reformation will not only want, but must gradually go on, reforming; since dogmas depend for their real character on the nature of the times, as much as fruits on the quality of the soil in which they grow. Thus, the great body of German theologians, a few divines in England, and the school of Dr Channing in America, (whilst they are proceeding, it is true, by very different routes,) all agree in one main object. The canon of interpretation which they would establish, has a much deeper and more extensive character than any in Griesbach. Their object is to discover and apply in Christianity a power of internal developement and modification; so that, as mankind advances under its protection, Christianity shall itself advance too, and keep adapting and perfecting its tendencies in proportion to the progressive civilisation of every age. A duty of this sort would seem to be one of the chief literary uses of a priesthood, in the light of commentators and teachers, wherever the Scriptures are freely circulated, and private judgment is allowed. A very opposite sect, and one which is already making up in vehemence what it wants, and we trust will always want, in numbers, has lately risen up among us. Its teachers seem to treat with utter scorn all general reasoning and particular consequences; and to be at the same time equally careless and suspicious of authority; for which they apparently substitute some private illumination of their own. There is no saying what sudden turns the impulse of a leading member or two may, from time to time, give to a party which has no difficulty in assuming that every thing has been wrong up to the last religious novelty invented by some member of their society. But looking at the actual working of their system in its present hands, it can only

tend to bind the comprehensive universality of the Christian religion in the strict chain of literal interpretation, and to recall the faith of intelligent Christians to the prejudices of uneducated zealots and darker ages.

A short while ago, the discourses and writings of these persons would have led a stranger, unacquainted with Christianity, to conclude, that the principal point, raised and revealed by it, was the fact and period of the Millennium. The rage for prophetic interpretation having a little subsided, and discussions on the humanity of Christ being found to be a topic better suited to the councils of divines than popular assemblies, the enthusiasm of disciples might have had time to cool. But about this time, two cases of miraculous pretensions happen to have been most unexpectedly, but most opportunely, submitted to the chance of a credulous or contemptuous public. No Hierophants to a party ever better deserved a godsend of this description; for none could more immediately, or more industriously, avail themselves of that mysterious predisposition to superstition, the germ of which is more or less latent in almost every human heart. Few of our readers are probably aware of the cases in question; fewer still know any thing of the portentous controversial superstructure, more curious even than the events on which it has been raised. We are tempted to notice the subject, by the confidence with which the argument has been maintained, as regards both the particular instances, and the general principle. We are, in the meantime, a little afraid of incurring, in the opinion of some of our friends, the fate which Wall, speaking of Irenæus, anticipates from succeeding generations, for all who undertake to answer the ‘idle enthusiastic stuff’ of their contemporaries. ‘So,’ he says, ‘any book written now in answer to the Quakers, &c. will, in the next age, seem to be the work of a man who had little to do.’

A short statement is necessary to explain the nature of these facts; it being remembered, that they are gravely relied on as manifestations directly and visibly divine; and that they have the honour of being the immediate cause of the promulgation of a rather novel view of the Christian dispensation. There are two cases. That of Miss Fancourt is a singular cure, stated to be received in answer to prayer; that of the Macdonalds is proclaimed as being a renewal of the gift of tongues. The *Morning Watch*,* a publication, in ability, inconsistency, and

* The political articles are not the least extraordinary parts of this extraordinary journal. Any reasonable person, who would take the trouble to dip into them, would learn in an instant what value to put

fierceness, worthy of Cromwell's camp, (for nothing since has been published like it,) contains the only particulars, in the shape of evidence, which we have yet seen. In a latter part of the eighth number, (page 948,) it seems allowed that it may possibly be necessary to give up the case of Mary Campbell, and that of other persons of weak judgment, who shall have proved, by their extravagant and unwarrantable presumptions, that they have mistaken false confidence for faith. Nothing, therefore, need be said of her adventures. But the case of the Macdonalds of Port-Glasgow, and their friends, is supported as being perfectly distinct. In respect of these, some farther well-attested facts were promised us. They were to be verified, it was said, by the examination of all the parties, and be made indisputable by the first medical authorities. A subsequent number has, however, lately appeared, in which two separate articles are dedicated to Miss Fancourt; but not a word of the Macdonalds. The doctors, it seems, therefore, are rather shy of their certificate. The experience of doctors in the Fancourt case will probably prevent reference to this sceptical profession. In our narrative and critical commentary we will give the sex precedence.

The cure of Miss Fancourt of a spine complaint, in answer to the prayer of Mr Greaves, has been the subject of prolonged polemical contention between the *Morning Watch* and the *Christian Observer*. The lady, belonging to a religious family, and herself of religious character, had been ill for eight years, and during the last two years was confined wholly to her couch. Mr Greaves 'believed that God had sent him that day to receive an answer to his many prayers in behalf of Miss Fancourt.—She observed him often during the evening engaged in silent supplication.' His final address to her, her conduct thereon, and the whole relation, can leave no question of the religious excitement, which indeed such a transaction necessarily implies, in all who are parties to it. The only question on the evidence, applies to the remaining fact—was the disorder in a state to be subject to the influence of a charm of this description? There is a difference

upon mere declarations of political opinion, (delivered, for instance, as instructions to the public on the present measure of reform,) under the sanction of the otherwise distinguished names of Mr H. Drummond and Mr Spencer Perceval. The reasonings and the conclusions are just what might be expected from writers who seem to consider, that a course of lectures on prophecy is the best preparatory study for young diplomatists; and that the only infallible guide in doubtful cases of external and internal policy, is to be found in the numerals of Daniel and the visions of the Apocalypse.

of opinion among her medical attendants on the point, whether the disease had been at any time organic, or was always functional only. But Dr Jervis, who alone appears to consider that a curvature of the spine had at one time actually taken place, expressly adds, ‘ Her disease had probably been some time since ‘ subdued, and only wanted an extraordinary stimulus to enable ‘ her to make use of her legs.’ (P. 153.) For the purpose, therefore, of the present question, although Dr Jervis admits that the disease had been at a former period organic, whilst Mr Travers regards it as ‘ chiefly, if not entirely, a disease of function,’ they both agree, as men of science, forming their judgments on the symptoms which they observed during their professional attendance, that, in point of fact, her disorder was in a state to be cured by a medicine of this sort administered through the mind. Mr Parkinson concurs in the opinion, that there had been nothing in the illness or the recovery, but what might be accounted for by natural means. The surgical question, whether a change of structure, which has once taken place, is permanent or removable, they may settle among themselves. All we want now is their joint and several opinion on the facts of the case before them; and that we have. The latter part of Mr Travers’s letter is worth transcribing from the pages of the *Morning Watch*, on account of its general application to occurrences of this description. ‘ A volume, and not an uninteresting one, ‘ might be compiled of histories resembling Miss Fancourt’s. ‘ The truth is, these are the cases upon which, beyond all others, ‘ the empiric thrives. Credulity, the foible of a weakened, ‘ though vivacious intellect, is the pioneer of an unqualified and ‘ overweening confidence; and thus prepared, the patient is in ‘ the most hopeful state for the credit, as well as the craft, of ‘ the pretender. This, however, I mention only by the way, for ‘ the sake of illustration. I need not exemplify the sudden and ‘ remarkable effects of joy, terror, anger, and other passions of ‘ the mind, upon the nervous system of confirmed invalids, in ‘ restoring to them the use of weakened limbs, &c. They are ‘ as much matters of notoriety as any of the properties and ‘ powers of direct remedial agents recorded in the history of ‘ medicine. To cite one: A case lately fell under my notice, of ‘ a young lady, who, from inability to stand or walk without ‘ acute pain in her loins, lay for near a twelvemonth upon her ‘ couch, subjected to a variety of treatment by approved and not ‘ inexperienced members of the profession. A single visit from ‘ a surgeon of great fame in the management of intractable cases, ‘ set the patient upon her feet, and his prescription amounted ‘ simply to an assurance, in the most confident terms, that she ‘ must disregard the pain, and that nothing else was required

‘ for her recovery, adding, that if she did not do so, she would
 ‘ become an incurable cripple. She followed his direction im-
 ‘ mediately, and with perfect success. But such and similar
 ‘ examples every medical man of experience could contribute in
 ‘ partial confirmation of the old adage, “*Foi est tout.*” Of all
 ‘ moral engines, I conceive that faith which is inspired by a reli-
 ‘ gious creed, to be the most powerful; and Miss Fancourt’s
 ‘ case, there can be no doubt, was one of many instances of sud-
 ‘ den recovery from a passive form of nervous ailment, brought
 ‘ about by the powerful excitement of this extraordinary stimu-
 ‘ lus, compared to which, in her predisposed frame of mind, am-
 ‘ monia and quinine would have been mere trifling.’

On the case of Miss Fancourt, thus disposed of, it surely ought to be waste of time to say a single word. It is silly to complain that ‘ the letters of Mr Travers and Mr Parkinson are ‘ not greatly to their credit as medical men.’ A collateral sneer of this sort will not affect their authority, where the question is one of fact, depending on medical science. All the practitioners who attended Miss Fancourt, declare that the statement put forth by her friends may be received, every word of it, as true, and yet accounted for by the operation of ordinary human causes. In defiance, however, of this unanimous opinion, persons are to be found who persist in crying, *Miracle!* What presumption can they think they are building up in their own behalf, whether as witnesses, or reasoners on this subject upon future occasions, by maintaining that in the present instance the finger of God is indisputably seen? The Roman Catholic Church, of whose unreasonableness our fanatics affect to speak in language which they of all people are the least entitled to employ, has lately exercised on this very point a much more intelligent discretion. The example ought to shame them, in cases naturally full of suspicion, and deprived of the securities of judicial investigation, into the adoption of some such subsidiary arrangements, or, at least, into a respect for the ordinary guarantees and probabilities of truth. In 1821, the career of Prince Hohenlohe was stopped short in the town of Bamberg, by a prohibition, (the judiciousness of which is more open to epigrams than to argument,) against the performance of any cures except after notice to the police. The presence of medical men was further required, as also that of a commission delegated by the municipal authorities. Prince Hohenlohe afterwards applied to the Pope for leave to exercise his miraculous gift of healing. The Pope fortunately had the good sense to enjoin the same temporal precautions. Upon this, the Roman Catholic world was suffered to relapse under the ordinary laws of nature; for the miracle-monger and the ghost appear to have in common

an extreme sensitiveness to restraints; to all formalities which imply suspicion, and all rules which can tend to enlighten error, or embarrass fraud. The strongest objection hitherto to the worst authenticated miracle in any Popish legend, has been that there was no evidence at all for it. It is henceforward to be no objection to Protestant miracles, that the only real evidence in the case, is all the other way.

No species of alleged supernatural agency is so fallible and ambiguous as that of cures. The cures performed by our Saviour, acquired their importance from the concurrence of the other miracles in connexion with which they were performed, and also from the concurrence of those accompanying circumstances in which all writers, competent and willing to understand an argument, recognise the only sufficient, and therefore an always indispensable criterion, between true and spurious pretensions. It is just one hundred years ago since the cures performed in the churchyard of St Medard, at the tomb of the Abbé Paris, attracted at least as much curiosity as the partisans of Mr Greaves and Miss Fancourt are likely to excite at the present day. Whoever is sufficiently afraid of the opposite dilemmas of scepticism and credulity, to read from page 130 to p. 244 of Bishop Douglas's *Criterion*, will perceive what very little credit third persons can rationally be asked to give to such relations, when advanced as evidence of miraculous interference. The power of imagination in the cure of diseases, operates to a degree of which few out of the profession are aware; but it is no new discovery. We have the authority of Hippocrates for it, as well as that of Mr Travers. History, indeed, is crowded with evidence of this kind. The French prophets destroyed their reputation, by unadvisedly staking it on the resurrection of Dr Eames. Otherwise, as long as they confined their practice to cures by means of prayer, as in the case of Sir Richard Bulkely, &c., all went on well. Astonishment at their own occasional success, (since this success depends on a principle in human nature, of whose power they are possibly not aware,) is very likely to make many, who begin in this line as hypocrites, finish in it as fanatics. Thus, perhaps, even Mr St John Long is not thoroughly acquainted with the most important ingredient in his own secret. About the middle of the seventeenth century, he had a bolder precursor in his countryman, of the name of Greatrakes, said to have been a person of some fashion in the county of Waterford. According to this gentleman's account of himself, he first felt, in 1662, a strange persuasion, of which he was not able to give a rational account to others, that the gift of curing the king's-evil by the stroking of his hand, was bestowed on him. In time, he attempted and succeeded in all diseases whatsoever.

Besides the certificates of many persons of distinction, there are the attestations of grave divines and eminent physicians. Which last class of witnesses, (as Dr Douglas observes, and as Mr St John Long has experienced,) ‘are not very ready in admitting ‘that cures may be effected without making use of the medicines which they themselves prescribe.’ In the Rawdon Papers, there are two curious letters. In one, Lord Conway, who had, on account of the health of Lady Conway, sent for him from Ireland, admits, that she was not the better for him; but adds, ‘very few others have failed under his hands, of many hundreds, ‘that he hath touched in these parts.’ Autolytus, when verifying his ballads, could not parallel the following account, transmitted above a year later, from this prince of quacks, then in London, to his patron at Ragley. ‘The *virtuosi* have been daily ‘with me since I writ to your honour last, and have given me ‘large and full testimonials, and God has been pleased to do ‘wonderful things in their sight, so that they are my hearty and ‘good friends, and have stopped the mouth of the court, where ‘the sober party are now most of them believers and my champions. The King’s doctors this day (for the confirmation of ‘their majesties’ belief) sent three out of the hospital to me, who ‘came on crutches, and, blessed be God, they all went home ‘well, to the admiration of all people, as well as the doctors. Sir ‘Heneage Finch says, that I have made the greatest faction and ‘distraction between clergy and laymen, that any one has these ‘1000 years.’ Yet, strange to say, notwithstanding these fallacious appearances, his reputation soon afterwards declined as suddenly as it had risen.

It is impossible to doubt that scrofulous disorders, (over which imagination would appear to have as little control as over the spine,) were healed in numerous instances, during several hundred years, by the royal touch of the Kings of England. Tooker describes, in the reign of Elizabeth, several cures of this description, within his own certain knowledge; and on many occasions he gives the names and addresses of the persons. Wiseman was principal army-surgeon to Charles the First, and also sergeant-surgeon to Charles the Second, after the Restoration. ‘I myself,’ he says, ‘have been a frequent eyewitness of many ‘hundreds of cures performed by his majesty’s touch alone, ‘without any assistance of chirurgery: and those, many of them ‘such as had tired out the endeavours of able chirurgeons, before they came hither.’ Charles the Second, within a certain number of years, *touched* 92,107 persons; and the efficacy of this remedy was such, that this is the precise number Dr Carr mentions as having been *healed* by him in the same period. Now, it will be admitted on all hands, that Charles the Second is not

a very likely person to have been made the recipient, or chosen vessel, for any supposed spiritual favour. It was part of the duty of Mr Dickens, (a man spoken of as beyond all suspicion, and who held the office of serjeant-surgeon to Queen Anne,) to examine the patients when they came to be touched by her. Some of the cures were afterwards established by his testimony. The key to these stories, absurd at first sight as they appear to us, applies also to many others collected by Dr Douglas. It will not be found, either in the pedigree of hereditary descent from the sainted confessor, or in the fact of royal inauguration, but in the reason given by Mr Beckett,—that is, ‘in the impression made on the minds of the patients by their confidence in receiving relief.’ We were looking the other day over an English pamphlet, published with a proselytizing object, as late as 1713, on the Life and Miracles of St Winifred. It seems that devout pilgrims, little more than a century ago, were in the habit of resorting, in great numbers, from Ireland, and all quarters of the kingdom, to the Holy Well, in North Wales, where this saint had suffered martyrdom. ‘In the travelling season, the town of Holywell appears populous, crowded with zealous pilgrims from all parts of Britain.’ It will be agreed at present that we need not call in a miracle—still less a miracle under the patronage of St Winifred—to account for the beneficial effects of a very cold spring, on systems excited by religious zeal. There was a quarto published in 1656, of the cures performed by a handkerchief dipped in the blood of Charles the First. The chapels of favourite Roman Catholic saints are often crowded, after the example of the temples of antiquity, with votive offerings, in testimony of miraculous relief. It is not the cure, but the medicine, which the heretical traveller calls in question. Middleton’s observation on cases of this description, so far from being scepticism, is that precautionary common sense which, amidst infinite frauds and fallacies, is our only protection against ultimate scepticism of a fatal kind. ‘Every man’s experience has taught him, that diseases, though fatal and desperate, are often surprisingly healed of themselves, by some secret and sudden effort of nature, impenetrable to the skill of man; but, to ascribe this presently to a miracle, as weak and superstitious minds are apt to do, to the prayers of the living, or the intercession of the dead, is what neither sound reason nor true religion will justify.’

The general rule which Dr Douglas proposes to draw as a corollary from these facts, is, ‘never to attribute any event to a miraculous interposition, when we can trace the operation of natural, adequate causes.’ We trust that the dissidents are at present not very numerous. Such as they are, they seem ready

on one hand to go the length of their Puritan predecessors, who, in former days, superseded human means and human learning, and undertook to change the events of life, as well as to explain anew a text in Scripture, by fasting and by prayer. On the other, they bid fair to outdo the wildest pretensions of the Church of Rome in its rashest times, and to come within the full benefit of the criticism which, even when Dr Douglas wrote, could scarcely be, in fairness, limited to the Church of Rome. ‘The writers of the breviary, the biographers of the ‘Romish saints, and but too many others of that communion, seem to reverse the rule, and to think that the bare possibility of there being a miraculous interposition in any particular case, is sufficient to warrant their believing that there really was. And this is obvious, not only from the cures which they ascribe to their saints, but also from other events, which they look upon as miraculous. Thus some celebrated reliques, or some favourite image, exposed to public view and public devotion, are looked upon to have brought about a change of weather, which would have happened however, and which, perhaps, the barometer had foretold.’

In the present state of our knowledge, perhaps with our present faculties, the boundary betwixt natural and supernatural effects cannot be drawn, so as not to cut through many debatable cases. Some, however, on either side, are too clear for argument. A case like Miss Fancourt’s falls as far within, as others, which can be easily imagined, will fall beyond, any reasonable line. The force of imagination, or some uncalculated healing power in nature, cannot restore a dead man to life, or replace an amputated limb. In such a case, nobody would think of enquiring into possibly latent causes. We should confine our scrutiny to the proof of the death, or of the operation respectively, and then proceed to examine into the proof of the subsequent restoration. A certificate, therefore, vouching a physical fact of this kind, from the surgeons of any hospital, must convey to the minds of every body who believed their testimony, the conviction that a new and supernatural cause could alone account for the event.

The other case set up is the ‘gift of tongues.’ We are prepared to admit the same, whenever an instance of the gift of tongues, properly so called, is properly verified. Middleton accordingly observes, in his *Free Enquiry*, p. 120, that ‘all the other extraordinary gifts, of healing diseases, casting out devils, visions, and ecstatic revelations, afford great room to impostors, to exert all their craft of surprising and dazzling the senses of the simple, the credulous, and the superstitious of all ranks; whereas, the gift of tongues cannot easily be counterfeited, or a pretension

‘ to it imposed on men of sense, or on any, indeed, but those
 ‘ who are utterly illiterate, and strangers to all tongues but their
 ‘ own; and to acquire a number of languages by natural means,
 ‘ and to a degree that might make them pass for a supernatural
 ‘ gift, was a work of so much difficulty and labour, as rendered
 ‘ it impracticable to support a pretension of that kind for a suc-
 ‘ cession of years.’—‘ In short, if we trace the history of this
 ‘ gift from its origin, we shall find, that in the times of the
 ‘ gospel, in which alone the miracles of the church are allowed
 ‘ to be true by all Christians, it was the first gift which was
 ‘ conferred upon the apostles in a public and illustrious manner,
 ‘ and reckoned ever after among the principal of those which
 ‘ were imparted to the first converts. But in the succeeding
 ‘ ages, when miracles began to be of a suspected and dubious
 ‘ character, it is observable that this gift is mentioned but once
 ‘ by a single writer, and then vanished of a sudden without the
 ‘ least notice or hint given by any of the ancients, either of the
 ‘ manner, or time, or cause of its vanishing. Lastly, in the
 ‘ later ages, when the miracles of the church were not only
 ‘ suspected, but found to be false by our reformers, and con-
 ‘ sidered as such ever since by all Protestants, this gift has
 ‘ never once been heard of, or pretended to by the Romanists
 ‘ themselves, though they challenge at the same time all the
 ‘ other gifts of the apostolic days. From all which, I think, we
 ‘ may reasonably infer, that the gift of tongues may be con-
 ‘ sidered as a proper test and criterion for determining the mi-
 ‘ raculous pretensions of all churches which derive their descent
 ‘ from the apostles; and, consequently, if, in the list of their
 ‘ extraordinary gifts, they cannot show us this, we may fairly
 ‘ conclude that they have none else to show which are real and
 ‘ genuine.’

It is singular, with reference to the testimony even of the primitive fathers in behalf of the subsistence of miraculous powers in the church after the time of the apostles, that the gift of tongues, and the raising of the dead—both of them the most conclusive of all miracles, and the first apparently the most necessary of all—are mentioned by no writer except Irenæus as subsisting in his own times. The passage in which Irenæus speaks of being obliged to employ the chief part of his leisure in learning the barbarous dialect of his diocese, (Gaul,) is irreconcilable with the supposition that he exercised the gift in his own person. There is no pretence, in any missionary publication, that assistance of this kind has been vouchsafed in a single instance for the conversion of the heathen. In one of his letters, Xavier, the apostle of the Indies, laments his ignorance of the language of those whom he was seeking to instruct ;

the consequence of which was, that he was little better than a mute statue among them. The abandonment of this head of miraculous power was so early and so entire, that Middleton seems ready to risk the merit of his case on behalf of the cessation of miraculous powers, ‘on this single point, that, after the apostolic times, there is not in all history one instance, either well attested or even so much as mentioned, of any particular person who had ever exercised this gift, or pretended to exercise it, in any age or country whatsoever.’*

It cannot be denied, therefore, that any supposed revival of the gift of tongues in our days has this presumption in its favour; it is no part of the regular stock in trade of superstition, handed down from generation to generation of fanatics. A gift of this nature has also an important connexion with the object and the reasonableness of such institutions as missionary societies. Burnet, in his preface to Lactantius, speaking of the Roman Catholic missions, states expressly, that the existence of this qualification ought to be ascertained as a preliminary authority for pilgrimages among the heathen. ‘I do not see how we should expect that they should yield easily, unless there were a new power of working miracles conferred on those who labour in conversions. What noise soever their missionaries make with their miracles

* Warburton, in his ‘*Doctrine of Grace*,’ (the second book of which is almost entirely devoted to criticisms on a series of extracts from Wesley’s Journal,) remarks, that of all the apostolical gifts, that of tongues is the only one with which Wesley, according to his own account of his proceedings, was not adorned. It would seem, however, from an earlier passage (Warburton’s Works, viii. 258), that modern enthusiasm has gone further lengths than Middleton was aware. ‘There are many well-attested cases in modern history (although we should agree that they have lost nothing of the marvellous in the telling) where enthusiasts, in their ecstasies, have talked very fluently in the learned languages, of which they had a very imperfect knowledge in their sober intervals. “When I saw,” says the noble author of the *Characteristics*, “the gentleman who has written lately in defence of revived prophecy (and has since fallen himself into the prophetic ecstasies), lately under an *agitation*, as they call it, uttering prophecy in a pompous Latin style, of which, out of his ecstasy, it seems he is wholly incapable, it brought into my mind the Latin poet’s description of the sibyl,” &c. And it is remarkable, that instances of this kind have occurred so frequently, that Thyraeus, a famous Popish exorcist, blinded as he was by the superstitious impiety of demoniacal possessions, has, in his *Directory*, expressly declared it to be the common opinion of his brotherhood, that the *speaking strange languages* is no certain sign of a *possession*, and warns the exorcist against this illusion.’

‘ in those remote parts, it is plain that these are all impostures ;
 ‘ for the most necessary of all miracles for the conversion of
 ‘ strange nations being the *gift of tongues*, with which the
 ‘ apostles were furnished at first, and since they are all forced
 ‘ to acknowledge that is wanting to them, we have all possible
 ‘ reason to conclude that God would not change his method, or
 ‘ qualify men to work wonders, and not give them that which is
 ‘ both the most sensible and most useful of all others, towards that
 ‘ end for which he authorizes them.’ Mr Irving holds at present
 apparently the same opinion.* At a missionary meeting not long

* The taunts of Roman Catholic polemics, on the idleness of the reformed churches in missionary labours, induced the latter, in their justification, at one time to insinuate, that the possession of these gifts was necessary as a sign, before sober men could allow themselves to take part in the conversion of the heathen. It is a condition which, on contemplating how fair a portion of the zeal, and life, and resources of Christendom has been since wasted in this benevolent crusade, one is almost tempted to regret that they subsequently abandoned. Grotius, it will be seen, was not singular in his expectations (in Marc. xvi. 17), although they are criticised by Hey as rash. ‘ If any person were employed in it at this day, in a manner agreeable to the will of our Lord, he would find himself indued with a power of working miracles.’ Tillotson, in his Sermon on the Evidence of our Lord’s Resurrection, speaks to the same effect : ‘ Therefore, I think it still very credible, that if persons of sincere minds did go to preach the pure Christian religion, free from those errors and superstitions which have crept into it, to infidel nations, that God would still enable such persons to *work miracles*, without which there would be little or no probability of success.’ So does Barrow : ‘ Neither, perhaps, is the communication of this divine virtue so ceased now, that it would be wanting upon any needful occasion ; the frequent performance of such works among them in whom faith, by abundance of other competent means, may be produced and confirmed, unto whom also the first miracles are virtually present by the aid of history and good reason, is indeed nowise necessary, nor perhaps would be convenient ; but did the same pious zeal for God’s honour, and the same charitable earnestness for men’s good, excite any persons now to attempt the conversion of infidels to the sincere Christian truth, I see no reason to doubt but that such persons would be enabled to perform whatever miraculous works should conduce to that purpose ; for the Lord’s hand is not shortened—the grace of Christ is not straitened—the name of Jesus hath not lost its virtue.’ Our subsequent experience of heathen nations, especially in Martyu’s controversy with the Mahommedan doctors, the little value which barbarians, and even educated Mussulmans, place on miracles as evidence of the will of the Deity, in consequence of their belief in magic, or in intermediate agency, seem to make it questionable whether the gift of miraculous powers could be sufficient for the purpose, unless

ago, we remember that his zeal was so dramatic, that the newspapers described him to have left his watch in pawn for his subscription. We conclude that he had not then made the following application of Isaiah, which we now find under his authority in the pages of the *Morning Watch*: ‘The prophet Isaiah is showing what controversy and argument God would maintain with a nation for the testimony of Christ; and he asserts it to be twofold—the internal testimony of truth and holiness, and the external testimony of signs and wonders. Those who, sending missionaries into foreign lands, will assert less to be necessary now, must find their warrant for it somewhere else than here, where there is a distinct contradiction of it.’

By the above account of it, the gift of tongues, in point of evidence and of object, almost complies with the conditions which criterionists require. It appears to be a species of supernatural endowment, which admits of satisfactory proof. It is, moreover, so valuable an assistance, that it has been by some thought to be an indispensable instrument for the conversion of the heathen. This becomes, therefore, one of the cases where we can conceive that the claim of miraculous powers may be preferred and established under circumstances sufficient to negative the possibility of human error, as well as of demoniacal illusion. The question is, whether there is any thing in the facts stated to have occurred at Port-Glasgow which reasonable persons can acknowledge to answer that description.

The only evidence given in detail of the nature of these ‘extraordinary manifestations,’ is in a letter (no less remarkable for the sobriety of its tone, than for the uncommonness of the sub-

some previous change was operated on their understandings. Their minds at present seem scarcely in a fit state to comprehend either the external or internal evidences of Christianity. It is impossible to read such discourses as that which Foster has subjoined to his *Essay on Popular Ignorance*, or as Heber’s *Sermon on the Conversion of the Heathen*, and not feel some scruple at the propriety of even hinting an objection to missionary labours. But nothing less than the anticipation of miraculous assistance, visible or invisible, would justify the course which has been pursued. The result proves that such assistance has been hitherto withheld. These failures are not merely a stumbling-block to the scorner who is looking on. They seem to raise a presumption in favour of the view taken by Grotius and Barrow, Bishop Burnet and Archbishop Tillotson. In the absence of miraculous powers, there should be some warrant either in scripture, or in experience, or from the nature of the case, for a probability of success. Otherwise, the lives of admirable men may continue to be sacrificed in vain.

ject of its narration) from Mr Cardale of Bedford-row, London. Mr Cardale, together with five companions, appears to have lately travelled to Port-Glasgow, and to have staid there three weeks, for the purpose of coming to a definite opinion, on the supposed inspiration of the Macdonalds. During their stay, they regularly attended the prayer-meetings, which are strictly private, and take place every evening. The history of one meeting is the history of all—a mixture of reading the Bible, of prayer, and of speaking, or rather of chanting, in an unknown tongue. Four persons spoke the first evening; of whom two only, Mr Macdonald and their servant woman, appear then to have spoken in unknown tongues. However, two ladies, who had then only received the gift of the spirit, under which they that evening gave testimony of the coming judgments, received the gift of tongues also, whilst Mr Cardale was in the country. Four individuals were admitted to this spiritual honour during the short period of a visit of three weeks. The gifted number amounted to nine in all. Of these he says,—

‘ The tongues spoken by all the several persons who had received the gift, are perfectly distinct in themselves, and from each other. J. Macdonald speaks two tongues, both easily discernible from each other. I easily perceived when he was speaking in the one, and when in the other tongue. J. Macdonald exercises his gift more frequently than any of the others; and I have heard him speak for twenty minutes together, with all the energy of voice and action of an orator addressing an audience. The language which he then, and indeed generally, uttered, is very full and harmonious, containing many Greek and Latin radicals, and with inflections also much resembling those of the Greek language. I also frequently noticed that he employed the same radical with different inflections; but I do not remember to have noticed his employing two words together, both of which, as to root and inflection, I could pronounce to belong to any language with which I am acquainted. G. Macdonald’s tongue is harsher in its syllables, but more grand in general expression. The only time I ever had a serious doubt whether the unknown sounds which I heard on these occasions were parts of a language, was when the Macdonalds’ servant spoke during the first evening. When she spoke on subsequent occasions, it was invariably in one tongue, which was not only perfectly distinct from the sounds she uttered at the first meeting, but was satisfactorily established, to my conviction, to be a language.’—‘ One of the persons thus gifted, we employed as our servant while at Port-Glasgow. She is a remarkably quiet, steady, phlegmatic person, entirely devoid of forwardness or of enthusiasm, and with

‘very little to say for herself in the ordinary way. The language which she spoke was as distinct as the others; and, in her case, as in the others, (with the exceptions I have before mentioned,) it was quite evident to a hearer that the language spoken at one time was identical with that spoken at another time.’ Though the ordinary voice of a gifted person may be unpleasing, yet, when it is employed in singing in the spirit, the tones and voice become perfectly harmonious. However great may be the exertion, it neither discomposes nor exhausts them. One of the ladies, who was only able to whisper from cold, both before and after the inspiration came on, nevertheless, one day, spoke in a loud voice for four hours continuously without the slightest exhaustion. Their whole appearance is that of supernatural direction. ‘They declare that their organs of speech are made use of by the Spirit of God; and that they utter that which is given to them, and not the expression of their own conceptions, or their own intention. But I had numerous opportunities of observing a variety of facts fully confirmatory of this.’ Mr Cardale closes this singular narrative by declaring, that the parties ‘are totally devoid of any thing like fanaticism or enthusiasm; but, on the contrary, are persons of great simplicity of character, and of sound common sense. They have no fanciful theology of their own; they make no pretensions to deep knowledge; they are the very opposite of sectarians, both in conduct and principle; they do not assume to be teachers; they are not deeply read, but they seek to be taught of God, in the perusal of, and meditation on, his revealed word, and to “live quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness “and honesty.”’ So stands the evidence up to a very recent period, as reported by a favourable, however faithful, witness; and it cannot be denied but that it represents a very singular exhibition.

Unfortunately, the scene which is here described, and which is assumed to carry on its surface the characteristic marks of the Holy Spirit, corresponds neither in evidence nor in object with the miracle which Christian writers have formerly understood under the title of the gift of tongues. The marvellous stories recorded by Dr Abercrombie, in connexion with Somnambulism, though they pretend to nothing of the sort, are much nearer approximations to it. Before a foundation can be laid for any argument or inference concerning divine inspiration, it must be clear that the sounds uttered on these occasions constitute such a language as the parties uttering them never could have been put in possession of by human means. By the expression, ‘an unknown language,’ must for this purpose be understood, not a mere mass of words professing to be a language, although

nobody knows it to be one, or has the means of knowing. Fabrications of this sort, both by way of amusement and of deception, are by no means uncommon, and have frequently succeeded for a time. The two things necessary to be made out are plain enough in themselves, and may be verified in a manner satisfactory to all men. Let the alleged language be proved to be a real one, by witnesses who know the language in question, and who, by interpretation or otherwise, can satisfy the public of the fact. When this is done—and not before—we may be asked to pass on to the enquiry, what is the evidence that the parties concerned had no means, either natural or acquired, of becoming acquainted with it? This second point never can arise until the first is established by direct evidence. Rumours were at one time circulated, that a lady going into their place of assembling, had on a sudden felt herself constrained to interpret. Mr Erskine also mentions a half sentence, which was understood to be the first breaking up of the silence of centuries on the part of the living God. But the gift of interpretation apparently has stopped short with half-a-dozen ambiguous words. The parties who represent themselves as speaking that which the Spirit putteth into their mouth, do not even themselves profess to understand a syllable of what they are saying; nor is there any human being who does. It is not easy to see what end could be proposed, in a case of this sort, by the medical certificates which were promised us, unless doctors were to be asked to vouch for the sanity of their patients upon general subjects. A hundred certificates to that effect would be beside the question. Independent of the niceties of partial insanity, hypothesis arrayed against hypothesis would be but conjecture after all. No test can be received in lieu of specific proof, directly establishing in the words spoken the existence of at least some one intelligible language. The public guarantee adopted for the purpose of authenticating the cures said to be performed by Prince Hohenlohe, is inapplicable to the manifestations in the west country. A writ in restraint of Protestant prophesying in an unknown language, unless in the presence of Dr Wilkins or Professor Lee, is difficult to execute; nor can it afford a shred of satisfaction, whilst the tongue thus assumed to be unknown to the family of Macdonald, remains equally unknown to our polyglot professors. The necessity of obtaining from these celebrated linguists some external evidence, in corroboration of these supposed gifts, was admitted by the attempt to reduce the sacred sounds to writing, in order to discover a similarity between the prophetic hieroglyphics and some nondescript dialect of Malay. These endeavours, how-

ever, failed. It has not been the fault of the advocates of this unprecedented cause, that interpreters have refused to give their words a meaning, or linguists been unable to find in their pothooks an approximation to the form of some distant Oriental character. Their final determination to proceed without evidence has been forced upon them by the melancholy discovery, that no evidence was to be had. Mr Cardale's letter makes out nothing supernatural—still less does it make out any thing, which, if supernatural, must be necessarily divine. In the first place, the power of framing a form of speech which shall sound to the ear less like gibberish than like the inflections of a compacted language, (so far from being an impossibility,) does not seem entitled to the rank of a very high degree of improbability. In the next place, on the supposition that the whole spectacle is clearly supernatural, surely there is nothing so immensely edifying in grown up people meeting to talk or to declaim in an unknown tongue, that one is compelled to attribute such a violation of the laws of nature to the deliberate hand of God, and not to the capricious perverseness of Satan. The physical effort of the human voice, *vox et præterea nihil*, whilst it remains unintelligible, cannot pretend to be of any value as a delivery of doctrine. This wild waste of human breath seems to be a work neither of goodness or mercy, nor of a redemptionary, nor of any other moral character whatever. It is no compliment to the discretion of our age, if the mere possibility that a hitherto incomprehensible vocabulary may ultimately turn out to be a language, is capable of being stated as authority even for a possibility of belief; especially when the assumed revival of the power of the apostles appears not in Africa or India, but on the shores of Scotland; under circumstances, too, which do not admit of its being ascertained whether it be truth or error; and where, if a truth, its usefulness is thrown away.

It will be found, that the fair conclusions to be drawn from the historical accounts transmitted to us in the New Testament, are not at variance with the above conclusion, as drawn from reason. In this, as in other cases, the contradictions between reason and revelation, in the raising and exaggerating of which some minds seem to find such dangerous amusement, are of man's making, not of God's. They principally arise from the restless and fortune-telling curiosity of explaining every thing, and from the pedantic vanity of obscuring the simplest and most practical truths of scripture, by extravagant and conjectural applications of its metaphysical, poetical, or narrative passages. Theologians look for truth, as children on excursions seek for

pleasure, by leaving the plain path and the light of day, to penetrate into caverns, and scramble in the dark. Allowing, for the sake of argument, that the course of the miracles which were performed at the first promulgation of the Gospel, may be appealed to as a precedent applicable to the times in which we live, no presumption in favour of the miraculous nature of any uninterpreted declamation can be extorted out of the Scriptures. It is incredible that Christian writers should fancy they perceive, in the manifestations at Port-Glasgow, a repetition of the glorious gift which descended upon the church at and after the day of Pentecost. Mr Erskine says, ‘The world dislikes the recurrence of miracles. And yet, it is true, that miracles have recurred. I cannot but tell what I have seen and heard. I have heard persons, both men and women, speak with tongues and prophesy, that is, speak in the spirit to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.’ He immediately adds, ‘The gift of tongues, when unaccompanied with interpretation, is ranked in the Scriptures as the lowest of the spiritual gifts—and it is the only one which has been decidedly manifested as a *permanent* gift in any of the persons on whom the present outpouring of the spirit has come.’ Now, every thing related in Scripture on this subject, is linked and bound up with the persons of the apostles—and accordingly with the sanction of the day of Pentecost itself. In every individual case, where, during the life of the apostles, this gift was afterwards derived to others through their ministration, the solemnity and publicity of its first communication to themselves was part of the title of its truth transmitted to their converts. No stronger contrast can be imagined than between these scenes. Where are the cloven tongues like as of fire? Where are the devout men of every nation under heaven, who not merely heard the apostles speaking in their own tongues, but heard them bearing testimony to the wonderful works of God? Besides, the gift, as afterwards exercised, was not a single power, but one of many gifts, under a system of concurrent miracles. The fact, in every instance, must also be assumed to have been established by its appropriate proof. There is no reason to suspect the contrary. Although Middleton, in his *Essay on the Gift of Tongues*, may have made it probable, that in the instance of Cornelius and the disciples at Ephesus, the party assembled was of the same speech, and that therefore the speaking with tongues could operate immediately in their persons only for a sign of their real admission into the church of Christ; yet there is nothing to authorize the least suspicion, but that the reality of the language on

these several occasions was distinctly and conclusively ascertained. This is true, also, of that very singular spectacle recorded in the 14th chapter of the Corinthians, on which occasion, the abuse of tongues by some weak members of the church of Corinth to the purpose of ostentation and spiritual pride, is censured and forbidden. There is not a syllable in the account of the transaction, implying that the gift had not, in the person of every claimant to it, originally been verified by an interpreter, or some sufficient medium of proof. The Apostle evidently admits, that the faculty in question had been given by inspiration, though the parties, being left, it seems, to their own discretion in the mode of exercising it, had turned the very gift of God into the means of scandal and disorder. It surely can afford no great presumption in behalf of the proposition, that God is really present at the meetings of the family of Macdonald, when the scene described by their literary friends is precisely the scene which the Epistle appealed to was written to condemn. If this gifted family and their believers will attentively peruse the chapter, (even without Locke's comment on it,) they will find it written, that they are 'to keep silence if there be no interpreter.' In order to obviate the pretext of being carried away by the spirit, contrary to this injunction, the Apostle informs us that no such constraint exists. They are left personally answerable for their behaviour, since 'the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.' Consequently, had this supposed language been ever proved to be a real one, the speaking it by these persons in the absence of an interpreter, is in express disobedience to the direction of St Paul. The case, therefore, under those circumstances would stand thus:—the power seems indeed at first to have been given by God; but every instance in which it has been since exercised, is in direct violation of the orders of his apostle. God therefore is less likely to be present at, or concerned in these performances, than that adversary, of whose communications, the less that is interpreted, so much the better for mankind.

The late attempt to excite the religious public, took its rise altogether from the assumed miraculous nature of the particular facts which we have been examining. It might be expected, therefore, that the excitement should at once subside on its being shown that the facts fell short of possessing the specific and characteristic evidence with which a miracle must necessarily be impressed, in order that a belief in one can be reasonably justified—much more can be reasonably required. But the prodigies which served at the beginning to startle and attract, (the Scotch portion of which were hailed by Mr Erskine as the voice

of God once more heard in the world, ‘after a long and deathlike ‘silence,’) are, it seems, no longer the marvellous phenomena which they were supposed to be. They have dwindled into comparative unimportance under the comprehensive argument and more magnificent views which have by degrees opened on their early patrons. For after the due sensation had been produced by the announcement of a miracle, it was soon discovered that miracles were placed in a false light, when they were represented as novelties and something extraordinary. Whereas, on the contrary, it could be proved, chapter and verse, that such things must be facts of every day’s occurrence, both in the shape of the supernatural interpositions, by which God, it is said, has promised to answer the prayers of the faithful, as well as in the shape of such powers and gifts of the spirit as are an absolute and indefeasible inheritance assured to every Christian. The only contingency on which a failure of miracles, at any period, can arise, is the awful one, of there being no instance in which prayer is truly and acceptably offered up to God—no congregation which can deserve to be called the church of Christ—and no single Christian who is really a Christian in spirit and in truth.

We will examine shortly the reasoning in both cases. First, in respect of prayer. The *Morning Watch* may save itself the trouble of publishing the two or three other cases which it professes to be keeping in reserve, provided that its writers can satisfy the public of the justness of the argument on which the following assertions rest. ‘So far from thinking the cure of ‘Miss Fancourt extraordinary, whether miraculous or not, we ‘believe that hundreds and thousands of similar cases have occurred in our own times, among the poor in spirit who are ‘rich in faith.’ (P. 213.) ‘It is a mere mockery of God to ‘pray without expecting an answer; and that such answers to ‘prayer, such *miracles*, have been experienced by *every* believer; ‘that the life of faith cannot subsist without them; and that, ‘so far from wondering at the occurrence of miracles, we wonder at their apparent rarity, and could adduce from our own ‘experience, and that of intimate friends, facts of daily occurrence as supernatural as the sudden cure of Miss Fancourt.’ (P. 150.) ‘Every miracle is an answer to prayer, and the prayer ‘of faith is omnipotent.’ (P. 149.)

A statement of this description cannot be made so much in utter ignorance, as in complete defiance of every thing which pious, yet reasonable men (Christian and even heathen) have ever thought or written upon that most difficult subject—prayer. It is false philosophically, if we consider the duty of prayer on

principles of reason and natural religion. It must be false, as a matter of scriptural interpretation, if we find the whole evidence of history and of our own experience, in contradiction with the meaning which these declarations affix to particular passages in the Bible. It must be false also morally, from the mischievousness which such language often has produced, and must produce again, by misleading honest, but dreaming and fuming spirits.

A pleasure in religious considerations, is a necessary mark and consequence of a devotional spirit. Such considerations will also, from a consciousness of our weakness, probably generally end by assuming more or less the character of prayer. Instead of criticising the tendency, or checking it in himself or others, a pious mind must delight in the privilege of almost personal intercourse, which this form of address implies. It is only when the privilege is misunderstood, and abused to the caprices of extravagant delusion, that reason is called on to interpose a few moderating suggestions. There are certain prayers which, as is said of certain prophecies, do their own work, and fulfil themselves. In praying to be holier and better, there can be no mistake either in the propriety of the object, or in the certainty of the result. But prayer, in the strict and limited sense of a direct petition for some specific and tangible favour—for visible and outward things—is the lowest and most doubtful expression in which religious feeling can indulge. What is called *saying our prayers* ought to be a far wiser and nobler exercise—an adoration of the divine perfections, a deep gratitude for the blessings of this life, and for the expectation of a better—an awful sense of the divine presence, (at once the most inspiring of all encouragements, and the most efficient of all controls for our degenerate nature,) an intense acknowledgment of entire dependence, a throwing ourselves into the arms, or rather at the feet of one ‘who knoweth our infirmities before we ask, and ‘our ignorance in asking.’ So considered and practised, prayer is a religious instinct which in some shape or other can never be long dormant in the hearts of those who believe in God as in a friend and father. In proportion as we were to arrive at more perfect views of God, and become less and less imperfect in our own characters, we should probably be less disposed to abandon these heights of religious aspiration, and descend to lower ground. It need not be questioned, however, but that in our present state the sphere of celestial vision may often be reduced, and definite subjects selected, with unmixed benefit. Most of us would naturally, and many do habitually, proceed much further towards the using prayer as a catalogue of earthly wants. It has

even been made an objection to public service, that it is not capable of being rendered sufficiently individual. Now, in this respect, as far as the effect upon ourselves is concerned, nothing, it may be allowed, can be more salutary or purifying, than to bring the particulars and details of our interests, and thoughts, and feelings, at once into the presence-chamber of God. Superstition can rarely have so corrupted its conceptions of the divine character, that our conduct and motives will not change their nature for the better by the sanctity of the place. This advantage is so valuable, and the difficulty of discovering any successful method of refreshing, and, as it were, ventilating our impure moral atmosphere by the breath of life, is so great, that a man might well shrink from the thought of disturbing a single inducement to prayer on the part of any of his fellow-creatures, merely because the inducement in its actual condition would not stand the test of philosophical analysis. But no error can, on the long run, really serve God or man. And it is the nature of this particular error to be exposed to hourly risks of heated exaggeration, such as shall speedily overbalance any good purpose to be served by it in more fortunate or more cautious hands. We are, it is true, permitted to ask, but we are not permitted to see or understand the nature and quality of the answer. ‘We are sure,’ says Taylor, ‘of a blessing, but in what instance we are not yet assured. We must hope for such things which He hath permitted us to ask, and our hope shall not be vain, though we miss what is not absolutely promised: because we shall at least have an equal blessing in the denial as in the grant.’ On the other hand, to choose not only our prayer, but the way in which it shall be answered—with a view not to the beneficial effect to be produced upon our own hearts, not in order that we may show in prayer the blossom, as in good works the fruit of holiness; but with a view to the direct effect to be produced on the divine will, is surely to mistake our situation and capacity. We are, by such a course, attributing too little to our heavenly Father, and too much, a great deal, to ourselves. To talk of the omnipotence of prayer, and of mocking or being mocked, unless we expect an answer to our prayers, is changing places, and putting God into the hands of man, instead of leaving ourselves, with pious confidence, in the hands of God. It might be expected of the Christian, that he should feel at least as solemnly as the Roman satirist, *Carior est illis homo quam sibi*. Indeed, the danger of praying amiss, and of being ‘cursed with a granted prayer,’ is so imminent, that the boldest man might decline to accept the terrible responsibility conveyed under the blind alternative condition of prayer being either omnipotent or

a mockery. Christ has left us a prayer. They who in their presumption object to it as too general, are not likely persons to improve it by adapting it more individually to their own wants or wishes. It is almost impossible to express in words the circumstances of one of these victories over the divine intentions, supposed to be obtained by prayer—to adapt to the use of modern kings the dial of Hezekiah—and avoid the appearance of nonsense or profaneness.

Paley, whom it is pitiable to see this little school of sciolist and dogmatical pretension affecting to despise as a second-rate secular theologian, has collected out of the Scriptures the texts in which a promise seems to be annexed to prayer. We know of no case where it is more necessary steadily to apply Jeremy Taylor's caution—'Absurdities to avoid is the only rule for interpreting many passages.' The Quakers even do not think it necessary to give a man who takes their coat their cloak also. Now no absurdity can be greater, than for a teacher of Christianity to put such an interpretation on the Christian Scriptures, as will place them in daily and hourly contradiction with facts, for the truth of which we have all the evidence that our nature is capable of receiving. In our former observations we have denied, on principles of reason and natural religion, the right of a mere mortal to address the supreme Being on any specific subject for direct testimony of regard or aid, on the understanding that he is authorized to expect a direct and visible answer to such prayers. Our further statement is, that it is a fact within every day's experience, that prayers, under whatever circumstance or expectation they may be addressed, often fail of obtaining their immediate object. So often, that although the event which has been prayed for may occasionally take place, no rational person will pretend to connect the petition and the result as cause and effect. If the sun broke out whilst a congregation was praying for fine weather, the village philosophers would hardly think the experiment conclusive. Much less, on the supposition of a prayer of this description or any other, would a sensible teacher of the people undertake to tell them, that prayer, when duly offered, must be omnipotent, or the Bible be untrue. What manner of claim can any given number of ladies and gentlemen have to call the meaning which they think fit to attribute to certain passages, *the Bible?* Especially when the consent of Christendom is against them. In a case, too, where a certain degree of violence of construction, and latitude of interpretation, by means of which the authority of Scripture is to be brought into conformity with the daily experience of human life, is the only improbability on one side—whilst a total

contradiction of all experience, is the improbability gratuitously created by their interpretation, on the other.

There is no necessity, on the present occasion, to raise any question concerning a particular providence. Its operation may be assumed. But, unless this operation can in any case be authenticated as such, and be made sensible to third persons, as an act distinguished from the course of God's ordinary providential government, no opportunity can arise of turning the general admission to any practical account in an attempt to ascertain the character of even the most unaccountable events. Whatever may be in any case our personal feeling, or the inclination of our own conjectures, particular effects cannot be expressly assigned to one class, whenever, from the narrowness of human knowledge concerning what falls within and what without the circle of God's ordinary government, they might as properly and plausibly be arranged under the other. This, one should have thought, was, as a question of fact, so clear, in the instance of external results at least, when they were sought to be obtained by prayer, that the appearance of an argument could not be maintained on the contrary supposition. The following excellent observations by Paley must be true of prayer; since they are true in a case, not so clear, because not so visibly open to the appeal to facts—the influence of the spirit. 'Undoubtedly God can, if he please, give that tact and quality to his communications, that they shall be perceived to be divine communications at the time. And this, probably, was very frequently the case with the prophets, with the apostles, and with inspired men of old. But it is not the case naturally; by which I mean, that it is not the case according to the constitution of the human soul. It does not appear by experience to be the case usually. What would be the effect of the influence of the Divine Spirit being always, or generally accompanied, with a distinct notice, it is difficult even to conjecture. One thing may be said of it, that it would be putting us under a quite different dispensation. It would be putting us under a miraculous dispensation; for the agency of the spirit in our souls distinctly perceived is, properly speaking, a miracle. Now, miracles are instruments in the hand of God of signal and extraordinary effects, produced upon signal and extraordinary occasions. Neither internally nor externally do they form the ordinary course of his proceeding with his reasonable creatures. And in this there is a close analogy with the course of nature, as carried on under the divine government. We have every reason which Scripture can give us for believing that God frequently interposes to turn and guide the order of events in the world,

‘so as to make them execute his purpose: yet we do not so perceive these interpositions as, either always or generally, to distinguish them from the natural progress of things. His providence is real, but unseen. We distinguish not between the acts of God and the course of nature. It is so with the spirit. When, therefore, we teach that good men may be led, or bad men converted, by the spirit of God, and yet they themselves not distinguish his holy influence; we teach no more than what is conformable, as, I think, has been shown, to the frame of the human mind, or rather to our degree of acquaintance with that frame: and also analogous to the exercise of divine power in other things: and also necessary to be so; unless it should have pleased God to put us under a quite different dispensation, that is, under a dispensation of constant miracles.’ It is much to be lamented, for the sake of religion, that Christian writers can be found who are so ignorant of their case, as to supersede the theology of Paley by the sceptical sophism of Hume, and expressly admit the truth of Hume’s misrepresentation—that ‘whoever believes the Christian religion is conscious of a continued miracle in his own person.’ These people complain that Christianity has not been preached since the third century. Can they really imagine that the example which they are presenting of headlong credulity, or insane personal presumption, and the view which they are labouring to exhibit of Christianity, are things likely to advance its kingdom in the centuries which are to come?

Serious dangers have arisen, and must arise again, from this misconception of the nature of the promises annexed, and of the answer to be returned, to prayer. Nations in different stages of civilisation try to secure the object of their prayers by different measures. The savage scourges his idol when his petitions are unsuccessful, in order to extort by fear what he has missed by favour. The Spartans were accustomed, during war, to offer up public prayers at an earlier hour than usual, with the view of getting the first word, and being beforehand with their enemies. Manœuvres of this sort seem at first sight to convey more unworthy notions of the Supreme Being than any of the credulous calculations of modern superstition: but they are not necessarily so mischievous. For they will not necessarily lead to such violent excesses as, in periods of personal or national excitement, must be first produced and then justified, and finally gloried in—whether under a presumptuous misapplication of the peculiar dispensation of the Old Testament, or an oracular reliance on the supernatural influence of prayer.

This is one of the wild accompaniments of new doctrines,

which, if the doctrines live long enough to form into a system, we hear no more of in the second generation. The quiet Quakers, on their first appearance, gave some singular demonstrations of mystic trust in the infallible operations and responses of the Spirit. The frantic principle, that when man asks, God must answer, if once thoroughly engrained, cannot be met by argument. In such a case, whatever any person may feel, or represent to be a divine command or promise, must be left to take its chance of being refuted by the result. According to Hume, a female Quaker came naked into the church where the Protector sat, under the conviction that she was moved by the Spirit to appear as a sign to the people. Proof of confidence in their prayers, prevailed even over life itself. Some of the sect attempted to fast forty days, in imitation of Christ. One carried his faith so far as to perish in the experiment. It was among the tenets of Muncer, the chief apostle of the Anabaptists, that signs and tokens were granted to his prayers, as part of his immediate intercourse with Heaven. When the German princes marched against him, he mistook, or misrepresented a rainbow, which happened to be in the heavens at the time, for a personal assurance of success. His followers were cut to pieces whilst watching the sign, and waiting for the Divine assistance, of which their faith believed it to be the pledge. ‘Seeking the ‘Lord,’ (with what reward, history tells us,) became a proverb in our civil wars. The interests of society would be protected against one of its worst convulsions, if fanatics could be taught that either miracles, or the means of discerning between God and Satan, are signs, beyond what man is entitled to expect on his behalf, and at his pleasure. We need not then fear that the folly or passions of mankind will again take refuge under the mantle of the Lord, or that a coal from the altar shall be ever found to be the readiest instrument for consecrating and inflaming the most misguided infirmities of our nature. When can we be safe whilst such absurd notions concerning prayer continue to be not merely countenanced, but expressly taught the people by their spiritual instructors? In this case, future Harrisons must continue to address future judges, in the unanswerable expostulations of the regicides of Charles the First. ‘Often,’ exclaimed he, ‘have I besought, with tears and supplications, the great ‘Searcher of the human heart, to whom you, and all kingdoms, ‘are less than a drop of water, to vouchsafe to me some conviction on my conscience; and I have received assurances, and ‘I firmly believe, Heaven will, ere long, testify, that there was ‘more of God than men suppose, in the marvellous acts which ‘have been performed.’

Any general proposition which assigns to human prayers an acknowledged and visible control over the laws of nature, appears to be encompassed with irreconcilable objections. Opinions, proceeding on the extremes of improbability, scarcely admit of degrees. But the gigantic scale of this system, enables its builders to master this difficulty. Wandering among their absurdities is a mountain journey. Alps after Alps arise. Their other point of controversy is the perpetuity of spiritual powers. What can be said of reasonings which (if they make out any thing) make out that every Christian must be able to show, as part of his title, that he is in possession of some miraculous gift or other in his own communion—indeed, in his own person? The very maintenance of such a thesis exhibits a mind capable of looking only at one side of a question, when there may be not only two sides to it, but perhaps a dozen. We do not deny them the merit of linking together a regular and imposing chain of texts—very valuable, in case they had been making a concordance, and not an argument. Under the circumstances, no more satisfactory example could be wished for, of the necessity of bringing to account, on such occasions, the opposite considerations, and giving each their due value, before we state the balance and result. It might be taken as a specimen of the maxim, that an argument which rests on a single line of deductions, however logically correct it may appear to be, or may really be within its own narrow process, can lead only to fallacies and arrogance in moral reasonings. There is no want, to be sure, of inconsistent assumptions, or conflicting inferences, in the miscellany of paradoxes, which, unsorted and unmustered, seem, in the present instance, to be brought together to the support of the same cause, by some unintelligible sympathy. There is also variety enough, if that were all, in the front of battle, which the literary followers ‘of the mightiest champion of God ‘in Britain’ present on different occasions.

These inconsistencies make the task of refutation obscure and endless. Mr Irving and Mr Scott agree in reprobating, as ‘a ‘wide-spread error,’ and an ‘arbitrary addition to revelation,’ the idea, that miraculous works in general can, even under the circumstances of an accompanying revelation, be appealed to as the witness of God. On this point, they do not condescend to explain themselves farther than by saying, that the miracles of Christ were of a certain description—were Gospel works—that catalogues of them are frequently referred to in the New Testament—and that Christ claimed for them a ‘moral character,’ as their distinguishing mark. Notwithstanding the discredit thus thrown by them on the simple exercise of supernatural powers,

used as a divine evidence, they have no hesitation in taking a leading part in the present controversy, and in giving the proceedings at Port Glasgow the implied sanction of their doctoral authority. If miracles are ‘an element, and but an element, of truth which commends itself to the consciences of men’—and if the moral character of God, independent of revelation, requires that man should be addressed ‘as a rational, that is, as a moral and spiritual being,’ Mr Scott would find it difficult, one should think, to establish the requisite characteristics in a transaction which consists of the display of only just so much superhuman power as goes to the uttering of unintelligible sounds. In its present state of proof, this mere volubility of mechanical sounds (since words they are not shown to be) does not attain to the degree of evidence of divine inspiration which the Puritans so stoutly contended for in the volubility of language poured forth by their gifted preachers. Nevertheless, the wiser divines of Charles the First held it a despising of the spirit of Christ ‘to make it no other than the breath of our lungs,—that useless gift of speaking, to which the nature of many men, and the art of all learned men, and the very use and confidence of ignorant men, is too abundantly sufficient.’ If our contemporaries could condescend to look into the opinions of distinguished churchmen concerning miracles, they would have found that no ‘arbitrary addition to revelation’ has been invented by them. There is no absolute system of evidence or rule of faith prescribed or adopted by the church on this subject. The task, however, of bringing contradictory accusations, is an easier one than that of endeavouring to ascertain or reconcile the opinions published by others, or even by themselves. At one moment, the church is reproached by Mr Scott with prejudicing the expectation of spiritual gifts; since it is described as holding the erroneous tenet, that miracles are wanted only to prove a divine revelation, and that when this is ascertained, they become of no further use. At another time, the ‘limited view which is now satisfying the churches who think that every superhuman work is necessarily of God,’ is complained of by Mr Irving as being ‘a great means of laying them open to the signs and wonders which the false Christs and false prophets prophesied to appear in the time of the end, shall work.’

It is a suspicious circumstance, that the sudden appearance of so startling a point of faith as the universality of the promise of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, should have entirely originated out of these very recent and very unauthenticable facts. Mr Erskine, in his tract on the *Gifts of the Spirit*, as well

as in that of *The Brazen Serpent*, admits that miracles are novelties in the ecclesiastical history of latter times. There is affirmed, however, to be a corresponding novelty in the atheism of our period, and even of our religion, (for men, it is said, have now a bundle of doctrines, a religion, instead of a God,) which can be only overcome by our being thus made aware of the proximity of the living God. He declares, accordingly, that the sealing of the revelations, and the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel, are one thing, and that thing is, the *re-endowment* of the church with the miraculous gifts, just before the great and terrible day of the Lord. This day has been denounced to be near at hand by some enthusiast or other, almost every year, since the death of the Apostles. Men have crowded to hill-tops, built arks, slept in their carriages, and (what was more decisive) left their lands to Mother-Church, century after century, under this delusion. Mankind are now again told, for the ten thousandth time, that they are actually standing on the brink of the precipice of that awful period, when (whatever interruption may have occurred in the manifestation of gifts) there will be a re-appearance of them. A writer in the *Morning Watch* takes the same view of our age. The confounding God with his laws, is asserted to be the appropriate error for which miracles are required at present, just as much as in the times of the Apostles. It was therefore to our infinite surprise, that we found it declared, a little farther on, that the danger and the unscripturalness of the expression of the age of miracles having revived, consists in the word *revived*; 'for we utterly deny,' says a colleague, 'that the age of miracles has ever ceased.' It is rather premature to call for the judgment of the public on the theological portion of this argument, whilst its learned advocates are disagreeing on the point of fact; especially when the fact is one on which, according as it is assumed one way or another, the whole bearing of the argument must be changed. There is something very characteristic in the mode by which, under their difference of opinion, and in their uncertainty whether miracles have ever ceased, Mr Irving and Mr Erskine respectively approach this argumentative dilemma. Mr Irving, with a boldness never enough to be admired, gives his adversaries the choice of the alternative. He proves to his own satisfaction, from texts in Scripture, that miraculous gifts belong to the Christian, in his double capacity, as being the temple of God, and the child of Christ. Farther, they are necessarily permanent and universal in the church, in order that they may serve as God's own witness to the words which the ministers of his Son declare. The inference from this hypothesis is delivered

with as much composure, as that two and two make four. The inference is, that miracles and gifts exist cocxtensively with Christianity and Christians. It will readily be conceived that the inventor of this splendid theory declines signifying an express adhesion to the allegation, that, in point of fact, these gifts have for a long time ceased. At the same time, he is satisfied with enshrining the averment of his doubt in a parenthesis of half a line. There is greater difficulty in conceiving the possibility of the answer made by him to the other half of the dilemma. On the supposition of the cessation of miraculous powers, the credit of his hypothesis is saved, by the following extraordinary declaration :—(In plain English, it amounts to the assertion, that if gifts and miracles disappeared in the third century, it is for no other reason than because the Christianity to which the Gospel promises belong, then also disappeared.) ‘ And now I frankly
‘ avow my belief, that there hath been no preaching of the re-
‘ surrection and redemption of the flesh, and of the world, in the
‘ Protestant churches, within my memory; and a very poor
‘ testimony of the redemption of the soul from sin—an Armi-
‘ nian, Pelagian, or particular redemption doctrine, and not a
‘ Christian one—preaching for the honours of a system of ar-
‘ ticles, or of confessions, more than for the honour of Christ.
‘ Certain only preaching of Christ glorified, possessed of the
‘ seven spirits of God—of Christ to come, and redeem the world
‘ from the usurpation of wickedness—of Christ to come, and
‘ raise all the dead to glorify his church, and to cast the wicked
‘ into hell. These are the realities of Christ’s consummate
‘ work, which, being preached, God seals with a first-fruits of
‘ the very thing declared; but these have no more, in an open
‘ manner, been declared in this island, or, I may say, in Chris-
‘ tendom, since the first three centuries, than in regions which
‘ the Gospel hath not visited, and so there has been nothing to
‘ seal to. The seal to the preaching of this time is a good living,
‘ a good name with the world, a reputation for learning and elo-
‘ quence. “ Verily, it hath its reward.”’ In case Mr Irving
preaches Christianity, (which we suppose that he conceives he does,) he has, by his own showing, the apostolical honour of *re-
viving* it, after a suspension, or loss of Christianity, for fifteen hundred years. The mantle of endowments ought also, by the same title, to be found on his favoured shoulders. He does not, however, inform us whether he himself possesses any, or what gift. Still less does he signify any feeling of personal diffidence or alarm at the inference, which, according to his theory, the absence of miraculous powers in his own person, necessarily substantiates against his spiritual doctrine and condition.

Mr Erskine's hypothesis is the same. According to him, 'the connexion between believing and possessing miraculous powers, is as real and permanent as the connexion between believing and being saved.' In a subsequent note, however, the humanity of the author modifies this alarming statement. This is managed, not by expunging the Christianity of fifteen centuries in as many lines, but by a distinction (of which there is no trace in his own or Mr Irving's general argument) between a belief which contains *life*, and may be sufficient for salvation, and a belief which contains *power*. Faith in the remission of sins and the duties of holiness (that is, in John's baptism) is, it seems, enough for the first purpose. But the doctrine of the Headship of Christ, of the special membership of believers, and of the general membership of men, is wanted for the second. Therefore we are only half Christians at present. These distinctions, and their application, are arbitrary refinements upon a passage which Dr Clarke's sensible and decisive sermon on it, ought to have placed beyond the possibility of being tampered with for so empirical a purpose. An alliance with 'the maggots of corrupted texts' leads us to two sorts of Christianity: and this difference is recognised as a regular part of the gospel scriptural system, rather than admit that miracles are not an inherent portion of every Christian's strength. Mr Erskine can hardly disbelieve his own doctrine. Accordingly, if a belief in this doctrine, and a consequent confidence in its results, were alone wanted in order to confer miraculous powers upon a Christian, Mr Erskine ought to be in possession of such powers. With a humility and self-abasement, which virtues less than his could scarcely have united with the same degree of confidence in his own spiritual logic, he confesses the personal imputation. 'I am conscious of writing what testifies against my own want of faith as much as it testifies against others; for I can see no reason but want of faith that hinders the scaling of the Spirit on any man.'

The fact that such a distinction existed, whilst the gift of miracles existed, will not prove the latter gift to exist at present. A man who had faith but as a grain of mustard seed, might, under the express word and authority of Christ, at his first advent, have cast mountains into the sea. We admit that the faith here spoken of (as appears more especially by the passage in which our Saviour upbraids his disciples for not being able to dispossess the lunatic 'because of their unbelief,') was not belief in Christianity generally, but the particular belief that they should be able to accomplish that very work by the power intrusted to them in Christ. The co-operation of this particular belief was

an indispensable condition to the exercise of the gift of miracles even by those to whom the gift was actually committed. But the mere belief is not enough in latter times to constitute the gift. Christendom has proved again and again that this transcendental confidence may exist in vain, and unaccompanied by any gift in the present age. Its failure in the hands of the unfortunate persons whom it has so frequently inspired and betrayed, seems destined to be thrown away as an example. Age after age, an irrepressible ardour hurries on sanguine spirits to grasp at the immediate miraculous reward of an undoubting zeal, in their own way and upon their own terms. In spite of the shipwreck of their predecessors on the self-same adventure, they dread no rocks for their own vessel, and strike on the reef whilst insisting loudest that God will not permit them to be deceived.

There sounds something almost profane in the summary boldness with which, here again, the word of God is staked, and its truth or falsehood made to turn on the fortune of a crude paradoxical speculation. The absence of miracles being assumed, Mr Erskine proceeds to inform us, that this fact can only be accounted for by one alternative; that is, either there is a lack of faith, as just described, in the church, or that the Bible is untrue. In confirmation of his own system, Mr Erskine pays the Prince of Darkness on this occasion a compliment, to which our adversary, however subtle, is not honestly entitled. It is true, that his instruments have not been permitted to use the absence of miracles as an argument against the truth of the Bible. But this silence is perhaps not altogether so crafty and Machiavelian as is suggested. It may be more satisfactorily explained, than by an apprehension on the part of Satan that our sleeping church might have been thus awakened to a sense of her true condition. Supposing the absence of miracles to prove the extinction of orthodox Christianity, we could provide a fiend with no better pastime than that of awakening the church outright, for the pleasure of witnessing her desperate and fruitless struggles. She would assuredly wake too late to restore the credit and influence of revelation, were she to wake on condition of making a contemporaneous acknowledgment that the Scriptures had failed in the object with which they had been revealed to us, and that the kingdom of Christ had done little more than survive the apostles, and then sink into abeyance. Satan left this objection against Christianity to be enforced by its friends, simply because it was not worth the trouble of his picking up. Indeed, the more completely he could keep questions of this kind out of sight, so much the better chance for him and his—at least ac-

ording to the opinion of the most celebrated Protestant divines, as will afterwards appear. Whenever a claim of miracles is preferred, it would seem to be the presumption from the Scriptures, that they are of Satan, rather than that they are of God.

It is agreed on both sides, that miraculous powers were vested in Christ, in his disciples, and in their immediate converts, although in different degrees. The duration of these powers is the present question. If they were not so much attestations of the Gospel as parts of it—and if there is not only no revocation, express or implied, of them contained in the Scriptures,—but, instead, positive promises of their continuance: it would, as is argued, follow, that the nonexistence of them at any period must be received as the most conclusive evidence of the nonexistence of Christian faith. In this case, the test to be substituted, will be—not by their *fruits* shall ye know them, but by their *gifts*. As we doubt whether the interests of Christendom would be advanced by the proposed alteration in the test, we have the less scruple in questioning the validity of the three suppositions assumed for a groundwork to this discouraging conclusion. In the first place, the notion that the possession of miraculous gifts is an *essential part* (inasmuch as it is the necessary consequence) of the faith of a Christian, is a more monstrous absurdity than we ever expected to see in print, till a press should be set up for the amusement of patients in St Luke's. Miracles and miraculous powers are possible indeed in all cases, probable perhaps in some; but essential apparently in none. God may interpose in his own creation by the performance of miracles for a variety of purposes, some within and more doubtless beyond our comprehension—besides that of the mere attestation of his written word. This may be done, either immediately by his direct influence, without the intervention of any angelic, human, or natural agency whatever. Or, he may use special and temporary instruments—as by the employment of intermediate spirits, by inspiring some mortal (like the prophets of old) with superhuman might for particular occasions, or by imparting, under peculiar circumstances and methods, extraordinary efficacy to the ordinary powers of animate or inanimate nature. In the absence of demonological fictions, this last supposition is the source whence, however perversely, the greater part of the charms and enchantments of witchcraft and of magic has been derived. Or, God may raise up and invest either a communion or an individual with permanent authority over either all or over only a portion of his laws. This latter description of authority was committed to the apostles. Even in their persons it appears to have been limited as to its

extent and sphere. There is no warrant in the Scriptures for inferring, that the apostles themselves, still less that any of their personal disciples, constituting the Apostolical Church, had the keys of nature put into their hands, with a plenary commission to lock and unlock its most secret chambers at their pleasure. Whether within this limited sphere their authority was also limited in respect of the occasion and circumstances of its exercise, has been a more disputed point.

To bring back and apply our reasoning to the present point. On two questions of fact there has been considerable debate in Christendom. First, whether visible miracles and miraculous powers, capable of being, and intended to be, recognised as such, have been for sometime altogether withheld? and, secondly, if withheld, from what period this universal suspension is to be dated? The first question has been for the most part treated as one of the points at issue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformed Churches. Rome holds that she is the only channel by which miraculous influences can descend; and that, in point of fact, instances of this description from time to time have actually occurred within her pale. Apparently no certain rule or fixed principle has been laid down, by which their occurrence is limited or may be expected. On the other hand, the great majority of Protestant writers (so great as to constitute, since Protestantism was once fairly established, every thing but the whole) admit, that no miraculous powers whatever belong to their respective communions collectively, or to their individual members. At the same time, they deny that any such gift is continued in the Roman Catholic Church. All the marvellous transactions related in whose legends, are attributed either to the fraud and invention of the parties, or to the delusions of evil spirits. It is but gradually, indeed, and almost reluctantly, that the general faith of Protestantism seems to have settled at this line. The transit was made with considerable difficulty and variance;—subject, of course, to occasional ebbs and flows in the great current of popular superstitions, according to the temper of the times; and subject also to endless shades and diversities, according to the creeds of individual scepticism or credulity. The Romanists, the Anglicans, and the Calvinists, arranged their scale of calculation respecting the nature and degree of communications from the spiritual world, very much on the terms mentioned by Sir Walter Scott towards the commencement of the eighth of his interesting *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*. Theories concerning the personality of Satan, his sensible agency, and that of subordinate spirits, do not, perhaps, necessarily involve, but they appear historically to have been in practice, always closely con-

nected with simultaneous and corresponding theories concerning the mode of intercourse pursued by God towards man in his own dealings with his creatures. This is a part of Christian faith and doctrine, which Henry VIII. did not undertake to establish by act of Parliament. Left to themselves, the English clergy for a considerable time after the Reformation, did not sufficiently reconnoitre the precise ground which it would on this mysterious and popular topic be their pastoral duty or professional interest to defend. Accordingly, they at first shrunk from expressly debarring themselves of some portion of miraculous authority, in their frequent skirmishes with the Roman doctors. Bishop Hall mentions in his Life, a dispute which he fell into in his youth with a Jesuit at Brussels. His antagonist, 'after an imperfect account of the difference of divine miracles and diabolical, thence slipped into a choleric invective against our church; which, as he said, could not yield one miracle. And when I answered, that in our church we had manifest proofs of the ejection of devils by fasting and prayers, he answered, that if it could be proved that any devil was possessed in our church, he would quit his religion.' Freedom of enquiry made such rapid progress in dispelling error, that by the time Bishop Hall was an old man it had found its way into Selden's *Table Talk*, as a popular question to which a vulgar answer had become annexed, 'Why have we none possessed with devils in England?' In point of fact, an excepted case seems to have been kept up under the head of exorcism, within which a corresponding and counteracting power was ascribed and pretended to by those who volunteered their services on the part of God, as long as a belief lasted in servants openly employed and deeds explicitly performed by them on behalf of Satan. Supposing, however, that this counteracting authority had not been accredited, nevertheless 'the shocking inconsistency' remarked upon by Sir Walter Scott, in the opinion that imaginary miracles for purposes of error survived the period of real miracles in support of truth, need not have arisen; since 'the spirit of discernment' would not be wanted to fix its true character on events, for which the supposition, that real miracles were withdrawn, could leave no alternative but delusion and imposture.

The impression that gifts of the spirit, (understanding by them miraculous powers,) have ceased, may be considered at present so positive and universal, that intelligent members of the Roman Catholic clergy would cross-examine any case which was stated to be an exception, with the same suspicion as ourselves. The author of the *Religio laici* retained so much of a layman's rights, as to leave them out from his splendid enumeration of the marks of the Catholic Church in the *Hind and Panther*; although they

form a subject infinitely better adapted to the ornaments of poetry than the parallel doctrine of immunity from errors, on which he expatiates in all the magnificence of his ‘long-resounding march and energy divine.’ Protestant taunts at inconsistency are sufficient to hinder the doctrine itself from being directly conceded by the church, as long as polemics will rather lose a soul than a sneer. Deference to feelings which are as much a point of honour as of faith, must restrict the Roman clergy to the part of simple lookers-on when we come to the second object of enquiry—namely, at what period these powers had ceased. Since the time that reason was first allowed to deal honestly and openly with this topic, the only question among rational and learned Protestants has been, whether the powers closed with the apostles, or were continued three or four centuries lower. Middleton insisted that we have no sufficient reason to believe, upon the authority of the primitive fathers, that any such powers were prolonged to the church after the days of the apostles. More timid critics, apprehensive of the ulterior consequences which might ensue from discrediting the fathers, wished to carry down the evidence of these vested powers to the day when temporal superseded spiritual authority, and Christianity mounted with Constantine the imperial throne.

Exceptions to this wise and learned caution have, doubtless, from time to time occurred. These exceptions have been more or less absurd, according to the different degrees of passion and ignorance which were mixed up in the character of the leaders. They have been more or less successful, according to the favourableness of the season for recruiting in a crusade against the human senses and human reason. But the instances were occasional ebullitions only. The insult of the present experiment, in the shape of a serious argumentative proposition, was reserved for the present times. Strange things have been often preached as the rights of man. But the attempt to dogmatize a people into the notion that miraculous powers are a universal right on the part of every believer, was never ventured to be systematically proposed, under the name of Christianity, to any preceding age. Can there really be fanaticism enough in our times to support a handsomely printed periodical devoted to the circulation of tenets such as these? A pretty world, indeed, we should have of it, if the general laws of nature were interrupted at every moment, and broken up into specialties and gifts; if (according to the division of labour in secular arts and occupations) every Christian had a miraculous power of some sort or other appropriated to himself, either for his personal satisfaction or in trust officially for the wants of the community; or if the self-same gift were to be communicated to us all, and we were to

pass our time, like the inspired brethren of Port-Glasgow, in holding religious *conversazioni*s in languages which nobody understood. It is true that the proposition, by which a miraculous power is broadly and unlimitedly attributed to prayer, is as capable of being abused. Wesley's miracles, as well as those of his followers, appear to have run in this channel, and not to have been claimed as regular gifts so much as to have been received in the way of occasional answers to their prayers. Although in this form of error there may be an equal capability, yet there is not, perhaps, the same likelihood of abuse. A greater number of circumstances will sooner check and bring it within bounds again. Besides, it is comparatively humble in its nature. It has this other advantage also; it operates as a real improvement on the disposition; and only becomes injurious when it is taken as a heavenly guarantee for the truth of particular opinions, or particular events. It is scarce worth while, however, to debate their respective degrees of mischievousness and folly. The fact is, that either assumption—whether it be of public miraculous gifts or visibly prevailing prayers, when they are announced as essential parts of Christianity—is alike unwarrantable, visionary, and insane.

The second supposition premised by these disputants, is, that these supposed Scriptural promises were never subsequently revoked. In such a case as this, no evidence of an express revocation of the prerogatives of the apostolical age need be required. Their absence ought to be received as proof that they were temporary only. Accordingly, Warburton's argument on the text containing the famous comparison instituted by St Paul between charity and these more showy gifts, appears, in this point of view, to be superfluous. Besides, the passage in question has been usually understood to relate to the comparative durability of the grace of charity, not so much in this life as in the next. At the same time, a school whose prepossessions are in favour of subtleties and novelties in religion, and from whom recognised and familiar interpretations receive as little consideration, when opposed to a fancy of their own, as at the hands of Wollaston or of Farmer, will not easily find a direct answer to his reasoning. The following passage is the commencement only and outline of his argument. '*Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.*' In the next two verses he gives the reason, '*For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.*' As much as to say: '*When that Christian life, the lines of which are marked out by the gospel, shall, by the vital powers*

‘ of charity, on which it is erected, arrive to its full vigour and maturity, then those temporary aids of the Holy Spirit, (such as *tongues, prophecy, and knowledge*, bestowed with a purpose to subdue the prejudices and scepticism of those without, and to support the weakness and infirmities of those within; and given too, but imperfectly, in proportion to the defects of the human recipients,) shall, like the scaffolding of a palace now completed, be taken down and removed.’

Warburton admits, that this text is ‘ perhaps the only express declaration’ recorded in Scripture, of the cessation of the miraculous operations of the Holy Spirit, after the establishment of the Christian faith. The negative evidence, in our opinion, relieves us from the necessity of insisting on any express declaration. It is answer enough to say, that the chief object of such operations being accomplished, they were no longer wanted on that account, at least in countries where Christianity was established; and that the continuance of such a system would turn our work-a-day world into a fairy land, by completely changing the whole character and conduct of human life. It is said, however—be that as it may—such is the system promised you in the Gospel; if you pretend to receive the Gospel, you must take it with its entire contents. The question, on the issue so stated, is one of the application of the passages as much as of simple interpretation—*reddendo singula singulis*. This is the third and last supposition their argument involves. The assertion amounts to a renewal, in scarcely a new form, of the old Roman Catholic interpretation concerning, and is supported by far more than Roman Catholic pretension to certain endowments, as promises made to the universal church. Nothing short of a spirit of infallible exposition ought to accompany this supposition, as its worthy colleague. However, it is maintained by a formidable array of texts—some are taken from the Old Testament; but the only ones really deserving of examination, are those which relate to the promises made in the New Testament to Christian converts.

So little use can be made on the present occasion of inapplicable precedents from the Book of Judges, and vague prophetic expressions out of Joel or Isaiah, that it is not worth while to do more than protest against the practice, so injurious to Christianity, of treating the Old and New Testament as concurrent schemes of the divine government, and as rules of similar cast, or equal authority, for the conduct and expectations of human life. The ark of the Jewish covenant preserved the doctrine of the unity of God. We owe to the writings of the Hebrew prophets, the peculiar evidence which is derived ‘ from the surer word of prophecy’ relating to the Messiah. But the system of

divine government described by the Jewish historians, is scarcely less alien from that of Christianity, than the system displayed by the Heathen poets. It is one perpetual system of particular providences; and those in many instances depending on principles, and recorded in a spirit and in language, which too often render the first lesson in the morning service a very problematical lesson to any ordinary congregation. Whilst the Pentateuch is read in a Christian church as indiscriminately as in an ancient Jewish synagogue, and received as the narrative of events and of a people, whose case is applicable to ourselves, we cannot wonder that such a narrative is often grievously misunderstood and misapplied. It has been, consequently, the storehouse of fanaticism in every age; from whose wall the Balfours of Burleigh, and their humble imitators in the vulgar field of Christian warfare, take down its monumental armour, 'the sword and the battle,' against both public and private peace.

In examining the texts of the New Testament, containing the promise of the Holy Spirit, it will be necessary to bear in mind the maxim which we have already applied to the texts containing the promises annexed to prayer. 'Absurdities to avoid, is the only rule for interpreting many passages.' The conclusions which are sought to be forced upon our understanding, by the interpretation of Mr Erskine and his allies of the *Morning Watch*, are so incredible as matters of fact, and so revolting to the conscience as matters of principle, that probably nothing but an absolute unavoidable necessity of construction—a necessity admitted to be unavoidable by the concurrent consent of all Christian writers of whatever sect—could justify their adoption. This necessity, fortunately, cannot be predicated of an interpretation which seems never previously to have crossed the threshold of the intellect of any divine whatever. We should doubt there being a Whitsunday sermon in existence, which is not a tissue of false reasoning and deception from one end to the other, in case this wild hypothesis deserved to be listened to for a moment. Let any one, who is startled by the confidence with which these innovating doctrines are fulminated forth, turn to the sermons preached by Taylor, Barrow, and Clarke, on that solemn festival. They will there learn what it is, which sober Christians intend to celebrate in that continual memorial of the inestimable gift as then conferred most visibly upon the church, and as still really bestowed upon every member duly incorporated into it. There are no three writers of any thing like equal ability and learning, in whom the character of their genius, and the natural tendency of their disposition, are so thoroughly distinct. They agree in declaring, that the evangelical covenant, of which the collation of this spirit is a principal ingredient, extends to every Christian :

and that, until we have received the spirit of manifestation and of oblation, we are not sons of God and relatives of Christ. But they agree also in declaring, that the operation which the Spirit of God actually works in all his servants, is confined to its strengthening power upon the heart. As they protest against the fanatical misconstruction put upon the promise of a return to prayer, and the unwarrantable confidence in signs derived from it, so they deny the similar misunderstandings concerning the nature of the only gifts, and only assistance, which the spirit affords to Christians since the time of the apostles.

‘There is no greater external testimony,’ says Taylor, (*Works* vol. v. p. 410, ‘that we are in the spirit, and that the spirit dwells in us, than if we find spiritual pleasure in the greatest mysteries of our religion. This new and godlike nature, which the Greeks generally called *χαρίσμα*, “a gracious gift,” is an extraordinary superaddition to nature—not a single gift in order to single purposes: but a universal principle, and it remains upon all good men during their lives, and after their death.’ P. 422. We never met with a greater instance of bad understanding, or bad faith, than in the appeal made in the *Morning Watch* to the members of the Church of England, on the ordinance of confirmation. All writers on confirmation, it is said, maintain, that the conveyance of miraculous powers in their church, is the specific purpose of retaining the rite. Jeremy Taylor’s second section is quoted as conclusive. Now, the slightest acquaintance with the most illiterate English clergyman, or a few minutes’ enquiry of any young lady preparing for confirmation, must have satisfied the writer that there was some mistake in this representation. Miraculous powers, in the popular sense, and in the sense in which they themselves are writing, are not among those gifts of the Holy Spirit which the ceremony is designed or expected to confer. If the writer would have read on to the seventh section, ‘on the many blessings consequent to confirmation,’ he would have seen that the regular effect of this power from on high, is expressly stated not to consist in miracles, but in spiritual and internal strengths. The belief and the evidence, as instanced and required, are both solely of this description. Some one is supposed to object (not, as it is now alleged, that Satan, if well-advised, might object that no visible miracles ensue, but) that the changes wrought upon our souls, are not, after the manner of nature, visible and sensible, and with observation. The answer returned is, ‘The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; for it is within you, and is only discerned spiritually.’

Barrow celebrates this excellent gift as the foundation, im-

provement, and completion of all our good. But in breaking up the advantages which proceed from it, according to his characteristic methodical divisions, the abilities created by it are restrained to such as are exclusively spiritual. Clarke, in his analysis of the different endowments, contained under the one common name of gifts, studiously separates the external miraculous powers from the internal sanctifying graces. The first were contemporary with the promulgation of the gospel only: they depended in no measure on the will of the persons themselves: ‘By having these gifts no man was the better Christian: so no man by wanting them was the worse: these gifts being bestowed, not for the benefit of the persons themselves, but for the conversion of others.’ The latter are to continue with us always to the end of the world: they do not operate upon us as machines, but require our concurrence—on which account they are at once both the virtues of the man and the fruits of the Spirit. ‘The Apostles were directed by a miraculous assistance of the Spirit upon every particular occasion: but we have now no promise of any such miraculous direction: obeying the Spirit now, is nothing else but obeying his dictates, as set down in the inspired writings: and to enable us to do this, we may, upon our sincere endeavours, expect his continual blessing and assistance.’ After these authorities it is needless to mention the despised names of Paley and of Heber. Indeed, among all Christians of every denomination, whatever difference has hitherto existed, related to the degree of credit which they were disposed to give to stories of scattered or single miracles. It has been left to us to witness the establishment of a sect of intellectual *convulsionaires* upon the broad foundation, that faith in Christ and the power of working miracles are one and the same thing. No Pope or miracle-monger ever set up on so large a scale before. The unanimity of sentiment in Christendom on this point is so entire, that instead of charging an ignorance of the reality of Christ’s kingdom as the paramount defect of our nominal Christianity, we wonder that the imputed heresy assigned to the last fifteen centuries has not been their universal ignorance and abdication of the power and promises of the Holy Spirit.

In point of interpretation, the history of Protestantism is a uniform disclaimer of the existence of any promise in the Scriptures that miraculous powers should be continued in the church. In point of fact, the actual exercise of powers of this description—almost in any individual instance, but certainly as a regular incident to and effect of faith,—has been as uniformly denied. But, as we hinted in a former passage, Protestant writers agree in acknowledging it to be foretold, that

false Christs and false prophets shall come—that the wicked one shall be revealed ‘with all power, and signs, and lying ‘wonders,’—and that bad men shall perform miracles even in the name of Christ. If our principal divines have been further right in requiring the elect of God to receive this prophetic announcement as the sign of Antichrist, and as the mark by which the enemies of God are to be discovered, the application of these prophecies cannot now be limited to Papal pretensions only. So easily, according to the usual course of theological controversy, are the tables turned by the respective parties against each other; and what at one moment is displayed as the power and prerogative of peculiar favour, is darkened into an appointed mark of judicial reprobation in the next! We do not doubt the readiness of the school of the Prophets to take up the gauntlet of this reproach in the boldest terms of polemical defiance. ‘Squadrons of texts’ have been too often marshalled on opposite sides in the ‘battle ‘royal of beliefs,’ not to ensure on such a subject ample space and materials for interminable contention, on the part of all who are rather attracted than repelled by the unreasonableness of a conclusion. Until such people have wearied the public into indifference, or raved themselves into exhaustion, we must submit in patience to this painful spectacle as the best compromise in a choice of evils. A living arbitrator, a *lex loquens*, by whose interpretation all are compelled or willing to abide, as it is the only, so is it even the worse, alternative. Difficulties and contradictions multiply on their heads, when, passing on from generalities, these adventurous spirits undertake, as in the present instance, to fix the stamp of authenticity and divine commission on certain specific acts. For they explicitly admit both cases; and insist on the signs and wonders, against which we are warned—as well as on those which we are promised. Under these circumstances, if mankind is concerned in the question otherwise than as spectators, we must be enabled, before we can be called on to take part by the adoption of one and by the rejection of the other, to see our way between the two. Mr Irving and Mr Scott are satisfied with stating generally, that miracles which come of God are distinguished by a moral or gospel character. When we compare the list of Scripture miracles with that of the delusions which swarm over the surface of the earth, and eat into the heart of history, we cannot honestly agree in recognising any such criterion. Mr Erskine more fairly allows that in the awful duty of distinguishing the side of truth from the side of error, ‘the only security lies in having ourselves ‘the seal of God—that gift of the Holy Ghost—by which we ‘may detect the lying wonders of Satan.’ According to his

account, therefore, the very fact of their being prepared to pass judgment between God and Satan in the affairs of Port-Glasgow amounts to a direct pretence to inspiration. The gift pretended to is that 'discerning of spirits,' so celebrated by the Apostles, as the divine endowment by means of which Simon the magician was detected by Peter, and Elymas the sorcerer confounded by Paul. It is not the first time, doubtless, that men have indemnified themselves for the absence of visible gifts by setting up a title to invisible ones. Their argument, if it entitles them to either, entitles them to both. Their claim is unfortunately confined to the case which admits of no other proof than their mere personal assertion that they are inspired.

Our readers may be surprised that we have entered at all into this discussion. Nor less so, at our having treated it as the proper subject of argument rather than of mere unmitigated contempt. If the doctrine in question had fallen within the most liberal limits of heresy or schism, we confess to so much of latitudinarianism in our opinions, that we should have left the regular practitioners in undisturbed possession of the case. But 'common quiet is mankind's concern.' When opinions of this prodigious and inflaming character are boldly inculcated by well-known writers of very popular talents, and have been propagated with so much industry and success as to have a well-appointed periodical of their own, we have felt called on to step out of our ordinary path. It is humiliating enough, that any part of the British people should be at present manifesting symptoms so completely akin in principle to those of the most dangerous enthusiasts of former times; or that any protest can be wanted now, on the authority of past experience and ancient learning, in behalf of that common quiet, which cannot be long separated from common sense. Unfortunately some undefinable and mysterious quality in human nature has so often taken civilized society by surprise, and has broken out into such sudden fermentation or explosion, that the friends of reason and religion must be excused for being perhaps easily alarmed. Fanaticism has its epidemics! The very air at times seems tainted. Nobody can be trusted in such a season. Things too contemptible to be ordinarily noticed, have, by the very circumstance of this otherwise well-merited neglect, become the means of introducing and communicating the most destructive plagues. But, without anticipating future evils, there is an immediate and an intolerable mischief in turning God's service from the heart, and from actions of piety and virtue, to the improbable, unnecessary, and useless forms 'of a fantastic and hypochondriacal religion.' To take up with the images of things, is to 'retire from Christ

‘to Moses, and at the best to be going from real graces to ‘imaginary gifts.’ It is to lose the substance for the shadow. In their zeal after the shadow of these gifts, which, by the word of the apostle, were at some period to cease, the virtue of charity, the perpetual virtue of our perfect state, seems in danger of failing altogether, or of being put away among the apostle’s childish things. The Commonwealth Saints construed texts and events into promises or warnings, trials or judgments, signs of election or reprobation, according as they applied them to their adversaries or to themselves. But they constructed no private font, in which a small religious coterie was to dip and incorporate its members, as the only visible Church on earth, excommunicating former ages, and unchristening the Christian world.

The topics of interest and literature are divided into so many different departments even in religion, that many of our readers are doubtless unprepared for the scene which we have presented. A sense of curiosity and astonishment at the existence of such a party, and of such opinions, will be the predominant impression in their minds. For those disciples who are as yet noviciates only, we indulge a hope, when declarations and consequences so absurd and so revolting are fairly placed before them, and are separated from the diseased atmosphere and exciting accompaniments, by which doctrines of this sort are unnaturally forced and fostered—that pure air and judicious management, and the kindly words of plain and softened reason, will not be thrown away. In respect of the leaders, our arguments are not meant for them; nor have we the least desire to enter into a competition of contemptuous paragraphs with religious disputants, the pride and bitterness of whose inselent theology exceed any thing within our knowledge, at least during the last two centuries of polemics. They declare that it would not be difficult, ‘article by article, to show that a ‘greater semblance of truth is preserved by the Papacy, detest-
‘able apostacy though it be, than by the system called Evan-
‘gelicalism.’ We always thought that the worst things about Evangelicalism were its exclusiveness—which led to narrow views of God and the divine government—and its misrepresentation of, and consequent want of sympathy with, human nature. It is, however, made abundantly clear at present that, if what is commonly understood by a Christian spirit, be an integral and essential part of Christianity, there may be a third system, guilty of ‘a more detestable apostacy’ from that spirit, and therefore infinitely worse than either.

ART. II.—*Two Essays on the Geography of Ancient Asia; intended partly to illustrate the Campaigns of Alexander, and the Anabasis of Xenophon.* By the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, Rector of the Edinburgh Academy. 8vo. London: 1829.

TO find the true position of the Median Ecbatana, is one of the most curious problems of comparative geography. Spared by successive conquerors, and flourishing under divers dynasties, this city has experienced the singular fate of being lost without having ever been destroyed. While the ruins of the once queenlike Nineveh may still, as many suppose, be recognised; while the scattered fragments of Babylon, on the scene of her pristine glory, attest the word of prophecy; while the vast remains and gigantic excavations of Persepolis strike the wanderer with awe, and even Susa, amid her desolation, yields ample proofs of former magnificence; a cloud of strange uncertainty overhangs the great and gorgeous capital of Media. If we reject the Oriental traditions referred to by Diodorus, (who is always, where possible, to be disbelieved,) Ecbatana was founded about the close of the eighth century B.C., by Deioces, and adorned with that gaudy pomp described in the earliest Grecian history; when it passed from the hands of his descendant into those of Cyrus, it continued to share, with Babylon and Susa, the favour of its new possessor; the Macedonian conquest left it almost uninjured; under the Seleucidæ, it maintained the traces of its original grandeur—gold and silver still glittering on its temples when it was visited by Antiochus the Great; during the dominion of the Arsacidæ, Ecbatana enjoyed once more the sunshine of the royal presence; and when the Persians, under the house of Sassan, A.D. 226, recovered the throne of Upper Asia, they must have been led by necessity as well as choice to cherish a residence, fenced by the bulwarks of Mount Zagros against the incursion of the Roman Eagles. Ammianus Marcellinus informs us that, about the close of the fourth century after Christ, Ecbatana continued to be a large and fortified city.

Thus, for the space of nearly twelve centuries, we can fondly gaze through the eyes of history upon the splendours of the Median capital.* But of a sudden, 'with a quaint device,' the

* Ecbatana was rather roughly handled by her first conqueror, Nabuchodonosor, who 'took the towers, and spoiled the streets thereof,

pageant vanishes. Like the dismayed sultan in the tale of Aladdin, we rub our astonished organs, and perceive that nothing short of a conjuration will enable us to retrieve the volatile metropolis. And well for us if this were all; but, unluckily, the slaves of *our* lamp are not remarkable for unanimity. Herbert, Gibbon, Sir William Jones, and the great French Orientalists, would carry us to Tauris or Tabriz; Golius, D'Anville, Major Rennell, and Mannert, beckon us away to Hamadan; and, in spite of both these formidable parties, Mr Williams points out Ispahan; and with a confidence, undaunted by famous names, assures us that *here* we are to look for the legitimate representative of old Ecbatana.

There is one circumstance, besides the historical relations of the place, which makes it peculiarly strange that Ecbatana, alone of her sister-capitals, should have been so long unidentifed in modern times. For, though unprovided with facilities for navigation, its vicinity must have possessed singular advantages, to withstand the caprice of Eastern despotism, and secure the favour of successive masters. A vicinity, so recommended, must still be adorned by a great city. Mosul, though on the opposite bank of the Tigris, depends on the same resources which once supported Nineveh; Seleuceia, Ctesiphon, and Bagdad, at gradually increasing distances, have represented Babylon; Shuster, fifty miles to the south-east of ancient Susa, stands proxy for the city of lilies; so does Schiraz for Persepolis, and Grand Cairo for Memphis; and, in like manner, there must be a considerable city, either on the actual site, or in the immediate neighbourhood of the Median metropolis. 'But,' says Mr Williams, 'there are circumstances in the chorographical nature of Greater Media, of which Ecbatana was the capital, that serve to confine the possible position of great towns within very narrow limits. It is so bounded on all sides, either by mountains or deserts, that all its streams (with the exception of the mountain-course of those which flow but a short distance within its borders) are lost in sandy plains. This circumstance materially diminishes the number of spots capable of maintaining large cities, and gives greater certainty to calculations that approximate to the truth. For as the inhabitants of the ancient Chalybon, Damascus, Arta, (Coana,) Maracanda, were situated on streams which rendered it impossible to make great changes,

'and turned the beauty thereof into shame,' (Judith cap. i. 14.); but this does not imply more than a chastisement, certainly not destruction.

‘ we need not be surprised that their chief cities still remain the same under the kindred names of Haleb or Aleppo, Damas or Damascus, Herat, and Samarcand. On the same principle, I affirm that the ancient Ecbatana, the capital of Media, is the modern Ispahan, the capital of Irak Agemi.’

Mr Williams is probably aware, and the truth of his theory receives corroboration from the fact, that he is not the first person who has believed in the identity of Ecbatana and Ispahan. ‘ It was an old notion,’ says a recent writer, ‘ that the modern Ispahan was the Ἀγβάτανα of the Μῆδοι, a notion that Herbert in his travels (p. 153) disposes of in his summary way, to make room for the claim of *Tabriz*.’ But the true originality of the work before us lies in the method of proof; and the ‘ light ’ which the author describes as flashing on his mind, must be understood to be that of conviction, not of discovery. According to his own account, it was his estimation of the character of Alexander the Great that first caused him to doubt the correctness of the established geography. On examining the lines of roads, and considering that the Macedonian invader, when three days’ march distant from Ecbatana, heard of the escape of Darius five days before, in the direction of the Caspian Gates, Mr Williams was at once impressed with a moral certainty, that had Hamadan been Ecbatana, Alexander, instead of approaching it, would have gained, by a cross road, at least two days’ march upon the royal fugitive. ‘ The suspicion of the fallibility of men like D’Anville, Rennell, &c., being thus once roused, could not be lulled without a thorough investigation of the whole case in all its original bearings.’

It is obvious, however, to remark, with reference to this piece of history, that it being the object of Darius, after his defeat at Gaugamela, to command a retreat by the Caspian defile into Bactria, he had little to do so far south as Ispahan, whereas the position of Hamadan would be almost directly in his road. Mr Williams will hardly resort for an answer to this difficulty to the *fourth** Ecbatana, which we shall presently find him apply-

* Namely, Assyrian Ecbatana, which the author wishes to have admitted into the maps of ancient Asia, on the authority of Plutarch and Ammianus Marcellinus, in addition to the Median capital, the Persian Ecbatana mentioned by Pliny, and the Syrian city of the same name, where Cambyses died on his return from Egypt. The situation of this Syrian city was on Mount Carmel, the scene of Elijah’s conflict with the priests of Baal. Mr Williams ingeniously supposes that the prophet purposely challenged his antagonists to meet

ing to the explanation of a passage in Eratosthenes, as reported by Strabo, that makes strongly against his views. At the same time, since Darius, we are assured by Arrian, judged rightly that his conqueror would forthwith turn his arms against the prizes of the war, Babylon and Susa, instead of following him by the difficult entrance into Media, the defeated monarch might venture into the latitude of Ispahan, both with the natural desire of reaching his chief Median city, (if Ecbatana were really there situated,) and for the sake of readier intelligence from Susiana. And we shall find that in some other respects, besides the usual promptitude of Alexander's movements, the site of Ispahan will accord better than any more northern position, with the account we have of his operations in pursuit of Darius after the capture of Persepolis.

But the argument, which we shall now proceed to examine, rests on grounds less liable to mistake than any estimation of human character and motives. From ancient authors Mr Williams has collected and compared details of marches and itineraries, which are brought to bear, with great skill and precision, upon the supposed situation of Ecbatana; and though this species of proof, depending chiefly upon numerical statements, of the accuracy of which we are not always sure, is essentially somewhat uncertain, yet the amount and variety of these statements, in the present instance, seem to obviate the probability of error. It is necessary, in the first place, to clear up sundry points in the geography of Susiana, the modern Khusistan, especially as connected with its rivers. Under this head our essayist agrees with Rennell that the ancient Susa is identical with Shus, and not, as the learned Dr Vincent imagined, with Shuster; he identifies the river Choaspes or Eulaeus—the Ulai of Daniel—with the Kerah; the Pasitigris (*i. e.* *Eastern Tigris*, according to the interpretation of Oriental scholars) with that noble stream, described by Kinneir, the Karoon,—called by Cherefeddin, in his life of Timour, the Tchar Danke, in which appellation the

him in this place as 'their favourite spot for kindling the religious pile,'—conceiving the very name Agbatana, or Ecbatana, to have some connexion with the fire-worship of the East. We may add, that the change from the Persian form *'Αγβάτανα* to the later Greek form *'Εκβάτανα* may be easily accounted for. The collocations *κβ* and *γβ* are equally adverse to the genius of the Grecian tongue, but *'Εκβάτανα* had at least the analogy of the compound word *ἐκβαίνα* in its favour. The *Hellenizing* process is carried still farther by Isidore of Charax, who alters the name to *'Αποβάτανα*.

Tartar *Tchar* agrees with the Persian *Kar-oon*; and he shows the ‘impetuous’ *Coprates* of the old historians to be the same with the modern *Abzal*, which joins the *Karoon* at some distance below *Shuster*. The author, having settled these preliminary points—and we may observe, in passing, that his introductory and incidental discussions are quite as engaging and instructive as his main enquiry—next establishes from the march of *Alexander* from *Babylon* to *Susa*, as related by *Arrian*, and from *Susa* to the *Pasitigris*, or *Karoon*, probably at *Shuster*, as given by *Diodorus Siculus* and *Curtius*, as also from the march of *Eumenes*, described by *Diodorus*, from the *Pasitigris* to *Persepolis*, that about twelve miles, *map-distance*, was the average daily progress of a *Macedonian* army—a result that is justified, moreover, by many other marches, within known points, which *Arrian* has recorded. The scale of progress, thus ascertained, is applied to the march of *Alexander* from *Persepolis* to *Ecbatana*. *Arrian’s* account of this march is as follows:—‘*Alexander* advanced towards *Media*, entered and subdued the territory of the *Parætacæ*, and appointed *Oxartes* their satrap. ‘But when he was informed, on his march, that *Darius* had determined to meet him, and risk another battle, (for, according to report, the *Scythians* and *Cadusians* were come to his assistance,) he gave orders that the beasts of burden, their drivers, and the rest of the baggage, should follow. Advancing with the rest of the army in battle-array, he entered *Media* on the twelfth day. Here he learned that *Darius* was not strong enough to give him battle, and that the *Cadusians* and *Scythians* were not come to his assistance; that, consequently, he had determined upon flight. *Alexander* on this marched forward still more rapidly. But, when distant three days’ march from *Ecbatana*, he was met by *Bisthanes*, the son of *Ochus*, who informed him that *Darius* had fled five days before, carrying with him 7000 talents from the *Median* treasury, and accompanied by 3000 cavalry, and 6000 infantry. *Alexander* entered *Ecbatana*.*’

The distinctness of this narrative is injured by two omissions, which render it unsafe to draw any conclusion from it alone. The first, however,—viz. that of the point from which to commence the twelve days’ march—is satisfactorily supplied by *Quintus Curtius*, who states that, after an expedition against the mountaineers, finished in thirty days, *Alexander* returned to

* *Arrian*, book iii. cap. 19.

Persepolis, and commenced from thence his march into Media. The second omission is, that the interval between the first report of Darius's inability to fight and the appearance of Bisthanes is not particularized; but Mr Williams thinks that one day is a sufficient allowance for this interval, since, had it been more, Arrian would probably have mentioned it. The whole time, then, spent upon the march, was sixteen days, which, being multiplied by twelve, the average number of miles daily marched over by a Macedonian army in these regions, the product will be one hundred and ninety-two miles; 'but this distance on the main road to Media will bring us, according to the map, to Ispahan. If it be objected, that in this case Alexander marched twelve days without encumbrance, and increased his rapidity for the last four days, it must be remembered that the winter had now set in, that Mount Zagros, with its ridges and deep ravines, had to be crossed; and, on consulting the map, it will be seen that the deviations of the road from a straight rectilinear line, connecting Persepolis and Ispahan, are far greater than in the preceding cases.*' These circumstances combined make the twelve miles daily, map-distance, of Alexander's progress, equal in value to fourteen and two-thirds, the average rate of every day's march in Cherefeddin's Journal of a march by Timour, at the head of a select body of troops, unencumbered with baggage, between Shuster and Calad Sefid (the Persian Gates.)

Should the latter of the two omissions in Arrian's narrative be still deemed to vitiate the whole proof derived from it, we fortunately possess an account of the same distance performed by another Macedonian army. 'Antigonus,' says Diodorus Siculus, 'gathered his troops, entered Ecbatana, and having taken thence 5000 talents of uncoined silver, marched for Persis, the distance to the Persepolitan palace being *twenty days' march*.' It is to be remarked that Antigonus was marching in peace, was conveying along with him a treasure of great weight and value, and consequently did not travel at the customary rate of a Macedonian progress. 'In the continuation of this very march,' observes our author, 'he was twenty-two days on the road from Susa to Babylon. As the same space was traversed by Alexander and his army in twenty days, we may infer, that, at the common rate of marching, a Macedonian army would have been about eighteen days on the road between Ecbatana and Persepolis. I need not say that it would

* That is, in the marches already noticed, from Babylon upon Susa, from Susa to the Pasitigris, and from that river to Persepolis.

‘ be hopeless to attempt to reconcile these itineraries with any spot far from the vicinity of Ispahan, not to speak of Tauris or Hamadan. It is as curious as satisfactory to be able to show that Nadir Shah spent exactly the same space of time between Ispahan and Estakar* as Antigonus did between Ecbatana and Persepolis. But it must be remembered that it was the winter season, and the country had been laid waste by the Affgans.’

Alexander’s second visit affords the next line of march that will serve to illustrate the position of Ecbatana. But in order to render it available, Mr Williams is obliged to show, that the ordinary view of this march, as commencing at Opis on the Tigris, is founded on a mistatement—wonderful to say—of the judicious and generally accurate Arrian, and that—still more wonderful—we must, in this instance, prefer the authority of Diodorus, who places both the commencement of the march, and the scene of the previous meeting and reconciliation, at Susa. Had the march really begun at Opis, and were the true site of Opis where Arrowsmith’s map fixes it, about seventy miles above Bagdad, these circumstances would favour the Hamadan hypothesis. Of the site of Opis more hereafter; but, meanwhile, it may be gathered from Arrian himself, that it was from forgetfulness he omitted to mention the return of Alexander and his land-forces from Opis to Susa before the mutiny and the march to Ecbatana—an omission perhaps corrected in that part of his work, between the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the seventh book, which we have lost—for, in the lofty and spirited address of the prince to his soldiers, the historian makes him expressly assert that, after having conducted him in safety to *Susa*, they had *there* deserted him, and left the protection of his person to vanquished barbarians. Schmieder attempts, indeed, to explain away the force of this passage, but it seems to us clearly to bear out Diodorus in his narrative, and our author in the credit he has given to it. Starting, then, from Susa, Alexander crossed the Pasitigris, and encamped in the villages called Caræ. In the four following days he traversed Sita, and arrived at a spot called Sambana. After remaining there seven days, he recommenced his march, and on the third day reached a tribe called Celonæ. Here he spent the rest of the day; and from this point made a deviation in order to visit a fruitful and delicious spot called Bagistane. He next entered a district capable

* ‘ Thamas Kouli Khan, (after quitting Ispahan,) having supported the rigour of the season with great constancy, after a march of twenty days, arrived near Astakar.’—Hauway’s *Nadir Shah*, part xiii. cap. 1.

of feeding immense herds of horses. He remained there thirty days, and in seven days more reached the Median Ecbatana.

In explaining this itinerary, Mr Williams remarks that the villages called Caræ must be looked for in the vicinity of Shuster—nay, that it may be etymologically inferred that Sapor built his new capital on the very site of these villages, and that in the *Karoon*, or *river of Caræ*,* we still recognise the original name of Shuster. So also Ptolemy places *Carine*—which Isidore describes as the first *Median* district on the great road between Seleuceia and Ecbatana—upon the western frontier of southern Media. Sambana is perhaps the same with the Cambadena of Isidore, and in Bagistane—elsewhere noticed by Diodorus as famous for the figure of Semiramis, sculptured out of a rock—we discover Isidore's 'city, Batana, situated on a mountain, *where is the image and pillar of Semiramis.*' The future enquirer is directed by our author to look for this in longitude 50-45, in latitude 32-15, where, according to the Arabic numerals of Uleg Bey's tables, the city 'Semiram' is placed. After thus noticing the chief points of the line, we have only to add that the distance between Susa and the Pasitigris is omitted, as having been before mentioned by Diodorus, and that the rest of the way between Shuster and Ispahan, amounts on the map to 170 English miles; which, divided by fourteen, the number of days spent in *actual marching*,† give about twelve miles as the average length of every day's march, and again, therefore, fix Ecbatana at Ispahan, or in its vicinity.

The result of these itineraries is thus summed up: 'We have a long line connecting Babylon and Persepolis, distant from each other, according to the map, 580 miles, and traversed by Macedonian armies in forty-eight days. This line is bisected at Shuster, and the 290 miles of its eastern division were traversed by a Macedonian army in twenty-four days. The next side of the triangle, formed by a line connecting Persepolis and Ispahan, was eighteen days' march, according to the usual pace of a Macedonian army; the distance on the map 190 miles. The circuit necessary to be taken, and the difficulties of the road, compensate for the apparent disproportion of this line.

* On the same principle, Ebn Haukal and the Nubian geographer invariably call the Karoon the *river of Tostar* (*Shuster*.)

† Mr Williams seems here to assume that the distance from the horse-pastures to Ecbatana must have been the same as that from Celonæ to Ecbatana, which Alexander would have passed over, had he made no deviation out of the direct line. And we admit that there could be no great difference between these two distances.

‘ The triangle is completed by the line that connects Shuster and Ispahan, distant 170 miles on the map, and traversed by a Macedonian army in fourteen days.’

The position of the Cossæi, a tribe from whom the Persian kings, when travelling from Ecbatana to Babylon, used to purchase a passage—through whose difficult defiles Antigonus, disdaining to pay this species of tribute, forced his way from the Eulæus to Ecbatana at the expense of a serious loss of men and beasts, and whom Alexander invaded and subdued, on his return from Ecbatana to Babylon, as recorded in the seventh book of Arrian’s history—will likewise aid in determining the site of the Median capital. These Cossæans bordered on the Uxians,* who occupied the country close to the Pasitigris†—they are placed by Pliny to the east of Susiana—and must have possessed that part of Mount Zagros, which lies between the eastern branch of the Coprates (Abzal) and the Pasitigris (Karoon.) Now it appears, from the circumstances above mentioned, that a line drawn from Ecbatana to Babylon must pass through the territory of these troublesome mountaineers; but a line drawn from Hillah (Babylon) to Ispahan will cross the very mountains between the Karoon and the Abzal, where we have shown that their fastnesses were placed. Draw the line from Hillah to Hamadan, or to Tabriz, and it will not come near the haunts of the Cossæi.

As every contribution to the mass of evidence is worth having, we may here mention Mount Orontes. Within twelve stadia of a mountain so named, Diodorus places Ecbatana, with the following remarkable addition:—‘ As there was on the opposite side of this hill a large lake, which discharged its waters into a river, Semiramis perforated the root of this mountain, and formed a tunnel fifteen feet broad and forty feet high. Through this she conveyed the lake stream, and supplied the city with water.’ Compare this with Chardin’s description of Ispahan:—‘ Ispahan is built on the river Zeinderood. This river rises in the mountains of Jagabat, three days’ journey to the north, and is in itself but a petty stream; but Abbas the Great conducted into it another river much larger, by piercing, at an incredible expense, the mountains which some say are the *Acrocronotes*, thirty leagues distant from Ispahan.’ Every great work is ascribed by the modern Persians to their eternal Shah Abbas, as by the ancient Assyrians to Semiramis; but Ispahan was a mighty city for many centuries before his reign; and, as a petty stream could not have fertilized the neighbouring plain

* Arrian, book vii. cap. 15.

† Book iii. cap 17.

for the supply of a large population, the artificial mode of conveying water, above described, must have been coeval with the greatness of the city. There can, indeed, be no doubt of its identity with the ancient work, however improperly assigned to Semiramis, which Diodorus mentions. The only discrepancy is between the thirty leagues of Chardin, and the twelve stadia of Diodorus; but, as Mr Williams observes, the various readings of the passage in the Greek author render it probable that his numbers are corrupted. There is a worse error—unnoticed by Mr Williams—in the text of Strabo, with regard to Thapsacus, which he makes but seven stadia from the coast of the Mediterranean.*

Of the ancient geographers, Isidore of Charax† supplies valuable testimony in his description of the route from Zeugma, on the Euphrates, through Seleuceia, Ecbatana, and Rhagæ, to the extremities of the east. The *schœnus* of this author (why does Mr Williams so often write it *schœnus*?) is first proved, by our essayist, to be equivalent to three miles and a quarter on the map, and then this measurement is applied to that part of the route which lies between Seleuceia and Ecbatana—the *Apobatanâ* of Isidore. The total distance between these two points amounts to 129 schœni, which, reduced according to the above rate, give 420 miles within a fraction. But ‘the distance between Seleuceia and Ispahan on the map is 424—a coincidence for which nothing except a very close approximation to the truth, can account.’ It is to be observed that, in Isidore’s description of the intermediate stages, there is enough to prove, that a line in the direction of Ispahan, and not of Hamadan or any other place, is the true line of his route from Seleuceia. Thus the first province recorded is Apolloniatis, with its Greek city Artemita, on the river Silla; but, according to Strabo, ‘Artemita, a considerable city, 500 stadia distant from Seleuceia, lies nearly direct east.’‡ Despising this assertion, the map-makers place Artemita nearly direct north of Seleuceia, on the line between that place and Hamadan, and have also invented an imaginary Silla, to suit the description of Isidore.

Ammianus Marcellinus, who, having served in Julian’s Persian campaign, had ample means of acquiring information, places Ecbatana ‘in the territory of the *Syro-Medi*,’ and Ptolemy ex-

* Strabo, book xvi. p. 741, ed. Casaubon.

† In the fragment of his greater work, which we possess under the title of *Parthicæ Mansiones*.

‡ Book xvi. p. 744, ed. Casaubon.

pressly asserts that *Syro-Media* was the southern district of *Media*, running parallel with *Persia*.

But the most forcible direct evidence is that of Pliny, in the following passage: ‘Gaza, the chief town of Atropatenè, is 450 miles from Artaxata, the same distance from Ecbatana of Media.’ Mr Williams continues: ‘When Pliny mentions any town as equidistant from two others, his meaning is, that the centre of a straight line, connecting the two extreme towns, is to be found at the site of the third town. If, therefore, we can discover the site of the middle and one of the extreme towns, the third will necessarily follow.’ Now Strabo aids us to fix the position of the capital of Atropatenè: ‘The summer palace of the kings of Atropatenè, by name Gaza, is situated in a plain, and in a strong fort, Vera, besieged by Antony in his Parthian expedition. Its distance from the Araxes, that separates Armenia and Atropatenè, is 2400 stadia, as Dellius, Antony’s friend, affirms, who commanded a division in the expedition against the Parthians, and wrote an account of it.’* These 2400 stadia, reduced to English miles, and allowing the loss of one-fifth for the difference between real and map-distance, give 219 miles, the exact distance between the Araxes and *Abhar* or *Avar*, which has always been a strong town possessed of a citadel, and which has, in its name, a strong similarity of sound to the ancient *Vera*. Again, the site of *Artaxata* is marked, on the authority of the Russian geographers, at the modern *Ardashat*, and, from the very nature of the country, far from that spot it could not be; but ‘the 450 miles of Pliny, reduced to English measure, give 420 miles, and, allowing one-fifth for the difference between the real and map-distance, the distance between Artaxata and the capital of Atropatenè may be estimated at 343 miles upon the map; which is the exact distance between *Ardashat* and *Abhar*.’ Having thus ascertained the central point, and one of the extremes, it remains for us to find the other extreme to the south-east, where Ecbatana is to be placed at the distance of 450 Roman miles from Gaza, that is,

* Strabo, book xi. p. 523. On the opening words of the original βασιλείον δ’ αὐτοῖς θειρὸν μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ ἰδρυμένον Γάζα, καὶ ἐν φρουρίῳ ἔρυμῳ Οὔρα, Mr Williams proposes a change of punctuation—βασιλείον δ’ αὐτοῖς θειρὸν μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ ἰδρυμένον, Γάζα καὶ κ. τ. λ. ‘Their summer palace is situated in a plain, and their Gaza, or treasury, in a strong fort called Vera.’ We cannot admit the change, on account of the awkward position it would give to καὶ, and the passage does as well for his argument without it.

Vera or Abhar. Reduced as before, these give 343 English miles; and this distance, measured on the map, brings us to a point only thirteen miles south-east of Ispahan; a mere trifle, as the author justly observes, in computing the distances between three capitals so remote from each other, and on a subject where the mind loves to sacrifice minute accuracy to the pleasure of impressing on the memory a remarkable coincidence. ‘But should any one object that the line might have taken another direction, and not that of Ispahan, we are able to obviate that objection by another similar line described by Pliny, where Susa is made the middle point, and Seleuceia and Ecbatana the extreme points.’ It seems that the map-distance between Seleuceia and Shus is 220 miles; from Shus to Ispahan there are about 210 miles, a trifling discrepancy, to which the observations above made are applicable. ‘Thus both lines, proceeding from such remote points as Ardashat and Seleuceia, are found to terminate in the immediate vicinity of Ispahan, where, and where alone, must the ancient Ecbatana, as described by Pliny, be placed.’ We are almost tempted to add the *quod erat demonstrandum* of the self-satisfied geometricians.

It has been urged against the passage of Pliny here discussed, that the distances are corrupted. But when it appears that the numbers of Strabo, with reference to one of the same places, must, in that case, likewise be corrupted, this objection loses force; and the attentive reader of the whole foregoing argument will be inclined, we suspect, to dismiss it altogether.

With the errors, real or apparent, of ancient writers concerning the site of Ecbatana, Mr Williams makes short work. Polybius, who talks of this city as ‘lying near or overhanging those parts of Asia which are round the *Mæotis* and the *Euxine*,’* is unceremoniously, but most equitably, characterised as knowing little of the country to the east of the Tigris. An assertion of Strabo, in the eleventh book, is explained by that fourth Ecbatana, to which we have already alluded, and which our author places between the Tigris and the mountains to the east, in the vicinity of the Caprus. The same recovered city will fall in with the line between Thapsacus and the Caspian Gates, on which an Ecbatana, mentioned by Eratosthenes, is put by that father of scientific geography. The remarks on Ptolemy must be given in the author’s own words:—

‘The last ancient geographer whom we have to examine is Ptolemy, whose authority may be said to be neutral; for if his latitude corre-

* In a fragment of his tenth book.

sponds better with Hamadan, yet his longitude reaches to Ispahan. Hamadan and Susa are under the same degree of longitude, but the Ecbatana of Ptolemy is four degrees to the east of his Susa; and this is true also of Ispahan and Shus. But it may be objected, that Ptolemy was more accurate in his latitudes than in his longitudes; consequently, that more weight must be attached to the former than to the latter. My answer is, that, as a general proposition, it is so; but, in this case, we have so many data for ascertaining his comparative longitudes that the objection must fall to the ground. Thus, Arbela, the mouth of the Gorgus, and Ctesiphon, are all placed under longitude 80; the mouth of the Lycus, longitude 79; Seleuceia, longitude 79. 3. These are all places well known, and answer to the line described by Ptolemy. Comparatively speaking, it matters not whether they are placed under the right longitude or not. Susa is put in longitude 84, and Ecbatana in 88; consequently, the latter place must be looked for eight degrees to the east of Arbela, the mouth of the Gorgus, and Ctesiphon; and this will bring us to the line under which Ispahan is found.

Perhaps it may not be difficult to account even for his error in the latitude of Ecbatana. It is well known that the later Greek writers erred greatly in assigning a greater breadth to the peninsula of Asia Minor than the truth demanded.* Even in its narrowest part, there is an excess of two degrees; and, as they proceeded eastward, the error seems to have proportionally increased. Thus, while, with respect to the mouths of the rivers of Susiana and of the Oroatis, Ptolemy's latitude is nearly exact, (and I have observed, in numberless cases, that his maritime are far more correct than his inland positions,) he raises Persepolis, which is fifteen minutes to the south of this parallel, 30, to 33. 20., constituting an error of nearly four degrees. His latitude of Ecbatana is 37.15.; from which, if we subtract the latitude of Persepolis, the difference, according to Ptolemy, will be 3.35. But the real latitude of Ecbatana is 32.25.; from which, if we subtract the real latitude of Persepolis, 29.45., the difference will be 2.40., leaving a difference of only 1.15.; so that, even according to Ptolemy's system, comparatively examined, Ispahan is nearer to his latitude than

* How different was the error of the early Herodotus! He makes the distance between Sinope and Cilicia only five days' journey. This space, according to the usual scale, is not more than one thousand stadia; and even if we rate a day's journey of a brisk traveller at more than two hundred stadia, the amount remains inexplicably wide of the truth. Scylax is guilty of the same mistake. Mr Niebuhr (*Dissertation on the Geography of Herodotus*) seeks to account for the error, by suggesting that a chain of couriers, like that of the Tartars in Turkey, might be established between the Euxine and the Cilician coast; and that a regular conveyance of letters in five days, was mistaken for the speed of a common foot messenger.

any other place where a great city could have existed. But we ought to consider that his error was progressive, and increased as he proceeded northward. According to Ptolemy, there are seventeen degrees between the mouth of the Oroatis and Derbend, his *Albaniaë Pylæ*, two points which cannot be mistaken; while, in reality, there are only twelve. As the whole error was therefore five degrees, the greatest part of which was caused by placing Persepolis nearly four degrees to the north of its true latitude, it is not to be wondered that the error had increased to five in the latitude of Ecbatana or Ispahan, which is placed by him in latitude 37. 15.'

Mr Williams closes his able and convincing proof with a slight survey, historical and chorographical, of Ispahan. We have seen that Ammianus Marcellinus, at the end of the fourth Christian century, makes the last mention of old Ecbatana. From the darkness of more than two hundred years, Ispahan emerges into light in the works of the Arabian historians, who write that this *great city* was captured by their countrymen in A.D. 641. Between the invasion of Julian and the Arab conquest there had been no intervening change of dynasty, nor any devastation by a foreign foe. Ecbatana must still have existed as a *great city*. In the tenth century, Ebn Haukal writes— 'Ispahan is the most flourishing of all the cities of Cohestan;' in the twelfth, Benjamin of Tudela finds it 'the metropolis of Media, an immense city;' in the fourteenth, when taken by Timour, it could afford 70,000 heads of adult male Shiites to be constructed into piles. It is clear, then, that the Arabs found Ispahan a flourishing capital; and that it continued such for centuries under their sway, long before the reign of the Shah Abbas. Its plain is, indeed, one of the most prolific in the world, not only supplying the wants of the city, but allowing of a liberal exportation. The Persian geographers attribute the foundation of the city to Taimurz, supposed to have lived *nine hundred years before Christ*; and Mirkond states a tradition that *the ancient Kings of Persia spent the summer at Ispahan*. According to Chardin, the climate is delicious; the air, in the midst of summer, is cooled by the mountain-breezes from the south and east; and at no period are the inhabitants oppressed by the heat.

Some objections to the Ispahan theory have been already incidentally noticed: two more shall now be adduced. Mr Long, in his useful summary of Herodotus, quotes the Apocrypha. It seems that, when Tobit sent his son Tobias from Nineveh to Rages to get the money from Gabael, the young man and his companion crossed the Tigris, and came to Ecbatana in Media. The position of Rages, that is, the ancient *Rhagæ* and

modern *Rai*, of which the ruins remain, is fixed by Arrian* and Apollodorus† at the distance of an excessive day's march, or, according to the latter, of five hundred stadia from the Caspian Gates, the defile between the two mountains now called *Har-kah-Koh*, *Sia-Koh*. A glance at the map will show that Ispahan lies somewhat out of the direct way for one journeying from the neighbourhood of the modern Mosul to this defile; nor, considering the company in which Tobias travelled, can we compare his route with that of our young gentlemen in the present day, who find London to be on the shortest possible road between so many different points, seemingly adverse to such a discovery. But even granting that Tobit's Nineveh were certainly near the site of Mosul, and that, consequently, it was a most circuitous mode of progress to take Ecbatana, if so far to the south-east as Ispahan, on the way to Rhagæ, we must not forget that there was a matrimonial project for Tobias in the contemplation of his guide, quite powerful enough to cause a deviation from the ordinary route.‡

Mr Long adds, that 'the Greek names Ἀγβάτανα or Ἐκβάτανα, 'the Chaldee Achmëtha (*Ezra*, vi. 2) and *Hamadan*, are all 'the same word.' We remark, that the interpretation of the Chaldee Achmëtha is doubtful; and that, according to Mr Williams, 'it is not wonderful if the word which the Greeks had 'written *Ecbatan* should by the Arabs be written *Ispahan*. 'When the Byzantine writers heard the Arab name, they wrote 'it *Ispachan*.'

Having reviewed, at so much length, the geographical Memoir of Ecbatana, we cannot devote equal space to Mr Williams's second and longer Essay. Well has he selected as its subject that enchanting narrative of the memorable advance by the younger Cyrus, and still more memorable retreat by Xenophon, in which the hero-writer has proved himself, like Cæsar, to be one whose pen and actions were mutually worthy of each other. After all the labour bestowed upon the geography of the Anabasis, by Forster, and other learned men, many difficulties remained to be solved, and the present author, though he makes bold innovations on the orthodox system, does not pretend to remove them without exception. It is by reason of the greater proportion of doubt which is thus left upon the mind of the reader that the

* Book iii. 20.

† Strabo, book xi. pp. 514, 524.

‡ Raphael goes to Rages for the money, and returns before the wedding festivities are over, bringing Gabael with him; but we have no information as to their rate of travelling.

impression made by this second treatise is not so pleasing as that which results from the exact and brilliant demonstrations of the first. Yet it is full of sound argument, of learning, and of ingenuity. Without attempting to follow through all the details of the questions discussed, we shall select three topics, as affording favourable specimens of the method and judgment of the author; and these shall be, 1. The position of Thapsacus, 2. The site of Opis—the most southerly point reached by the Greek adventurers after their barren victory of Cynaxa, and 3. The point at which the retreating army, afraid to attempt the passage of the Tigris, and unable to pursue any longer the course of its bank, was forced to strike into the mountainous region of the Carduchi—the modern Curds.

Thapsacus, the name of which is explained by Mr Forster as signifying a pass or ford, was the place where the Cyreian army, led on by the politic gallantry of Menon, crossed the Euphrates. To guide to a right determination of this point, and avoid the mistake of the geographers, who have marked it too far down the stream, it is important, in the first instance, to observe, that those villages on the river Chalus, appropriated to the girdle-money of Parysatis, at which Cyrus encamped on the fourth day after leaving Myriandrus, lay higher up in a northern direction than the modern Haleb or Aleppo. The Chalus may certainly be identified with the Couaic, which washes the walls of Haleb, but there are positive reasons for believing the villages alluded to could not have been on the site of that city. Mr Williams has shown Myriandrus to be the same with the modern Pias: Now, from Pias to Aleppo is a distance of sixty-four miles upon the map, a distance that gives sixteen miles *per diem* for the advance of the army, whereas their average rate of progress was much less. Moreover, on this route they must have crossed three rivers—the Oinoparas, the Arceuthus, and the Ufrenus of Strabo—but not one of these is mentioned by Xenophon, whence the legitimate inference is that they were not crossed. The breadth, too, of the Chalus or Couaic at Aleppo is not equal to the *plethrum* of Xenophon's description; 'but Poccocke found its stream
' much wider in the upper part of the vale, as, like all rivers that
' lose themselves in the desert, it diminishes gradually as it ap-
' proaches its termination.'

A glance at the map will show why we consider it of importance to take the line of march through the upper part of the vale of the Couaic, where the fertility of the soil makes the position of rich villages as probable as in the lower region of the valley. In five days after quitting the banks of this river, the army reached the Daradax, where there were a park and palace

of Belesis, that is, of the Syrian ruler. Mr Williams supposes this royal residence to be the Barbalisus of the Peutingerian tables and the Byzantine historians,—the Barbarissus of Ptolemy,—and suggests that the river Daradax was nothing more than an artificial canal for the conveyance of water from the Euphrates into the park,—an hypothesis which derives great support from the breadth of one hundred feet assigned by Xenophon to the *sources* of the stream. It is, again, material to fix the seat of Belesis at the spot indicated by our author, with reference to the position of Thapsacus at the distance of *three days'* march from that point.

Strabo speaks of this place in the following terms: 'The distance between Thapsacus and Babylon, according to Eratosthenes, is 4800 stadia,* and not less than 2000 between the Zeugma in Commagenè (where Mesopotamia commences) and Thapsacus.' The Commagenian Zeugma was at Samosata, and was quite distinct from the Zeugma of Ptolemy, described by him as being in Cyrrestica, and which lay opposite to the modern Bir; but from the difference between the latter Zeugma and that of Commagenè not having been observed, the ancient geography of this part of the Euphrates has been thrown into confusion. The distance furnished by Strabo has been calculated from the Cyrrestic bridge, and the site of Thapsacus of course carried proportionally too far down the river; but the 2000 stadia, calculated, as Strabo expressly directs, from the Commagenian bridge, will bring us to the true situation as marked on Mr Williams's map. The stadium of Eratosthenes is that named the Aristotelian by D'Anville, and valued by him at something more than fifteen to a mile; the map-distance from Samosata to Surich, in the immediate vicinity of which Mr Williams places Thapsacus, is 140 miles, and the 2000 stadia, divided by fifteen, without including the fraction, give nearly 134 miles,—a result that comes sufficiently near to the conclusion aimed at. Of the other distance of 4800 stadia between Thapsacus and Babylon, no use can be made until that portion of the Euphrates be better mapped than it is at present, since the road between these two places must have, in the desert, followed the various bendings of the stream. It is worth while, however, to remark that Xenophon's account makes it no less than 197 para-

* At p. 130, this is rightly stated by Mr Williams, but at p. 143, he speaks, by an evident confusion of places, of the 'distance between Babylon and the Zeugma' as 4800 stadia.

sangs=5910 stadia between Thapsacus and the plain of battle, which was at a considerable distance to the north of Babylon. Mr Forster supposes the Persian guides to have betrayed the Greek writer into inaccuracy by their own random statements, and Mr Williams somewhere affirms that he has no respect for the parasangs of Xenophon, which he conceives to be 'only the ' Oriental hours, varying in length according to the difficulties ' or the facilities of the way.'

Even without the measurements of Eratosthenes, reported by Strabo, we have evidence with regard to the position of Thapsacus, which should have prevented the possibility of error. Ptolemy places it opposite to Nicephorium in Mesopotamia, and the abridger of Strabo illustrates this position, where, he says, 'Thapsacus is a city of Arabia, Nicephorium of Mesopotamia, ' 100 stadia distant from each other.' If, then, the site of Nicephorium be verified, that of Thapsacus must necessarily follow. Now, Nicephorium, the Callinicum of Eutrepus, is identical with the modern Racca. Mr Williams has taken rather superfluous pains to prove this point, which is already admitted upon D'Anville's maps, as well as in other works of inferior authority. The wonder is that, in the face of this admission, Thapsacus should have been transported by the geographers down to the site of the modern Ul-Der,* instead of standing *vis-à-vis* to Racca, to which post our author has most righteously restored it.

The position of Opis is the second point we wish to extract from Mr Williams's geography of the Anabasis. It is generally supposed that when the Greeks, under the treacherous guidance of Tissaphernes and Orontes, had crossed the Tigris, they immediately marched *up* the bank of the river. But had this been the case they could not have fallen in with the bastard brother of the king, and his great army from *Susa* and *Ecbatana*—which are named together by Xenophon, in a manner that strongly corroborates the identity of the latter city with Ispahan. The Persian chiefs undoubtedly conducted them *down* the stream, in order to effect this junction with troops coming from the south-eastern districts. Yet Forster places Opis as high up as the site of Bagdad, and some would carry it even seventy miles higher.

* Ul-Der, or El-Der, is considered by Mr Williams as identical with the Id-Dara, or Da-Dara of Ptolemy; 'the name itself has suffered no material change; and its position in Ptolemy, fifty minutes to the west of Zaitha, fixed before on the left bank of the Euphrates, ' eleven miles below the mouth of the Khabour, indubitably identifies it ' with Ul-Der, which has too long on modern maps usurped the title ' of Thapsacus.'

Since this would make it stand not only above the Gyndes, below the confluence of which with the Tigris Herodotus seems to mark its position, but also above Seleuceia, below which the Opis of Alexander* was situated, it is necessary, according to the view taken by these geographers, to imagine a double Opis, and that the Opis of Xenophon was different from that of Herodotus and of Alexander the Great. Larcher has actually adopted such an hypothesis, arguing especially from the fact that the Opis described by Strabo, which he considers the same with that mentioned by Herodotus and Arrian, was a mere village, whereas the Opis of Xenophon was a vast town. But the vast town of Xenophon and other ancient writers might easily be a village in the age of Strabo, since the establishment of a great mart at Seleuceia, and the opening up the navigation of the Tigris to that place, would inevitably ruin the prosperity of a settlement lower down the river. There can be no rational doubt that the Opis of Herodotus, of Xenophon, fifty years later, and of Alexander, thirty years after him, was the same. We repeat, therefore, that Alexander's Opis was below Seleuceia, and that the words of Herodotus lead us to infer that it lay below the confluence of the Gyndes with the Tigris. In our state of ignorance and uncertainty with respect to the Gyndes, Mr Williams ingeniously supposes that its northern branch might have reached the bridge over the Tigris between Susa and Babylon, and that such branch was the *Phycus*, upon which Xenophon places Opis; and 'henceforward,' he concludes, 'I shall assume it as a fact, that the Opis of Xenophon was about seven miles above the Koote of the map (of Arrowsmith). It is from this spot, therefore, that I commence the return of the Greeks up the river.'

Tissaphernes, having succeeded in the object of his south-eastern march, changed its direction, and led his intended victims,

* There is no doubt of this fact were it only from the arrangement of Strabo (lib. xvi. p. 740): 'the rivers [the Tigris and Euphrates] are navigable up the stream, the one [the Tigris] as far as Opis and the present Seleuceia,'—but in quoting the remainder of that passage, Mr Williams rides his text too hard: 'The Persians, wishing on principle to prevent the navigation of the rivers, and afraid of foreign invasions, had raised artificial barriers; but Alexander, when visiting these rivers, destroyed as many as he could, especially up to Opis.' The words which Mr Williams has printed in italics are not intended by Strabo to distinguish between Opis and Seleuceia, which did not yet exist in Alexander's time, but between the Tigris, the river of Opis, and the Euphrates, the river of Babylon.

first by an inland circuit—since we hear nothing of the Tigris for six days—and then up the left bank of the river. We shall beg to accompany them as far as the point of their final separation from the Tigris. The key to this position is the river Zabatus, or rather Zates, (for the former name depends on a conjectural emendation,) which Mr Williams believes to be, not ‘the universally received Greater Zab,’ but the Diala or Dijela of the moderns. The actual distance between the mouth of this river and the bridge above Koote—marched over by the Greeks in eleven days—does not exceed 112 miles; and though this gives only ten miles and a fraction for each day’s march, yet the circumstances under which they were advancing—the want of cordiality between Clearchus and Tissaphernes, and consequent suspicions of the weaker party, and the delay occasioned by plundering the villages of the queen-mother—may well account for a diminution of the average progress of the army during these eleven days. It may be shown even from physical causes, that the Greater Zab could not have been the Zates. ‘The Greater Zab is one of the largest rivers of the second class in Asia, and not to be forded—at least never yet forded by infantry in the neighbourhood of the Tigris.’ Authorities ancient and modern—Herodotus, Quintus Curtius, Ebn Hangkal, Rauwolf, and Niebuhr—may be adduced in support of this assertion. ‘Even Rauwolf’s account,’ says one author, ‘shows that the magnificent and furious Zab, the ravenous wolf (*Lycus*) of the Macedonians, could not have been the Zates of Xenophon, about 130 yards broad, and crossed by the Greeks, without the slightest difficulty or opposition, in the presence of a powerful enemy.’ ‘After this,’ says Xenophon, ‘they took their breakfast, passed the river Zates, and marched on.’ It ought also to be remembered, that had the Greeks crossed the Lycus near its confluence with the Tigris, which they must have done were it the Zates, they would have found a still greater river than at the spot where Rauwolf and Niebuhr crossed it; as two streams, one of itself a very considerable river, the other not so large, form a junction with it, not far below the regular ford between Mosul and Arbela.’

Besides this, it is not to be imagined that Xenophon, generally so accurate in his notice of considerable streams, should at once, on crossing to the east of the Tigris, become a blunderer, and omit to mention the Diala, over which the route of the Greeks must of necessity have taken them. Mr Williams adds in another place: ‘the five days’ march between the villages of Parysatis and the Zates are described as being through the desert; and such, at this day, is the region immediately

‘ to the south of the mouth of the Diala. Kinneir, after passing
 ‘ the ruins of Seleuceia and Ctesiphon, in sailing down the
 ‘ Tigris, says, *from this to Koote, the country on both sides the river*
 ‘ *was an uninhabited desert.*’

After crossing the Zates, the Greeks reached the spot where the precipitous nature of the ground prevented their further progress along the Tigris by the following stages :

	Days.
Skirmishing with Mithridates,	1
Larissa,	1
Mespila,	1
Skirmishing with Tissaphernes,	1
March under the new arrangement,	4
Across hills into villages in the plain,	1
Halt when overtaken, and march by night,	1
March without being overtaken,	2
Force their way into the plain,	1

13

According to our author their advance was arrested at the point where the Hamrun hills strike on the left bank of the Tigris. Now the map distance between the mouth of the Diala and this spot is 120 miles, which, divided by 13, give something more than nine miles for the rate of daily progress; and, considering that they did not march full three miles on the first day, and that, excepting on the third, eleventh, and twelfth days, they were incessantly fighting as well as marching, the wonder is that they got on so well. The daily advance of a Roman army commanded by Antony did not, under like embarrassments, exceed eight miles. Mr Williams compares the Greek march with that of Julian's army before and after the death of the Apostate, as recorded by Ammianns and Zosimus. He shows that the space between the Diala and the impassable spot on the bank of the Tigris was traversed both by the Greeks and Romans in exactly the same interval of time. ‘ On consulting the map,’ he continues, ‘ it will be seen that the Hamrun hills, after running parallel with the Tigris for some distance, suddenly turn to the left, and thus form a natural *cul-de-sac*. I can almost affirm that the Romans were in the exact position occupied by the Greeks previous to their ascent into the mountainous regions of the Carduchi; and had Tissaphernes occupied the passes, as dreaded by the Greeks, the result must have proved something similar.’

Our author, with these impressions, ‘ cannot sufficiently admire the complacency with which good scholars and men of

‘ sense and information have drawn an imaginary line between
 ‘ Samara and the mouth of the Greater Zab, to represent the
 ‘ road through the desert traversed by the Greeks during the
 ‘ five days immediately preceding their arrival on the banks of
 ‘ the Zates. For, as far as I have been able to discover, such
 ‘ a line of road never existed, nor has it been attempted by
 ‘ armies or caravans, or even single travellers; and a recapitu-
 ‘ lation of a few of the most important expeditions from Western
 ‘ Asia against the capitals on the Tigris and the Euphrates, and
 ‘ the reverse, will serve to show this.’ The expeditions of
 Alexander, Trajan, Timour, Nadir Shah, &c., are then pressed
 into the service, and the conclusion may be given in Mr Wil-
 liams’s own words:—‘ Now it is idle to suppose, that Greek,
 ‘ Roman, Persian, Tatar, and Turk, should, for a space of more
 ‘ than two thousand years, have invariably taken a very consi-
 ‘ derable circuit, even when their fleets were sailing down the
 ‘ Tigris,—that caravans and travellers should have taken the
 ‘ same line, did not some physical obstruction prevent the pos-
 ‘ sibility of forming a road along the Tigris between the line of
 ‘ the Hamrun hills and the mouth of the Lycus; consequently
 ‘ it is pure romance to suppose, that the 10,000, with their four
 ‘ attendant armies, could, in five days, have traversed this most
 ‘ impracticable ground. And if this be the case, as no doubt
 ‘ it is, all that I have hitherto advanced on the subject must,
 ‘ on the great scale, be undoubtedly true.’

We regret that we cannot follow the author into the moun-
 tain-haunts of the Carduchi; but we must be allowed, in taking
 leave of him, to extract a vigorous and striking passage:—
 ‘ I know of no tribe of people more interesting to the historian
 ‘ of the human race than the Curds. There they have remain-
 ‘ ed among their mountain-fastnesses an unchanged and record-
 ‘ ed race for more than two thousand years. They have pre-
 ‘ served their language, their habits, laws, customs, and inde-
 ‘ pendence. From their heights they have witnessed the plains
 ‘ successively occupied and forsaken by nations from every
 ‘ quarter of the compass. The Mede, the Persian, the Greek,
 ‘ the Parthian, the Arab, the Tatar, and the Turk, have all
 ‘ set up their habitations in the vales, and have passed away;
 ‘ for even the Turk does no more than linger there. It has
 ‘ been no home, no resting-place for any of these races; but the
 ‘ Curd looks back on an unbroken descent through a hundred
 ‘ generations; from father to son the mountain-heritage has
 ‘ been handed down without a breach, and while he traces his
 ‘ lineage to the patriarch Noah, he points to the ruins of the
 ‘ ark as a proof that he possesses the paternal inheritance still

‘ unviolated, and that he represents the eldest branch of the ‘ far-famed Noachidæ.’

If we have done any justice to Mr Williams’s two essays, we must have excited in our readers a wish warmly cherished by ourselves, that he should fulfil his promise of a larger work on the Geography of Ancient Asia. In executing such a work, his arrangement will naturally be somewhat more methodical, and the digressions, in which he is apt to indulge, will become less numerous. His style, preserving all its strength and freedom, will perhaps more rarely approach the verge of incorrectness. Of the ardour with which he will accumulate knowledge, and the ingenuity with which he will apply it, no doubt can be entertained. There is but one thing that causes us any apprehension. Having addressed the present treatises to *Xenophon the Athenian*, and *Alexander the Macedonian*, how is he to rise on the scale of dedication, for the more extensive and elaborate performance? We see nothing left for him unless it be to imitate the example of that grammarian, who composed a volume on Orthoepy, and inscribed it to *the Universe*.

ART. III.—*Fauna Boreali-Americana; or the Zoology of the Northern Parts of British America.* By JOHN RICHARDSON, M.D. F.R.S. F.L.S. Part First; containing the Quadrupeds. 4to. London: 1829.

A KNOWLEDGE of the various phenomena presented by the different groups of animals and plants, in accordance with the latitude, the longitude, and the altitude of their position, constitutes the science of physical geography, as applied to organized beings, and forms one of the most interesting and important branches of natural history. When we take an extended survey of the geographical distribution of animals and plants, we find that they are generally disposed over the earth’s surface in bands or parallel zones, corresponding, in a great measure, with the peculiarities of temperature and climate which are appropriate to the nature of each. When the temperature of a particular latitude becomes colder, as on mountains or highly elevated plains, or warmer, as on plains by the sea-shore or in low lying sheltered valleys, we find, in the former case, that the species approximate in their nature and characters to those of a more southern, in the latter, to those of a more northern parallel. In regard to the vegetable kingdom, this intimate relation between the species and the temperature was long since ably

illustrated by Tournefort, in his observations on Mount Lebanon. At the base of that mountain, he gathered the productions peculiar to Asia; after these occurred species characteristic of the Italian fields; as he continued to ascend, those of France presented themselves; at a still greater elevation, a Flora, analogous to that of Sweden, was observable; and, among the cold and barren peaks, a botanist might have supposed himself on the summits of the Doplirian Alps. Each zone of the mountain had, in fact, a temperature corresponding to that of the country in which its race of plants most naturally flourished, or where they had what may be called their centre of dominion.

Viewed under a similar aspect, each hemisphere of the earth has been regarded as an immense mountain, of which the equator forms the basis, and the north and south poles the respective summits; and if the general surface were less unequal,—that is to say, presented scarcely any highly elevated plains, or lofty alpine chains, which necessarily derange or alter the direction of the isothermal lines,—then the temperature of countries would bear a much more exact relation to their distance from the equator, and the geographical distribution of plants and animals might be illustrated simply by parallel lines of greater or less extent.*

In the study of zoological geography, there are, however, many minor circumstances to be taken into consideration, which frequently change or counterbalance the more usual results, and consequently derange such calculations as might not unreasonably be formed upon a knowledge of latitudinal and longitudinal position, and of the height of a country above the level of the sea. The nature of the soil and surface, the different degrees of dryness and humidity, and the consequent character of the climate and vegetation, the comparative extent of land

* It is much to be desired that some well-informed zoologist should reconstruct the map prefixed to Zimmerman's *Specimen Zoologicæ Geographicæ Quadrupedum* (Leyden, 1777). Though highly meritorious for the period of its publication, it has long been inadequate to represent the actual state of our knowledge. The learned author published a second edition of his map, corrected in relation to the geographical discoveries of Cook; and he has given an explanation of that revised edition in the third volume of his *Zoologia Geographica*—a work in the German language. Perhaps a better model, as admitting of clearer views and more ample details, would be found in Schouw's excellent *Plantegeographisk Atlas* (Copenhagen, 1821); where a separate map of the world is given to illustrate the distribution of each of the great natural families of the vegetable kingdom.

and water, the extent and continuity of forests, marshes, and sandy deserts, the direction of mountain ranges, the courses of rivers, the existence of waterfalls, and the form and position of lakes;—these and several other circumstances must be taken into consideration, and will be found materially to affect the distribution of animal life over the surface of the earth. The insular position of a country also greatly influences its zoological features, more especially if that country is in the course of rapid improvement or alteration under the hand of man. The draining of fens and marshes, the reclaiming and fencing of commons and other wastes, the clearing of forest lands, the banking of rivers, and the general progress of commerce, agriculture, and inland navigation, consequent on a great increase of population, become by degrees so influential on the local character and physical constitution of a country, that all the larger, and especially the fiercer wild animals are, in the first place, hemmed in and restricted within narrow bounds, and finally altogether extirpated. It is thus that the beaver no longer establishes its republican dwellings on the banks of the Rhone or the Danube,—that the bear, the wild boar, and the wolf, cannot now be numbered among the denizens of the British forests,—and that even the hart and hind have scarcely wherewithal to screen themselves from the sultry noontide, amid the scanty remnants of ‘our old ‘ancestral woods.’ Indeed, the lion himself, the king of beasts, which in ancient times as an inhabitant of Thrace and Macedonia, must have shaken the hoar-frost from his shaggy mane, has now withdrawn to the distant countries of the East, or the burning deserts of Africa.

The geographical distribution of animals presents a wide field for speculation, although the modes by which that distribution has been effected will probably remain for ever concealed from human knowledge. Their gradual extension by natural means, from a single centre of creation, scarcely falls within the sphere of credibility; and thus the creation of various groups of species over different points of the earth’s surface, and in accordance with the climate and physical character of different countries; or the removal and dispersion, by supernatural agency, of the greater proportion of existing species from an original centre, seem the two points, one or other of which remains to be illustrated by whoever is curious in such bewildering speculations. Many legitimate sources, however, of the highest interest, spring on the nearer side of that mysterious bourne which separates our probable knowledge of things, as they exist in their now established relations, from our possible knowledge of the same, or analogous things, as they existed in former times, and in a

different order of relation. It is for the naturalist and the physical geographer assiduously to collect an ample, accurate, and extended series of facts, with a view to exemplify the real and characteristic localities of the species which constitute the animal kingdom—not established upon vague and superficial resemblances, but on the actual knowledge of identical forms—and, by comparing and combining these determinate observations, to deduce the laws in accordance with which species and genera are now disposed over the surface of the earth.*

* One of the most important of those preliminary enquiries which are essential to a proper comprehension of zoological geography, consists of the investigation and ascertainment (at least approximately) of the limits which nature has assigned to the variation in the specific characters of animals, and the establishment of fixed and determinate principles, by reference to which it may be discovered whether certain distinctions were sufficient to constitute a specific difference, or were merely the result of climate, or of some peculiar or accidental combination of circumstances. We find, for example, that the golden plover of Europe (*Charadrius pluvialis*) is described and figured as an American species by Alexander Wilson (*American Ornithology*, vol. vii. p. 71). Asia, Africa, and New Holland also produce a species, which is so nearly identical, that the individuals from these countries are chiefly distinguishable from those of the first-named regions by the pale hair-brown colour of the inferior coverts of their wings. A certain portion of the commissure of the bill is yellow, and on account of that character, it has been distinguished by Wagler by the specific name of *xanthocheilus* (*Systema Avium*); and it is figured under that same designation as distinct from the golden plover, by Sir William Jardine and Mr Selby (*Illustrations of Ornithology*, part 6, plate 85). The common magpie of Europe (*Corvus pica*), and that of the northern parts of North America (*Corvus Hudsonius*), have been classed as distinct species, in consequence of a still slighter disparity in their plumage (*Appendix to Captain Franklin's First Journey*, p. 672). So, also, the hooded blackcap (*Tinto Negro de Capello*), of the island of Madeira, is by some observers regarded as identical with the European species (*Curruca atricapilla*). If it is identical, how does it happen that a peculiar variety should be confined to the island of Madeira? If it is not identical, it is equally singular that a species, so closely allied both in aspect and manners to the European species, should not have been observed in any continental country. One of the chief difficulties, then, in tracing the distribution of widely-extended species, arises from the uncertainty under which naturalists labour, from the want of a positive and assured test by which to ascertain whether a certain character should be regarded as expressive of specific distinction, or ought rather to be ranked as within the legitimate range of individual variation; whether, in short, such forms of animal life as

It was the opinion of Pennant, that all the animals of America were derived from the north-eastern quarter of Asia, to which they had previously made their way from Mount Ararat, and that the two continents were at one period united as far southwards as the Aleutian Islands, 'in a climate not more rigorous than that which several animals might very well endure, and yet afterwards proceed gradually to the extreme of heat.'* This view of the matter does certainly not agree with the co-existences which we now perceive as fixedly established between certain forms of animal life, and the physical characters of countries; neither does it coincide with a multiplicity of special facts with which it ought at least to be in some measure reconcilable.

How does it happen that the tiger has never travelled beyond the continent and islands of Asia, while the sloth has reached South America, and the ornithorhynchus New Holland? Why are the pampas of the New World inhabited by quadrupeds entirely different from the species which occur in the plains of Tar-

appear to be repeated over most of the great continents of the earth, should be regarded as specifically the same, or merely as analogous to, or representative of each other. Where we have acquired a knowledge of the habits and economy of a species, and of the individuals of that species, wheresoever found, and if these are uniformly the same under different and far-removed localities, then a trivial distinction in plumage should be regarded as insufficient to constitute a specific difference between them; but when we find the individuals from one country or continent characterised and distinguished by some peculiarity in their instinctive habits, or modes of life, as well as by a cognizable difference of aspect, we are then authorized to infer that they are specifically distinct, and are entitled to rank them accordingly.

We have entered into these apparently trifling details, because we are aware that some modern writers deny that any species is widely distributed, and maintain that every great continent is characterised by organized beings, which form as it were a system in themselves; and that such as appear to be identical with these in other regions are merely a repetition of somewhat analogous forms, and may be detected and described by certain permanent specific characters, independent of colour, or other unessential attributes. This is probably an extreme view of the case; but it is well that it has been brought forward, in as far as it cannot be proved to be either true or false, without leading to a much more accurate comparison of species than has hitherto prevailed; and without precision in these matters, the subject of zoological geography will remain in many respects 'a vast expansion, given over to night and darkness.'

* *Introduction to the Arctic Zoology*, p. 277.

tary and the Karoos of Africa? Did the mountains of Armenia offer no proper resting-places to the llamas and vicunhas which now dwell among the passes of the Andes? Were the Peaks of Ararat unfit for the condor of Peru, or the shores of the Caspian Sea for the great Washingtonian eagle, which has been found only in the United States? In what manner did the mole contrive to travel under ground to the last-named territories; and how did it manage to support itself while journeying towards the southern states, when we know that there are no earth-worms (its accustomed food) in the vicinity of the Arctic circle, near which it must have passed, according to Pennant's theory of the progression of species, while advancing from the north-east coast of Asia to the north-west corner of the New World?

To whatever country the observant traveller turns his steps, he finds it characterised by various peculiar tribes; and many of these, the farthest removed from what we consider as the central station in which all living creatures were originally placed, are the most imperfectly provided with the means of locomotion. Many species appear, as it were, to be voluntarily imprisoned,—at least the causes of their circumscription have hitherto evaded our researches; while the location of others is more apparently dependent on the physical circumstances by which they are surrounded.

The fleet and fiery onager, 'whose home I have made the wilderness, and the barren land his dwelling,' knows not how to pass beyond certain determinate, though to us invisible boundaries, within which he is doomed to dwell, in spite of his never-tiring strength, and long endurance of thirst and hunger. For thousands of years before the birth of Columbus, the llamas of the New World (as it is called by the inhabitants of not more ancient countries) had tracked the mountain passes of the Andes, and gazed with their dusky masters at once on the Atlantic ocean and the 'far Pacific,' across neither of which the audacious genius of man had as yet aspired to venture. For countless generations has the Polar bear,

'With dangling ice all horrid, stalk'd forlorn,'

along the frost-bound shores of Greenland, and would now be sought for in vain under a less inclement sky. The tiger, with his fevered blood and all-subduing strength, lurks like a pestilence among the most beautiful of the Asiatic islands, or glares with cruel and unsated eye from the jungle grass of India. The cunning panther couches among the branches of the African forests, or with noiseless footsteps winds his insidious way

through the 'silvan colonnade' of over-arching groves, presenting a striking contrast in the silent celerity of his movements to the restless clamour of the wily monkeys, the 'mimic men,' whose fantastic tricks he so often seeks in vain to terminate. His congener of the New World, the fiercer and more powerful jaguar, prowls along the wooded shores of the Orinooka, or, reclined beneath a magnificent palm-tree, forms a picture such as that which so often delighted the eyes of Humboldt and his brave companion. The wary moose-deer of the northern continent, roaming amid the gloom of primeval forests, reposes during the sultry noontide with his magnificent antlers beneath the refreshing shade of a gigantic tulip-tree, or, starting at the far cry of wolves or other wild animals, alike unknown in kind to every other region of the earth, he plunges for safety across some sea-like river, threatening with 'armed front' the upraised jaws of a huge and fire-eyed reptile reposing on its sunny banks. The sandy and desert plains of Africa alone produce of birds and quadrupeds the tallest of their kind—the swift-footed ostrich, and the gentle camelopard, neither of which are elsewhere known.

A glance at the innumerable and far-spread legions which compose the busy world of insect life, renders the subject still more complex and confounding. A discovery ship, under the guidance of brave men, surmounts with difficulty the terrors of the ocean, and after being months on the trackless main, and some thousand miles from any of the great continents of the earth, she arrives at last, and accidentally, at some hitherto unknown island of small dimensions, a mere speck in the vast world of waters by which it is surrounded. She probably finds the 'Lord of the Creation' there unknown, but though untrod by human footsteps, how busy is that lonely spot with all the other forms of active life! Even man himself is represented not unaptly by the sagacious and imitative monkeys, which eagerly employ so many vain expedients to drive from their shores what they no doubt regard as merely a stronger species of their race. 'Birds of gayest plume' stand fearlessly before the unsympathizing naturalist, and at every step of the botanical collector the most gorgeous butterflies are wafted from the blossoms of unknown flowers, and beautify the 'living air' with their many splendid hues. Yet how frail are such gaudy wings, and how vainly would they now serve as the means of transport from that solitary spot, where all the present generations have had their birth! In what manner, then, did they become its denizens, or by what means were they transported to a point almost imperceptible, in comparison with the immeasurable extent of the circumjacent ocean?

An ingenious French writer, M. Bory de St Vincent, selects, as an illustration of his sentiments on this subject, Mascareigne, or the Isle of Bourbon, situated a hundred and fifty leagues from the nearest point of Madagascar, from which it might, on a casual survey, be supposed to have derived its plants and animals. This remarkable island does not contain a particle of earth or stone which has not been originally submitted to the violent action of submarine volcanic fire. All its characters indicate a much more recent origin than that of the ancient continent. It bears about it an aspect of youth and novelty which recalls what the poets have felt or feigned of a nascent world, and which is only observable in certain other islands, also admitted among the formations of later ages. Mascareigne was at first one of those 'soudraux brulans' on the bosom of the ocean, similar to such as have since been seen to arise, almost in our own times, at Santorin and the Azores. Repeated eruptions of this submarine and fiery furnace, heaping up bed upon bed of burning lava, formed at last a mountain, or rocky island, which the shocks of earthquakes rent in pieces, and on the heated surface of which the rains of heaven, speedily transformed into vapour, watered not

' the flowery lap
Of some irriguous valley,'

nor shed their refreshing influence over any possible form of vegetation. The fabled salamander alone might have become a denizen of that lurid rock,

' Dark, sultry, dead, unmeasured ; without herb,
Insect, or beast, or shape or sound of life.'

Now, by what means did a rich and beautiful verdure at last adorn it, and how have certain animals chosen for their peculiar abode an insulated spot, rendered by the nature of its origin uninhabitable for a long period after its first appearance, and during its progressive formation and increase? Winds, currents, birds, man himself,—one or all of these causes sufficed, it will be said, to bring about such signal changes. First, the winds, bearing up impetuously the winged seeds with which so many plants are furnished, transport them to far distant countries. Secondly, currents, subjected under the torrid zone to a regular and continuous course, carry along with them such fruits as they have swept from their native shores, and deposit them on remote or opposing coasts. Thirdly, birds which feed on seeds, disgorge or otherwise deposit them on desert lands during their migratory flights. Lastly, man, who has navigated the

ocean for so many centuries, may, at some remote period, have coasted the shores of such an island as Mascareigne, and left there the animals by which it is now characterised.

The following considerations are adduced to show the insufficiency of these causes to produce the supposed results.

1. Winds effectively carry with them, to a great distance, the lighter seeds of a certain number of vegetables; but it is doubtful whether they carry them 150 leagues, to deposit them precisely on a lonely point, almost imperceptible in comparison with the immeasurable extent of the circumjacent ocean. Vegetables with winged seeds, susceptible of being floated through the air, are by no means numerous, especially in the island under consideration, and to which, consequently, the winds could have carried but a small number, if any, of the now indigenous species.
2. The currents of the ocean, it is admitted, may transport some fruits and seeds, capable of floating, along with the miscellaneous debris which is continually in the course of being swept away from the shores. Of this the cocoas of Praslin, commonly called Maldivian cocoas, furnish a familiar example. But does it ever happen that these fruits or seeds, after being subjected to the action of saline currents, are found to germinate? Salt water, if not utterly destructive, is at least highly injurious to the greater proportion of plants; and those unwearied botanists, whom the love of science has induced to brave the terrors of the ocean, know from fatal experience, how hurtful the smallest sprinkling of sea water proves to their botanical collections, both of plants and seeds. The only species which the waves of the sea are likely to obtain in good condition, are certain circumscribed tribes which grow along the shores, such as saltworts, thrifts, and a few cruciferæ. But these tribes are almost entirely unknown in the island of Mascareigne. The seeds of forest and other larger trees, from the interior of countries and the elevated sides of mountains, which are occasionally met with by the sea-shore, could only have been brought there by torrents, or other natural accidents, after a lengthened and alternate exposure to excessive humidity and extreme dryness, in consequence of which they would, in all probability, be deprived of their natural faculty of reproduction. Even the cocoas before alluded to, enveloped both by a thick impenetrable shell and a kind of fibrous wadding, when carried by the oceanic currents from their natal soil, and thrown upon the Indian shores, or those of the archipelagoes, are never found in such a condition as to admit of vegetation. The truth is, that these and other fruits are incapable of floating at all till after they are dead, and, consequently, can never be conveyed to a distance

either by winds or waves, till such time as they have entirely lost the power of germination. 3. It is not denied that certain frugiverous birds disseminate the germs of plants over the surface of those countries which they inhabit, and on the bark of trees where they repose; of which last mode the misseltoe, so frequent on apple-trees, is a familiar example; but it has been observed by ornithologists, that birds which feed on fruits and seeds are usually stationary, or at least of a much less migratory disposition than the insectivorous tribes, and more especially so in climates where the variations of the seasons never render necessary a change of place. There being nothing to attract them to a necessarily sterile rock, far removed on every side from those coasts which they might previously have inhabited, and entirely beyond the bounds of their accustomed flights, they cannot plausibly be considered as the means of transporting even that small number of seeds which are fitted by their peculiar structure to withstand the heat of the stomach, during the very short interval of time which is allowed to elapse before the utterly destructive process of digestion commences. On the other hand, birds of a more lofty and sustained flight, such as those which are habituated to seek their places of repose amid the insulated and sterile rocks of the ocean, derive their nourishment from fishes, molluscous animals, and other marine productions; and, therefore, however in themselves fitted or ordained by their Creator to be the primitive inhabitants of Mascareigne, they are, by the very constitution of their nature, necessarily disenabled from acting as agents in the transmission of any species of plants. Lastly, man is not in the practice of planting lichens, mosses, and confervæ, among numerous other vegetable productions, none of which are cultivated, or in any way productive of the slightest benefit in the countries referred to. Man, who might have transported thither the stag or the goat, or certain insects which follow him wheresoever he goes, and in spite of himself, would not intentionally have introduced the mischievous apes, against which he now wages a fierce and unremitting war, nor those gigantic bats which hover through the evening air, and increase the obscurity of a short-lived twilight, nor the numerous and noxious reptiles which infest the fields and dwelling-places. Neither could he have transported the originals of all those splendid and innumerable insects, the 'gilded summer flies,' which commingle

‘ Their sports together in the solar beam,
Or in the gloom of twilight hum their joy.’

Nor could he have been in any manner accessory to the peo-

pling of the lakes and pools with those peculiar species of fresh-water fish, cray-fish, and aquatic insects, which the scientific zeal of naturalists has there discovered. Finally, that monstrous and extraordinary bird, the dodo, indigenous to the island under consideration, and which so greatly astonished the early settlers, could not have been carried from any other quarter of the world, because it was neither known previously, nor has it ever since been seen or heard of elsewhere.*

It appears then inadmissible to suppose that all, or any of these organized beings, have been transported from the more ancient continents, to the insulated positions which they now inhabit, either by the power of winds, the prevalence of currents, the agency of birds, or the influence of the human race. When, and by what means, then, may it be asked, were they there conveyed? This is the problem which many thoughtful enquirers have long sought, and probably will for ever seek, in vain to solve.

In the vegetable, as well as in the animal kingdom, the causes of the distribution of the species, in the opinion of Humboldt, are among the number of mysteries which natural science cannot reach. This science, or the branch of it which takes cognizance of zoological geography, is not occupied in the investigation of the origin of beings, but of the laws according to which they are now distributed over the surface of the earth. It enters into the examination of things as they are, the co-existence of vegetable and animal forms in each latitude, at different heights and at different degrees of temperature; it studies the relations under which particular organizations are more vigorously developed, multiplied, or modified; but it approaches not problems the solution of which is impossible, since they touch the origin or first existence of the germs of life. 'We may add,' says that enlightened naturalist, 'that the attempts which have been made to explain the distribution of various species over the globe by the sole influence of climate, date at a period when physical geography was still in its infancy; when recurring incessantly to pretended contrasts between the two worlds, it was imagined that the whole of Africa and of America resembled the deserts of Egypt and the marshes of Cayenne. At present, when men judge of the state of things, not from one type arbitrarily chosen, but from positive knowledge, it is ascertained that the two continents, in their immense extent, contain countries that are altogether analogous, and that there are regions of America

* *Dict. Class. D'Hist. Nat.*, t. v. p. 44.

‘ as barren and burning as the interior of Africa.’* Each hemisphere, according to the same authority, produces plants of a different species; but it is not by the diversity of climates that we can attempt to explain why equinoxial Africa has no laurineæ, and the new world no heaths; why the calceolareæ are found only in the southern hemisphere, and the roses only in the northern; why the birds of continental India are less splendidly attired than those of Brazil and other sultry regions of South America; and finally, why the tiger is peculiar to Asia, and the ornithorhynchus to New Holland. It would be equally difficult to explain why the common grouse, or moor game (*Tetrao Scoticus*) should occur nowhere in the known world except in the islands of Great Britain and Ireland, while, at the same time, a frail and feeble butterfly (*Vanessa Cardui*) is found over great portions of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, and is as familiarly known in the central islands of the vast Pacific ocean, as in the flower gardens of England. It is, indeed, true that the migration and distribution of organized bodies can no more be solved as a problem in physical science, than the mystery of their original creation; and that ‘ the task of the philosopher is fulfilled when he has indicated the laws, in accordance with which Nature has distributed the forms of animal and vegetable life.’†

Few of those animals which we find either in Mascareigne or in other islands, whether remote or contiguous, can be said to have derived their primitive stock from other regions, even if the means of transfer could be demonstrated or rendered probable; because, with the exception of a very limited number of species which we find elsewhere under similar climates, each Archipelago presents species, or even genera, which are peculiar and proper to it alone;—so that if these peculiar forms of life came originally from a distant country, not only must they have been transported from their pristine abodes, by means which at present we can neither demonstrate nor imagine, but the original races, if any such remained in the mother country, must have been entirely extirpated. Now, as it is a matter of certainty that many of these islands are of more recent origin than the great continents of the earth, some recent speculators have argued from this the necessity of admitting the possibility of a comparatively modern creation of animal and vegetable life, whenever such a concurrence of favourable circumstances has

* *Personal Narrative*, vol. v. p. 180.

† *Ibid*, vol. iii. p. 496.

taken place in any particular point of our planet, as determines the completion of those wondrous plans which an all-wise and ever-provident Ruler had seen fit previously to organize.*

It has been observed that, for the most part, those animals which are found in islands, or greatly insulated continents, rarely inhabit other countries; for example, the species of New Holland, and of South America, do not occur in any of the ancient continents; and this has been adduced as a proof that the surface of the earth, and the relative positions of sea and land, have undergone several signal changes since the period at which animals became generally distributed over that surface, according to those peculiar laws of geographical allotment by which the particular localities of species and genera are now established and maintained.

As, however, a difference in respect to longitude is much less influential in the modification of climate, and the consequent production of a diversity of species, than an equal difference in respect to latitude, we find that the northern parts of North America exhibit a zoological aspect, more allied to that of Norway, Lapland, and some of the corresponding parallels of Asia, than to the southern parts of the New World. For example, the wolf, the rein-deer, and the elk, are common alike to the northern parts of either continent; but with the exception of one or two species, chiefly feline, such as the puma (*Felis concolor*), the animals of North and South America do scarcely in any respect correspond. Under more southern parallels, however, where the masses of land are separated by greater extent of intervening ocean, such countries as lie under the same latitude, present a difference in the character of their zoological productions, apparently regulated in a great measure by their longitudinal distances. The equatorial regions of Asia, Africa, and America, possess no quadruped which is common to more than two of those regions, and were it not for the occurrence of the lion, the jackall, and one or two others, in each of the two first-named continents, it might be said that none of the three possessed a single mammiferous animal in common. Though New Holland produces a few birds, which seem identical with the species of Europe, its quadrupeds differ, without exception, not only from those with which we are familiar in Europe, but from those with which we are acquainted in any other quarter of the globe. They belong almost entirely to that anomalous group, named pouched or marsupial animals, of which we have like-

* Bory de St Vincent, Art. *Creation*, in *Dict. Class. d'Hist. Nat.*

wise examples (though both specifically and generically distinct) in one of the American tribes.

We must here, however, not only limit ourselves to the consideration of a single department of zoological geography, but must further restrict our observations, in the meantime, almost entirely to the countries illustrated by Dr Richardson's work.

In tracing the progress and distribution of animal life in North America, so far as regards the mammiferous land species, Melville Island, and the rest of the North Georgian group, may be assumed as the most northern region of which we possess any precise information. The mammiferous quadrupeds of those forlorn islands are nine in number; and of these five are carnivorous, and four herbivorous; viz.

Carnivorous.

The white, or Polar bear,	.	.	.	Ursus maritimus.
The wolverene,	.	.	.	Gulo luscus.*
The ermine, or stoat,	.	.	.	Mustela erminea.
The wolf,	.	.	.	Canis lupus.
The fox,†	.	.	.	C. lagopus.

Herbivorous.

The lemming,	.	.	.	Lemmus Hudsonius.
The hare,	.	.	.	Lepus glacialis.
The musk-ox,	.	.	.	Bos moschatus.
The rein-deer,	.	.	.	Cervus tarandus.

Of these, the last two are only summer residents, which visit Melville Island from the south, towards the middle of May, and quit it, on their return southwards, in the end of September.

We may take, as our next position, the continental American shores of the Polar Sea, and the most northern portions of the continent, and we shall there find that the *north-eastern corner* carries its purely Arctic character further to the south than any of the other meridians. This very bare and desolate portion of America, bounded by the Coppermine River, the Great Slave Lake, and other lakes on the west, by the Churchill, or Mis-

* The wolverene, or glutton, was not met with in the living state in Melville Island, but a skull was picked up, which was afterwards identified as pertaining to that species.

† In making use of such terms as fox, lemming, and hare, these appellations must be taken in connexion with the Latin specific names, for the English words do not signify the identical species so designated in Europe.

sinippi, on the south, and by the sea on the north and east, is generally known under the name of the 'Barren Grounds;' so called by the traders, in consequence of its being almost entirely destitute of wood, except along the banks of its larger rivers. The soil of the narrow valleys, which separate the low primitive hills of this district, is either an imperfect peat earth, affording nourishment to dwarf birches, stunted willows, larches, or black spruce trees; or, more generally, the soil is composed of a rocky debris, consisting of coarse quartzose sand, unadapted to other vegetation than that of lichens. The centres of the larger valleys are filled with lakes of limpid water, which are stored with fish, even though in some places completely land-locked. The reindeer, or caribou, and the musk-ox, are the prevailing quadrupeds of these barren wastes, where the absence of fur-bearing species has prevented any settlement by the traders. The only human inhabitants are the Caribou-eaters, a people composed of a few forlorn families of the Chepewyans. This quarter of America, then, though not actually the most northern in a geographical point of view, may be considered as the most truly Arctic, when viewed in relation to its zoological aspect. We therefore assume it, along with the principal portion of the southern shore of the American Polar Sea, as our second position. These districts present the following animals, in addition to such as we have already enumerated as characteristic of Melville Island; viz.

Carnivorous.

The Barren Ground bear,	Ursus Arctos (?) Americanus.
The vison-weasel,	Mustela vison.
The otter,	Lutra Canadensis.

Herbivorous.

The musquash,*	Fiber zibethicus.
The yellow-checked meadow mouse,	Arvicola xanthognathus.
Wilson's meadow mouse,	A. Pennsylvanicus.
The Northern meadow mouse,	A. Borealis.
Back's lemming,	A. trimucronatus.
The Greenland lemming,	A. Groenlandicus.
Parry's marmot,	Arctomys Parryi.

Hitherto our species have not only increased, but no vacancy has occurred in the ranks by the desertion of any of the North Georgian or other Arctic species. As we proceed southwards,

* The musk-rat of Pennant's *Arctic Zoology*, vol. i. p. 106, and the *Castor Zibethicus* of Linn. *Syst. Nat.* i. p. 79.

however, into the territories of our *third* position, although the species, as might be anticipated, continue to increase, their real amount is, to a certain extent, diminished by the dropping off of a few ice-haunting, or peculiarly Arctic species. Thus we shall lose the company of the musk ox; some of the Arvicolæ disappear; the icy hare (*L. glacialis*) declines to enter upon a more abundant and richer pasture than that of its favourite dwarf birch-trees, and the visits of the Polar bear become ‘few and far between.’ As we may therefore have no other opportunity of discussing the subject, we shall here devote a few lines to a sketch of the geographical history of the first and last of the above-named quadrupeds, as the most remarkable land animals of the Arctic regions.

The Polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) has been seen in higher latitudes than any other quadruped; that is, between the 82° and the 83° north. Its southern limit may be stated to be about the 55th parallel. It is well known at York Factory, on the south-western shore of Hudson’s Bay, particularly during the autumn, having probably been drifted in the summer season, from the northward, on the ice. It is, indeed, a truly ice-loving and maritime species, and prevails along a great extent of the shores of the Northern Ocean, never entering into woody regions, except by accident, during the prevalence of great mists, nor showing itself at more than a hundred miles from the sea. Indeed, any near approach even to that distance from saline waters may be regarded as very rare. Some vague observers have no doubt described this animal as occurring occasionally in the more central parts of North America, but they have mistaken a light-coloured, or hoary variety of the grizzly bear (*Ursus ferox*), for the Polar species. It abounds in Greenland, Spitzbergen, and Nova Zembla, and was met with by Captain Parry among the North Georgian Islands, even during the depth of that prolonged and gloomy winter.* The species, however, decreases in numbers to the westward of Melville Island. Dr Richardson met

* ‘On the return of the ships through Barrow’s Straits, a bear was met with, swimming in the water, about midway between the shores, which were about forty miles apart; no ice was in sight, except a small quantity near the land. On the approach of the ships, he appeared alarmed, and dived, but rose again speedily; a circumstance which may confirm the remark of Fabricius, that well as the Polar bear swims, he is unable to remain long under water.—*Supplement to the Appendix of Captain Parry’s Voyage for the Discovery of a North-West Passage, in the years 1819-20.* London, 1824.

with none between the mouths of the Mackenzie and Coppermine Rivers; and the Esquimaux informed Captain Franklin that white bears very rarely visited the coast to the westward of the Mackenzie. They were, however, observed by Cook, during his third voyage, among the islands of Behring's Straits, although Pennant asserts the contrary; and according to the latter authority they do not occur on the Asiatic shores to the eastward of the Tchutskoinoss.* They were not seen by Captain Beechey during his recent voyage to the Icy Cape.† It thus appears that the Polar bear prevails very generally along all the frozen shores within the Arctic circle, with the exception of about 35 degrees of longitude on either side of Point Beechey, in which it is comparatively rare; and that in Hudson's Bay, and along the northern coast of Labrador, and the nearer portions of East and West Greenland, it occurs not unfrequently 6 or 8 degrees to the south of the Arctic circle.

We are indebted for our systematic knowledge of the musk-ox to Pennant, who received a specimen of the skin from the traveller Hearne.‡ It had been previously noticed, however, by several of the earlier English voyagers, and M. Jeremie had imported a portion of the wool to France, from which stockings were manufactured more beautiful than those of silk.¶ Though this animal bears an original name in the language of the Esquimaux (from which circumstance the districts it inhabits have been presumed to be the proper lands of that peculiar people), it is known to the Crees and Northern Indians only by a compounded designation.§ In presenting a sketch of its geographical distribution, we cannot do better than avail ourselves of the following passage from Dr Richardson's admirable volume, which, while it conveys more substantial information on the subject of Arctic zoology than any publication which has appeared since the time of Pennant, is also highly valuable as correcting

* *Arctic Zoology*, vol. i. p. 62.

† *Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific and Behring's Straits, to cooperate with the Polar Expeditions*. London, 1831. Although the white bear was not seen alive during the progress of the voyage, its skin appears to have been obtained by Captain Beechey amongst other peltry from the natives on the coast of Hotham's Inlet, Kotzebue's Sound.

‡ *Arctic Zoology*, vol. i. p. 11.

¶ *Voyage au Nord*, t. iii. p. 314. Charlevoix, *Nouv. France*, t. v. p. 194.

§ The Esquimaux term for the musk-ox is *Oomingmah*; it is called *Mathel-moostoos*, or ugly bison, by the Cree Indians, and *Adgiddah-yawseh*, or little bison, by the Copper tribes and Chepewyans.

the occasional errors of that excellent work, and adding all the most useful and interesting information which has been more recently acquired.*

‘ The musk-ox inhabits the Barren Lands of America, lying to the northward of the sixtieth parallel of latitude. Hearne mentions that he saw tracks of one within a few miles of Fort Churchill, in lat. 59°; and in his first journey to the north, he saw many in about latitude 61°. I have been informed that they do not now come so far to the southward, even in the Hudson’s Bay shore; and further to the westward they are rarely seen in any numbers lower than latitude 67°, although from portions of their skulls and horns, which are occasionally found near the northern borders of the Great Slave Lake, it is probable that they ranged at no very distant period over the whole country, lying betwixt that great sheet of water and the Polar Sea. I have not heard of their having been seen on the banks of Mackenzie River, to the southward of Great Bear Lake, nor do they come to the south-western end of that lake, although they exist in numbers on its north-eastern arm. They range over the islands which lie to the north of the American continent, as far as Melville Island, in latitude 75°; but they do not, like the reindeer, extend to Greenland, Spitzbergen, or Lapland. From Indian information, we learn, that, to the westward of the Rocky Mountains, which skirt the Mackenzie, there is an extensive track of barren country, which is also inhabited by the musk-ox and reindeer. It is to the Russian traders that we must look for information on this head; but it is probable that, owing to the greater mildness of the climate to the westward of the Rocky Mountains, the musk-ox, which affects a cold and barren district, where grass is replaced by lichens, does not range so far to the southward on the Pacific coast as it does on the shores of Hudson’s Bay. It is not known in New Caledonia, nor on the banks of the Columbia, nor is it found in the Rocky Mountain ridge at the usual crossing-places near the sources of the Peace, Elk, and Saskatchewan Rivers. It is therefore fair to conclude, that the animal described by Fathers Marco de Niça and Gomara, as an inhabitant of New Mexico, and which Pennant refers to the musk-ox, is of a different species. The musk-ox has not crossed over to the Asiatic shore, and does not exist in Siberia, although fossil skulls have been found there of a species nearly allied, which has been enumerated in the systematic works under the name of *Ovibos Pallantis*. The appearance of musk-oxen

* The etchings by Thomas Landseer, which illustrate Dr Richardson’s volume, are remarkable both for spirit and accuracy. They are infinitely superior to the wood engravings which adorn several of our modern works on natural history, and which, however beautiful in their mechanical execution, and the clearness of their printing, are disfigured by an affected mannerism, and are moreover extremely defective as zoological representations. They want the truth of Nature and of Bewick;—not so those of the Fauna Boreali-Americana.

on Melville Island, in the month of May, as ascertained on Captain Parry's first voyage, is interesting not merely as a part of their natural history, but as giving us reason to infer that a chain of islands lies between Melville Island and Cape Lyon, or that Wollaston and Banks' Lands form one large island, over which the migrations of these animals must have been performed.*

We may add to the preceding extract, that Mr Anthonie Parkhurst, who wrote in the year 1578, asserts that in the island of Newfoundland 'there are mightie beasts, like to camels 'in greatnesse, and their feet cloven. I did see them afarre off, 'not able to discerne them perfectly, but their steps showed that 'their feete were cloven, and bigger then the feete of camels. I 'suppose them to be a kind of buffes which I read to be in the 'countreys adjacent, and very many in the firme land.† It is more probable, however, that these 'mightie beasts' were rather musk-oxen than real 'buffes,' as the former animal still occurs in Labrador, and other north-eastern parts of America, where the bison is quite unknown.‡

We shall now proceed to the consideration of our third zoological portion of North America. 'A belt of low primitive 'rocks,' says Dr Richardson, 'extends from the barren grounds 'to the northern shores of Lake Superior. It is about two 'hundred miles wide, and as it becomes more southerly, it recedes from the Rocky Mountains, and differs from the Barren 'Grounds principally in being clothed with wood. It is bounded 'to the eastward by a narrow stripe of limestone, and beyond 'that there is a flat, swampy, partly alluvial district, which 'forms the western shores of Hudson's Bay. As far as regards 'the distribution of animals, the whole tract, from the western 'border of the low primitive rocks to the coast of Hudson's Bay, 'may be considered as one district, with the exception that the 'sea bear seldom goes farther inland than the swampy land which 'skirts the coast.' This tract may be named the *eastern district*, and the following additional species now make their appearance:—

Carnivorous.

Two or three unknown bats,	.	Vespertiliones.
The American marsh shrew,	.	Sorex palustris.
Forster's shrew,	. . .	Sorex Forsteri.

* *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, vol. i. p. 275.

† Hackluyt's *Collection*.

‡ Keating's *Account of Major Long's Expedition to the Source of St Peter's River*, &c. Vol. ii. chap. 1.

An undetermined species of shrew } mole, }	Scalops.
A species of badger?	Meles ?
The common weazel,	Mustela vulgaris.
The pine marten,	Mustela martes.
The pekan, or fisher,	Mustela Canadensis.
The Hudson's Bay skunk,	Mephitis Americana Hudsonica.
The American fox,	Canis (vulpes) fulvus.
Two varieties of the above, viz.	
1st, The American cross fox,	Canis (vulpes) decussata.
2d, The black, or silver fox,	————— argentata.
The Canada lynx,	Felis Canadensis.

Herbivorous.

The American beaver, and its va- } rieties, }	Castor fiber Americanus, et ejus varietates.
The American field mouse,	Mus leucopus.
The Labrador jumping mouse,	Meriones Labradorius.
The Quebec marmot,	Arctomys empetra.
The Hackee squirrel,	Sciurus (Tamias) Lysteri.
The Chickaree squirrel,	Sciurus Hudsonius.
The Severn River flying squirrel,	Pteromys sabrinus.
The American hare,	Lepus Americanus.
The moose deer,	Cervus alces.

The list immediately preceding the above contained, inclusive of the Melville Island species, all of which likewise inhabit the Barren Ground district, nineteen species of quadrupeds. Those of our third position, or eastern district, amount to thirty-two species, exclusive of the bats; and that number is composed of thirteen species from our former list, the distribution of which extends southwards from the Barren Grounds into the eastern district, and of the nineteen species last enumerated, which, as far as we yet know, appear for the first time in that district. The six species of the Barren Ground list, which we lose in consequence of our advance to the southward, are, *Arvicola Borealis*, *A. trimucronatus* and *Grænlandicus*, *Arctomys Parryi*, *Lepus glacialis*, and *Ovibos moschatus*.

The eastern district is bounded to the westward by a flat limestone deposit; and a remarkable chain of lakes and rivers, such as the Lake of the Woods, Lake Winipeg, Beaver Lake, and the central portion of Churchill or Missinippi River, all lying to the southward of the Methy portage, marks the line of junction of the two formations. The whole of this district being well wooded, yields the fur-bearing animals in great abundance; and a variety of the bison, named for that reason the wood bison, is contained within the western border of its more northern quarter. The following additional species make their

appearance in this our *fourth* zoological department, which Dr Richardson names the *limestone* tract, viz.

Carnivorous.

The hoary bat,	Vespertilio pruinosus.
The long-tailed star-noze,	Condylura longicauda.

Herbivorous.

The leopard marmot,	Arctomys Hoodii.
The black squirrel,	Sciurus niger.
The four-banded pouched squirrel,	Sciurus quadrivittatus.
The Canada porcupine,	Hystrix pilosus.
The bison,	Bos Americanus.

We have thus gained seven new species; but as the entire number of quadrupeds ascertained to inhabit the limestone district amounts only to thirty-three, or one more than the preceding, it is evident that six of our former list must have dropt away. These six are the following—*Ursus maritimus*, a species of *Scalops*, a species of *Meles* (?), *Canis lagopus*, *Arvicola Hudsonius*, and *Pteromys sabrinus*. The most remarkable accession is that of the bison, or American buffalo, regarding the distribution of which we shall therefore say a few words.

The bison inhabits a great portion of the temperate parts of North America, and extends southwards probably as far as the 35th degree of N. lat. Its characteristic positions are the great prairies to the westward of the Mississippi, where they sometimes unite in prodigious troops, amounting in some instances to 10,000 individuals.* They were observed in the Carolinas soon after the arrival of the earliest colonists, but they have been long since forced to retire before the ‘pale-faced European,’ and concentrate their forces on the plains of the Missouri. They have not been seen for a long period in Pennsylvania, but they were observed in Kentucky about the year 1766. The altered and circumscribed localities of this animal afford a good example of the influence which the human race exerts over the natural boundaries of the brute creation. There seems to be no doubt that they formerly existed throughout the whole extent of the United States, with the exception perhaps of the territory to the east of Hudson’s River and Lake Champlain, and of some narrow lines of coast along the Atlantic shores and the Gulf of Mexico. They were, however, seen near the Bay of St Bernard by Alvar Nunez during the earlier part of the 16th century, and that locality may be regarded as the most southerly to which the species can be traced on the eastern side of the

* Harlan’s *Fauna Americana*, p. 270.

Rocky Mountains. Like several other animals, they extend much farther north among the central than the eastern territories, for we find that a bison was killed by Captain Franklin's party on the Salt River, in the sixtieth parallel; whereas they cannot be traced in any of those tracts which lie to the north of Lakes Ontario, Erie, &c. and to the eastward of Lake Superior. But westward of Lake Winipeg they advance, according to Mr Keating,* as far as the 62d degree of N. lat.; and Dr Richardson states, on the testimony of the natives, that they have taken possession of the flat limestone district of Slave Point, on the north side of Great Slave Lake, and have even wandered to the vicinity of Great Martin Lake, in latitude 63° or 64°. The extension of the bison in a westerly direction, appears to have been formerly limited by the range of the Rocky Mountains; but it is said of late years to have discovered a passage across these mountains, near the sources of the Saskatchewan. Though not mentioned by Father Venegas among the quadrupeds of California, it is known to occur at present both in that country and in New Mexico. Its existence on the Columbia is also well ascertained. We shall conclude our geographical notice of the bison with the following incident, related by Dr Richardson, in illustration of its manners.

‘ In the rutting season, the males fight against each other with great fury, and at that period it is very dangerous to approach them. The bison is, however, in general, a shy animal, and takes to flight instantly on winding an enemy, which the acuteness of its sense of smell enables it to do from a great distance. They are less wary when they are assembled together in numbers, and will then often blindly follow their leaders, regardless of, or trampling down, the hunters posted in their way. It is dangerous for the hunter to show himself after having wounded one, for it will pursue him; and although its gait may appear heavy and awkward, it will have no difficulty in overtaking the fleetest runner. While I resided at Carlton House, an accident of this kind occurred. Mr Finnan McDonald, one of the Hudson's Bay Company's clerks, was descending the Saskatchewan in a boat, and one evening, having pitched his tent for the night, he went out in the dusk to look for game. It had become nearly dark when he fired at a bison-bull, which was galloping over a small eminence; and as he was hastening forward to see if his shot had taken effect, the wounded beast made a rush at him. He had the presence of mind to seize the animal by the long hair on its forehead, as it struck him on the side with its horn; and being a remarkably tall and powerful man, a struggle ensued, which continued until his wrist was severely sprained,

* *Account of Major Long's Expedition to the Source of St Peter's River*, vol. ii. chap. i.

and his arm was rendered powerless; he then fell, and after receiving two or three blows became senseless. Shortly afterwards he was found by his companions lying bathed in blood, being gored in several places; and the bison was couched beside him, apparently waiting to renew the attack had he shown any signs of life. Mr McDonald recovered from the immediate effects of the injuries he received, but died a few months afterwards.*

We now resume our general sketch of the distribution of North American quadrupeds. Interposed between the limestone district before mentioned, and the base of the Rocky Mountains, an extensive tract occurs of what is called prairie land. The inequalities of its surface are so slight, on a general survey, that, while crossing it, the traveller has to direct his course either by the compass or the observation of the heavenly bodies. The soil is pretty fertile, though for the most part dry and sandy, and supports a thick sward of grass, which affords an abundant pasture to innumerable herds of bison. Widespread plains of a similar aspect, but greater extent, border the Arkansa and Missouri rivers. They are described as becoming gradually narrower to the northward, and occupy in the southern portion of the fur countries about 15 degrees of longitude, from Manetobaw or Manetowoopoo, and Winipegoo Lakes, to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. In some places they are partially intersected by low ridges of hills, and also by several streams, of which the banks are wooded; and towards the outskirts of the plains many detached masses of finely formed timber, and pieces of still water, are disposed in so pleasing and picturesque a manner, as to produce rather the appearance of a highly cultivated English park than of an American wilderness.

‘In the central parts of the plains, however,’ says Dr Richardson, ‘there is so little wood that the hunters are under the necessity of taking fuel with them on their journeys, or in dry weather of making their fires of the dung of the bison. To the northward of the Saskatchewan the country is more broken, and intersected by woody hills; and on the banks of the Peace River the plains are of comparatively small extent, and are detached from each other by woody tracts; they terminate altogether in the angle between the River of the Mountains and Great Slave Lake. The abundance of pasture renders these plains the favourite resort of various ruminating animals. They are frequented throughout their whole extent by buffalo and wapiti. The prong-horned antelope is common on the Assinaboyn or Red River, and south branch of the Saskatchewan, and extends its range in the summer to the north branch of the latter river. The black-

* *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, vol. i. p. 281.

tailed deer, the long-tailed deer, and the grizzly bear, are also inhabitants of the plains, but do not wander farther to the eastward.*

The following short list exhibits the mammiferous animals which are characteristic of this district:—

Carnivorous.

The grizzly bear,	Ursus ferox.
The prairie wolf,	Canis latrans.
The kit fox,	— (vulpes) cinereo-argentatus.

Herbivorous.

The wistonwish, or prairie marmot,	.	.	.	Arctomys Ludovicianus.
The tawny marmot,	————— Richardsonii.
Franklin's marmot,	————— Franklinii
The mole-shaped sand rat,	Geomis (?) talpoides.
The Camas rat,	Diplostoma.
The Virginian hare,	Lepus Virginianus.
The horse,	Equus caballus.
The Wapiti deer,	Cervus strongylocerus.
The black-tailed deer,	————— macrotis.
The long-tailed deer,	————— leucurus.†

Many of the fur bearing species before mentioned, are also found along the wooded margins of the rivers which flow through these open plains; and the banks of the Red River are inhabited by the racoon (*Procyon lotor*), and may be regarded as its most northern boundary.

We now arrive at the base of the Rocky Mountains, a vast and continuous chain, which, stretching from Mexico in a north-north-west direction, and nearly parallel with the shores of the Pacific Ocean, terminates about the 70th degree of north latitude, to the westward of the mouths of the Mackenzie River, and within sight of the Arctic Sea. These mountains, though inferior in height to the Andes of the southern continent (of which, on an extended survey, they may be regarded as the northern continuation), greatly exceed in elevation the other chains of North America. This, independent of any more special knowledge of the fact, becomes apparent from a consideration of the courses of the great rivers of the country, all of which derive their sources and primary streams from the Rocky Mountains, however different may be the direction in which their waters flow. Thus the Columbia, which runs southward, and falls into the Northern Pacific Ocean in the 46th pa-

* *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, vol. i. p. xxix. of *Introduction*.

† In addition to the above we may mention, that the Canada rat (*Mus bursarius*, of Shaw) has been recently ascertained to inhabit the banks of the Saskatchewan.

rallel, derives its primary streams from the western slopes of the same rocky chain, the eastern sides of which give rise to the waters of the Missouri, which, following a south-easterly and southern direction, terminate their long-continued course of 4500 miles in the Gulf of Mexico. The Saskatchewan, in both its great branches, likewise flows from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, and uniting its streams a short way below Carlton House, it flows through Lake Winipeg, and then, assuming the name of Nelson River, it empties itself in the vicinity of Cape Tatnam, into Hudson's Bay. So also the Mackenzie, which in point of size may be regarded as the third river in North America, (being inferior to the Missouri and St Lawrence alone,) derives its two main branches, the Elk and Peace Rivers, from these mountains; and, ere long, flowing northwards, and in a north-westerly direction, it opens its numerous mouths into the Polar Sea, after a course of nearly 2000 miles. It has been noticed as a singular fact, that the Peace River actually rises on the west side of the Rocky Mountain ridge, within 300 yards of the source of the Tacootchessè, or Fraser's River, which flows into the Gulf of Georgia, on the western shore. It is evident, then, that the great chain of the Rocky Mountains forms one of the most prominent and commanding features in the physical geography of North America.

The following animals inhabit the Rocky Mountains, in addition to many of the species contained in the preceding lists:—

Say's bat,	Vespertilio subulatus.
The bank meadow mouse,	Arvicola riparius.
The sharp-nosed meadow mouse	———— novoboracensis.
The tawny lemming,	———— helvolus.
The rocky mountain neotoma,	Neotoma Drummondii.
The whistler,	Arctomys pruinosus.
The American souslik,	———— guttatus ?
Say's marmot,	———— lateralis.
The little chief hare,	Lepus (Lagomys) princeps.
The Rocky Mountain goat,	Capra Americana.
The Rocky Mountain sheep,	Ovis montana.

The two species last named, are among the most remarkable and important of the North American quadrupeds. The Rocky Mountain goat inhabits the highest, and least accessible summits. The precise limits of its territorial range have probably not yet been ascertained; but it appears to extend from the 40th to the 64th, or 65th degree of north latitude. It is rarely, if ever, observed at any considerable distance from the mountains, and is said to be less numerous on the eastern than the western sides. It was not met with by Mr Drummond on the

eastern declivities of the mountains, near the sources of the Elk River, where the sheep are numerous; but he learned from the Indians, that it frequents the steepest precipices, and is much more difficult to procure than the sheep.* Its flesh is hard and dry, and somewhat unsavoury, from its musky flavour. Beneath its long hairy covering, there is a coating of wool, of the finest quality. If the Highland Society, and the Hudson's Bay Company, were to combine their resources of 'ways and means,' the importation of this fine animal into the Alpine and insular districts of Scotland, might be effected without much difficulty, or any great expense.

The Rocky Mountain sheep, which there seems good reason for regarding as distinct from the argali of the North of Asia, inhabits the range from whence it derives its name, from its northern termination, or at least from latitude 68°, to the 40th degree of north latitude. It also dwells among many of the elevated and craggy ridges which intersect the country lying to the westward, between the principal range and the shores of the Pacific Ocean; but it does not appear to have advanced beyond the eastern declivities of the Rocky Mountains, and it consequently does not occur in any of the hilly tracts nearer to Hudson's Bay. Their favourite feeding-places are 'grassy knolls, skirted by craggy rocks, to which they can retreat when pursued by dogs or wolves.' Their flesh, according to Mr Drummond, is quite delicious, when in season, being far superior to that of any of the deer species which frequent the same localities, and even exceeding in flavour the finest English mutton. It is probable, however, that a botanical tourist, alike vigorous in body as intelligent in mind, and breathing the pure and bracing air of these Alpine regions, receives the bounties of Providence with a proper, though peculiar zest.

There are many interesting tracts of country lying to the westward of the Rocky Mountains, of the natural history of which, however, we have still an uncompleted knowledge. Two large herbivorous animals, either closely allied to or identical with the wild goat and sheep of the Rocky Mountains, are said to inhabit California;† and the following brief enumeration of the quadrupeds of that country is given by Captain Beechey.

* *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, vol. i. p. 269. Major Long states, from the information of a factor of the Hudson's Bay Company, that they are easy of access to the hunter. See Harlan's *Fauna Americana*, p. 258.

† *Phil. Trans.* No. 318, p. 332, and Jones's *Abridg.* vol. v. p. 194.

In the woods not immediately bordering upon the missions, the black bear has his habitation, and when food is scarce it is dangerous to pass through them alone in the dusk of the evening; but when acorns are plenty, there is nothing to fear. A species of puma (*Felis concolor* ?), and another powerful feline animal (*Felis onca* ?), are likewise inhabitants of the woods. A large mountain cat (*gato del monte*) is common; a pole-cat haunts the forests; and wolves and foxes are very numerous. The fallow deer (?) browses on the pasture land, not only in the interior, but also upon some of the islands, and around the shores of the harbour of San Francisco; and the rein-deer (?) is said to inhabit the inland districts, more especially a large plain called Tulurayos, on account of the abundance of bulrushes by which it is covered. The fields are burrowed by a small rat resembling the *Mus arvalis*, by a mountain rat of the *cricetus* kind, and by another little animal, apparently of the squirrel tribe, called *ardillo*, said to be excellent eating. A small rabbit inhabits the sandhills near the presidio; but hares are much less common. The sea-otter frequents the harbours of San Francisco, but less abundantly than in former times, when (as in 1786) 50,000 might have been collected in a single year.* A species of marmot (*Arctomys Beecheyi*) has been recently discovered in those parts of California which adjoin the Columbia.

The extensive plains which skirt the upper branches of the Columbia, present the same general character as the more eastern plains of the Missouri and Saskatchewan, and are inhabited by the same species. We have already mentioned that the bison has recently made its way across the mountains, though it is still comparatively few in numbers, and of restricted localities on the western plains. During Mr Drummond's hurried journey across the Rocky Mountains, the snow covered the ground too deeply to admit of his adding much to his collections, but he states that it is impossible to avoid remarking the great superiority of the climate on the western side of that lofty range. 'From the instant,' he adds, 'that the descent towards the Pacific commences, there is a visible improvement in the growth of timber, and the variety of forest trees greatly increases. The few mosses that I gleaned in the excursion were so fine, that I could not but deeply regret that I was unable to pass a season or two in that interesting region.'†

* Beechey's *Narrative*, part ii. p. 403.

† Lewis and Clarke mention *Ursus ferox*, *Canis latrans*, *Canis cinereo-argentatus*, the braro (*Meles Labradoria* ?), *Cervus macrotis*,

New Caledonia, of which the central post at Stuart's Lake lies in $54\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ north latitude, and 125° west longitude, extends from north to south about 500 miles, and from east to west about 350 or 400. It contains many large lakes, and Mr Harmon calculates that one-sixth part of the entire country is covered with water. Except for a few days in winter, during which the thermometer descends as low as 32° below zero of Fahrenheit, the weather is much milder than on the eastern side of the mountains; an amelioration, which is no doubt owing to the comparatively narrow extent of the land which intervenes between the mountains and the sea. The summer is not oppressively hot throughout the day; the nights even of that season are usually cool; and slight frosts are perceptible during some period of every month of the year. Snow generally falls about the 15th of November, and disappears by the 15th of May: So that the winter may be said to be shorter by about one-third than it is in some places situated under the same latitude on the other side. The smaller quadrupeds of this territory consist of beavers, otters, lynxes, fishers, martins, wolverenes, foxes of different kinds, badgers, polecats, hares, and a few wolves. There are also some moose-deer; the natives occasionally kill a black bear; and the caribou occurs at certain seasons.* It is mentioned in Captain Cook's third voyage, that the party saw racoons, foxes, martins, and squirrels, alive, on the coast of New Caledonia, and they obtained the skins of black and brown bears, of wolves, and various foxes, and of otters, ermines, marmots, lynxes, and hares. The skins of moose-deer, and of some additional species, not at present distinctly recognised, are mentioned by Mears as among the articles of commerce exhibited by the natives of Nootka Sound.†

We now arrive at a very forlorn quarter, the north-west cor-

var. B. *Columbiana*, *Cervus leucurus*, and *Aplodontia leporina*, as inhabiting the plains of the upper branches of the Columbia. The *Condylura macroura*, several species of *Felis*, of *Geomys* and *Diplostoma*, were noticed by Mr Douglas in the same localities. A species of fox, very similar to that of Europe, or the red fox of the Atlantic States of America, frequents the sea-coast at the mouth of the Columbia; and two species of marmot (*A. brachyurus* and *Douglasii*) inhabit the banks of that fine river.

* *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America, between the 47th and 58th degrees of latitude*, by Daniel William Harmon, a Partner in the North West Company. Andover: 1820.

† *Voyages to the north-west coast of America, in 1788 and 1789*, by John Mears, Esq. 4to. London: 1790.

ner of the North American continent, an extensive territory forming a portion of the vast Russian dominion, and of the zoological productions of which our knowledge is both vague and meagre. Indeed, with the exception of some very scanty notices in the works of Cook and Kotzebue, and the recent voyage of Captain Beechey, which apply only to certain narrow portions of the sea-coast, we scarcely know where to seek for information on the subject. Dr Richardson reports from the statements of the few Indians of Mackenzie's River, who have crossed the Rocky Mountains in that northern portion, that on their western side there is a tract of barren ground frequented by rein-deer and musk-oxen; and it may be presumed, from the quantity of furs procured by the Russian company, that woody regions, similar to those that prevail to the eastward of the mountains, also exist in the north-western quarters of America. The following list is given by Langsdorff, of the skins contained in the principal magazine of the Russian Fur Company, on the island of Kodiak. They are collected principally on the peninsula of Alaska, in the vicinity of Cook's Inlet, and other continental shores. 'Brown and red bears, black bears, foxes, black and silver-grey (the stone fox, *Canis lagopus*, is not found to the southward of Oonaska) glutton, sea, river, and marsh otters, lynx, beaver, zizel marmot, common marmot, hairy hedgehog (*Erinaceus ecaudatus*), rein-deer, American wool-bearing animal.* Though the musk-ox was not seen by Captain Beechey's party in these north-west districts, they ascertained that it was known to some of the natives who had descended to the shores of Kotzebue's Sound, from the remoter parts of Buckland's River. Rein-deer were observed feeding on some rather luxuriant pasture at Cape Lisburn; and these animals were not unfrequently represented in herds, with spirit and accuracy, on various implements in use by the natives of those icy shores. Foxes were noticed between Capes Barrow and Franklin, the most northern portions hitherto ascertained of the American continent, and wherever a forlorn

* See *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, and *Voyages and Travels to various parts of the world, in the years 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, and 1807*, by G. H. von Langsdorff. 2 vols. London: 1813. We may add, that the Esquimaux of Choris Peninsula, in the interior of Kotzebue's Sound, when shown by Captain Beechey the natural history plates in Rees's Cyclopaedia, recognised the figures of the following species, and bestowed on them their own appropriate names:—'Squirrel, fox, musk-rat, rein-deer, musk-ox, white bear, walrus, seal, otter, porcupine, mouse, beaver, hare, goat, sheep, bull (musk?), white horse (?), narwhal, whale, porpoise, dog.'

family of the human race had established their desolate dwelling-place, there the faithful and accommodating dog, the most genuine cosmopolite of the brute creation, was found to accompany its lord and master.

It will be observed that we have omitted all mention of whales, walrusses, and seals; and chiefly for this reason, that it has been our intention rather to illustrate the distribution of *land* animals, properly so called, than of such as pertain to the sea. Suffice it to say, in regard to the aquatic mammalia just named, that they are found as far north as the highest latitude to which human enterprise has yet attained, and that they extend over the entire circumference of the Arctic circle. Of the land species, the Arctic fox, the rein-deer, and the polar bear (itself, however, scarcely less maritime than the phocine tribes), are the most widely spread; and of such as are peculiar to North America, it is probable that the musk-ox is distributed over the greatest number of meridians.

We have now made a pretty extensive circuit from Melville Island, over the Barren Grounds, and through the eastern district, the limestone tract, the prairie lands, the Rocky Mountain range, the western coasts, and the north-west or Russian territory, and we find ourselves again by the shores of the Polar sea. We trust that our rapid sketches of some of the zoological features by which these northern divisions of the new world are distinguished, however slight and superficial, will not be deemed entirely deficient in interest. Of course a great deal requires to be yet accomplished, not so much to verify the facts,—for these, as far as they go, may probably be relied upon as sufficiently accurate,—but rather to multiply and extend them. As our knowledge of the natural characters of these countries becomes more ample as well as more detailed, we shall no doubt discover various exceptions to whatever general rules we might be tempted to deduce from our present scanty materials—for the subject is still in its infancy; and this immature condition must plead our excuse for the somewhat meagre outlines which we have thought it incumbent on us to present, rather than leave so interesting a field of observation entirely unexplored. Before entering upon any general consideration of the natural history of the United States, we shall conclude our observations on the more northern parallels, by citing a single example of the effects which local peculiarities produce on the zoological characters of a country, independent of its particular position in relation to latitude alone. The mouths of the Mackenzie, which pour their waters into the Arctic Ocean under a higher latitude than any other large Ame-

rican river, traverse for a time an alluvial delta which nourishes a comparatively luxuriant vegetation, and hence along its banks several animals advance to a more northern latitude than the more stunted vegetation of the Coppermine River permits them to attain. We may thus perceive the interconnexion or mutual dependence of the links of a lengthened chain of facts in natural history. Below the junction of Peel's River with the Mackenzie, the branches of the latter irrigate the low lands with the warmer waters which have flowed from the southern countries, and which, breaking up their icy covering at an earlier period, 'produce a more luxuriant vegetation than exists in any place in the same parallel on the American continent,' (Dr Richardson's *Introduction*, p. 22); and the moose-deer, the American hare, and the beaver, follow this extension of a life-sustaining vegetation. Of course the existence of these herbivorous animals induces a corresponding increase in the localities of wolves, foxes, and other predaceous kinds.

The whole of the mammiferous animals known to inhabit the great northern districts of the new world (exclusive of cetacea), may be stated as amounting to between 80 and 90 species. We shall now pass southwards to the United States; where, however, the field being so varied and extensive, and the species so greatly increased by the appearance of many interesting forms of animal life, peculiar to, or characteristic of, temperate and warmer regions, we shall not at present venture upon any individual details. What we have already stated will suffice to correct the error committed by M. Desmarest, who gives 54 as the amount of the mammiferous species of North America.* Dr Harlan, collecting together all the detached observations which have appeared in various journals, and including the species discovered during Major Long's expedition, and those contained in the published voyages of Captains Franklin and Parry, has distinguished, with tolerable accuracy, 147 species as inhabitants of North America. Of these, however, 11 species are fossil, and no longer occur in the living state, and 28 pertain to the cetaceous tribes. We have therefore 108 as the number of North American quadrupeds, properly so called. Of the latter num-

* *Mammalogie, ou description des Espèces de Mammifères. Seconde Partie. Avertissement*, p. 7. The above may be either a typographical mistake, or stated through inadvertence, as in fact M. Desmarest, in the body of his excellent work, describes about a hundred species which are known to exist in North America.

ber, 21 species are supposed to occur both in North America and the old world, viz. :—

Carnivorous.

Of the Mole	1 species,	Talpa	Europea.	Linn.
Shrew,	2 species,	1st, Sorex	constrictus.	Hermann.
		2d, Sorex	araneus.	Linn.
Bear,	1 species,	Ursus	Arctos.	Linn.
Glutton,	1 species,	Gulo	luscus.	Sabine.
Otter,	1 species,	Lutra	marina.	Erxleben.
Wolf,	2 species,	1st, Canis	lupus.	Linn.
		2d, Canis	lycaon.	Linn.
Fox,	2 species,	1st, Canis	vulpes, var. alopex.	Linn.
		2d, Canis	argentatus.	Geoff.
Seal,	2 species,	1st, Phoca	vitulina.	Linn.
		2d, Phoca	ursina.	Linn.
Weasel,	2 species,	1st, Mustela	vulgaris.	Linn.
		2d, Mustela	erminea.	Linn.
<i>Herbivorous.</i>				
Beaver,	1 species,	Castor	fiber.	Linn.
Field mouse,	1 species,	Mus	sylvaticus.	Linn.
Water rat,	1 species,	Mus	amphibius.	Linn.
Squirrel,	1 species,	Sciurus	striatus.	Klein.
Deer,	2 species,	1st, Cervus	alces.	Linn.
		2d, Cervus	tarandus.	Linn.
Sheep,	1 species,	Ovis	montana.*	Kich.

The preceding list, though not critically correct in every particular, (of which the omission of the pine martin and the insertion of the Rocky Mountain sheep may be given as examples,) will suffice to afford a general idea of the relationship which exists between the mammiferous land animals of America, and those of Europe and the north of Asia.

The quadrupeds of Mexico (the only portion of North America to which we have not yet alluded) are still very imperfectly known. Many of the species mentioned by Hernandez † and Clavigero, ‡ are either altogether fabulous, or have been so vaguely and inaccurately described by those authors, as to be not now recognisable by modern observers. It is known, however, that some of these species are common to South America and Mexico, others to Mexico and the United States, while but a small

* Harlan's *Fauna Americana*. Introduction, p. 8.

† *Nova Plantarum, Animalium, et Mineralium Mexicanorum Historia*, a Francesco Hernandez, Medico, in Indiis præstantissimo primum compilata, &c.

‡ *History of Mexico*, translated by C. Cullen. 2 vols. 4to. 1807.

proportion are peculiar to Mexico alone.* In fact, the southern portion of that vast territory, in common with the peninsular projection of Florida, is allied in many of its zoological features to South America and the islands of the West Indies. But were we to seek to illustrate the connexion which exists between the zoology of the southern states of North America, and the tropical regions of the New World, we ought to turn our attention rather to the feathered creation—to those winged tribes, the locomotive powers of which so greatly exceed in long enduring swiftness the fleetest of the four-footed race. The subject of migration is also intimately related to that of the local distribution of the species, and a rich and varied field therefore lies before us, did not our restricted limits forbid our entering at present into the details of ornithological geography. We shall, however, embrace an early opportunity of prosecuting that interesting department of the science, and of laying the results before our readers.†

* *Cebus apella*, *Phyllostoma spectrum*, *Potos caudivolvula*, *Canis Mexicanus*, *Felis mitis*, *Felis Mexicanus*, *Didelphis cancrivora*, and *Didelphis cayopollin*, are mentioned by Dr Harlan as peculiar to Mexico; but a great proportion of these species are by no means confined to that country.

† In the meantime, we have great pleasure in calling the attention of the public to two very remarkable ornithological works at present in the course of publication. 1. *The Birds of America, engraved from Drawings made in the United States and their territories.* BY JOHN JAMES AUDUBON, F.R.S.L. and E. &c. Vol. 1st. Folio. London: 1831. 2. *Ornithological Biography, or an Account of the Habits of the Birds of the United States of America; interspersed with delineations of American Scenery and Manners.* By the same author. Vol. 1st. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1831. We have studied Mr Audubon's productions, both of pen and pencil, with instruction as well as pleasure. Whether we consider the life and activity which his ornithological portraits exhibit—their unrivalled accuracy in the representation of the various habits as well as external characters of the species—or the fine taste and poetical feeling which pervades his pictures, we hesitate not to say that his work is the greatest and most successful effort which ornithological skill has yet accomplished.

ART. IV.—*The Undying One ; and Other Poems*. By the Hon. MRS NORTON. 8vo. London: 1830.

SOME persons of a desponding turn of mind will have it, that the attendance on Apollo's levees has been for some time past on the decline—that the older nobility have been keeping aloof, and that, under cover of a profusion of finery and false ornaments, several suspicious characters have been seen moving about the apartments of late, whom the vigilance of the gentlemen in waiting ought to have excluded. Nevertheless, we see no great reason for despair ; for, as to the obnoxious *parvenus*, they have seldom long escaped detection ; and upon their second intrusion, have generally been *invited*, as the French say, when a member of the House of Commons is turned out, to quit the chamber with all celerity. Some of them, indeed, like Mr Montgomery, have found their way into the street with such emphasis and rapidity, that, on recovering their senses, they have turned round, and, with strange contortions of visage, and frightful appeals, have bitterly reviled the officials, who, in the discharge of their duty, had been obliged to shut the door in their face. Others, like Mr Reade, who made a very violent attempt the other day to gain admittance, flourishing the knocker till he disturbed the neighbourhood,—put a more blustering face upon the matter, after their exclusion ; affect to say, that they never made any such application—that they would not walk in though they had been invited ; and, with a 'calm confidence,' enter their appeal, as Swift dedicated his Tale of a Tub, to Prince Posterity. Again, although it cannot be denied that the visits of the old supporters of the court have been less frequent, we, who would wish to look at the cheerful side both of politics and poetry, are inclined to think that among the recent arrivals, there are several names of no inconsiderable promise ; nay, already of very respectable performance. Among the later presentations, it rather strikes us the majority has consisted of ladies ; and of these, if report says true, none seems to have made a more successful appearance than Mrs Norton. She might indeed, with advantage to herself, have chosen a robe of a more sober and unpretending character ; but we are ready to admit, that she wears it gracefully, and are not surprised, on the whole, that her entrance did produce what the newspapers call a sensation.

It was natural, indeed, that the descendant of so gifted a family should be received with attention. But if her poem has

been successful—as we are told it has—it assuredly owes extremely little of its interest and attractions to the subject. She has pleased, not in consequence of, but in spite of, the fable on which she has employed her powers.

We really had begun to flatter ourselves—rashly, as it appears—that the reading world had finally got quit of the Wandering Jew, who, for centuries past, has occasionally revisited the glimpses of the moon, making polite literature hideous. His scene with the Bleeding Nun, in Lewis's romance, we should have thought, would have been his last appearance on the stage, for a century at least; but instead of discreetly retiring for a time, as might have been expected, after such an exhibition, into the privacy of infinite space, the appearances of this intolerable *revenant* in our lower world have of late become more frequent and alarming than ever. In Germany, Klingemann, and Achim von Armin, have not scrupled to introduce him under his true character; and Shelley, and Captain Medwyn, both bold men in their way, have tried a similar experiment with the English public. All this, however, might be borne; for, so long as he chooses to come forward as the veritable Ahasuerus, we should feel inclined with Antonio, to say, 'there was much kindness in the Jew,'—in enabling us, we mean, to pass by on the other side, and avoid his society in due time. But the worst and most dangerous feature about his late appearances is this, that he has been assuming various *aliases*, and obtaining admittance into respectable circles under borrowed names; a device, against which no precaution can avail; for his general manner in the outset resembles so much that of any other gentleman (of the Corsair school,)—he avoids so skilfully any allusion to his reminiscences of Judæa, that we only begin to suspect him when about to part company with him; and can hardly even then persuade ourselves that our agreeable companion in the post-chaise, is our old Jewry friend, till he vanishes at last, as old Aubrey says, 'with a melodious twang,' and a sulphurous odour. Nay, to such a remarkable extent have his devices in this way been carried, that he lately prevailed upon a respectable English divine, to introduce him under the euphonious name of Salathiel, in which character, we understand, he swindled the proprietors of some circulating libraries—to a small amount. And here is a second insidious attempt of the same nature, in which this intolerable Jew again comes forward to levy contributions on the public, by the style and title of Isbal the *Undying One*.

Seriously—Is it not singular that a legend so absurd, and the

unfitness of which for poetical narrative appears so obvious, should have been such a favourite with poets and novelists? Not that we mean to deny that the more general conception of the position of a being on whom the curse of immortality on earth has been suddenly imposed, is not in itself a striking, an impressive one. Nothing is more easy to conceive, than that in the hands of a person whose mind combines the philosophical element with the poetical, the picture of such a being,—solitary in the centre of a busy world, disconnected from all human hopes, passions, sympathies,—longing to die and to rest, to follow where all that made life worth living for had gone before him, may be capable of producing the profoundest emotion. In fact, this has been done by Godwin in his *St Leon*, where the train of reflection of such an immortal—at first joyous and exulting in the boundless expansion of his powers, gradually sinking into sadness, and at last into an overpowering sensation of loneliness and desolation—is depicted with a deep knowledge of the human heart, and in a strain of touching and mournful eloquence.

But though those prospects of futurity, in which the victim of immortality throws forward his views into unborn ages, appear impressive and effective when thus embodied merely in reflection; or although a momentary glimpse of his situation may be one of solemn interest, there are insuperable obstacles to any attempt to pursue the fortunes of such a being through the lapse of centuries, or to exhibit his feelings in successive detail. Not to mention the extreme difficulty of carrying onward our sympathies to the third and fourth generation, even with the assistance of a connecting link in the existence of some one who survives them all, such an attempt invariably leads to one of two things,—either a dreary monotony, or a variety obtained at the expense of consistency and truth. To represent such a being, labouring under the consciousness that he has nothing in common with those around him, as susceptible and impassioned to the last—loving, hating, grieving on, with the same unabated energy, at the latest stage of his career, as when first he commenced his restless pilgrimage—if it enable the poet to vary the scene, deprives the conception of all which redeems it from the character of absurdity, or gives it a distinctive character. The whole effect of such an idea on the mind, is produced by the simple representation of that state of callous, impassive, unalterable desolation into which such a creature sinks—a state of gloomy, tideless tranquillity, and weatherbeaten hardihood of soul, which nothing can agitate, nothing overpower. What human passion, indeed, should interest him over whom the experience of centuries has passed?—what new grief plough deep

where so many old ones have left their furrows?—what attachment bind him who soon feels that he can now love nothing truly, because he now loves nothing with that identity of heart, that abandonment of soul, wherein resides the charm and essence of the feeling? ‘In ‘the tomb of my wife and ‘children,’ says St Leon, as he follows out to its dreary consequences the effects of the secret of the stranger, ‘I felt that my heart would be buried. Never, never, ‘through the countless ages of eternity, should I form another attachment. In the ‘happy age of delusion, happy and auspicious, at least, to the ‘cultivation of the passions, when I felt that I also was a mortal, I was capable of a community of sentiments, of a going ‘forth of the heart. But how could I, an immortal, hope hereafter to feel a serious and expansive feeling for the ephemeron ‘of an hour!’

And yet what St Leon held to be impossible, is exactly what Mrs Norton has attempted to do; and in consequence of this, so completely has she extinguished all that is peculiar in the situation of her hero, that, but for his own information on the subject, which he occasionally volunteers rather needlessly, we should never, in this loving, fighting, marrying Jew, discover that we had to do with the wretched, passionless wanderer on whom the curse had lighted. Susceptible to the last, he wanders on, still falling in love, and vowing *eternal* constancy to Edith of England, Xarifa of Spain, Miriam of Palestine, and Linda of Castaly, and burying them all in succession;—filling up the gaps between these piping times of peace by fits of desperate fighting; though it is not always easy to discover for what cause, or under which king, our Bezonian draws his sword, except that

‘Where'er a voice was raised in freedom's name,
There, sure and swift, my eager footstep came;’

as if to such a being, absorbed in the selfishness of his own misery, the watchwords of freedom and slavery would not be equally indifferent. We find him lending a hand in the struggles of ancient Rome with her Gothic invaders—in the warfare of Spain with the Moors—and in our own civil wars, not to mention a campaign or two in Ireland; in all of which he behaves with that bravery which might be expected from one who knew that his life was safe, though his head might perchance be broken.

Homer has been celebrated for the variety of the modes in which he dispatches his heroes; Mrs Norton's ingenuity in vary-

ing the death of her heroines is scarcely less remarkable. The case of Edith, the first favourite of this Jewish Bluebeard, is distressing; and, in fact, by uncharitable persons would certainly be regarded as a case of murder. Isbal and she have been living a life of great domestic comfort for years, when, like the Ancient Mariner, all of a sudden, *suadente diabolo*,

—— ‘ his frame is wrench’d
With a strange agony,
That forces him to tell his tale,
And then it leaves him free.’

That is, free to marry again; for the consequence of this most unnecessary disclosure is the immediate death of his wife. Xarifa, her successor, dies a natural death, expiring in fact before he has time to tell her his story, which he is on the point of doing. His third wife he makes quick conveyance with—not feeling himself prepared, at the time, with any satisfactory solution of the question which he saw she was about to put to him, why he exhibited no symptoms of advancing age as well as herself. The last dies, we hardly know how or when, except that the catastrophe takes place off the Irish coast;—an uncertainty which we share with the person who should know most of the matter, Isbal himself;—for never, it seems,

—— ‘ shall his heart discover
The moment her love and her life were over;
Only this much shall the lost one know,—
Where *she* hath departed *he* may not go.’

Mrs Norton must really excuse us, if we have freely expressed our sentiments as to the absurdity of the subject on which her powers, and those of no inconsiderable order, have been wasted. If we did not think her poem indicated genius, we should not have noticed it at all: we have done so, because we feel satisfied that, with a more congenial subject—one calmer, commoner, less ambitious—a very different whole would have been the result. It is strange how difficult it is to persuade ladies that their forte does not lie in representations of those dark passions, which, for their own comfort, we hope they have witnessed only in description. And yet none can fail at last to perceive that the concentration of thought and expression necessary for the drama; the stately steady grandeur required in the epic poem; nay, the knowledge of the worst as well as the best features of the heart, required for the more

irregular narrative poem, are hardly ever found in the poetry of women. Would Mrs Norton only confine herself to simpler themes, instead of plunging beyond the visible diurnal sphere, there is much in this poem that assures us of her complete success;—many individual pictures, clear, graphic, picturesque; many passages of tender feeling breaking out into a lyrical form, which we think discover much grace and a great command of versification. Of this, indeed, there is perhaps too great a variety, since the volume exhibits specimens of every measure in the English language; and perhaps a few more. As a proof how well Mrs Norton can paint, take the following striking description of the Wanderer looking in at the door of an English cottage on a Sabbath morning, while the inmates are at church:

‘ A lowly cot
 Stood near that calm and consecrated spot.
 I enter'd it:—the morning sunshine threw
 Its warm bright beams upon the flowers that grew
 Around it and within it—'twas a place
 So peaceful and so bright, that you might trace
 The tranquil feelings of the dwellers there;
 There was no taint of shame, or crime, or care.
 On a low humble couch was softly laid
 A little slumberer, whose rosy head
 Was guarded by a watch-dog; *while I stood
 In hesitating, half-repentant mood,
 My glance still met his large bright watchful eye,
 Wandering from me to that sweet sleeper nigh.*
 Yes, even to that dumb animal I seem'd
 A thing of crime; the murderous death-light gleam'd
 Beneath my brow; the noiseless step was mine;
 I moved with conscious guilt, and his low whine
 Responded to my sigh, whose echo fell
 Heavily—as 'twere loath within that cot to dwell.’

On the death of Edith, his first love, the Jew engaged with ardour in the struggle between the Spaniards and the Moors; and after a fierce combat in the neighbourhood of Granada, meets with a female figure sitting on the field of battle, and wailing over the dead. This is Xarifa, who, in some very touching stanzas, pours out her lamentations for her husband who had fallen in the fight:

‘ My early and my only love, why silent dost thou lie?
 When heavy grief is in my heart, and tear-drops in mine eye,
 I call thee, but thou answerest not, all lonely though I be,
 Wilt thou not burst the bonds of sleep, and rise to comfort me?’

‘ O wake thee, wake thee from thy rest, upon the tented field,
This faithful breast shall be at once thy pillow and thy shield;
If thou hast doubted of its truth and constancy before,
O wake thee now, and it will strive to love thee even more.

‘ If ever we have parted, and I wept thee not as now—
If ever I have seen thee come, and worn a cloudy brow—
If ever harsh and careless words have caused thee pain and woe—
Then sleep—in silence sleep—and I will bow my head and go.

‘ But if through all the vanish'd years whose shadowy joys are gone,
Through all the changing scenes of life I thought of thee alone ;
If I have mourn'd for thee when far, and worshipp'd thee when near,
Then wake thee up, my early love, this weary heart to cheer !’

These are sweet and natural verses, particularly the latter two ; and we can assure Mrs Norton, far more effective than whole pages of gloomy grandeur and despair. As another specimen of her better powers in these gentle delineations, we shall extract her picture of the close of Xarifa's life, under the conviction that some fatal secret preyed upon her husband's mind, and her parting address as she dies by his side near the Guadalquivir.

‘ One eve at spring-tide's close we took our way,
When eve's last beams in soften'd glory fell,
Lighting her faded form with sadden'd ray,
And the sweet spot where we so loved to dwell.
Faintly and droopingly she sat her down
By the blue waters of the Guadalquivir,
With darkness on her brow, but yet no frown,
Like the deep shadow on that silent river.
She sat her down, I say, with face upturn'd
To the dim sky, which daylight was forsaking,
And in her eyes a light unearthly burn'd—
The light which spirits give whose chains are breaking !
* * * * *

‘ And a half smile lit up that pallid brow,
As, casting flowers upon the silent stream,
She watch'd the frail sweet blossoms glide and go,
Like human pleasures in a blissful dream.
And then, with playful force she gently flung
Small shining pebbles from the river's brink,
And o'er the eddying waters sadly hung,
Pleased, and yet sorrowful, to see them sink.
“ And thus,” she said, “ doth human love forget
Its idols—some sweet blessings float away,
Follow'd by one long look of vain regret,
As they are slowly hastening to decay ;

And some, with sullen plunge, do mock our sight,
 And suddenly go down into the tomb,
 Startling the beating heart, whose fond delight
 Chills into tears at that unlook'd-for doom.
 And there remains no trace of them save such
 As the soft ripple leaves upon the wave,
 Or a forgotten flower, whose dewy touch
 Reminds us some are withering in the grave !
 When all is over, and she is but dust,
 Whose heart so long hath held thy form enshrined ;
 When I go hence, as soon I feel I must,
 Oh ! let my memory, Isbal, haunt thy mind.
 Not for myself—oh ! not for *me* be given
 Vain thoughts of vain regret, though that were sweet ;
 But for the sake of that all-blissful Heaven,
 Where, if thou wiltest it, we yet may meet.
 When in thy daily musing thou dost bring
 Those scenes to mind, in which I had a share ;
 When in thy nightly watch thy heart doth wring
 With thought of me—oh ! murmur forth a prayer !
 A prayer for me—for thee—for all who live
 Together, yet asunder in one home—
 Who their soul's gloomy secret dare not give,
 Lest it should blacken all their years to come.
 Yes, Isbal, yes ; to *thee* I owe the shade
 That prematurely darkens on my brow ;
 And never had my lips a murmur made—
 But—but that—see ! the vision haunts me now !"
 She pointed on the river's surface, where
 Our forms were pictured seated side by side ;
 I gazed on them, and hers was very fair ;
 And mine—was as thou seest it *now*, my bride.
 But hers, though fair, was fading—wan and pale
 The brow whose marble met the parting day.
 Time o'er her form had thrown his misty veil,
 And all her ebon curls were streak'd with grey ;
 But mine was youthful—yes !—such youth as glows
 In the young tree by lightning scathed and blasted—
 That, joyless, waves its black and leafless boughs,
 On which spring showers and summer warmth are wasted.'

Such passages as these sufficiently show where Mrs Norton's true field lies, and how likely she is, within her proper department, to attain an elevated place in poetry. Other proofs might easily be selected from the miscellaneous poems which are appended in the *Undying One* ; among which that entitled, 'Re-collections,' is perhaps the most striking. There is a peculiarly graceful flow of versification, and simplicity of expression, in the following stanzas :—

‘ Do you remember when we first departed
 From all the old companions who were round us,
 How very soon again we grew lighthearted,
 And talked with smiles of all the links which bound us ?
 And after, when our footsteps were returning,
 With unfelt weariness o'er hill and plain,
 How our young hearts kept boiling up, and burning,
 To think how soon we'd be at home again ?

‘ Do you remember how the dreams of glory
 Kept fading from us like a fairy treasure ;
 How we thought less of being famed in story,
 And more of those to whom our fame gave pleasure ?
 Do you remember in far countries, weeping,
 When a light breeze, a flower, hath brought to mind
 Old happy thoughts, which till that hour were sleeping,
 And made us yearn for those we left behind ?’

The present volume is an improvement on its predecessor.* The next (for in the glass of futurity we see others) will, we are sure, be a still greater improvement on the present, provided always Mrs Norton eschews the supernatural and the exaggerated, and trusts to her power of depicting the calmer aspects of life, and

‘ The common thoughts of mother earth,
 Its simpler mirth and tears.’

* The *Sorrows of Rosalie*, written, we believe, when Mrs Norton was very young.

ART. V.—*Lettres à M. Letronne, Membre de l'Institut, et de la Légion d'Honneur, Inspecteur-Général de l'Université de France, sur les Papyrus Bilingues et Grecs, et sur quelques autres Monumens Gréco-Egyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités de l'Université de Leide.* Par C. J. C. REUVENS, Professeur d'Archéologie, et Directeur du Musée. 4to. (Avec un Atlas, fol.) A Leide : 1830.

THE Museum of Egyptian Antiquities at Leyden, although of very recent formation, is indisputably one of the most interesting and valuable in Europe. It consists, firstly, of the celebrated Anastasy collection, the acquisition of which is due to the liberality of the Netherlands government, by whom it was purchased for a large sum in the year 1828; secondly, of the minor collections previously acquired, of M. de l'Escluze, a merchant of Bruges, and the Signora Cimba of Leghorn; thirdly, of a variety of articles separately obtained either by purchase or donation; forming altogether an assemblage of monuments worthy of being classed with the first cabinets in Europe, and greatly superior to all those of secondary importance. Inferior in grand monuments to the superb Drovetti collection at Turin, that of the Chevalier d'Anastasy,* here deposited, is certainly equal, both in the number and value of its contents, to the collection of Mr Salt, our late consul-general at Alexandria, which now forms the principal ornament of the Egyptian division of the new Museum in the Louvre; whilst, in some things, particularly Græco-Egyptian manuscripts, it is decidedly superior to both. Of grand monuments, it contains a monolithic chapel, statues, sarcophagi, stelaë, mummies, and fragments, some of them covered with hieroglyphic sculptures; the smaller articles are of all the kinds and classes known to travellers or antiquaries; and in the department of manuscripts it is exceedingly rich; containing in all a hundred and thirty-two, of which above a hundred are papyral, strictly so called, and twenty-four are written on cloth. Of the papyri, twenty are in Greek, and three bilingual; not to mention demotic contracts with apposite registries in Greek, nor interlineations and transcriptions in the Grecian character, which appear on several of these manuscripts. The total number of

* Swedish vice-consul at Alexandria, and well known for the zeal, industry, and perseverance with which he devoted himself to the study as well as the collection of Egyptian antiquities.

papyri in the Museum is a hundred and forty-seven, of which fifteen, obtained prior to the purchase of the Anastasy collection, are purely Egyptian, and in a high state of preservation.

The *Lettres* which Professor Reuvens, the keeper of the Museum, has addressed to the distinguished author of *L'Histoire de l'Égypte tirée des Inscriptions Grecques*, may be considered as the precursors of a more extensive and complete work on these monuments. They are three in number, and are devoted, the first to an elaborate analysis and illustration of two very remarkable bilingual manuscripts in papyrus; the second, to an exposition of a Greek inscription on a monument in marble, believed, with reason, to be of Egyptian origin; and the third, to a variety of analytical details respecting the Greek papyri, which occupy so prominent a place in this collection. The first, however, is, in several respects, the most curious and important; for although considerable ingenuity is evinced in the restoration of the inscription on the marble monument, and very satisfactory information is conveyed respecting the subject-matter of the Greek papyri examined, yet Professor Reuvens greatly overrates the importance of the one, and there seems to be but little that is really interesting or valuable in the contents of the other. But it is otherwise with the bilingual manuscripts; which, independently altogether of their contents, remarkable as these undoubtedly are, afford the means of adding considerably to the number of demotic characters or groups already ascertained, and of contributing to the extension of the enchorial alphabet, as well as to the enlargement of the enchorial lexicon. This, it is true, is a task which still remains to be performed. Profoundly versed in archæological learning, and having easy access to the contents of these manuscripts through the medium of the Greek versions, M. Reuvens has applied his erudition and ingenuity to the illustration of the strange philosophical fancies with which they are filled; to the exclusion of the more humble but useful labour of determining new groups of characters, and thus increasing the means of deciphering such manuscripts as are purely Egyptian. He has forgotten that we are much more in want of elementary knowledge than of learned disquisitions; and that the discovery of a new fact is worth a thousand speculations, however ingenious, on a subject where, as yet, but little is really known, and even that little imperfectly. Until we are able, without accidental or factitious aids, to decipher Egyptian writings, whether in the sacred, the hieratic, or the enchorial character, it is vain to hope that any effectual progress will be made in the wide field of enquiry, which has at length been opened to enlightened curiosity; and hence the improvement of

the instrument, or key, by which alone this can be accomplished, ought, in our opinion, to engross a corresponding and pre-eminent share of attention. At the same time, it is but just to say that, in the secondary investigations to which Professor Reuvens has confined himself, he has not only displayed an intimate acquaintance with Egyptian archæology in its principal branches, but, by a happy concentration of numerous scattered rays, scarcely discernible by an ordinary eye, he has succeeded in throwing a powerful and steady light on several points which were previously involved in mystery and darkness; and particularly in detecting the real source of those theosophical extravagancies which, engrafted on Christianity, constituted the Gnosticism of the first ages of the church.*

The two bilingual papyri analyzed by Professor Reuvens are numbered 65 and 75 in the catalogue of the Museum. The former, considered by M. d'Anastasy, as one of the principal ornaments of his collection, he describes as 'grand papyrus en caractères hiératique sou démotiques, se déroulant en rituel à pages; les lignes entremêlées de caractères Grecs dans presque toutes les pages et espaces plus ou moins: sur le revers écrit avec lacunes dans la partie supérieure seulement, en hiéroglyphes, caractères hiératiques ou démotiques et Grecs.' The latter, transmitted in a third supplement to his collection, he represents as 'écrit d'un côté en Grec, de l'autre en démotique;' expressions which, as we shall presently see, require correction. No. 65 is principally in the hieratic character; but with some Greek texts, it moreover contains interlinear transcriptions of demotic words written in Greek, and is thus of inestimable value both for the verification and extension of the new system of Egyptian interpretation; although, as we have already remarked, Professor Reuvens has unaccountably neglected to apply it to the purpose for which it is so singularly adapted. This papyrus, which is rolled, and, excepting the beginning, in a good state of preservation, is ten feet in length by nine inches and a half in breadth. No. 75 is only about half the length of No. 65, but

* The promptitude of M. Reuvens is not less remarkable than his learning. Although the negotiations were concluded early in 1828, the Anastasy collection did not reach Leyden until the commencement of 1829, and the gratuitous additions, transmitted by the chevalier, were only received in August 1830: yet these *Lettres* were published before the close of last year; and moreover the appendix contains an account of a papyrus, which must have arrived after a considerable portion of the work had passed through the press. The activity and readiness of the learned keeper are therefore manifest.

it has nearly the same breadth. It is folded flat, and the exterior side, containing only an Egyptian hieratic text, has suffered much; the interior is written almost wholly in Greek; but the right extremity, containing the conclusion of the Greek text, is not entire; and the left extremity is also mutilated. The exterior surface of both manuscripts bears evident marks of frequent manipulation, particularly about the middle, where the *thumbing* has been constant and long continued; a circumstance which, taken in connexion with the peculiar nature of their contents, seems to warrant the conclusion, that, unlike the funerary rituals, these papyri were in daily use, or at least read at stated intervals in the celebration of certain religious mysteries. They are magic or rather mystic rituals, filled with the metaphysico-allegorical fictions of theurgy, intermixed with receipts for the preparation of certain remedies, rules for the conduct of life, directions as to the proper mode of consulting the divinity, and procuring pleasant dreams, with a variety of other strange and irrelevant things; and they evidently served as text-books for the exposition of that fanciful system of theosophism which the Gnostics afterwards grafted on the doctrines of Christianity.

Of the series of magic operations and observances described in No. 75, the invocation of mystic love, contained in the second paragraph of the first section or column, is by far the most remarkable. It is in these words:—‘ I invoke thee, thou who [reposest] on the beautiful couch; thou who [residest] in the house —serve me; and go always to proclaim whatsoever I tell thee, and wherever I send thee, under the form of a god or a goddess, such as men and women venerate, saying all that is unwritten, or that is told and enjoined thee, quickly. The fire has reached the greatest idols, and the heaven has been swallowed up, not knowing the circle of the holy scarabæus, called PHOREI; the winged scarabæus, the ruler that resides in the midst of heaven has been beheaded, or dashed in pieces; that which is greatest and most glorious has been destroyed, and the lord of heaven, after being shut up, has perished; to the end that thou mayest serve me with the men and women among whom I desire thy ministrations. Come to me, lord of heaven, enlightening the earth; serve me with men and women, small and great, and oblige them always to do that which is written by me.’*

* The original of this curious appeal to the divinity of mystic love is as follows:—*Ἐπικαλοῦμαι σαι, τον εν τη καλη κοιτη, τον εν τω πο...νω οικω*
VOL. LIII. NO. CVI. 2 B

Some of the expressions in this invocation are exceedingly remarkable. The 'god seated on the beautiful couch' appears to have been one of the ordinary epithets of the divinity, and, in fact, another epithet mentioned by Jamblichus, namely, 'the 'god seated on the lotus,'* occurs in the third paragraph of this same inauguration of mystic love. In the expression, 'the fire 'has reached the greatest *idols*' or images, the word 'idols' must, we think, be understood as applying to and describing *the celestial signs*; and the clause ought therefore, in our opinion, to be rendered, 'the fire has reached the greatest of the zodiacal 'signs.' This is confirmed by an analogous expression which occurs in another part of the ritual. With regard to 'the circle 'of the holy scarabæus,' there can be no doubt whatever that it indicates *the apparent course of the sun in the heavens*. For, in the first place, the description of the movement of the scarabæus given by Horus Apollo plainly shows the meaning which that author attached to the figure of this insect, when employed symbolically; and, secondly, Clemens of Alexandria, in describing the various modes of writing used by the ancient Egyptians, expressly states, as an example of the enigmatic-symbolic kind, that 'they assimilate the oblique revolution of the planets to the 'bodies of serpents,' and 'compare that of the sun to the body of a 'scarabæus.'† And this is further evident from the concluding words of the invocation: 'But if thou hearest not my prayers,

διακονησον μοι και απαγγειλον αιει, ο τι αν σοι ειπω και οπου αν αποστέλλω, παρομοιουμενος θεω η θεα, οιω αν σεβανται οι ανδρες και οι [sic in orig.] γυναικες, λεγαν παντα ταυτα υπογραφομενα η λεγομενα και παρατιθεμενα σοι ταχυ. Εφθασε το πυρ επι τα ειδωλα τα μεγαιστα και καταπιετω [sic in orig.] ουρανος, τον κυκλον μη γεινωσκων του αγειου κανθαρου, λεγομενου ΦΩΡΕΙ· κανθαρος ο πτεροφνης, ο μεσουραναν τυραννος, απεκεφαλισθη, η μελισση το μεγαιστον και ενδοξον αυτου κατεχρησατο, και δεσποτην του ου [sic] ουρανου συνκατακλεισαντες ηλλαξαν· ως συ διακονησεις μοι προς ους θελω ανδρας και γυναικας. Ηκε μοι ο [sic] δεσποτα του ουρανου επιλαμπων τη οικου μενη διακονησον μοι προς τε ανδρας και γυναικας μεικρους τε και μεγαλους και επαναγκασης αιει αυτους ποιειν παντα τα γεγραμμενα υπ' εμου. The errors of language observable in this passage, are probably chargeable against the hierogrammatist or scribe. The most obvious are επικαλουμεσαι for επικαλουμαι σε, οι for αι, κατεπιετω for κατεπιετο, the syllable ου repeated, ο for ω, and the diphthong ει used for ι. *Lettres*, p. 11.

* 'Ο ἐπὶ λώτου καθήμενος, vii. 2.

† Stromates, v. 647. Potter. Horus Apollo, i. 10. Had Professor Reuvens recollected the well-known and often-quoted passage of Clemens, he would have been at no loss to interpret the meaning of 'the 'circle of the holy scarabæus.' He is in doubt as to its meaning, solely because his memory is at fault.

‘ the circle shall be consumed by fire, and *there shall be darkness on the whole earth*, and the scarabœus shall descend, until thou hast completely fulfilled all that which I write or which I say ; now, now ! quickly, quickly !’* The scarabœus, says the text, is denominated ΦΟΡΕΙ, a word which every Egyptian scholar must at once recognise as identical with PHRE, *the sun*, of which it is merely a vocalized expansion. In some hieratic and hieroglyphic texts accompanying the image of the insect, Champollion, it is true, reads *Thoré* ; but it is far from improbable that he may have confounded the phonetic symbols of *phi* and *théta* ; and, even if the case were otherwise, there would be no great difficulty in supposing these sounds to have been interchangeable in Egyptian, as well as in other languages, where the one easily passes into the other.

Turning from mere verbal illustration to the subject-matter of the ritual, we were forcibly struck with the points of coincidence, as well as contrast, which we discovered in almost every section, with something contained in the *Egyptian Mysteries* commonly ascribed to Jamblichus ; a work which has hitherto formed the only source of our knowledge respecting the thaumaturgy of the philosophical sects, non-Christian or semi-Christian, Gnostic or independent, which flourished in the first ages of our era, and professed the mystic doctrines, based on the ancient mythology of Egypt, to which we find so frequent allusion in these manuscripts. Theurgy, says Jamblichus, is exercised by the ministry of secondary genii (δαιμονες), who, by their nature, are the servants and executors of the orders of the gods (δαιμονιον διακονικόν, υπηρετικόν) ; and, according to him, these genii are compelled to yield obedience by means of threats, clothed in the most imperious forms of expression, and containing an enumeration of terrible accidents which must befall the great hierarchy of gods, provided the lesser powers prove recusant or refractory. In other words, the δαιμόνιον διακονικόν was only to be moved by terror acting upon love,—by a dread of the disasters imprecated befalling the great divinities to whom these lesser were bound both by affinity and affection. Jamblichus states, that the man who uttered these imprecations changed his nature, so to speak, in pronouncing them, and, whilst engaged in the prayer or invocation, became a sort of divine person ; adding, that barbarous words, derived from the Syriac superstitions, and unintelligible

* Εαν δε μου παρακουσης, κατακαησεται ο κυκλος, και σκοτος εσται καθ ολην την οικουμενην, κι κληνθαρος καταβησεται εως πεινησεις μαι παντα οσα γραφω η λεγω απαραβατως· ηδ ηση, αχυ, ταχυ.

even to the Egyptians who employed them in their formularies of invocation, were those which had the greatest power over the ministering spirits or genii, by means of whom theurgy, or magic, was exercised.* Hard words are, no doubt, sufficiently frightful; and some may perhaps think that we have been silyly making an experiment of their effect upon the nerves of our readers. There would, indeed, be reason for this opinion, were we to copy out only a few of the horrible compounds which we have met with in the incantations of the Egyptian thaumaturgists. But we shall spare our readers this infliction.

From what has been said, however, it is manifest, that these secondary or ministering powers were supposed to act from love, even while yielding to the immediate influence of fear. This is the doctrine continually professed and maintained by Jamblichus. According to him, 'it is the love, the friendship, the affinity of all the parts of the universe, which renders magic possible, and places the inferior genii under an obligation to obey the superior gods, without, however, being constrained thereto, and without opposition between the different parts of the great whole.' He denies and reprobates the idea of the *θεῶν ἀνάγκαι*, 'the constraints of the gods,' which prevailed in his time, and which, indeed, appears in almost every theurgic formula; but he at the same time admits, as we have already seen, that the *δαίμόνιον διακονικόν* might be constrained by such imprecations as those we are considering, and that fear, the companion of love, rendered them subservient to men who used terrible threats against the superior powers. There were certain terms of menace, such as 'the burning of the idols,' or celestial signs, 'the swallowing up of the heavens,' and the 'destruction of the scarabæus,' which the inferior, in their excessive love for the superior order of intelligences, could not possibly endure; and these accordingly were employed by the theurgist to dispose, or rather to compel, the former to serve him, *ἵνα διακονήσεις μοι*. The evils threatened were supposed to be inseparable from disobedience on the part of the subordinate spirits; in other words, the

* Jamblichus *de Myst.* i. 20, ii. 7, iv. 1, 3, vi. 5, 6, 7, vii. 12. Meiners and Tiedemann have called in question the authenticity of this book, but without sufficient reason; as must be evident even to those who read our brief notice of its contents, and observe the confirmation they have received from the ritual expounded by Professor Reuvens. Jamblichus, or whoever was the author, must have had before him Egyptian texts or compositions analogous to those under consideration.

theurgist possessed a complete control over them by means of his minatory invocations. So far then the coincidence is remarkable, and the mutual illustration striking. One notable discrepancy, however, may be pointed out between the subtle doctrine of the philosopher and the vulgar practices indicated in this magic ritual. Jamblichus fiercely denounces the use of all images fabricated by the hand of man. The ritual, on the other hand, not only ordains it, but prescribes their particular forms, which, by a singular species of syncretism, appear to have been, in a great measure, borrowed from the Greeks. Thus, in the commencement of the second paragraph, we are informed, that love ought to be represented under the figure of a child, with a bow, arrows, and a butterfly in his hand; that seven pine-apples, with sugar-plums, should be placed beside him; and that the inauguration of his statue should be made by sacrificing seven birds, among which we find the names of the quail, the dove, and the turtle.

Another circumstance deserving of notice in this ritual, is the additional evidence it supplies of the sacredness of the number *four*, and the constant arrangement of all entities as well as objects in quaternions. In the consecration of mystic love, directions are given to construct an altar with '*four* horns.' In the same ceremony, in the second invocation, conjuration is made 'in the name of him who holds the circle [of the scara-*bœus*], and who has made the *four* bases or [elements], and 'blended the *four* winds.' A similar expression occurs in the third invocation; and in a subsequent part of the same section, we meet with the words, 'he who agitates the winds of the *four* corners of the Red Sea,' an expression which appears to have been borrowed from the Jewish school of Alexandria. It would be superfluous to quote instances to prove a fact which is universally known. Indeed, the whole mythological system of Egypt may be described as a vast aggregation of tetrads or quaternions. Besides the *four* elements which are expressly mentioned by Jamblichus, as well as in the fragments of the Hermetic books preserved by Stobæus, we have the *four* zones or firmaments; the *four* primary cosmogonic powers, viz. primordial darkness, Ammon-Generator, his female emanation Ammon-Neith, and Chnouphis-Phré; the *four* divinities that preside over the birth of man, viz. the Demon, Fortune, Love, and Necessity; the symbolical crocodile with *four* heads, representing, probably, the gods Phré, Sôon, Atmou, and Osiris; together with multiples of this number mythologically applied. Nor was it in Egypt alone that the number *four* was considered as peculiarly sacred. At an early period the same notion appears

to have taken root in Judea. Philo the Jew, in his life of Moses, dilates on the holiness of this number, while discoursing of the *tetragrammaton*, יהוה, *Jehovah*, composed of *four* letters; and Josephus holds it in equal reverence, by reason of the *four faces* of the tabernacle.* In the Gnostic schools, which flourished in Egypt a century later, it appears to have formed the basis of all cosmogonic speculations. The cosmogony of Basilides assumes as its fundamental principle an ogdoad composed of the Supreme Being and seven of his emanations; a principle borrowed either from the mythology of ancient Egypt, or the metaphysics of Central Asia. Valentinus, and Marcus who succeeded him, adopted the tetrad, which they called the true *tetractys* of Pythagoras; and by Marcus the *four* elements of matter were considered as the *image* of the sacred number; whilst, among other doctors of the *Gnosis*, contemporary or subsequent, the system of ogdoads, variously modified, formed the basis of every cosmogonic or philosophic speculation. Nor was this doctrine confined to the Gnostics alone. For we find Irenaeus, one of the Christian fathers, maintaining stoutly that, as there were only four climates, four cardinal winds, and four elements, so there could only be *four* Gospels, and neither more nor less; and he is not the only one of the primitive lights of the church who had imbibed this fanciful and ridiculous notion.†

The second magic ritual, No. 65, though the first in numerical order, contains, as already mentioned, interlinear transcriptions, in Greek letters, of Egyptian words, according to the demotic form of writing; but the text of this papyrus is, for the most part, hieratic; intermixed, however, with a crowd of isolated words in demotic characters, of which a part only is accompanied with transcriptions in Greek. Towards the end there are also several demotic transcriptions of words in hieratic; and in the body of the text may be observed numerous demotic letters mixed with the hieratic, as well as isolated words in demotic, containing, though rarely, hieratic letters. Kosegarten,‡ and other Egyptian scholars, had previously remarked this simultaneous use of two kinds of writing in some deeds and demotic contracts; but in no instance that we are aware of had it been

* Philo, *de Vita Moysis*, iii. 670. Josephus, *Antiq. Judaic.* iii. c. 7. § 7.

† Irenaeus, iii. 11, 221. See also the commentary of Grabe on the passage referred to. Matter, *Histoire du Gnosticisme*, tom. i. pp. 29 and 273.

‡ De *Prisca Aegyptior. Litterat. Comm.* i. p. 20.

carried to such an extent as in the manuscript under consideration; nor has any papyrus yet been discovered which offers so many helps for the improvement, both of the alphabet and vocabulary, although Professor Reuvens has most unaccountably neglected to turn them to account. After the transcriptions there are two passages of Greek, consisting of several lines each, interpolated into the Egyptian text, which we consider of great importance, as showing, in the most convincing manner, the entire concordance of this with the preceding manuscript, No. 75. The first of these may be rendered thus:—‘Pursue me not, thou . . . I carry the coffin of Osiris, and I go to deposit it at Abydos, to deposit it in the tombs, and to arrest it for the combats: if any one interrupt me, I will turn it against him.’* The second, an invocation analogous to that already given, is in these terms:—‘I invoke thee, thou who art in the void, wind, or terrible, invisible, all-powerful god of gods, thou who destroyest and renderest desert; I, who hate a flourishing house, as thou hast been expelled from Egypt and the country beyond. Thou art surnamed *He who breaks every thing, and is not conquered*. I invoke thee, O *Typhon Seth!* I perform thy magical ceremonies, calling upon thee by thy proper name, and, in virtue of these, thou canst not refuse to hear me.’ [Here follows a series of epithets not Greek.] ‘Come to me altogether, and go and cast down such a man or such a woman by cold and by heat. He has done me injury,

* Μη με διαχε οδι: ανοχπαπιτε . . . μετουβανες βασταζω την ταφην του Οσιριους και υπαρχα καταστησαι αυτην εις Αβυδος καταστησαι εις τας τας και καταβισθαι εις μαχας: εαν μοι ο Διοκοπος παρασχη, προσερω αυτην αυτω. The words *ανοχπαπιτε* and *μετουβανες* are Egyptian, written in Greek characters; but their meaning has not been ascertained. *Ανοχ*, or *ΑΝΟΚ*, or *ΑΝΟΓ*, is in Coptic, as in Hebrew, the substantive pronoun of the first person, and hence *Ανοχ Χνουβις*, the constant inscription on the Gnostic stones, means *I am Chnoubis*; but *παπιτε* defies all interpretation. M. Reuvens supposes it a various reading of *Παπιπετου*, the name of the town of Abydos; but this conjecture is inadmissible, inasmuch as it would render the passage nonsensical. May it not be a variation of *ΡΑΟΡΙ* or *ΡΑΟΡΗ*, the name of the second month, and, consequently, expressive of time? The word *μετουβανες* is still more enigmatical. In Coptic, *OUAB* signifies *pure, holy*; *OUEB*, *a priest*; and *METOUEB*, *priesthood*, (Young's *Enchorial Lexicon*, p. 105); but *ανες* still remains unexplained, although it is probable that the particle *η* forms part of it. Were we to hazard a conjectural interpretation, we should say that the word, as here used, means *a priest adorned for the celebration of funeral obsequies*.

‘ and has shed the blood of the *phyon* at his or at her house :
 ‘ wherefore I perform these profane [ceremonies] !’*

These formularies are not less curious and instructive than that to which we have already directed the reader’s attention. The first is peculiarly remarkable for the resemblance it bears to a passage in Jamblichus, setting forth the forms of menaces employed by the theurgists to oblige the inferior genii or divinities to be obedient to their will ; namely, ‘ to break the heaven ‘ in pieces, or to divulge the secrets of Isis, or to manifest the ‘ mystery of Abydos, or to stop the bark of [Osiris], or to scatter ‘ towards Typhon the members of Osiris.’† These menaces are not necessarily connected, and hence the stoppage of the bark or boat of Osiris is not to be considered as synonymous with the mystery of Abydos. In a succeeding chapter, (the 7th,) Jamblichus clearly indicates that the bark of which he speaks is that of the sun ; wherefore stopping or arresting the bark of Osiris is precisely equivalent to the expression in the former invocation,‡ ‘ the scarabæus shall descend, and there shall be ‘ darkness upon the whole earth.’ But this mystery may have had some relation to the tradition concerning the sepulture of the god, who, according to the fable, was killed and cut in pieces by Typhon. The expression in the manuscript, ‘ I bear ‘ the coffin or bier of Osiris, in order to deposit it at Abydos,’ is in perfect harmony with the predilection of the Egyptian grandees for that city as a place of sepulture, doubtless that their remains might rest contiguous to some fragment of the god ; and it also accords with a circumstance, mentioned by the ancients, and observed by the moderns, that all interments were made in the fashion of that of Osiris, as described in the fabulous legend. With regard to the origin of the mythic fiction, which places the tomb of Osiris and the victory of Typhon at Abydos, we agree with M. Jomard in thinking it an allegorical

* The original is as follows :—*Επικαλούμαι σε τον εν τω κενω, πνευμα, η δεινον αορατον παντακρατορα θεον θεων, φθοροποιον και ερημοποιον, ο μισω οικιαν ευσταθουσαν, ως εξεβραστης εκ της Αιγυπτου και εξω χωρας επενωμαστης [sic in orig.] ο πανταρησσαν και μη νικωμενος επικαλούμαι σε, Τυφον Σηθ· τας σας μαντικας επιτελω, οτι επικαλούμαι σε το σον αυθεντικον σου ονομα εν εις ου θυνη παρακουσαι.—[Here follows a series of fourteen epithets not Greek.] —Ολον ηγε μοι και βαδισον και καταβαλε τον Δ η την Δ ριγει και πυρεια. Αυτος ηδικησεν με και το αιμα του φυανος εξεχυσεν παρ’ εαυτω η αυτη δια τουτο ταυτα ποιω κοινα.*

† De *Mysteriis*, vi. cap. 5.

‡ Among the demotic words not transcribed, we observe *Abrasax*, otherwise written *Braxasa*, a well-known magical term of the Gnostics.

description of the proximity of the desert, and of the encroachment of the sand occasioned by Typhon, or the hot wind which blows over that arid and burning waste. The second passage, containing the invocation to Typhon, requires little comment. It is a magical incantation, for the purpose of causing evil to a private enemy, and the prayer is addressed to Typhon, surnamed Seth, an epithet well known in Egyptian antiquity.* It is somewhat doubtful, however, whether this god ought to be considered as a divinity exclusively Egyptian, or as a maleficent being of the Gnostic creed, and Egyptian only in origin. Professor Reuvens inclines to the latter opinion, though, as appears to us, without any sufficient reason. Typhon was considered, among the Egyptians, a particular wind;—of this, we apprehend, there can be no doubt whatsoever among scholars;—and it is expressly as such that he is invoked in the passage in question, where he is particularly described as existing ‘in the void;’ as ‘*πνευμα*, breath or wind;’ as ‘terrible, invisible, all-powerful;’ and as the being who ‘destroys,’ by converting what is fruitful into ‘a desert waste.’ This is much too direct and precise to be applied to a metaphysical entity, such as the half-pagan half-Christian fancy of a Gnostic would have imagined.

The appendix contains a description of a third ritual, in the form of a book, which seems to have been originally included in the same package with the bilingual papyrus, No. 75, but separated by the Arabs, ‘qui, suivant leur frauduleuse coutume, l’ont probablement detaché du papyrus principal, afin d’en tirer un plus grand prix par la double vente.’ It is entirely in Greek, and filled with the wildest fictions of astrological Gnosticism; but it is nevertheless valuable, as containing a number of demotic words, with their Greek transcriptions, and, of course, supplying new matter for the enchorial lexicon.

Our notice of Professor Reuvens’ second and third *Lettres* must be exceedingly brief; indeed they are not of sufficient importance, either mythologically or historically, to warrant our attempting any abstract or examination of the petty details with which they are, for the most part, filled. The former is devoted, first, to a hypothetical restoration of the inscription on the marble monument already mentioned; and, secondly, to an account of a mummy, which formed part of the Anastasy collection. The restoration proposed is ingenious but far-fetched, and the new monetary denomination of *assarion*, evolved by Professor Reuvens, must long, we fear, rest exclusively on the authority of his conjectural interpretation.† The mummy

* Jablonski, *Pantheon Aegyptiorum*, lib. iii. p. 107.

† We look forward with anxiety for the appearance of M. Letronne’s

described is chiefly remarkable as being that of a young woman, named Sensaos, the sister of one Petemenoph, whose mummy is deposited in the cabinet of antiques attached to the Royal Library at Paris. In the third *Lettre*, which is subdivided into fifteen articles, we have accounts of about a score of Greek papyri, some of them interesting, some of them very much the reverse. The principal results obtained are, the verification or correction of a few dates, and the determination of several Egyptian words, which occur in these manuscripts, and appear to have been employed where the Greek language supplied no term applicable to the object or thing meant to be described.

Before concluding, there is one subject, in regard to which we must take leave to say a few words. The radical identity of the modern Coptic with the old Egyptian, particularly in the Theban or Baschmouric dialect, has, at length, been fully established. Independently of the researches of M. Etienne Quatremère, the value and importance of which we formerly acknowledged, when treating of the subject of Hieroglyphics generally, the historical evidence of the antiquity of the original Coptic words collected by Wilkins, Lacroze, and Jablonsky, affords a complete demonstration of this truth; whilst the structure of the language itself, which has evidently been formed upon the model of the hieroglyphics,* together with the exceedingly rude and imperfect state of its grammar, tend to confirm the conclusion deduced from extrinsic considerations. It must be obvious, therefore, that a familiar knowledge of Coptic is indispensable to the successful prosecution of researches connected with the graphic system of the ancient Egyptians; and, without this acquisition, it is vain to attempt to decipher either monumental inscriptions or papyral manuscripts in the hieratic or demotic character. The artificial alphabets which have been constructed, are imperfect and limited instruments when applied to a complex system of writing, a very small portion of which only is phonetical. We must have other helps and resources, or our progress will be arrested almost at the very threshold of our labours; and one of the most important of these is a knowledge of the Coptic in its oldest form. But how is this knowledge to be attained? The lexicon of Lacroze, the only one to which we can trust, is scanty and incomplete; the grammar of Scholtz has become so scarce, that there are probably not half a dozen copies of it extant upon the continent; and the work of Woide is equally rare and

promised *Recherches sur les Monnaies Grecques*, as likely to introduce light and order into a subject at present involved in obscurity and confusion.

* See the 'Advertisement' to Young's *Enchorial Lexicon*, p. ix.

useless. Mr Tattam's grammar, recently published, is a most creditable performance, and cannot fail to be highly serviceable; but it is not calculated to supply the defect which is at present most severely felt. What we want most is a lexicon,—a mere collection of words. Grammar is a very secondary affair in a language where the nouns are the same in all the cases, the verbs without inflexions or conjugations, and a few particles, easily learned, constitute its only resource for effecting verbal modifications. A good lexicon is the prime requisite; and we know of only one man living who is, in all respects, capable of executing it as it ought to be executed; we mean M. Klaproth, the learned and justly celebrated author of *Asia Polyglotta*. Will he permit us to recommend to him a task for which his Letters on Acrological Hieroglyphs prove him to be so eminently qualified, and which, unless he undertake it, will probably fall into the hands of some dabbler, who has neither the learning nor the opportunities necessary for its performance?*

* The Atlas which accompanies this work, has greatly disappointed us. With the exception of a table of the principal Greek and demotic papyri, arranged in the order of places, subjects, and dates, which any ordinary compiler might have prepared, and some few additions, of doubtful authority, to the enchorial alphabet, it contains absolutely nothing of the least interest or value, and seems to have been got up merely for show. The Greek transcriptions of demotic and hieratic words, have been provokingly withheld; and instead of fac-similes of the bilingual texts, which would have been universally acceptable, we are furnished with views, direct and in profile, of a wretched nycitorax, carved in marble, and a print of the figure on the lid of a sors, differing, in no respect of any importance, from those with which all the world is familiar. The paper indeed is excellent, and the lithography highly respectable; but the matter, unfortunately, bears no sort of proportion to the amplitude of the space which it occupies, and the imposing garb in which it is offered to the public. In short, as we have before observed, Professor Reuvens has neglected that branch of the subject which Egyptian scholars consider as by far the most interesting, and which, from his situation and opportunities, he might have materially advanced; devoting his time and labours to matters purely secondary, where it is easy to exhibit a parade of erudition, but difficult, if not impossible, to make the slightest addition to actual knowledge. Might it not have occurred to M. Reuvens, that the celebrated Hellenist, to whom these *Lettres* are addressed, would have preferred a Greco-Egyptian text to a Dutch commentary without the original; and experienced more satisfaction in comparing correct fac-similes of the principal papyri of the Anastasy collection, than in wading through prolix descriptions, or perusing a muster-roll of authorities with which he must long have been familiar?

ART. VI.—1. *Addenda ad Corpus Statutorum Universitatis Oxoniensis*. 4to. Oxonii: 1825.

2. *The Oxford University Calendar, for 1829*. 8vo. Oxford: 1829.

THIS is the age of reform: Next in importance to our religious and political establishments, are the foundations for public education; and having now seriously engaged in a reform of 'the constitution, the envy of surrounding nations,' the time cannot be distant for a reform in the schools and universities which have hardly avoided their contempt. Public intelligence is not, as hitherto, tolerant of prescriptive abuses, and the country now demands that endowments for the common weal should no longer be administered for private advantage. At this auspicious crisis, and under a ministry, no longer warring against general opinion, we should be sorry not to contribute our endeavour to attract attention to the defects which more or less pervade all our national seminaries of education, and to the means best calculated for their removal. We propose, therefore, from time to time, to continue to review the state of these establishments, considered both absolutely in themselves, and in relation to the other circumstances which have contributed to modify the intellectual condition of the different divisions of the empire.

In proceeding to the Universities, we commence with Oxford. This University is entitled to precedence, from its venerable antiquity, its ancient fame, the wealth of its endowments, and the importance of its privileges; but there is another reason for our preference.

Without attempting any idle and invidious comparison—without asserting the superior or inferior excellence of Oxford in contrast with any other British University, we have no hesitation in affirming, that comparing what it actually is with what it possibly could be, Oxford is, of all academical institutions, at once the most imperfect and the most perfectible. Properly directed, as they might be, the means which it possesses would render it the most efficient University in existence; improperly directed, as they are, each part of the apparatus only counteracts another; and there is not a similar institution which, in proportion to what it ought to accomplish, accomplishes so little. But it is not in demonstrating the imperfection of the present system, that we principally ground a hope of its improvement; it is in demonstrating its *illegality*. In the reform of an ancient establishment like Oxford, the great difficulty is to initiate a move-

ment. In comparing Oxford as it is, with an ideal standard, there may be differences of opinion in regard to the kind of change expedient, if not in regard to the expediency of a change at all; but, in comparing it with the standard of its own code of statutes, there can be none. It will not surely be contended that matters should continue as they are, if it can be shown that, as now administered, this University pretends only to accomplish a petty fraction of the ends proposed to it by law, and attempts even this only by illegal means. But a progress being determined towards a state of right, it is easy to accelerate the momentum towards a state of excellence:—*ἀρχὴ ἡμῶν παντός.*

Did the limits of a single paper allow us to exhaust the subject, we should, in the *first* place, consider the state of the University, both as established in law, but non-existent in fact, and as established in fact, but non-existent in law; in the *second*, the causes which determined the transition from the statutory to the illegal constitution; in the *third*, the advantages and disadvantages of the two systems; and, in the *fourth*, the means by which the University may be best restored to its efficiency. In the present article, we can, however, only compass—and that inadequately—the first and second heads. The third and fourth we must reserve for a separate discussion, in which we shall endeavour to demonstrate, that the intrusive system, compared with the legitimate, is as absurd as it is unauthorized—that the preliminary step in a reform must be a return to the Statutory Constitution—and that this constitution, though far from faultless, may, by a few natural and easy changes, be improved into an instrument of academical education, the most perfect perhaps in the world. The subject of our consideration at present requires a fuller exposition, not only from its intrinsic importance, but because, strange as it may appear, the origin, and consequently the cure, of the corruption of the English Universities, is totally misunderstood. The vices of the present system have been observed, and frequently discussed; but as it has never been shown in what manner these vices were generated, so it has never been perceived how easily their removal might be enforced. It is generally believed that, however imperfect in itself, the actual mechanism of education organized in these seminaries, is a time-honoured and essential part of their being, established upon statute, endowed by the national legislature with exclusive privileges, and inviolable as a vested right. We shall prove, on the contrary, that it is new as it is inexpedient—not only accidental to the University, but radically subversive of its constitution,—without legal sanction, nay, in violation of positive law,—arrogating the privileges exclusively conceded to another system,

which it has superseded,—and so far from being defensible by those it profits, as a right, that it is a flagrant usurpation obtained through perjury, and only tolerated from neglect.

I. Oxford and Cambridge, as establishments for education, consist of two parts—of the *University proper*, and of the *Colleges*. The former, original and essential, is founded, controlled, and privileged by public authority, for the advantage of the state. The latter, accessory and contingent, are created, regulated, and endowed by private munificence, for the interest of certain favoured individuals. Time was when the Colleges did not exist, and the University was there; and were the Colleges again abolished, the University would remain entire. The former, founded solely for education, exists only as it accomplishes the end of its institution: the latter, founded principally for aliment and habitation, would still exist, were all education abandoned within their walls. The University, as a national establishment, is necessarily open to the lieges in general; the Colleges, as private institutions, might universally do as some have actually done—close their gates upon all, except their foundation members.

The University and Colleges are thus neither identical, nor vicarious of each other. If the University ceases to perform its functions, it ceases to exist; and the privileges accorded by the nation to the system of public education legally organized in the University, cannot, without the consent of the nation—far less without the consent of the academical legislature—be lawfully transferred to the system of private education precariously organized in the Colleges, and over which neither the State nor the University have any control. They have, however, been unlawfully usurped.

Through the suspension of the University, and the usurpation of its functions and privileges by the Collegial bodies, there has arisen the second of two systems, diametrically opposite to each other. The one, in which the University was paramount, is ancient and statutory; the other, in which the Colleges have the ascendant, is recent and illegal. In the former, all was subservient to public utility, and the interests of science; in the latter, all is sacrificed to private monopoly, and to the convenience of the teacher. The former amplified the means of education in accommodation to the mighty end which a University proposes; the latter limits the end which the University attempts to the capacity of the petty instruments which the intrusive system employs. The one afforded education in all the Faculties; the other professes to furnish only elementary tuition in the lowest. In the authorized system, the cycle of instruction was distri-

buted among a body of teachers, all professedly chosen from merit, and each concentrating his ability on a single object; in the unauthorized, every branch, necessary to be learned, is monopolized by an individual privileged to teach all, though probably ill qualified to teach any. The old system daily collected into large classes, under the same professor, the whole youth of the University of equal standing, and thus rendered possible a keen and steady competition; the new, which elevates the colleges and halls into so many little universities, and in these houses distributes the students, without regard to ability or standing, among some fifty tutors, frustrates all emulation among the members of its small and ill-assorted classes. In the superseded system, the Degrees in all the Faculties were solemn testimonials that the graduate had accomplished a regular course of study in the public schools of the University, and approved his competence by exercise and examination; and on these degrees, only as such testimonials, and solely for the public good, were there bestowed by the civil legislature, great and exclusive privileges in the church, in the courts of law, and in the practice of medicine. In the superseding system, Degrees in all the Faculties, except the lowest department of the lowest, certify neither a course of academical study, nor any ascertained proficiency in the graduate; and these now nominal distinctions retain their privileges to the public detriment, and for the benefit only of those by whom they have been deprived of their significance. Such is the general contrast of the two systems, which we must now exhibit in detail.

System de jure. The *Corpus Statutorum* by which the University of Oxford is—we should say, *ought to be*—governed, was digested by a committee appointed for that purpose, through the influence of Laud, and solemnly ratified by King, Chancellor, and Convocation, in the year 1636. The far greater number of those statutes had been previously in force; and, except in certain articles subsequently added, modified, or restricted, (contained in the Appendix and Addenda,) they exclusively determine the law and constitution of the University to the present hour. Every member is bound by oath and subscription to their faithful observance.—In explanation of the statutory system of instruction, it may be proper to say a few words in regard to the history of academical teaching, previous to the publication of the Laudian Code.

In the original constitution of Oxford, as in that of all the older universities of the Parisian model, the business of instruction was not confided to a special body of privileged pro-

fessors. The University was governed, the University was taught, by the graduates at large. Professor, Master, Doctor, were originally synonymous. Every graduate had an equal right of teaching publicly in the University the subjects competent to his faculty, and to the rank of his degree; nay, every graduate incurred the obligation of teaching publicly, for a certain period, the subjects of his faculty, for such was the condition involved in the grant of the degree itself. The Bachelor, or imperfect graduate, partly as an exercise towards the higher honour, and useful to himself, partly as a performance due for the degree obtained, and of advantage to others, was bound to read under a master or doctor in his faculty, a course of lectures; and the master, doctor, or perfect graduate, was, in like manner, after his promotion, obliged immediately to commence, (*incipere*,) and to continue for a certain period publicly to teach, (*regere*,) some at least of the subjects pertaining to his faculty. As, however, it was only necessary for the University to enforce this obligation of public teaching, compulsory on all graduates during the term of their *necessary regency*, if there did not come forward a competent number of *voluntary regents* to execute this function; and as the schools belonging to the several faculties, and in which alone all public or ordinary instruction could be delivered, were frequently inadequate to accommodate the multitude of the inceptors; it came to pass that in these Universities the original period of necessary regency was once and again abbreviated, and even a dispensation from actual teaching during its continuance, commonly allowed.* At the same time, as the University only accomplished the end of its existence through its regents, they alone were allowed to enjoy full privileges in its legislation and government. In Paris, the non-regent graduates were only assembled on rare and extraordinary occasions; in Oxford, the regents formed the House of Congregation, which, among other exclusive prerogatives, anciently constituted the initiatory

* In Oxford, where the public schools of the Faculty of Arts, in *School Street*, were proportionally more numerous (there are known by name above *forty* sets of schools anciently open in that street, *i. e.* buildings, containing from four to sixteen class-rooms) than those in Paris belonging to the different nations of that faculty, in the *Rue de la Fouarre*, this dispensation was more tardily allowed. In Paris, the master who was desirous of exercising this privilege of his degree, petitioned his faculty *pro regentia et scholis*; and schools, as they fell vacant, were granted to him by his nation, according to his seniority.

assembly, through which it behoved that every measure should pass before it could be submitted to the House of Convocation, composed indifferently of all regents and non-regents resident in the University.*

This distinction of regent and non-regent continued most rigidly marked in the Faculty of Arts—the faculty on which the older universities were originally founded, and which was always greatly the most numerous. In the other faculties, both in Paris and Oxford, all doctors succeeded in usurping the style and privileges of *regent*, though not actually engaged in teaching; and in Oxford, the same was allowed to masters of the Faculty of Arts during the statutory period of their necessary regency, even when availing themselves of a dispensation from the performance of its duties; and extended to the Heads of Houses, (who were also in Paris *Regens d'honneur*,) and to College Deans. This explains the constitution of the Oxford House of Congregation at the present day.

The ancient system of academical instruction by the graduates at large, was, however, still more essentially modified by another innovation. The regents were entitled to exact from their auditors a certain regulated fee (*pastus, collectum*). To relieve the scholars of this burden, and to secure the services of able teachers, salaries were sometimes given to certain graduates, on consideration of their delivery of ordinary lectures without collect. In many universities, attendance on these courses was specially required of those proceeding to a degree; and it was to the salaried graduates that the title of *Professors*, in academical language, was at last peculiarly attributed. By this institution of salaried lecturers, dispensation could be universally accorded to the other graduates. The unsalaried regents found, in general, their schools deserted for the gratuitous instruction of the privileged lecturers; and though the right of public teaching competent to every graduate still remained entire, its exercise was, in a great measure, abandoned to the body of professors organized more or less completely in the several faculties throughout the universities of Europe. To speak only of Oxford, and in Oxford only of the Faculty of Arts, ten salaried readers or professors of the *seven arts* and the *three philosophies*† had been nomi-

* It was only by an abusive fiction that those were subsequently held to be *Convictores*, or actual residents in the University, who retained their names on the books of a Hall, or College.

† The Faculty of Arts originally comprehended, besides the three philosophies, the whole seven arts. Of these latter, some were, how-

nated by the House of Congregation, and attendance on their lectures enforced by statute, long prior to the epoch of the Laudian digest. At the date of that code, the greater number of these chairs had obtained permanent endowments; and four only depended for a fluctuating stipend on certain fines and taxes levied on the graduates they relieved from teaching, and on the under graduates they were appointed to teach. At that period it was, however, still usual for simple graduates to exercise their right of lecturing in the public schools. While this continued, ability possessed an opportunity of honourable manifestation; a nursery of experienced teachers was afforded; the salaried readers were not allowed to slumber in the quiescence of an unfringible monopoly; their election could less easily degenerate into a matter of interest and favour; while the student, presented with a more extensive sphere of information, was less exposed to form exclusive opinions when hearing the same subjects treated by different lecturers in different manners. These advantages have, by such an arrangement, been secured in the German universities.

In Oxford, the *Corpus Statutorum* introduced little or no change in the mechanism of academical instruction; nor has this been done by any subsequent enactment. On the contrary, the most recent statutes on the subject—those of 1801 and 1808—recognise the ancient system ratified under Laud, as that still in force, and actually in operation. (*Corp. Stat. T. iv. Add. p. 129—133. p. 190—192.*) The scheme thus established in law, though now abolished in fact, is as follows:—

Education is afforded in all the faculties in which degrees are granted, by the University itself, through its accredited organs, the public readers or professors—a regular attendance on whose lectures during a stated period is in every faculty indispensably requisite to qualify for a degree. To say nothing of Music, the

ever, at different times, thrown out of the faculty, or separated from the other arts, and special degrees given in them either apart from, or in subordination to, the general degree. Thus, in Oxford, special degrees were given in Grammar, in Rhetoric, and in Music. The two former subjects were again withdrawn into the faculty, and their degrees waxed obsolete—but Music and its degree still remain apart. The General Sophist was a special degree in Logic, but subordinate to the general degree in Arts. It is needless to say, that these particular degrees gave no entry into the academical assemblies. The historians of the universities of Paris and Oxford have misconceived this subject, from not illustrating the practice of the one school by that of the other. Duboullay and Wood knew nothing of each other's works, though writing at the same time, and Crevier never looked beyond Duboullay.

University grants degrees, and furnishes instruction in four faculties—Arts, Theology, Civil Law, and Medicine.*

In *Arts* there are established *eleven* Public Readers or Professors; a regular attendance on whose courses is necessary during a period of four years to qualify for bachelor—during seven, to qualify for master. The student must frequent during the first year the lectures on Grammar and Rhetoric; during the second, Logic and Moral Philosophy; during the third and fourth, Logic and Moral Philosophy, Geometry and Greek; during the fifth, (bachelors of first year,) Geometry, Metaphysics, History, Greek—and Hebrew, if destined for the church; during the sixth and seventh, Astronomy, Natural Philosophy, Metaphysics, History, Greek,—and Hebrew, if divines.

To commence student in the faculty of *Theology*, a mastership in arts is a requisite preliminary. There are two professors of Divinity, on whom attendance is required, during seven years for the degree of bachelor, and subsequently during four for that of doctor.

In the faculty of *Civil Law* there is one professor. The student is not required to have graduated in arts; but if a master in that faculty, three years of attendance on the professor qualify him for a bachelor's degree, and four thereafter for a doctor's. The simple student must attend his professor during five years for bachelor, and ten for doctor; and previous to commencing student in this faculty, he must have frequented the courses of logic, moral and political philosophy, and of the other humane sciences during two years, and history until his presentation for bachelor. By recent statute, to commence the study of law, it is necessary to pass the examination for bachelor of arts.

To commence student in *Medicine*, it is necessary to have obtained a mastership in arts, and thereafter the candidate, (besides a certain attendance on the prælector of anatomy,) must have heard the professor of medicine during three years for the degree of bachelor, and again during four years for that of doctor.†

The professors are bound to lecture during term, with exception of Lent, *i. e.* for about six months annually, twice a-

* Since the Reformation, as the subject of the faculty of Canon Law was no longer taught, degrees in that faculty have very properly been discontinued. But why are degrees still continued in the other faculties, in which the relative instruction is no longer afforded?

† Of several other chairs subsequently established, we make no mention, as these were never constituted into necessary parts of the academical system.

week, and for two full hours;* and penalties are incurred by teacher and student for any negligence in the performance of their several duties. Among other useful regulations, it is enjoined, ‘that after lecture, the professors should tarry for some time in the schools; and if any scholar or auditor may wish to argue against what has been delivered from the chair, or may otherwise have any dubiety to resolve, that they should listen to him kindly, and satisfy his difficulties and doubts.’

But though a body of professors was thus established as the special organ through which the University effected the purposes of its institution, the right was not withdrawn, nay, is expressly declared to remain inviolate, which every master and doctor, possessed in virtue of his degree, of opening in the public schools a course of lectures on any of the subjects within the compass of his faculty. (Corp. St. T. iv. § 1.)

But besides the public and principal means of instruction afforded by the professors and other regents in the University, the student was subjected until his first degree, or during the first four years of his academical life, to the subsidiary and private discipline of a tutor in the Hall or College to which he belonged. This regulation was rendered peculiarly expedient by circumstances which no longer exist. Prior to the period of the Laudian digest, it was customary to enter the University at a very early age; and the student of those times, when he obtained the rank of master, was frequently not older than the student of the present when he matriculates. It was of course found useful to place these academical boys under the special guardianship of a tutor during the earlier years of their residence in the University. With this, however, as a merely private concern, the University did not interfere; and we doubt whether before the chancellorship of Leicester, any attempt was made to regulate, by academical authority, the character of those who might officiate in this capacity, or before the chancellorship of Laud, to render imperative the entering under a tutor at all, and a tutor resident in the same house with the pupil. (Compare Wood’s Annals, a. 1581, and Corp. Stat. T. iii. § 2.) Be this, however, as it may, the tutorial office was viewed as one of very subordinate importance in the statutory system. To commence tutor, it was only necessary for a student to have the lowest degree in arts, and that his learning, his moral and religious character, should be approved of by the head of the house in which he re-

* Previously to Laud’s statutes, the professors in general were bound to lecture *daily*, and all, if we recollect, at least *four times* a-week. The change was absurd. It was *standing* which should have been shortened.

sided, or, in the event of controversy on this point, by the vice-chancellor. All that was expected of him was, ‘to imbue his pupils with good principles, and institute them in approved authors; but above all, in the rudiments of religion, and the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles; and that he should do all that in him lay to render them conformable to the Church of England.’ ‘It is also his duty to contain his pupils within statutory regulations in matters of external appearance, such as their clothes, boots, and hair; which, if the pupils are found to transgress, the tutor for the first, second, and third offence, shall forfeit six and eightpence, and for the fourth, shall be interdicted from his tutorial function by the vice-chancellor.’ (T. iii. § 2.) Who could have anticipated from this statute what the tutor was ultimately to become?

The preceding outline is sufficient to show that by statute the University of Oxford proposes an end not less comprehensive than other universities, and attempts to accomplish that end by the same machinery which they employ. It proposes as its adequate end, the education of youth in the faculties of arts, theology, law, and medicine; and for accomplishment of this, a body of public lecturers constitute the instrument which it principally, if not exclusively, employs. But as the University of Oxford only executes its purpose, and therefore only realizes its existence, through the agency of its professorial system; consequently, whatever limits, weakens, or destroys the efficiency of that system, limits, weakens, and destroys the University itself. With the qualities of this system, as organized in Oxford, we have at present no concern. We may, however, observe, that if not perfect, it was perfectible; and at the date of its establishment, there were few universities in Europe which could boast of an organization of its public instructors more complete, and none perhaps in which that organization was so easily susceptible of so high an improvement.

In the system *de facto* all is changed. The University is in abeyance;—*Magni stat nominis umbra*. In none of the faculties is it supposed that the professors any longer furnish the instruction necessary for a degree. Some chairs are even nominally extinct where an endowment has not perpetuated the sinecure; and the others betray, in general, their existence only through the Calendar. If the silence of the schools be occasionally broken by a formal lecture, or if on some popular subjects (fees being now permitted) a short course be usually delivered; attendance on these is not more required or expected, than attendance in the music-room. For every degree in every faculty above Bachelor of Arts, standing on the books, is allowed to count for residence in the University, and attendance on the public courses;

and though, under these circumstances, examinations be more imperatively necessary, a real examination only exists for the elementary degree, of which residence is also a condition.

It is thus not even pretended that Oxford now supplies more than the preliminary of an academical education. Even this is not afforded by the University, but abandoned to the Colleges and Halls; and the Academy of Oxford is therefore not one public University, but merely a collection of private schools. The University, in fact, exists only in semblance, for the behoof of the unauthorized seminaries by which it has been replaced, and which have contrived, under covert of its name, to slip into possession of its public privileges.*

But as academical education was usurped by the tutors from the professors—so all tutorial education was usurped by the *fellows* from the other graduates. The fellows exclusively teach all that Oxford now deems necessary to be taught; and as every tutor is singly vicarious of the whole ancient body of professors—*ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων*—the present capacity of the University to effect the purposes of its establishment must, consequently, be determined by the capacity of each fellow-tutor to compass the encyclopædia of academical instruction. If Oxford accom-

* How completely the *University* is annihilated—how completely even all memory of its history, all knowledge of its constitution, have perished in Oxford, is significantly shown in the following passage, written by a very able defender of things as they now are in that seminary. ‘There are, moreover, some points in the constitution of this place, which are carefully kept out of sight by our revilers, but which ought to be known and well considered, before any comparison is made between what we are, and what we ought to be. THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD IS NOT A NATIONAL FOUNDATION. It is a congeries of foundations, originating some in royal munificence, but more in private piety and bounty. They are moulded indeed into one corporation; but each one of our twenty Colleges is a corporation by itself, and has its own peculiar statutes, not only regulating its internal affairs, but confining its benefits by a great variety of limitations.’ *Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review*, p. 183. We shall content ourselves with quoting a sentence from the ‘*Abstract of divers Privileges and Rights of the University of Oxford*,’ by the celebrated Dr Wallis, the least of whose merits was an intimate acquaintance with the history and constitution of the establishment of which he was Registrar. ‘The rights or privileges (whatever they be) [are] not granted or belonging to Scholars as living in Colleges, &c. but to Colleges, &c., as houses inhabited by Scholars, the Colleges which we now have being accidental to the corporation of the University, and the confining of Scholars now to a certain number of Colleges and Halls being extrinsical

plishes the objects of a University even in its lowest faculty, every fellow-tutor is a second ‘ Universal Doctor,’

Qui tria, qui septem, qui omne scibile novit.

But while thus resting her success on the *extraordinary* ability of her teachers, we shall see that she makes no provision even for their *ordinary* competence.

As the fellowships were not founded for the purposes of teaching, so the qualifications that constitute a fellow are not those that constitute an instructor. The Colleges owe their establishment to the capricious bounty of individuals, and the fellow rarely owes his eligibility to merit alone, but in the immense majority of cases to fortuitous circumstances.* The fellowships in Oxford are, with few exceptions, limited to founder’s kin—to founder’s kin, born in particular counties, or educated at particular schools—to the scholars of certain schools, without restriction, or narrowed by some additional circumstance of age or locality of birth—to the natives of certain dioceses, archdeaconrics, islands, counties, towns, parishes or manors, under every variety of arbitrary condition. In some cases, the candidate must be a graduate of a certain standing, in others he must not; in some he must be in orders, perhaps

‘ to the University, and by a law of their own making, each College (but not the Halls) being a distinct corporation from that of the University.’

* This is candidly acknowledged by the intelligent apologist just quoted. ‘ In most Colleges the fellowships are appropriated to certain schools, dioceses, counties, and in some cases even to parishes, with a preference given to the founder’s kindred for ever. Many qualifications, quite foreign to intellectual talents and learning, are thus enjoined by the founders; and in *very few* instances is a free choice of candidates allowed to the fellows of a College, upon any vacancy in their number. *Merit therefore has not such provision made as the extent of the endowments might seem to promise.* Now it is certain that each of these various institutions is not the best. The best of them perhaps are those [how many are there?] where an unrestrained choice is left among all candidates who have taken one degree. The worst are those which are appropriated to schools, from which boys of sixteen or seventeen are forwarded to a fixed station and emolument, which nothing can forfeit but flagrant misconduct, and which no exertion can render more valuable.’ *Reply to the Calumnies, &c.* p. 183. We may add, that even where ‘ a free choice of candidates is allowed,’ the electors are not always Fellows either of Oriel College, Oxford, or of Trinity College, Cambridge.

priest's, in others he is only bound to enter the church within a definite time. In some cases the fellow may freely choose his profession; in general he is limited to theology, and in a few instances must proceed in law or medicine. The nomination is sometimes committed to an individual, sometimes to a body of men, and these either within or without the College and University; but in general it belongs to the fellows. The elective power is rarely, however, deposited in worthy hands; and even when circumstances permit any liberty of choice, desert has too seldom a chance in competition with favour. With one unimportant exception, the fellowships are perpetual; but they are vacated by marriage, and by acceptance of a living in the church above a limited amount. They vary greatly in emolument in different Colleges; and in the same Colleges the difference is often considerable between those on different foundations, and on the same foundations between the senior and the junior fellowships. Some do not even afford the necessaries of life; others are more than competent to its superfluities. Residence is *now* universally dispensed with; though in some cases certain advantages are only to be enjoyed on the spot. In the church, the Colleges possess considerable patronage; the livings as they fall vacant are at the option of the fellows in the order of seniority; and the advantage of a fellowship depends often less on the amount of salary which it immediately affords, than on the value of the preferment to which it may ultimately lead.

But while, as a body, the fellows can thus hardly be supposed to rise above the average amount of intelligence and acquirement; so, of the fellows, it is not those best competent to its discharge who are generally found engaged in the business of tuition.

In the first place, there is no power of adequate selection, were there even sufficient materials from which to choose. The head, himself, of the same leaven with the fellows, cannot be presumed greatly to transcend their level; and he is peculiarly exposed to the influence of that party spirit by which collegial bodies are so frequently distracted. Were his approbation of tutors, therefore, free, we could have no security for the wisdom and impartiality of his choice. But in point of fact he can only legally refuse his sanction on the odious grounds of ignorance, vice, or irreligion. The tutors are thus virtually self-appointed.

But in the second place, a fellow constitutes himself a tutor, not because he suits the office, but because the office is convenient to him. The standard of tutorial capacity and of tutorial performance is in Oxford too low to frighten even the diffident or lazy. The advantages of the situation in point either of

profit or reputation, are not sufficient to tempt ambitious talent; and distinguished ability is sure soon to be withdrawn from the vocation,—if marriage does not precipitate a retreat.* The fellow who in general undertakes the office, and continues the longest to discharge it, is a clerical expectant whose hopes are bounded by a College living; and who, until the wheel of promotion has moved round, is content to relieve the tedium of a leisure life by the interest of an occupation, and to improve his income by its emoluments. Thus it is that tuition is not solemnly engaged in as an important, arduous, responsible, and permanent occupation; but lightly viewed and undertaken as a matter of convenience, a business by the by, a state of transition, a stepping-stone to something else.

But in the third place, were the tutors not the creatures of accident, did merit exclusively determine their appointment, and did the situation tempt the services of the highest talent, still it would be impossible to find a complement of able men equal in number to the cloud of tutors whom Oxford actually employs.

This general demonstration of what the fellow-tutors of Oxford must be, is more than confirmed by a view of what they actually are. It is not contended that the system excludes men of merit, but that merit is in general the accident, not the principle, of their appointment. We might, therefore, always expect, on the common doctrine of probabilities, that among the multitude of college tutors, there should be a few known to the world for ability and erudition. But we assert, without fear of contradiction, that, on the average, there is to be found among those to whom Oxford confides the business of education, an infinitely smaller proportion of men of literary reputation, than among the actual instructors of any other University in the world. For example: the second work at the head of this article exhibits the names of above forty fellow tutors; yet among these we have not encountered a single individual of whose literary existence the public is aware. This may be an unfavourable accident; but where is the University out of Britain of which so little could at any time be said?

* 'So far from a College being a drain upon the world, the world drains Colleges of their *most efficient* members; and although the University *thus becomes a more effectual engine of education* [! how?] it loses much of that characteristic feature it once had, as a residence of learned leisure, and an emporium of literature.'—*Reply to the Calumnies*, &c. p. 185.

We at present consider the system *de facto* in itself, and without reference to its effects; and say nothing of its qualities, except in so far as these are involved in the bare statement of its organization. So much, however, is notorious; either the great University of Oxford does not now attempt to accomplish what it was established to effect, and what every, even the meanest, University proposes; or it attempts this by means inversely proportioned to the end, and thus ludicrously fails in the endeavour. That there is much of good, much worthy of imitation by other Universities, in the present spirit and present economy of Oxford, we are happy to acknowledge, and may at another time endeavour to demonstrate. But this good is *occasioned*, not *effected*; it exists not in consequence of any excellence in the instructors,—and is only favoured in so far as it is compatible with the interest of those private corporations, who administer the University exclusively for their own benefit. As *at present organized*, it is a doubtful problem whether the tutorial system ought not to be abated as a nuisance. For if some tutors may afford assistance to some pupils, to other pupils other tutors prove equally an impediment. We are no enemies of collegial residence, no enemies of a tutorial discipline, even now when its former necessity has in a great measure been superseded. To vindicate its utility under present circumstances, it must, however, be raised not merely from its actual corruption, but even to a higher excellence than it possessed by its original constitution. A tutorial system in subordination to a professorial (which Oxford formerly enjoyed) we regard as affording the condition of an absolutely perfect University. But the tutorial system as now dominant in Oxford, is vicious, in its *application*—as usurping the place of the professorial, whose function, under any circumstances, it is inadequate to discharge; and in its *constitution*—the tutors as now fortuitously appointed being, as a body, incompetent even to the duties of subsidiary instruction.

II. We come now to our second subject of consideration—to enquire by what causes and for what ends this revolution was accomplished; how the English Universities, and in particular Oxford, passed from a legal to an illegal state, and from public Universities were degraded into private schools? The answer is precise; this was effected solely by the influence, and exclusively for the advantage, of the Colleges: but it requires some illustration to understand how the interest of these private corporations was opposed to that of the public institution, of which they were the accidents; and how their domestic tuition was able gradually to undermine, and ultimately to supersede, the system of academic lectures in aid of which it was established.

Though Colleges be unessential accessories to a University, yet common circumstances occasioned, throughout all the older Universities, the foundation of conventual establishments for the habitation, support, and subsidiary discipline of the student; and the date of the earliest Colleges is not long posterior to the date of the most ancient Universities. Establishments of this nature are thus not peculiar to England; and like the greater number of her institutions, they were borrowed by Oxford from the mother University of Paris—but with peculiar and important modifications. A sketch of the Collegial system as variously organized, and as variously affecting the academical constitution in foreign Universities, will afford a clearer conception of the distinctive character of that system in those of England, and of the paramount and unexampled influence it has exerted in determining their corruption.

The causes which originally promoted the establishment of Colleges, were very different from those which subsequently occasioned their increase, and are to be found in the circumstances under which the earliest Universities sprang up. The great concourse of the studious, from every country of Europe, to the illustrious teachers of law, medicine, and philosophy, who in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries opened their schools in Bologna, Salerno, and Paris, necessarily occasioned, in these cities, a scarcity of lodgings, and an exorbitant demand for rent. Various means were adopted to alleviate this inconvenience, but with inadequate effect; and the hardships to which the poorer students were frequently exposed, moved compassionate individuals to provide houses, in which a certain number of indigent scholars might be accommodated with free lodging during the progress of their studies. The manners, also, of the cities in which the early Universities arose, were, for obvious reasons, more than usually corrupt; and even attendance on the public teachers forced the student into dangerous and degrading associations.*

* ‘Tunc autem,’ says the Cardinal de Vitry, who wrote in the first half of the thirteenth century, in speaking of the state of Paris,—‘tunc autem amplius in Clero quam in alio populo dissoluta (Lutetia sc.), tamquam capra scabiosa et ovis morbida pernicioso exemplo multos hospites suos undique ad eam affluentes corrumpebat, habitatores suos devorans et in profundum demergens, simplicem fornicationem nullum peccatum reputabat. Meretrices publicæ ubique per vicus et plateas civitatis passim ad lupanaria sua clericos transeuntes quasi per violentiam pertrahabant. Quod si forte ingredi recusarent, confestim eos Sodomitæ, post ipsos conclamantes dicebant. *In una autem et eadem domo scholæ erant superius, prostibula inferius. In parte*

Piety thus concurred with benevolence in supplying houses in which poor scholars might be harboured without cost, and youth, removed from perilous temptation, be placed under the control of an overseer; and an example was afforded for imitation in the *Hospitia* which the religious orders established in the University towns for those of their members who were now attracted, as teachers and learners, to these places of literary resort. Free board was soon added to free lodging; and a small bursary or stipend generally completed the endowment. With moral superintendence was conjoined literary discipline, but still in subservience to the public exercises and lectures: opportunity was obtained of constant disputation, to which the greatest importance was not unwisely attributed through all the scholastic ages; while books, which only affluent individuals could then afford to purchase, were supplied for the general use of the indigent community.

But as Paris was the University in which collegial establishments were first founded, so Paris was the University in which they soonest obtained the last and most important extension of their purposes. Regents were occasionally taken from the public schools, and placed as regular lecturers within the Colleges. Sometimes nominated, always controlled, and only degraded by their faculty, these lecturers were recognised as among its teachers; and the same privileges accorded to the attendance on their College courses, as on those delivered by other graduates in the common schools of the University. Different Colleges thus afforded the means of academical education in certain departments of a faculty—in a whole faculty—or in several faculties; and so far they constituted particular incorporations of teachers and learners, apart from, and independent of, the general body of the University. They formed, in fact, so many petty Universities, or so many fragments of a University. Into the Colleges, thus furnished with professors, there were soon admitted to board and education pensioners, or scholars, not on the foundation; and nothing more was wanting to supersede the lecturer in the public schools,

superiori magistri legebant, in inferiori meretrices officia turpitudinis exercebant. Ex una parte meretrices inter se et cum Cenonibus [lenonibus] litigabant: ex alia parte disputantes et contentiose agentes clerici proclamabant.—(Jacobi de Vitriaco, Hist. Occident. cap. vii.)—It thus appears that the schools of the Faculty of Arts were not as yet established in the *Rue de la Fouarre*. At this date in Paris, as originally also in Oxford, the lectures and disputations were conducted by the masters in their private habitations.

than to throw open these domestic classes to the members of the other Colleges, and to the *martinets* or scholars of the University not belonging to Colleges at all. In the course of the fifteenth century this was done; and the University and Colleges were thus intimately united. The College regents, selected for talent, and recommended to favour by their nomination, soon diverted the students from the unguaranteed courses of the lecturers in the University schools. The great faculties of theology and arts became at last exclusively collegial. With the exception of two courses in the College of Navarre, the lectures, disputations, and acts of the Theological Faculty were confined to the college of the Sorbonne; and the Sorbonne thus became convertible with the Theological Faculty of Paris. During the latter half of the fifteenth century, the ‘famous Colleges,’ or those ‘of complete ‘exercise,’ (cc. magna, celebria, famosa, famata, de plein exercise,) in the Faculty of Arts, amounted to *eighteen*—a number which, before the middle of the seventeenth, had been reduced to *ten*. About eighty others, (cc. parva, non celebria,) of which above a half still subsisted in the eighteenth century, taught either only the subordinate branches of the faculty, (grammar and rhetoric,) and this only to those on the foundation, or merely afforded habitation and stipend to their bursars, now admitted to education in all the larger colleges, with the illustrious exception of Navarre. The *Rue de la Fouarre*, (*vicus stramineus*,) which contained the schools belonging to the different nations of the faculty, and to which the lectures in philosophy had been once exclusively confined, became less and less frequented; until at last the public chair of Ethics, long perpetuated by an endowment, alone remained; and ‘the street’ would have been wholly abandoned by the university, had not the acts of Determination, the forms of Inceptorship, and the Examinations of some of the nations, still connected the Faculty of Arts with this venerable site. The colleges of full exercise in this faculty, continued to combine the objects of a classical school and university: for, besides the art of grammar taught in six or seven classes of humanity or ancient literature, they supplied courses of rhetoric, logic, metaphysics, physics, mathematics, and morals; the several subjects taught by different professors. A free competition was thus maintained between the Colleges; the principals had every inducement to appoint only the most able teachers; and the emoluments of the rival professors (who were not astricted to celibacy) depended mainly on their fees. A blind munificence quenched this useful emulation. In the year 1719, fixed salaries and retiring pensions were assigned by the crown to the college regents; the *lieges* at large now obtained

the gratuitous instruction which the poor had always enjoyed, but the University gradually declined.

After Paris, no continental University was more affected in its fundamental faculty by the collegial system than Louvain. Originally, as in Paris, and the other Universities of the Parisian model, the lectures in the Faculty of Arts were exclusively delivered by the regents *in vico*, or in the *general* schools, to each of whom a certain subject of philosophy, and a certain hour of teaching, was assigned. Colleges were founded; and in some of these, during the fifteenth century, *particular* schools were established. The regents in these colleges were not disowned by the faculty, to whose control they were subjected. Here, as in Paris, the lectures by the regents *in vico* gradually declined, till at last the three public professorships of Ethics, Rhetoric, and Mathematics, perpetuated by endowment, were in the seventeenth century the only classes that remained open in the halls of the Faculty of Arts, in which, besides other exercises, the Quodlibetic Disputations were still annually performed. The general tuition of that faculty was conducted in four rival colleges of full exercise, or *paedagogia*, as they were denominated, in contradistinction to the other colleges, intended less for the education, than for the habitation and aliment of youth, during their studies. These last, which amounted to above thirty, sent their bursars for education to the four privileged Colleges of the Faculty; to one or other of which these minor establishments were in general astricted. In the *paedagogia*, with the single exception of the *Collegium Porci*, Philosophy alone was taught, and this under the fourfold division of Logic, Physics, Metaphysics, and Morals, by four ordinary professors and a principal. Instruction in the *Litteræ Humaniores*, was, in the seventeenth century, discontinued in the other three, (*cc. Castri, Liliæ, Falconis*);—the earlier institution in this department being afforded by the oppidan schools then everywhere established; the higher by the *Collegium Gandense*; and the highest by the three professors of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew literature, in the *Collegium trilingue*, founded in 1517, by Hieronymus Buslidius—a memorable institution, imitated by Francis I. in Paris, by Fox and Wolsey in Oxford, and by Ximenes in Alcala de Henares. In the *paedagogia* the discipline was rigorous; the diligence of the teachers admirably sustained by the rivalry of the different Houses; and the emulation of the students, roused by daily competition in their several classes and colleges, was powerfully directed towards the great general contest, in which all the candidates for a degree in arts from the different *paedagogia* were brought into concurrence—publicly and minutely tried by sworn examiners—and finally

arranged with rigorous impartiality in the strict order of merit. This competition for academical honours, long the peculiar glory of Louvain, is only to be paralleled by the present examinations in the English Universities ;* we may explain the former when we come to speak of the latter.

In Germany collegial establishments did not obtain the same preponderance as in the Netherlands and France. In the older universities of the empire, the academical system was not essentially modified by these institutions ; and in the universities founded after the commencement of the sixteenth century, they were rarely called into existence. In Prague, Vienna, Heidelberg, Cologne, Erfurth, Leipsic, Rostoch, Ingolstadt, Tubingen, &c., we find conventual establishments for the habitation, aliment, and superintendence of youth ; but these, always subsidiary to the public system, were rarely able, after the revival of letters, to maintain their importance even in this subordinate capacity.

In Germany, the name of *College* was usually applied to foundations destined principally for the residence and support of the academical teachers ; the name of *Bursa* was given to houses inhabited by students, under the superintendence of a graduate in arts. In the colleges, which were comparatively rare, if scholars were admitted at all, they received free lodging or free board, but not free domestic tuition ; they were bound to be diligent in attendance on the lectures of the public readers in the University ; and the governors of the house were enjoined to see that this obligation was faithfully performed. The *Bursæ*, which corresponded to the ancient halls of Oxford and Cambridge, prevailed in all the older Universities of Germany. They were either benevolent foundations for the reception of a certain class of favoured students, who had sometimes also a small exhibition for their support (*bb. private*), or houses licensed by the Faculty of Arts, to whom they exclusively belonged, in which the students admitted were bound to a certain stated contribution (*positio*) to a common exchequer (*bursa*—hence the name), and to obedience to the laws by which the discipline of the establishment was regulated (*bb. communes*.) Of these varieties, the second was in general engrafted on the first. Every *bursa* was governed by a graduate (*rector, conventor* ;) and, in the larger institutions, under him, by his delegate (*conrector*) or assistants (*magistri conventores*.) In most Universities it was enjoined that

* We suspect that the present Cambridge scheme of examination and honours was a direct imitation of that of Louvain. The similarity in certain points seems too precise to be accidental.

every regular student in the Faculty of Arts should enrol himself of a burse; but the burse was also frequently inhabited by masters engaged in public lecturing in their own, or in following the courses of a higher faculty. To the duty of rector belonged a general superintendence of the diligence and moral conduct of the inferior members, and (in the larger bursae, with the aid of a *procurator* or *æconomus*) the management of the funds destined for the maintenance of the house. As in the colleges of France and England, he could enforce discipline by the infliction of corporeal punishment. Domestic instruction was generally introduced into these establishments, but, as we said, only in subservience to the public. The rector, either by himself or deputies, repeated with his bursars their public lessons, resolved difficulties they might propose, supplied deficiencies in their knowledge, and moderated at the performance of their private disputations.

The philosophical controversies which, during the middle ages, divided the universities of Europe into hostile parties, were waged with peculiar activity among a people, like the Germans, actuated, more than any other, by speculative opinion, and the spirit of sect. The famous question touching the nature of Universals, which created a schism in the University of Prague, and thus founded the University of Leipsic, which formally separated into two, the faculty of arts in Ingolstadt, Tubingen, &c., and occasioned a ceaseless warfare in the other schools of philosophy throughout the empire—this question modified the German bursae in a far more decisive manner than it affected the colleges in the other countries of Europe. The Nominalists and Realists withdrew themselves into different bursae; whence, as from opposite castles, they daily descended to renew their clamorous, and not always bloodless contests, in the arena of the public schools. In this manner the bursae of Ingolstadt, Tubingen, Heidelberg, Erfurth, and other universities, were divided between the partisans of the *Via Antiquorum*, and the partisans of the *Via Modernorum*; and in some of the greater schools the several sects of Realism—the Albertists, Thomists, Scotists—had bursae of their '*peculiar process*.'

The effect of this was to place these institutions more absolutely under that scholastic influence which swayed the faculties of arts and theology; and however adverse were the different sects, when a common enemy was at a distance, no sooner was the reign of scholasticism threatened by the revival of polite letters, than their particular dissensions were merged in a general resistance to the novelty equally obnoxious to all—a resistance which, if it did not succeed in obtaining the absolute pro-

scription of classical literature in the Universities, succeeded, at least, in excluding it from the course prescribed for the degree in arts, and from the studies authorized in the bursae, of which that faculty had universally the control. In their relations to the revival of ancient learning, the bursae of Germany, and the colleges of France and England, were directly opposed; and to this contrast is, in part, to be attributed the difference of their fate. The colleges, indeed, mainly owed their stability—in England to their wealth—in France to their coalition with the University. But in harbouring the rising literature, and rendering themselves instrumental to its progress, the colleges seemed anew to vindicate their utility, and remained, during the revolutionary crisis at least, in unison with the spirit of the age. The bursae, on the contrary, fell at once into contempt with the antiquated learning which they defended; and before they were disposed to transfer their allegiance to the dominant literature, other instruments had been organized, and circumstances had superseded their necessity. The philosophical faculty to which they belonged, had lost, by its opposition to the admission of humane letters into its course, the consideration it formerly obtained; and in the Protestant Universities a degree in arts was no longer required as a necessary passport to the other faculties. The Gymnasias, established or multiplied on the Reformation throughout Protestant Germany, sent the youth to the universities with sounder studies, and at a maturer age; and the public prelections, no longer intrusted to the fortuitous competence of the graduates, were discharged, in chief, by professors carefully selected for their merit—rewarded in exact proportion to their individual value in the literary market—and stimulated to exertion by a competition unexampled in the academical arrangements of any other country. The discipline of the bursae was now found less useful in aid of the University; and the student less disposed to submit to their restraint. No wealthy foundations perpetuated their existence independently of use; and their services being found too small to warrant their maintenance by compulsory regulations, they were in general abandoned.

In the English Universities, the history of the collegial element has been very different: nowhere did it deserve to exercise so small an influence, nowhere has it exercised so great. The colleges of the continental Universities were no hospitals for drones; their foundations were exclusively in favour of *teachers* and *learners*; the former, whose number was determined by their necessity, enjoyed their stipend under the condition of instruction; and the latter, only during the period of their academical

studies. In the English colleges, on the contrary, the fellowships, with hardly an exception, are perpetual, not burdened with tuition, and indefinite in number. In the foreign colleges, the instructors were chosen from competence. In those of England, but especially in Oxford, the fellows in general owe their election to chance. Abroad, as the colleges were visited, superintended, and reformed by their faculty, their lectures were acknowledged by the University as public courses, and the lecturers themselves at last recognised as its privileged professors. In England, as the University did not exercise the right of visitation over the colleges, their discipline was viewed as private and subsidiary; while the fellow was never recognised as a public character at all, far less as a privileged instructor. In Paris and Louvain, the college discipline superseded only the precarious lectures of the graduates at large.* In Oxford and Cambridge, it was an improved and improvable system of professorial education that the tutorial extinguished. In the foreign Universities, the right of academical instruction was deputed to a limited number of 'famous colleges,' and in these only to a full body of co-operative teachers. In Oxford, all academical education is usurped, not only by every house, but by every fellow tutor it contains. The alliance between the Colleges and University in Paris and Louvain was, in the circumstances, perhaps a rational improvement; the dethronement of the University by the Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, without doubt, a preposterous revolution.

It was the very peculiarity in the constitution of the English colleges which disqualified them, above all similar incorporations, even for the lower offices of academical instruction, that enabled them in the end to engross the very highest; and it only requires an acquaintance with the history of the two Univer-

* In Paris (1562) the celebrated Ramus proposed a judicious plan of reform for the Faculty of Arts. He disapproved of the lectures on philosophy established in the colleges; and was desirous of restoring these to the footing of the public courses delivered for so many centuries in the *Rue de la Fouarre*, and only suspended a few years previously; and that eight accredited professors should there teach the different branches of mathematics, physics, and morals, while the colleges should retain only instruction in grammar, rhetoric, and logic. This was to bring matters towards the very statutory constitution subverted in the English Universities by the colleges, and which, with all its imperfections, was even more complete than that proposed by Ramus, as an improvement on a collegial mechanism of tuition, perfection itself, in comparison to the intrusive system of Oxford.

sities, to explain how a revolution so improbable in itself, and so disastrous in its effects, was, by the accident of circumstances, and the influence of private interest, accomplished. ‘Reduce,’ says Bacon, ‘things to their first institution, and observe how ‘they have degenerated.’ This explanation, limited to Oxford, will be given by showing, 1. How the students, once distributed in numerous small societies through the halls, were at length collected into a few large communities within the colleges; 2. How in the colleges, thus the penfolds of the academical flock, the fellows frustrated the common right of graduates to the office of tutor; and 3. How the fellow tutors supplanted the professors—how the colleges superseded the University.

1. In the mode of teaching—in the subjects taught—in the forms of graduation, and in the general mechanism of the faculties, no Universities for a long time resembled each other more closely than the first and second schools of the church, Paris and Oxford; but in the constitution and civil polity of the bodies, there were from the first considerable differences. In Oxford, the University was not originally established on the distinction of Nations; though, in the sequel, the great national schism of the northern and southern men, had almost determined a division similar to that which prevailed from the first in the other ancient Universities.* In Oxford, the chancellor and his deputy combined the powers of the rector and the two chancellors in Paris; and the inspection and control, chiefly exercised in the latter, through the distribution of the scholars of the University into nations and tribes, under the government of rector, procurators, and deans, was in the former more especially accomplished by collecting the students into certain privileged houses, under the control of a principal responsible for the conduct of the members. This subordination was not indeed established at once; and the scholars at first lodged, without domestic superintendence, in the houses of the citizens. In the year 1231, we find it only ordained, ‘that every clerk or scholar resident in ‘Oxford, must subject himself to the discipline and tuition of ‘some master of the schools,’ *i. e.*, we presume, enter himself as the peculiar disciple of one or other of the actual regents.

* Matters went so far, that as, in Paris, each of the four nations elected its own procurator, so, in Oxford, (what is not mentioned by Wood,) the two proctors (procuratores) were necessarily chosen, one from the northern, the other from the southern men; also the two scrutators, anciently distinct (?) from the proctors.

(Wood's *Annals*, a. c.) By the commencement of the fifteenth century, it appears, however, to have become established law, that all scholars should be members of some college, hall, or entry, under a responsible head, (Wood, a. 1408;) and in the subsequent history of the university, we find more frequent and decisive measures taken in Oxford against the *Chamberdekyngs*, or scholars haunting the schools, but of no authorized house, than in Paris were ever employed against the *Martinets*. (Wood, aa. 1413, 1422, 1512, &c.) In the foreign Universities it was never incumbent on any, beside the students of the Faculty of Arts, to be under collegial or bursal superintendence; in the English Universities, the graduates and under-graduates of every faculty were equally required to be members of a privileged house.

By this regulation, the students were compelled to collect themselves into houses of community, variously denominated Halls, Inns, Entries, Chambers, (Aulae, Hospitia, Introitus, Camerae.) These halls were governed by peculiar statutes established by the University, by whom they were also visited and reformed; and administered by a principal, elected by the scholars themselves, but admitted to his office by the chancellor or his deputy, on finding caution for payment of the rent. The halls were in general held only on lease; but by a privilege common to most Universities, houses once occupied by clerks or students could not again be resumed by the proprietor, or taken from the gown, if the rent were punctually discharged, the rate of which was quinquennially fixed by the academical taxators. The great majority of the scholars who inhabited these halls lived at their own expense; but the benevolent motives which, in other countries, determined the establishment of colleges and private bursae, nowhere operated more powerfully than in England.* In a few houses foundations were made for the support of a certain number of indigent scholars, who were incorporated as fellows, (or joint participators in the endowment,) under the government of a head. But with an unenlightened liberality, these bene-

* Lipsius, after speaking of the *Pædagogia* of Louvain—'Pergamus; nam et aliud Collegiorum genus est, ubi non tam docetur quam aliter juventus, et subsidia studiorum in certos annos habet. Pulchrum inventum, et quod in Anglia magnifice usurpatur: neque enim in orbe terrarum simile esse, addam et fuisse. Magnæ illic opes et vectigalia: verbo vobis dicam? Unum Oxoniense collegium (rem inquisivi) superet vel decem nostra.' *Lovanium*, l. iii. c. 5. See also Polydori Virgillii *Angl. Hist.* l. v. p. 107, edit. Basil.

factions were not, as elsewhere, exclusively limited to learners, during their academical studies, and to instructors; while the subjection of the colleges to private statutes, and their emancipation from the control of the academical authorities, gave them interests apart from those of the public, and not only disqualified them from co-operating towards the general ends of the University, but rendered them, instead of powerful aids, the worst impediments to its utility.

The colleges, into which commoners, or members not on the foundation, were, until a comparatively modern date, rarely admitted, remained also for many centuries few in comparison to the halls. The latter were counted by hundreds; the former, even at the present day, extend only to *nineteen*.

At the commencement of the fourteenth century, the number of the halls was about *three hundred*, (Wood, a. 1307)—the number of the secular colleges, at the highest, only *three*. At the commencement of the fifteenth century, when the colleges had risen to *seven*, a Fellow of Queen's laments, that the students had diminished as the foundations had increased. (Ullerston, *Defensorium*, &c. written 1401.) At the commencement of the sixteenth century, the number of halls had fallen to *fifty-five*, (Wood, a. 1503,) while the secular colleges had, before 1516, been multiplied to *twelve*. The causes which had hitherto occasioned this diminution in the number of scholars, and in the number of the houses destined for their accommodation, were, among others, the plagues, by which Oxford was so frequently desolated, and the members of the University dispersed—the civil wars of York and Lancaster—the rise of other rival Universities in Great Britain and on the continent—and, finally, the sinking consideration of the scholastic philosophy.* The character which the Reformation assumed in England, co-operated, however, still more powerfully to the same result. Of itself, the schism in religion must necessarily have diminished the resort of students to the University, by banishing those who did not acquiesce in the new opinions there inculcated by law; while among the reformed themselves, there arose an influential party, who viewed the academical exercises as sophistical, and many who even regarded degrees as Antichristian. But in England the Reformation incidentally operated in a more peculiar manner. Unlike its fate in other countries, this religious revo-

* The same decline was, at this period, experienced in the continental Universities. See the article on the *Epist. Obs. Vir.* pp. 185, 186 of this volume, Note †.

lution was absolutely governed by the fancies of the royal despot for the time; and so uncertain was the caprice of Henry, so contradictory the policy of his three immediate successors, that for a long time it was difficult to know what was the religion by law established for the current year; far less possible to calculate, with assurance, on what would be the statutory orthodoxy for the ensuing. At the same time, the dissolution of the monastic orders dried up one great source of academical prosperity; while the confiscation of monastic property, which was generally regarded as only a foretaste of what awaited the endowments of the Universities, and the superfluous revenues of the clergy, rendered literature and the church, during this crisis, uninviting professions either for an ambitious, or (if disinclined to martyrdom) for a conscientious man. The effect was but too apparent; for many years the Universities were almost literally deserted.*

* In the year 1539, the House of Convocation complains, in a letter addressed to Secretary Cromwell, that ‘the University, within the last five years, was greatly impaired, and the number of students diminished by one half;’ and in a memorable epistle, some ten years previous, to Sir Thomas More, the same complaint had been still more strenuously urged.—‘*Pauperes enim sumus. Olim singuli nostrum annum stipendium habuimus, aliqui à Nobilibus, nonnulli ab his qui Monasteriis præsent, plurimi à Presbyteris quibus ruri sunt sacerdotia. Nunc vero tantum abest ut in hoc perstemus, ut illi quibus debeant solitum stipendium dare recusant. Abbates enim suos Monachos domum accersunt, Nobiles suos liberos, Presbyteri suos consanguineos: sic minuitur scholasticorum numerus, sic ruunt Aulae nostræ, sic frigescunt omnes liberales disciplinæ. Collegia solum perseverant; quæ si quid solvere cogantur, cum solum habeant quantum sufficit in victum suo scholasticorum numero, necesse erit, aut ipsa una labi, aut socios aliquot ejici. Vides jam, More, quod nobis omnibus imminet periculum. Vides ex Academia futuram non Academiam, nisi tu cautius nostram causam egeris,*’ &c. (Wood, a. 1539, 1540.) In 1546, in which year the number of graduations had fallen so low as *thirteen*, the inhabited *halls* amounted only to *eight*, and even of these several were nearly empty. (Wood, a. 1546.) About the same time, the celebrated Walter Haddon laments, that in Cambridge ‘the schools were never more solitary than at present; so notably few indeed are the students, that for every master that reads in them there is hardly left an auditor to listen.’ (*Lucubrations*, p. 12, edit. 1567.) ‘In 1551,’ says the Oxford Antiquary, ‘the colleges, and especially the ancient *halls*, lay either waste, or were become the receptacles of poor religious people turned out of their cloisters. The present halls, especially St Edmund’s and New Inn, were void of students.’ (a. 1551.)

The halls, whose existence solely depended for their support on the confluence of students, thus fell; and none, it is probable, would have survived the crisis, had not several chanced to be the property of certain colleges, which had thus an interest in their support. The Halls of St Alban, St Edmund, St Mary, New Inn, Magdalen, severally belonged to Merton, Queen's, Oriel, New, and Magdalen Colleges; and Broadgates Hall, now Pembroke College, Gloucester Hall, now Worcester College, and Hert Hall, subsequently Hertford College, owed their salvation to their dependence on the foundations of Christ Church, St John's, and Exeter.

The circumstances which occasioned the ruin of the halls, and the dissolution of the cloisters and colleges of the monastic orders in Oxford, not only gave to the secular colleges, which all remained, a preponderant weight in the University for the juncture; but allowed them so to extend their circuit and to increase their numbers, that they were subsequently enabled to comprehend within their walls nearly the whole of the academical population, though, previously to the sixteenth century, they appear to have rarely, if ever, admitted independent members at all.* As the students fell off, the rents of the halls were taxed at a lower rate; and they became, at last, of so insignificant a value to the landlords, that they were always willing to dispose of this fallen and falling property for a trifling consideration. In Oxford, land and houses became a drug. The old colleges thus extended their limits, by easy purchase, from the impoverished burghers; and the new colleges, of which there were *four* established within half a century subsequent to the Reformation, and altogether *six* during the sixteenth century, were built on sites either obtained gratuitously or for an insig-

‘ The truth is, though the whole number of students were now a thousand and fifteen, that had names in the buttery books of each house of learning, yet the greater part were absent, and had taken their last farewell.’ (a. 1552.) ‘ The two wells of learning,’ says Dr Bernard Gilpin in 1552,—‘ the two wells of learning, Oxford and Cambridge, are dried up, students decayed, of which scarce an hundred are left of a thousand; and if in seven years more they should decay so fast, there would be almost none at all; so that the devil would make a triumph, whilst there were none learned to whom to commit the flock.’ (*Sermons preached at Court*, edit. 1630, p. 23. See also Wood, aa. 1561, 1563.)

See statute of 1489, quoted in Dr Newton's *University Education*, p. 9, from Darrel's transcript of the ancient statutes, preserved in the Bodleian.

nificant price. After this period only *one* college was founded—in 1610; and *three* of the eight halls transmuted into colleges, in 1610, 1702, and 1740; but of these *one* is now extinct.

These circumstances explain in what manner the halls declined; it remains to tell, why, in the most crowded state of the University, not one has been subsequently restored. Before the era of their downfall, the establishment of a hall was easy. It required only that a few scholars should hire a house, find caution for a year's rent, and choose for Principal a graduate of respectable character. The Chancellor, or his Deputy, could not refuse to sanction the establishment. An act of usurpation abolished this facility. The general right of nomination to the principality, and consequently to the institution of halls, was, 'through the absolute potency he had,' procured by the Earl of Leicester, Chancellor of the University, about 1570; and it is now, by statute, vested in his successors.* In surrendering this privilege to the Chancellor, the colleges were not blind to their peculiar interest. From his situation, that magistrate was sure to be guided by their heads: no hall has since arisen to interfere with their monopoly; and the collegial interest, thus left without a counterpoise, and concentrated in a few hands, was soon able, as we shall see, to establish an absolute supremacy in the University.

2. By statute, the office of tutor is open to all graduates. This was, however, no barrier against the encroachment of the fellows; and the simple graduate, who should attempt to make good his right—how could he succeed?

As the colleges only received as members those not on the foundation, for their own convenience, they could either exclude them altogether, or admit them under whatever limitations they might choose to impose. By University law, graduates were not compelled to lodge in college; they were therefore excluded as unprofitable members, to make room for undergraduates, who paid tutor's fees, and as dangerous competitors, to prevent them from becoming tutors themselves. This exclusion, or the possibility of this exclusion, of itself prevented any graduate from commencing tutor, in opposition to the interest of the foundation members. Independently of this, there were other circumstances which would have frustrated all interference with the fellows' monopoly; but these we need not enumerate.

3. Collegial tuition engrossed by the fellows, a more important step was to raise this collegial tuition from a subsidiary to

* Wood's *Hist. et Antiq. Univ.* lib. ii. p. 339. *Hist. and Antiq. of Coll. and Halls*, p. 655. *Statuta Aularia*, sect. v.

a principal.* Could the professorial system on which the university rested be abolished, the tutorial system would remain the one organ of academical instruction; could the University be silently annihilated, the colleges would succeed to its name, its privileges, and its place. This momentous revolution was consummated. We do not affirm that the end was ever clearly proposed, or a line of policy for its attainment ever systematically followed out. But circumstances concurred, and that instinct of self-interest which actuates *bodies* of men with the certainty of a natural law, determined, in the course of generations, a result, such as no sagacity would have anticipated as possible. After the accomplishment, however, a retrospect of its causes shows the event to have been natural, if not necessary.

The subversion of the university is to be traced to that very code of laws on which its constitution was finally established. The academical body is composed of graduates and under-graduates in the four faculties of arts, theology, law, and medicine; and the government of the University was of old exclusively committed to the masters and doctors assembled in Congregation and Convocation; heads of houses and college fellows shared in the academical government only as they were full graduates. The statutes ratified under the chancellorship of Laud, and by which the *legal* constitution of the University is still determined, changed this republican polity into an oligarchical. The legislation and the supreme government were still left with the masters and doctors, and the character of fellow remained always unprivileged by law. But the heads of houses, if not now first raised to the rank of a public body, were now first clothed with an authority such as rendered them henceforward the principal—in fact, the sole administrators of the University weal.†

* This third step in the revolution, which from its more important character we consider last, was, however, accomplishing simultaneously with the second, of which it was, in fact, almost a condition.

† Anciently the right of previous discussion and approval belonged to the House of Congregation. The omnipotent Earl of Leicester, to confirm his hold over the University, and in spite of considerable opposition, constrained the masters to surrender this function to a more limited and manageable body, composed of the vice-chancellor, *doctors*, heads, (for the first time recognised as a public body?) and proctors (Wood *a.* 1569). Laud, desirous of still farther concentrating the government, and in order to exercise himself a more absolute control, constituted the hebdomadal meeting of his very humble servants the heads; and to frustrate opposition from the House of Convocation to this momentous and unconstitutional change, he forced the innovation

And whereas in foreign Universities, the University governed the colleges—in Oxford the colleges were enthroned the governors of the University. The vice-chancellor, (now also necessarily a *college* head,) the heads of houses, and the two proctors, were constituted into a body, and the members constrained to regular attendance on an ordinary weekly meeting. To this body was committed, as their *especial duty*, the care of ‘*enquiring into, and taking counsel for, the observance of the statutes and customs of the University*; and if there be aught touching the good government, the *scholastic improvement*, the honour and usefulness of the University, which a majority of them may think worthy of deliberation, let them have power to deliberate thereupon, to the end that, after this their deliberation, the same may be proposed more advisedly in the Venerable House of Congregation, and then with mature counsel ratified in the Venerable House of Convocation.’ (T. xiii.) Thus, no proposal could be submitted to the houses of Congregation or Convocation, unless it had been *previously discussed and sanctioned by the ‘Hebdomadal Meeting*;

and through this preliminary negative,* the most absolute control was accorded to the heads of houses over the proceedings of the University. By their permission, every statute might be violated, and every custom fall into desuetude: without their permission, no measure of reform, or improvement, or discipline, however necessary, could be initiated, or even mentioned.

A body constituted and authorized like the Hebdomadal Meeting, could only be rationally expected to discharge its trust, if its members were subjected to a direct and concentrated responsibility, and if their public duties were identical with their private interests. The Hebdomadal Meeting acted under neither of these conditions.

In regard to the first, this body was placed under the review

on the University by *royal statute*. The Cambridge Caput, first instituted by the Elizabethan statutes, forms a curious pendant to the Oxford hebdomadal meeting; and in general, the history of the two Universities is a history of the same illegal revolution, accomplished by the same influence, under circumstances similar, but not the same.

* And as if this preliminary negative were not enough, there was conceded by the same statutes to the single college head who holds for the time the office of vice-chancellor, an absolute veto upon all proceedings in the houses of congregation and convocation themselves. In Cambridge, a preliminary veto is enjoyed by every member of the Caput.

of no superior authority either for what it did, or for what it did not perform; and the responsibility to public opinion was distributed among too many to have any influence on their collective acts. 'Corporations never blush.'

In regard to the second, so far were the interests and duties of the heads from being coincident, that they were diametrically opposed. Their public obligations bound them to maintain and improve the system of University education, of which the *professors* were the organs; but this system their private advantage, both as individuals and as representing the collegial interest, prompted them to deteriorate and undermine.

When the *Corpus Statutorum* was ratified, there existed two opposite influences in the University, either of which might have pretended to the chief magistracy—the *Heads of Houses* and the *Professors*. The establishment of the Hebdomadal Meeting by Laud, gave the former a decisive advantage, which they were not slack in employing against their rivals.

In their individual capacity, the heads, samples of the same bran with the fellows, from whom and by whom they were elected, owed in general their elevation to accidental circumstances; and their influence, or rather that of their situation, was confined to the members of their private communities. The professors, the *élite* of the University, and even not unfrequently called for their celebrity from other schools and countries, were professedly chosen exclusively from merit; and their position enabled them to establish, by ability and zeal, a paramount ascendancy over the whole academical youth.

As men, in general, of merely ordinary acquirements—holding in their collegial capacity only an accidental character in the University—and elevated simply in quality of that character by an act of arbitrary power to an unconstitutional pre-eminence, the heads were, not unnaturally, jealous of the contrast exhibited to themselves by a body like the professors, who, as the principal organs, deserved to constitute in Oxford, what in other Universities they actually did, its representatives and governors. Their only hope was in the weakness of their rivals. It was easily perceived, that in proportion as the professorial system of instruction was improved, the influence of the professorial body would be increased; and the heads were conscious, that if that system were ever organized as it ought to be, it would no longer be possible for them to maintain their own factitious and absurd omnipotence in the academical polity.

Another consideration also co-operated. A temporary decline in the University had occasioned the desertion of the halls; a few houses had succeeded in collecting within their walls the whole academical population; and the heads of these few houses

had now obtained a preponderant influence in the University. Power is sweet; and its depositaries were naturally averse from any measure which threatened to diminish their consequence, by multiplying their numbers. The existing colleges and halls could afford accommodation to a very limited complement of students. The exclusive privileges attached in England to an Oxford or Cambridge degree in the professions of law, medicine, and the church, filled the colleges, independently of any merit in the academical teachers. But were the University restored to its ancient fame—did students again flock to Oxford as they flocked to Leyden and Padua, the halls must again be called into existence, or the system of domestic superintendence be abandoned or relaxed. The interest of the heads was thus opposed, not only to the celebrity of the professorial body in itself, but in its consequences. The University must not at most transcend the standard of a decent mediocrity. Every thing, in fact, that tended to keep the confluence of students within the existing means of accommodation, found favour with these oligarchs. Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles even at matriculation, imposed by the puritanical Leicester, was among the few statutes not subsequently violated by the Arminian heads; the numbers of poor scholars formerly supported in all the colleges were gradually discarded; * the expenses incident on a University education kept graduated to the convenient pitch; and residence after the first degree, for this and other reasons, dispensed with.

At the same time, as representatives of the collegial interest, the heads were naturally indisposed to discharge their duty towards the University. In proportion as the public or professorial education was improved, would it be difficult for the private or tutorial to maintain its relative importance as a subsidiary. The collegial tuition must either keep pace with the University prelections, or it must fall into contempt and desuetude. The student accustomed to a high standard in the schools, would pay little deference to a low standard in the college. It would now be necessary to admit tutors exclusively

* Before the decline of the Halls, academical education cost nothing, and the poor student could select a society and house proportioned to his means, down even to the begging Logicians of Aristotle's Hall. The Colleges could hardly have prevented the restoration of the halls, had they not for a considerable time supplied that accommodation to the indigent scholars to which the country had been accustomed. From the 'Exact Account of the whole Number of Scholars and Students in the University of Oxford, taken anno 1612,' it appears that about 450 *poor scholars and servitors* received gratuitous, or almost gratuitous, education and support in the colleges. How many do so now?

from merit; the fellows, no longer able to vindicate their monopoly, would, in a general competition, sink to their proper level even in their own houses; while, in the University, the collegial influence in general would be degraded from the arbitrary pre-eminence to which accident had raised it.

In these circumstances, it would have been quite as reasonable to expect that the heads of colleges should commit suicide to humour their enemies, as that they should prove the faithful guardians and the zealous promoters of the professorial system. On the contrary, by confiding this duty to that interest, it was in fact decreed, that the professorial system should, by its appointed guardians, be discouraged—corrupted—depressed—and, if not utterly extinguished, reduced to such a state of inefficiency and contempt, as would leave it only useful as a foil to relieve the imperfections of the tutorial. And so it happened. The professorial system, though still imperfect, could without difficulty have been carried to unlimited perfection; but the heads, far from consenting to its melioration, fostered its defects in order to precipitate its fall.

In Oxford, as originally in all other Universities, salaried teachers or professors were bound to deliver their prelections gratis. But it was always found that, under this arrangement, the professor did as little as possible, and the student undervalued what cost him nothing. Universities in general, therefore, corrected this defect. The interest of the professor was made subservient to his diligence, by sanctioning, or winking at, his acceptance of voluntary gifts or honoraria from his auditors; which, in most Universities, were at length converted into exigible fees. In Oxford, this simple expedient was not of course permitted by the heads; and what were the consequences? The Hebdomadal Meeting had the charge of watching over the due observance of the statutes. By statute and under penalty, the professors were bound to a regular delivery of their courses; by statute and under penalty, the students were bound to a regular attendance in the public classes; and by statute, but not under penalty, the heads were bound to see that both parties duly performed their several obligations. It is evident, that the heads were here the keystone of the arch. If they relaxed in their censorship, the professors, finding it no longer necessary to lecture regularly, and no longer certain of a regular audience, would, ere long, desist from lecturing at all;* while the students,

* How well disposed the salaried readers always were to convert their chairs into sinecures, may be seen in Wood, aa. 1581, 1582, 1584, 1589, 1590, 1594, 1596, 1608, &c.

finding attendance in their classes no longer compulsory, and no longer sure of a lecture when they did attend, would soon cease to frequent the schools altogether. The heads had only to violate their duties, by neglecting the charge especially intrusted to them, and the downfall of the obnoxious system was inevitable. And this they did.

At the same time other accidental defects in the professorial system, as constituted in Oxford—the continuance of which was guaranteed by the body sworn ‘to the scholastic improvement’ of the University—co-operated also to the same result.

Fees not permitted, the salaries which made up the whole emoluments attached to the different chairs were commonly too small to afford an independent, far less an honourable livelihood. They could therefore only be objects of ambition, as honorary appointments, or supplemental aids. This limited the candidates to those who had otherwise a competent income; and consequently threw them in general into the hands of the members of the collegial foundations, *i. e.* of a class of men on whose capacity or good intention to render the professorships efficient, there could be no rational dependence.

Some, also, of the public lectureships were temporary; these were certain to be negligently filled, and negligently taught.

Another circumstance likewise concurred in reducing the standard of professorial competence. The power of election, never perhaps intrusted to the safest hands, was in general even confided to those interested in frustrating its end. The appointment was often directly, and almost always indirectly, determined by college influence. In exclusive possession of the tutorial office, and non-residence *as yet* only permitted to independent graduates, the fellows, in conjunction with the heads, came to constitute the great proportion of the resident members of Convocation and Congregation; and therefore, except in cases of general interest, the elections belonging to the public bodies were sure to be decided by them.*

* Since writing the above, we notice a curious confirmation in *Terræ-Filius*. This work appeared in 1721, at the very crisis when the collegial interest was accomplishing its victory. The statements it contains were never, we believe, contradicted; and though the following representation may be in some points exaggerated, the reader can easily recognise its substantial truth. Speaking of the professors: ‘I have known a profligate debauchee chosen professor of moral philosophy; and a fellow, who never looked upon the stars soberly in his life, professor of astronomy: we have had history professors, who never read any thing to qualify them for it, but Tom Thumb, Jack the Giant-killer, Don Bellianis of Greece, and such like records:

Nor was it possible to raise the tutorial system from its state of relative subordination, without an absolute subversion of the professorial. The tutor could not extend his discipline over the bachelor in arts, for every bachelor was by law entitled to commence tutor himself. But the colleges could not succeed in vindicating their monopoly even of the inferior branches of education, unless they were able also to incapacitate the University from affording instruction in the superior. For if the public lectures were allowed to continue in the higher faculties, and in the higher department of the lowest, it would be found impossible to justify their suppression in that particular department, which alone the college fellows could pretend to teach. At the same time, if attendance on the professorial courses remained necessary for degrees above bachelor in arts, a multitude of graduates, all competent to the tutorial office, would in consequence continue domiciled in the University, and the fellows' usurpation of that function it would be found impossible to maintain. With the colleges and fellows it was therefore all or nothing. If they were not to continue, as they had been, mere accessories to the University, it behoved to quash the whole public lectures, and to dispense with residence after the elementary degree. This the Heads of Houses easily effected. As the irresponsible guardians of the University statutes, they violated their trust, by allowing the professors to neglect their statutory duty, and empty standing to be taken in lieu of the course of academical study, which it legally implied.

The professorial system was thus from the principal and

‘ we have had likewise numberless professors of Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, who scarce understood their mother tongue ; and not long ago, a famous gamester and stock-jobber was elected Margaret Professor of Divinity ; so great, it seems, is the analogy between dusting cushions and shaking of elbows, or between squandering away of estates and saving of souls.’ And in a letter, from an under-graduate of Wadham—‘ Now, it is monstrous, that notwithstanding these public lectures are so much neglected, we are all of us, when we take our degrees, charged with and punished for non-appearance at the reading of many of them ; a formal dispensation is read by our respective deans, at the time our grace is proposed, for our non-appearance at these lectures, [N. B.] *and it is with difficulty that some grave ones of the congregation are induced to grant it.* Strange order ! that each lecturer should have his fifty, his hundred, or two hundred pounds a-year for doing nothing ; and that we (the young fry) should be obliged to pay money for not hearing such lectures as were never read, nor ever composed.’ (No. X.)

necessary, degraded into the subordinate and superfluous; the tutorial elevated, with all its additional imperfections, from the subsidiary, into the one exclusive instrument of education. In establishing the ascendancy of the collegial bodies, it mattered not that the extensive cycle of academical instruction was contracted to the narrow capacity of a fellow tutor;—that the University was annihilated, or reduced to half a faculty—of one professorship—which every ‘graduated dunce’ might confidently undertake. The great interests of the nation, the church, and the professions, were sacrificed to the paltry ends of a few contemptible corporations; and the privileges by law accorded to the *University* of Oxford, as the authorized organ of national education, were by its perfidious governors furtively transferred to the unauthorized absurdities of their *college* discipline.

That the representatives of the collegial bodies, as constituting the Hebdomadal Meeting, were the authors of this radical subversion of the establishment of which they were the protectors,—that the greatest importance was attached by them to its accomplishment,—and, at the same time, that they were fully conscious of sacrificing the interests of the University and public to a private job;—all this is manifested by the fact, that the Heads of Houses, rather than expose the college usurpations to a discussion by the academical and civil legislatures, not only submitted to the disgrace of leaving their smuggled system of education without a legal sanction, but actually tolerated the reproach of thus converting the great seminary of the English Church into a school of perjury, without, as far as we know, an effort either at vindication or amendment. This grievous charge, though frequently advanced both by the friends and enemies of the establishment, we mention with regret; we do not see how it can be rebutted, but shall be truly gratified if it can. Let us enquire.

At matriculation, every member of the University of Oxford solemnly swears to an observance of the academical statutes, of which he receives a copy of the *Excerpta*, that he may be unable to urge the plea of ignorance for their violation; and at every successive step of graduation, the candidate not only repeats this comprehensive oath, but after hearing read, by the senior Proctor, a statutory recapitulation of the statutes which prescribe the various public courses to be attended, and the various public exercises to be performed, as the conditions necessary for the degree, specially makes oath, ‘that having heard what was thus read, and having, within three days, diligently read or heard read, [the other statutes having reference to the degree he is about to take,] moreover the seventh section of the sixth

‘title, that he has performed all that they require, those particulars excepted for which he has received a dispensation.’ (Stat. T. ii. § 3, T. ix. S. vi. § 1—3.) The words in brackets are omitted in the re-enactment of 1808. (Add. T. ix. § 3.)

Now, in these circumstances, does it not follow that every member of the University commits perjury, who either does not observe the statutory enactments, or does not receive a dispensation for their non-observance?

Under the former alternative, false swearing is manifestly inevitable. Of the University laws, it is much easier to enumerate those which are not violated than those which are; and the ‘*Excerpta Statutorum*,’ which the entrant receives at matriculation, far from enabling him to prove faithful to his oath, serves only to show him the extent of the perjury, which, if he does not fly the University, he must unavoidably incur. Suffice it to say, that almost the only statutes now observed, are those which regulate matters wholly accidental to the essential ends of the institution—the civil polity of the corporation—or circumstances of mere form and ceremonial. The whole statutes, on the contrary, that constitute the being and the wellbeing of the University, as an establishment of education in general, and in particular, of education in the three learned professions—these fundamental statutes are, one and all, absolutely reduced to a dead letter. And why? Because they establish the University on the system of professorial instruction. The fact is too notorious to be contradicted, that while every statute which comports with the private interest of the college corporations is religiously enforced, every statute intended to insure the public utility of the University, but incompatible with their monopoly, is unscrupulously violated.

The latter alternative remains; but does dispensation afford a postern of escape? The statutes bestow this power exclusively on the Houses of Congregation and Convocation, and the limits of ‘*Dispensable*’ and ‘*Indispensable Matter*’ are anxiously and minutely determined. Of itself, the very fact that there was aught indispensable in the system at all, might satisfy us, without farther enquiry, that at least the one essential part of its organization, through which the University, by law, accomplishes the purposes of its institution, could not be dispensed with; for this would be nothing else than a dispensation of the University itself. But let us enquire farther:—

The original statute (Corp. St. T. ix. S. iv. § 2), determining the *Dispensable Matter* competent to the House of Congregation, was re-enacted, with some unimportant omissions, in 1801 and 1808. (Add. pp. 136, 188.) By these statutes, there is

allowed to that House the power of dispensation in twenty-three specified cases, of which the fourth—‘*Pro minus diligenti publicorum Lectorum auditione*’—need alone be mentioned, as showing, by the only case in point, how limited is the power committed to Congregation, of dispensing with the essential business of the University. The students were unconditionally bound, by oath and statute, to a regular attendance on the different classes; and a dispensation for the cause of ‘a just *impediment*,’ is here allowed to qualify, on equitable grounds, the rigour of the law. It will not be contended, that a power of dispensation allowed for the *not altogether diligent* attendance on the public readers, was meant by the legislature to concede a power of dispensing with all attendance on the professorial courses; nay, of absolutely dispensing with these courses themselves.

There has been no subsequent enactment, modifying the Laudian statutes touching the dispensing power of Convocation. This house, though possessing the right of rescinding old and of ratifying new laws, felt it necessary to restrict its prerogative of lightly suspending their application in particular cases, in order to terminate ‘*the too great license of dispensation, which had heretofore wrought grievous detriment to the University.*’ (Corp. St. T. x. S. ii. § 5.) Accordingly, under the head of *Dispensable Matter*, there is to be found nothing to warrant the supposition, that power is left with Convocation of dispensing with the regular lectures of all or any of its professors, or with attendance on these lectures by all or any of its scholars. On the contrary, it is only permitted, at the utmost, to give dispensation to an ordinary (or public) reader, who had been forced by necessity to deliver his lecture, through a substitute, without the regular authorization. (T. x. S. ii. § 4.) Again, under the head of *Indispensable Matter*, those cases are enumerated in which the indulgence had formerly been abused. All defect of standing (standing at that time meant *length of attendance on the professorial lectures*), all non-performance of exercise, either before or after graduation, are declared henceforward indispensable. But if the less important requisites for a degree, and in which a relaxation had previously been sometimes tolerated, are now rendered imperative; *multo majus*, must the conditions of paramount importance, such as delivery of, and attendance on, the public courses, be held as such,—conditions, a dispensation for which having never heretofore been asked, or granted, or conceived possible, a prospective prohibition of such abuse could never, by the legislature, be imagined necessary. At the same time it is declared, that hereafter no alteration is to be attempted of the

rules, by which founders, with consent of the University, had determined the duties of the chairs by them endowed; and these rules, as thus modified and confirmed, constitute a great proportion of the statutes by which the system of public lectures is regulated. (T. x. S. ii. § 5.) Under both heads, a general power is indeed left to the chancellor, of allowing the Hebdomadal Meeting to propose a dispensation; but this only ‘*from some necessary and very urgent cause,*’ and ‘*in cases which are not repugnant to academical discipline.*’ We do not happen to know, and cannot at the moment obtain, the information, whether there now is, or is not, a form of dispensation passed in convocation for the non-delivery of their lectures by the public readers, and for the non-attendance on their lectures by the students. Nor is the fact of the smallest consequence to the question. For either the statutes are violated without a dispensation, or a dispensation is obtained in violation of the statutes.

But as there is nothing in the terms of these statutes, however casuistically interpreted, to afford a colour for the monstrous supposition, that it was the intention of the legislature to leave to either house the power of arbitrarily suspending the whole mechanism of education established by law, that is, of dispensing with the University itself, whereas their whole tenor is only significant as proving the reverse; let us now look at the ‘*Epinomis, or explanation of the oath taken by all, to observe the statutes of the University, as to what extent it is to be held binding,*’ in which the intention of the legislature, in relation to the matter at issue, is unequivocally declared. This important article, intended to guard against all sophistical misconstruction of the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by this oath, though it has completely failed in preventing its violation, renders all palliation at least impossible.

It is here declared, that all are forsworn who wrest the terms of the statutes to a sense *different from that intended by the legislature*, or take the oath under any mental reservation. Consequently, those are perjured, 1. *who aver they have performed, or do believe what they have not performed, or do not believe;* 2. *they who, violating a statute, do not submit to the penalty attached to that violation;* 3. *they who proceed in their degrees without a dispensation for the non-performance of dispensable conditions, but much more they who thus proceed without actually performing those prerequisites which are indispensable.* ‘*As to other delicts,*’ (we translate literally,) ‘*if there be no contempt, no gross and obstinate negligence of the statutes and their penalties; and if the delinquents have submitted to the penalties sanctioned by the statutes, they are not to be*

‘ held guilty of violating the religious obligation of their oath.
 ‘ Finally, as the reverence due to their character exempts the
 ‘ MAGISTRATES of the University from the common penalties of
 ‘ other transgressors, *so on them there is incumbent a stronger con-*
 ‘ *scientious obligation* ; inasmuch as they are bound not only to
 ‘ the faithful discharge of their own duties, but likewise dili-
 ‘ gently to take care that all others in like manner perform theirs.
 ‘ Not, however, that it is intended that every failure in their
 ‘ duties should at once involve them in the crime of perjury.
 ‘ *But since the keeping and guardianship of the statutes is intrusted*
 ‘ *to their fidelity, if (may it never happen !)* through their negligence
 ‘ *or sloth, they suffer any statutes whatever to fall into desuetude, and*
 ‘ *silently, as it were, to be abrogated, in that event WE DECREE*
 ‘ THEM GUILTY OF BROKEN FAITH AND OF PERJURY.’ What
 would these legislators have said, could they have foreseen that
 these ‘ Reverend Magistrates of the University’ should ‘ silently
 ‘ abrogate’ every fundamental statute in the code of which they
 were the appointed guardians ?

It must, as we observed, have been powerful motives which
 could induce the heads of houses, originally to incur, or subse-
 quently to tolerate, such opprobrium for themselves and the
 University ; nor can any conceivable motive be assigned for
 either, except that these representatives of the collegial interest
 were fully aware that the intrusive system was not one for which
 a sanction could be hoped from the academical and civil legisla-
 tures, while, at the same time, it was too advantageous for them-
 selves not to be quietly perpetuated, even at such a price.

We do not see how the heads could throw off the charge of
 ‘ broken faith and perjury,’ incurred by their ‘ silent abrogation’
 of the *University* statutes, even allowing them the plea which
 some moralists have advanced in extenuation of the perjury
 committed by the non-observance of certain *College* statutes.*
 For, in the *first* place, this plea supposes that the observance
 of the violated statute is *manifestly* inconsistent with the end
 of the institution, towards which it only constituted a mean.
 Here, however, it cannot be alleged that the statutory, or pro-
 fessorial system, is manifestly inconsistent with the ends of a
 University ; seeing that all Universities, except the English,
 employ that instrument exclusively, and as the best ; and that

* PALEY, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, b. ii. c. 21.
 His arguments would justify a repeal of such statutes by public autho-
 rity, never their violation by private and interested parties, after
 swearing to their observance.

Oxford, under her new tutorial dispensation, has never manifestly been the exemplar of academical institutions.

In the *second* place, even admitting the professorial system to be notoriously inconvenient, still the plea supposes that the inconvenience has arisen from a change of circumstances unknown to the lawgiver, and subsequent to the enactment. But in the present case, the only change (from the maturer age of the student) has been to enhance the importance of the professorial method, and to diminish the expediency of the tutorial.

But in the *third* place, such a plea is, in the present instance, incompetent altogether. This is not the case of a private foundation, where the lawgiver is defunct. Here the institution is public—the lawgiver perpetual; and he might at every moment have been interrogated concerning the repeal or observance of his statutes. That lawgiver is the House of Convocation. The heads in the Hebdomadal Meeting are constituted the special guardians of the academical statutes and their observance; and, as we formerly explained, except through them, no measure can be proposed in Convocation for instituting new laws, or for rendering old laws available. They have a ministerial, but no legislative function. Now the statutory system of public teaching fell into desuetude either in opposition to their wishes and endeavours, or with their concurrence. The former alternative is impossible. Supposing even the means of enforcing the observance of the statutes to have been found incompetent, it was their duty both to the university and to themselves, to have applied to the legislative body for power sufficient to enable them to discharge their trust, or to be relieved of its responsibility. By law, they are declared morally and religiously responsible for the due observance of the statutes. No body of men would, without inducement, sit down under the brand of ‘violated faith and perjury.’ Now this inducement must have been either a public, or a private advantage. The former it could not have been. There is no imaginable reason, if the professorial system were found absolutely or comparatively useless, why its abolition or degradation should not have been openly moved in convocation; and why, if the tutorial system were calculated to accomplish all the ends of academical instruction, it should either at first have crept to its ascendancy through perjury and treason, or, after approving its sufficiency, have still only enjoyed its monopoly by precarious toleration, and never demanded its ratification on the ground of public utility. If the new system were superior to the old, why hesitate to proclaim that the academical instruments were changed? If Oxford were now singular in perfection, why delusively pretend that her

methods were still those of universities in general? It was only necessary that the heads either brought themselves, or allowed to be brought by others, a measure into Convocation to repeal the obsolete and rude, and to legitimate the actual and improved.

But as the heads never consented that this anomalous state of gratuitous perjury and idle imposition should cease, we are driven to the other alternative of supposing, that in the transition from the statutory to the illegal, the change was originally determined, and subsequently maintained, not because the surreptitious system was conducive to the public ends of the University, but because it was expedient for the interest of those private corporations, by whom this venerable establishment has been so long administered. The collegial bodies and their heads were not ignorant of its imperfections, and too prudent to hazard their discussion. They were not to be informed that their policy was to enjoy what they had obtained, in thankfulness and silence; not to risk the loss of the possession by an attempt to found it upon right. They could not but be conscious, that should they even succeed in obtaining—what was hardly to be expected—a ratification of their usurpations from an academical legislature, educated under their auspices, and strongly biassed by their influence, they need never expect that the state would tolerate, that those exclusive privileges conceded to her graduates, when Oxford was a university in which all the faculties were fully and competently taught, should be continued to her graduates, when Oxford no longer afforded the public instruction necessary for a degree in any faculty at all. The very agitation of the subject would have been the signal for a Visitation.

The strictures which a conviction of their truth, and our interest in the honour and utility of this venerable school, have constrained us to make on the conduct of the Hebdomadal Meeting, we mainly apply to the heads of houses of a former generation, and even to them solely in their corporate capacity. Of the late and present members of this body, we are happy to acknowledge, that, during the last twenty-five years, so great an improvement has been effected through their influence, that in some essential points Oxford may, not unworthily, be proposed as a pattern to most other universities. But this improvement, though important, is partial, and can only receive its adequate developement by a return to the statutory combination of the professorial and tutorial systems. That this combination is implied in the constitution of a perfect university, is even acknowledged by the most intelligent individuals of the collegial inte-

rest—by the ablest champions of the tutorial discipline:* such an opinion cannot, however, be expected to induce a majority of the collegial bodies voluntarily to surrender the monopoly they have so long enjoyed, and to descend to a subordinate situation, after having occupied a principal. All experience proves, that universities, like other corporations, can only be reformed from without. ‘Voilà,’ says Crevier, speaking of the last attempt at a reform of the University of Paris by itself—‘voilà à quoi aboutirent tant de projets, tant de délibérations: et cette nouvelle tentative, aussi infructueuse que les précédentes, rend de plus en plus visible la maxime *claire en soi, que les campagnes ne se réforment point elles-mêmes, et qu’une entreprise de réforme où n’intervient point une autorité supérieure, est une entreprise manquée.*’† A Committee of Visitation has lately terminated its labours on the Scottish Universities: we should anticipate a more important result from a similar, and far more necessary, enquiry into the corruptions of those of England.

ART. VII.—*Observations on the Paper Duties.* London: 1831.

KNOWING the vast expenditure that the country has to sustain, and knowing also that no sort of retrenchment which it is possible to adopt, how desirable soever on other grounds, can make any material deduction from that expenditure, so long as national independence, security, and good faith are maintained, we have at no time joined with those who clamour for a reduction of taxation. We have not really suffered so much from the *magnitude* of the sums required for the public exigencies, as from the *mode* in which portions of these sums have frequently been raised, and from the burdens imposed for the protection of some particular interest—that is, to bolster up and support a part of the public at the expense of the rest. It is the inequality and oppressiveness by which many parts of our system of taxation are characterised, that render it productive of so much mischief. Were it freed from these defects—were it made to bear equally on all classes, according to their ability, and applied only to advance really national objects, we feel assured it would not be found too great for our resources, nor would it even materially retard our progress. It would, however, be unfair not to acknowledge that a good deal has been

* *Reply to the Calumnies, &c.* p. 146.

† *Histoire de l’Université de Paris*, t. vi. p. 370.

done of late years to render the pressure of taxation more equal. The repeal of the duties on beer and coal is, in this respect, deserving of the greatest eulogy: the former fell wholly on the beverage of the lower and middle classes, without so much as touching that of the noble and affluent; while the latter fell only on particular districts, imposing on them a heavy burden, from which other districts, quite as able to bear it, were wholly exempted. These odious distinctions are now entirely abolished; and it will ever be matter of astonishment that they were suffered to grow up and continue for so many years. But though much has been accomplished, much yet remains to be done, in order to rid our system of taxation of distinctions disgraceful alike to the government and the country. Had the Duke of Wellington and Lord Althorpe been merely anxious to purify our fiscal policy from injustice, we are not sure that the beer duty, or the coal duty, would have been that of which they would have first recommended the abolition. The taxes on Literature are still more glaringly unjust, and, we incline to think, not less inexpedient; nothing, indeed, ever called more strongly for immediate revision and amendment.

The taxes on books consist of the duties on paper and advertisements, and the eleven copies given to public libraries. The first are as follow:—

First class paper (including all printing paper),	3d per lb.
Second do.	1½d per do.
Glazed paper, millboard, &c.	L.1, 1s. per cwt.
Pasteboard, 1st class,	1, 8s. per do.
Do. 2d class,	14s. per do.

These duties produced last year (1830) L.665,872, 5s. 8½d. of net revenue. The regulations and penalties under which they are charged and collected, are about the most complicated, vexatious, and oppressive, of any in the excise laws. At an average, the duties amount to from 20 to 30 per cent of the cost of the paper and pasteboard used in the printing and boarding of books. Heavy, however, as these duties certainly are, they are light compared with those laid on advertisements. A duty of 3s. 6d. is charged on every advertisement, long or short, inserted in the Gazette, or in any newspaper, or any work published in numbers or parts; and as the charge, exclusive of the duty, for inserting an advertisement of the ordinary length in the newspapers, rarely exceeds 3s. or 4s., the duty adds fully 100 per cent to its cost. And as it is quite as necessary to the sale of a work that it should be advertised, as that it should be printed, the advertisement duty may be justly regarded as an *ad valorem*

duty of 100 per cent on the material of a most important manufacture! Had this duty furnished a large revenue, something might have been found to say in its favour. But even this poor apology for oppressive exaction cannot be urged in its behalf. It is exorbitant without being productive. Last year (1830) it produced L.157,482, 7s. 4d. in Great Britain, and L.16,337, 14s. in Ireland; making together L.173,821, 1s. 4d.; of which miserable pittance, we believe we may safely affirm, a *full third* was derived from advertisements of books.

But the real operation of the duties on books will be best learned from the following statements, to which we invite the attention of our readers. They have been drawn up by the first practical authority in London, and the fullest reliance may be placed on their correctness. They refer to an octavo volume of 500 pages, printed on respectable paper, to be sold by retail for 12s. a-copy.

Estimate of the cost of such a volume, when 500, 750, and 1000 copies are printed, showing what part of this cost consists of taxes.

FIVE HUNDRED COPIES.

	Cost.	Duty.
Printing and corrections,	L.88 18 0	
Paper,	38 10 0	L.8 12 10
Boarding,	10 0 0	3 3 8
Advertising,	40 0 0	20 0 0
11 copies to public libraries.		
14 copies (say) to author.		
475 copies for sale at 8s. 5d.	L.199 17 11	
Deduct cost,	177 8 0	
		L.31 16 6
Profit to author and publisher, } commission, interest on ca- pital, &c. when all are sold, }	L.22 9 11	

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY COPIES.

	Cost.	Duty.
Printing and corrections,	L.95 6 0	
Paper,	57 15 0	L.12 19 4
Boarding,	15 0 0	4 15 7
Advertising,	50 0 0	25 0 0
11 copies to public libraries.		
14 copies to author.		
725 copies for sale at 8s. 5d.	L.305 2 5	
Deduct cost,	218 1 0	
		L.42 14 11
Profit to author and publisher, } commission, interest on ca- pital, &c. when all are sold, }	L.87 1 5	

ONE THOUSAND COPIES.

	Cost.	Duty.
Printing and corrections,	L.102 14 0	
Paper,	77 0 0	L.17 5 9
Boarding,	20 0 0	6 7 5
Advertising,	60 0 0	30 0 0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	L.259 14 0	L.53 13 2
11 copies to public libraries.		
14 copies to author.		
975 copies for sale, at 8s. 5d. L.410 6 3		
Deduct cost, 259 14 0		
	<hr/>	
Profit for author, &c. as } above, when all are sold, }	L.150 12 3	

The following Statement shows the operation of the Duties on a Pamphlet of Five Sheets, or Eighty Pages, of which 500 Copies are printed.

PAMPHLET, FIVE HUNDRED NUMBER.

	Cost.	Duty.
Printing L.14 14 0		
Extras 5 5 0		
	<hr/>	
	L.19 19 0	
Paper	6 0 0	L.1 0 0
Stitching,	0 12 6
Stamp-office duty,	0 15 0	0 15 0
Advertising (say)	15 0 0	7 10 0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	L.42 6 6	9 5 0
25 copies for author and public libraries.		
175 copies for sale, 25 for } L.2, 14s. }	L.51 6 0	
Profit to author and publisher, interest, &c. after all are sold, }	8 19 6	

Now, it results from these statements, which, as already mentioned, have been derived from the highest practical authority, that when the edition is an average one of 750 copies, the duties amount to about a *fifth*, or 20 per cent of its cost. And whether the edition consist of 500, 750, or even 1000 copies, the duties may be said invariably to exceed all the remuneration the author can reasonably expect to obtain for his labour!

But it is essential to bear in mind, that the preceding statements show only how the duties affect books when the entire impression is sold off at the full publication price. In truth and reality, however, this is a contingency that but seldom happens. Excluding pamphlets, it may, we believe, be truly affirmed, that, at an average, the original impression of half the books printed is hardly ever sold off, except at a ruinous reduction of price. Now, if we suppose, in the previous example of an edition of 750 copies, that only 225 instead of 725 were sold, the result would be, that only L.44, 19s. 5d. would remain as profit to the author and publisher, and as a compensation for interest, the risk of bad debts, &c. Were only 525 copies sold, the cost would not be more than balanced; and there would be nothing whatever to remunerate the author for his labour, or the bookseller for the employment of his capital. Were only 425 copies sold, government would have received L.42, 15s. 11d. of duty from a speculation, by which the author had lost years, perhaps, of toil, and the bookseller L.40, 4s. of his capital. The mere possibility of such a supposition being realized, would be a sufficient ground for the immediate revision, if not abolition, of the duties; but, in point of fact, such cases, far from being merely possible or rare, are of every-day occurrence.

Those by whom the duties on books were imposed, seem to have proceeded on the rudest analogies. They appear to have thought, that because they taxed leather when in the tan-pit, sugar when in the warehouse, and malt when in the cistern, without exciting any complaint of injustice, they might do the same by the paper, and other materials used in the manufacture of books. They did not reflect, or, if they did, the reflection made no impression on them, that there is a radical difference between the demand for books, or food for the mind, and food for the body. The latter is sure, under any circumstances, to command a sale; the demand for it is comparatively constant; it cannot be dispensed with. If a tax be laid on beer, hats, or shoes, it may, perhaps, lessen in a trifling degree the demand for them; but whatever may be the amount of the tax, the supplies of beer, hats, and shoes brought to market, will in future sell for such an advanced price as will leave the customary profit to their producers. With books, however, the case is altogether different. They are luxuries, the taste for which is in the last degree capricious; so much so, that the most sagacious individuals are every day deceived in their anticipations as to the success of their works, and even as to the sale of new editions. But if a book do not speedily succeed, it is so very ruinous an affair, that a publisher is glad to dispose of the greater part

of an impression at a fourth or a fifth part of its regular price; and is often, indeed, obliged to sell it as waste paper to the trunkmaker or the tobacconist.

On a late investigation into the affairs of an extensive publishing concern in the metropolis, it was found, that of 130 works published by it in a given time, *fifty had not paid their expenses*. Of the eighty that did pay, thirteen only had arrived at a second edition; but, in most instances, these second editions had not been profitable. In general, it may be estimated, that of the books published, *one-fourth* do not pay their expenses; and that only one in eight or ten can be reprinted with advantage. As respects pamphlets, we know we are within the mark when we affirm, that *not one in fifty* pays the expenses of its publication.

Neither must it be imagined that the publishing concern now alluded to, was more unfortunate than such concerns generally are. Old-established houses, with large capitals and extensive connexions, run less risk, no doubt; but they avoid it, not by declining to publish unpopular works, for their opinions are, in this respect, quite as fallible as those of others; but by declining to publish, at their own risk, any work not brought to them by a person who is known, and the credit of whose name will, they expect, carry off as many copies as may indemnify them for their outlay. Those unknown individuals who are desirous to come before the public as authors, and who have, at the same time to make head against the *res angusta domi*, resort to such as are anxious to make their way as publishers; and the fruits of their labours will never see the light, unless they find some one of the latter class bold enough to adventure perhaps the whole of his capital upon a cast of the die, or upon the publication of a work which may probably not succeed, but which, if it do, will hardly fail of introducing him, as well as its author, to public notice and favour. It is on this class of authors and publishers—on those who are struggling with difficulties and discouragements of all sorts—that the duties press with the greatest severity. Here they do not merely sweep, as in the majority of other cases, the entire remuneration of the author and bookseller into the pockets of the tax-gatherer; but the fear of being unable to defray the duties prevents many works (it may be, some very valuable ones) from being published.

Now, when such is the fact—when it may be established by unquestionable evidence that one book in every four, and forty-nine pamphlets in every fifty, do not pay their expenses, can any thing be more palpably subversive of every fair princi-

ple, than to lay the *same duty* on all works before they are published? In a *very few* cases, such duty may fall principally on the buyers, and be only a reasonable deduction from the profits of the author and publisher; but in a vast number more, it swallows them up entirely; and in very many cases, there are no profits for the duty to absorb, so that it is *paid wholly out of the capital of the unfortunate author or publisher*. Were the judges of the courts of law to decide cases by a throw of the dice, there would be quite as much of reason and justice in their decisions, as there has been in the proceedings of our finance ministers as to taxes on literature.

Were an attempt made to treat the dealers in blacking, coffee, tea, or sugar, as authors and publishers are treated, the whole country would be in flames, and the meditated injustice would not take place. But no such attempt will ever be made. If a merchant import a cargo of sugar, corn, or flax, he may lodge it in a public warehouse, and need not pay a sixpence of duty, except upon such portions as he sells to the retailers. Now, what is there so very noxious about authors and publishers, that they should be denied a privilege that is freely conceded to every one else, and be compelled to pay the full duty on books before their publication, when it is certain that a very large proportion of them will remain on their hands? Is it not a disgrace to a civilized nation like England, that the sugar which the owner of an estate in Jamaica brings to market, should be treated with a degree of indulgence denied to the works of Gibbon and of Smith? If books *must* be taxed, let publishers be put under the *surveillance* of the Excise—let them be obliged to keep an account of the books they sell, and let them be taxed accordingly; but do not let the loss arising from an unsuccessful literary speculation—and more than half such speculations are unsuccessful—be aggravated to a ruinous degree by the pressure of a system of taxation which is not allowed to affect either gin or dice, and than which there is nothing, even in Algiers, more signally unjust, partial, and oppressive.

The proposed reduction of the advertisement duty will do something to lessen the exorbitancy of the existing taxes on literature; but it does nothing whatever to obviate the injustice of the mode in which they are imposed; and the deduction which it makes from their amount is but inconsiderable. It acknowledges, without correcting, one of the evils attached to the present system. Instead of being reduced, the advertisement duty ought to be unconditionally repealed. It merely amounts, as we have previously stated, to about L.170,000 a-year; and there cannot be the shadow of a doubt, that the

blank occasioned by its repeal would at no distant period be fully filled up by the consequent greater productiveness of the duty on paper. A duty on advertisements is one that can have no place in any system of taxation, that has the smallest pretensions to be founded on fair principles. The sale of an estate worth L.100,000 may be as briefly announced as the publication of a sixpenny pamphlet, or the bankruptcy of a dealer in prawns; and because such is the case, the same duty is laid on them all. Were equal duties imposed on small beer and champagne, the injustice would be similar, though far less in degree. It is really astonishing how such a tax should be tolerated. A third part of the advertisement duty, is, we believe, derived from announcements of books. Indeed, it has utterly destroyed pamphlets, in so far at least as they were a source of profit.

We may remark, by the way, that in the late scheme for altering the advertisement duty, it was proposed to lay a certain duty on advertisements, containing a given number of words, and a higher duty on all that exceeded this limit. We confess we have not been able to discover any good grounds for this distinction. The newspapers will not insert an unusually long advertisement without receiving a proportionally large fee; and it does seem to be preposterous to lay a peculiarly heavy duty upon a notice in a newspaper, merely because it cannot be compressed into a few lines. The proposed alteration would afford employment to some scores of persons in counting the words in advertisements. But whether this be any advantage, we leave to others to determine; though, if it be not one, it will be difficult to discover any one else.

We believe that no parliament, reformed or unreformed, will now continue the practice of levying taxes on books, previously to their publication and sale. It is not possible, for the reasons already stated, that such taxes can be otherwise than *unjust*. But though they were imposed according to the number and price of the copies actually sold, they are such as ought not to be resorted to except in cases of necessity. By raising the price of books, and in so far preventing the diffusion of knowledge among the poorer and least instructed classes, they cannot fail, however equally imposed, of being in the highest degree injurious. It is natural that they should be a favourite source of revenue in countries, the governments of which are founded on force or fraud, or both, and who have consequently an interest in obstructing the diffusion of that knowledge which would infallibly sap the foundations of their power. But their adoption by a government honestly anxious to consolidate and main-

tain the just rights and liberties of all classes, is a solecism and an absurdity. Such a government has much to fear from ignorance, but nothing from instruction. And it is labouring most effectually for its own security, when it is taking every practicable method for diffusing a taste for books and reading among all classes of its subjects.

The previous remarks refer principally to the taxes imposed on literature for public purposes. But besides these, all authors and publishers are compelled to deliver up *gratis* eleven copies of all new works, and of all new and improved editions of old works published by them, to so many public libraries. This is exceedingly burdensome upon the more expensive class of publications, of which only very small impressions can be printed. Eleven copies of them would often form a very fair remuneration for the author; and the obligation to give away such a number has repeatedly caused the abandonment of such publications; while, in all cases, it contributes powerfully to lessen the number, and deteriorate the quality of the maps, plates, and other embellishments in the books that are published. A tax of this sort would not be tolerable even were it imposed for a public purpose; such, however, is not its object. Though called *public*, the libraries which receive the eleven copies are, with the single exception of the British Museum, private establishments, belonging to particular corporations or institutions, and *accessible only to their members*. Why, when an author produces a work, should he be compelled to bestow copies of it on the lawyers of Dublin and Edinburgh, and the Universities? On what principle can these bodies pretend to demand from him a portion of his property? And how, we beg to know, are the interests of science and learning advanced by loading the shelves of the University libraries with *all* publications of all sorts that issue from the press? Perhaps it might be expedient, in order to insure the preservation of every work, that copies of it should be deposited, one in London, one in Edinburgh, and one in Dublin. Even this would be calling upon the unfortunate race of authors to make a considerable sacrifice for the public advantage. But to call upon them to sacrifice *ten* copies, exclusive of that given to the British Museum, for the benefit of so many *private* institutions, is a proceeding utterly at variance with every principle of justice. We believe, too, that the Universities would willingly relinquish this ungracious and oppressive privilege for a moderate compensation. A small annuity paid to each of them, would enable them to buy copies of all the new publications that are of the least use to them, or that, in fact, they ought to possess.

The law of other countries is, in this respect, far more equitable than ours. In America, and in Prussia, Saxony, and Bavaria, only *one* copy of every work is required from the author; in France and Austria *two* copies are required; and in the Netherlands, *three*. The governments of the most despotical states treat authors better than they have hitherto been treated by the legislature of England.

The duties on newspapers amount, at present, to fourpence on each, under a discount of twenty per cent; and hence it is that it is not possible, without a violation of the stamp laws, to sell newspapers under sevenpence or sevenpence-halfpenny. But though oppressive, this duty cannot be said to be unjust. Newspaper publishers know pretty well before hand how many copies of their journal will be required, and it is their own fault if they print more; whereas, we have already seen, that no such previous knowledge can ever be obtained in the case of new books. No excuse can, however, be made for the exorbitancy of the duty; and we were glad to observe that it was Lord Althorpe's intention to propose that it should be reduced to twopence, without any discount. We do not think that such a duty could be fairly objected to as applicable to the present order of papers. But all fixed duties on newspapers are radically objectionable, because they effectually hinder the free and open circulation of the cheaper sort,—throwing their supply into the hands of the least reputable portion of the community, who circulate them surreptitiously, and make them vehicles for diffusing doctrines of the most mischievous tendency. What we would, therefore, beg to propose is, that the duty on newspapers should be an *ad valorem* one, amounting to twenty-five per cent, perhaps, or to one penny on a newspaper sold at fourpence, to one halfpenny on one sold for twopence, and so proportionally. The advantages resulting from such a plan would, we think, be many and great. The unjust stigma that now attaches to low-priced papers would be removed; and men of talent and principle would find it equally advantageous to write in them, as in those sold at a higher price. Were such an alteration made, we venture to predict that the present twopenny papers, than which nothing can be conceived more utterly worthless, would very soon be superseded by others of a totally different character; so that in this way the change would be in the highest degree beneficial. It would also, we apprehend, introduce into newspaper compiling, that division of labour, or rather of subjects, which is found in every thing else. Instead of having all sorts of matters crammed into the same journal, every different topic of considerable interest would be separately treated in a low-

priced journal, appropriated to it only, and conducted by persons fully conversant with its principles and details. Under the present omnivorous system, individuals who care nothing for the theatre, and never read a paragraph about it, are notwithstanding unable to procure a paper in which it does not occupy a prominent place; and those who cannot, like some honourable members, distinguish "God save the King" from "Blue Bonnets," have daily served up to them long dissertations on concerts, operas, oratorios, and so forth. The proposed system would give the power of selecting. Those who preferred an *olla podrida* to any thing else, would no doubt be sure of finding an abundant supply; while those who wished for a more select regimen,—who preferred one or two separate dishes to a multitude huddled together, would be able, which at present they are not, to gratify their taste. Neither can there be the least doubt that an *ad valorem* duty of this sort would be far more productive than the present duty; inasmuch as though it would be less on each paper, the number of papers would be prodigiously augmented. It also would have the advantage of being easy of collection; for being a certain portion of the price, no question could arise with respect to it.

It has been proposed by some to repeal the duty on newspapers altogether, and to substitute in its stead a postage on those that must be carried by post. But to this we should be disposed to object in the strongest manner. If a distinction were to be made, it ought assuredly to be in favour of country places, and not in favour of towns. Besides, every one who knows any thing of the feelings of the great mass of the people, is well aware that they would infinitely rather pay fourpence for a paper to the publisher, than threepence to him and one penny to the post-office. It is to no purpose to tell us that this is an unreasonable prejudice. It exists, will continue to exist, and ought to be respected.

Were the duties on books and advertisements repealed, and those on newspapers imposed in the way now suggested, there would be nothing to object to in the taxes on literature. By making these changes, government would lose very little, if any revenue, at the same time that it would put an end to a system pregnant with injustice and oppression, and provide for the diffusion of sound information among the lowest ranks and orders of the people.

ART. VIII.—1. *Remarks on several recent Publications regarding the Civil Government and Foreign Policy of British India.* By THOMAS CAMPBELL ROBERTSON, Esq., Bengal Civil Service. 8vo. London: 1829.

2. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the long-continued Stationary Condition of India and its Inhabitants; with a brief Examination of the Leading Principles of two of the most approved Revenue Systems of British India.* By a Civil Servant of the Hon. East India Company. 8vo. London: 1830.

3. *A brief Vindication of the Honourable East India Company's Government of Bengal, from the Attacks of Messrs Richards and Crawford.* By ROSS DONNELLY MANGLES, Esq., Bengal Civil Service. 8vo. London: 1830.

THERE is no necessary connexion between the government of British India and the monopoly of the tea trade. Accident alone has placed them in the same hands; and any endeavour to try the pretensions of the Merchants who have enjoyed the one, in the same issue with the merits of the Princes who have conducted the other, can tend but to ravel both questions. For it must be obvious to the meanest capacity, that our empire in the East may have been wisely and benevolently administered, though it be proved to demonstration, that the exclusive commercial privileges of the Company have cost the community two millions per annum; or, on the other hand, that justice and humanity may cry aloud for a revision of our whole system of Indian policy, though it should be found that any interference with those privileges would recoil upon us in that fearful shape, which comes home to every man's business and bosom, in the privation of an habitual luxury.

Leaving, therefore, the question of monopoly to be decided on its own merits, and waving for the present any reference to the Company's commercial relations with India—which have become of late years very unimportant—we propose to restrict our enquiries and speculations, in this article, to the conduct of that body in its Sovereign capacity, and to the future prospects of the great and motley population subjected to its rule. The field, though thus circumscribed, is vast in its extent, and the subject, considered in all its bearings, is too important to be lightly handled, even at a moment when the storms that are gathering more immediately around us, demand all our judgment and energy. Whilst such dangers are impending, indeed,

wisdom would counsel us to improve the breathing time that is permitted, by strengthening the outworks of our empire, before the body of the place be invested, and the struggle, foreign or domestic, draws every mind into its absorbing vortex.

It behoves us, then, to remember, that the legislature will shortly be summoned to decide, as far as man can dispose of man, or the interests of the present generation are involved, upon the moral and political destinies of millions, who must receive from our hands the cup of good or evil. The time, therefore, is fully come, when that 'private reason, which 'always prevents or outstrips public wisdom,' should inform itself, both with respect to the deserts of those delegated rulers, who are now about to render an account of their stewardship, and concerning those measures which enlightened policy, philanthropy, and the highest and holiest obligations may concur (for where are they really at variance?) in dictating for our adoption. We may neglect or slur over the duty; but the responsibility is one from which we cannot escape, and which, in that event, would be heavy and disgraceful on us and on our children. We may reap from our Indian empire—the most magnificent appendage that any modern kingdom ever annexed to itself by conquest—an almost boundless harvest of wealth and power;—of that noblest, most stable power, which stands on the broad basis of character; and we may render our dominion an inestimable benefit to the nations that have submitted to our sway. But the path of supineness and indifference is also open before us. The concerns of India have at no time been a welcome subject in English society, or before an English parliament. Nor is this the only risk of error; for selfishness, prejudice, and angry passions, have long since taken up their usual posts at either extreme; the one denouncing all change as pregnant with inconvenience or danger; the other including every scheme of revenue, every plan for the administration of justice, and the whole policy of our Anglo-Indian government, under one sweeping denouncement of folly and misrule. Misrepresentation has not been spared, and large drafts have been drawn upon the credulity of the British public, with a degree of audacity, which nothing but a calculation of impunity, founded on its presumed ignorance, could have generated. Meanwhile, the eyes of envious Europe are upon us—vastly over-estimating the direct advantages which we derive from our Oriental dominions, but equally prepared to exaggerate any indications either of selfishness or apathy, which jealousy may detect in our conduct; and eager to brand Englishmen of the present age with the same foul stains which all the waters of the inter-

mediate ocean can never efface from the characters of those to whose valour and talents we are indebted for our present ascendancy in the East. The wrongs which they perpetrated have long slept in the grave with the ambition of the conqueror, and the sorrows of the victim. Restitution, were it practicable, would be productive of evils infinitely greater than those which attended the original acts of injustice and spoliation, which are now, to all practical purposes, only historical events. But a glorious course is before us. We may yet redeem, in some measure, the memory of those great men, to whom we owe so large a debt of national gratitude, by making a righteous use of the noble legacy which they have bequeathed us; and by placing ourselves, as humble but willing instruments, in the hands of that great Architect, who alone can make partial moral deformities contribute to the symmetry and excellence of the universal plan.

We are not without our misgivings that neither Trojan nor Tyrian will be altogether satisfied with the conclusions at which we have arrived with regard to the past, or our views of future policy; but we know that all honest arbiters have been equally unsuccessful in their endeavours to please either party, from the earliest ages, down to the late decision upon the Canadian boundary. As respects the existing condition of British India, and the progress that has been made of late years in developing its resources, and ameliorating the condition of its population, we shall presently adduce our reasons for submitting an estimate calculated upon data that would seem to have been sedulously kept out of sight by some, and strangely disregarded by others. In so doing, we shall lay ourselves open to a charge of over-refinement from the philosophers who allow little influence to any moral causes, but those which address themselves immediately to physical condition, and who regard defective political institutions as almost the exclusive sources of social evil. Our opinions regarding future arrangements are equally remote from those of partisans. The horror of reform under which some writers of conservative principles are suffering, seems as absurd as the assumption that to alter is necessarily to amend. We are no more desirous of being the organ of the party which is always, like the Athenians of old, desiring some new thing—in utter ignorance of the nature and character of the political structure into which it proposes to dovetail its figments—than we are of falling in with the prejudices of those who deem it most wise and fitting that their own halting steps should give time to the great onward-march of knowledge and improvement.

When the newspapers announce that a horse has trotted a certain number of miles in a given time, the multitude, indeed, gape and wonder incontinently, if the mere figures bear such a relation as to seem to justify astonishment; but the initiated suspend their opinion, till they have ascertained what weight the animal carried. In like manner, when the effects of chemical or mechanical powers are to be estimated, we make allowance for all unavoidable friction and resistance. The rapidity of the stream against which the steam-boat makes way, and the nature of the surface upon which the locomotive engine travels, together with their respective burdens, enter, of course, into our calculations. On the same principles, we esteem the traveller who advances ten or twenty miles a day through the trackless deserts of central Africa, at least as active and energetic as another who bowls along the turnpike road from York to London in an equal space of time.

If it be our desire to arrive at truth, and not merely to make out a plausible case, we must pursue an analogous course when moral efforts and moral success are the questions at issue. In the nature of things, there is not, there cannot be, any fixed or absolute standard to which the labours of the statesman, the lawgiver, or the practical reformer, can be brought for admeasurement and valuation. It is difficult for those who live in the centre of progressive civilisation, to do justice to others who are employed in opening a new road towards political regeneration in distant regions. In such a case, the combined energies of many good and great men may only suffice to prevent further moral deterioration. It must be often left to successive generations to afford an impetus to society in an opposite direction. A thousand circumstances, beyond the mensuration of the advance made in a given period, must be taken into our calculations when we speculate upon the government of nations, and the effects of political institutions upon human happiness. Before we enter upon enquiries of the nature in question, one of the most important points is to ascertain with the utmost accuracy the exact point from which the rulers, whose conduct we are about to investigate, were compelled to start. It is evident that without such preliminary data, we shall, for the most part, be talking at random, since no man, however acute, can possibly pronounce upon the length of a string till he see both ends of it. These observations, unfortunately, are not so superfluous as they may appear. If our readers had waded through as many party pamphlets upon the *vexata questio* of Indian government, as it has fallen to our lot to read, they would have come in contact with more than one writer whose understanding is

darkened by the fallacies which we are taking so much trouble to brush away.

What, then, was the moral and political condition of the natives of Hindostan,—to use the word as it is employed in European geography,—at the time when our countrymen began to play a prominent part upon that distant stage of enterprise and action? In what degree were the people wise, free, intelligent? what were their laws, institutions, religion, and morals? and how far were they prepared or disposed to profit by intercourse with more enlightened strangers?

Despotism, intense and unmitigated, compared with which the autocracy of the Peters and Pauls of Russia may be called liberty and license, had overshadowed the whole continent of India, and bowed down every mind and spirit to the very dust, beneath the accumulated pressure of centuries. During all this period, with only very partial and temporary exceptions, the people had enjoyed none of that protection from foreign or domestic spoilers, which absolute governments have sometimes afforded to their subjects in other quarters of the world. Even their poets and romancers have been compelled to place their golden age in times the most remote; since history could tell no tales but those of war, revolution, anarchy, and rapine. We have the best authority for asserting that the higher the stream is traced, the more frequent, wild, and bloody do these scenes of misery appear. Under such inflictions, the bonds of social order were almost entirely dissolved. Society hung together, indeed, but its constituent parts could not be said to coalesce; and the community rather resembled the state of beasts of prey, on one hand, with timid and defenceless animals, on the other, dwelling in the same wilderness,—the former sometimes fighting desperately among themselves, sometimes uniting to hunt down their common quarry,—than an association for purposes of mutual protection and advantage. There is this unhappy exception to the verisimilitude of our illustration: Providence has ordained that no degree of injury shall produce a change in the instincts and habits of the feebler animals; but the case is very different with human nature in India, as elsewhere. In that wretched country, those classes whom circumstances had placed at the mercy of the great and powerful, were not only rendered callous and indifferent to suffering, but having been made use of as tools, they became corrupted by example—they learned to value their own lives and those of their brethren in general at the meanest rate, and to regard blood as water.

A few facts, selected from the mass, will suffice to prove that this picture, however frightful, is not over-coloured. Colonel

Wilks informs us that the natives of the south of India use a single word (*wulsap*), to signify that which no other people on the face of the globe could express without a long periphrasis;—namely, the flight of a whole village community into the jungles before an invading army. There were banded thousands in the very heart of India, who did not even pretend to subsist otherwise than by plunder; who engaged in no trade, and turned no furrow, but swept the country periodically, with rape and torture, murder and conflagration. And there existed, though in much smaller numbers, a class of hereditary highwaymen, who literally never attempted to possess themselves of a traveller's purse, until they had strangled him, after an ingenious fashion peculiar to the craft.

We learn from Bishop Heber, that the Rajpoot tribes, who are in many respects superior to other Indian races, were deformed by all 'the vices of slaves, added to those of robbers.' From this stigma no class can justly be exempted. Hopeless, unvaried slavery had branded deeply and darkly upon every heart and mind the mean vices congenial to, and inseparable from, that condition of moral degradation. Its more glaring effect had been to render almost every man, of whatever rank or station, false, fraudulent, and corrupt. Some slight respect was felt for the military oath, but no other obligation was proof against the smallest temptation. Every palm itched; and an opportunity of plunder or revenge, by chicanery, embezzlement, or false testimony, if possible, as involving less jeopardy than open violence, was never allowed to pass unimproved. Moral restraint there was absolutely none; on the contrary, he was held the greatest philosopher who could practise iniquity most plausibly, and lay himself open to the least hazard of detection.*

It will readily be supposed that in a country so situated, there existed nothing at all resembling what we should denominate a tolerable administration of justice. In some provinces, a rude

* Sir Walter Scott tells us of a people in central Africa, in whose language the word employed to signify 'a caravan,' means, literally, 'a thing to be devoured.' If this be so, we need no further account of the habits of the tribe in their relation to travellers. In like manner, the notions which the inhabitants of Hindostan entertain of wisdom, may be gathered from the single fact, that 'filsoof,' *φιλοσοφος*, signifies 'a cunning knave, a fellow who lives and thrives by roguery.' The word is never used, apparently, when the transaction referred to involves, in the opinion of the speaker, any heinous degree of turpitude. But they do not measure those matters by any common standard with ourselves.

and most imperfect species of arbitration prevailed; simply because there was no real civil judicature; and because those who obtained no redress from a Panchayet went without it altogether. But it seems to have happened not unfrequently, where the habits of the people were most warlike, that these bungling attempts to arrange disputes, ended in a pitched battle between the parties and their retainers. Great crimes were, doubtless, sometimes avenged; but even in cases of that nature, the proceedings were so arbitrary, the punishment so capricious, and the innocent were so often involved in common ruin with the guilty, that the people must have learned to regard the laws, if such they could be called, as more inimical to their peace and welfare than any unauthorized wrongs. One example may suffice to illustrate our position. ‘I remember,’ says Sir Henry Strachey, ‘being told by a gentleman high in the Company’s service, who had long resided in Bengal, that he once complained to the nabob at Moorshedabad, in whom was then vested the criminal jurisdiction of Bengal, of the prevalence of robbery in a particular district. Going to that district a few days afterwards, he was much shocked to find that, pursuant to the orders received from the nabob, a great number of men who had been seized were put to death by impalement, and other cruel modes of execution. How many of the men so executed were guilty, it was impossible to say; but from what I have seen of the judicial proceedings of that period, I should doubt whether any were regularly proved to be guilty.’*

The only regular medium through which, generally speaking, the several governments of India came ordinarily in contact with their subjects, was that of fiscal extortion. In this respect there would appear to be little doubt that the Mahommedans increased the power of the screw beyond that previously employed by Hindoo rulers. At the same time there is no reason to believe that the latter were remarkable for their forbearance in its application. We have now before us some extracts in manuscript from the work of a Father Francis Catson (as we read the name), a Jesuit, founded on the Memoirs of Signor Manouchi, a Venetian, forty-eight years a physician at Delhi and Agra, in the reigns of Shahjehan and Aurungzebe. The author tells us that the governors of the several provinces under the Mogul emperors, ‘who are, properly speaking, only the farmers of the empire, let out in their turn these lands. The

* *Selection of Papers from the Records at the East India House.—Judicial Selections*, vol. ii. p. 70.

‘great difficulty is to find labourers in the country who are willing to engage in the cultivation of the lands, for the sole advantage of obtaining a mere subsistence. Violence in consequence is obliged to be resorted to; and the peasants are compelled to labour upon them. Hence their revolts, and frequent emigrations to the countries of the Indian rajahs, who are accustomed to treat them with rather more humanity.’ It is remarkable that this Venetian physician speaks of the whole soil of the country as being the property of the sovereign. It is most likely that this extreme notion originated with the Mahomedan conquerors of an idolatrous people. But even the Hindoo princes seem to have claimed some lien upon the gross produce of the soil, differing essentially from mere taxation. In whatever hands the power of exacting this due were vested, the whole current of evidence and probability appears to set with the opinion, that it was always exercised in a manner manifesting a very great indifference on the part of the rulers to the sufferings of the lower classes of the agricultural population. Subsequently to the Mahomedan invasion, at any rate, a very grinding system prevailed; and a yoke so heavy and constant in its pressure, may well be supposed to have done its work of degradation in less than eight centuries.

There was, moreover, constantly in operation, a source of demoralization and misery more abundant, and more uniformly and permanently present, than any to which we have hitherto referred. We mean the odious superstition, which, with the great collateral system of caste, has engraven its dark characters upon the moral and intellectual condition of the people of Hindostan, deeper than even the bitter curse of temporal tyranny. Religion, to say the very least, must be one of the mightiest principles of good or evil, according as the tendency of its peculiar moral code, and the nature and efficacy of its sanctions, may incline and vary, that can be brought to act upon the human mind. Nevertheless, there are now lying before us publications upon the character and stationary condition of the people, in which the most inquisitive reader might labour in vain to discover whether they are deists, or polytheists, worshippers of the heavenly bodies, or of monkeys;—sacrificers of the hearts of living men, like the Mexicans, or disciples of the sceptical school of Athens. Really this would seem to be a philosophical improvement upon the plan of acting Hamlet without the intervention of the noble Dane. The people have been stationary it is true; but a matter so trifling as religion is passed over as a thing which has had no share in producing such an effect. It would appear that although their religion is false and bad, it

may be considered as not having retarded their advance, as long as writers do not find themselves at all at a loss to account for their backwardness from other causes. If it had been true and good, there are speculators who cannot see how it could have helped them, as long as the system of revenue devised by the Mahommedans continued in force. In case you persist in pushing these disputants upon this subject, you will find that the burning of widows, and female infanticide, the violent immolation of human victims to Kali, and the suicides that take place at the temple of Juggernaut, and at the confluence of the Ganges and Jumna, together with the unspeakable abominations recorded under the head of religious ceremonies by the Abbé Dubois, and others, and the horrible penances which Hindoo devotees impose upon themselves, will be represented as having either a tendency to advance civilisation, or, at worst, as being wholly ineffective.

Let Mr Rickard's various publications* be searched, and not one syllable will be found indicating even a suspicion that the religious creed of the Hindoos, with its ethical adjuncts, has been productive of the slightest effects, either good or evil. The theory which attributes every perceptible effect to one specific cause, must exclude all other agents from co-operation. Mr Rickards never loses an opportunity of assuring us that the system of land revenue devised by the Mahommedans, and inherited by us, has generated that 'character of slavish submission and moral degradation,' which he admits to belong to the people of India. 'Of the social virtues of native Indians,' he says, 'we see daily as much as can reasonably be expected; and of their vices, as much as can be easily accounted for, from the nature of the governments under which they have so long groaned.' Why seek for concurrent causes, if, after exhibiting a picture of utter 'demoralization,' it can be proved that 'the revenue or financial system of India is at the bottom of all this evil?'

What this inoperative religion of the Hindoos is at the present hour, let Bishop Heber tell;—an observer, it must be admitted, liberal and dispassionate, and perfectly qualified to form the comparative estimate which he has instituted. 'Of all idolatries which I have ever read or heard of, the religion of the Hindoos, in which I have taken some pains to inform myself, really appears to me the worst, both in the degrading notions which it gives of the Deity; in the endless round of its burdensome cere-

* *India; or, Facts submitted to illustrate the Character and Condition of the Native Inhabitants; with Suggestions for Reforming the Present System of Government.* Parts 1, 2, 3.

‘ monies, which occupy the time, and distract the thoughts, without either instructing or interesting its votaries; in the filthy acts of uncleanness and cruelty, not only permitted but enjoined, and inseparably interwoven with those ceremonies; in the system of castes,—a system which tends more than any thing else the devil has yet invented to destroy the feelings of general benevolence, and to make nine-tenths of mankind the hopeless slaves of the remainder; and in the total absence of any popular system of morals, or any single lesson which the people at large ever hear, to live virtuously, and do good to each other.’—*Journal*, vol. ii. p. 384. This is a fearful picture; and yet there is good reason to believe, that, with respect to rites and sacrifices at least, an alteration for the better had taken place before the sketch was taken. The latter, indeed, have probably never flourished in their pristine enormity, since the complete establishment of Mahomedan domination.

Something farther must be taken into account before we can close this gloomy page of human folly and suffering. The mischief produced by the institution of castes has been, in some respects, under-estimated. Bishop Heber has said, that it was destructive of the feelings of general benevolence, and that it tended to render ‘ nine-tenths of the people the hopeless slaves of the remainder.’ He might have added, with equal truth, that it served to create a false scale of crime; to sophisticate all natural sense of moral responsibility; and to engender a species of barbarous arrogance and self-sufficiency; which, again, has operated strongly to keep the Hindoos stationary, through their wilful and contemptuous rejection of those benefits, which, under other circumstances, their intercourse with enlightened foreigners must have conferred upon them.

It is somewhat less than forty years since Lord Cornwallis established that system of civil administration, which the Supreme Government has maintained to the present day, and which, though greatly modified in 1816, still obtains, to a certain extent, at Madras, where it was introduced in 1802. Up to the date of Lord Cornwallis’ assumption of the reins of government, the Masters of British India had lived for the purpose of the day. Their efforts alternated between struggles for retention and aggrandizement; and they imitated, as closely as possible, the barbarous policy of their Mahomedan predecessors, with the additional awkwardness inherent to their condition as strangers in the land. There was a crying necessity for reform, not only on the score of humanity, but because abuse and misrule were rapidly undermining their own strength, and exhausting the country. That Lord Cornwallis executed the ar-

duous task in a bold and energetic manner, will not be denied, even by those who are most disposed to question the wisdom of his measures. It appears to us, that without going into detail, it will not be difficult to separate the good from the evil elements of the institutions in question; nor to discriminate those cases in which the Governor-General was misled by the prejudices of birth and education, from those where he was compelled to bow to circumstances, or was only allowed a choice of evils. For a complete analysis of the system, we must refer our readers to the instructive work of Mr Mill.*

Defects have an obtrusive character, and therefore to these we first address ourselves. Lord Cornwallis, an able, honest, and most benevolent statesman, had, like other men, his habits of thinking, and those, naturally, were European in their form and colour. It has also been said, that his immediate advisers among the servants of the Company, were by no means remarkable for any intimate acquaintance with the structure of native society, or the wants and feelings of the people. His lordship was so deeply impressed with the impossibility of remaining stationary, that the good sense which dictated Mr Shore's temperate advice with regard to the revenue arrangements, did not in any degree affect his determination to admit of no delay.

The results were these: The whole plan was European in its complexion. The steps by which it was introduced were too sudden and abrupt, and placed the institutions of the government too far in advance of the general mind of the people. There were declaratory enactments in abundance; but no definition of rights; and the relation of zemindar and ryot (within which categories almost every individual in the country might be included) was left to arrange itself, or to be determined by the new courts of justice, with the assistance of regulations, which upon this head were irreconcilably contradictory. Lord Cornwallis was bound, by his cherished European theories, to uphold the zemindars, whilst the claims of the ryots were too strong, and his feelings too humane, to permit him to abandon them to the mercy of their superiors. So the former were declared to be proprietors of the soil, in the fullest sense of the term; whilst it was attempted, at the same time, to limit their demands for rent, and to preserve the right of occupancy to the ryots and under tenants. The consequences were such as might have been anticipated: endless quarrels and litigation,

* *History of British India.*

springing from this bitter root, have descended as heirlooms to the present generation.*

The same want of forethought characterised the introduction of the new system of police. It was, no doubt, absolutely necessary to deprive the landholders of the large jurisdiction which they had always enjoyed, and as uniformly neglected or abused; but this end might have been fully attained without the destruction of those subordinate institutions which had considerable affinity to the proposed plan, and might easily have been amalgamated with it. In practice, the magisterial power would have been greatly strengthened by the maintenance of those institutions on an improved footing; the expense would have been trifling; and the government would have secured to itself, by the strongest ties, a large body of retainers in the very heart of the native communities. In very many instances, lands had been allotted from time immemorial in every village or pergunnah, for the support of guards, constables, or watchmen (for they were variously designated); and it was either through mere carelessness, or from a vague and most groundless persuasion, that the stipen-

* The following extracts from a MS. dispatch, from the Bengal Government, in the Judicial Department, dated 22d February, 1827, will serve to show how enduring the effects of this legislative solecism have been, and in how great a degree Lord Cornwallis' improvidence has tended to neutralize the benefits of his own institutions, and the exertions of his successors.—‘ But as having a far more extensive operation than all the foregoing causes, we are led to ascribe the alleged inadequacy of our civil tribunals in the lower provinces to meet the demands upon them, to the precipitation with which the permanent settlement was carried into effect, without previously defining the relative rights and interests of the zemindars, and other landholders, and the various classes of the cultivating population; or without providing such means as would have enabled the courts of justice to ascertain those rights and interests, by recourse to recorded documents in those controversies, which form, directly or indirectly, not only the most numerous, but often the most embarrassing of all the questions which are brought forward in judicial adjudication.’—‘ The real pressure upon our tribunals, arises from the mass of litigation connected with the rights, tenures, and interests of the proprietors and occupiers of land. This pressure could not, we apprehend, be removed by any modification in the nature and description of our tribunals. It is now too late to apply a remedy to an evil which might have been guarded against when the permanent settlement was formed; but it is and will be our anxious wish to adopt such measures, both in the revenue and judicial departments, as may be feasible, with a view to define the rights and interests of the cultivators, and to secure those rights.’

diary force of the state would be found adequate to the prevention of crime, and the apprehension of offenders, that these assignments were mixed up with the mass at the time of the permanent settlement, or were left to be subsequently appropriated by the zemindars. The consequences were very serious; for the magistrates were not only deprived of the zealous services of a large body of men, exceeding 100,000 in the Bengal provinces alone, who might have been permitted to hold their service-lands from government, upon a tenure of good behaviour; but many of this formidable fraternity threw themselves into the opposite scale. 'When they were deprived of their lands,' says Sir Henry Strachey, 'a great number of them naturally became 'decoits,' (gang-robbers.) 'The instruments of extortion, the 'plunderers of the ryots,' (as employed by the zemindars to 'collect their rent,) 'being already robbers, the change in their 'occupation was not great.' Those who have merely heard or read what gang-robbery is, or rather was, in Bengal, will concur in lamenting that so dreadful a scourge should have been perpetuated and increased by oversight or precipitation.

But after every allowance is made for all these offsets, a very brief enquiry will suffice to show that the institutions in question contained a great preponderance of good. 'We did establish 'one system,' says Sir Henry Strachey, (whom we quote as one of the ablest and most unprejudiced of the retired servants of the Company,) 'and imperfect as it is in practice, no law 'or institution, no measure of any sovereign, in any age or 'country, perhaps ever produced so much benefit. The advantages of our system are beyond all praise. The Eastern people 'have had wise kings and just judges. We have heard, no 'doubt, of particular acts of signal equity, and of great skill in 'detecting injustice among them; but never had they a consistent; 'uniform, judicial system; a set of tribunals to which the people 'might resort, and, without regard to the personal character of 'the judge or ruler, depend upon obtaining justice. This great 'blessing may be said, with strict truth, to have been unknown in 'India till conferred upon it by the English East India Company.* Such were the merits of the plan in the opinion of a distinguished functionary, who witnessed its developement, who was personally engaged in the execution of its details, and who has spoken, as the *Fifth Report* will testify, more bold and unpalatable truths with regard to the defective parts of it which fell under his observation in their earliest and most aggravated form,

* *Selection of Papers*, vol. ii. p. 59—60.

than any one whose sentiments have been given to the public. For straightforward earnestness of purpose, energy and clearness of style, there are very few writers who excel him; whilst he is second to none in knowledge of the subject under discussion, and in the benevolence and enlargement of his general views.

Many of the errors which we have noticed or hinted at were owing to this, that Lord Cornwallis was unable to bring his mind down to the low level of the morality and intelligence of those for whom he had to legislate; and, consequently, the system was in many respects too refined for the people for whose benefit it was devised. Candour cannot visit such miscalculations with any harsh censure, however deeply we may deplore their effects. No expansion of mind, no general knowledge of mankind, nothing indeed short of a long and close personal intercourse with the natives of India, in the abject condition to which they had been reduced, could have led a British statesman to suspect, for example, that even the higher classes connected with the soil would have preferred the scourge or the rack to the sale of their estates, in the event of default, for the liquidation of arrears of land revenue. There is no question that if they had been consulted, and could have foreseen the manner in which the new system would work, they would have chosen coercion, however cruel or degrading, rather than the milder process, with its irrevocable results. The same mistake of aiming too high, and making the first step too long, materially affected other parts of the system. There seems to have been a hope at least, that the community, as soon as it recovered from the more paralysing influences of anarchy, extortion, and general misrule, would have made some efforts for its corporate improvement, and thus relieved the hands of government from a portion of its heavy tasks. Up to the present hour, however, it has remained inert; and though the successors of Lord Cornwallis may be blamed, with some justice, for the tardy and parsimonious application of direct and cogent stimuli to the deep moral lethargy of their subjects, it must be confessed that their labours have been always incessant—often eminently philanthropical; and that they have been beset in the path of improvement, by difficulties and discouragements of the most mortifying and depressing nature.

Those who speak lightly of the labour of moral regeneration, have studied the records and philosophy of human nature to very little purpose. A brief experiment upon any given *roué* of their acquaintance, would be quite sufficient to qualify the presump-

tion of their tone. As there are notoriously many individuals so foolish and vicious that it is impossible to serve or save them, we see no reason to question the possible reduction of nations to a condition of analogous degradation. Lord Byron's enthusiasm did not prevent him from observing, and this too with reference to the Greeks, that 'even under the wisest government, the regeneration of a nation can only be the difficult work of time.' History presents us with a hundred examples of the onward march of nations from a rude and primitive state to free institutions, combined with the blessings of civilisation, for one in which an effectual stand has been made against the demoralizing and degrading effects of despotic power and superstition. Ferocity and ignorance are bars to improvement which even individual genius has sometimes proved competent to break down on behalf of a people; but there is a degree of moral emasculation which renders re-invigoration almost impossible.

If it be asked, therefore, why so little advance has been made, up to the present day, towards the reorganization of the social system, even in those provinces of British India which have been longest subject to our sway, the answer is in great measure contained in the sketch that we have hastily traced of the state of misery and degradation, political and religious, in which we found our subjects. We must take into our estimate, (to borrow the apt language of Mr Mill,) 'the extreme difficulty of distributing justice to a people without the aid of the people themselves;' and 'the utter impracticability, under the present circumstances, education, and character of the people of India, of deriving from them the aid which is required.' We must enquire in what degree the vices which slavery has rendered endemic and universal, (falsehood and perjury in particular,) have tended to neutralize the most strenuous and honest endeavours, whether made by government or its servants, to better the condition of a people whom vice and ignorance, superstition and oppression, combine to render untrue to themselves.

There is no axiom more self-evident, nor one more frequently appealed to, than that which designates truth as the great bond of society. 'Mankind must trust to one another,' says Paley, 'and they have nothing better to trust to than one another's oath.' Where this security is wanting, the legislator builds upon a quicksand, and the reformer gropes in the dark: there is no foundation-stone for the social edifice. On examining the Reports furnished by the servants of the Company, and the Charges delivered by the Justices of the King's Courts at each of the three Presidencies, they bear one melancholy burden: No de-

pendence can be placed upon any native evidence where gain is to be acquired, a friend is to be served, or an enemy is to be destroyed, by false testimony. ‘Men of the first rank in society,’ observes a Judge of Circuit in 1802, ‘feel no compunction at mutually accusing each other of the most heinous crimes, and supporting the accusation with the most barefaced perjuries.’* ‘In every case of dacoity brought before me,’ says another officer of the same rank, at a period somewhat later, ‘the proof rested on a written confession given in evidence at the trial; and I regret to add, that all those confessions bear the marks of fabrication.’ The public records afford materials for the multiplication of these instances to any extent. Those who are curious in perjury, will find ample confirmation of our statement in the reports given in the Calcutta newspapers of two capital charges tried before the Supreme Court in the month of August last. The prisoners in both cases were acquitted. The jurors, being apparently in utter despair of eliciting the truth from the mass of irreconcilable evidence before them, took the course which naturally suggests itself as the safest to men under such bewildering circumstances. But how are the laws to be asserted, crime and outrage suppressed, and the well-disposed protected, in a manner satisfactory to European feelings, if (as an Englishman, who was examined in one of the cases referred to, deposed) false witnesses to any amount are to be procured in the interior of the country at two shillings a-head?

Such were the people whom we undertook to govern; such was the body from which the instruments of government were to be selected. The difficulty that presented itself in an insuperable shape to the great mechanical boast of Archimedes, was felt in its full moral force by the rulers of British India;—they had no independent site for their engines. Beyond the small number of European functionaries at command—too many of whom, it must be added, were deeply imbued with the lax principles which obtained under the former *régime*—no exertion or ingenuity could furnish the government with agents in any degree superior to the general level of the community. Throughout the Eastern world official venality is an indigenous vice. To administer justice with such men as judges—to conduct the details of police, through such machinery, without inflicting greater evils upon the people than the crimes which it was proposed to suppress, was found to be a task of intense difficulty. ‘In employing the

* *Fifth Report.*

‘ natives of India,’ says Mr Mill, ‘ the government can never reckon upon good conduct, except when it has made provision for the immediate detection and punishment of the offender.’ Hence the necessity of incessant watchfulness on the part of the English functionaries, and the consequent waste of valuable time and energy; hence, in spite of every precaution, frequent injustice, malversation, and abuse of power. Is it wonderful that the wheels of improvement should have moved heavily through such obstacles; and that zeal should often grow faint from mere sickness of heart? ‘ It is mortifying,’ writes the Chief Secretary at Madras, upon the discovery of some gross abuses on the part of the principal native officers of a court of justice under that presidency, ‘ that all the endeavours in which the government has incessantly persevered during a course of years, for the purpose of protecting the people against violence and oppression, of securing to them the enjoyment of their rights and property, and of instilling into their minds just notions of the principles by which the British dominion over them is intended to be regulated, should, throughout a large province, have been entirely frustrated by the schemes of two worthless individuals, intent only upon the acquisition of dishonest gains.’ Thus it is, that low cunning may often counteract the operations of moral machinery, however great the skill that devised, or the talents employed in conducting it.

The Selection of Papers from the Records at the East India House, published some time ago by the Company, and the Minutes of the Evidence taken last year before the Committee of the House of Lords, enable us to lay party pamphlets on one side, and to approach this enquiry with some degree of confidence in the materials upon which our judgment on the past, and our opinions with respect to the future, are to be formed. For it is but justice to those concerned to admit, that the papers appear to have been selected for publication with a great regard to fairness. We cannot detect in these massive volumes any thing resembling an attempt to keep blotches out of sight, to palliate errors, or to bolster up this or that system. Again, they who study the Evidence with attention, and observe the general bearing of the questions, especially when an interrogatory professes to embody a former answer as given by the witness under examination, and to pursue it to its consequences, will not complain that any undue favour to the present rulers of our Indian empire is the characteristic of our Parliamentary Committees. Here, then, we may feel satisfied that we have firm ground under our feet. However, the great discrepancies

of opinion, which the voluminous papers in question present, call for wary walking. Even with regard to facts, there is much contradiction and inconsistency, as might, indeed, be expected, considering the number and character of the many minds through which our information comes refracted. Mr Rickards, for instance, asserts, at page 500 of the Evidence, that 'our system of police exhibits perhaps the strongest proofs of failure as regards our Indian administration;' whilst we gather from other authority of equal weight, that it is 'perfectly efficient' for the punishment and prevention of crimes; that crimes have diminished both in magnitude and number; that the police in the Lower Provinces is 'very greatly improved' of late years; that, in the Upper Provinces, it is 'good;' and that 'the circumstances of the country, and the immense size of the jurisdictions, considered, the police in India cannot be held to be inferior to that existing in any part of the world.' On referring to Lord Hastings's Minute of the 2d October, 1815, now lying before us in manuscript, we find that nobleman expressing his experimental conviction, that the system in force under the Supreme Government, 'is fully equal to the effectual performance of all the duties of police, which follow the actual perpetration of a crime;' and that, with regard to its powers of investigation, and the apprehension of offenders, 'it must be acknowledged, where the magistrate's control is able and active, to fall very little short of the best organized system of Europe.'

But of these differences, wide and irreconcilable as they appear, a very sufficient explanation may be given, which will serve at the same time to correct or neutralize many other errors, into which the Evidence, in its naked form, is calculated to mislead the public.

There has been, in the first place, a practical annihilation of time and space, which, agreeable as it might prove to absent lovers, has the most mystifying and perplexing effect upon subjects of enquiry like the present; and, secondly, the natives of India have been spoken of, even by those whom experience should have taught better, as if the subjects of our mighty empire in the East were a single people, with uniform habits, prejudices, and feelings. Thus, to fix at once upon an illustrious offender, Sir Thomas Munro asserts, that 'there can be no doubt that the trial by punchayet is as much the common law of India in civil matters, as that by jury is of England;' whilst it is notorious, that, in very many extensive provinces, the system is merely known by name; that, in others, it has never

differed in practice from arbitration of the simplest character ; and that, to quote the language of the Bengal government, ‘ though it may have existed at some distant period, it has been ‘ long forgotten and disused throughout almost every part of the ‘ territories subject to the ordinary regulations of this presi- ‘ dency,’ which probably contains two-thirds of the whole population of British India. From the carelessness with regard to date and place, which we have mentioned as the primary source of error, things past and things present have been mixed up in almost inextricable confusion ; and our Indian government has not unfrequently been called to plead at the bar of public opinion to charges, founded, indeed, upon facts, but facts which have long ceased to exist beyond the pages of official records.

‘ The mule,’ says the Spanish proverb, ‘ was a good mule, ‘ but he’s dead.’ Our systems of police did, at one period, exhibit proofs of failure, strong enough to justify the terms in which Mr Rickards has spoken of them ; but twenty years have elapsed since the tide turned, though that gentleman has neglected, seemingly, to watch it. We have already explained the circumstances of difficulty and constraint under which Lord Cornwallis broke up the ancient institutions of the country in this great branch of internal administration ; and have shown in what respects oversights and precipitancy were permitted to vitiate the wholesome elements of his plan of reform. But the causes which then induced a farther relaxation of the bonds of social order, already loose and feeble, and which occasioned a painful increase of the more violent crimes, have long ceased to operate. Many of them were, perhaps, only the temporary convulsions which a body politic so unhealthy must have experienced from the most judicious change of system. At the present moment, the police is, we are convinced, the most effective arm of our Indian government. We find it stated at page 64 of the Evidence, that ‘ the ‘ average of dacoities’ (gang-robberies) ‘ of late years, is about as ‘ one and a fraction to seven, as compared with the state of things ‘ twenty-five or thirty years ago :’ and that ‘ in the district of ‘ Kishnagar, formerly most notorious for dacoities, that crime ‘ has decreased from an average in former years of 250 or 300, ‘ to 18 or 20.’ Authentic official documents are now lying before us in manuscript. They enable us to form accurate notions of the ratio in which the more serious crimes have been suppressed. The subjoined tables refer exclusively to what are called the Lower Provinces of the Bengal Presidency, but the population of the country, included within those limits, can scarcely fall short of thirty millions.

	Total Gang Robberies.	Total Wilful Murders.	Of Violent Affrays.
Average of each year, from 1803 to 1807, inclusive	1481	406	482
Do. of do. from 1808 to 1812, do. . . .	927	326	204
Do. of do. from 1813 to 1817, do. . . .	339	188	98
Do. of do. from 1818 to 1824, do. . . .	234	123	30

There is not much information in the Evidence hitherto published, with respect to the state of crimes and police in the territory subject to the government of Madras, nor have we means at hand for supplying the deficiency. But as regards Bombay, we have the unexceptionable testimony of Mr Mount Stewart Elphinstone, who answers, in reply to the question, ‘Is it an efficient police?’ that, ‘considering the nature of the country, which is very full of hills, and woods, and places where robbers can find refuge, it is good; but’ (he adds) ‘there is a great want of public spirit in the people, and they are afraid of accusing robbers lest they should be acquitted, and they might be in danger from their violence afterwards.’—Evidence, pp. 289—90.

The ‘want of public spirit in the people,’ of which Mr Elphinstone complains, has been felt with paralyzing and discouraging effect in other parts of India. Lord Hastings remarks, in his Minute of October 1815, to which we have above referred, that ‘a preventive police must depend not only on the skill and vigilance, as well as promptitude, with which the stipendiary force of the state is directed, but also on the energy of individuals in their respective stations of life. The hired arm of the police must necessarily be limited both in its extent and effect. Its principal support must come from society itself; and the opportunity should not be missed of observing that hitherto in this country it has had no such aid.’—And at page 185 of the Evidence, we find Mr Robertson, a distinguished public officer, ascribing the defective character of the police about the years 1810 and 1812, to the reluctance of the landed proprietors to co-operate with it;—it was ‘the want of will,’ rather than ‘the want of influence,’ to strengthen the hands of the magistracy, for the general benefit of the community.

The fact is, that the police has been well conducted of late years, because in that department European energy and intelligence have been brought to bear most directly upon the people; and because those qualities and that superiority, being exerted for the suppression of crime, have proved, in the long run, too strong for the vicious propensities and habits of the ill-disposed portion of the inferior race. In other words, the police, though formed of native materials, yet acting under English guidance

and control, and with combined and uniform power and objects, has achieved exactly such victories, in its own field of operation, as our disciplined battalions of sepoy, trained and commanded by Englishmen, have invariably gained over the rabble armies of their countrymen. There is not, we believe, a single instance upon record, in which a magistrate of common activity and acuteness has been baffled, for any length of time, in his endeavours to put down the more violent and heinous offences against person and property; with the exception always of murders committed under the influence of jealousy, superstition, or prejudices of caste; and we are fully persuaded that our Indian government possesses the means of carrying the improvement to far greater lengths than it has yet attained. It is well known, that with respect to gang-robbery in particular, the appointment of a zealous and energetic magistrate to a district which has suffered severely under that dreadful scourge, is uniformly followed by a decrease of crime within that particular jurisdiction; and, with almost equal certainty, by a corresponding augmentation of the numbers of robberies in those adjoining districts where the police is least efficient. In all such instances, in a case where so large a share of the happiness of their subjects is at stake, the government should be prepared to act with decision and firmness. Every magistrate who allows gang-robbery to increase under his authority, should be removed to some situation of minor importance and responsibility. The simple existence of such a state of things, when an educated Englishman, with ample means and appliances, has to cope with no more formidable antagonists than the imbecility and small cunning of feeble and ignorant Asiatics, is in itself sufficient proof of his incapacity. With such a Civil Service as they possess, our Indian governments can never be in want of efficient magistrates; and we trust that none of that 'false compassion,' which, as Burke truly remarks, 'aims a stroke at every moral virtue,' will be permitted to shelter the unworthy or incompetent, at the expense of the native community. Our remarks of course are not intended to apply to those gang-robberies which are perpetrated by marauders from independent states, who often visit our dominions, disguised as merchants or pilgrims, for purposes of plunder; but setting aside those occurrences, we are persuaded that if the government acted with strictness and impartiality on the system which we have suggested, the calendars might be lightened one half, with respect to the crime in question, in the course of five or six years. We are equally sure that such a plan would carry with it the cordial sympathies of every honest and zealous public servant in India. The rest need not be consulted.

But whilst the police has been greatly improved of late years, and whilst every day strengthens the hands of the magistrate, within whose jurisdiction a generation, bred up in habits of peace and order, is silently pushing its lawless predecessor from the stage, the administration of civil justice has not kept pace with the other blessings of good government. In this department there has been a manifest failure. The expression which has been used—of a denial of justice—would convey something more than the fact. Nor has any very palpable effects upon the superficialities of society been produced. But the failure is quite sufficient to call imperatively for anxious investigation into the causes of so serious an evil, and for our earnest endeavours to provide and apply a remedy.

The principal cause of failure admits of easy exposition. With numerical strength utterly unequal to the task, we have endeavoured to administer justice to many millions of people, of whose habits, customs, associations, and feelings, we have of necessity a very limited acquaintance. This has been attempted through the exclusive medium of European agency, in all the higher departments of judicial office, and in all cases of importance. To increase the disproportion between the demand for justice, and the means of dispensing it, our plan embraces a series of appeals, regular or special;—since the latter, whatever may be the letter of the law, are practically admitted on the slightest grounds. The direct effect has been to overload the files of every court of appellate jurisdiction (and three, if not four, stand in that relation to those immediately below them in the scale), with voluminous proofs, varying with the length of appellants' purses, and the vigour of their obstinacy. As an indirect consequence, the litigious spirit, congenial to the natives of India, has been rendered still more eager and restless, by a system which affords to each party so many distinct chances of success.

The natives have been largely employed in subordinate judicial offices; but the state of the civil files throughout the provinces subject to the supreme government, place it beyond question, that the European judges have either retained more business in their own hands than they are capable of executing, or that there is some defect in the system which prevents its working satisfactorily. Under the presidency of Madras and Bombay, the native judges appear to be more trusted and more trustworthy; the fitness and the distinction probably acting and reacting on each other.

Nevertheless it can scarcely, we think, be doubted, that whatever be the causes, the people of central and western India have more moral aptitude for the judicial office than those of the

provinces subject to the government of Bengal. For whilst Mr Elphinstone speaks of the conduct of the native judges under the presidency of Bombay as 'highly satisfactory' (and he is borne out in this opinion by Sir John Malcolm and the most intelligent public officers who have served in the quarters above indicated), the Evidence demonstrates that men who have enjoyed equal powers and opportunities of observation, in other parts of India, have been led to form conclusions of a very opposite character. Mr Jenkins, who for many years acted as administrator of Nagpoor, during the minority of the prince, is asked, 'What was the opinion you were led to form regarding the probity and efficiency of the native officers?' He replies, 'With regard to their efficiency, we always found officers sufficiently qualified to perform the duties assigned to them. We took the officers, generally speaking, as we found them. We were careful not to exact too much from them in the way of probity, hoping that in the course of time, seeing we were resolute that they should be as pure as we could make them, they would improve.' And again, 'I had every confidence in the natives, generally speaking, *so far as they were strictly superintended and looked after.* We could not expect to find, after a total want of all government, which had taken place before we took charge of the country, that there should be great probity or great honesty in the natives.' But the servants who have been employed more immediately under the supreme government speak in a more decided tone. At pages 60 and 65 of the Evidence, we find the following questions and answers recorded:—'Where they [the natives] have been in the receipt of suitable salaries, have they proved trustworthy, and equal to the duties imposed upon them? They are certainly equal, in point of abilities, to any duty.—Have they proved trustworthy, as far as your observation goes? They require very great and constant vigilance and superintendence. I do not think that a native is to be trusted without that.—Did the Sudder Ameens in general administer justice satisfactorily? I believe so, when they were well superintended: all native agency depends entirely upon that; and, speaking entirely upon personal knowledge, I never knew a native who could otherwise be trusted.' (Mr Ross Mangles.) At page 84, Mr Courtney Smith, a judicial officer of great experience, is asked, 'As far as you are enabled to form an opinion of the character of the natives, and their competency, do you think they are competent to higher situations than they have hitherto occupied?' He answers, 'I think they are clever, shrewd men; but their character is open to suspicion. They are intriguing, generally, and supposed to be corrupt.' And at

page 89, the same gentleman gives the following evidence: ‘Do the natives discharge the duties that attach to them with accuracy and ability? I think they are certainly accurate and able.—As much as Europeans would be under similar circumstances? Quite so, I think; but I stop short at accuracy and ability.—You mean that you exclude integrity? I think that a very suspicious point.’

The witnesses, whose evidence we have just quoted, whilst they evidently agree with Mr Jenkins, in regarding the demoralized condition of the people as the principal cause of their unfitness for high and responsible office, and for judicial situations in particular, concur in opinion, that the British government has neglected to use the proper means to obviate the natural difficulties of its very peculiar situation. For whilst there are many hundred situations in which unprincipled intelligence may reap a golden harvest, and whilst native officers are daily acquiring great wealth from venality and extortion, in despite of every check that our ingenuity has yet devised, and notwithstanding the greatest possible vigilance on the part of their European superiors, yet not a single prize has been held out by us for moral excellence. We have never made it worth a native servant’s while to be honest. We have placed him, with a miserable salary, in a situation where he is absolutely beset with temptations; and though we have apprized him, indeed, of the consequences of detected delinquency (not very formidable in a land where public opinion extends no farther than to brand the corrupt judge, or the peculating officer of revenue, with the folly of being found out), yet—that is all. Nothing farther has been attempted, by way of enlisting his interest on behalf of official uprightness. The committee ask Mr Mangles, ‘If they [the natives] were well paid, do you think they would be trustworthy?’ He answers—‘More trustworthy, certainly. *The experiment has never been tried, but it ought to be tried.*’ Mr Smith says, to the same purport—‘Government thought, in Lord Cornwallis’s time, that even European integrity might be increased and secured by increase of salary. I suppose it is pretty much the same with regard to the natives.’—‘The natives,’ says Sir Henry Strachey, ‘hold no judicial offices but the lowest, and are paid very ill. It is only since the Europeans were well paid that they themselves became trustworthy.’—*Judicial Selections*, vol. ii. p. 67.

Taking the moral condition in which we found the natives of India as a starting post, it was evidently a much more easy task to train them up into efficient officers of police, than to fit them for the administration of civil justice. Every tree is not capable

of being fashioned into a Mercury, but a garden god may be hewn out of the rudest log. A subordinate officer of police may be guilty of occasional lapses—it may require, indeed, the most unceasing watchfulness, on the part of the European magistrate, to compel him to do his duty under circumstances of temptation; yet, by able management, good service to the state may be, as it were, extorted from him. But such hands are very ill qualified for the exercise of judicial functions; for it is not only more difficult to keep them clean, as the wealthy suitor is generally prepared with far greater powers of seduction than the burglar, or gang-robber, but the very means that are employed to guard against corruption, or to facilitate its detection, have a direct tendency to destroy the usefulness of the judge whom it is deemed necessary so to hedge in. The natives of India, with very partial exceptions, have the most deep-rooted suspicion of each other. Official venality, however gross, is scarcely regarded as a crime, unless it be attended with extortion of a very heinous character. This, they know, is a universal sentiment; and they have, therefore, the most absolute distrust of the principles of those among their fellow-countrymen who are elevated to the judgment-seat. It is clearly far beyond the power of any government at once to obviate these feelings. Submissive as our Indian subjects are, the governor-general cannot compel them to place that reliance upon the integrity of their brethren, which it is admitted on all hands that the English servants of the Company have personally won for themselves. Every check which it is thought necessary to impose upon judges selected from the body of the people (and we do not find that any who have written or spoken on the subject think that such safeguards can be dispensed with), in as much as it would manifest a want of confidence on the part of the ruling power, must foster and abet the suspicious habits of the community, and thus tend still further to enhance the difficulty of dispensing justice through the medium of native agency.

Yet, though we by no means underrate the difficulty of effecting it, we are persuaded that it is by native agency alone, under very active superintendence on the part of English officers, that justice can be satisfactorily administered to the vast population of our Eastern empire; growing, as it is, in numbers, and advancing in civilisation and wealth. With every year the wants of the people in this respect will increase. As more land is cultivated, more business transacted, more engagements entered into—as dormant rights become more valuable or better understood—as lawless violence is suppressed, and as intelligence becomes more generally diffused, with respect more par-

ticularly to the terms of equality on which the British government is disposed to meet its subjects in the courts of law ; so, in exact proportion, are measures imperatively called for to raise the judicial supply to the present level of the demand ; and to provide that the one shall keep pace with the other for the future. As a first and indispensable step, the emoluments of lower judicial offices must be raised to such a degree, as to give the natives who fill them all the respectability in the eyes of their countrymen that official salary can confer, as well as to elevate them above every-day temptation to corruption. They must be placed in such a situation, that, except under very peculiar circumstances, honesty will really be their best worldly policy. No pains should then be spared to render a delinquent really infamous. We need not be told, that we can no more *force* feelings of disapprobation and contempt, than we can create confidence ; but still something may be done to lead popular opinion. When the new system was fairly introduced, and notice of the public rights and expectation under it declared, wherever severe examples should afterwards appear expedient, no secondary considerations ought to be allowed to interfere with the interests of the community at large.

But it is not upon these grounds alone that we would urge the necessity of holding out some prizes really worth attainment as objects of ambition and enjoyment to our native subjects. Waving the justice of their claims, we need not repeat what has been so often insisted upon regarding the anomalous character of our rule—the wide discordance of our religion, habits, and manners, from those of every class of our subjects ; and the consequently obvious wisdom of employing every available expedient to reconcile them to our sway, in order to give the greatest possible number a direct interest in the permanence of our power. But, as Mr Elphinstone truly remarks, ‘ it is generally the effect of ‘ our institutions to break down the upper class’* of society. We must therefore exert ourselves to counteract this tendency, by placing both power and distinction within the reach of the well-born and well-educated. The necessity, at the same time, of making them sensible of their entire dependence upon British ascendancy, is what we are not likely to forget. For to give our native subjects education, or even to place it within their reach (and we cannot now withhold it if we would), whilst we deny them the fair and honest gratification of their ambition, is to

* Evidence, p. 286.

light the fire, and get up the steam with the one hand, and plug up the safety valve with the other. There are still other considerations, higher and holier than any that mere policy can dictate, in behalf of the moral obligation of training up our Indian fellow-subjects, by gradual steps, to a capacity for self-government. Humanly speaking, their liberation from the thralldom of superstition, and their reception of the doctrines of liberty and light, are incompatible with their present condition of political degradation.

Such is a brief outline of the axioms by which, if we would act justly and wisely, one part of our future conduct towards our Eastern empire should be regulated. To us they appear as self-evident as any principles of policy can be. Yet, such is the power of professional prejudices over some minds, that Sir Edward Hyde East, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, has proposed a plan, which, besides all other objections to it, provides for the permanent exclusion of our native subjects from every judicial office of trust or emolument.* And not only so, but they are to be exposed, even in those situations which our narrow policy has left open to them, to competition with the locust flight of barristers and attorneys with which Sir Edward proposes to darken the land. English advocates are to be admitted to plead in the Mofussil or District Courts—Sir Edward ‘will not say in the place of’ (the country may be safely left to judge between them), ‘but in addition to, the ‘native pleaders;’ because ‘the very regulations which the ‘government, at the suggestion of the courts, has been obliged ‘to make, to guard against their ignorance and corruption, sufficiently declare their general incapacity, proneness to extortion, ‘and degraded condition.’ So, to mend the morals of the present race of pleaders, their scanty pittance of bread is to be taken out of their mouths; and in order to raise the better educated classes in general from their ‘degraded condition,’ we are at once to proclaim our conviction of ‘their general incapacity,’ in the form of a sentence nearly tantamount to general incapacitation. Sir Edward proceeds with admirable *naïveté*, ‘the only ‘remaining difficulty would be in respect of the present native ‘practisers: these might be retained till they dropped off. For some ‘short time, their utility in causes would be obvious, in the best ‘of them, on account of their intimate knowledge of the language and habits of the suitors, and of the peculiar customs and

* Evidence, p. 145, et infra.

‘ laws of the provinces. Others of them might be appointed to
 ‘ inferior situations about the courts; and moderate pensions,
 ‘ under special circumstances, would compensate other reasonable
 ‘ claims, if any, upon the government. Occasion of jealousy in
 ‘ future, if such should be found to arise, would be done away
 ‘ by admitting native candidates also to the bar, and to act as
 ‘ solicitors, who choose to educate themselves for such functions,
 ‘ as before, with the acquirement of English in addition to, or in
 ‘ place of, Persian.’—p. 151.

The papers from which we have made the foregoing extracts are appended to Sir Edward’s evidence. He informed the committee when he tendered them, that ‘ the greater part
 ‘ of those observations were written after he had been upon the
 ‘ bench two years.’ During that time, the chief justice had probably never travelled twenty miles from Calcutta, nor acquired a colloquial knowledge of any Oriental language. But he writes, he tells us, under ‘ strong belief,’ however acquired, ‘ that the present system cannot long go on;’ and he hopes that this ‘ truth may not be learnt in a more unpleasant manner.’ Fifteen years have elapsed since these gloomy anticipations were committed to paper. They have never been realized, it is true; but that can scarcely be the fault of the learned judge: for if ever a man be qualified to estimate the character and wants of many different nations—all subject, indeed, to one foreign power, but spread over a vast surface of country, and as distinct in manners, habits, and feelings, as Greeks and Germans, Spaniards and Frenchmen—it must be when he has resided two years in the metropolis, in that familiar intercourse with the visitors from the distant provinces, to say nothing of the unsophisticated baboos of Calcutta, which judges of the Supreme Court, who speak no language but their own, are so well fitted to maintain.

How these opportunities were improved, one quotation from Sir Edward East’s papers will demonstrate. Our readers will not fail to remark the support which his opinions receive from the highest authorities. ‘ The Hindoos being peculiarly
 ‘ desirous of arbitration (which is noticed in Sullivan’s Tracts
 ‘ and other works,* and is confirmed by my own experience),

* Here is another specimen of the errors into which the vague generalities so frequently indulged in by many writers upon subjects connected with India, are calculated to seduce the uninitiated. Mr Sullivan’s aphorism was probably intended to apply exclusively to the natives of a particular district or province, and within such limits was no doubt correct. Sir Edward, catching at support, has been misled by some unguarded expression into dogmatizing upon the feelings of an hundred millions of souls in the lump.

‘ his jurisdiction’ (that of the barrister, judge, and magistrate) ‘ should be bottomed in that mode of proceeding.’ Now Mr Orme informs us, speaking probably of the natives of the coast of Coromandel, that ‘ that pusillanimity and sensibility of spirit, which renders the Gentoos incapable of supporting the contentions of danger, disposes them as much to prosecute litigious contests. No people are of more inveterate and steady resentment in civil disputes. The only instance in which they seem to have a contempt for money, is their profusion of it in procuring the redress and revenge of injuries at the bar of justice. Nothing can be more adapted to the feminine spirit of a Gentoo than the animosities of a lawsuit.’ ‘ We know,’ says Sir Henry Strachey, ‘ that the inhabitants of Bengal consider a lawsuit as the remedy for every dispute which arises among them. In vain we exhort them to any sort of arbitration: they are satisfied only with the decision of a court, which they look upon as a command from a master or sovereign. I may add, that they almost always appeal when the cause is appealable, if they can pay the expense attending the prosecution of such appeal.’ These two exceptions cut huge cantlets out of the grand total of ‘ the Hindoos;’ and, if it were worth our while, we could sever other limbs from the body by a similar process. But it may afford some satisfaction to Sir Edward East to learn, that though the natives of India are not, generally speaking, so ‘ desirous of arbitration’ as to authorize hopes of the realization of that part of his plan which is ‘ bottomed in that mode of proceeding,’ there are large and most important provinces where litigation is happily at so low an ebb, that the condition of the lean notary, in the *Fortunes of Nigel*, would be very marrow and fatness compared with the tenuity of the barristers and attorneys who depend upon it for their livelihood. Thus it is that wholesale legislation resembles coat-making by contract;—even the battalion companies are marvellously ill fitted; but the grenadiers cannot force themselves into the vestures that are allotted them, and the drummer boys are lost in the folds of their garments.

But as there are many who see in a large exportation of lawyers to India, the great panacea for all delays and defects in the administration of justice, it may not be amiss to devote a few lines to a question which seems to want only a slight sifting to set it at rest.

Some knowledge of jurisprudence, and a knowledge of the people, are necessary qualifications in a judge. A European resident in India is more likely to acquire the one than an English barrister the other. Justice cannot be administered to the

Hindoos, without acquiring not only the language,—for that is a task comparatively easy,—but a knowledge of their institutions, prejudices, superstitions, and moral and domestic economy. And this is not to be picked up by any man in a moment: indeed Sir Henry Strachey seems to doubt whether any European officer of our government, whose station necessarily debars him from familiar intercourse with the people, can ever advance beyond the most moderate attainments in this respect. At any rate, those who are best qualified to estimate the difficulties of the task, concur in opinion with respect to the length and labour of the necessary apprenticeship. ‘Employ all civil servants at *first* in the revenue line,’ says Sir Thomas Munro, ‘not merely to teach them revenue business, but because they will see the natives under their best forms, as industrious and intelligent husbandmen and manufacturers; will become acquainted with their habits, manners, and wants, and lose their prejudices against them; will become attached to, and feel a desire to befriend and protect them; and this knowledge and feeling will adhere to them ever after, and be most useful to them and the natives during the rest of their lives.’ Mr Courtney Smith is asked, at page 93 of the Evidence, in rather ‘leading’ terms,—‘Do you not think that it would be an advantage that the education of a judge in the Zillah Courts should be exclusively professional?’ But he answers, ‘No, I do not see how it would be an advantage that it should be exclusively professional: his knowledge of revenue, for example, is of great use.’ And at page 39, Mr Fortescue replies to the question—‘Has a person, educated wholly in the judicial department, that knowledge which will enable him to decide the revenue cases that will come before him?’—in the following terms: ‘I think not; I think no judicial officer can be a good one who has not commenced in the revenue department.’ We may rely upon these answers with the greater confidence, because they were delivered without the slightest reference to the question which we are arguing, as regards the employment of homebred barristers in the Mofussil Courts of justice.

Under existing arrangements, the several local governments can always command competent knowledge and abilities for the higher judicial appointments. They have a large field for selection, and every member of the body from which the choice is to be made, has served under their eye from his youth up. Thus not only the talents and integrity, but the habits of business and industry, the energy and judgment, and, what is even of greater

importance, the disposition towards the native population possessed by each candidate, can be weighed with the greatest accuracy against the qualifications of his competitors. There is no service in the world where real merit is so certain to command success without the aid of patronage or fortune. We fear that Sir Edward East's scheme will scarcely possess this recommendation in its favour.

Our limits will not allow us to enter at length upon the Panchayet question. It is the less necessary, as we gather both from the Evidence and Selections, that not a few even of the disciples of Sir Thomas Munro have virtually abandoned the position which they took up in the first instance. The warmest eulogists of the system at the present day go no farther than to declare, that under the judicious and jealous superintendence of an English officer, the Panchayet may be rendered an efficient instrument for general purposes of civil justice; and that with regard to all questions of caste, ceremony, and usage, or the settlement of those complicated accounts in which Indian money-brokers rejoice, it possesses considerable advantages over any other form of administration. This, however, is but to 'damn with faint praise,' when we compare such measured commendations with the terms formerly used by Sir Thomas Munro. 'There can be no doubt,' he said, 'that the trial by Panchayet is as much the common law of India in civil matters, as that by jury is of England. No native thinks that justice is done where it is not adopted;'^{*} and, acting under this strong impression, when the reform of the judicial system at Madras was intrusted to his hands in 1815, he introduced a regulation, 'to call into operation the ancient institution of trial by Panchayet, and to render the principal and more intelligent inhabitants, as well as the heads of villages, useful and respectable, by employing them to administer justice to their neighbours.'

Trial by Panchayet was thus formally recognised as a part of the common law of the country under fixed and definite rules; and means of resorting to it were provided at a lower charge than any other legal process. The results were as fol-

^{*} There is much to the same purpose, or even stronger, in Sir Thomas Munro's Reports; and the Court of Directors appear to have adopted his opinions, without enquiry or discrimination.

laws. Suits decided by native agency exclusively, under the Presidency of Madras :—

Native Judges variously designated.		Punchayets.
1817, . . .	65,940 . . .	362
1818, . . .	54,181 . . .	272
1819, . . .	53,398 . . .	132

Total native Judges, 173,519.

Total Punchayets, 766*

These returns furnish the most absolute practical demonstration, that the inhabitants, even of those provinces of our empire, where Punchayet is indigenous, whatever may have been their taste at a former period, now entertain a very decided preference for the mode in which justice is administered by their countrymen in our courts. There are papers also before us of a much later date, which prove that the ancient procedure is falling into still further desuetude. The Government of Bombay wrote to the Court of Directors on the 31st of May, 1826, in the following terms :—‘ The fact represented by the collector of Poonah, that Punchayets are less resorted to than formerly, deserves attention. This which appears to be the case elsewhere, as well as the great increase of the demand for justice, we are disposed to attribute, in a great measure, to the improved system of administration by which it is brought near every man’s home, and is of speedier operation.’ The sanguine theory, therefore, which regarded the formal recognition of trial by Punchayet, as the very descent of Astræa upon British India, may now be viewed as exploded; and we must look to other measures—to the larger employment of native judges, upon more liberal allowances; to a modification of the existing laws of appeal; and, perhaps, to the legislative council of natives, suggested by Mr Rickards, even for that gradual amelioration of the present state of things, which sobriety of judgment will authorize us to anticipate.

Upon these fertile topics, however, we must not enter at present. We find, indeed, that we have not left ourselves room for more than a few cursory remarks upon the subject of colonization.† Yet it is a question not to be disposed of lightly.

* Selections, vol. iv. p. 46.

† This is a loose expression: but it would sound pedantic to talk of capitalization, whilst any longer periphrasis would be inconvenient. Yet none but capitalists could advantageously resort to India, and few, if any, will do so, with the intention of taking up their permanent residence there. Until we can alter the climate, we must be content to be mere sojourners in our noble dependency.

Whilst we earnestly hope to see the noble field which British India presents, thrown open, under the slightest possible limitations, to the knowledge, enterprise, and industry of our countrymen; and although we are firmly convinced that such a relaxation of the present system would be productive of benefits to our native fellow-subjects, in a degree vastly preponderating over any admixture of evil; nevertheless, we cannot close our eyes to many difficulties, which, if they be not obviated by preliminary arrangements, will go far to vitiate the whole measure, and convert a blessing into a curse.

In truth, the opponents of colonization have manifested but small acumen in their selection of arguments for the defence of existing restrictions; and have shown still less of that wisdom which should prompt those who find themselves attacked in a weak position, to draw back into stronger ground, even at the expense of some concession. They have iterated and reiterated statements respecting the absolute immutability of Hindoo prejudices, and their hatred alike of innovation, and of men who kill cows and peacocks, and wear hats and breeches, mingled with denunciations of danger, which, for vagueness and mystery, might do honour to the oracle of Delphi. But none of those blessed with this insight into futurity, have descended from their lofty generalities; still less have they been so practical as to indicate how the perils in question are to be qualified, or a change of policy effected with the least inconvenience and hazard; provided the legislature be determined (their vaticinations notwithstanding) to permit the free residence of British subjects in the interior of our Indian empire. As they evidently do not understand the strength of their own case, we must take leave to say a few words on their behalf.

The real obstacles to colonization are to be found,—first, in the extreme difficulty of devising and executing a code of laws, civil and criminal, suitable and applicable alike to the natives of British India, and a large body of British settlers, and the manifest impossibility of dealing, in this respect, with each class distinctly; and, secondly, in the nature of landed tenures throughout India, as regards the concurrent rights and immunities of the several classes connected with the soil, and also the Hindoo laws of inheritance.

Sir William Jones has truly said—‘That laws are of no avail without manners; or, in other terms, that the best legislative provisions would have no beneficial effect even at first, and none at all in a short course of time, unless they were congenial to the dispositions and habits, to the religious prejudices, and approved immemorial usages of the people for whom they

‘ were enacted.’ Now it would obviously be a hopeless task to frame laws congenial alike to Hindoos and Englishmen ; and yet, if the latter be spread over India in considerable numbers, and mix with the people in all the various relations of life, as buyers and sellers, landlords and tenants, masters and servants, it will be equally impracticable and unfair to administer justice in one form and spirit to the many, and in another to the few. If an English planter, for instance, be the aggressor in a violent affray, attended with bloodshed,—(and the natives of the Western provinces in particular are easily provoked, and, when excited, prodigal of life to a proverb,)—will it not be an act of monstrous injustice to send him down to the Supreme Court in Calcutta, for trial before a jury of his own countrymen, and to compel the aggrieved party to undertake a journey of eight or even twelve hundred miles, to support the prosecution ? In a case of breach of contract, or an action of trover, on the other hand, how will the British settler relish a settlement of the matter at issue by the judge of the Zillah Court,—a gentleman in a white jacket and trowsers,—according to the most approved doctrines of the Hindoo Shasters ? How, again, will native officers of police deal with refractory Europeans, leagued together, though in inconsiderable numbers, to oppose the execution of the laws, in any part of the country, remote from a military cantonment ? Further, it must be evident that all these difficulties will put on a very aggravated appearance, when the British government shall perform its imperative duty of employing native agency in the higher and more responsible branches of judicial administration.

If, therefore, India be thrown freely open to British colonists, great concessions and sacrifices must be made either on one side or the other ; and, policy apart, justice dictates very plainly from which party they ought to be demanded. The condition of our Indian empire is vastly different from that in which we found North America and Australia. It is a country densely peopled and highly cultivated ; every acre of land is already appropriated ; and whilst we are fully justified in availing ourselves of our dominion over it, to the fullest extent compatible with equity, our legislature is under the most solemn obligations not to allow any feelings of national arrogance to interfere with the effectual protection of the people who have submitted to our sway. Those Englishmen, therefore, who choose to transport themselves and their capital thither, must be content to leave many of their rights and privileges at home, like the Breton nobleman’s sword, till they have earned wherewithal to return and reclaim them. For the people in whose land they purpose

to settle, and who will, doubtless, be greatly benefited by such an infusion of European intellect and energy, under judicious regulations, possess minds just as ill qualified to participate in English institutions, as their stomachs to digest the food to which our climate and habits of exercise have accustomed us. That they may be led up to a much higher capacity for such inter-communion, we hope and believe; but the steps, and more especially the earlier ones, must be short and cautious; and in the meanwhile, as our moral diet would be absolutely destructive to our native fellow-subjects, British settlers must submit for a time to be fed with their spoon meat.

In the Evidence, we find Sir Thomas Strange asked, ‘Do you think it would be possible to place Europeans and natives on the same footing in the provinces, and to make them amenable to the same courts?’ And the learned judge replies, ‘I certainly think the general administration of justice in the Provinces ought to be according to the laws of the natives exclusively.’ P. 471. Mr Rickards, who undoubtedly stands quite clear of all suspicion of a bias in favour of antiquated prejudices, with regard to the fragile nature of our tenure of dominion in India, would make submission to those laws, on the part of settlers, a ‘condition’ upon which alone ‘they ought to be suffered to reside in the interior.’ ‘Every one,’ he adds, ‘who resides in a foreign country, necessarily subjects himself to the laws of that country; and I see no reason why Europeans in India should not be subject to the laws of India, if those laws were passed with due consideration to the rights and interests of those intended to be governed by them, and finally scrutinized and confirmed by the legislature of this country.’ P. 504. Here is a rebuke, from the mouth of a doctor of their own sect, for those who have spoken and written, as if colonization were a spell-word to charm away all evil elements from the administration of our Indian empire, and as if the bare fiat of the legislature were all that could be required for the efficacy of the incantation.*

But the peculiar institutions of our subjects with respect to the tenure of landed property in particular, and the feelings with

* Mr Mill has alleged that colonization will afford us the means of employing a number of intelligent Englishmen, settled in the provinces, in the magistracy and police. This would be true, and a strong argument in favour of the measure, if justice to the legitimate claims of our native subjects, whom we have too long excluded from a fair participation in the advantages of official employment, were not a higher consideration.

which they regard their hereditary rights in the soil, present another serious obstacle to colonization upon an extensive scale. For if the settlers desire to raise produce in large quantities, at such a price, and of such quality, as to compete in the markets of Europe with the exportations of the West Indies and America, they must either become the proprietors of estates, or, at least, possess themselves of such a hold upon them, as may place the complete control of the cultivation in their hands. Money would secure these advantages in other parts of the world; but in India, which is, and always has been, almost exclusively an agricultural country, the social relations are of so singular a character, that, wherever our fiscal greediness and clumsy legislation have spared them, landed property, in the meaning which we attach to the term, can never be at the disposal of an individual. There are exceptions of course,—as in the case of land held free of revenue, and tilled by its owner in person; or of those parts of estates which zemindars, in some districts, retain in their own hands, and cultivate by hired servants. But, generally speaking, rights are so interlaced, there are so many concurrent liens upon every estate, and this theory of property is so completely borne out by existing circumstances, that the English colonist will find it a matter of extreme difficulty to push cultivation to any considerable extent,—especially if he wishes to introduce a new crop or a new system,—within limits sufficiently confined to enable him to superintend it in person, or to work up the raw produce upon remunerating terms. For it will readily be understood, that the end in view can never be attained through the occupation of a number of small patches scattered over a wide tract of country. Such, doubtless, are to be purchased in every part of India; but then the settler must have almost as many factories as acres; and the ruinous expense of his establishments would effectually exclude him from those markets where alone there is any regular demand for his crops.

‘The landed property in Upper India,’ to quote Mr Robertson’s evidence, ‘may be said to belong to the community of the village. One man is often the senior and managing owner of the village, though, in many cases, he has several recorded partners and colleagues. These individuals obtain, either by descent, or sometimes by their personal influence among those of their own caste, a superiority in the village, and the management of its affairs. Those of their family and caste have certain privileges, and certain portions of the produce; and then, again, the other lands are let out to men sometimes in the same village, sometimes in the neighbouring village, while certain

‘portions and certain rights are possessed by the different craftsmen or artisans; such as the schoolmaster, the washerman, the watchman, the carpenter, the blacksmith, who have each a right to a certain share in the produce of the soil.’ (Evidence, p. 200.) Mr Robertson illustrates his statement, by an anecdote relating to the ‘managing owner’ of an estate possessed in the coparceny described. It had fallen into arrears of revenue, and ‘had been put up to sale for a balance of 700 rupees due to the government; and as no purchaser appeared, it was bought in by the government at a nominal price.’ The villages subscribed to raise the amount of the balance,—some of the poorer contributing as little as two or three rupees: the sum was thus made good, and the manager restored to his situation, at the request of the community. Some time afterwards this man abused his trust, and sold the estate to a Mr Maxwell, an indigo planter of Anglo-Indian descent. The coparceners disputed his right to sell more than his own share, and brought a suit before the judge of the district (Mr Robertson) to cancel the deed of sale. A decision was given in their favour, and the principal villagers evinced their feelings of gratitude, by pursuing and apprehending some mounted robbers who had committed depredations in the vicinity of the estate. The Nizamut Adawlut ordered ‘a very handsome reward’ to be given to the person who particularly distinguished himself by his public spirit upon the occasion; but in the meantime, the Civil Court of Appeal reversed the decree of the judge of the district; and ‘the very man upon whom the superior criminal court in Calcutta had ordered the reward to be conferred, went at noon-day into the house of the man who had sold the village to Mr Maxwell, dragged him out into the street, and cut his head off, and then absconded across the Ganges, and I suppose, went to join the robbers in the country of Oude.’

We speak deliberately when we say that there are thousands upon thousands in British India who would have taken vengeance, equally prompt and bloody, under similar circumstances of wrong. We are not, of course, defending the murderer; but the attachment to the soil of his native village, and to the little community with which his own rights and interests are inseparably bound up, stands in the place of patriotism to the native of British India; and violent as the ebullitions of these feelings are sometimes shown to be, they are not unmingled with powerful elements of good. Experience has proved that when once this link is broken, the Hindoo of the agricultural order either sinks into apathy, or becomes a ‘broken man;’ reckless of his

own life, and unsparing towards others. Very few members of this middle class will be tempted to dispose of their hereditary property in favour of British colonists. Larger zemindars who are less rude and simple in their habits and feelings, who are frequently in embarrassed circumstances, and who have sometimes little if any personal connexion with the soil, may be found more accommodating; but then they can confer upon the purchaser no rights beyond those which they themselves enjoy. These will often appear to be strictly limited even in practice; and since the full exposure of Lord Cornwallis's grand error, the leaning both of our courts of law and of the executive government has been most decidedly favourable to the sub-proprietors and actual cultivators of the soil. Whenever the settlement in the provinces under the supreme government has been revised in conformity with the provisions of Regulation VII. of 1821, the immunities of the humblest individual connected with the land have been recorded in the most complete and unequivocal manner. Enquiry, indeed, has been so busy of late years, that those rights are far better understood both by natives and Europeans than at an earlier period of our rule; and many able men have not scrupled to avow their conviction, that the zemindars in most parts of India are mere upstarts, whom we have raised to their present eminence, through our ignorance of the validity of the claims of others.

It will obviously be extremely difficult to buy, if no one is empowered to sell. The zemindar indeed can dispose of his rights to collect the rental of the estate; the coparcener can sell his individual lien upon the village; and the ryot (though not, *perhaps*, without the consent of the zemindar) may confer upon the settler his privileges of cultivation; but the deed of the one cannot affect in any manner the immunities of the other. The ryot, for instance, has by law a right to cultivate his land as he pleases, and this right is in no respect vitiated by the transfer of the superiority. The colonist, therefore, who buys a zemindary with the intention of cultivating sugar, cannot compel the growth of a single cane beyond the limits of the land which the former possessors held in their own hands; and we are by no means certain that such tenures are either common or extensive. Again, according to that canon of Hindoo law which obtains in those provinces of British India, to which, on account of the superior character of the climate, colonists will principally resort, 'a man in possession of ancestral real property, though 'not under any tenure limiting it to the successive generations 'of his family, is not authorized to dispose of it without the

'consent of his sons and grandsons.'* And our courts, including even the King's Court in Calcutta, are bound to administer justice to our native fellow-subjects in strict conformity with their own laws and usages.

Still, we are bold to avow ourselves as warm advocates for the colonization of British India, as those whose zeal for the attainment of the object has been but sparingly mixed with knowledge of the means. For this much, we think, is certain; that however fair the prize before us may be, ignorance of the difficulties that lie in the way will never help us to obtain it. There are some, indeed, to whom abuse of the Company appears to be the only end in view; and to such persons, of course, it is a matter of small moment what delusions their statements give rise to. For ourselves, we trust that we are influenced by much higher motives; and, therefore, we have not feared to state what we know to be the truth, at the expense, perhaps, of a few sanguine anticipations. More sober men, however, will thank us; for the lets and hindrances which we have described, are such as, we are convinced, may easily be modified or removed, when the wise and temperate of either party shall leave the declaimers to their vocation of darkening counsel, and apply themselves in earnest to the task of achieving a grand national object, without compromising our own honour, or the welfare of the people of India.

We have purposely abstained from mixing up mercantile considerations with our estimate of the East India Company's government of the British empire in the east. We see no reason why we should revile the successors of Aurungzebe, because we would wish to cheapen tea. We are persuaded that even a cursory examination of the Selections and Evidence will undeceive not a few who have imbibed prejudices against our Indian administration. We are not to be told that many of the witnesses are, or have been, servants of the Company; and that consequently the testimony which they bear to the general wisdom and benevolence of the measures of government, and the great and increasing prosperity of the country, is to be received with suspicion. For, the Selections, the Fifth Report, and other documents already in the possession of the public, contain abun-

* We quote *An Essay on the Rights of Hindoos over Ancestral Property*, by Rammohun Roy, an Indian gentleman of Braminical caste, and extraordinary talents and acquirements, who is now on a visit to this country.

dant proof, that, regarded as a body, the servants of the Company are the most plain-spoken of placemen; and that in very many instances, some of the most eminent have not hesitated to protest in the most earnest terms against the proceedings of the local government, their immediate superiors.

With respect to the feelings which the natives of India entertain for their British rulers, evidence of the most unquestionable character has lately been laid before the public. Burckhardt visited Mecca as a pilgrim; and whatever may have been the suspicions of the Pacha of Egypt or his sons, the safety with which he perambulated the tomb of the false prophet, in the midst of his bigoted disciples, is a conclusive proof that he was considered a true Moslem. He tells us that those Mahomedans from India, with whom he conversed, or whom he met at the ports on the Red Sea, spoke invariably of their Christian masters in the same language and spirit. They hated and reviled their religion, as a matter of course; and seem to have used no very delicate terms of ridicule with reference to European habits of social intercourse; for in the eyes of a Mussulman, women unveiled, and shaking hands with their husbands' friends, and swine within the sacred precincts of a mosque, are almost equal abominations. But they uniformly praised the public conduct of the English, and spoke of their government as just and liberal. Those who are acquainted with India, need not be told that this anecdote furnishes an argument *a fortiori* with regard to the disposition of the Hindoo population.

If the Company's administration were free from great offsets and drawbacks upon any approximation to positive goodness, it would, indeed, be very unlike any government that ever existed on the face of the earth. It has committed many errors and oversights; but it has had to struggle against many difficulties of situation. Plato held that the Supreme Being made the world as faultless as he could, but that the obstinate pravity of matter compelled him to admit much evil into his plan. We have endeavoured to indicate some of the disorderly and mischievous elements which the rulers of our Eastern empire found loose and intractable in the social chaos of that fair land, which seemed destined by nature to be the garden of the world, but which the evil passions and gross idolatry of man had almost converted into a howling wilderness. It would require a volume to discuss the subject, in all its branches, fully and freely. For the present, we must take leave of it, and must allow the Revenue department, and other topics, to remain untouched.

ART. IX.—*Friendly Advice, most respectfully submitted to the Lords, on the Reform Bill.* 8vo. London: 1831.

THE admirable temper with which this short Tract is written, well merits the praise which it has received from all but the violent and bigoted enemies of Reform, and accounts for the impression which it is said to have made upon the public. There is certainly no subject of more deep, we may say awful interest to the country at the present moment, than the question which it undertakes to discuss; namely, what conduct ought the Peers to pursue with respect to the Reform Bill?

That the Lords are likely to be much less favourable to this great measure than the Commons, is a proposition which may be laid down with great safety. The narrow majority which voted for the second reading, has been prodigiously extended by the bold and wise measure of Dissolution, and the results of the General Election. Before proceeding to contemplate the gratifying spectacle which these results exhibit to every lover of his country, and her institutions, let us pause for a moment to reflect upon the system of unwearied, oftentimes no doubt the wilful, misrepresentation which preceded, and we verily believe brought about, that great event.

The King's Ministers had brought their measure forward with all solemnity and previous notice. They had openly stated that their Sovereign approved of it; that it had been fully submitted to him in its details; and that he had maturely considered it. Any person of candour must have perceived that his Majesty was well inclined to the Bill; otherwise he never would have allowed the Government to bring it forward as their own measure. Any person of ordinary charity, to say nothing of feelings of merely decent respect towards the Monarch, must have thought it wholly impossible that a Prince, so fair and open in all his dealings, should lend himself to the course of duplicity plainly imputed to both the King and his Ministers, by the supposition, that he allowed the Bill to be brought in against his will. Any man of common sense ought to have known, that neither King nor Minister in this country was very likely to venture upon so hazardous an experiment as introducing a measure interesting to all the people, with the view of having it rejected. And yet rejected it must be, if so propounded as was insinuated. In truth, those anti-reformers—monopolists of all loyalty—with one ceaseless cry of 'Church and King' on their lips, for the purpose of preserving their own power at the ex-

pense of both, did neither more nor less than impute to their gracious Sovereign the design of letting his Servants propose the plan, in order that his Parliament might reject it. They everywhere gave out that the Bill was not acceptable to the King; and, by this most unfounded aspersion, they succeeded in lessening the majority in its favour.

A few unprincipled men may have known better than they rumoured abroad, the state of the facts. But we are inclined to think that, on one subject at least, the bulk of the Lords and Commons, who used such language, were the dupes of some artful individuals. Our reason is this: They were of course much averse to a dissolution, because they foresaw its inevitable consequences must be fatal to themselves and highly beneficial to the Ministers. Yet by holding the language, and pursuing the course they did, a dissolution was rendered inevitable, unless a resolution not to dissolve had been taken by the King. Now, such a resolution could only spring from lukewarm feelings towards the Bill; and, accordingly, we believe, many supposed his Majesty to be determined against dissolving, who yet thought him on the whole friendly to the measure. These had not the temerity to say, or the indecency to suppose, that he was hostile, but only that he was not zealously friendly to the Reform. They calculated that he would support it; and support his Servants in every thing but that which alone could secure them success: they reckoned upon his refusing to dissolve a Parliament which had only sat a few months.

Never were hapless politicians so caught in their own snare. They went on from one violent act to another, heedless of all the warnings that were given, and disregarding every argument of probability which each succeeding day afforded, to demonstrate the good faith of the Monarch, and the firmness of his Ministers. They were resolved to be deceived; and deceived they were. Upon their false information, or upon surmises which hardly deserved the name, they acted; and they consummated the ruin of their hopes. First came their bitter opposition to the introduction of the Bill; but this they rather showed by much speaking than by venturing to divide. They debated it at endless length, with varying fortunes, in the Commons: in the Lords, they made up their minds to a discussion, but lost heart as soon as it had begun, and would fain have retreated from the conflict. The Ministers prevented this, and gave them such a debate as insured an unexampled discomfiture. Then came the second reading; but before it, the remarkable division upon the Timber duties, in which all the enemies of Reform joined, for the purpose of defeating a measure which some of their own leaders had

themselves introduced when in power. There is certainly no instance like this in the history of faction in modern times. We must go back to the days when principle counted for nothing in party proceedings; and when men took up or laid down their opinions exactly as it suited their purpose, in conducting the great contest for places, under the thin disguise of debating the affairs of the nation. A conduct, for some generations unknown among English statesmen, was now resorted to by the Opposition, in order to injure the Reform Bill. The behaviour of Sir Robert Peel, and Mr Herries, upon this remarkable occasion, will not soon be forgotten; nor will they who revert to it fail to mark the humbling contrast afforded to the proceedings of the leaders, by one or two men who had filled inferior offices under them, and who felt compelled, with all their hatred of the Reform Bill, to vouch their possession of something like consistency and public principle, by at least adhering to their own measures of commercial policy, though these were proposed by a reforming administration. There is another passage in recent political history, which will also be recollected as offering to the calm observer a contrast yet more remarkable, and more humiliating to the Peels and the Goulburns. When they, after years of bitter hostility to the Catholic question, brought it forward rather than relinquish their power (this motive their recent conduct entitles every candid enquirer to fix them with), who supported them among the foremost?—the original proposers and firm friends of emancipation, to be sure. They could do no otherwise: As men of common honesty, they could do nothing else. But neither honesty nor consistency required them to agree with the Government of that day, in admiring the weak and effeminate spite of one man, who, from personal hatred of one other man, encumbered the Relief Bill with a provision levelled at Mr O'Connell alone, and exposed the peace of Ireland to be destroyed, in order to gratify a fit of unaccountable and silly spleen. Yet, when the Opposition, we mean the Whigs, saw that the Ministers were deficient in firmness to grapple with those personal feelings, and were resolved to yield them a slavish obedience, rather than lose the great measure of religious liberty, they waved all objections, and joined in supporting the Bill, which, but for their self-denying patriotism, was now lost, and with it the Ministry dissolved.

Again, when the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders afforded those patriotic men another opportunity of opposing and of unseating the Ministers—without the slightest breach of their own consistency, the abandonment of a single pledge, or dereliction of one principle they had ever professed—

they only looked to the success of the great measure of Catholic Relief, and gave their adversaries a cordial support at the risk of their own popularity, and with the certain result of keeping their opponents in power. This it was that made the Duke of Wellington praise their conduct as 'chivalrous.' We call it not so; but we say it was the course which public honesty and patriotism pointed out. We further say, that it was *not* the course pursued in 1831 by those who must have joined their noble colleague in the panegyric of 1829. We go on and add, that if in all the senate -- ay, and in all the country, there was one man more than all the rest owed a debt of gratitude personally to the generous forbearance of the Whig Opposition in 1829, that man was Sir Robert Peel; but we cannot go still further and subjoin, that he took the opportunity of the Timber question in 1831 to repay even any small instalment of that debt. It remains unsatisfied: it was requited with hostility in circumstances that rendered the repayment not only easy but agreeable, and made the contrast we allude to prodigious in the eyes of all men. They who had hoped better things of him are certainly now disappointed; and there is no doubt of his having also failed in securing, even by such conduct, his object of a reconciliation with the party whom he lost for ever in 1829.

When Sir R. Peel in that year abandoned the Anti-Catholic cause, and took the foremost part in carrying the Emancipation, he conferred a great benefit on the country at the cost of large sacrifices to himself. But among those sacrifices, his adversaries remarked, was that of all claims to political consistency, and of all authority and weight in the country; and even his friends could not doubt that he had given up all *possession* of the political influence which he had enjoyed as the High Church champion; though they might hope for an extension of his influence in other quarters. Those who belonged neither to the class of friends or adversaries, the impartial public, deemed the whole proceeding unintelligible and equivocal, though they might rejoice in the results of it. Men were unable to comprehend how a person could at one time resist a proposition which he described as fatal to the constitution in Church and State, with a vehemence fitted for such an occasion, and because of a majority against him, shortly thereafter lend his assistance in carrying the selfsame measure through Parliament. Men could not understand how the same person who this year declared he left office because the Prime Minister was a friend of the Catholic question, should next year himself join another Prime Minister in carrying the whole of the question, and proclaiming they must resign their places if they carried it not. Men seemed to think all con-

fidence in the opinions of statesmen at an end; regarding it impossible to say what evolutions they should next witness performed by public men. Mr Wilberforce, upon an alarm as to West India concerns, might be for reviving the slave trade—or Mr Buxton, upon a Jamaica panic, defend Colonial Slavery—or, upon some misbehaviour of the working classes, Mr Brougham might avow himself the enemy of Education. But what most of all created wonder was, that Sir R. Peel should take such a step, and all the while declare that his whole opinions on the Catholic question and Test Act remained unaltered. To say the very least, he thus placed himself in a situation wholly novel, and full of difficulty; and adopted a line of conduct extremely liable to misconstruction. The memorable words of the historian were frequently cited, who, in recording Marlborough's apostasy at the Revolution, has thus expressed himself:—'Yet even he (Lord Churchill) could resolve, during the present extremity, to desert his unhappy master, who had ever reposed entire confidence in him. He carried with him the Duke of Grafton, natural son of the late king, and some troops of dragoons. This conduct,' adds Hume, 'was a signal sacrifice to public virtue of every duty in private life; and required ever after the most upright, disinterested, and public-spirited behaviour to render it justifiable.' Now, those who most charitably judged the case of the modern convert, admitted that it was, like his of 1688, one which justified a vigilant, and even jealous attention to his future conduct; and when they found him in 1831 pursuing the course to which we have alluded, they could hardly deny that the moment had arrived for looking back upon the dark passages of 1829, as if the light shed upon these made every thing intelligible now, which then might be charitably represented as only mysterious or equivocal.—But we pass on to the effects of the majority gained by such strange means upon the Reform Bill.

The second reading, which, but for that mischance, must have been carried by a considerable majority, was now carried even by a single vote. The enemies of the measure hoped to throw it out; exerted all their energies for this purpose; and flattered themselves that they might 'eat the fruit and live.' The recess at Easter gave them fresh warnings of their danger, in new assurances that they were rushing on to their ruin. All warnings were vain; some foolish persons had spread the notion that no dissolution would happen, whatever became of the Bill. Accordingly, after showing every species of virulence against all the measures of the Government, they succeeded in getting up a motion to change one not very essential portion of the

Reform Bill—a motion which, if lost, would not greatly help the Bill, and, if carried, might be represented either as a defeat of the whole measure, or as immaterial, according to the present view of its contrivers. This is that famous motion which goes by the name of its author, General Gascoigne, then, but not now, member for Liverpool—if, indeed, its real authors were not certain deeper speculators, who, with all their confident assurances that there would be no dissolution, had still a lurking fear which belied their words, and hoped they might be safe in beating the Ministers, even if they should prove to be wrong in what they said about the intentions of the King. No sooner was this very shortlived success of the party announced, than the public had the good sense to see through all such thin disguises. They refused to argue upon the terms of the General's motion. They would listen to no explanations. They would hear of no compromise. Above all, were they justly indignant at the vain and hollow pretence of the anti-reformers—who now found out that they were not anti-reformers—but for a moderate, nay, some said a liberal, and some even a large Reform. Their labour was all they had for the pains they thus took to delude the country. They were the known enemies of Reform, and of the Bill: the Country was the friend of both.

Some little alarm seems, however, to have stricken the stout foretellers of 'no dissolution' as soon as they had, by means of the prediction, gained their point. They were seized with unpleasant misgivings. They had more time to reflect on their own hopeless position. The Ministers *must* dissolve if they could. Should they fail, they must retire in a body. Then, how could the self-same men, whose utter, and notorious, and ludicrous incapacity to carry on the government four months before drove them from office, attempt to return, when their adversaries had gained all the strength conferred by even a temporary possession of power, and the prodigious accession of real force derived from extraordinary favour in the country?—such popularity as no party since the end of the American war ever had possessed;—to say nothing of the wide divisions among the late Ministers, which now made their uniting in office next to impossible. A short delay would now have been very precious to those speculators; but no such breathing-time were they fated to gain. It was in vain that in their alarm, and repenting them of what they had done, they reported the motion of General Gascoigne as wholly immaterial, and said the Bill might still go on—in vain that they even urged the government to overlook it, and proceed with their 'great measure'—in vain that they vowed they were friendly to the principle, but only objected to the details.

Their eagerness to follow up the success on the Timber question had betrayed them; and they now began to be aware of the position into which they had been drawn by false confidence in false prophets, and falsers informants. Of those false stories, the correspondence of several in this city with their political friends in London, would furnish, from all we have heard, very singular specimens; singular for the confidence of the assertions, and singular for their utter falsehood.

The rumours we have been alluding to filled the House all the day after the General's motion; and it was not till the day following that those foolish persons awoke to the sad certainty that they had put a period to their Parliamentary existence. They found that the Ministry had, with their wonted promptitude and decision, resolved upon a dissolution next day; and that their gracious Master fully joined in the determination, which, indeed, he alone could carry into effect. Now the unhappy creatures who on Tuesday night had been all exultation, finding that they had been rejoicing over their own ruin, and triumphing in the success of the Bill, astounded at the dreadful discovery, staggered and reeled about—first like men half awakened in some sudden fire or shipwreck, knowing neither where they were nor what they should do—then, like the frantic let loose, and filling the air with their wild and incoherent screams, they flocked to the House of Commons to impede the supplies; as if to furnish an additional justification of the measure, resolved on, and actually carried, a vote of that description. But it was too late. The Lords were in like manner harassed with their desperate fury. A motion was announced for next day to address the Crown against dissolving. Measures were taken to interpose this, and obtain an address before the King's speech could be read by the royal commissioners. Both Houses were assembled in hopes of carrying this project into execution; in both, the violence of the preceding night's scenes were renewed; and with an exasperated fury in both, which left it very doubtful whether the actors in the Commons fell short of their fellows among the Lords, in the extravagance of their conduct. Still a hope remained that the project of stopping the King's speech and interposing an address might succeed. That hope rested entirely upon the Speech being read by the Chancellor, or by his Majesty in person. Suddenly the thunder of the guns was heard to roar, breaking the silence of the anxious crowds without, and drowning even the noise that filled the walls of Parliament. In the fulness of his Royal State, and attended by all his magnificent court, the Monarch approached the House of Lords. Preceded by the great officers of state and of the household, he

moved through the vast halls, which were filled with troops in iron mail, as the outside courts were with horse, while the guns boomed, and martial music filled the air. Having stopped in the robing-chamber in order to put on his crown, he entered the House and ascended the throne, while his officers and ministers crowded around him. As soon as he was seated, he ordered the Usher of the Black Rod to summon the Commons; and his Majesty, after passing some bills, addressed them. It is reported by those who were present, that the effect will not soon be forgotten of the first words which he pronounced, or the firmness with which they were uttered, when he said, that ‘ he had come to meet his Parliament in order to prorogue it, ‘ with a view to its immediate dissolution !’ He then, with an audible voice, commanded the Lord Chancellor to prorogue, which being done, the Houses dispersed, and the royal procession returned amidst the hearty and enthusiastic shouts of thousands of the people.

Never was joy more sincere, more universal, than that of the capital, and of the whole country, upon this great and important event. Those who wished for the pageant might naturally be filled with its splendour, and occupied with the feelings it was fitted to excite. Even as a common pageant it was striking; but as one in which the court and the people equally shared, and equally exulted—as a procession achieving, while it celebrated, the victory of the most sacred of popular causes, won by Prince and People, over the common enemies of both, it may be pronounced to have been a display wholly without example. For this reason it is, that we have dwelt minutely on its details; and as we have taken due pains to be accurately informed, the reader may rely on the correctness of our account.* But the delight given by this event soon spread over the whole kingdom;—the people of all ranks and of every description were flung into an ecstasy of joy. We will not say with the great, but very partial historian already cited, that ‘ men died of pleasure when informed of this ‘ happy and inspiring event;’ but we may truly add with another, that on seeing the joy and loyalty of the whole country on having got rid of the Parliament which opposed their wishes, ‘ a ‘ man could not but wonder where those people dwelt who had ‘ done all the mischief, and kept the King so many years from ‘ enjoying the comfort and support of such excellent subjects.’—*(Clarendon.)*

* We have had access to letters from several eyewitnesses, and very near observers of the whole.

The same unanimous feeling marked the progress of the elections wherever the voice of the people could be heard in the choice of their representatives. Here again, the speculations of the anti-reformers were as extravagant, as groundless as before. Not all the lessons they had so recently received; not all the brittleness of the experience, not a week old, could wean them from those fond hopes to which they still clung, that Reform, in the end, would fail. They had hoped the Minister would, by the cry within Parliament, be obliged to give up the plan: the plan was persisted in to the second reading. Then they had hoped that the narrow majority at that stage, and the indications of dislike in the Timber duty division, would cause the measure to be changed in the recess: the measure was continued as it had been before Easter. The King, they flattered themselves, did not agree with his servants: he persevered in giving them the most cordial support. But at least he will refuse to dissolve: he dissolved, and in person, with his own lips pronouncing the solemn words that destroyed their dreams, and sent them astounded to their constituents. Still 'hope springs eternal in their breasts;' and as their chief leader said he would meet the freemen with the bill in his hand, and reckon upon the support of those whom it disfranchised, so they all fell into the like calculation; and hoped to find those who gained nothing by the measure, and those who lost all by it, would join in resisting it, and opposing its authors. Again they were doomed to the bitterness of never-ending disappointment: the people covered themselves with as much glory in sacrificing their own interested feelings to the duty they owed their country, as the noblest persons in England had won, by laying upon her altar the willing sacrifice—the costly and precious sacrifice of their borough property and power. The freemen, every one, even those who, from non-residence, are disfranchised by the bill, resisted the wiles of the anti-reformers; rejected with scorn their advances; and returned representatives who pledged themselves to support the measure.

The result has been at once most honourable for the people of this country, and most glorious for the cause of Parliamentary Reform;—indeed, of all public improvement. The general sketch given of it in the following passage of the sensible and convincing Pamphlet before us, may suffice to place the subject in a plain point of view:—

'The General Election, just over, one should think, might convince any reflecting mind how universal this feeling is. The mere numerical returns are sufficient for the argument. But the kind of places which have chosen men pledged to the Bill, and the kind of men who

have so been chosen, cast a light equally strong upon the same matter. For all England there are eighty-two county members. These, if any, are supposed to be chosen by the landed interest—the Aristocracy. In the county elections, if anywhere, is the influence of the House of Lords felt. At any rate, those Lords whom we address as enemies to Reform, cannot deny this; for their argument is, that the influence which they enjoy under the present system will be taken away by the change, and surely they can never mean to rest their power in the House of Commons upon the rotten boroughs, and admit that they have nothing to do in county elections. Well, how many country gentlemen, enemies of the Bill, have been returned to resist it, by the landed interest, under the law of elections as it now stands, and as those Lords are supposed to wish it may always continue? Exactly *six*—or about an eleventh of the whole county representation! What counties return these six? Not Yorkshire—not Lancashire—not Lincolnshire—not Chester—nor Devon—nor Somerset—nor Kent—nor Essex—nor Norfolk—nor Leicestershire—nor Oxfordshire—nor Cumberland; no—but the close-borough counties of Westmoreland—Monmouth—Bucks (where supposed friends to Reform proved more friends to their family interest)—Huntingdonshire, where one reformer greatly headed the poll, and a second night, with all ease, have accompanied him—and Salop, where a gentleman was returned friendly to all other liberal measures, and therefore kindly retained, notwithstanding his unaccountable aberration upon the most important of all. In every one city or borough which has any thing like a popular election, both candidates, and in London all four, were returned in favour of the Bill.

‘The Anti-reformers, following their principal leader, Sir Robert Peel’s example, attempted to gain the freemen, and especially the non-residents, whom the Bill certainly disfranchises. These poor but honest and spirited men indignantly turned away from the appeal to their interested feelings, and joined in declaring for the whole Bill, and for those who would carry it through. See, again, the havoc which the prevailing sentiment has made among the strongest and most anciently established family interests—all have been swept away before the universal tide of reform. The Duke of Newcastle goes to ‘his own,’ but ‘his own knows him not;’ and two Reformers are returned for Newark, where one could not gain admittance a few months before, with all his zeal and all his talents; and in both Basselaw and the county of Notts at large, his grace, who returned two members last autumn, now returns no more. His Parliamentary interest is reduced to four rotten-borough seats, where no man, save himself, interferes. The Duke of Beaufort’s own brother, and his eldest son, justly popular noblemen, and highly distinguished in the career of arms, are both flung out, because they stand against Reform. Their kinsman of Rutland loses both his county seats, and his relative loses both his also at Grantham.

‘The Percy of Northumberland is signally overthrown by the Prime Minister’s son, who, last autumn, had not ventured into the field; and above all, the Lowther influence, against which Mr Brougham had

thrice stood, and thrice stood in vain, when all he desired was to wrest one seat from the "great boroughmonger," is now completely destroyed in all its strongholds. The Lowther member for Carlisle is defeated—Lord Lowther himself yet more signally beaten in Cumberland—and he who would not before listen to one liberal member for Westmoreland, is fain to accept one seat for his own son, in order to avoid the certain loss of both. These are the doings of the Bill, and they are wonderful in our eyes.

‘ But look at the kind of men who professed—for they were compelled to profess—principles of Reform. How happens it that one Mr Peel at Cambridge professes a wish for a liberal allowance of Reform, though not for the whole Bill? How comes it to pass that another Mr Peel, at Newcastle, even pledges himself to the Bill? What made Master Dowdeswell, by inheritance as well as personally against all Reform, give the same pledge at Tewkesbury? What induced Lord Lowther, in Cumberland, to avow himself a reformer, adding, "better late than never;" while his proposer, a Mr Stanley, said, "his noble friend was for a large and satisfactory kind of Reform—such as the people were resolved to have."

‘ The Parliament, chosen by the people in this way, is about to meet, and the Bill is to be introduced forthwith, such as it was last session. It will assuredly be carried up to your Lordships by very considerable, probably by very large majorities. Any majority above one hundred is plainly to be reckoned a large one, because it is formed, after deducting all the influence of all the close boroughs. These boroughs may be good, or bad, or indifferent; they may be fit to keep if you will; they may even have the good qualities which make it necessary to retain them; but one quality they certainly have not—they do not represent any portion of the people—their representatives speak the sense of a few peers alone. Therefore, in estimating the *popularity* of any bill, and in deciding how far its general acceptance in the country ought to weigh with the House of Lords, you must of course deduct the votes of the rotten-borough members, for those show only the opinions of some few among the Lords themselves.’

We should, perhaps, have stated the same matter more concisely, and we venture to think more strikingly, in a single sentence. England returns eighty-two members for counties, of whom seventy-six are pledged to support the Bill; of the members for the great cities and towns, every one is for it; of the other towns, nearly the whole. There remain to resist the wishes of the people six county members, a few Welsh, Irish, and Scotch, and a decided majority of the nominees for rotten boroughs. But Ireland has returned a great majority, even Scotland a majority, for Reform. If, again, we look at the choices made in the late elections, and estimate the force of the prevailing feeling, by the swift punishment which the people dealt out to their anti-reform representatives of the last Parliament, the

result is equally striking. No less than thirty-one members for counties, in England alone, lost their seats for having opposed the Bill; and the General's motion cost about ten Irish, and eight Scotch members, their seats; besides unseating about forty other English members, including the gallant General himself. So that a difference of above 160, upon a division, has been occasioned by the general election; and this, notwithstanding the present most imperfect state of the representation in all parts of the three kingdoms, but especially in Scotland;—notwithstanding, too, the extreme efforts in labour and in money of the borough faction—efforts not to be blamed, any more than they are to be wondered at, when we consider that they were struggles for departing existence.

The eyes of all men are now naturally directed with intense anxiety towards the proceedings of a Parliament thus returned, and sent by an unanimous people to deliberate upon the great object of all their wishes. The desire for a restoration of that freedom of election, proclaimed by the Bill of Rights to be the birthright of the subject, is not one of those sudden, groundless, and passing emotions that have been known to fill the public mind in this, as in other countries, and speedily to exhaust its force, and be felt no more. It is a deep-rooted conviction, which for half a century has been gathering strength, acquiring the consistency of a fixed principle, and establishing itself in the minds of Englishmen as a part of their mental constitution—planted in their understandings, interwoven with their habits, cherished by their feelings, regulating their whole political conduct. At different times, it has seemed only partially alive, yet it has always in reality been spreading and gaining strength. Each succeeding error of the Government has given it new energy, and at each crisis of public disaster, through misgovernment, it has blazed forth suddenly with a light that was temporary; but at all times it has been making its way, gathering force from events occasionally, but deriving its chiefest aliment from the general progress of improvement among a great, reflecting, educated people. The owners of close boroughs, uniting themselves with the wealthy landlords in the country, and availing themselves of the expense entailed by the abuses of the system upon all county elections, have, with the proprietors and magistrates, who returned for almost all Scotland members like those of the closest English boroughs, prevailed for many years, in aid of the weight of the government, to resist the prayers of the people, and pronounce that Reform should be stayed. From the people, the voice has now gone forth with a far louder sound, proclaiming that corruption shall be no more! It is answered by an honest Ministry;

it finds favour with a Prince greatly beloved ; it is echoed by an overwhelming majority of the Commons' House of Parliament : it is then the voice of all who have any constituents—all whose election was not a mere mockery ; it is rejected and resisted only by men who are sent by borough patrons to save by their votes the rights which those patrons hold in defiance of the constitution, and of the wishes, and of the most sacred principles, and the dearest interests of the country. How can such opposition avail ? How can the enemies of the Bill ever expect so monstrous a consummation as the rejection of a measure which all the people have declared for, and all the members vote for, whom either county, city, or large town have chosen ? But, above all, how can any lover of the public tranquillity wish to see the Parliament turn a deaf ear to the desires and petitions of the whole country—nay, of the whole members chosen by the country, in order to gratify the proprietors of close boroughs, and a few scores of Scotch magistrates and landowners ? That the House of Commons will do no such thing, is admitted on all hands. The Bill will pass triumphantly through that House, and be sent up to the Lords.

But then we find the anti-reformers, so often frustrated in their hopes, and foiled in their endeavours to obtain support, look to the Lords for succour ; and, assuming that the measure is hateful to the Aristocracy, reckon upon that Chamber of Parliament throwing it out, in which the Patrician order is embodied. We utterly deny the assumption, that the Bill is rejected by the Aristocracy. Since when, we should be glad to know, have the Dukes of Norfolk and Somerset, and of Hamilton and Argyle, ceased to belong to the Aristocracy, of which they are the very heads ? But are the Dukes of Devonshire, Bedford, Grafton, and Richmond—the Marquisses of Stafford, Lansdowne, and Cleveland—the Earls of Grosvenor, Winchelsea, Manners, Fortescue, Carlisle, and a crowd of other names, as illustrious in descent, as richly endowed with hereditary possessions—are they to be overlooked in an enumeration of the Aristocracy ? The bitterest enemies of the measure always allow, that the voices of the Lords are nearly balanced in point of numbers—in rank and importance there is plainly no comparison at all ; there, the scales preponderate clearly for the Bill, and its enemies kick the beam. But suppose the division among the Lords far less equal than it is either way ; still it must be granted that there is a most important body of the Aristocracy for the measure, and for it without the least regard to their own private interest—nay, in utter disregard of all such motives. The whole balance then results in this, when fairly struck ; The country is for the Bill,

with no division at all—the Commons are as clearly for the Bill—the Government are for the Bill;—the Lords alone are divided, and their numerical majority leans against it. Can this be any thing like a reason for its rejection? If it is passed, you say the Lords have yielded to the rest of the country, and their divided wishes are not consulted. But if it passes not, then the Commons and the country have yielded—their undivided wishes have not only not been consulted, but been thwarted and scorned. Shall a divided Aristocracy decide so great a matter according to the narrow balance of its numerical majority, in defiance of an united people, and a majority, amounting really to unanimity, of its real representatives?

It is the useful object of the well-timed Tract now before us, to direct the serious attention of the Peers to the important duty which will ere long devolve upon them, of maturely considering the great measure of Parliamentary Reform, adopted by the rest of their fellow-countrymen with an unexampled concurrence of sentiments. Heartily and respectfully joining with the author of this address in the feeling of reverence for that august assembly,—as the guardians of the constitution, as a body independent of the people, and who have often shown themselves alike independent of the Crown,—we take leave to add our humble exhortations against the most dangerous of all counsellors in state affairs, because one who is not seldom found in concert with high and noble feelings—pride. How often do we hear men of a gallant spirit say, they will not act as they are desired, because they cannot brook the tone of defiance in which the demand is couched! And truly this principle, upon all ordinary private occasions, is the right one. But even upon such occasions, when a man's own individual interests alone are concerned, it is not always right, or indeed safe, to hear no other adviser. And in fact hardly a year passes over our heads, in which prudence, or justice, or charity, do not step in, to make us comply with requests or demands which are urged in an unbecoming manner. However, that is very far from being the case in hand. Suppose we admit that every man has a right to consult the dictates of a proud spirit only, in his own affairs—how would it be in cases where he is but a trustee or manager for another? We will put a case of daily occurrence. The members of the Bar are no way deficient in spirit—no way wanting in a good opinion of their own rights, or an adequate sense of their own personal dignity. Yet what advocate ever suffers his client to lose his cause, because the opposite counsel taunted him—threatened him—laughed at him—dared him to call a witness, or put a question? He feels that he is acting for another; and that of all things the most dishonour-

able he could do, would be to sacrifice his client's interest to his own feelings. Nay, when that client himself ill uses him—all but personally insults him, treats him with folly, and even with invective—he may decline afterwards undertaking his defence; but while the cause lasts, he will serve the man in spite of himself, and in utter disregard of his own justly irritated feelings. We will put a case yet nearer the point. Suppose one of the Peers themselves, as may happen any hour, while acting for an infant ward, is possibly insulted by the demands of a tenant, or of a suitor of that ward,—would he suffer his pride, however justly offended, to affect in the least particular his conduct in managing the estate or disposing of the person? Say that a young gentleman, a very desirable match for his charge, treats him with positive insult in the very act of demanding his consent to the marriage, whatever other steps he may take to seek the reparation of his injured honour, we venture to say that no man of common honesty would withhold his consent for an instant, upon the sole ground of his own personal grievance.

How, then, shall men invested with a high public trust suffer the suggestions of mere pride to mislead them in the discharge of their most important duties? We are now assuming, that the Lords, whom we most respectfully address, do not feel any insuperable objections to the Bill, but are moved by the consideration, that ill-judging, or over zealous men,—or, if they please, insolent and overbearing men, demagogues, if they will,—offensively menace the Aristocracy, and tell them they dare not reject the Reform; and we are applying ourselves to this topic alone. Our answer for the Peers is, what their own high spirit—their paramount sense of duty, must at once give;—they dare do what their consciences dictate, but they dare not reject a measure, merely because they dislike the language in which its adoption is pressed upon them. Nothing is so foolish as the cry propagated by the interested enemies of Reform, that the House of Lords will lose its importance, and be lowered in public estimation, if they pass the Bill under the influence of alarm; and adopt it, not because they approve its principles, but because the rest of the community is for it. They will lose their importance ten thousand times more completely, and more justly, if they listen to such silly insinuations. It is not a threat held out, but an argument fitly used, to say that all the country besides are for the measure; it is a reason, we do not say a conclusive one, but a strong reason it assuredly is, in favour of any great plan affecting men's interests, that all those for whom they are called to legislate ardently desire it. There is nothing unbecoming in feeling much alarm and apprehension upon great

state affairs. This is not the base fear of personal danger, which no man will confess, and no honourable man will submit to; but the wise and wholesome fear of public disaster, which every man of patriotism, and indeed of sense, will avow that he is ready to be warned and guided by. That the Peers have a right to throw out the Bill is undeniable; the law of the land gives them the right as unquestionably as it gives the King his crown, or the Commons their privileges. But that they are injured or disgraced if they do not exercise the right, is a notion fitter for bedlam than the neighbourhood of St Stephen's. It is a fancy that no man will act upon, but he who is ready to jump down a coal-pit, in assertion of his rights, and in proof that he is not afraid. In fact, these ideas are so absurd, when fairly stated, that we rarely meet them in argument; hence they pass unexposed. No one gives them for the reason of his conduct; but then unhappily many are really and secretly moved by them who put forward other arguments; and we are quite certain, that not a few noble Lords, at this moment, could get over almost all their other objections against the measure, if this were quite out of their way. At the risk of being tedious, then, we must continue our amicable remonstrances; dictated by the most respectful consideration for the real importance and weight of the Upper House—a most essential and invaluable branch of our Mixed Constitution.

Let us only remind them of the events which distinguish the memorable spring of 1829. The Lords had uniformly, and for a quarter of a century, rejected all the bills sent up from the Commons, and negatived all the propositions made by their own members, with reference to an important measure. The lapse of time, the diffusion of information, more mature reflection, and, above all, the course of events, had effected a great change in men's feelings and opinions upon that subject. The popular prejudices had worn away; the excited temper had generally subsided; the public, and many of the leading statesmen, once hostile, had become neutral or friendly; and the majority, though barely a majority, of the House of Commons, had come to a settled opinion, attested by various divisions, that the Emancipation ought to pass. Still there was, amongst the Peers, no appearance whatever of relaxed hostility; and large majorities continued to reject every attempt at carrying the question. If ever the Upper House was committed to oppose a measure, it was here. The votes were recorded, decidedly pronounced against it, and by a balance that seemed to render the renewal of attempts in its favour hopeless. The last of these divisions was at the close of the session 1828. How then, men enquired, was it possible for the same House of Lords to turn round and

adopt the measure so recently rejected? The session of 1828 had thus closed; but the very next session, six months after, opened with a proposition from the Throne, for unqualified Emancipation. The bill now passed the Commons, with large majorities; it came to the Lords; they received it without any feelings of indignation; they took it into deliberate consideration; they discussed it long and ably; and they adopted it by a large majority. Who will venture to say that the Peers injured their character, or lost their constitutional influence, or lowered their rank in the state, or suffered any the slightest degradation, by their passing in 1829, what in 1828, they had rejected? Who will deny that they did their duty, and earned their country's gratitude, by this wise and manly course? But who can tell the consequences that might have followed from an opposite course; or count the evils which would have visited the empire had the Lords listened to the silly advice, often in that day given them, to think of their consistency—to consult their pride—to be above yielding—to refuse the offers of rebels—to scorn the threats of the Catholic Association—to disdain showing fear? The empire would have been convulsed by the loss of the Bill—the Constitution would have been shook from its foundations, by the dreadful collision of its two grand branches;—and the House of Lords, far from gaining character, or preserving its weight in the government, would have exposed itself to the just and grave charge of sacrificing its duty to a vain, weak, and groundless pride; of acting under the influence of a mean and unworthy fear,—the fear of being thought afraid; while it would not listen to the suggestions of that fear of public mischief, which is itself the truest wisdom, and which all honest statesmen are bound above every thing to cherish. How nobly and how appropriately did the advice we are now feebly tendering to the hereditary lawgivers and judges of the realm, come from him who never knew such fear, and was far above listening to the suggestions of false pride! In his place among his peers, when he urged the measure he had so lately resisted, the hero of Waterloo and Salamanca confessed himself afraid—avowed that he dared not face the coming mischief: but the alarm that affrighted him, and from which his firm mind shrank, was a Civil War. It is said, that several Newspaper Editors, and some Clergymen, in different parts of the country, rose nobly above all such apprehensions, being happily endowed with much greater strength of mind.

Let it not then be imagined that we would recommend to the House of Lords any motive, any principle of action, less rational or less worthy of their exalted station, and eminent functions in

the Constitution, than those which guided them in 1829. We are verily persuaded that the public feeling in Ireland was weak and partial compared with the desire of Reform, which pervades the people of Great Britain and Ireland universally at this moment. In 1829, the two parts of the empire were divided; even Ireland was very far from being unanimous; and Britain was, upon the whole, very clearly, though not very intemperately, hostile to the change proposed. Can any man now doubt the union of all voices, in all parts of the country, in behalf of the measure before Parliament? Will the Lords lose or gain in the esteem of their country, by joining the interested and petty minority, and opposing the vehement and prevailing wish?

The most reflecting men have, at all times, deprecated as the last of evils a conflict of the two Houses of Parliament. In 1784 it was held to justify an appeal to the people by dissolution; but then the people were clearly for the side espoused by the Lords; and a House of Commons being returned almost as different from the former as the present is from its predecessor of bad memory, the union of the two Houses was restored. Let us calmly consider what would result from a similar conflict now, and how the government would be conducted in the midst of it.

Suppose the bill is carried by a very great majority in the Commons, (and any thing above a hundred deserves that name, though we may safely reckon upon two), and that the Lords, taking part with the nominees of rotten boroughs and their proprietors, reject it by a majority of twenty or thirty. The Houses are then at direct variance, and upon the most momentous question that ever was discussed in either. No means are left for restoring an agreement between them; this is clear beyond all dispute; it is like the proposition in Euclid, which was derided of old as plain even to asses;—it is a proposition hardly to be doubted by the Cambridge Clergy, who lately flocked to ‘record their deliberate opinion,’ and to show that they differed from all the rest of mankind. To them, however, it may be, that a demonstration of this proposition is still wanted, and we can easily supply it. Let the two Houses differ; then let it be proposed to reconcile them by some change. Either that change must be a new construction of the one or the other. But the Lords’ House cannot be constructed anew, except by many creations; a thing full of difficulty and risk, and which the Lords themselves would hate worse than the Bill. Therefore it must be effected by a new construction of the Commons. But this can only be done by a new dissolution. Therefore let the Parliament be dissolved for the third time in ten months. There

will be another general election. But the electors are unchanged, or if changed, they are only the more steadily bent upon the Bill, and exasperated at the opposition of the Lords. All the present men favourable to it will be returned, and some who oppose will be flung out. At Cambridge, for example, the very persons whom we are now addressing, will *not* vote as they lately did; they will suffer Lord Palmerston and Mr Cavendish to come in. So that the new House of Commons will differ from the Lords by a considerably greater majority than the present one does. Therefore a dissolution will not do. But there is no other way of changing the two Houses. Therefore no means are left for restoring an agreement between them. Which was the thing to be demonstrated.

We have passed over the accompaniments of the new election; we have omitted all reference to popular excitement; we have said nothing of the change of Ministry, which is included in the case supposed; of the votes passed by the House of Commons, indicating their sense of the conduct pursued by the Lords; of the delight with which in times of violence such votes are sure to be hailed by the whole body of the people; of the views respecting the constitution of our hereditary house of legislature and judicature, which the conflict is not unlikely to engender; of the danger resulting from the prevalence of such notions in these times. Neither have we stopt to enquire how the government is to be carried on during this awful struggle; or to ask what manner of men they are who would stand forth to undertake it. This we know, that in November last, the leaders of the present opposition—the hopes of the anti-reformers—left office, unable, in the utter helplessness to which they were reduced, to carry on the government another day. But they were then the objects only of pity, perhaps mingled with respect; and their successors had not then the extreme popular favour which they now enjoy. In the case we are somewhat fancifully putting, of the same men returning to place, they would come back by far the most generally contemned ministers that ever took office; and they would come to a House of Commons, loathing them by a majority of two to one, with a country heartily joining in the same feelings; only backed by a few borough-mongers who shared the general detestation; and with even a House of Lords divided in a proportion which of itself would make it hopeless for any but a popular and a strong Ministry to carry on the nation's affairs. Compared with their situation, that of the Maurepas, the Vergennes, and the other *imbeciles*, who swiftly succeeded each other in the agony of the Bourbon despotism, was fortunate and commanding. Our anti-reformers are fifth, not first-rate

men. They have not the least hold of any portion of the country; and neither their conduct, nor their endowments, nor their firmness of purpose, deserve to have the least hold over any class of men. The people reject them: they have declared against freedom and reform. The press abhors them: they have evinced their fellow-feeling with the tyrants of July 1830, their hatred of the liberty of France, their dislike of the influence of journals,—which means, the influence of public opinion. The very high Tory party, the men who roar out Church and King, when they would make a monopoly of Religion, and a tool of Government—even this faction will not receive them; for they never more can trust the heroes of 1829,—the men who appear to glory in being above all party connexion, and make it a kind of principle to have no fixed principles on state affairs.*

* We allude here to a report of Sir Robert Peel's late speech at a Tamworth dinner. He professes his principle to be, that an English statesman should connect himself with no class of politicians, nor adhere rigidly to any set of principles; but from time to time take his associates and his views according to circumstances.—The Tract before us makes the following remarks on this gentleman, in which, generally speaking, we concur:—‘ Among these shortsighted ‘ men’ (the enemies of reform), ‘ the first place is due to Sir Robert ‘ Peel—a man who had once, in his youth, gotten entangled in a ques- ‘ tion of the like kind, which he afterwards so bitterly repented having ‘ ever touched, and had no right, in his riper years, to commit a second ‘ blunder of the selfsame description. Yet did even *he* show himself ‘ shortsighted enough to announce himself the irreconcilable foe of ‘ Reform, at a moment when all were becoming more or less its friends ‘ —and he stoutly resisted giving to Birmingham the abused franchise ‘ of convicted Retford. This year he has only followed up the same ‘ error—but how deeply does he now repent him of it! How fer- ‘ vently does he wish the last year of his life could be blotted out! ‘ In this wish we must say he has ourselves for partners. His *rash- ‘ ness* has our blame—perhaps, rather our regrets—more than any ‘ thing else. His abilities are valuable to his country—his services ‘ have been very considerable—and it is fit to hope that they may ‘ become again available. But for the present he has placed himself ‘ in a situation where he really cannot be of use to the state, and can- ‘ not gain a good distinction for himself. Already he has faltered, ‘ and displayed the resolution to recede; and thus the very chief of ‘ Anti-reformers betrays, by his wavering, that the tide is too powerful ‘ to be stemmed—and that he is himself prepared to be carried away ‘ before it. Other individuals there be in the like predicament, and ‘ these right many—But “ peace to all such!” ’

In adverting to election speeches, which we do very reluctantly, the fierce and frothy *diatribe* against the Ministry, by Mr North, vented

Such are the Ministry whom the course recommended by their faction to the Lords would inevitably place in office. This is the sort of men whom that wise proceeding would call to the helm of affairs, to pilot our state through the conflict so much desired by wise and well-informed men like the Dukes of Newcastle and Buccleuch; the latter of whom is said to have represented all the people of Scotland as totally ignorant of the Bill, and unable to comprehend it, or to see their own interests; and, truly, they don't quite see them in the same light with his grace. Under the guidance of such men, are we to be launched amidst the wildest conflict of all the political elements. The talents and eloquence of Mr Goulburn, the high fame of Mr Herries, the sagacity and discretion of Lord Londonderry, are to be the reliance of the country for salvation, when the people are loudly, and with one voice, calling for the measures against which these men are pledged; and the House of Commons is opposed to the government by the largest majorities, and the Peers are their only supporters by a small turn of the balance. But this is the consummation devoutly wished by the lovers of the '*conflict*'—this is the *euthanasia* which they desire for the constitution of England. Let us be candid to men whom we widely dissent from. We don't at all believe that the distinguished individuals we have been forced to name—forced by their foolish adherents to name—at least two of them—ever dreamt of any thing so monstrous. They better know their own power, and their duty to the country.

But let us submit one other consideration to the friends of '*conflict*.' The Bill, they say, cannot pass without an agreement of both Houses; nor can the Ministry go on if the Lords oppose them. Take both propositions in their order. Unless the Lords assent, the Parliament cannot be reformed. True;

at Drogheda, merits a word. Truly *he* is a fit person to complain of emptiness and feebleness! He seems in so hot a passion as to have lost his reason. He admires, we fancy, the capacity of the Goulburns and the Twisses, when he roars about an incapable Ministry. This piece of rant, we see by the newspapers, has produced some merriment in London; where it seems to be supposed this gentleman has been chiefly enraged, because coming over with a high Hibernian reputation, of a provincial cast, he found the audience in the English House of Commons incapable of listening to his strains. This is understood, we see, to be the incapacity he really is so very wroth at. But it seems also to be thought, we observe, that no change of either men or measures will ever alter the capacity of the House of Commons in this particular.

but unless the Commons assent, the Parliament cannot be kept as it is. To shut out all change, requires the agreement of both Houses, just as much as to effect any change. This consideration is inseparably connected with the question of 'conflict,' and frequently brings out of conflict, compromise. Again, if the Lords reject the Ministry, they must retire. We have been looking at the consequences of that movement, and assuredly they are such as can afford but little consolation. But there is one effect of this retirement which is so very obvious, that it may possibly prevent it from happening. If this Ministry cannot go on without the Lords, their successors can as little go on without the Commons. Public affairs, say the anti-reformers, will thrive ill if the House of Lords vote against the government, though by a narrow majority. True; but how much better will they thrive under a government against which an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons votes? But it is absurd to speculate upon such things. No government, God be praised, can ever be attempted in this country against the declared voice of the House of Commons and the country, if it had all the Peers in a body to back it. And the Peers are the first to feel this truth; as they would certainly be the first to suffer by supporting an administration universally opposed by the people and their representatives.

These reasons will probably prevent the collision we have been adverting to. But it is justly observed in the Pamphlet which has given occasion to these remarks, that the Lords, at least the honest and respectable part of their number, 'will do well to be 'on their guard against the subtle arts of factious men.'

'These may not venture to attack the Reform Bill openly in front; but they will try to take it in flank. They will not oppose it, or move any thing against it; but they will certainly vote against the Government on every thing else, in order to throw out the Government and the Bill also. They will hardly move an amendment on the address to the King; but they will get up little motions against the Ministers—they will try to throw out whatever is proposed by the Government—they will oppose the Chancellor's Law Reforms, and Lord Melbourne's Subletting Act, and whatever else they can hope to defeat. Let the Lords beware of all such tricks, for tricks they are. All of their manœuvres mean only one thing—hostility to the Reform Bill. The meaning of every thing the Opposition will say, is—"Throw out the Bill!" the meaning of every question they will put, is—"Throw out the Bill!" the meaning of every vote they will give, is—"Throw out the Bill!" They may affirm, and vow, and swear, and smite their breast, shed abundant tears, and heave deep sighs, and call God to witness that they have no enmity to the King's Government; and are not prepared to give any opinion on the Bill, until it comes

before them! Heed them not; turn away the ear from their cry; all they do really mean is to get your votes against the Ministry, and then they reckon on the Bill, the hateful Bill, being lost for ever. All who wish well to the House of Lords and the Constitution must carefully be on their guard against such devices.

We would continue the theme, and pursue this advice, most respectfully counselling the Lords, that now, and even after the Bill shall have passed into a law, they should diligently take the opportunity afforded by a season of general public satisfaction, to cultivate the friendly regards of their fellow-countrymen, 'all the commons of the realm.' Don't let them imagine that they ever can be permanently unpopular with this nation at large, except through their own fault. They may render themselves hateful by an odious use of their property for political purposes: some of them acting in this way, made even the Ballot a favourite—contrary to the order of nature—last year. They may render their whole order hateful; and make its very existence—by separating themselves from the people, and setting themselves up as barriers between that people and the attainment of its dearest wishes—as a mound to be lashed by the rage of popular fury. Such things are possible. But they only are made possible by pursuing a conduct against all precedent, and against all prudence. The Peerage is naturally popular in England. The people are highly aristocratic in their habits and tastes. The first thing a man does when he acquires wealth, is to desire its society, its connexion, even to aspire after its honours; and the constitution wisely favours such views, by throwing it open to all merit and all importance, without any exclusive regard to hereditary claims. Let the Lords cultivate such feelings, and they will retain the favour, only suspended, which they long enjoyed with their countrymen; and they will live to bless the measure that took from them the bad influence of borough patronage, and gave them in its stead their old place in the hearts of the people.

One word more, upon a very obvious course which the enemies of Reform will take to avert their doom, and impede the progress of the Bill. Many are *moderate* reformers, we now find; such a thing as an enemy of all Reform is not to be seen now-a-days—save the firm and honest Duke of Wellington, who was as greatly superior to the rest in this affair as he ever was in every other—not a man of them all but avows himself for some considerable change. Since when, and of what kind, are questions easier put than answered. The most impenetrable silence is kept upon the sort of Reform which these men would substitute for the Bill. There is, however, one thing abundantly clear. As their way of talking now pledges them to

nothing, it leaves them quite free to produce the very smallest *modicum*—the most tiny measure of Reform—and then, holding up their little nipperkin, to call it a Reform plan. The Lords would be worse than self-deluded to fling out the Bill of the Government in the hope of the country's thirst for real Reform being so slaked. One other thing is as plain, and it disposes of the question in this, its more invidious and dangerous form. Any change, however little, must assuredly disfranchise some of the boroughs. Then, they who most stoutly resist the effectual measure of the Ministers, will as stoutly oppose that; and thus, if it is carried against them, they will lose the favourite object of their care, while the country will remain just as dissatisfied as ever. This consideration at once removes all idea of rejecting the measure (which even its enemies admit would satisfy the popular interest, though it may offend the borough interest), in order to adopt one which very certainly would equally disappoint and equally offend both.

Before closing these remarks, we must advert to the high importance of adhering, as far as it is possible, to the arrangements of the Bill, as they have been for two months before the country. The principles of the measure cannot, of course, be altered. That no one thinks of, after the sense of the people has been taken upon them, and members elected pledged to their support. Any change in the details which tend to carry the principles more advantageously into effect, we ought not to reprobate. But, unfortunately, men cannot always agree upon what is detail and what is principle; and one class of persons may, not captiously, but very honestly, think you are altering the principle, when you are only mending the machinery for carrying it into execution. To lay down any absolute or inflexible rule is impossible; but clearly the strong leaning ought to be against change. When the Duke of Wellington proposed the Catholic question, no one disapproved of the course taken, of carrying the Bill through, exactly as it was brought in; and no one thought this a dogmatical and intolerant manner of proceeding. In the present case, that is perhaps impracticable; but it is a precedent worthy of being followed as nearly as may be possible.

- ART. X.—1. *Speech of Robert Monsey Rolfe, Esq., delivered in the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds, on the 2d day of May 1831; on occasion of his being put in nomination at the General Election as a Candidate for the representation of that Borough.* Bury: 1831.
2. *Conciliatory Reform. A letter addressed to the Right Honourable Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., on the means of reconciling Parliamentary Reform to the interests and opinions of the different orders of the community; together with the draft of a Bill, founded on the Ministerial Bill, but adapted more closely to the principles and precedents of the Constitution.* By FRANCIS PALGRAVE, Esq. of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. London: 1831.
3. *An Address to the King, the Lords, and Commons, on the Representative Constitution of England.* By H. A. MEREWETHER, Esq. Serjeant at Law. London: 1830.

A LOVE of change, a contempt for ancient forms and institutions, a carelessness when the rights of property are in question, are among the very last charges which can be laid at the door of the English people. In the year 1817, to the astonishment of civilized Europe, a gauntlet was thrown down in the principal Court at Westminster, and a criminal who was accused of murder was held entitled to defend himself by judicial combat. Whether the dramatic dialogue and scenic representation, by which the conveyance of property, under the form of a Recovery, has been turned into a series of fictions and buffooneries, shall continue to be kept up for the profit and amusement of sergeants at law, is even now a matter of grave legal deliberation. The caution with which our nation has always contrived to get on from time to time with the least alteration that would answer the immediate purpose, has had its disadvantages as well as advantages. But on the whole, from the excellent quality and position of our early institutions, from the plastic skill with which our successive alterations were moulded, adjusted, and applied to the original building, and, above all, from the wonderful good fortune with which events played into our hands, there can be no doubt but that the advantages in favour of our experimental process have greatly preponderated.

Under these circumstances, whenever an occasion should arise of the great body of the English people calling for a change, their previous conduct will have earned for them the presumption that there is good reason for their call. It may be further

presumed that, in case any specific change shall have found favour in their eyes, its proposers were able to show cause for every deviation which it contained from ancient forms and institutions. Above all, valid protection for every thing reasonably entitled to the name of a private right, whether of property or of any other description, must have been indispensable, as a condition precedent to their approbation. It may also, in such a case fairly be supposed, that the public was satisfied that the remodelling of such public rights as needed reforming, had been undertaken, as far as they could judge, on solemn principles and sound analogies, and that the whole proceeding was based upon, derived from, and tending to, no other consideration than that of the public good.

It is our firm opinion, that the character of the English people in this respect is still unchanged; as it is our trust, that notwithstanding all provocations and deceptions, this great national characteristic will remain unchangeable. Late events confirm rather than shake us in our confidence. It is no new theory of the Rights of Man, or of the English Constitution, after which, in their approbation of the Reform Bill, the people are said to have run wild. No exception to the above remarks can be fairly stated to exist in the almost unanimous demand of the middle and lower classes that the House of Commons should really answer to its name,—should become a *representative* Assembly, and representative of the *Commons*. There can be no question concerning the sentiments of the grave Clarendon on this subject, when, notwithstanding his known devotion to every atom of our establishments, and whilst writing with the bitterness of an exile, he felt constrained to recommend the precedent even of Cromwell for imitation. Mr Justice Blackstone, were he now alive, would have perceived no contradiction between the popularity of the ministerial measure of Parliamentary Reform and our ancient reputation for solidity and truth. That ‘orthodox judge,’ as Gibbon justly calls him, lays down the principles of the constitution in utter variance with the practice which we are superseding;* but in complete accordance with the practice about to be introduced. He describes it as a *misfortune* that the deserted boroughs continue to be summoned; and agrees with Lord Chatham and Mr Pitt in the propriety of ‘a more complete representation of the ‘people.’ Accordingly, he must have agreed (unless, as in the case of Wilkes, he could have been prevailed on to contradict

* *Commentaries*, v. i. p. 171.

his own book), both in the *disfranchising* and *enfranchising* parts of the present Bill—in what it takes away as well as in what it gives. After making the same painful distinction, as Montesquieu also was obliged to make, between our theory and our fact, it is impossible to doubt but that Blackstone, were he alive and honest, must have rejoiced in the removal of those ‘deviations and corruptions which length of time, and a loose state of national morals, has too great a tendency to produce.’ Mr Christian, Professor and Judge, and twice as orthodox as even Blackstone himself, lived to superintend the fifteenth edition of these Commentaries. Within the last few years, half a dozen different editors have prepared as many different editions of the work, in the shape of a text book for English magistrates and students. What were these learned writers about, and how comes it that they were permitted, without comment or contradiction, to mislead the young and ignorant whom it was their express office to instruct, if the withdrawal of the summons from deserted boroughs, and the substitution of a more complete representation of the people, is a change which deserves the obnoxious name of *revolution*? If it is not a revolution, what are we to think of Sir Robert Peel, who so designates it? Again, can these writers have been in cool blood, and in their studies, countenancing perjury and confiscation? Probably not; yet election advertisements and speeches are crowded with such imputations. The free-men of Bury are warned to oppose the amendment of the constitution, by their oaths and by their God. Sir Charles Wetherell stuns the House of Commons with the shout of corporation robbery. Mr H. Drummond lectures the freeholders of Surrey not to enter into a political partnership with Jonathan Wild. And the ingenuous disfranchiser of the whole county constituency of Ireland, is reported to have told the good people of Tamworth, that the safety of property was incompatible with *Schedule A*.

Honest men ought to join in protesting against the system of false alarms and fallacies which has been too long and far too successfully indulged in. An object of temporary delusion may be served; but all confidence on the part of the common people, in the understanding or good faith of their superiors, must be ultimately endangered by it. Nothing, for instance, would tend more effectually to destroy the supposed professional value of the political apprehensions manifested by the Church of England at the present moment, than a collection of the occasions on which the cry of ‘the Church in danger’ has been raised during the last century and a half. A more than proportionate reaction is the consequence of detected attempts to impose on our ignorance, credulity, and fears. Under ordinary circumstances, the

difficulties which the common people must encounter in any attempt to get at truth, is a very melancholy consideration. Besides the regular traders in daily or weekly falsehoods, the main arrangements of Parliamentary debate are got up on the principle of scene-painting; with a broader outline, and features more highly coloured than the life. On an occasion like the present, it is surely a most dangerous, as well as violent extension of the privilege of exaggeration, to misrepresent a recasting of political franchises, on public grounds, under such terrible denunciations. The nature and course of the following observations will be proof at least that our defence of the right of legislative interposition, and of the mode which the government is pursuing in it, is founded on more impartial and more comprehensive views than the politics of the day. It is not worth while to define property, and travel through an elaborate analysis, in order to show that the elective franchise, whether attached to an Irish forty shilling freehold, to the non-resident qualification of an individual, or to the corporate character of the members of a corporation, is not *property*. The common sense and feeling of mankind are also agreed on this additional distinction: property, when vested in private individuals as such, and therefore called private property, is held on very different terms and presumptions from property which is vested in persons sustaining a public character, or members of a public body, and which is therefore considered to belong to them solely in that right.

The misrepresentations alluded to call for a few elementary words on the subject of Rights. We know of no sanctuary, or ark, where a catalogue of rights, abstracted from all human circumstances and considerations, has been deposited by nature, and where they are to be found ready arranged and ticketed according to their metaphysical precedence. Man, on a survey of the earth, and of his partners in it, and after an examination into his own nature and condition, must make out for himself the list, and marshal its degrees in the best manner that he can. All notions of God and of conscience must be very different from what reason can undertake to justify, if they are of a kind to embarrass this moral scale by the introduction of any other element or measure than that of the greatest amount of happiness—greatest both in quantity and quality—to which the whole system of Being, within the reach of our conduct and consideration, can attain. The generality of this test is by no means inconsistent with a heraldry of degrees in nature. The very fact that a moral obligation of acting as arbiter in such claims is felt to be imposed on man, as a part of his constitution, of itself marks out his rank among the creatures of the earth. All creation

gains by his interposition. Compare, even as far as the condition of other subordinate animals is concerned, a region cultivated and civilized by man, with one which Providence has not placed as yet under his guardianship and control. The same principle applies in every balance of contending duties, in the case of individual conduct, and in all possible competitions among supposed rights between different members of the great family of mankind. As personal prudence settles the question between higher and lower pleasures within that moral government which every rational man has to establish over himself; so must it be philosophically true,—first, that no case can be made out for the classing any thing whatever under the description of rights at all, which does not, on the whole, contribute to the general happiness of mankind; and next, that no standard of rights can be just originally, or long remain so, which is not constructed, and, as occasion may require, corrected, on the principle of encouraging the formation, development, and protection, of the different sources of enjoyment of which our nature is capable, in direct proportion to the best estimate which we can make of the comparative excellence of these enjoyments.

Natural rights and duties are spoken of in a double sense. In their first and most extensive meaning, they include all the maxims and rules, however obscure and variable, by the observance of which, nature (that is, the earth in its productions, and mankind in their intercourse with each other), can be made to produce the greatest mass of enjoyment. In their narrower sense, the one in which they are ordinarily contrasted with *legal* rights, they mean nothing but those simple propositions which are so intimately connected with, and immediately derived from, the *nature of man*, that they appear to be of universal evidence and application. The difference is perhaps only in degree betwixt these two meanings; but it is often so important as to seem a difference in kind. Cases arising under the first, according to circumstances and occasions, are frequently dependent upon, and made the slave of, positive law. It is the prerogative of the latter to be not only more generally independent of positive law, but in great extremities its master. Such are those few cases of general rules, in which it is dangerous for casuists to admit the possibility, and still more difficult for them to prove, the actual occurrence of an exception. Rights and duties of this latter description want little from philosophy by way of proof, and as little by way of secondary and artificial sanction from the law of the land. This sanction, however, it is even more necessary, for the peace of society, to fix upon them than on the more vague and doubtful instances of the former class.

Parricide need not be left out of the criminal code, as a horror beyond human legislation. Institutions essential to the prosperity of our species, as the institution of private property, for instance, should acquire only additional sacredness as a rule, from the solemnity with which the law approaches and enforces any necessary exceptions to that, the creation and preservation of which is by far its greatest object. Instead of wounding the moral affections, checking freedom in the exercise of the understanding, or violating conscience in any form, the law ought to raise for them, by its provisions, a visible home and asylum. Of course it is of the last importance that, in respect of those clear rules, which can never be contradicted, either by individuals or nations, with impunity, the *law of nature* and the *law of the land* should be in strict concurrence. In case they both agree, all is well. Wherever they differ, one of those terrible necessities arises, in which a virtuous man has to determine between the immediate evil consequences of legal obedience on the occasion in question; and the contingent mischiefs which may result to society from the example of a private citizen setting up his personal scruples in opposition to the law. In an instance of this sort, it cannot be doubted but that all disagreement between these laws should be removed the instant it is recognised. There can be as little doubt which of the two ought to give way. In his gifts of humanity and reason, God has provided that few mistakes comparatively shall take place under this extreme division.

The next stage of enquiry runs out into that extensive sphere, within which rights and duties, either from not being originally so self-evident, were more easily misunderstood and overborne; or where, by a change in the condition and mechanism of society, institutions and rules which were originally useful, have become useless, or perhaps pernicious. There are virtues and vices even, which are virtues and vices of circumstance only. These accordingly have left them space to turn in, and must change their nature and proportions, according as they apply to different nations, periods, and ranks. Lord Bacon said long ago—‘If vices were, upon the whole, matter profitable, the virtuous man would be the sinner.’ It is the duty, therefore, of wise and honest legislators, to freely enquire whether they or their predecessors have originally mistaken, or violated, this inferior class of rights and duties in the ignorance or passion of positive legislation; and also, to be cautiously and continuously watching to discover whether any changes have arisen, or are arising, in the formation and distribution of those physical and moral elements which constitute society. An alteration in the

wealth and wants, opinions and feelings of mankind, requires simultaneous and analogous alterations in the political, civil, or criminal code of a nation. Laws, which it might have been madness in one age not to make, it may be more mad to continue in the next. To insist upon a people being governed by the same laws, in spite of these changes, is to destroy human happiness more certainly than if we were compelled by statute to subject our bodies, in injury or sickness, to the imperfect experiments of our ancestors; or than if grown up people should be obliged to sleep in the cradles and amuse themselves with the rattles of their infancy. If, on comparing our own knowledge with that of our ancestors, the advantage is not thought to be as much on our side in legislation as in surgery and medicine; yet the frame of society and the mind of man alters more than the human body. Moral elasticity and assimilation have their limits. Under these circumstances two opposite evils are introduced. The law which prejudice will not allow to be removed, necessity spoils as law by a looseness of construction; whilst in the subject of this compulsory conformity, enough of outstanding pressure is left to generate disease.

It cannot be disputed that the law of a country should be as conducive as possible to its happiness. Municipal legislation ought accordingly to vary its course, as circumstances vary, by the removal of every unnecessary restraint from the free development of human power and action. Justinian's celebrated definition of civil liberty is repeated by Montesquieu, and was adopted by Lord Plunkett in the debates on what is commonly called the Manchester Massacre. It amounts to 'the being governed by law.' This definition can be correct only on the supposition of the correctness of Blackstone's supplement to the ordinary definition of law. Yet Blackstone's own definition of civil liberty supposes quite the contrary. Paley and Blackstone agree that civil liberty consists in the 'being restrained by no law but what conduces in a greater degree to the public welfare.' It would be fortunate if the latter part of Blackstone's definition of municipal law were practically true. 'It is a rule of civil conduct,' he says, 'prescribed by the supreme power in a state, *commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong.*' By this confusion the most important preliminary chapter is made an inextricable and mischievous labyrinth. In this case no reforms in positive law of any sort can be ever wanted. It would be perfect the moment it was law. However, we fear that Paley is correct in stating that the law of no country does at present deserve (may we expect that it ever shall deserve?) this extreme compliment. It

is, nevertheless, the duty of every law-maker to strive after the approximation. Like the asymptote, positive law may go on approaching the definition of civil liberty for ages, but in our actual condition of intellectual and moral weakness it will never touch.

There is another class of rights and duties, distinct from the great department, whose two main subdivisions we have described. The subject-matter of this class falls more entirely within the undisturbed province of the mere letter of municipal law. It consists of those cases where a rule is required to be laid down, but where it is perfectly indifferent what the rule may be. As changes always must produce a certain degree of inconvenience, when once a rule is established in a case of this sort, it will, by the supposition, be very seldom right to alter it.

These observations apply solely to the legislation carried on by the competent jurisdictions. They suppose that the distinction between judicial and legislative acts is well understood, and faithfully preserved. The judgment-seat has nothing to do with considerations such as we have been discussing. It is a property essential to the pure administration of justice, that the law should be made by a separate authority; should be publicly promulgated by it in the character of law; and put into the hands of the judge as a dry and peremptory rule, by which all cases comprehended in it are to be governed. It is no less essential to the possible reasonableness and suitableness of laws, which are to be afterwards thus rigidly administered, that the makers of them should previously, contemporaneously, and subsequently, look off their statute-book into the world. They should never mistake the spirit of a judge for that of a legislator. They are bound, in their legislative capacity, only by those great principles of which we have spoken; and a considerable latitude of discretion, in the application of these principles, is a necessary part of the awful responsibility of their office. By way of security against any temptation and self-deception in the exercise of this discretion, all *ex post facto* legislation, in the shape of bills of attainder, or pains and penalties, should be proscribed as instruments of power rather than of law. Indeed, every instance even of prospective legislation (in order to avoid the possible bias of partialities) should be made to embrace, as much as possible, general principles and classes of men, instead of individual facts or persons. In all modifications of existing rules and institutions, the importance of keeping constantly in mind how great a burden of proof is *primâ facie* thrown on those who are the advocates of legislative alteration, need scarcely be insisted on. Some evil—to be made up to society in the end—must always attend on every, even the most maturely

considered change. A tax even cannot be taken off without a loss being sustained in some quarter from the repeal. The further evil, comprised in incautious changes (by the amendments and re-amendments which they require), brings on the misery of frequent changes. These, by rendering the rule of conduct precarious, by unsettling the expectations of mankind, and by destroying the sense of security, may lay society waste as effectually as a barbarian invasion.

Because precautions are advisable in the exercise of a right, the obligation of exercising it, may, nevertheless, be not a jot the less imperious and sacred. The laws of a country cannot be handed down from one generation to another in such a state as to supersede the necessity of revision. No nation has suffered more than our own from a neglect of this duty in our government, and from an acquiescing, or almost superstitious leaning, to the supposed wisdom of our ancestors on the part of the people. Hence, instead of at once abolishing an institution or a law, when the object of them ceased, or after they had become positively injurious, the ancient forms have been usually kept up. In the place of new means plainly and honestly directed to the end in view, society foolishly allowed itself to be juggled into the experiment of providing for permanent necessities by some indirect and circuitous method, which ought either never to have existed at all, or at best would have been good only as a temporary accommodation. Thus the judges were driven to do illegally and coarsely what Parliament was too ignorant, too idle, or too selfish, legally to perform. Our proceedings became gradually encumbered with an intolerable load of fictions; and, as a certain consequence of a departure from simplicity and intelligibility, a door was opened to abuses and prevarications of a hundred kinds. There are two truths which should be thoroughly understood: first, that the connexion between the end and the means ought to be made and preserved as close and demonstrable as possible. It is one of the main uses of reason, and is our main intellectual security against fallacies and fraud. Next, that in the contemporary adjustment of the machinery to its purpose, every successive generation must be left to be ruled and guided by its own circumstances and discretion. If the ancestral shoes, to which we have succeeded, pinch their present wearer, or are so near worn out as to let in the dirt, is our only alternative that of going lame or barefoot?

There are different shades of plausibility and absurdity, according to the subject to which the doctrine is applied, in the pretension that prior generations are entitled to block up the great highway of the law against those who follow. The as-

sumption is in its most unwarrantable form, when the dogmatical attempt is made, whether by sovereign or priest, to stop short the intelligence of man, or even to lay down, as it were, an immovable iron frame, on which, as on a rail-road, the human mind is to travel its weary round throughout futurity. The mind cannot be made to stand still; nor can the course of reason be forced into any orbit. Were its orbit even a circle, the point at which it culminates and declines cannot be so fixed, that the mere certificate of the opinions of any century must be conclusive on posterity. People living in the year 1831, have as much right to think for themselves (act for themselves they must) as those of 1688 or 1546. Thus far all, or nearly all, are agreed. In nothing which decree or statute ever undertook to fix, is so little to be gained, and so heavy a price to be paid for that little, as by putting drags, and blinkers, and conditions, on the independent use of the understanding. Franchises, and privileges, and the arbitrary orders in society, come next. It is a hundred to one, but that the original intention of any specific forms, in the course of time is answered and expired. Distinctions of this sort can seldom, in this event, long continue to be simply indifferent and harmless. On the supposition that the compliment and confidence implied in them, when they were conferred, have turned into a scandal and suspicion, and that the public interest may be better served by their total abolition, or by putting them in some other shape, these are things the principle of which was necessarily temporary at their origin, and which have the further important and delightful advantage, of being revocable without any serious sacrifice of the interests of the individuals concerned.

It is far different with property. All the incalculable benefits which arise from this institution depend, in a great measure, on the permanence of its rules. If credit is once shaken in respect of property, the manufacturer pays off his workmen—the farmer stops his plough—and a whole kingdom in a few weeks will fall into the condition of a farm, the lease of which is not expected to be renewed. Hardly any possible object can indemnify the public for this mischief. The effect of the precedent may cow the confidence, and paralyze the arm of a people for ages. In no other case, is the violence done to the arrangements and expectations of the persons, when the subject previously, and perhaps exclusively, appropriated to their enjoyments, is resumed and brought again into common, so immediate and intense. These remarks apply to private property only. In a well regulated community, the

great mass of its property will be so parcelled out into private hands. The rest will belong to the public at large in the person of its government; or will be vested in *public* bodies (as distinguished from *private* partnerships), merely in right of their artificial capacity. There is not raised in this latter course a shadow of claim on the behoof of the individual members of these bodies in their own persons. The whole belongs to this ideal and legal fiction (for a corporation is by its nature incorporeal), which the law, by its Promethean power, constructed, animated, and endowed with certain rights solely for the *public benefit*. It is admitted that these rights, although of necessity exercised by means of individuals, exist in the corporation, and in its corporate capacity only. Now, that any *private benefit* could be prospectively intended for the corporation, which, nevertheless, is clothed with the entirety of the external legal right, will be maintained by nobody who comprehends what the law understands by a corporation, who must not be also ready to settle a pension on a ghost, or to restore the usage of setting out a cream-bowl for the fairies. This description of property, as it arose, must by its nature continue to be coupled with a trust. The trust is often more or less precise. But the ownership is universally understood and felt to stand on the principle of a trust of a much higher, and more immediate, and more positive nature, than that which attends on private ownership. By the law of England, a public body of this sort may consist of one or more individuals. The property, of which it is the corporate proprietor, has in almost all cases, where the trust was only an implied one, been allowed, by the general understanding of society, to take the double nature of a private interest and a public trust. On a very early occasion, and with great legal authority in behalf of our legal positions, we undertake to show up the abuse which the law has committed on this part of the case, and the still greater abuses which have grown up into general practice, often in ignorance that it is an abuse at all, in consequence of long legal impunity. Upon any reformation of these abuses, so much of the property as has become in opinion a private interest, should be always kept sacred for the use of its liferenters. That in which the trust has been recognised, may be withdrawn at any time, or vested in new trustees, and its object partially modified, or totally extinguished. If the distinction between the two cannot be safely traced, it will be generally the most prudent course to leave the trust and the interest bound up together for the life of those already in possession. The precaution of not filling up the vacancies will in

time restore society, without the hardship and the odium of having injured individuals, to its full authority over both.

No person can admit more fully than ourselves the proposition, that the inviolability of property is the great and indispensable security for human happiness and civilisation. At the same time, this proposition is evidently true of such things only as cannot be so well enjoyed in common. In these alone, therefore, does the moral right of exclusive property exist. Thus, a claim to the dominion of the sea, in exclusion of the right of navigation to the vessels of other countries, is in principle indefensible. *A fortiori* is a moral foundation wanting in behalf of the institution of property in all cases, where the general balance of enjoyment and of misery, arising out of the creation of the right, must, from the nature of things, be on the melancholy side. Slavery, for instance, is in this predicament, whether established by the insolence of Greek philosophy, as the law of nature against all barbarians, or created by act of parliament as the law of the land; or rather the law of a certain number of enumerated sugar islands against a certain number of human beings of African descent.

The suggestion originally urged in France by St Simon on the Regent, and the arguments to the same effect renewed by Jefferson in America, against the existence of a right in one generation to impose upon society a burden by way of tax, beyond the probable duration of the life of that very generation, are, according to our view of the rights of property under society, quite untenable in the sweeping form in which they are stated. If a distinction is to be taken between two sorts of property, which are both equally entitled to that character, the title of the public creditor, expressly guaranteed by a revenue act, for a direct consideration actually advanced to the community, stands upon a more open and recent contract than the title by which the landholder possesses his estate, coming to him unsupported by any public claim of this kind, but trusting for its safety to the ordinary sanction of the law. The immediate policy of a legislative confiscation of the funds over a confiscation of lands, rests entirely on its comparative facility. Burke, in case a competition should arise between their claims, decides in favour of the property of the citizen against the demands of the creditor of the state. This he does on the supposition, that 'the public can pledge nothing but the public estate; and that it can have no public estate but in what it derives from a just and proportioned imposition upon the citizens at large.'—(*Reflections*). The notion of a limit to impositions, would seem to imply that the fundholder has un-

der his bargain no right to even a property-tax as part of his security, much less to Mr Ricardo's plan of a division. The other supposition, by which Burke apparently confines the right of mortgaging the public revenue (not to each generation—for on that question he does not enter—but) to constitutional governments, is rather dangerous doctrine for the engagements of loan-contractors with continental kings. He calls it a dangerous power, 'the distinctive mark of a boundless despotism.' The treasure of the nation, of all things, 'has been the least allowed to the prerogative of any king in Europe.' The pecuniary engagements of the old government of France, are described as being the very acts which were of all others 'of the most ambiguous legality.' The possessor of stock is the purchaser of a tax to that extent, according to the terms of the original security. The security depends on the source out of which the loan act undertook to raise this portion of the revenue. If it was stipulated that a lien should be given on the property of the country, nothing can be more just. The tax-holder, by such an engagement, becomes a tenant in common with the holders of all the real and personal property in the country, for whose defence his money has been expended. The right to impose a property-tax, either towards the annual expenses of government, or in defrayal of a debt incurred on this specific understanding, is part of the universal right vested in society. In the same manner as each possessor may dispose of his own property, so the majority, or whatever numerical proportion is intrusted with the supreme power of the state, may dispose, in whole or in part, of the property of all. If the tax is not raised solely from property, but principally from labour, although the labour of a man who has nothing else to give may be reasonably made to pay for the protection which he is in the course of actually receiving, yet the justice of allowing a preceding generation to pledge, in behalf of its contemporary policy, the labour of an individual who is yet unborn, seems a much more doubtful proposition. The property which in 1800 might have been sold outright by the Parliament of that year, might of course be also mortgaged. If only mortgaged, it descends with its burden. The next heir, if born in 1801, has no ground of complaint. He can have no right to any property at all, rather than his neighbour, except under the law. If he does not like it on the condition with which the law has charged it (that of certain payments to the public mortgagee), he may give it up. On the other hand, let us suppose the tax imposed in 1800 to have been imposed on consumable articles—and so far, to a considerable extent,

imposed on labour. A man born the year afterwards, cannot grumble because he finds that his ancestors have not transmitted him some sort of property or other; property being a thing which, it is evident, from the nature of it, many must go without. But would his remonstrance against their course of proceeding be equally unreasonable, in case his ancestors had left untouched the natural fund for the payment of their debts—that is, their property, and had had recourse, instead of it, to his contingent labour. He is thus brought into the world a good deal worse than nothing. He finds himself, in his own bodily and intellectual self, charged with the obligation of working off their incumbrances by a tax, which, although imposed nominally on articles of subsistence, is actually imposed as much on his own person, sinews, and drudgery, as a poll tax. We are far, nevertheless, from questioning the right of indirect taxation for the payment of the public creditor, when, and to the extent that, it is necessary. We only submit that this fund is so much more one of a secondary than of a primary nature, that, in marshalling the assets of the nation for this purpose, property ought to be had recourse to in the first instance. It seems to us monstrous that it should be excepted upon principle. It is favour enough not to insist on evidence, that the resources of this natural expedient are first exhausted—or at least that the sources of public wealth are beginning to suffer in apprehension, from the extent to which the immediate drain on property is carried—before the payment of the public debt is attempted to be raised on labour. The impolicy of this mode is only the greater, if the appearance of hardship contained in it is altogether fallacious; and if the whole expense of the machinery of indirect taxation should turn out to be ultimately thrown on the owners of property. This will be the fact, if rents and profits are only proportionately diminished by every charge thrown on the employment of productive labour.

So much ignorance is brought out from its hiding-places, even among educated persons, under the warmth and excitement of great national discussions, that for some time past we have been every day acquiring greater respect for the invisible elements of cohesion and improvement by which society is held together, or pushed forward in advance. Objections to innovation are in a constant course of infliction, and are laid on in a form much more worthy of the celestial empire of China, than becomes an enlightened European people. During the patient endurance of this discipline, we have, for the sake of some of our friends, and those not the least positive, thanked God that there was no

window at our breasts. Our astonishment at finding them equally unacquainted with the first notions of civil and political jurisprudence, and of the infinite series of precedents in point, of which the history of mankind, and especially that of their own country, is composed, would have appeared any thing but civil. A cursory examination of a few main divisions will show the most careless reader, what little authority there is for daily manifestations of extreme horror at the thought of the possible interference of the legislature with public or even private rights. This exposure consists, indeed, of little more than a detail of some of the most important changes in the law at different periods of society. Whether the change was originally in any instance introduced by custom, decisions, or enactment, is of no consequence; for the validity of either mode equally assumes the ratification of that power, whatever it may be, which constitutes the supreme power in the state.

The distinction between interests in possession, vested, or contingent only, is of great weight in point of fact as well as law. The English law in particular has made the most of the subtleties arising out of the latter considerations; and is in one sense rewarded by their having been made the subject of by far the ablest work which it possesses; one, indeed, of which the logical arrangement and refined analysis would be an ornament to any science. But the distinction is almost equally important in point of fact. This depends on the supposition (which may be assumed to be a truth), that the injury and alarm which society at large, as well as the individuals directly affected, would experience by an alteration of the law on any subject, must vary according as the right affected stands in one or other of the above degrees. Therefore it will be necessary to prove, in justification of any measure, according as it bears upon these respective cases—that the counterbalancing advantages rise in the same proportions. The application of these distinctions, however, can never arise with regard to corporations. The attribute of perpetuity maintains all their interests in perpetual possession. If society, therefore, was to be held to be restrained, it is restrained for ever. Fortunately, by the very definition of a corporation, every interest belonging to it is a trust. This resumption is merely the removal of a trustee. In the case of franchises, individuals may have an incipient and vested right, which yet does not come into possession till a future day—as infant sons of freemen. Here again, fortunately, although the distinctions are possible, they are not applicable; for a franchise is a trust. In all cases, whether of property or of trust, the

rights of persons unborn may be properly looked upon as purely contingent.

These distinctions of possession, of vesting, and of contingency, being introduced where they are permitted from motives of policy and expectation, cannot be extended to subjects in which the general policy of them is neither applicable nor recognised,—and where, consequently, unfounded personal expectations are entitled to no respect. Nevertheless, according to much that has been lately talked and written, the law of England must be called the vested inheritance of every Englishman; and the humblest individual may be told that he is entitled to insist that the law in general—much more is any one, standing in certain relations, or belonging to a certain class, entitled to insist that the particular laws connected with his condition, prospects, and expectations—shall never be violated by legislative encroachments. It is absurd to extend these precautionary distinctions to the public, and public bodies. Individuals may want protection by a rule against the spite or avarice of personality in legislation. But the community itself, and the great classes which compose it, have nothing to gain by tying their own hands.

We will begin with private rights. The principles out of which the relations of private life arise, and on which the institution of property depends, are so simple and so necessary, as the very nucleus and foundation of society, that in respect of them, the circumstances are not very likely to take place, which can alone call for, and therefore will alone justify, interference. For instance, the law upon the three great domestic conditions which form the sacred circle of a family and a home—husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant—must have been comparatively fixed at an early stage of civilisation. There seems, at first sight, little reason why the law concerning them should not continue the same from the time of the patriarchs to the present day; and there is great reason why the legislator should be seen and felt as little as possible in the inside of one's house, meddling with what nature and usage will be probably disposing of at least as beneficially as himself. However, not only does the law of these relations vary from country to country; but, what alone is important for our present purpose, in the same country from age to age. Let any one trace the progressive history of the English law, on this interesting chapter of family arrangements, in Mr Reeve's work, and continue it downwards, and he will find variations enough. As regards matrimony itself, according to the mutable considerations of contemporary policy, the marriage acts have changed backwards and forwards

(in the reign of Henry VIII., George II., and George IV.), all the regulations on which the validity of a marriage depends. Even as to the right of forming this connexion—the nursery of our race—a great class of the community, the clergy, were not allowed to marry till 2 and 3 Edward VI. The permission was taken away from them, and, what would be called their vested right, destroyed by Mary. Elizabeth reluctantly submitted to their marriage as a fact, but would never legitimate the practice by law. This innovation was accordingly left to be among the first acts of James. As to parents, the statute of James, and Charles, and William III., interposed between a Roman Catholic parent and the education of his children. The equitable legislation of the Chancellor has invented, in his encroaching court, a kindred law, by which the custody and presence of his children is taken from every father, who, in the opinion of the Chancellor for the time being, shall misconduct himself. As regards the great relation between those who have labour to dispose of, and those who want to purchase it, Parliament, in almost every reign, from the 23 Edward III. to 5 Elizabeth and 54 George III., has varied at its pleasure the rights and obligations between the master, on one side, and labourers, artificers, and apprentices, on the other. These changes were interposed according to the fluctuating views which police, trade, humanity, or other objects, might suggest on the occasion.

According to Blackstone, the right of property is merely a civil right. One or more of his editors is shocked, and classes it under the law of nature. It is a very pretty quarrel, and one of those which explanation, conducted on their own principles, certainly will not spoil. If human happiness is promoted by the institution of property, it is a natural right. Moreover, wherever it is clear that any particular system of property will be more generally advantageous than another, it is also a natural right that such a system should be adopted. Independent of this theory or any other, the existence of property in some shape or other is contemporaneous with our earliest evidence of the existence of society. The law of nature appears to be thus far coincident with the law of the land, even though that land should be the banks of the Amazon. But, when accident has determined, or society has become sufficiently reflecting to choose between, different systems of property, a difference between these laws may be imagined to commence. Now, we know of no test but that which we have suggested, by which a particular system of property, or any other claim whatever, can be made out to be a part of the law of nature. It is the duty of a government, in case the law of the land does not coincide with

this test, to promote their coincidence, as fast and as far as possible. Meanwhile, the alternative of treating the law of the land as null and void, in consequence of this contradiction; or, on the other hand, of considering it as final and unalterable, because it happens to be the law at any given hour, or to have been the law from time whereof tradition runneth not to the contrary, are tenets equally absurd. In point of fact, this is an absurdity, which no nation, least of all that of England, has committed. We began with every variety of property, as far back as we can trace it, and, consistent in our inconsistency, we have passed through every variety of change.

It is the principle only of property which is necessarily constant and universal. But it may, and does assume, a hundred forms. A tribe of savages, who have not advanced beyond the notion of common occupancy among themselves, yet feel and defend the right of property in their hunting-grounds to the exclusion of their neighbours. The begging friars, who disputed whether, having made a vow of poverty, they could call the morsel of bread, after it was in their mouths, their own, had never a doubt of the title of their fraternity to the exclusive possession of their monastery against all rival orders. The institution of property, in its rudest state, is that of common occupancy. Ecclesiastical policy and benevolent fanaticism have sought to humanize the experiment in a civilized community. The one consists in free quarters; take that take can. The other prides itself on its strict Spartan regulations; like the Jesuit missions in Paraguay, or one of Mr Owen's Parallelograms. The first has never existed but by name, even among the veriest collection of barbarians, in any thing on which the possessor had invested his personal labour. It ceases to exist in animals or in land, the moment that, through the means of pasturage or of cultivation, the forethought or industry of individuals begins to look for their subsistence to something beyond wild beasts, or shellfish, or the spontaneous fruits of neglected and plundered nature. We wish to speak, with all the moral respect we feel, of those who, in occupancy in common, see 'the pattern of that 'just equality, to be perhaps hereafter.' In the accomplishment of a noble object, they unfortunately have fallen on the most mistaken and fatal means. Their system professes to abolish the selfish and jealous passions which private property is supposed to foster, and to combine the sort of equality which is so falsely imagined to be part of a state of nature, with the regularity and order of a constituted society. It is a confusion of mere instinct with the thousand elements of our mysterious nature, to think

that not only a step, but the step, is gained in behalf of our perfectibility, by transferring to man the policy of an ant-hill or a bee-hive. This error is the same in principle, and differs only in the subject to which it is applied, with that of the visionaries of Greece; in whose Utopia wives and children were made public property, by way of preventing the weakness and abuse of conjugal or paternal feelings. Among the most successful modifications of this experiment, appear to be the village communities which have endured for centuries, and the family partnerships which occasionally pass on undivided for one or two generations, in Hindostan. The highest specimen of the possibilities of our race is not, however, that in which man, under the yoke of Castes, approaches nearest to a machine. With the self-will of the European character, nothing but religious or political enthusiasm could make the partners passive, even for a time, under such a system. Enthusiasm is too partial and temporary an instrument to rely on. In cases to which it does not extend, or when it has become extinct, we are thrown back on the ordinary principles of human nature. It will be wiser, therefore, never to lose sight of them, or stir beyond them, in our speculations upon an institution which naturally comprehends all descriptions of people, and all times.

The full benefit of property will be most effectually derived from it, even on behalf of those to whom no share personally falls in its original distribution, by placing it immediately and entirely in the ownership and management of individuals. The public interest is, on the whole, best consulted by giving it up into their hands, discharged of any specific trust. No general rules have fewer exceptions than these:—First, That the body of the people, who have only their labour to depend on, are quite as much interested in the establishment, protection, and increase of that fund, out of which labour is to be remunerated, as the direct possessors of the fund. Next, that the owners of private property ought to be trusted with the sole management and employment of it, under the conviction that society will lose less by this arrangement than by constant superintendence and interference. It is impossible for a rich man to spend a single shilling (however selfishly and disgracefully, as far as concerns his own character and objects), but that the public has the benefit of the expenditure. The fine lady, whose heart is set on a lace veil, will probably assist, by its purchase, the poor mechanic on whom she has never bestowed a thought, as much as if she had given him in charity the amount which his employer is thus enabled to pay to him in wages. These latent and disguised advantages constitute the sanctity and the trust of private pre-

erty, in its most absolute and hardened form. Because Providence has so framed and placed us, that these advantages are best secured, and the very object of the trust is most successfully attained, by freeing every proprietor from a legal responsibility concerning the mode in which he may use his property, it is not to be inferred that thereby any doubts can possibly be thrown on the moral existence of the trust. If it is the interest of society to seem to forget that it is a trust, it is the political duty of every individual to learn and to remember it. His possession is any thing but an adverse one. Whether the possessor dates from the Norman conquest, or from the last loan, the right cannot be lost on the part of the public (since it is one of those rights, which is also an obligation, as all important rights really are) of confirming, or of altering, the possession on public grounds. The only limit which the representative of private parties may challenge as a condition on their behalf, is this: Their estates, regarded singly, are private property. It is only when contemplated collectively, legislated upon collectively, that they are a trust, and amenable to society. All this is implied in every exercise of Parliamentary taxation, and in the right to levy sixpence in the pound in a parish cess.

Our ancestors felt these truths so strongly, that, by a generous and philosophical comment, they converted the terrible outline and incidents of the feudal system into a popular constitution. ‘My lords,’ said Holborne, in that noblest of all legal arguments, his defence of Hampden, in the case of ship-money, ‘whatsoever estate is in the king in the politic capacity, is in him as *rex*, and not in him in his natural capacity; and what is in him so, is for the benefit of the kingdom. That is the reason that all land is held immediately or mediately of the king. So the king, when all was in him, disposed of some for the service of the kingdom. Hence arose tenures originally.’ In regulating private property, the successive legislative authorities in England have often taken narrow views of their object, and have made sufficiently absurd and contradictory provisions for its execution. But, instead of foregoing or gainsaying, by any self-denying declarations, the right of exercising their power, it is from this exercise of their power, according to fluctuations of supposed convenience and policy, that legal history has abounded, at different times and places, with every anomaly; and that it has been subsequently and slowly more and more brought towards something like a uniformity.

The legal historian in the case of property generally, and especially in respect to feudal benefices, will have to trace the progress from estates for life only to the period when the title

by inheritance was acknowledged. Afterwards, by a still greater innovation, the power of testamentary disposition, in other words, disherison, was introduced with all its shadowy distinctions. Under this authority were passed the statutes of mortmain and of charitable uses, the statute *de donis* and of fines—which respectively tie up or enlarge the power of the owner—and in the last case, cut off rights which the previous law had given. There are the diversities of tenure, with their accompaniments—the various rules of descent; that of the eldest son, that of the youngest son; that of partibility among all; that of partibility among males only. There are the disgavelling statutes, to the prejudice of younger children. There is the statute of wills, to the prejudice of the elders, or of all. There is the distinction, at present so unreasonable, between real and personal estate. Then there is the gradual alteration of the rights of the widow and children, in what the old common law (as it were in sneer of the primogeniture of the feudal landholder) called their *reasonable part*; their title, nevertheless, to which reasonable part, after having been pertinaciously maintained in the principality of Wales, and in the customs of York and London, has been positively barred by modern statutes.

In the disguise of corn laws, we artificially raise the fortune of a landholder at the public cost; and when he is dead we expressly protect his acres against his debts. Formerly, under the pretence of religious scruples, now under the pretence of politics or morals, we lower the profits of the moneyholders for the sake of others. By no possible means can the legislature exercise a greater power over property than by its regulations concerning money. The principle would be the same if our circulation was carried on in copper ingots, and neither the nation nor an individual in it owed a shilling. But our immense system of manufacturing wealth and artificial credit, and our load of public and private debts, transmitted from generation to generation as charges on our property, make it impossible that the slightest legislative movement in the value of money should not vibrate through the kingdom. No limit can be put to the injury which property may have sustained from restraints in the shape of usury laws, or from the fearful fluctuations under which the value of money has been made to sink or rise from the express provisions of the law. The loss and gain to individuals arising on the debased coinage of former times, and on its subsequent restoration, were child's play, compared to the effect of our currency legislation since 1798. It is inconsistent with our theory of the lawful power of government, to make any question on the authority of Parliament over this

subject. On the supposition that, at each period, the opposite enactments were called for by a pressure of circumstances approaching to necessity, it was the duty of government to carry them into effect. Different opinions may be entertained on the prudence of both parts of our policy in this battle between paper and gold, as well as on the extent of the consequences of the respective measures. But they were passed entirely on general grounds of public service; and the great alteration which they must work on the relative classes of property distributed over the country, could not but be positively, although imperfectly, foreseen;—at least foreseen, so far as to render it a singular objection on the part of Sir Robert Peel against a great public measure, that it may be, somehow or other, collaterally a precedent for trenching upon property. The objection is not the less remarkable when nobody is a shilling richer or poorer in consequence of the latter measure so objected to. The inconsistency is at its height when it is observed, that all the rights which a Reform Bill can give on one hand, or take away on the other, are political rights only—of the same nature as those which were conferred and withdrawn on the passing the act for Roman Catholic emancipation by Sir Robert Peel himself. The policy or impolicy of that question was long enough debated; but the notion of confounding a political franchise with property, was left to be invented by the factions of to-day.

After what we have written, we begin to fear lest we should be thought to have mistated the tender part of our case; and that our readers may doubt—not the just authority of a community to recast its political and civil institutions—but the justness of any distinction either in reason or precedent, in favour of a more timid caution, and scrupulous demeanour towards private rights. It may be said that it was no more unjust to make Naboth surrender his vineyard even at its market value, than it would have been to deprive him of his right of electing, or being elected to the Sanhedrim. True; if both were acts of personal violence directed against a single individual on private grounds. We admit also, if the successful accomplishment of a great public object requires that the private property of one man, and the political privileges of another, should be given up, that both must be sacrificed alike. The suburbs of a besieged town are razed for its defence. Canals, rail-roads, and new streets, have made us acquainted with the necessities of peace. The question of compensation in these cases of property admits the right of interference: that this question is not, and cannot decently be raised in cases of disfranchisement, will shew the distinction be-

tween the two. Unless the public had a paramount right over property, the question of compensation could not arise. There is no condition of this sort more than of confiscation, directly expressed on the part of society in a man's title-deeds. But political privileges, where the necessity of their being abdicated exists, do not admit of being bought up; they are not representable by money: nor is it easy to say in what other way, were it worth while to enter on the question in a matter of simple trust, they could be replaced by any appropriate favour. As to any notion of pecuniary compensation, it is almost a misdemeanour to talk of compensation, on account of the transfer into other hands of a political trust, out of which, in case either patron or voter could be proved to have derived any pecuniary profit, they are liable to fine and imprisonment as public offenders. The feeling that a wide distinction exists between the cases of private property and of trust, is not a prejudice. The distinction is sometimes confused from the supposed combination, in the same person, of what is called an interest coupled with a trust. What the distinction is, will appear from our observations in an earlier page. It is probable that a former generation have settled the principle and detail of private rights on grounds of such universal application, as to leave their successors a certain balance of disadvantages, and an uncertain balance of advantage upon any change. In case of public rights this probability gradually diminishes and disappears. It is this comparison which has caused the whole difference in our arrangements, opinions, and language, on the two subjects. The public interest may accordingly, in one case, be safely left to be implied, and to be traced and derived through the private, until a personal independent claim (almost to the exclusion of the opinion or authority of the public) is not merely suffered, but encouraged to grow up. It can be occasionally only that thinking persons are required to rub off the sacred rust, and point out to the ignorant owner Cæsar's image and superscription. In the other case, except in brutal or stationary communities, and in places where divine right, legitimacy, and prescription, are set up as pretensions, which are titles *per se* (to be obeyed and not to be investigated), it is evident that the whole artificial machinery by which a government is carried on, is so liable to be disordered from its extent and complication, and to become inadequate to its office, from the new interests, opinions, and sentiments which may be forming, swelling, and bursting out from under it, that it would be madness to contemplate a similar fixity in institutions.

If society is to be progressive, appropriate changes in every department of its administration can alone bring the government into harmony with the governed. In order to conciliate this conformity, it is necessary that the public interest should constitute the immediate, and not the mediate consideration in this class of questions, and that both in word and deed this public responsibility should be always kept in sight. There may be, with ill-informed people, a good deal of indistinctness and misunderstanding about the precise nature of the trusts with which different institutions and persons are charged, by reason of their public character. But in nothing is the feeling surer, and the language more explicit, than in the distinction universally recognised between the immunities of private life and the liabilities of those who place themselves in, or accept of, public trusts. For instance, wherever a corporation, sole or aggregate, exists, there is an inseparable corresponding impression, that whatever belongs to the corporation, whether in franchise or in property, can only belong to it on public grounds. This is the one and only conceivable object of creating the corporate, and of adding it on to the personal, capacity. Legal refinements, and we scruple not to say, most indefensible and suspicious decisions, have spread a very discreditable obscurity over much of this part of our law. But the lawyers have not mystified the people. It is probably too late for courts of justice, in most of the instances, to relieve these institutions from the misconstructions by which the natural object of corporate institutions is now so frequently defeated. Parliament is in every way as much better qualified, as it is imperatively summoned, to the task. Every day's language bears testimony that the public is well aware, not only that in these cases the power has been expressly reserved, but that proper occasions for putting the power in execution must arise. Public bodies and relations were constituted for public purposes. Any franchises with which they have been invested, and any property which the bounty of individuals has been permitted to pass on in this channel from age to age, under the restraints of a perpetual entail in mortmain, which are an exception to the general policy of the law, are impressed with the same public character. There is no mask of false pretences to remove in this instance; no expectation to be disappointed; no supposed adverse title to be set up. If this were not so, society would be obliged to bribe its own trustees into connivance; or violence must be called in, in order to accomplish any political reformation, where the parties were not disposed voluntarily to come forward and consent to be reformed. The public can supply the

want of that vigilance, by which private interests are more than sufficiently secure, only by reserving a greater latitude of construction and process for its protection. These are the known terms and tenure of its offices. Thus, even judicially, the offences subject to impeachment are left at large. So the two Houses have chalked out for themselves, on the trial of corrupt boroughs, a course of numerical proportion, unheard of in instances of private right, and in courts of justice; and have taken very little trouble in the arrangement of an indemnity or escape for the few righteous whose Gomorrah* they occasionally took a fancy to destroy. The civil law ordains, 'that, for the misbehaviour of a *body corporate*, the directors only shall be answerable in their personal capacities.' This rule seems, in point of strict judicial principle, to be deduced more logically from the definition of a corporation than the doctrine of the English and Scotch courts, by which the offences of members of a corporation, in their individual capacity, are distinguished from that species of corporate negligence, or abuse of franchise, by which the corporation is dissolved, as by a breach of the implied condition of its existence. Our doctrine, though rather irreconcilable with the definition of an ideal fiction like a corporation, is an important admission of the origin of the title, and the continuance of the trust. Nothing is said in respect of this disfranchising quality, to distinguish the acts of an individual constituting a corporation sole,

* The pitiful hypocrisy with which Parliament has so long nationalized the Lacedemonian practice of encouraging a crime by the most effectual of all modes—participation—and only punishing it when the parties bungled so as to be found out, is a modern innovation. According to late precedents, Westbury would not have been in existence, so as to have had the honour of sheltering Sir Robert Peel on his flight from Oxford. Its prior reputation rested on the fact of having furnished the historians of Parliamentary corruption with the earliest recorded case of direct bribery. Making all allowances for the change in the value of money, the sum of L.4 was small enough. The offence was brought so completely home, that the mayor was fined and imprisoned, and a fine of L.20 was assessed on the corporation for 'their said lewd and slanderous attempt.' Lord Tenterden would find authority in this precedent for the vindictive power which he was so ready to confer upon the House of Commons; but hardly sufficient authority; since Lord Mansfield confidently observed, when the case was quoted before him, that Lord Coke must have substituted the House of Commons for the Star-Chamber, because there could be no fine set by the House of Commons.

from the acts of a corporation aggregate. This might be rather alarming doctrine if it were applied to an unfortunate see—for example, Ely. According to the distinction adopted by our law, it would seem, that certain specific derelictions or violations of duty, have been pronounced beforehand to so far defeat the purposes of the institution, as to compromise and involve the entire corporation, and thereby create a forfeiture, which a court of justice might enforce. But it must have been also foreseen, when such fictitious creations as corporations were admitted within the pale of the common law, that the objects of their creation might terminate from many other causes besides those laches or misuses on which a judge would feel bound to act, or which were capable of legal proof. The common law, therefore, of both countries, has, in the chapter of corporations, enumerated, among the regular methods by which they may be dissolved, that of an act of parliament, when the ‘powers or privileges of a corporation are deemed fit to be recalled.’ An express notice of this sort is not introduced for nothing. The student will fully feel the ground of the diversity when he remarks, that the omnipotence of Parliament is never mentioned as being one of the several manners by which a complete title to ordinary property, whether real or personal, can be acquired or lost.

We have said enough, and more than enough, on the principle. Nothing has more retarded the formation of just opinions on the powers and duties of government, than the use made of occasional facts, still more, of different hypotheses. Its freedom of action has been supposed to be restrained by contract;—whether by the fiction of an original contract; or by the express terms of a union of states (either totally or partially independent), as at the American Union; or at the successive Unions of England with Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. The same paralyzing consequences have been derived from a *charte octroyee*; from prerogatives which were unalienable by their nature; from fundamental laws and declarations of rights, &c., which were never to be repealed. Under these names, governments, and writers, have vainly sought to bind a firmer chain of obligation on the conscience of succeeding legislatures than is to be obtained from considerations of the public good. All our countrymen would admit, as far as other countries are concerned—Spain and Portugal for instance—the absurdity and impolicy of interposing theoretical obstacles of this nature in the way of practical improvement. But many of the arguments and incidental objections which are constantly insisted on when any question of domestic reformation is suggested, evidently presuppose that there is some peculiarity in the English constitution which makes it

an exception. The prerogatives of an absolute monarchy may be broken down; but, when any particular political interests or powers have been communicated to a portion of the people, it seems that no new aspirants are to be let into the partnership, or any new arrangement proposed, which may tend to disturb existing, and, as they are called, *vested* rights. Now, as far as precedent is concerned, by far the most distinctive feature in the English constitution, is its progressive nature. Its great original merit, or good fortune, lay in the division of the legislative power, by which the people, acting through the press and hustings up to the House of Commons, gradually grew strong enough to force a way for public opinion; whilst something was gained by way of additional deliberation, and a great deal by way of security for internal tranquillity, and the permanence of our established forms of government, by requiring the concurrence of the three separate members of the body politic to any legislative measure. It is difficult to provide impulse enough to make certain of improvements, together with control enough to prevent violence. The form and substance of our political organization so far combined both principles, that we have been saved from the evils of inaction and decay on one side; and, on the other, from the fearful necessity of attempting too much at once. Every step of our progress has been taken in conformity with our characteristic adherence to the ancient foundations from which our system had arisen; and with our love of those ancient organs, through which the popular voice had been accustomed to direct, animate, and defend us. The royal authority is not gone in England, although the exercise of the constitutional negative on the part of the crown has been long cautiously suspended. The Lords may preserve for ages, and to the infinite advantage of their country, as well as their own honour, their constitutional authority, provided it is discreetly, temperately, and honestly interposed. Wielded as a weapon in the face of the people, it will be broken to pieces, and the very fragments of it will not be to be found.

Burke's direct argument against Reform rested entirely on the advantages of a prescriptive government. Comparing the present measure with the former alterations which our ancestors at different periods adopted, we cannot comprehend what there is in the nature or degree of its provisions, which should prevent our government from still deserving the title which Burke then attributed to it, notwithstanding its previous changes. The negative arguments advanced by him consisted of three points. With the first we perfectly agree,—that a people have no abstract right to any

certain form of government or representation. No antiquarian even would be so superstitious as to hold that Spain and Turkey were bound to despotism by the indissoluble links of prescription. On the other hand, no notionalist, one should think, can be so practically insane, as to see an abstract right or wrong in any particular combination of political powers. Happiness is at the bottom of all rights—especially of political ones. It consists so much in feelings and opinions, that men must be left mainly to be happy in their own way, however absurd that way may appear to us to be. This is not less true in politics and in religion, than in private life. We may wonder at their taste; but external authority is no more justified in depriving the Portuguese of their political beatitude in obedience to the will of Miguel,—or the monk of the religious satisfaction which he experiences in a scourge or a hair shirt,—than it would be in prohibiting, by proclamation, dissipated men and frivolous women from those elegant drudgeries by which the very amusements of fashion are so frequently perverted into a vexation and a fatigue. There can be no doubt, that it would be as absurd, in their respective moral and intellectual conditions, to attempt to prove the right to, or force the establishment of, a republic on the Spanish peasantry, as it would be to take the same course in behalf of despotism with a New Englander. Whatever Solon might think, there is no metaphysical best in laws and institutions. Those are best which are best adapted to a people. Therefore, if best to-day, whether they will continue to be best to-morrow, depends on the prior question, whether the wants and sentiments of the people continue to be the same.

Burke's two other objections depend altogether on degree, and circumstance, and time. He denied, first, the expediency of Reform; next, that there was any popular wish upon the subject. Every man in England is now so far agreed on the expediency of some Reform, that this head of objection is reduced to a question of degree. As to the popular will, the great apprehension which is felt is, not that it will not carry us forward on its wave at least as high as the proposed standard, but lest it should hurry us far beyond it. In respect of the modern proposition, that Parliament has no moral right over the whole frame of the government, and over every anomaly of franchise which either accident, or usurpation, or misdecision, may have created in any corner of the kingdom, Burke was too accomplished an historian, and too philosophical a statesman, ever to let it pass his lips, when they were foaming and fulminating with every sort of scorn against revolutionary opinions.

The feudal system became early the common law of Europe.

Few subjects of comparison are full of deeper curiosity and interest, than the causes out of which arose the remarkable contrast between the fortune of constitutional history in England and in every other country. This is partly to be accounted for by a greater origin a difference in our political classification of the three orders or estates of which feudal society was understood to consist, than has been commonly borne in mind; next, by the spirit, necessities, and occasions, which led betimes to the breaking down of the prejudices of separate interests and hostile feelings in the great classes of the English community. The very irregularities of our political system, which have since led to so much mystification and corruption, had at one period this good effect. There were distinctions, indeed, but it was made almost impossible to understand them, and therefore to presume on them; for it was evident that they were the result of accident, and stood on no principle whatever. Our arrangements seem, on the whole, to have been as fortunate a combination as possible; considering the disjointed and imperfect capabilities of a country where the want of roads and of a press must have impeded the intercourse of men and even of minds. They left us the vigour of local institutions, the encouragement and control of juxtaposition, in the rival examples of neighbouring towns and counties, together with an efficient amalgamation on those important occasions, when the different elements were not only from time to time brought into each other's presence, but mixed up together in the performance of a common legislative duty on equally independent terms. There is another consideration, scarcely less important, and the principal one with which we are concerned at present. This is the advantage which we have obtained from occasions, in themselves frequently disastrous, and at the time discouraging enough, which have furnished the opportunity of proclaiming and enforcing there cognition of the right of Parliamentary regulation over every branch of the constitution. Disputed successions raised the point over and over again in the case of the title to the crown. The great dispute on religion was carried to a successful termination by an act which changed the whole character of the House of Lords. The history of the House of Commons is one history of change. The arbitrary summons and omissions of boroughs, at the discretion or corruption of the sheriff, were succeeded by, and for a time contemporary with, the first creation by charter—that of Wenlock, (17 Edward IV.)—the last—that of Newark (29 Charles II). By a strange retribution, the abuses of this last, and most reluctantly submitted to creation, have contributed, as much as any other circum-

stance whatever, to swell to its present height the national sensation in favour of Reform.

First let us look at the motto of the *jus coronæ*. It is part of the great fundamental maxim, on which depends the right of succession to the throne of England, that 'the right of inheritance therein may, from time to time, be changed or limited by act of Parliament.' (1 Blackstone, 191.) To mention no other instances, this right was actually exercised in the person of Henry IV. (203), and in that of Henry VII. (205.) The question of the Roses, under which the strength of England was wasted during so many reigns, was not merely an opposition of contending forces, but of contending opinions. The title of the House of Lancaster was only less sacred than that of the House of Hanover, inasmuch as they mixed it up too much with the mere *de facto* possession; instead of standing openly and solely on the popular doctrine of the supremacy of Parliament. To this, however, Richard III. had thought it advisable, in his case also, directly to appeal, as the best 'known quieter of men's minds.' Twice in the reign of Henry VIII. was the succession varied by act of Parliament. And the remarkable remainder was introduced, which gave the crown to such persons as the king, by letters patent, or last will and testament, should limit and appoint. Was it the recollection of this strange testamentary power bestowed on her father, which seems to have puzzled the courtiers who stood round the deathbed of Elizabeth, and waited for her sign? The act of settlement, under which alone our gracious sovereign, William IV., sits now on the throne of England, would assuredly be precedent enough, did it stand alone. But it was passed in strict accordance with the practice of former times. This practice was not a mere fact, grown up under or extorted by force of circumstances. The Parliamentary doctrine is embodied in principle by the express general enactments of 13 Elizabeth and 6 Anne. By both these statutes it is made high treason to deny that the kings of this realm, with the authority of Parliament, are not able to make laws and statutes to bind the crown and the descent thereof. How completely this text had, at an earlier period, sunk into the hearts and understandings of the people, is evident by the celebrated distinction between the limits of spiritual and temporal authority in human hands, with which Sir T. More silenced Rich, the attorney-general, on his inquisitorial visit to him in the Tower. There is something more striking still in Lord Surrey's spirited justification, on the field of Bosworth, of the Parliamentary allegiance which, in compliance with Richard the Third's appeal, he had owed and paid to his fallen master.

It will be easily understood, that the passions or necessities of former times are likely to have transmitted to us fewer examples of a similar jurisdiction, directly exercised by Parliament, over the second branch of the legislature. But here, again we have sufficient evidence of the exercise to show, that our ancestors had no idea of any difficulty or distinction in one case more than the other. However fixed and uniform may be the view which a lawyer at the present day takes of nobility, its antiquarian annals contain a greater variety of changes than are traceable in any other part of our constitution. Nobility consisted, till the end of the reign of John, of all who held any quantity of land of the king. According to Domesday Book, and the Appendix to Brady, this list did not exceed seven hundred persons, of whom several held in soccage. These were the proprietors of the whole kingdom, except of that portion which was reserved to the king and to the church. From the last year of the reign of John to the 11th of Richard II., tenure was disregarded, and the *right* to a writ of summons had become confined to the ancient or greater barons. The remonstrance (1225) shows that it was these alone, to omit any of whom from the writ was an abuse of the prerogative. The king summoned such additional members as, and on what terms, he chose. The present doctrine, that a general summons confers a peerage of inheritance, is only about as old as the reign of Elizabeth. It seems probable that a general writ previously gave no right beyond that actual Parliament. There are ninety-eight laymen who were summoned only once—fifty others who were summoned two, three, or four times. The confusion is so great that there are nearly half a dozen different suggestions as to what it was in the writ of summons which determined whether the peerage was to be an inheritable one or for life—also on the points whether these occasional writs were not addressed to the intermediate order of bannerets, and whether the parties assisted merely (as the judges at present), without a suffrage.

The variations which took place in the number of the spiritual lords up to the Reformation were greater still. Out of one hundred and twenty-two abbots, and forty-one priors, occasionally sitting, it happened, either through mistake or from peculiar circumstances, that only twenty-five abbots and two priors were constantly summoned. The Abbot of Westminster sat in the first Parliament of Elizabeth; but never afterwards. The practice of creating peers by patent commenced 11 Richard II. The assent of Parliament is so generally expressed, in patents of peerage, down to the time of Henry VII. that West infers this assent to have been a necessary condition. Mr Hallam mentions

several instances of peers by statute. (*History of the Middle Ages*, iii. p. 193). A return to the earlier practice of occasionally granting a seat in the House of Lords for life, or for a session, has been lately recommended. In fact our system of peerage has been totally changed by the novelty introduced at the Scotch and Irish Union, of peers who are not lords of Parliament. On these occasions, however, the ancient custom has been restored, of lords of Parliament for life and for a session. No reason can be assigned why England might not partially adopt the practice. The temporal nobility amounted only to fifty-five in the reign of Henry VIII. They have been subsequently altered as much in their numbers as in the principle and stock out of which they are selected. Lord Delamere complained of this as a grievance under the Stuarts. (11 *State Trials*, 1358). Lord Harcourt's administration, previous to the meeting of the Irish Parliament, made five earls, seven viscounts, and ten barons in one day. In 1711, Queen Anne created a batch of twelve at once. (Lord Dartmouth's note, 6. Burnet, 87). Nothing in politics is more usual or more dangerous than the practice of looking at the evils on one side only. In jealousy of this prerogative, a bill was brought in, in the two following years of 1718 and 1719, for limiting the number of the Peerage. It was supported by the Ministers, and on one occasion passed the Lords. It was defended by Addison, and opposed by Walpole and Steele. Mr Hallam states the arguments of both parties, and concludes by a very just summing up against it. (2. *Constitutional History*, p. 590). De Lolme says, it would have destroyed the constitution. The consolidation of a self-existing body, independent both of king and people, must sooner or later have formed within its circle a spirit of oligarchical combination, which neither king nor people would in this event have had the means of counteracting. The misapplication of the fact, that the crown, after deliberate discussion in the case of Newark, was understood to have resigned the corresponding prerogative of adding to the number of the House of Commons, was but superficial authority for this by no means analogous proposition. But nobody at the time doubted the right of Parliament, to discuss and to determine it either way as the public interest might require. Least of all can we doubt at the present crisis the wisdom of their decision.

If it is observed, on some of our references, that the right was often only varied, and not taken away;—that the parties were usually left undisturbed beyond the admission of others; the case of the East India Company and the interlopers, indeed the dispute on the infringement of the commonest patent, will show what the owners of an exclusive privilege think of this distinc-

tion. When the doctrine of vested rights is mooted in questions of this sort, we are not subtle enough to discriminate in principle between the injury which is done to the old monopoly, as often as it is violated by these mutations, additions, and restrictions, and the injury which is done to the right of possession when it is put an end to altogether. The difference is only a difference of degree—not of principle. On this sophistical pretence of injustice to existing rights, the most moderate reformer, who would raise the twelve electing aldermen into a baker's dozen, is as unjust as the radical who should insist upon universal suffrage. But precedents of disfranchisement, both in the case of a whole class, and that of an individual, are not wanting. Previous to the dissolution of the monasteries, the number of spiritual *always* exceeded the number of temporal lords in the Upper House. After the dissolution, the monastic dignitaries ceased to be summoned; and the number of lay creations has subjected the ecclesiastical minority to the fact (disadvantage it is none) of an increasing disproportion in every reign. We cannot conceive why the clergy more than the lawyers should be thought to have any reasonable, or well-understood interest, distinct from that of the people, or what public end is answered by their being personally represented in either House, in a different way from what is the case with any other profession. Far, therefore, from calling, with Mr Palgrave, for additional lords spiritual, we do not regret the change which has been thus effected in the internal constitution of the House of Lords. In case any one questions the degree of change which this incidental disfranchisement has worked, let him consider what would be the universal impression, expectation, and alarm, if an ecclesiastical majority were, at this moment, masters of the legislative wisdom of the Upper House of Parliament.

We will add Blackstone's comment on a singular case of personal destitution from a title, which has since become so deservedly, and hereditarily, dear to the English nation. In the reign of Edward IV., George Neville, Duke of Bedford, was degraded by Act of Parliament on account of his poverty. The preamble states, 'Forasmuch as oftentimes it is seen, that when
' any lord is called to high estate, and hath not convenient livelihood to support the same dignity, it induceth great poverty
' and indigence, and causes oftentimes great extortion, embrocery, and maintenance to be had; to the great trouble of all
' such countries where such estate shall happen to be.' Blackstone says,—'This is a singular instance, which serves, at the
' same time, by having happened, to show the power of Parliament; and, by having happened but once, to show how ten-

‘der the Parliament hath been, in exerting so high a power.’ (1. *Comment.* 402). This tenderness has cost us dear. The power ought never to have been allowed to sink into desuetude. We do not at all hold with Juvenal, that poverty, as such, has any thing ridiculous about it. But in the case of poor peers, unfortunately the ridiculousness is not all. Coke denies that the king had a prerogative censorship of this kind over the pecuniary independence of his hereditary counsellors. But the old doctrine seems never to have been overruled by a competent tribunal; and there is contemporary authority to the contrary, nearly as good as Coke’s. Cruise (*On Dignities*, p. 80) cites a case from Dugdale, of the second Lord Say and Sele, who grew necessitated to mortgage the greater part of his estate, so that afterwards the barony became extinct. Lord Burleigh (25th Eliz.) reported to Parliament the case of Lord Ogle, in the time of Edward VI., when it was resolved, that if a nobleman want possessions to maintain his estate, he cannot press the King, in justice, to grant him a writ to call him to Parliament. Whatever difference of opinion constitutional lawyers may indulge in, concerning the mode by which this interposition was most properly enforced, the debate and the precedents establish that the Constitution has left wisely open the question of a general superintendence and individual removal; even in that division of legislative authority, in respect of which the express recognition of responsibility, and of trust, has been kept in the background almost as studiously as in the case of private property itself.

Notwithstanding a great deal, both in appearance and in practice, that was frequently most irreconcilable with any theory of the kind, yet the sacred words of *Representative* and of *Commons*, and the solemn acknowledgments once in seven years, or oftener, from candidates on the hustings, kept up the continuous tradition of a trust in the mind of freeholder and freeman, as well as in that of the Parliament-man himself. This remained the fact during every metamorphosis which the Lower House has undergone. It was true at the time when the burgess received his two shillings, and rode up his five-and-thirty miles a-day to London or Acton Burnell, to negotiate with the sovereign for the reduction of the subsidy of his poor Commons from a tenth to a fifteenth; and when he protested against being drawn into, and delayed by a consultation on public affairs, as being things quite beyond his capacity and concern. No less so, than when the successor of the said burgess is called on by a constituency of provincial statesmen to spend his thousands, and to pledge himself to the abolition of the Polignac administration in France, and that of Negro slavery in the West Indies.

One might as well reason from the Wittangemot to the Parliament of the nineteenth century, as from any similitude to it in the members who assembled under the writs of A.D. 1266, or during the two next centuries, whilst the King, by his sworn servant, the sheriff, was abusing the writ of summons into an instrument of fear or favour. The transfer to the body of the people of the power which wealth and intelligence naturally carry with them, and under which the legislative authority of the Commons has gradually advanced to its present height, almost began after the period when the formation, and flux, and assimilation of its component parts, which our antiquaries have so painfully investigated, had, in great measure, already stopped. But society was in movement. Evasion, therefore, and artifice overruled, and then became the law. The statute of Henry V., which required members to be inhabitants of the places for which they served, points out the closeness of the connexion which was aimed at in those times. It was nothing more than what the physical state of the country, independent of all moral considerations, must have previously enforced. The Cornish members had Cornish names—Northern were of the north—Southern of the south. The names of the burgesses long continued to be more plebeian than those of the knights. In the reign of Henry VI., the election of a county member was set aside because he was not of gentle birth. When the act of Henry V., which was not repealed till 14th Geo. III., required the representatives to be inhabitants, it is easy to conceive what was the law at that time, in respect of *non-resident electors*. In case either the payment of Parliamentary wages had continued, or this statute of Henry V. had been enforced, Reform must have been long ago forced upon the small boroughs, from the nature of the case. On the other hand, in case a Parliamentary jealousy of the continuance on the part of the crown, of its prerogative of occasional disfranchisement, had not intervened, a sufficient counteraction against that most certain innovator—Time, was contained in that prerogative. A judicious use of it would have prevented the nuisance of rotten boroughs from accumulating through neglect to such a degree, as to be only abateable by a much more sudden and sweeping measure than could have been then necessary, or is indeed in any case desirable, except as the least of two evils. The growth and fluctuation in the number of members during the intermediate reigns from 23d Edward I. down to Charles II., are in complete contradiction to our late pernicious system of absolute and perpetual uniformity. The principle of unprincipledness, by which the crown corrupted its use of this prerogative of addition, is sufficient proof that it could not be safely

trusted with the converse prerogative of subtraction. But it by no means followed, that the beneficial power should be thrown away, on account of failure or mismanagement in its original machinery. These additions became mere additional numbers of the worst sort. As Elizabeth had jobb'd Cornwall, her paltry imitator tried his hand on Ireland. The answer which James made in 1613 to their remonstrance, exposes his vivacity and kingcraft with more than his usual absurdity. 'What if I had created forty noblemen, and four hundred boroughs? The more the merrier—the fewer the better cheer.'

The practice of dropping towns through favouritism, or neglect, on the part of the sheriff, or from the decay and indigence of the place, was not carried on into the reign of Henry VIII.; since which time it does not appear that any place has lost its right of representation. By a most unreasonable inconsistency, the period when our stationary system commenced, was the very period when a greater change was about to commence in the formation and distribution of the elements of social power than former ages had ever seen. There are some towns, such as Sheffield, Birmingham, and Leeds—corporate towns too—for whose earlier omission it is difficult to account. But the following return by the Sheriff of Lancashire (where the size of the parishes is of itself testimony of its rude and desert condition in former times), will sufficiently explain the unrepresented state in which this wonderful theatre of modern ingenuity and industry had been left. This return was repeated from the 23d Edward III., through the next five reigns. 'There are no cities or boroughs within the county of Lancaster from which any citizens or burgesses ought, or have been accustomed to come to Parliament, or are able, by reason of their poverty.' There was no Manchester in those days. It is evident from this return, what those ancestors, with the defiance of whose wisdom we are reproached, would have thought of Sir Robert Peel, and the moderate Reformers, who voted last year against the extension of the franchise to Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds.

From the time that Parliament took this prerogative upon itself, or in the cases where it carried on a contemporary jurisdiction, it cannot be surmised even from silence, that any notion of vested rights disabled it, either from granting the franchise to places formerly unrepresented, or from taking it away either from places or persons, whose exercise of it was deemed incompatible with the policy or convenience of the times. Enough, in both of these courses, has been done in every period of our history—formerly by prerogative as well as statute—subsequent

to the Revolution, by statute only—to do away (as far as precedents can shame men into fairness) with the possibility of all questions of *right* on these occasions, and to remit us to the discussion of policy only. From Edward I. to Henry IV., it seems that the right of election of the knights of the shire was in all freeholders. The 7th Henry IV. invaded this monopoly, by throwing it open to ‘suitsors duly summoned, and *others.*’ The evil of ‘excessive numbers,’ recited in its preamble, brought in the celebrated enactment of 8th Henry VI., which disfranchised all people who had not a freehold to the value of (what was then no inconsiderable sum) forty shillings a-year. The Unions, in the instance of both Scotland and Ireland, could be only carried into execution at the price of almost national disfranchisements. The mode in which, since 1663, the Convocation has sunk into the opportunity for a divine to make a ceremonial speech in Latin, and by which the right of ecclesiastical taxation is transferred to Parliament, whilst the clergy have been admitted to vote at elections in right of their glebes, are recent innovations which usage has sanctioned, and is sanctioning, as law. Yet all this, according to some people’s notions, must be a scramble of injustice. Whatever opinion the reader may entertain of the legal rights of a clergyman to sit in the House of Commons previous to 41st Geo. III.—and our opinion is decidedly in favour of Lord Thurlow and of the right—there can be no doubt of the view which Parliament, in passing that statute, must have taken of its duty. It acted on its own responsibility, as trustee for the public, on grounds of policy alone, and in disregard of suggested rights, when, without referring a doubtful question to a court of justice, it undertook to decide the point by an express disqualifying enactment. Professor Christian, whose prejudices make him an authority on a subject of this sort, properly remarks,—‘the most strenuous advocates for the admissibility of the clergy by the common law, will not necessarily object to their exclusion by an act of the legislature. They were so excluded from the Parliaments of Scotland and Ireland. And perhaps it may be justly observed, that sound policy and the most important interests of society require, that the ambition of a clergyman should be confined to his own profession, and that piety and learning should be his surest recommendation to advancement.’ All observations on this branch of the legislature must appear superfluous (except as historical facts), after the annihilation of 200,000 Irish freeholders within these two years. Before ‘the shoes were old,’ in which they had walked as the chief reformers at the funeral of the electoral fran-

chise of a whole people, it required no trifling degree of assurance, in the chief opponents of the present measure, to storm, and protest against the insecurity to property, which the disfranchisement of a few aldermen, non-resident burgesses, and pot-wallopers, must inevitably produce.

The singling out an individual, as in the case of Wilkes and Tooke, and the destroying the right of which he is in possession, are the most odious cases of legislation, from being occasional and personal acts, and liable to all the suspicions of personality which had made proceedings of this kind, under the name of *privilegia*, so atrocious in the opinion of the Romans. Yet in this, the worst of all cases, Burke is far from questioning the right. His argument, on the Middlesex election, against the vote by which Wilkes had been expelled from the House of Commons by means of a simple resolution of the House, went on the distinction—not that the disqualification in question, or any other, might not properly exist—but that it was legislative in its nature, and therefore required the concurrence of the whole legislature. ‘A legislative act has no reference to any rule but these two: original justice, and discretionary application. Therefore it can give rights; rights where no rights existed before: and it can take away rights where they were before established. For the law which binds all others, does not, and cannot bind the law-maker: he, and he alone, is above the law.’

There is no peculiar sanctity impressed on political, or any other franchises, in the case when they are engrafted on that intangible and invisible creation of the law called a corporation, whether the corporation be municipal or ecclesiastical. If there is a difference—the fact, that the whole mechanism and structure of an artificial body of this sort, are so plainly arbitrary, that no man was ever idiot enough to imagine that they were of the essence and nature of man and of society, shows on which side the difference lies. Among natural rights, who ever maintained that the law of nature entitled a man to be an Alderman of Scarborough, for instance? or in that capacity to job its representation;—in other words, to exchange the right of legislating for the people of England, in consideration of the presentation of the sons of the said alderman to the *cure* of souls in the Vale of Belvoir?

The adoption of the plan developed in Mr Palgrave's pamphlet, entitled *Conciliatory Reform*, would, we fear, conciliate few of the alarmists, except its learned author. Mr Palgrave has not been so far betrayed by antiquarian affections, as to take under his patronage the sophism of corporation rights. But a touching remonstrance on the folly of our not reconstructing our legal habit-

ation on the vanished groundwork of Saxon guilds, and the notion that '*unmeaning* masses of population' will acquire a meaning, by the process of incorporation, appear to us to be only one degree more reasonable. Places lying without the liberties of a corporation in the present age, are no worse off, as far as we can observe, than places which happen to be so blessed. On walking one day through Mary-le-Bone, and the next day through the city, we do not see that the case of Mary-le-Bone, and our suburbs, calls for the pity which is expressed on their behalf, as subjected to neglect, 'perhaps without a parallel in Europe.' At all events, Mr Palgrave knows as well as ourselves—indeed must know infinitely better, if he stops to reason on his knowledge—that, on a comparison of English and foreign institutions, the distinction of corporations will not account (as is suggested) for that prosperous combination of progressive freedom and tranquillity which has so eminently characterised our constitutional career. Other countries have resembled us much more closely in our system of corporations than in our other political divisions of the public power, or in the invaluable school-room, as well as guardroom of a jury.

There is not now, nor ever was, any necessary connexion between the exercise of the elective franchise, and the proper duties of a corporate body,—whether the body was united on the terms of a municipal jurisdiction—an association for the prosecution of felons, or for any other purpose—a friendly society, or a professional club. Our representative system was complete in its principle, if not in its spirit, without the intervention of the commercial guilds, whose principle was monopoly; or that of the municipal corporation, whose most important object was revenue or police. The more we enquire, the more we find that most of our liberties of every kind had a fiscal origin. Franchises were given to places which could pay for the additional protection. Members were summoned from places which could give the most decisive answer concerning taxes. The chief men in guilds, when there were any, or the borough officers, would be begged, as being the principal people in the place, to undertake the journey, and make the best terms they could, in a matter where they had a deeper interest than the rest, in proportion to their wealth. If the Parliamentary wages were paid only by the electors, the right of election would soon become exclusive, without the charge of usurpation. The complication of villainy and baseness, by which, in later times, the corporate and political connexion has been, in most occasions, consummated, and by which it has been stained to its very bone and marrow, passes all conception and belief. If boroughs have

not destroyed the muniments they have so long concealed, the historian of the English constitution, and the historian of human corruption, may both hope soon for the publication of a mass of new materials. In case the Cornish boroughs had been placed in a circle within twenty miles of London, instead of being sheltered in the obscurity of a distant province, the moral indignation of the heart of England would have broken to pieces those infamous organizations of corruption a hundred years ago.

Under these circumstances especially, it has been matter of surprise and pain to us, that so many pastors of a Christian church should have deemed it decent to make common cause with the rotten boroughs. We lament that the clergy, and the body of the English people, seem, at least in political opinion and feeling, to be separated by such a distance—we had almost said such a chasm. Clergymen have as much right to their own sentiments as any other members of the community. But our regret is not the less that this difference in sentiment should exist; nor are our apprehensions less serious for the consequences to which a pertinacious adherence in, and an active manifestation of extreme opinions may (indeed must, in that case, sooner or later) ultimately lead. The sort of opposition which a people will the least forgive, is that which implies the existence of separate interests and of personal distrusts. The necessity that the Church of England must, in many points, itself submit to be reformed, is no secret. Calmly and judiciously reformed, it will remain a national blessing, and speedily regain the affections of the people. The only question is, by whom, and in what manner, and to what extent, this shall be done. A collected opposition by the leaders of the church against a measure of pure political reformation, must tend to generate most suspicious inferences, and unavoidable bitterness of feeling. Such an occurrence would, therefore, seriously endanger the present prospect of confining within its proper limits, and of peaceably accomplishing that species of Reform, which the end, and the popularity of the Ecclesiastical Institutions of England, absolutely require. Without this, the wisdom and eloquence of their chosen advocates (the best, we take for granted, they could get) from the University of Cambridge, will be of no avail. There are strange rumours in circulation of the course in meditation by the bishops. In what hopes are they indulging? As far back as 1321, to be sure, among the reasons for avoiding the award by which the two Despencers had been banished, is to be found the allegation that it has been passed without the assent of the Prelates. But Bishop Gardiner got no encouragement in his day

for the notion, that acts of the legislature would be void for his absence, and that of the other ecclesiastical members of Parliament, even though they were absent by constraint. Laud's brethren took as little by the protest made by them against all acts passed in their absence, as being the acts of a Parliament no longer free. Coke and Selden establish, by sufficient precedents, the validity of a bill, although every spiritual lord should have voted against it. In case the venerable Bishop of Norwich cannot get a proxy, his presence, nevertheless, we trust, will save us from the necessity of solving the debated problem, by what style an act of Parliament should be entered, which has been passed (as was the Act of Uniformity, 1st Eliz. c. 2) with the dissent of all the bishops. We should dread the omen of the precedent in that statute: the name of the lords spiritual is omitted throughout the whole. Lord Eldon's notions on Reform might come to pass.

God forbid that the English nation should be driven back, in retrospect, to those fatal periods of clerical disaffection to the constitution! It is painful to remember the temper with which George I. was welcomed by the Church of England, when his Parliamentary title to the throne was the only objection to his person, and the formation of a Whig ministry the only grievance of which the clergy could complain. Of that period, Mr Hallam observes, that 'the clergy, in very many instances, were a curse rather than a blessing to those over whom they were set; and the people, while they trusted that from those polluted fountains they drew the living waters of truth, became the dupes of factious lies and spirits.' Some circumstances, at the late Cambridge election (especially the sort of reception given to Lord Palmerston, by St John's), made us think of Gray's complaint against that learned University, and of the baneful influence which 'Jacobitism had produced there on good manners and good letters.' The germ of this disease is of longer standing. Its inveterateness may be best conceived, by turning to the remarkable debate of 1705, and by considering the declarations which were wrung from every bishop, to whose manliness that church was indebted for its existence, against the undutifulness of a clergy devoted to the Pretender and his cause. Compton, Burnet, Patrick, and Hough, rose in succession to protest against their conduct. Burnet's observations on this debate are worthy of a bishop of 1688. 'In one respect, it was acknowledged that the church was in danger. There was an evil spirit, and a virulent temper spread among the clergy. There were many indecent sermons preached on public occasions. These were dangers created by those very men who

‘filled the nation with this outcry against imaginary ones, while their own conduct produced real and threatening danger.’ That excellent man, Bishop Patrick, stood up, and moved, ‘that the judges, also, might be consulted what power the Queen had in visiting the Universities: complaining of the heat and passion of the gentlemen there: which they inculcated into their pupils, who brought with them the same fury to the parishes, when they came abroad, to the great disturbance of public charity. At the election at Cambridge, it was shameful to see a hundred or more young students, encouraged in hallooing like schoolboys and porters, and crying ‘No Fanatic, No Occasional Conformity, against two worthy gentlemen that stood candidates.’ James I. gave members to the Universities, out of his respect for learning, and for the sake of the republic of letters. Late events, were he again on earth, would go far towards provoking him to resume his charter, on a breach of trust. We pray that these encouragers of science and academic merit, in the person of Mr Cavendish, may never have occasion to apply to themselves the reproach Bishop Hough complained of—of having compounded to be the last of their order.

Whoever is disposed to carp at the moral and tendency of our observations, will find that he is likely to have on his hands a much more extensive quarrel with the English constitution, than he was probably at first aware. It has been the fortune of every body, we suspect, within the last three months, to hear a good deal said on all sides, of which he can by no manner of means approve. For our own part, we have never joined in wholesale abuse of the general spirit and character of our institutions. Considering the immense difficulty (according to the experience of mankind in all ages) of constructing and keeping together a tolerably good government, we thought ourselves well off whilst we were in possession of perhaps the best—certainly of the best but one—that ever had existed. On the other hand, we have no distrust of the English people. The system which it is proposed to substitute for the most defective portions of the former one, connects so naturally, and by so easy a transition, with those sound parts which are retained—whilst it is, at the same time, throughout, so much more simple, rational, and honest—that there can be no comparison, if we look at the two on paper, or leave them the matter of plain argument by plain men. In case the middling ranks are at all what we believe them to be, they will not permit the cause of reason to be contradicted and put to shame by the result. The change must secure to us, according to all probability, very nearly every one

of our former advantages, whilst it bids fair to save us from a constantly recurring load of mischief and disgrace. It is no presumption against the intelligence and virtue of the people, that they have resolved to make the experiment. Still less can it be stated (consistently with any respect for truth, sense, or history), that by reason of the revocation of that description of political franchise, which it is necessary to demolish, in order to make room for our alterations, and which had been so long notoriously and irreclaimably abused, we are grounding our reformation on an act of revolutionary injustice.

Art. XI.—*Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: with Notices of his Life.* By THOMAS MOORE, Esq. 2 vols. 4to. London: 1830.

WE have read this book with the greatest pleasure. Considered merely as a composition, it deserves to be classed among the best specimens of English prose which our age has produced. It contains, indeed, no single passage equal to two or three, which we could select from the *Life of Sheridan*. But, as a whole, it is immeasurably superior to that work. The style is agreeable, clear, and manly; and, when it rises into eloquence, rises without effort or ostentation. Nor is the matter inferior to the manner.

It would be difficult to name a book which exhibits more of kindness, fairness, and modesty. It has evidently been written, not for the purpose of showing, what, however, it often shows, how well its author can write; but for the purpose of vindicating, as far as truth will permit, the memory of a celebrated man who can no longer vindicate himself. Mr Moore never thrusts himself between Lord Byron and the public. With the strongest temptations to egotism, he has said no more about himself than the subject absolutely required. A great part—indeed the greater part of these volumes, consists of extracts from the *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*; and it is difficult to speak too highly of the skill which has been shown in the selection and arrangement. We will not say that we have not occasionally remarked in these two large quartos an anecdote which should have been omitted, a letter which should have been suppressed, a name which should have been concealed by asterisks; or asterisks which do not answer the purpose of concealing the name. But it is impossible, on a general survey, to deny that

the task has been executed with great judgment and great humanity. When we consider the life which Lord Byron had led, his petulance, his irritability, and his communicativeness, we cannot but admire the dexterity with which Mr Moore has contrived to exhibit so much of the character and opinions of his friend, with so little pain to the feelings of the living.

The extracts from the journals and correspondence of Lord Byron, are in the highest degree valuable—not merely on account of the information which they contain respecting the distinguished man by whom they were written, but on account, also, of their rare merit as compositions. The Letters—at least those which were sent from Italy—are among the best in our language. They are less affected than those of Pope and Walpole;—they have more matter in them than those of Cowper. Knowing that many of them were not written merely for the person to whom they were directed, but were general epistles, meant to be read by a large circle, we expected to find them clever and spirited, but deficient in ease. We looked with vigilance for instances of stiffness in the language, and awkwardness in the transitions. We have been agreeably disappointed; and we must confess, that if the epistolary style of Lord Byron was artificial, it was a rare and admirable instance of that highest art, which cannot be distinguished from nature.

Of the deep and painful interest which this book excites, no abstract can give a just notion. So sad and dark a story is scarcely to be found in any work of fiction; and we are little disposed to envy the moralist who can read it without being softened.

The pretty fable by which the Duchess of Orleans illustrates the character of her son the regent, might, with little change, be applied to Byron. All the fairies, save one, had been bidden to his cradle. All the gossips had been profuse of their gifts. One had bestowed nobility, another genius, a third beauty. The malignant elf who had been uninvited, came last, and, unable to reverse what her sisters had done for their favourite, had mixed up a curse with every blessing. In the rank of Lord Byron, in his understanding, in his character, in his very person, there was a strange union of opposite extremes. He was born to all that men covet and admire. But in every one of those eminent advantages which he possessed over others, there was mingled something of misery and debasement. He was sprung from a house, ancient indeed and noble, but degraded and impoverished by a series of crimes and follies, which had attained a scandalous publicity. The kinsman whom he suc-

ceeded had died poor, and, but for merciful judges, would have died upon the gallows. The young peer had great intellectual powers; yet there was an unsound part in his mind. He had naturally a generous and tender heart; but his temper was wayward and irritable. He had a head which statuaries loved to copy, and a foot, the deformity of which the beggars in the streets mimicked. Distinguished at once by the strength and by the weakness of his intellect, affectionate yet perverse, a poor lord, and a handsome cripple, he required, if ever man required, the firmest and the most judicious training. But, capriciously as nature had dealt with him, the relative to whom the office of forming his character was intrusted, was more capricious still. She passed from paroxysms of rage to paroxysms of fondness. At one time she stifled him with her caresses—at another time she insulted his deformity. He came into the world, and the world treated him as his mother treated him—sometimes with kindness, sometimes with severity, never with justice. It indulged him without discrimination, and punished him without discrimination. He was truly a spoiled child,—not merely the spoiled child of his parent, but the spoiled child of nature, the spoiled child of fortune, the spoiled child of fame, the spoiled child of society. His first poems were received with a contempt which, feeble as they were, they did not absolutely deserve. The poem which he published on his return from his travels, was, on the other hand, extolled far above its merit. At twenty-four he found himself on the highest pinnacle of literary fame, with Scott, Wordsworth, Southey, and a crowd of other distinguished writers, beneath his feet. There is scarcely an instance in history of so sudden a rise to so dizzy an eminence.

Every thing that could stimulate, and every thing that could gratify the strongest propensities of our nature—the gaze of a hundred drawingrooms, the acclamations of the whole nation, the applause of applauded men, the love of the loveliest women—all this world, and all the glory of it, were at once offered to a young man to whom nature had given violent passions, and whom education had never taught to control them. He lived as many men live who have no similar excuses to plead for their faults. But his countrymen and his countrywomen would love him and admire him. They were resolved to see in his excesses only the flash and outbreak of that same fiery mind which glowed in his poetry. He attacked religion; yet in religious circles his name was mentioned with fondness, and in many religious publications his works were censured with singular tenderness. He lampooned the prince regent; yet he could not alienate the

Tories. Every thing, it seemed, was to be forgiven to youth, rank, and genius.

Then came the reaction. Society, capricious in its indignation as it had been capricious in its fondness, flew into a rage with its froward and petted darling. He had been worshipped with an irrational idolatry. He was persecuted with an irrational fury. Much has been written about those unhappy domestic occurrences which decided the fate of his life. Yet nothing is, nothing ever was positively known to the public, but this,—that he quarrelled with his lady, and that she refused to live with him. There have been hints in abundance, and shrugs and shakings of the head, and ‘Well, well, we know,’ and ‘We could an if we would,’ and ‘If we list to speak,’ and ‘There be that might an they list.’ But we are not aware that there is before the world, substantiated by credible, or even by tangible evidence, a single fact indicating that Lord Byron was more to blame than any other man who is on bad terms with his wife. The professional men whom Lady Byron consulted, were undoubtedly of opinion that she ought not to live with her husband. But it is to be remembered that they formed that opinion without hearing both sides. We do not say, we do not mean to insinuate, that Lady Byron was in any respect to blame. We think that those who condemn her on the evidence which is now before the public, are as rash as those who condemn her husband. We will not pronounce any judgment; we cannot, even in our own minds, form any judgment on a transaction which is so imperfectly known to us. It would have been well if, at the time of the separation, all those who knew as little about the matter then as we know about it now, had shown that forbearance, which, under such circumstances, is but common justice.

We know no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality. In general, elopements, divorces, and family quarrels, pass with little notice. We read the scandal, talk about it for a day, and forget it. But once in six or seven years, our virtue becomes outrageous. We cannot suffer the laws of religion and decency to be violated. We must make a stand against vice. We must teach libertines, that the English people appreciate the importance of domestic ties. Accordingly, some unfortunate man, in no respect more depraved than hundreds whose offences have been treated with lenity, is singled out as an expiatory sacrifice. If he has children, they are to be taken from him. If he has a profession, he is to be driven from it. He is cut by the higher orders, and hissed by the lower. He is, in truth, a sort of whipping-boy, by whose

vicarious agonies, all the other transgressors of the same class are, it is supposed, sufficiently chastised. We reflect very complacently on our own severity, and compare with great pride the high standard of morals established in England, with the Parisian laxity. At length our anger is satiated. Our victim is ruined and heart-broken. And our virtue goes quietly to sleep for seven years more.

It is clear that those vices which destroy domestic happiness, ought to be as much as possible repressed. It is equally clear that they cannot be repressed by penal legislation. It is therefore right and desirable that public opinion should be directed against them. But it should be directed against them uniformly, steadily, and temperately, not by sudden fits and starts. There should be one weight and one measure. Decimation is always an objectionable mode of punishment. It is the resource of judges too indolent and hasty to investigate facts, and to discriminate nicely between shades of guilt. It is an irrational practice, even when adopted by military tribunals. When adopted by the tribunal of public opinion, it is infinitely more irrational. It is good that a certain portion of disgrace should constantly attend on certain bad actions. But it is not good that the offenders merely have to stand the risks of a lottery of infamy; that ninety-nine out of every hundred should escape; and that the hundredth, perhaps the most innocent of the hundred, should pay for all. We remember to have seen a mob assembled in Lincoln's Inn to hoot a gentleman, against whom the most oppressive proceeding known to the English law was then in progress. He was hooted because he had been an indifferent and unfaithful husband, as if some of the most popular men of the age—Lord Nelson, for example—had not been indifferent and unfaithful husbands. We remember a still stronger case. Will posterity believe, that in an age in which men, whose gallantries were universally known, and had been legally proved, filled some of the highest offices in the state, and in the army, presided at the meetings of religious and benevolent institutions—were the delight of every society, and the favourites of the multitude—a crowd of moralists went to the theatre, in order to pelt a poor actor for disturbing the conjugal felicity of an alderman? What there was in the circumstances, either of the offender, or of the sufferer, to vindicate the zeal of the audience, we could never conceive. It has never been supposed that the situation of an actor is peculiarly favourable to the rigid virtues, or that an alderman enjoys any special immunity from injuries such as that which on this occasion roused the anger of the public. But such is the justice of mankind.

In these cases, the punishment was excessive; but the offence was known and proved. The case of Lord Byron was harder. True Jedwood justice was dealt out to him. First came the execution, then the investigation, and last of all, or rather not at all, the accusation. The public, without knowing any thing whatever about the transactions in his family, flew into a violent passion with him, and proceeded to invent stories which might justify its anger. Ten or twenty different accounts of the separation, inconsistent with each other, with themselves, and with common sense, circulated at the same time. What evidence there might be for any one of these, the virtuous people who repeated them neither knew nor cared. For in fact these stories were not the causes, but the effects of the public indignation. They resembled those loathsome slanders which Goldsmith, and other abject libellers of the same class, were in the habit of publishing about Bonaparte,—how he poisoned a girl with arsenic when he was at the military school,—how he hired a grenadier to shoot Dessaix at Marengo,—how he filled St Cloud with all the pollutions of Capreae. There was a time when anecdotes like these obtained some credence from persons, who, hating the French emperor, without knowing why, were eager to believe any thing which might justify their hatred. Lord Byron fared in the same way. His countrymen were in a bad humour with him. His writings and his character had lost the charm of novelty. He had been guilty of the offence which, of all offences, is punished most severely; he had been over-praised; he had excited too warm an interest; and the public, with its usual justice, chastised him for its own folly. The attachments of the multitude bear no small resemblance to those of the wanton enchantress in the Arabian Tales, who, when the forty days of her fondness were over, was not content with dismissing her lovers, but condemned them to expiate, in loathsome shapes, and under severe punishments, the crime of having once pleased her too well.

The obloquy which Byron had to endure, was such as might well have shaken a more constant mind. The newspapers were filled with lampoons. The theatres shook with execrations. He was excluded from circles where he had lately been the observed of all observers. All those creeping things that riot in the decay of nobler natures, hastened to their repast; and they were right;—they did after their kind. It is not every day that the savage envy of aspiring dunces is gratified by the agonies of such a spirit, and the degradation of such a name.

The unhappy man left his country for ever. The howl of

contumely followed him across the sea, up the Rhine, over the Alps; it gradually waxed fainter; it died away. Those who had raised it began to ask each other, what, after all, was the matter about which they had been so clamorous; and wished to invite back the criminal whom they had just chased from them. His poetry became more popular than it had ever been; and his complaints were read with tears by thousands and tens of thousands who had never seen his face.

He had fixed his home on the shores of the Adriatic, in the most picturesque and interesting of cities, beneath the brightest of skies, and by the brightest of seas. Censoriousness was not the vice of the neighbours whom he had chosen. They were a race corrupted by a bad government and a bad religion; long renowned for skill in the arts of voluptuousness, and tolerant of all the caprices of sensuality. From the public opinion of the country of his adoption, he had nothing to dread. With the public opinion of the country of his birth, he was at open war. He plunged into wild and desperate excesses, ennobled by no generous or tender sentiment. From his Venetian harem he sent forth volume after volume, full of eloquence, of wit, of pathos, of ribaldry, and of bitter disdain. His health sank under the effects of his intemperance. His hair turned grey. His food ceased to nourish him. A hectic fever withered him up. It seemed that his body and mind were about to perish together.

From this wretched degradation he was in some measure rescued by an attachment, culpable indeed, yet such as, judged by the standard of morality established in the country where he lived, might be called virtuous. But an imagination polluted by vice, a temper embittered by misfortune, and a frame habituated to the fatal excitement of intoxication, prevented him from fully enjoying the happiness which he might have derived from the purest and most tranquil of his many attachments. Midnight draughts of ardent spirits and Rhenish wines had begun to work the ruin of his fine intellect. His verse lost much of the energy and condensation which had distinguished it. But he would not resign, without a struggle, the empire which he had exercised over the men of his generation. A new dream of ambition arose before him—to be the centre of a literary party; the great mover of an intellectual revolution;—to guide the public mind of England from his Italian retreat, as Voltaire had guided the public mind of France from the villa of Ferney. With this hope, as it should seem, he established *The Liberal*. But, powerfully as he had affected the imaginations of his contemporaries, he mistook his own powers, if he hoped to direct their

opinions; and he still more grossly mistook his own disposition, if he thought that he could long act in concert with other men of letters. The plan failed, and failed ignominiously: Angry with himself, angry with his coadjutors, he relinquished it; and turned to another project, the last and the noblest of his life.

A nation, once the first among the nations, pre-eminent in knowledge, pre-eminent in military glory, the cradle of philosophy, of eloquence, and of the fine arts, had been for ages bowed down under a cruel yoke. All the vices which tyranny generates—the abject vices which it generates in those who submit to it—the ferocious vices which it generates in those who struggle against it—had deformed the character of that miserable race. The valour which had won the great battle of human civilisation,—which had saved Europe, and subjugated Asia, lingered only among pirates and robbers. The ingenuity, once so conspicuously displayed in every department of physical and moral science, had been depraved into a timid and servile cunning. On a sudden this degraded people had risen on their oppressors. Discouraged or betrayed by the surrounding potentates, they had found in themselves something of that which might well supply the place of all foreign assistance,—something of the energy of their fathers.

As a man of letters, Lord Byron could not but be interested in the event of this contest. His political opinions, though, like all his opinions, unsettled, leaned strongly towards the side of liberty. He had assisted the Italian insurgents with his purse; and if their struggle against the Austrian government had been prolonged, would probably have assisted them with his sword. But to Greece he was attached by peculiar ties. He had, when young, resided in that country. Much of his most splendid and popular poetry had been inspired by its scenery and by its history. Sick of inaction,—degraded in his own eyes by his private vices, and by his literary failures,—pining for untried excitement and honourable distinction,—he carried his exhausted body and his wounded spirit to the Grecian camp.

His conduct in his new situation showed so much vigour and good sense as to justify us in believing, that, if his life had been prolonged, he might have distinguished himself as a soldier and a politician. But pleasure and sorrow had done the work of seventy years upon his delicate frame. The hand of death was on him: he knew it; and the only wish which he uttered was that he might die sword in hand.

This was denied to him. Anxiety, exertion, exposure, and

those fatal stimulants which had become indispensable to him, soon stretched him on a sickbed, in a strange land, amidst strange faces, without one human being that he loved near him. There, at thirty-six, the most celebrated Englishman of the nineteenth century closed his brilliant and miserable career.

We cannot even now retrace those events without feeling something of what was felt by the nation, when it was first known that the grave had closed over so much sorrow and so much glory;—something of what was felt by those who saw the hearse, with its long train of coaches, turn slowly northward, leaving behind it that cemetery, which had been consecrated by the dust of so many great poets, but of which the doors were closed against all that remained of Byron. We well remember that, on that day, rigid moralists could not refrain from weeping for one so young, so illustrious, so unhappy, gifted with such rare gifts, and tried by such strong temptations. It is unnecessary to make any reflections. The history carries its moral with it. Our age has indeed been fruitful of warnings to the eminent, and of consolations to the obscure. Two men have died within our recollection, who, at a time of life at which few people have completed their education, had raised themselves, each in his own department, to the height of glory. One of them died at Longwood, the other at Missolonghi.

It is always difficult to separate the literary character of a man who lives in our own time from his personal character. It is peculiarly difficult to make this separation in the case of Lord Byron. For it is scarcely too much to say, that Lord Byron never wrote without some reference, direct or indirect, to himself. The interest excited by the events of his life, mingles itself in our minds, and probably in the minds of almost all our readers, with the interest which properly belongs to his works. A generation must pass away before it will be possible to form a fair judgment of his books, considered merely as books. At present they are not only books, but relics. We will, however, venture, though with unfeigned diffidence, to offer some desultory remarks on his poetry.

His lot was cast in the time of a great literary revolution. That poetical dynasty which had dethroned the successors of Shakspeare and Spenser was, in its turn, dethroned by a race who represented themselves as heirs of the ancient line, so long dispossessed by usurpers. The real nature of this revolution has not, we think, been comprehended by the great majority of those who concurred in it.

If this question were proposed—wherein especially does the poetry of our times differ from that of the last century?—ninety-nine persons out of a hundred would answer that the poetry of the last century was correct, but cold and mechanical, and that the poetry of our time, though wild and irregular, presented far more vivid images, and excited the passions far more strongly than that of Parnell, of Addison, or of Pope. In the same manner we constantly hear it said, that the poets of the age of Elizabeth had far more genius, but far less correctness, than those of the age of Anne. It seems to be taken for granted, that there is some necessary incompatibility, some antithesis between correctness and creative power. We rather suspect that this notion arises merely from an abuse of words; and that it has been the parent of many of the fallacies which perplex the science of criticism.

What is meant by correctness in poetry? If by correctness be meant the conforming to rules which have their foundation in truth, and in the principles of human nature, then correctness is only another name for excellence. If by correctness be meant the conforming to rules purely arbitrary, correctness may be another name for dulness and absurdity.

A writer who describes visible objects falsely, and violates the propriety of character,—a writer who makes the mountains ‘nod their drowsy heads’ at night, or a dying man take leave of the world with a rant like that of Maximin, may be said, in the high and just sense of the phrase, to write incorrectly. He violates the first great law of his art. His imitation is altogether unlike the thing imitated. The four poets who are most eminently free from incorrectness of this description are Homer, Dante, Shakspeare, and Milton. They are, therefore, in one sense, and that the best sense, the most correct of poets.

When it is said that Virgil, though he had less genius than Homer, was a more correct writer, what sense is attached to the word correctness? Is it meant that the story of the *Æneid* is developed more skilfully than that of the *Odyssey*?—that the Roman describes the face of the external world, or the emotions of the mind, more accurately than the Greek?—that the characters of Aclates and Mnestheus are more nicely discriminated, and more consistently supported, than those of Achilles, of Nestor, and of Ulysses? The fact incontestably is, that for every violation of the fundamental laws of poetry, which can be found in Homer, it would be easy to find twenty in Virgil.

Troilus and Cressida is perhaps of all the plays of Shakspeare that which is commonly considered as the most incorrect. Yet it seems to us infinitely more correct, in the sound sense of

the term, than what are called the most correct plays of the most correct dramatists. Compare it, for example, with the *Iphigénie* of Racine. We are sure that the Greeks of Shakspeare bear a far greater resemblance than the Greeks of Racine to the real Greeks who besieged Troy; and for this reason, that the Greeks of Shakspeare are human beings, and the Greeks of Racine mere names;—mere words printed in capitals at the head of paragraphs of declamation. Racine, it is true, would have shuddered at the thought of making Agamemnon quote Aristotle. But of what use is it to avoid a single anachronism, when the whole play is one anachronism,—the topics and phrases of Versailles in the camp of Aulis?

In the sense in which we are now using the word correctness, we think that Sir Walter Scott, Mr Wordsworth, Mr Coleridge, are far more correct writers than those who are commonly extolled as the models of correctness,—Pope, for example, and Addison. The single description of a moonlight night in Pope's *Iliad* contains more inaccuracies than can be found in all the *Excursion*. There is not a single scene in *Cato*, in which every thing that conduces to poetical illusion,—the propriety of character, of language, of situation, is not more grossly violated than in any part of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*. No man can possibly think that the Romans of Addison resemble the real Romans, so closely as the moss-troopers of Scott resemble the real moss-troopers. Watt Tinlinn and William of Deloraine are not, it is true, persons of so much dignity as *Cato*. But the dignity of the persons represented, has as little to do with the correctness of poetry as with the correctness of painting. We prefer a gipsy by Reynolds to his Majesty's head on a signpost, and a *Borderer* by Scott to a senator by Addison.

In what sense, then, is the word correctness used by those who say, with the author of the *Pursuits of Literature*, that Pope was the most correct of English Poets, and, that next to Pope, came the late Mr Gifford? What is the nature and value of that correctness, the praise of which is denied to *Macbeth*, to *Lear*, and to *Othello*, and given to Hoole's translations and to all the *Seatonian* prize-poems? We can discover no eternal rule—no rule founded in reason and in the nature of things—which Shakspeare does not observe much more strictly than Pope. But if by correctness be meant the conforming to a narrow legislation, which, while lenient to the *mala in se*, multiplies, without the shadow of a reason, the *mala prohibita*,—if by correctness be meant a strict attention to certain ceremonious observances, which are no more essential to poetry than etiquette to good government, or than the washings of a Pharisee to devotion,—

then, assuredly, Pope may be a more correct poet than Shakspeare; and, if the code were a little altered, Colley Cibber might be a more correct poet than Pope. But it may well be doubted whether this kind of correctness be a merit—nay, whether it be not an absolute fault.

It would be amusing to make a digest of the irrational laws which bad critics have framed for the government of poets. First in celebrity and in absurdity stand the dramatic unities of place and time. No human being has ever been able to find any thing that could, even by courtesy, be called an argument for these unities, except that they have been deduced from the general practice of the Greeks. It requires no very profound examination to discover that the Greek dramas, often admirable as compositions, are, as exhibitions of human character and human life, far inferior to the English plays of the age of Elizabeth. Every scholar knows that the dramatic part of the Athenian tragedies was at first subordinate to the lyrical part. It would, therefore, have been little less than a miracle if the laws of the Athenian stage had been found to suit plays in which there was no chorus. All the greatest masterpieces of the dramatic art have been composed in direct violation of the unities, and could never have been composed if the unities had not been violated. It is clear, for example, that such a character as that of Hamlet could never have been developed within the limits to which Alfieri confined himself. Yet such was the reverence of literary men during the last century for these unities, that Johnson, who, much to his honour, took the opposite side, was, as he says, 'frighted at his own temerity;' and 'afraid 'to stand against the authorities which might be produced 'against him.'

There are other rules of the same kind without end. 'Shakspeare,' says Rymer, 'ought not to have made Othello black; 'for the hero of a tragedy ought always to be white.' 'Milton,' says another critic, 'ought not to have taken Adam for 'his hero; for the hero of an epic poem ought always to be 'victorious.' 'Milton,' says another, 'ought not to have put 'so many similes into his first book; for the first book of an 'epic poem ought always to be the most unadorned. There are 'no similes in the first book of the Iliad.' 'Milton,' says another, 'ought not to have placed in an epic poem such lines as 'these:—

' I also erred in overmuch admiring.'

And why not? The critic is ready with a reason—a lady's reason. 'Such lines,' says he, 'are not, it must be allowed, un-

‘pleasing to the ear; but the redundant syllable ought to be confined to the drama, and not admitted into epic poetry.’ As to the redundant syllable in heroic rhyme, on serious subjects, it has been, from the time of Pope downward, proscribed by the general consent of all the correct school. No magazine would have admitted so incorrect a couplet as that of Drayton—

‘As when we lived untouch’d with these disgraces,
When as our kingdom was our dear embraces.’

Another law of heroic poetry, which, fifty years ago, was considered as fundamental, was, that there should be a pause—a comma at least, at the end of every couplet. It was also provided that there should never be a full stop except at the end of a couplet. Well do we remember to have heard a most correct judge of poetry revile Mr Rogers for the incorrectness of that most sweet and graceful passage—

‘’Twas thine, Maria, thine, without a sigh,
At midnight in a sister’s arms to die,
Nursing the young to health.’

Sir Roger Newdigate is fairly entitled, we think, to be ranked among the great critics of this school. He made a law that none of the poems written for the Prize which he established at Oxford should exceed fifty lines. This law seems to us to have at least as much foundation in reason as any of those which we have mentioned—nay, much more, for the world, we believe, is pretty well agreed in thinking that the shorter a prize-poem is, the better.

We do not see why we should not make a few more rules of the same kind,—why we should not enact that the number of scenes in every act shall be three, or some multiple of three,—that the number of lines in every scene shall be an exact square,—that the *dramatis personæ* shall never be more or fewer than sixteen,—and that, in heroic rhymes, every thirty-sixth line shall have twelve syllables. If we were to lay down these canons, and to call Pope, Goldsmith, and Addison, incorrect writers for not having complied with our whims, we should act precisely as those critics act who find incorrectness in the magnificent imagery and the varied music of Coleridge and Shelley.

The correctness which the last century prized so much, resembled the correctness of those pictures of the garden of Eden which we see in old Bibles,—an exact square, enclosed by the rivers Pison, Gihon, Hiddekel, and Euphrates, each with a convenient bridge in the centre—rectangular beds of flowers—a long canal, neatly bricked and railed in—the tree of knowledge, clipped like one of the limes behind the Tuilleries,

standing in the centre of the grand alley—the snake twined round it—the man on the right hand, the woman on the left, and the beasts drawn up in an exact circle round them. In one sense the picture is correct enough. That is to say, the squares are correct; the circles are correct; the man and the woman are in a most correct line with the tree; and the snake forms a most correct spiral.

But if there were a painter so gifted, that he should place in the canvass that glorious paradise, seen by the interior eye of him whose outward sight had failed with long watching and labouring for liberty and truth,—if there were a painter who could set before us the mazes of the sapphire brook, the lake with its fringe of myrtles, the flowery meadows, the grottoes overhung by vines, the forests shining with Hesperian fruit, and with the plumage of gorgeous birds, the massy shade of that nuptial bower which showered down roses on the sleeping lovers,—what should we think of a connoisseur who should tell us that this painting, though finer than the absurd picture in the old Bible, was not so correct? Surely we should answer—It is both finer and more correct; and it is finer because it is more correct. It is not made up of correctly drawn diagrams; but it is a correct painting—a worthy representation of that which it is intended to represent.

It is not in the fine arts alone that this false correctness is prized by narrow-minded men,—by men who cannot distinguish means from ends, or what is accidental from what is essential. M. Jourdain admired correctness in fencing. ‘You had no business to hit me then. You must never thrust in *quart* till you have thrust in *tierce*.’ M. Tomès liked correctness in medical practice. ‘I stand up for Artemius. That he killed his patient is plain enough. But still he acted quite according to rule. A man dead is a man dead; and there is an end of the matter. But if rules are to be broken, there is no saying what consequences may follow.’ We have heard of an old German officer, who was a great admirer of correctness in military operations. He used to revile Bonaparte for spoiling the science of war, which had been carried to such exquisite perfection by Marshal Daun. ‘In my youth we used to march and countermarch all the summer without gaining or losing a square league, and then we went into winter quarters. And now comes an ignorant, hotheaded young man, who flies about from Boulogne to Ulm, and from Ulm to the middle of Moravia, and fights battles in December. The whole system of his tactics is monstrously incorrect.’ The world is of opinion, in spite of critics like these, that the end of fencing is to

hit, that the end of medicine is to cure, that the end of war is to conquer, and that those means are the most correct which best accomplish the ends.

And has poetry no end,—no eternal and immutable principles? Is poetry, like heraldry, mere matter of arbitrary regulation? The heralds tell us that certain scutcheons and bearings denote certain conditions, and that to put colours on colours, or metals on metals, is false blazonry. If all this were reversed,—if every coat of arms in Europe were new fashioned,—if it were decreed that *or* should never be placed but on *argent*, or *argent* but on *or*,—that illegitimacy should be denoted by a *lozenge*, and widowhood by a *bend*,—the new science would be just as good as the old science, because both the new and the old would be good for nothing. The mummery of Portcullis and Rouge Dragon, as it has no other value than that which caprice has assigned to it, may well submit to any laws which caprice may impose on it. But it is not so with that great imitative art, to the power of which, all ages, the rudest and the most enlightened, bear witness. Since its first great masterpieces were produced, every thing that is changeable in this world has been changed. Civilisation has been gained, lost, gained again. Religions, and languages, and forms of government, and usages of private life, and modes of thinking, all have undergone a succession of revolutions. Every thing has passed away but the great features of nature, the heart of man, and the miracles of that art, of which it is the office to reflect back the heart of man and the features of nature. Those two strange old poems, the wonder of ninety generations, still retain all their freshness. They still command the veneration of minds, enriched by the literature of many nations and ages. They are still, even in wretched translations, the delight of schoolboys. Having survived ten thousand capricious fashions, having seen successive codes of criticism become obsolete, they still remain, immortal with the immortality of truth,—the same when perused in the study of an English scholar, as when they were first chanted at the banquets of the Ionian princes.

Poetry is, as that most acute of human beings Aristotle said, more than two thousand years ago, imitation. It is an art analogous in many respects to the arts of painting, sculpture, and acting. The imitations of the painter, the sculptor, and the actor, are, indeed, within certain limits, more perfect than those of the poet. The machinery which the poet employs, consists merely of words; and words cannot, even when employed by such an artist as Homer or Dante, present to the mind images

of visible objects quite so lively and exact as those which we carry away from looking on the works of the brush and the chisel. But, on the other hand, the range of poetry is infinitely wider than that of any other imitative art, or than that of all the other imitative arts together. The sculptor can imitate only form; the painter only form and colour; the actor, until the poet supplies him with words, only form, colour, and motion. Poetry holds the outer world in common with the other arts. The heart of man is the province of poetry, and of poetry alone. The painter, the sculptor, and the actor, when the actor is unassisted by the poet, can exhibit no more of human passion and character than that small portion which overflows into the gesture and the face—always an imperfect, often a deceitful sign—of that which is within. The deeper and more complex parts of human nature can be exhibited by means of words alone. Thus the objects of the imitation of poetry are the whole external and the whole internal universe, the face of nature, the vicissitudes of fortune, man as he is in himself, man as he appears in society, all things of which we can form an image in our minds, by combining together parts of things which really exist. The domain of this imperial art is commensurate with the imaginative faculty.

An art essentially imitative ought not surely to be subjected to rules which tend to make its imitations less perfect than they would otherwise be; and those who obey such rules ought to be called, not correct, but incorrect artists. The true way to judge of the rules by which English poetry was governed during the last century, is to look at the effects which they produced.

It was in 1780 that Johnson completed his *Lives of the Poets*. He tells us in that work, that since the time of Dryden, English poetry had shown no tendency to relapse into its original savageness; that its language had been refined, its numbers tuned, and its sentiments improved. It may, perhaps, be doubted whether the nation had any great reason to exult in the refinements and improvements, which gave it *Douglas for Othello*, and the *Triumphs of Temper for the Fairy Queen*.

It was during the thirty years which preceded the appearance of Johnson's *Lives*, that the diction and versification of English poetry were, in the sense in which the word is commonly used, most correct. Those thirty years form the most deplorable part of our literary history. They have bequeathed to us scarcely any poetry which deserves to be remembered. Two or three hundred lines of Gray, twice as many of Goldsmith, a few stanzas of Beattie and Collins, a few strophes of Mason, and a few clever prologues and satires, were the masterpieces of this age of consummate excellence. They may all be printed in one volume, and

that volume would be by no means a volume of extraordinary merit. It would contain no poetry of the highest class, and little which could be placed very high in the second class. The *Paradise Regained*, or *Comus*, would outweigh it all.

At last, when poetry had fallen into such utter decay that Mr Hayley was thought a great poet, it began to appear that the excess of the evil was about to work the cure. Men became tired of an insipid conformity to a standard which derived no authority from nature or reason. A shallow criticism had taught them to ascribe a superstitious value to the spurious correctness of poetasters. A deeper criticism brought them back to the free correctness of the first great masters. The eternal laws of poetry regained their power, and the temporary fashions which had superseded those laws went after the wig of Lovelace and the hoop of Clarissa.

It was in a cold and barren season that the seeds of that rich harvest which we have reaped, were first sown. While poetry was every year becoming more feeble and more mechanical,—while the monotonous versification which Pope had introduced, no longer redeemed by his brilliant wit and his compactness of expression, palled on the ear of the public,—the great works of the dead were every day attracting more and more of the admiration which they deserved. The plays of Shakspeare were better acted, better edited, and better known than they had ever been. Our noble old ballads were again read with pleasure, and it became a fashion to imitate them. Many of the imitations were altogether contemptible. But they showed that men had at least begun to admire the excellence which they could not rival. A literary revolution was evidently at hand. There was a ferment in the minds of men,—a vague craving for something new; a disposition to hail with delight any thing which might at first sight wear the appearance of originality. A reforming age is always fertile of impostors. The same excited state of public feeling which produced the great separation from the see of Rome, produced also the excesses of the Anabaptists. The same stir in the public mind of Europe, which overthrew the abuses of the old French government, produced the Jacobins and Theophilanthropists: Macpherson and the Della Cruscas were to the true reformers of English poetry, what Knipperdolling was to Luther, or what Cloutz was to Turgot. The public was never more disposed to believe stories without evidence, and to admire books without merit. Any thing which could break the dull monotony of the correct school was acceptable.

The forerunner of the great restoration of our literature was

Cowper. His literary career began and ended at nearly the same time with that of Alfieri. A parallel between Alfieri and Cowper may, at first sight, seem as unpromising as that which a loyal Presbyterian minister is said to have drawn, in 1745, between George the Second and Enoch. It may seem that the gentle, shy, melancholy Calvinist, whose spirit had been broken by fagging at school,—who had not courage to earn a livelihood by reading the titles of bills in the House of Lords,—and whose favourite associates were a blind old lady and an evangelical divine, could have nothing in common with the haughty, ardent, and voluptuous nobleman,—the horse-jockey, the libertine, who fought Lord Ligonier in Hyde Park, and robbed the Pretender of his queen. But though the private lives of these remarkable men present scarcely any points of resemblance, their literary lives bear a close analogy to each other. They both found poetry in its lowest state of degradation,—feeble, artificial, and altogether nerveless. They both possessed precisely the talents which fitted them for the task of raising it from that deep abasement. They cannot, in strictness, be called great poets. They had not in any very high degree the creative power,

‘ The vision and the faculty divine ;’

but they had great vigour of thought, great warmth of feeling,—and what, in their circumstances, was above all things important, a manliness of taste which approached to roughness. They did not deal in mechanical versification and conventional phrases. They wrote concerning things, the thought of which set their hearts on fire ; and thus what they wrote, even when it wanted every other grace, had that inimitable grace which sincerity and strong passion impart to the rudest and most homely compositions. Each of them sought for inspiration in a noble and affecting subject, fertile of images, which had not yet been hackneyed. Liberty was the muse of Alfieri,—Religion was the muse of Cowper. The same truth is found in their lighter pieces. They were not among those who deprecated the severity, or deplored the absence, of an unreal mistress in melodious commonplaces. Instead of raving about imaginary Chloes and Sylvias, Cowper wrote of Mrs Unwin's knitting-needles. The only love verses of Alfieri were addressed to one whom he truly and passionately loved. ‘ Tutte le rime amorose che seguono,’ says he, ‘ tutte sono per essa, e ben sue, e di lei solamente ‘ poichè mai d' altra donna per certo non canterò.’

These great men were not free from affectation. But their affectation was directly opposed to the affectation which gene-

rally prevailed. Each of them has expressed, in strong and bitter language, the contempt which he felt for the effeminate poetasters who were in fashion both in England and in Italy. Cowper complains that

‘Manner is all in all, whate’er is writ,
The substitute for genius, taste, and wit.’

He praised Pope; yet he regretted that Pope had

‘Made poetry a mere mechanic art,
And every warbler had his tune by heart.’

Alfieri speaks with similar scorn of the tragedies of his predecessors. ‘*Mi cadevano dalle mani per la languidezza, trivialità e prolissità dei modi e del verso, senza parlare poi della snervatezza dei pensieri. Or perchè mai questa nostra divina lingua, sì maschia anco, ed energica, e feroce, in bocca di Dante, dovrà ella farsi così sbiadata ed eunuca nel dialogo tragico.*’

To men thus sick of the languid manner of their contemporaries, ruggedness seemed a venial fault, or rather a positive merit. In their hatred of meretricious ornament, and of what Cowper calls ‘creamy smoothness,’ they erred on the opposite side. Their style was too austere, their versification too harsh. It is not easy, however, to overrate the service which they rendered to literature. Their merit is rather that of demolition than that of construction. The intrinsic value of their poems is considerable. But the example which they set of mutiny against an absurd system was invaluable. The part which they performed was rather that of Moses than that of Joshua. They opened the house of bondage;—but they did not enter the promised land.

During the twenty years which followed the death of Cowper, the revolution in English poetry was fully consummated. None of the writers of this period, not even Sir Walter Scott, contributed so much to the consummation as Lord Byron. Yet he, Lord Byron, contributed to it unwillingly, and with constant self-reproach and shame. All his tastes and inclinations led him to take part with the school of poetry which was going out, against the school which was coming in. Of Pope himself he spoke with extravagant admiration. He did not venture directly to say that the little man of Twickenham was a greater poet than Shakespeare or Milton. But he hinted pretty clearly that he thought so. Of his contemporaries, scarcely any had so much of his admiration as Mr Gifford, who, considered as a poet, was merely Pope, without Pope’s wit and fancy; and whose satires are decidedly inferior in vigour and poignancy to the very imperfect juvenile performance of Lord Byron himself. He now and then

praised Mr Wordsworth and Mr Coleridge; but ungraciously, and without cordiality. When he attacked them, he brought his whole soul to the work. Of the most elaborate of Mr Wordsworth's poems he could find nothing to say, but that it was 'clumsy, and frowsy, and his aversion.' Peter Bell excited his spleen to such a degree, that he apostrophized the shades of Pope and Dryden, and demanded of them whether it were possible that such trash could evade contempt? In his heart, he thought his own *Pilgrimage of Harold* inferior to his *Imitation of Horace's Art of Poetry*,—a feeble echo of Pope and Johnson. This insipid performance he repeatedly designed to publish, and was withheld only by the solicitations of his friends. He has distinctly declared his approbation of the unities; the most absurd laws by which genius was ever held in servitude. In one of his works, we think in his *Letter to Mr Bowles*, he compares the poetry of the eighteenth century to the Parthenon, and that of the nineteenth to a Turkish mosque; and boasts that, though he had assisted his contemporaries in building their grotesque and barbarous edifice, he had never joined them in defacing the remains of a chaster and more graceful architecture. In another letter, he compares the change which had recently passed on English poetry, to the decay of Latin poetry after the Augustan age. In the time of Pope, he tells his friend, it was all Horace with us. It is all Claudian now.

For the great old masters of the art he had no very enthusiastic veneration. In his *Letter to Mr Bowles* he uses expressions which clearly indicate that he preferred Pope's *Iliad* to the original. Mr Moore confesses that his friend was no very fervent admirer of Shakspeare. Of all the poets of the first class, Lord Byron seems to have admired Dante and Milton most. Yet in the fourth canto of *Childe Harold* he places Tasso—a writer not merely inferior to them, but of quite a different order of mind—on at least a footing of equality with them. Mr Hunt is, we suspect, quite correct in saying, that Lord Byron could see little or no merit in Spenser.

But Lord Byron the critic, and Lord Byron the poet, were two very different men. The effects of his theory may indeed often be traced in his practice. But his disposition led him to accommodate himself to the literary taste of the age in which he lived; and his talents would have enabled him to accommodate himself to the taste of any age. Though he said much of his contempt for men, and though he boasted that amidst all the inconstancy of fortune and of fame he was all-sufficient to himself, his literary career indicated nothing of that lonely and unsocial pride which he affected. We cannot conceive him, like Milton or Wordsworth,

defying the criticism of his contemporaries, retorting their scorn, and labouring on a poem in the full assurance that it would be unpopular, and in the full assurance that it would be immortal. He has said, by the mouth of one of his heroes, in speaking of political greatness, that 'he must serve who gain would sway;' and this he assigns as a reason for not entering into political life. He did not consider that the sway which he had exercised in literature had been purchased by servitude—by the sacrifice of his own taste to the taste of the public.

He was the creature of his age; and wherever he had lived, he would have been the creature of his age. Under Charles I. he would have been more quaint than Donne. Under Charles II. the rants of his rhyming plays would have pitted it, boxed it, and galleried it, with those of any Bayes or Bilboa. Under George I. the monotonous smoothness of his versification, and the terseness of his expression, would have made Pope himself envious.

As it was, he was the man of the last thirteen years of the eighteenth century, and of the first twenty-three years of the nineteenth century. He belonged half to the old, and half to the new school of poetry. His personal taste led him to the former; his thirst of fame to the latter;—his talents were equally suited to both. His fame was a common ground on which the zealots of both sides—Gifford, for example, and Shelley—might meet. He was the representative, not of either literary party, but of both at once, and of their conflict, and of the victory by which that conflict was terminated. His poetry fills and measures the whole of the vast interval through which our literature has moved since the time of Johnson. It touches the *Essay on Man* at the one extremity, and the *Excursion* at the other.

There are several parallel instances in literary history. Voltaire, for example, was the connecting link between the France of Louis the Fourteenth, and the France of Louis the Sixteenth, —between Racine and Boileau on the one side, and Condorcet and Beaumarchais on the other. He, like Lord Byron, put himself at the head of an intellectual revolution,—dreading it all the time,—murmuring at it,—sneering at it,—yet choosing rather to move before his age in any direction, than to be left behind and forgotten. Dryden was the connecting link between the literature of the age of James the First, and the literature of the age of Anne. Oromandes and Arimanes fought for him—Arimanes carried him off. But his heart was to the last with Oromandes. Lord Byron was, in the same manner, the mediator between two generations—between two hostile poetical sects. Though always sneering at Mr Wordsworth, he was yet, though perhaps unconsciously, the interpreter between Mr

Wordsworth and the multitude. In the *Lyrical Ballads* and the *Excursion*, Mr Wordsworth appeared as the high priest of a worship, of which Nature was the idol. No poems have ever indicated so exquisite a perception of the beauty of the outer world, or so passionate a love and reverence for that beauty. Yet they were not popular;—and it is not likely that they ever will be popular as the works of Sir Walter Scott are popular. The feeling which pervaded them was too deep for general sympathy. Their style was often too mysterious for general comprehension. They made a few esoteric disciples, and many scoffers. Lord Byron founded what may be called an esoteric Lake school of poetry; and all the readers of poetry in England, we might say in Europe, hastened to sit at his feet. What Mr Wordsworth had said like a recluse, Lord Byron said like a man of the world,—with less profound feeling, but with more perspicuity, energy, and conciseness. We would refer our readers to the last two cantos of *Childe Harold*, and to *Manfred*, in proof of these observations.

Lord Byron, like Mr Wordsworth, had nothing dramatic in his genius. He was indeed the reverse of a great dramatist; the very antithesis to a great dramatist. All his characters,—Harold looking back on the western sky, from which his country and the sun are receding together,—the Giaour, standing apart in the gloom of the side-aisle, and casting a haggard scowl from under his long hood at the crucifix and the censor,—Conrad, leaning on his sword by the watch-tower,—Lara, smiling on the dancers,—Alp, gazing steadily on the fatal cloud as it passes before the moon,—Manfred, wandering among the precipices of Berne,—Azzo, on the judgment-seat,—Ugo, at the bar,—Lambro, frowning on the siesta of his daughter and Juan,—Cain, presenting his unacceptable offering,—are all essentially the same. The varieties are varieties merely of age, situation, and costume. If ever Lord Byron attempted to exhibit men of a different kind, he always made them either insipid or unnatural. Selim is nothing. Bonnivart is nothing. Don Juan, in the first and best cantos, is a feeble copy of the Page in the *Marriage of Figaro*. Johnson, the man whom Juan meets in the slave-market, is a most striking failure. How differently would Sir Walter Scott have drawn a bluff, fearless Englishman, in such a situation! The portrait would have seemed to walk out of the canvass.

Sardanapalus is more hardly drawn than any dramatic personage that we can remember. His heroism and his effeminacy,—his contempt of death, and his dread of a weighty helmet,—his kingly resolution to be seen in the foremost ranks, and the anxiety with which he calls for a looking-glass, that he may be

seen to advantage, are contrasted with all the point of Juvenal. Indeed the hint of the character seems to have been taken from what Juvenal says of Otho :

‘ Speculum civilis sarcina belli.
Nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam,
Et curare cutem summi constantia civis,
Bebriaci in campo spoliū affectare Palati,
Et pressum in facie digitis extendere panem.’

These are excellent lines in a satire. But it is not the business of the dramatist to exhibit characters in this sharp antithetical way. It is not in this way that Shakspeare makes Prince Hal rise from the rake of Eastcheap into the hero of Shrewsbury, and sink again into the rake of Eastcheap. It is not thus that Shakspeare has exhibited the union of effeminacy and valour in Antony. A dramatist cannot commit a greater error than that of following those pointed descriptions of character, in which satirists and historians indulge so much. It is by rejecting what is natural, that satirists and historians produce these striking characters. Their great object generally is to ascribe to every man as many contradictory qualities as possible : and this is an object easily attained. By judicious selection and judicious exaggeration, the intellect and the disposition of any human being might be described as being made up of nothing but startling contrasts. If the dramatist attempts to create a being answering to one of these descriptions, he fails, because he reverses an imperfect analytical process. He produces, not a man, but a personified epigram. Very eminent writers have fallen into this snare. Ben Jonson has given us a Hermogenes, taken from the lively lines of Horace ; but the inconsistency which is so amusing in the satire, appears unnatural, and disgusts us, in the play. Sir Walter Scott has committed a far more glaring error of the same kind in the novel of Peveril. Admiring, as every reader must admire, the keen and vigorous lines in which Dryden satirized the Duke of Buckingham, he attempted to make a Duke of Buckingham to suit them,—a real living Zimri ;—and he made, not a man, but the most grotesque of all monsters. A writer who should attempt to introduce into a play or a novel such a Wharton as the Wharton of Pope, or a Lord Hervey answering to Sporus, would fail in the same manner.

But to return to Lord Byron : his women, like his men, are all of one breed. Haidee is a half-savage and girlish Julia ; Julia is a civilized and matronly Haidee. Leila is a wedded Zuleika—Zuleika a virgin Leila. Gulnare and Medora appear to have been intentionally opposed to each other. Yet the dif-

ference is a difference of situation only. A slight change of circumstances would, it should seem, have sent Gulnare to the lute of Medora, and armed Medora with the dagger of Gulnare.

It is hardly too much to say, that Lord Byron could exhibit only one man and only one woman,—a man proud, moody, cynical,—with defiance on his brow, and misery in his heart; a scorner of his kind, implacable in revenge, yet capable of deep and strong affection;—a woman all softness and gentleness, loving to caress and to be caressed, but capable of being transformed by love into a tigress.

Even these two characters, his only two characters, he could not exhibit dramatically. He exhibited them in the manner, not of Shakspeare, but of Clarendon. He analyzed them. He made them analyze themselves, but he did not make them show themselves. He tells us, for example, in many lines of great force and spirit, that the speech of Lara was bitterly sarcastic,—that he talked little of his travels,—that if much questioned about them, his answers became short, and his brow gloomy. But we have none of Lara's sarcastic speeches, or short answers. It is not thus that the great masters of human nature have portrayed human beings. Homer never tells us that Nestor loved to tell long stories about his youth; Shakspeare never tells us that in the mind of Iago every thing that is beautiful and endearing was associated with some filthy and debasing idea.

It is curious to observe the tendency which the dialogue of Lord Byron always has to lose its character of dialogue, and to become soliloquy. The scenes between Manfred and the Chamois-hunter,—between Manfred and the Witch of the Alps,—between Manfred and the Abbot, are instances of this tendency. Manfred, after a few unimportant speeches, has all the talk to himself. The other interlocutors are nothing more than good listeners. They drop an occasional question, or ejaculation, which sets Manfred off again on the inexhaustible topic of his personal feelings. If we examine the fine passages in Lord Byron's dramas,—the description of Rome, for example, in Manfred,—the description of a Venetian revel in Marino Faliero,—the dying invective which the old Doge pronounces against Venice, we shall find there is nothing dramatic in them; that they derive none of their effect from the character or situation of the speaker; and that they would have been as fine, or finer, if they had been published as fragments of blank verse by Lord Byron. There is scarcely a speech in Shakspeare of which the same could be said. No skilful reader of the plays of Shakspeare can endure to see what are called the fine things taken out, under the name of 'Beauties' or of 'Elegant Extracts;' or to hear any single pas-

sage,—‘To be or not to be,’ for example, quoted as a sample of the great poet. ‘To be or not to be,’ has merit undoubtedly as a composition. It would have merit if put into the mouth of a chorus. But its merit as a composition vanishes when compared with its merit as belonging to Hamlet. It is not too much to say that the great plays of Shakspeare would lose less by being deprived of all the passages which are commonly called the fine passages, than those passages lose by being read separately from the play. This is perhaps the highest praise which can be given to a dramatist.

On the other hand, it may be doubted whether there is, in all Lord Byron's plays, a single remarkable passage which owes any portion of its interest or effect to its connexion with the characters or the action. He has written only one scene, as far as we can recollect, which is dramatic even in manner—the scene between Lucifer and Cain. The conference in that scene is animated, and each of the interlocutors has a fair share of it. But this scene, when examined, will be found to be a confirmation of our remarks. It is a dialogue only in form. It is a soliloquy in essence. It is in reality a debate carried on within one single unquiet and sceptical mind. The questions and the answers, the objections and the solutions, all belong to the same character.

A writer who showed so little of dramatic skill in works professedly dramatic, was not likely to write narrative with dramatic effect. Nothing could indeed be more rude and careless than the structure of his narrative poems. He seems to have thought, with the hero of the Rehearsal, that the plot was good for nothing but to bring in fine things. His two longest works, *Childe Harold* and *Don Juan*, have no plan whatever. Either of them might have been extended to any length, or cut short at any point. The state in which the *Giaour* appears, illustrates the manner in which all his poems were constructed. They are all, like the *Giaour*, collections of fragments; and, though there may be no empty spaces marked by asterisks, it is still easy to perceive, by the clumsiness of the joining, where the parts, for the sake of which the whole was composed, end and begin.

It was in description and meditation that he excelled. ‘Description,’ as he said in *Don Juan*, ‘was his *forte*.’ His manner is indeed peculiar, and is almost unequalled,—rapid, sketchy, full of vigour; the selection happy; the strokes few and bold. In spite of the reverence which we feel for the genius of Mr Wordsworth, we cannot but think that the minuteness of his descriptions often diminishes their effect. He has accustomed himself to gaze on nature with the eye of a lover—to

dwell on every feature—and to mark every change of aspect. Those beauties which strike the most negligent observer, and those which only a close attention discovers, are equally familiar to him, and are equally prominent in his poetry. The proverb of old Hesiod, that half is often more than the whole, is eminently applicable to description. The policy of the Dutch, who cut down most of the precious trees in the Spice Islands, in order to raise the value of what remained, was a policy which poets would do well to imitate. It was a policy which no poet understood better than Lord Byron. Whatever his faults might be, he was never, while his mind retained its vigour, accused of prolixity.

His descriptions, great as was their intrinsic merit, derived their principal interest from the feeling which always mingled with them. He was himself the beginning, the middle, and the end, of all his own poetry—the hero of every tale—the chief object in every landscape. Harold, Lara, Manfred, and a crowd of other characters, were universally considered merely as loose incognitos of Byron; and there is every reason to believe that he meant them to be so considered. The wonders of the outer world—the Tagus, with the mighty fleets of England riding on its bosom—the towers of Cintra overhanging the shaggy forest of cork-trees and willows—the glaring marble of Pentelicus—the banks of the Rhine—the glaciers of Clarens—the sweet Lake of Lemman—the dell of Egeria, with its summer-birds and rustling lizzards—the shapeless ruins of Rome, overgrown with ivy and wall-flowers—the stars, the sea, the mountains;—all were mere accessories—the background to one dark and melancholy figure.

Never had any writer so vast a command of the whole eloquence of scorn, misanthropy, and despair. That *Marah* was never dry. No art could sweeten, no draughts could exhaust, its perennial waters of bitterness. Never was there such variety in monotony as that of Byron. From maniac laughter to piercing lamentation, there was not a single note of human anguish of which he was not master. Year after year, and month after month, he continued to repeat that to be wretched is the destiny of all; that to be eminently wretched, is the destiny of the eminent; that all the desires by which we are cursed lead alike to misery;—if they are not gratified, to the misery of disappointment—if they are gratified, to the misery of satiety. His principal heroes are men who have arrived by different roads at the same goal of despair—who are sick of life—who are at war with society—who are supported in their anguish only by an unconquerable pride, resembling that of Prometheus on the rock, or of

Satan in the burning marl ; who can master their agonies by the force of their will, and who, to the last, defy the whole power of earth and heaven. He always described himself as a man of the same kind with his favourite creations, as a man whose heart had been withered—whose capacity for happiness was gone, and could not be restored ; but whose invincible spirit dared the worst that could befall him here or hereafter.

How much of this morbid feeling sprung from an original disease of the mind—how much from real misfortune—how much from the nervousness of dissipation—how much of it was fanciful—how much of it was merely affected—it is impossible for us, and would probably have been impossible for the most intimate friends of Lord Byron, to decide. Whether there ever existed, or can ever exist, a person answering to the description which he gave of himself, may be doubted : but that he was not such a person is beyond all doubt. It is ridiculous to imagine that a man, whose mind was really imbued with scorn of his fellow-creatures, would have published three or four books every year in order to tell them so ; or that a man, who could say with truth that he neither sought sympathy nor needed it, would have admitted all Europe to hear his farewell to his wife, and his blessings on his child. In the second canto of *Childe Harold*, he tells us that he is insensible to fame and obloquy—

‘ Ill may such contest now the spirit move,
Which heeds nor keen reproof nor partial praise.’

Yet we know, on the best evidence, that, a day or two before he published these lines, he was greatly, indeed childishly, elated by the compliments paid to his maiden speech in the House of Lords.

We are far, however, from thinking that his sadness was altogether feigned. He was naturally a man of great sensibility—he had been ill educated—his feelings had been early exposed to sharp trials—he had been crossed in his boyish love—he had been mortified by the failure of his first literary efforts—he was straitened in pecuniary circumstances—he was unfortunate in his domestic relations—the public treated him with cruel injustice—his health and spirits suffered from his dissipated habits of life—he was, on the whole, an unhappy man. He early discovered that, by parading his unhappiness before the multitude, he excited an unrivalled interest. The world gave him every encouragement to talk about his mental sufferings. The effect which his first confessions produced, induced him to affect much that he did not feel ; and the affectation probably reacted on his feelings. How far the character in which he exhibited himself

was genuine, and how far theatrical, would probably have puzzled himself to say.

There can be no doubt that this remarkable man owed the vast influence which he exercised over his contemporaries, at least as much to his gloomy egotism as to the real power of his poetry. We never could very clearly understand how it is that egotism, so unpopular in conversation, should be so popular in writing; or how it is that men who affect in their compositions qualities and feelings which they have not, impose so much more easily on their contemporaries than on posterity. The interest which the loves of Petrarch excited in his own time, and the pitying fondness with which half Europe looked upon Rousseau, are well known. To readers of our time, the love of Petrarch seems to have been love of that kind which breaks no hearts; and the sufferings of Rousseau to have deserved laughter rather than pity—to have been partly counterfeited, and partly the consequences of his own perverseness and vanity.

What our grandchildren may think of the character of Lord Byron, as exhibited in his poetry, we will not pretend to guess. It is certain, that the interest which he excited during his life is without a parallel in literary history. The feeling with which young readers of poetry regarded him, can be conceived only by those who have experienced it. To people who are acquainted with real calamity, 'nothing is so dainty sweet as lovely melancholy.' This faint image of sorrow has in all ages been considered by young gentlemen as an agreeable excitement. Old gentlemen, and middle-aged gentlemen, have so many real causes of sadness, that they are rarely inclined 'to be as sad as 'night only for wantonness.' Indeed they want the power almost as much as the inclination. We know very few persons engaged in active life, who, even if they were to procure stools to be melancholy upon, and were to sit down with all the premeditation of Master Stephen, would be able to enjoy much of what somebody calls the 'ecstasy of woe.'

Among that large class of young persons whose reading is almost entirely confined to works of imagination, the popularity of Lord Byron was unbounded. They bought pictures of him; they treasured up the smallest relics of him; they learned his poems by heart, and did their best to write like him, and to look like him. Many of them practised at the glass, in the hope of catching the curl of the upper lip, and the scowl of the brow, which appear in some of his portraits. A few discarded their neckcloths, in imitation of their great leader. For some years the Minerva press sent forth no novel without a mysterious, unhappy, Lara-like peer. The number of hopeful under graduates and

medical students who became things of dark imaginings,—on whom the freshness of the heart ceased to fall like dew,—whose passions had consumed themselves to dust, and to whom the relief of tears was denied, passes all calculation. This was not the worst. There was created in the minds of many of these enthusiasts, a pernicious and absurd association between intellectual power and moral depravity. From the poetry of Lord Byron they drew a system of ethics, compounded of misanthropy and voluptuousness; a system in which the two great commandments were, to hate your neighbour, and to love your neighbour's wife.

This affectation has passed away; and a few more years will destroy whatever yet remains of that magical potency which once belonged to the name of Byron. To us he is still a man, young, noble, and unhappy. To our children he will be merely a writer; and their impartial judgment will appoint his place among writers, without regard to his rank, or to his private history. That his poetry will undergo a severe sifting; that much of what has been admired by his contemporaries will be rejected as worthless, we have little doubt. But we have as little doubt, that, after the closest scrutiny, there will still remain much that can only perish with the English language.

ERRATA.

- Page 395, line 3, for *omne* read *totum*.
- 421, — 12, for *entrant* read *intrans*.
- 427, — 11, for *campagnics* read *campagnics*.

QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ALGEBRA.

Wright's Supplement to Wood's Algebra. Parts I. to III. 8vo. 21s.

ARCHITECTURE, ANTIQUITIES, AND THE FINE ARTS.

Turner's England and Wales. Part XI. Imperial 4to. Proofs, 1*l.* 1s.

—————. Royal 4to. 14s.

—————. Imperial 4to. India, 1*l.* 11s. 6d.

Captain Locker's Illustrations of Byron's Works. 4to. 2*l.* 2s.

The Public Buildings of Westminster described, (forming the fourth volume of the Little Library,) with engravings. 16mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

Keightley's Mythology of Greece and Italy, (12 plates by Brooke,) 8vo. 18s. boards.

Zoological Gardens and Menageries. 2 vols. 8vo. Cloth, 1*l.* 4s.

Legh's Music of the Eye, or Essays on Architecture. Royal 8vo. Plates. 1*l.* 10s. boards.

BIOGRAPHY.

Lord Henley's Memoir of Lord Northington. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d. bds.

Todd's Life of Cranmer. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 6s. boards.

Memoirs of Madame du Barri. Vol. IV. (Forming Vol. XXXII. of Autobiography.) Royal 18mo. 6s. bds. Demy 18mo. 5s. 6d. bds.

Darnell's Life and Correspondence of Isaac Bascre, D.D. 8vo. 12s. boards.

J. Mackenzie's Life of Thomas Muir. 12mo. 4s. boards.

Memoirs of Pearce, by his Son. 12mo. 4s. cloth.

Life of the Rev. E. Erskine. 12mo. 7s. 6d. boards.

Life of Sir Thomas Lawrence, with three portraits. 2 vols. 8vo 1*l.* 12s. boards.

Memoir of Jane Judson, by the Rev. Browne Hall Draper. 18mo. 2s. half-bound.

Watson's Life of the Rev. J. Wesley. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

BOTANY.

Richard's Elements of Botany, translated by W. Macgillivray, A. M. 8vo. 14s. boards.

EDUCATION.

Stepping Stones for Tottering Feet. 16mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

Xenophon's Cyropædia, with English Notes. By E. H. Barker. 8vo. 9s. 6d. boards.

Backker's Petit Théâtre de la Jeunesse. 12mo. 6s. boards.
 Outlines of History, (from Cabinet Cyclopædia,) for Schools. 12mo.
 6s. 6d. bound.

Hall's Dictate Book. 12mo. 5s. 6d. sheep.

Hurwitz Hebrew Etymology and Syntax. 8vo. 12s. cloth.

———— Grammar. 8vo. 17s. cloth.

D'Emden's Genders of French Nouns. Square. 9s. bound.

Spiller's Exercises on French Pronunciation. 12mo. 4s. 6d. sheep.

Bell's System of Geography. Part IX. 7s. 6d. boards.

Albert and Smith's Homonymes François. 12mo. 3s. cloth.

Bernay's Familiar German Exercises. 12mo. 6s. 6d. cloth.

Pestalozzi and his Plan of Education. By Dr Biber. 8vo. 14s. cloth.

HISTORY.

Sheppard's Historical Account of St Vincent. 8vo. 12s. boards.

Josiah Conder's Italy. 3 vols. 18mo. 18s. boards.

Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, by W. M'Gavin. 8vo.
 15s. boards.

Ancient and Modern Egypt, (forming Vol. III. of the Edinburgh Ca-
 binet Library,) 12mo. 5s. boards.

Sir James Mackintosh's History of England, Vol. II. (forming Vol.
 XVIII. of Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia. foolscap. 6s. boards.

Lockinge's Historical Gleanings of the Field of Naseby. 12mo. 7s. bds.

LAW.

Stewart's Conveyancing. Vol. 3. Royal 8vo. 17. 4s. boards.

Freeman's Pocket Companion. 32mo. 3s. cloth.

Familiar Summary of the Laws of Bills of Exchange. 18mo. 2s. sewed.

Hansard's Debates. 3d Series. Vol. II. of Session 1830-31. Dec. 21.
 1830 to March 1831. royal 8vo. 17. 10s. boards, & 17. 13s. 6d. half bd.

Introduction to the Laws of England. Vol. I. 8vo. 5s. sewed.

Price's Practice in the Exchequer of Pleas. 8vo. 14s. boards.

MEDICINE.

Holland on Fœtus, &c. 8vo. 8s. boards.

Mayo on Indigestion. 8vo. 5s. 6d. boards.

W. Cross's Lectiones Celsianæ et Gregorianæ. 18mo. 5s. boards.

Clarke on Female Complaints. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 17. 16s. boards.

St John Long's Exposure of Medical Practitioners, &c. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 boards.

Moir's Ancient History of Medicine. folio. 6s. boards.

Hamilton's History of Medicine. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 4s. boards.

Scott's Art of Preventing the loss of Teeth. 8vo. 5s. 6d. boards.

Sir H. Halford's Essays and Orations at the College of Physicians.
 crown 8vo. 6s. 6d. boards.

Beal's Observations on Distortions of the Spine. 8vo. 5s. sewed.

Syme on Diseased Joints. 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Dr Young's Egyptian Dictionary. 8vo. 12s. boards.

Family Library of French Classics. Vols. I. & II. fine paper, 4s.
 each. Common paper, 3s. 6d. each.

- The Naval Gallery, by Edward Hawke Locker, Esq., imperial 8vo. 12s. 6d. boards. Royal 4to. India paper, 1*l.* 5s. boards.
- Reynolds's Dramatic Annual. small 8vo. 10s. 6d. half bound.
- Doddridge's Correspondence. Vol. V. 8vo. 15s. boards.
- Leigh's Guide to Wales and Monmouthshire. 12mo. 9s.
- Roberts's Welsh Interpreter. 12mo. 3s. 6d. boards.
- Arrowsmith's (Eton) Ancient and Modern Geography. 8vo. 16s. bds.
- Dillon's Commercial Tables. 8vo. 21s. boards.
- Colman's Circle of Anecdote. 18mo. 3s. boards.
- National Minstrel. 32mo. 2s. boards.
- Hope's Lectures on the Destinies of the British Empire. 8vo. 6s. bds.
- Social Life in England and France, from 1789 to 1830. 8vo. 7s. bds.
- Crotch's Lectures on Music. 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.
- Landor's Gebir, Count Julian, and other Poems. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.
- The Old Man of the Mountain, &c. Tales from the German of Tieck. Foolscap. 6s. boards.
- A Mother's Present to her Daughters. 32mo. 2s. 6d. boards. 3s. 6d. silk. 5s. morocco.
- Hall's Sketches of Irish Character. 2d series. 8vo. 9s. boards.
- The State Papers (Henry VIII.) 4to. Vol. I. Large paper, 5*l.* 5s. Small paper, 3*l.* 3s.
- The Pastor's Family. 12mo. 6s. boards.
- H. Martineau's Five Years of Youth. 12mo. 6s. half-bound.
- D'Israeli's Commentaries on Charles I. Vol V. and concluding vol. 8vo. 14s. boards.
- New Words on many Subjects, Grave and Light. 12mo. 6s. bds.
- Audubon's American Ornithological Biography. Imperial 8vo. 1*l.* 5s. boards.
- Encyclopædia Metropolitana. Vol. V. 4th Division. 4to. 2*l.* 2s. boards.
- People's (The) Book. foolscap. 5s. 6d. boards.
- Annual Retrospect of Public Affairs. Vol. II. (forming Vol. IV. of Lardner's Cabinet Library.) Foolscap. 5s. boards.
- Tate's Foreign Exchanges. 8vo. 8s. cloth.
- Wright's Slavery at the Cape of Good Hope. 8vo. 4s. boards.
- Murray on the Diamond. 12mo. 5s. boards.
- Panorama of Constantinople and its Environs. Royal 4to. Plain, 1*l.* 1s. boards. Coloured, 1*l.* 14s. boards.
- Mrs Sherwood's Roxobel. 3 vols. 12mo. 1*l.* 7s. cloth.
- Map of the Basin of the Tay, from a Survey by James Knox. In a Case. 1*l.* 1s.
- Topography of the Tay, by James Knox, (being a companion to the Map.) 12mo. 9s. boards.
- The Horse, from the Library of Useful Knowledge. 8vo. 8s. bds.
- Family Cabinet Atlas, complete. Plain, 1*l.* 10s. cloth. Coloured 2*l.* 2s. cloth.
- A Caution to Bankers, Merchants, &c. 18mc. 3s. 6d. boards.
- Cambridge Problems, 1821 to 1830. 8vo. 7s. boards.

Cambridge Classical Examinations, second series. 8vo. 8s. boards.

Rose's Orlando Furioso. Vol. VIII. Crown 8vo. 9s. 6d. boards.

Whately's Lectures on Political Economy. 8vo. 7s. boards.

Vaughan's Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s. boards.

Thomson's History of Chemistry. Vol. II. (forming Vol. X. of the National Library.) Foolscap. 6s. boards.

Merle's Odds and Ends, in prose and verse, with illustrations by George Cruikshank. 8vo. 8s. cloth.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.

Dr Lardner's Hydrostatics and Pneumatics, (forming Vol. XVII. of the Cabinet Cyclopaedia). 12s. boards.

Brewster's Treatise on Optics, (forming Vol. XIX. of Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia). 12mo. 6s. boards.

McCulloch's System of Geology. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 12s. boards.

De Luc's Letters on Geology. 8vo. 12s. boards.

NOVELS, TALES, AND ROMANCES.

Wedded Life in the Upper Ranks. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s. boards.

The King's Secret. 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

Destiny. By the Author of "Marriage." 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

At Home and Abroad. 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 4s. boards.

W. Child Green's Alibeg the Tempter. 4 vols. 12mo. 1l. 2s. boards.

The Young Duke. By the Author of "Vivian Grey." 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

The Twelve Nights. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

Bogle Corbet; or the Emigrants. By the Author of "Lawrie Tod." 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

Haverhill; or Memoirs of an Officer in the Army of Wolfe. By James Athearn Jones, Esq. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

Atherton: a Tale of the Last Century. By the Author of "Rank and Talent." 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 8s. 6d. boards.

Philip Augustus; or the Brothers in Arms. By the Author of "Darnley," "De l'Orme," &c. 3 vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards.

POETRY.

Mitchell's Siege of Constantinople, a Poem. 8vo. 5s. bds.

Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt. Foolscap. 5s. bds. (forming Vol. XI of the Aldine Poets.)

Dugald Moore's Bridal Night, and other Poems. 12mo. 7s. 6d. bds.

Beattie's Poems. Foolscap. (forming Vol. XII. of the Aldine Poets.) 5s. bds.

Fitz-Raymond; or, the Rambler on the Rhine. 8vo. 7s. 6d. bds.

Selections from Wordsworth. 12mo. 5s. bds.

Southey's British Poets, from Chaucer to Jonson. 8vo. 30s. cloth.

Aikin's British Poets, from Jonson to Beattie. 8vo. 18s. cloth.

Bocardo Orlanda Innamorata du Panizzi. Vol. V. Crown 8vo. 12s. bds.

THEOLOGY.

Lovett's Revelation of St John. 8vo. 9s. bds.

Hall on the Faith and Influence of the Gospel, with Essay by Dr Chalmers. 12mo. 5s. bds.

Clark's Scripture Promises, with Essay by Dr Wardlaw. 12mo. 3s. bds.

Dr Pye Smith's, Fletcher's, &c., Discourses on Prophecy. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Extracts from Taylor's Living and Dying. Foolscap. 6s. bds.

Rev. J. Latrobe on Church Music. 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.

Hall on the Athanasian Creed. 8vo. 5s. bds.

Rev. Dr Burton's Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century. 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.

Rev. J. Younge's Sermons. 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.

Bishop Andrews' Sermons on Fasts and Festivals, by Davis. 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.

The Christian's Prayer, with Notes. 8vo. 4s. 6d. bds.

Rev. A. Ollivant's Sermons. 8vo. 8s. bds.

Edwards on the Freedom of the Will, with Essay. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Do., 12mo. 8s. 6d. bds.

Outline of the Scripture Evidence of the Trinity. 12mo. 4s. bds.

Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, abridged by T. Smith, with cuts. One vol. 3s. 6d. half-bd.

Do., two Parts. 1s. 6d. each, sewed.

Thornton's Bereaved Parents Consoled. 32mo. 1s. 6d. cloth; 2s. 6d. silk.

Morrison's Counsels for the Communion Table. 32mo. 1s. 6d. cloth 2s. 6d. silk.

Evangelical Spectator. 12mo. Vol. III. 4s. 6d. bds.

Fenwick's (Rev. C. J.) Sermons. 8vo. 12s. bds.

The Pulpit. Vol. XVI. 8vo. 7s. 6d. bds.

Jones's Ecclesiastical History. Vol. I. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Hall's Contemplations, (Russell's edition, without abridgement.) 5 vols. 17. 5s. boards.

Joanna Baillie on the General Tenor of the New Testament, regarding the nature and dignity of Jesus Christ. 8vo. 5s. boards.

Hall on the Institution and Abuse of Ecclesiastical Property. 8vo. 6s. boards.

Blunt's Abraham. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

Snow's Prayers. 18mo. 2s. 6d. boards.

Dr Dibdin's Sunday Library. Vol. III. Foolscap, 5s. boards.

Best's Sermons on the Amusements of the Stage. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

Tyro's Enquiry after Prophetic Truth. 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood's Sermons. Vol. III. 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

Rev. J. Slade's Sermons. 12mo. 6d. boards.

Familial Introduction to the Christian Religion, in a Series of Letters, by a Senior. 12mo. 7s. bound.

The Young Christian's Sunday Evening. 12mo. 4s. boards.

The Atonement and Sacrament of the Lord's Supper considered. 12mo. 3s. 6d. boards.

Lee's Analysis of Secker's Lectures. Post 8vo. 4s. boards.

Alexander on the Canon of Scripture. 12mo. 6s. 6d. boards.

Bickersteth's Chief Concerns of Man. 12mo. 5s. bound.

Grove's Missionary Journal. 12mo. 5s. boards.

Sabin's Judgment of the Quick. 12mo. 3s. boards.

Stratton's English and Jewish Tithe Systems Compared. 12mo. 5s. boards.

Wynpersse on the Divinity of our Lord, with Introduction and Notes, by Alexander. 18mo. 3s. 6d. boards.

Irving's Lectures on the Revelation. 4 vols. 12mo. 17. 2s. boards.

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instruction. Foolscap. 7s. boards.

Ritchie's Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. 8vo. 18s. boards.

Maitland on the Romans. 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

Rose's (Rev. H. J.) Sermons preached at Cambridge in 1830-31. 8vo. 7s. boards.

A Father's Recollections of Three Pious Young Ladies. 12mo. 5s. boards.

VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

Keppel's Narrative of a Journey across the Balcan, with Map. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 12s. boards.

Burnes' Visit to the Court of Sinde. 8vo. 6s. boards.

Captain Hall's Fragments of Voyages and Travels. 3 vols. 18mo. 15s. boards.

W. R. Wilson's Travels in the Holy Land, &c. Third edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 10s. boards.

Sir Arthur Brooke's Travels in Spain and Morocco. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 10s. boards.

Tyerman and Bennet's Journal of Voyages and Travels, compiled by J. Montgomery. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 16s. boards.

INDEX.

A.

- Advertisements*, amount of duty on, for 1830, 428 ; oppressiveness of the taxation, *ib.* 434.
- Alfieri*, comparison between him and Cowper, 561.
- America, North*, mammiferous land species of, 341 ; distribution of quadrupeds in, 350 ; number of quadrupeds, 358.
- Animals*, geographical distribution of, 328 ; a wide field for speculation, 330 ; migrations of animals, 332.
- Authors* suffer severely from oppressive taxation on paper and advertisements, 429 ; injustice of being compelled to give eleven gratis copies of their works to public libraries, &c. 434.

B.

- Bachelor of Arts*, qualifications for, 390.
- Baker, Sir Richard*, notice of his Chronicle of English history, 9.
- Bear, Polar*, account of, 342.
- Beechey's Voyage to the Pacific and Behring Straits*, 210 ; setting out of the expedition, 212 ; course pursued, 213 ; coral islands in the Pacific, 214 ; formation of, 215 ; how peopled, 216 ; arrival at Otabeite, and description of, 217 ; moral condition of, 218 ; description of the Sandwich Islands, 219 ; arrival in California, 221 ; description of Loo Choo, 223 ; arrival in Behring's Straits, 226.
- Bison*, where it inhabits, 348 ; account of, quoted from Dr Richardson, 349.
- Bombay*, character of the police of, 457.
- Books* published, how many on an average defray the expenses, 431.
- Bulwer's Siamese Twins*, character of, 143 ; his 'Milton,' a poem, 146 ; character of, 150.
- Burke*, an uniform opponent of Reform, 528 ; objections of, 529.
- Byron*, notice of Moore's Life of, 544 ; constitution of his mind, 546 ; unjust conduct of the public to him in the case of his separation from his wife, 549 ; his retreat to the continent, 550 ; connexion with Greece, 551 ; contributed largely to the revolution in English poetry, 562 ; analysis of his poetry, 563 ; his genius undramatic, 564 ; his range of characters circumscribed, 565 ; monotony of his poetry, 567 ; his melancholy partly feigned, 568 ; effects of his poetry on the public, *ib.* ; probable estimate which posterity will form of it, 559, 560.

C.

- Cain, the Wanderer*, review of, 110.

Calendar of Oxford University, for 1829, 384.

Cambridge University, constitution of, 386.

Cardale, Mr., his account of an exhibition of the gift of tongues, 275 ; the pretended miracle accounted for, 278.

Carte, Thos. account of his history of England, 13.

Coral Islands in the Pacific, 216 ; formation of, 218.

Cornwallis, Lord, character of, and account of his civil administration in India, 448.

Cooper, compared with Alfieri, 561.

Cromwell, Lingard's account of his expulsion of the Parliament from their seats, 22.

D.

Daniel, Samuel, notice of his History of England, 8.

Dorians, Muller's History of, 119 ; character of the people, 122 ; Dorian states—Sparta, 127—140 ; their general character, 140.

Duties on Paper, 427 ; oppressiveness of, 428, 429.

E.

East, Sir E. Hyde, injudicious plan regarding pleaders in British India, proposed by, 464.

Ecbatana, at what time founded, 306 ; in what region of Asia situated, 307.

Echard's Lawrence, notice of his History of England, 11.

Egyptian antiquities at Leyden, the most valuable in Europe, 370.

Emigration, Bill to facilitate, 43 ; infinite importance of, 53.

England, History of, 1 ; early historians, 2-15 ; Hume's history, 16 ; Lingard's, 18.

Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum, 181 ; its appearance and effects, 193 ; its character, 194 ; authors of, 196-210.

Erskine, Thos. Letter of, on the gifts of the spirit, 261 ; Brazen Serpent, *ib.*—his opinion regarding miracles, 294 ; absurdity of, *ib.*

Eton School, instructions given at, 79.

F.

Fabyan, Robert, the father of English historians, 2.

Fancourt, Miss, case of spine, complaint cured, 265.

Fox, John, notice of his Book of Martyrs, 6.

G.

Game Laws, bill to amend, 43 ; influence of these laws to degrade the peasantry, 60.

German Poetry, Taylor's Historic survey of, 150 ; progress of German literature, 166 ; restorers of ancient learning, 184.

Goethe, correspondence of with Schiller, 82 ; character of his epistolary composition, 83 ; developement of his intellectual character, 84 ; connexion with Schiller in 'The Hours,' a periodical, 90 ; commencement of *Faust*, 93 ; his estimation of Madame de Stael, 102.

Grafton, account of his edition of Hall's 'Chronicle,' 3; character as a historian, 5.

Greatrakes, his pretended power of healing accounted for, 267.

H.

Hall, Thomas, notice of his 'Chronicle,' 3.

— *Captain Basil*, mistatements of, respecting Loo Choo, 222.

Hayward, Sir John, notice of his 'Life of Henry IV.' 7.

Heber, Bishop, his character of the Rajpoot tribes, 443.

Henry, Dr, notice of his History of England, 17.

Higden, Ranulph, notice of his Polychronicon, 1.

Hindoos, account of their religion, 446.

Hollingshed, Raphael, notice of his 'Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland,' 6.

Horton, Wilmot, important services of, on the subject of emigration, 53.

Humboldt quoted on the distribution of species over the globe, 338.

Hume, David, character of his History of England, 13.

Hutten, Ulric von, one of the authors of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, 196.

I.

India, British, government of, 438; Heber's character of the Rajpoot tribes, 443; account of the Hindoo religion and its effects, 446; establishment of the system of civil administration in India, 447; defects of, 448; causes why so little advance has been made in the reorganization of the social system, 452; great difficulties which the rulers had to encounter, 453; defects of the old system of police, and superiority of the present, 456; tables of the ratios in which the more serious crimes have been suppressed, 457; police of Bombay, *ib.*; remarks on gang robberies, 458; Mr Jenkin's opinion on the efficiency of native officers, 460; moral condition of the people, 461; by what means justice can be satisfactorily administered, 462; plan of Sir Edward Hyde East respecting pleaders, 464; colonization of India by capitalists, 470; obstacles to, *ib.*; Mr T. C. Robertson's remarks on landed property in Upper India, 473.

Irving, Reverend E., views of, respecting prayer, 281; refutation of, 282.

Ispahan identified with the ancient Ecbatana, 308-318; remarks on Mr Williams's historical survey of, 320.

L.

Leyden, the museum of Egyptian antiquities at, the most valuable in Europe, 370; what consisting of, *ib.*

Lingard's History of England, 1; character of, 18; quotation from, 22; his account of the execution of Don Pantaleon Sa, 26; massacre of the Vaudois, 27; account of the battle between the English and Dutch in 1665, 33; plague in London, 34; errors into which he has fallen, 40-42.

Literature, taxes on, 427; injustice of, 428; average number of books which pay their expenses, 431; manner in which literature should be taxed, 433; injustice of authors being compelled to give eleven gratis copies to libraries, &c., 435; duties on newspapers, 436.

M.

Macqueen, T. Potter, on the state of the nation at the close of 1830, 43.

Mammoth, notice of an entire one found in Siberia, 229.

Mascareigne, island of, speculations on the source from whence it derived its plants and animals, 335; cannot have derived its stock of animals from other regions, 339.

Miracles, Pretended, 261; cure of Miss Fancourt accounted for, 265; other cases of cure accounted for, 267; account of an exhibition of the gift of tongues, 275; the pretended miracle accounted for, 278; Mr Erskine's opinions regarding miracles, 291; refutation of, 294; views of the Protestant and Catholic churches regarding miracles, 295; time at which they ceased, 297.

Ministry, unanimity of the present, 233; their plan of Reform calculated to produce the most beneficial effects, 234; unmanly conduct of Sir Robert Peel towards the present ministers, 242; possible results of their defeat, 244.

Moore's Life of Byron, character of the work, 544.

More, Sir Thomas, notice of his 'Pitiful Life of King Edward V.,' 4.

Morning Watch, article of the Rev. Edward Irving in, 261; views of, respecting miracles, 281; falsity of, 282; mistatements regarding confirmation, 301.

Müller's History of the Dorians, 119; effects of upon the learned world, 120; division of his history, 125; his theory of government, 128; notice of the Spartans, 130; laws, 132; institutions, 133; literature, 136.

N.

Norton, Hon. Mrs. notice of her *Undying One*, 361; absurdity of the subject she has chosen, 365; quotations from, 366-368; character of her poetry, 369.

O.

Opis, position of fixed by Mr Williams, 323.

Otaheite, moral condition of the island, 217.

Oxford University, imperfections of the system at, 384; necessity of a reform in, 385; constitution of, 386; original constitution of, 388: ancient system of instruction, 389; qualifications for bachelor of arts at, 391; Oxford does not now accomplish what it was meant to effect; 398; causes of this, 399.

P.

Paley, Dr, quoted on Prayer, 285.

Palgrave, Francis, Esq., notice of his letter on 'Conciliatory Reform,' 539.

- Paper*, duties on, 427; their amount, 428; glaring injustice of, *ib.*
Pauperism, causes and cure of, 43.
Peel, Sir R., reprehensible conduct of, regarding the Reform Bill, 480; remarks on his speech at Tamworth, 497.
Peers, suggestions to the, 478; conduct of, regarding the emancipation bill, 494; probable results if they reject the present Reform Bill, 495.
Pennant, opinion of, respecting the derivation of American animals, 332.
Plague in London, Dr Lingard's account of, 34.
Police, Native, of British India, their inefficient character, 460.
Poor Laws, the abuse of, the cause of disturbance in the South of England, 46.
Prayer, views of the Rev. E. Irving respecting, 281; confutation of, 282.
Ptolemy, Rev. Mr Williams' remarks on the latitude he assigns to Ecbatana, 317.

Q.

- Quarterly List of New Publications*, 253, and 573.

R.

- Rajpoot tribes*, Heber's character of, 443.
Rapin's History of England, 11.
Read's Poems, 105; Cain the Wanderer, 110; defects in rhythm and accent, 117.
Reform Bill and the Ministry, 242; beneficial nature of the bill, 234; character of its opponents, 238; possible results of the defeat of the bill, 244. friendly advice to the Lords upon, 478; unmanly conduct of Sir R. Peel regarding, 480; General Gascoigne's motion, and effects, 483; account of his Majesty's dissolving of Parliament, 485; results of the elections, 486: advice to Parliament regarding, 500.
Reuchlin, character of, 188; the victim of persecution, 189; controversy with the Dominicans, 191.
Reurens on the Egyptian Museum at Leyden, 370; analysis of his work, 371; qualifications for the task, 372.
Richardson, John, notice of his Zoology of the Northern parts of British America 328; account of the Musk-Ox quoted, 345: account of the Bison quoted, 349.
Rights, political and vested, 502; extensive nature of the enquiry, 507; laws should be altered according to circumstances, 508; inviolability of property the great security for happiness, 512; private rights, 517; Blackstone's opinion of the right of property, 518; rights to be bestowed by the Reform Bill only political, 523; notice of the Bill brought in during Queen Anne's reign for limiting the number of peers, 533.
Robertson, T. C., Esq., his 'Remarks on several recent publications 'regarding the Civil Government of British India,' 438; opinion of respecting landed property in Upper India, 473.

S.

- Sandwich Islands*, description of, 219.
Schiller, correspondence of with Goethe, 82; style of his letters, 83; character of his mind, 87; his periodical 'The Hours,' 90; his opinion of Goethe's 'Wilhelm Meister,' 95; notice of Wallenstein, 99.
Schools, Public, of England, 64; constitution of that of Westminster, 64; comparison with that of Eton, 65; system of punishment vicious, 72; defects of the system of education at, 77.
Scott, Rev. A., *Neglected Truths*, by, 261.
Senior, N. W., *Lectures on the Rate of Wages*, 43.
Siamese Twins, a Poem, by Mr Bulwer, character of, 143.
Spartans, Müller's account of the, 127, 140.
Speed, *History of England* by, 8.
Stow, notice of his 'Chronicle of English History,' 8.

T.

- Taylor's Historic Survey of German Poetry*, 151; character of, 156; his opinion of Kant's Philosophy, 169; quotation from Klopstock, 174.
Taxes, the country suffers not from their magnitude but from the mode in which they are levied, 427.
Taxes on Literature, 427; injustice of, 428; on advertisements and paper, *ib.*; their amount and oppressiveness, 429; mode in which they should be levied, 433.

U.

- Undying One*, by the Hon. Mrs Norton, 361; absurdity of the subject she has chosen, 365; touching picture quoted from, 366; character of the work, 368.
Universities of England—Oxford, 384; necessity of a reform in, 385; constitution of Oxford and Cambridge, 386; English Universities contrasted with continental, 405; causes of the decline of Halls, 411.

W.

- Wages*, impossibility of fixing the rate of, according to the price of bread, 47; extract from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on, 50.
Westminster Latin Grammar, and *Græcæ Grammaticæ Compendium*, notice of, 68.
Williams, Rev. John, on the geography of Ancient Asia, 306; opinion of on the situation of Ecbatana, 307; identifies it with Ispahan, 308; proves from the marches of Alexander, 310; his remarks on the latitude assigned by Ptolemy to Ecbatana quoted, 317; remarks on his historical survey of Ispahan, 320; his opinion of the position of Opis, 323; on the retreat of Xenophon, and the route he took, 325.

X.

- Xenophon*, opinion of Mr Williams on the route he took in his retreat with the 10,000, 326.

Z.

- Zoology* of the northern parts of British America, 328.



19462

Edinburgh Review
Vol. 53, 1831. Mar-June, 1831.

P
LE
E

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

3 DAY LOAN

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

