

were sublimated by religion, and through the amiableness of his character had been nourished to their utmost strength."

And again, to vindicate poor Lindley Murray, from page 58:—

"The time allowed between his appointment and his departure was so short, that the family had not time to prepare an outfit for him, but during the following winter his mother and sister were busily employed in spinning, weaving, knitting, &c., for him, and as the result of their labors, a large stock of such articles of bodily comfort, as industrious housewives can manufacture from the produce of their flocks, or from their flax, were prepared, and sent after him."

At page 85 we pause to note a *smile* of our austere author over the New England Primer, and to exclaim that really he must go to school again and try to commit and apply the simple rule—A verb must agree with its nominative in number and person:—

"Blessed book! In how many youthful minds hast thou sowed the seeds of heavenly truth! Young as we are, we too have tender recollections of thee. Thy very shape and appearance was peculiar. Thy figure was square, a figure well chosen to represent perfection. Thy paper was dark in color and somewhat dingy in appearance, as well be-seemed the modest humility of thy character. We have seen thee since in perfectly white paper, in shape like an ordinary catechism, with bright red cover. Pah! thou art not the Primer of our youth. As well represent to us John Knox in the picture of a modern dandy, with Joinville necktie, or his renowned daughter Mrs. Welsh, in hoops and crinoline. Thine thy frontispiece with the picture of John Rogers perishing in the flames, while his wife and ten children were standing by. Did ever work in gallery of Fine Arts excite more attention and study, and influence a greater number of minds for good, impressing upon them the principles of religious liberty, and instilling into them the martyr spirit of Christianity, than did that same old wood-cut?"

It would appear that when our author condescends to be amiable he has a Quakerly preference for the second person singular. We pass through a wilderness of bad writing and worse grammar—always excepting the Doctor's own narrative—and arrive at page 177:—

"The tendency in the present day is to look upon this state of mind as the result of mere bodily derangement. Doubtless this is often one cause, and it is a view of it that is not to be overlooked. But we fear that the spiritual element, which may frequently be the main one, is apt to be disregarded. This was the aspect, however, in which he mainly, if not entirely, regarded *them*, perhaps sometimes neglecting bodily causes, which might have had considerable influence."

Now, who or what is the "*them*" we have printed in italics? We think we know what

he means; but there should be no room for doubt. The singular noun "*state*" in the first sentence becomes a plural in the last.

We give two or three more illustrations of Mr. Patterson's literature, and then we will sum up and pass sentence upon him as a literary man. In page 227 we have the following:—

"At one time he was obliged to toil up a steep ascent, at another to cross a brook by a single fallen tree, on which it required the whole skill of a rope dancer to preserve his equilibrium, and which was not always successful in preventing his having a thorough wetting in it, while again he might be seen clambering up its banks by laying hold of the bushes with which it was lined."

And farther down in the same page we have, in two short sentences, two grievous errors in grammar:—

"Woods still cover a great part of Nova Scotia, but along any of the lines of travel, there is now to be seen only comparatively small trees, and these commonly second growth. All the woods fit for timber *has* been taken to market; but then the forest was the undisturbed growth of ages."

In page 229:—

"So that the traveller was in danger, either of being brushed from his saddle, or, at all events, of being rudely scratched by the branches, unless he was expert enough to parry them off as he advanced, which if *they* had been any rain just previous, would be sure to afford him the benefits of a shower bath."

We would like to ask Mr. Patterson what he means by the "*lower legs of an ox*," in page 231? Can it be correctly predicated of an ox that it has upper and lower legs?

Then, again, our author is the very worst of anecdote-mongers. Here is a proof in page 258. For want of space we can only give the first half of the story:—

"On another occasion, a woman had a cow under some complaint. She was convinced that he could cure it, if he chose, and he happening to be at her place, she pressed him to go to see the cow. He told her that he could do nothing for her. She, however, insisted; urging him only to lay his hand upon her. As she would take no denial, he, at length went, and laying a rod which he had in his hand upon her back, he said, 'If you live you live, and if you die you die.'"

Upon whose back did the Doctor lay his rod? the woman's or the cow's? We will take our last quotation but one from page 279:—

"The remainder of this narrative was written after he had had a stroke of paralysis and though some of his most interesting and laborious journeys were taken after this date yet the narrative is meagre, and without the minuteness of detail, and vividness of description, which *renders* the former portions so interesting."