

danger with a moral courage which is equal to that of the strongest. We see this in great things. We perfectly appreciate the sweet and noble dignity of an Anne Boleyn, a Mary, Queen of Scots, or a Marie Antoinette. We see that it is grand for delicately-bred, high-nurtured, helpless personages, to meet death with a silence and confidence like his own. There is no beauty in fear. It is a mean, ugly, disheveled creature. No statue can be made of it that a woman would wish to see herself like.—*Thoughts on Women.*

3. THE QUEEN'S LETTER—THE ALBERT MEMORIAL.

The following letter, dictated by her Majesty, and dated "Osborne, 19th of February," was addressed by Sir George Grey to the Lord Mayor of London. The letter says:—

"The Queen feels grateful from the bottom of her heart for the universal sympathy that has been expressed for her in her deep affliction; but it is still more soothing to her feelings to know that the noble character, the truly princely nature, of him whose loss has bowed her to the earth, with a sense of desolation and misery that every day, alas! serves only to increase, is appreciated by the country; that the benefits he has been instrumental in conferring upon the nation, the good he has wrought since he first came among us, and to effect which he may truly be said alone to have lived, are understood and acknowledged.

"The Queen is also much touched by the feeling which has led the promoters of the movement for erecting a national monument to the Prince to leave the nature of that monument to her decision. It is a subject on which there must necessarily be much difference of opinion. Many, influenced, doubtless, by the belief that there was nothing which the Prince himself had so deeply and constantly at heart as the promotion of whatever might tend to the advantage of the community at large, or of any portion of it, have thought that the most appropriate monument to his memory would be to connect his name to some great work that should have that end in view; and the Queen cannot but be gratified by this proof of a just appreciation of his character.

"But it would probably be difficult to procure anything like agreement as to the nature of the institution which should thus bear his honored name, and it would be inexpressibly painful to the Queen were any controversy to arise on such a subject.

"It would also be more in accordance with her own feelings, and, as she believes, with those of the country generally, that the proposed monument should be more directly personal to its object—should be, in fact, more what is commonly understood by the word. Even so it is probable that opinions may differ as to the character that would be most appropriate for such a monument. But the Queen is confident that the same good feeling which has led to the reference of the subject to her decision, will lead to a cordial acquiescence in it—to the cheerful abandonment of individual views, and to a unanimous working together to effect the object all have at heart.

"After giving the subject her best consideration, her Majesty has come to the conclusion that nothing would be more appropriate, provided it is on a scale of sufficient grandeur, than an obelisk to be erected in Hyde Park on the site of the Great Exhibition of 1851, or some spot immediately contiguous to it; nor would any proposal that can be made be more gratifying to the Queen personally, for she can never forget that the Prince himself had highly approved of the idea of a memorial of this character being raised, on the same spot, in remembrance of that Exhibition.

"There would also be this advantage in a monument of this nature—that several of the first artists of the day might take part in its execution; for there would be room at the base for various fine groups of statuary, each of which might be intrusted to a different artist.

"In the selection of the artists to be employed, in the choice of a design, and in the consideration of the details of execution, the Queen would wish to obtain the best advice; and she would therefore desire to call to her assistance a small committee, consisting of persons in whom she could feel satisfied that the country would repose entire confidence.

"I have written by her Majesty's command to those whose assistance she thus desires to obtain, and I will lose no time, as soon as I shall have received their answers, in communicating their names to your Lordship."

A second letter to the Lord Mayor has been published with her Majesty's permission. Her Majesty thinks that as a Sovereign, though not as a wife, she can be allowed to join with the nation in a monument to her late husband. The Queen attributes, under Providence, much of the happiness and prosperity of her reign to her beloved husband, who was her wise counsellor and unfailing guide and support. The letter adds, no one can know as the Queen does how his every thought was devoted to the country, how his only aim was to improve the condition of the people, and to promote

their best interests; and her Majesty asks to be allowed to consider how she may best take part with the movement of her people in doing honor to her beloved Prince.

4. THE LATE PRINCE CONSORT AND CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT.

In the Debate on the Address, at the opening of the Imperial Parliament, Lord John Russell said:—

"I am bound to state that the opinions the Prince gave, the temper he displayed, and the impartiality with which he viewed subjects of State, were of great service to the Sovereign. I will say one thing more—and I think that those who have watched the position of the Sovereign during the last twenty years will agree with me—that there has been a great change in this respect, a most beneficial change from what prevailed in former reigns. It often happened, when the Sovereign proceeded in opposition to certain political principles entertained by a portion of his subjects, that favour was given to one party, while another was decidedly proscribed; and the consequence of such distinctions, the effect of that favour shown to one party—whether it were the Whig party at the beginning of the House of Hanover, or whether it was the opposite party in other reigns—was to make one portion of the subjects of the Sovereign feel a degree of bitterness and animosity which would not otherwise have existed. Now, I happen to know from the Prince himself the view he took of the duty of the Sovereign in such a case. He stated to me, not many months ago, that it was a common opinion that there was only one occasion on which a Sovereign of this country could exercise a decided power, and that was in the choice of the First Minister of the Crown. The Prince went on to say that in his opinion that was not an occasion on which the Sovereign could exercise a control or pronounce a decision; that when a Minister had retired from being unable to carry on the government, there was at all times some other party prepared to assume the responsibilities of office, and most likely to obtain the confidence of the country. But, he said, a transfer having been made, whether the Minister was of one party or the other, he thought that the Sovereign ought to communicate with him in the most confidential and unreserved manner with respect to the various measures to be brought forward, the fortunes of the country, and the events that might happen—that whether he belonged to one party or another, the utmost confidence should prevail between the Sovereign and the Minister who came forward in Parliament as the ostensible possessor of power. I do, my lords, attribute in great measure to that opinion, which the Sovereign held in common with the Prince, the fact that there has been no feeling of bitterness among any party in this country arising from political exclusion, and that all parties during these twenty years have united in rendering that homage to the Sovereign which the conduct of Her Majesty has so well deserved; and the country still reaps the benefit of the good counsel which the Prince Consort gave to the Crown."

VII. Short Critical Notices of Books.

—BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE, and the BRITISH REVIEW.—The present critical state of European affairs will render these publications unusually interesting during the coming year. They will occupy a middle ground between the hasty written news-items, crude speculations, and flying rumours of the daily Journal, and the ponderous volume of the future historian, written after the living interest and excitement—of the great political events of the time shall have passed away. It is to these periodicals that readers must look for the only really and intelligible and reliable history of current events, and, as such, in addition to their well-established literary, scientific, and theological character, we urge them upon the consideration of the reading public. In calling the attention of our readers to Messrs. L. Scott & Co's. Reprints of these able publications, we cannot do better than give a description of the origin and design of their publications.

—THE EDINBURGH REVIEW was established in 1802. It is said to have originated among a number of convivial young spirits, who were accustomed to meet for the purpose of discussing all the great subjects of literature, science, philanthropy, and politics. Its success was immediate and very great. There was about it a freedom, boldness, and spirit; such a varied learning, elegant criticism, piquant satire, and acute reasoning, that it became the terror of parliaments—the censor of literature—the dictator of the press. Its first editor was the celebrated Canon of St. Paul's, after whom the great reviewer, Jeffrey, then a young Scottish lawyer, took the chair of honour. In politics, it supported the principles of the Whigs, as led by Charles James Fox; and in religion, its High Priests were Harry Brougham and Sydney Smith. The *Edinburgh* of to-day is more moderate