

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coloured covers/<br>Couverture de couleur   | <input type="checkbox"/> Coloured pages/<br>Pages de couleur   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Covers damaged/<br>Couverture endommagée  | <input type="checkbox"/> Pages damaged/<br>Pages endommagées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Covers restored and/or laminated/<br>Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée  | <input type="checkbox"/> Pages restored and/or laminated/<br>Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cover title missing/<br>Le titre de couverture manque   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/<br>Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coloured maps/<br>Cartes géographiques en couleur   | <input type="checkbox"/> Pages detached/<br>Pages détachées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/<br>Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Showthrough/<br>Transparence   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coloured plates and/or illustrations/<br>Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quality of print varies/<br>Qualité inégale de l'impression                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bound with other material/<br>Relié avec d'autres documents   | <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous pagination/<br>Pagination continue   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion<br>along interior margin/<br>La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la<br>distorsion le long de la marge intérieure  | <input type="checkbox"/> Includes index(es)/<br>Comprend un (des) index  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Blank leaves added during restoration may appear<br>within the text. Whenever possible, these have<br>been omitted from filming/<br>Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées<br>lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,<br>mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont<br>pas été filmées. | Title on header taken from: /<br>Le titre de l'en-tête provient:   |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Title page of issue/<br>Page de titre de la livraison                                     |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Caption of issue/<br>Titre de départ de la livraison                                      |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Masthead/<br>Générique (périodiques) de la livraison                                      |

Additional comments: / There are some creases in the middle of pages.  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						

180

20832 THE  
NEW BRUNSWICK  
THE MUSEUM

SANCTI JOHANNIS

MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

CONDUCTED BY P. BENNETT.

J. T. YOUNGHUSBAND, PRINTER.

No. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1836.

Vol. I.

From the New-York Knickerbocker.

CONSUMPTION.

*Pulmonary Consumption and Means of Prevention.*

(Concluded.)

The causes of consumption may with propriety be divided into the *predisposing* and the *exciting*.—Among the first, and probably the most frequent, is the inheritance from one or both parents of a morbid constitution, or tendency to this disease. Scrofulous affections also predispose to this complaint, and these are often inherited, though they are as frequently caused by improper diet, impure air, deficient clothing, or by whatever weakens the system, or prevents its full and healthy development.

By *exciting* causes are meant those that awaken into diseased action this predisposition to the disease, such as colds, inflammation, and other affections of the lungs, which in those not at all predisposed to consumption seldom produce it, though they sometimes do, when neglected or improperly treated. But such instances are not common, and it is certain if the predisposition did not exist, there would be but little of the disease. It is therefore by preventing the transmission from one generation to another of this predisposition, or morbid constitution, that

we must look for much diminution of the disease in this country.

But how can this be effected? In answer to this enquiry, I submit the following observations:

*First.* Those strongly predisposed to consumption, should conscientiously abstain from matrimony. Duty to themselves and their country requires this. It is criminal in those in whom this disease is lurking, to connect themselves by marriage, and inflict upon themselves and those with whom they are connected unspeakable misery. On this subject more correct views should be entertained, and religiously acted upon. If young people, in the indiscretion peculiar to their age, incline to form such alliances, parents and friends should guard them against it. Hitherto they have been reprehensibly neglectful in this respect. For young persons, there is much excuse. Females in whom this disease exists in a latent form, are in early life the most interesting of their sex. Their minds are usually precocious and brilliant—their countenances fair and animated—and to a careless observer, appear blooming with health. But in truth, this precocity and brilliancy are symptoms of impending danger. This has been stated by most writers on consumption, and must have been observed by all who have given much attention to the in-

ipient forms of this disease. Even after the disease is established, it often for a while appears to increase the beauty of its victim. Percival has poetically and correctly alluded to this:

“O! there is a sweetness in beauty’s close,  
Like the perfume scenting the withered rose;  
For a nameless charm around her plays,  
And her eyes are kindled with hallowed rays,  
And a veil of spotless purity  
Has mantled her cheek with its heavenly dye,  
Like a cloud whereon the queen of night  
Has poured her softest tint of light;  
And there is a blending of white and blue  
Where the purple blood is melting through  
The snow of her pale and tender cheek;  
And there are tones that sweetly speak  
Of a spirit who longs for a purer day,  
And is ready to wing her flight away.”

But though those predisposed to consumption are often as beautiful as the flowers of spring, they are as delicate and fragile. They usually have slender forms and narrow chests; their lungs are easily irritated; they take cold from slight exposure, and have frequent cough, which for a while is scarcely noticed, or readily yields to remedial measures. Such persons, I repeat, should avoid matrimony, especially in early life. If no exciting cause awakens into diseased action the apprehended predisposition before the age of twenty-five, and they are in good health, there will then be less danger, as reasonable hopes may be indulged that the disease will never be developed.

*Secondly.* Neither should those marry who are sickly, or whose constitutions are much impaired by disease, even if not consumptive. A late writer on consumpition, Dr. Clark, who speaks from great experience, considers dyspepsia in the parent the most fertile source of that vitiated system in the children which leads to this disease. An impaired state of health, however produced in the parent, is often manifested in the children by a tendency to scrofulous

and consumptive diseases. Thus we often find the younger children more disposed to disease than the elder, and on enquiry, find it may be attributed to a change in the health of one or both parents. Parents should remember that inattention to their own health, or living irregular, dissipated lives, not only impairs their own health, and causes themselves much suffering, but that the evils they experience from this source will be transmitted to their offspring. Like the fabled Laocoon, the ‘long-venomed chain’ that binds the father, also encircles and destroys the children.

*Thirdly.* Early marriages are likewise productive of consumption in this country. Causes that in Europe operate to prevent early marriages, do not exist here. Hence we observe very early marriages among all classes.

The stripling from college, and the girl from the boarding-school—the apprentice when he arrives at the age of twenty-one, and girls from the age of fifteen to twenty—enter into this state, and though in some instances no evils result, yet not unfrequently we notice the health of one or both parents decline, and if they do not die, their children are feeble, and often cut off before adult age. I speak from personal observation, when I say that early marriages are in this country often productive of consumptive diseases. Unless remarkably healthy, none of either sex should marry before the age of twenty-four, or not until two or three years after the system has acquired its full development. Those whose health has been much impaired from any cause had better delay a few years longer.

Still, some who are predisposed to

consumption, and many with imperfect health, will marry—and cannot the development of this disease, in the offspring of such, be prevented? I confidently answer, Yes. Very much may be done to prevent it, by a proper course of physical education—by attention to the diet, dress, exercise, and amusements of children and youth. Those children hereditarily predisposed to consumption, require very different treatment from what they generally receive.—Instead of being nurtured like tender plants within doors, or confined at school, they should pass much of the time, during mild weather, in the open air, engaged in play and pleasant exercise. The first object of parents or guardians, as relates to the early education of such children, should be, to give them healthy bodies—to endow them with good physical powers. They should not seek to develop at an early age the intellect of these delicate beings, and strive to place a Corinthian capital on a column of sand; but should endeavor, in the first place, to make the foundation good, and then whatever is added will be serviceable and enduring.

*First, of Diet.* All children, more especially the children of enfeebled or consumptive parents, require from their earliest infancy a large supply of nutriment. If the mother is feeble, or exhibits a strong predisposition to disease, a healthy nurse should be procured for the infant.—By adopting this course, I have seen the delicate infants of feeble mothers apparently rescued from the grave, and become healthy and robust.—After the usual term of nursing has passed, plain nourishing food—all that the child craves—and considerable animal food too, should be al-

lowed. This last is quite essential to children predisposed to scrofulous diseases, and also to prevent, in children who are not, the formation of a tendency to this disease. I fear some have opinions on this subject, which, if generally reduced to practice in this country, would prove very detrimental, and tend to produce a degenerate race of men and women, feeble in body and mind. Some persons appear to believe that disease and death lurk in most kinds of rich, nourishing food; that not only pies and cakes are injurious to health, but that fine bread and animal food are also, and that children should be sparingly fed, and chiefly supported on vegetable diet. Those who hold, and promulgate such opinions—true disciples of Sancho Panza's doctor, who represented all ordinary food injurious to health—appear to be increasing in this country, and may for a while do mischief. In a hot climate, vegetable food may be sufficient, but in ours, I am confident a more nutritious and stimulating diet is essential to the growth and perfection of the system, and to the full development of all the powers of body and mind.

The history of diseases in all ages of the world abundantly prove, that insufficiency of food, especially in early life, is by far the most productive cause of disease. This is the cause of most of the scrofula, of rickets, and other diseases that rage among the poor. It is this that causes the early decrepitude and look of premature old age which is exhibited even by the youth in many parts of Europe. Children brought up on coarse food, but little nutritious, or that are supported chiefly on vegetable food, are very apt to be scrofulous. Even in domestic animals

scrofulous affections, or a general disease of the glands, is caused by want of nutritious food. Scrofula is common among the poor, and those supported on weak broths and coarse bread. It is often produced among the children of charitable establishments, when but little or no animal food is allowed. This and other diseases have been caused by diminishing the nourishment, and withdrawing animal food, in prisons and penitentiaries, and has ceased on returning to better diet. It may be said that the Irish, some of whom live mostly on potatoes, are healthy.—This is incorrect. Probably in no other country is there as much sickness as in Ireland. A late medical writer estimates the amount of cases of fever alone in Ireland, at one hundred and eight thousand, or one in seventy-two of the population. The fever that rages there is of a low typhus kind, and has been attributed to the enfeebled state of the inhabitants, caused by want of nourishment. Contrast with this, a statement made by Dr. Tweedie, physician to the Fever Hospital in London, that, though almost every description of mechanics had been at some period admitted there, yet he adds, "I do not recollect a single instance of a butcher being sent to the establishment." Similar observations have been made at other hospitals.

In hot climates, animal food is not so necessary—the appetite does not naturally crave it. In such climates vegetable food appears to be sufficiently stimulating. So some individuals in cold climates do not require animal food, and some may have better health by abstaining from it. But such instances, I suspect, are extremely rare, especially among

children in good health, who require when growing much invigorating nutriment. Let me therefore entreat those who have the care of children, to be careful of denying their requests for food; but, on the contrary, be mindful to supply them with an abundance that is nutritious. I beseech them to be guided by the same common sense and experience which guides farmers in their endeavors to raise large and handsome animals.—To make children grow well and become vigorous and healthy—to make fine animals of them—is the first duty of their parents and guardians.

As regards the influence of diet in producing the disease we are considering, it should be known that most European writers on this disease have stated, as a singular fact, that butchers and their families very rarely have consumption. Thackeray, in his excellent work on the '*Effects of Trades and Professions, on Health and Longevity*,' says:—"Butchers and the slaughter-men, their wives and errand-boys, almost all eat fresh cooked meat at least twice a day; they are plump and rosy, cheerful and good-natured. Consumption is remarkably rare among them. If we see a consumptive-looking youth among them, we generally find that his parents, aware of an hereditary disposition to consumption, brought him up to the business, with the hope of averting the formidable malady." Many others have alluded to the fact that butchers are generally exempt from scrofula and consumption.

Let no one understand, from these remarks on diet, that I am an advocate for gluttony, or gormandizing, or that I deny evils do not result from over-eating. All I wish to have understood is, that I believe these evils

have by many been greatly overrated—more than the truth will warrant—and that nutritious food, well cooked, animal food, is not the cause of many of the evils that flesh is heir to, but, on the contrary, the want of it is; and there is danger in our climate of enfeebling children, and preventing the full development of their bodies—of causing scrofulous and consumptive diseases—by a very spare, innutritious, or exclusively vegetable diet.

*Dress.* This should vary with the season. The practice of partially clothing infants, leaving the arms naked in cold weather, etc., is cruel and dangerous. Probably no one cause sweeps off so many infants as cold. From observations made in Europe, it appears that the mortality among infants is greater in cold than in warm climates—that the mortality is much greater in the cold season of the year than in the warm, and that a much greater proportion of children live, that are born in the spring or summer, than of those born in the winter. Great caution should be used, not only in dressing children warm, but in exposing them to cold. They may, to be sure, be clothed too warmly, and be kept too much in a confined atmosphere; but these errors should be avoided, without committing the more common one of exposure to cold without sufficient clothing.

But this extreme carefulness, as regards exposure to cold is necessary only for the first winter or two; after this, children should gradually be accustomed to the cold, though they should be warmly clad. Young females are too regardless of the importance of dressing warm in winter. They should wear flannel constantly in the cold season, and thick warm

stockings and shoes, and not change them for thin ones to attend evening parties. The notion of hardening youth by exposure to cold in their clothing, is absurd and dangerous. The only sure way to protect ourselves from the evils of a cold climate, is to dress warm, sleep warm, together with exercise, and an abundance of invigorating food.

Above all, parents should be careful to have the dresses of children loose. I seldom see a young child, especially a girl, that is not dressed too tightly about the chest. No doubt many, very many, would escape consumption, and early death, were it not by the shocking practice of compressing the body by dress. Consumption is rare, very rare indeed, in persons with large, full chests.—How fearful, therefore, should parents be, lest their own children are prevented from having such, by improper, though at present fashionable, dressing. The tight lacing of young ladies and adult females, is unquestionably dangerous, and causes no doubt much disease, but not as much, I apprehend, as dressing children tightly about the chest. In early life, the ribs are easily compressed, and the chest made smaller. But not only should all such compression be avoided in childhood, but the dress should be quite loose, to permit the enlargement of the thorax, in laughing, running, and other exercises, and thus enable it to grow larger.

Many of the small, narrow chests we see in young ladies, are made so by this compression, which prevents the full expansion of the lungs, and an enlargement of the thorax. Some children, however, have small chests from birth, which predispose them to consumption, but I believe many of

these might be remedied, by avoiding all compression of the chest when young, and encouraging them in those exercises that expand the lungs, and enlarge the breast.

*Air, Exercise, and Amusements.*—If there is a place on earth where the air should be pure, it is the apartment of a young child. It not only should be kept free from dust, but from bad effluvia, and the air frequently be renovated. There is great neglect in this respect, both in nurseries and schools; a neglect which is one of the most frequent causes of scrofula, and is perhaps the reason why this disease prevails more among females, who are less in the open air, than among males; in the proportion, it is said, of five to three. As I have said, children should be much of the time in the open air, when the weather is not severely cold. Instead of shutting them up in a small school-room, five or six hours every day, during the first years of life, and keeping them most of the time in one position, they should be permitted to spend most of their time out of doors; and parents should be more anxious to enlarge the muscles of their children, and expand their chests by exercise, than their minds by study. This is the proper course to adopt with all children, and absolutely essential to strengthen and invigorate those that are delicate, and predisposed to disease.

Let it not be objected to this course, that those with whom it is adopted will forever remain mentally inferior. This is not in fact true. A child that has not learned a letter, or been within a school-house, until after the age of six years, but has passed much of his time in healthful exercises out of doors, and thereby

gained a healthy, vigorous body, will, when he has an opportunity for learning, outstrip the pale, puny things that have been confined from infancy in schools, and become renowned for their proficiency in many sciences. And the former will continue to exhibit through life more mental as well as bodily energy and ability. Innumerable facts might be adduced to prove this statement.

In regard to the early education of children, I am surprised that more inquiry has not been made respecting the early lives of those whom the world deservedly calls great, and the course adopted with them pursued with others. But in general, immediate results are alone regarded, and no inquiry is made respecting the ultimate effects upon the mind and body of the course adopted, but sufficient evidence of its utility is thought to be furnished, if thereby a child can be made to learn rapidly.

I apprehend if we inquire respecting the early education of most of those who have exhibited remarkable abilities, we shall find no sanction for confining young children closely at school: on the contrary, we probably should be induced to ask, if the exercise they enjoyed out of doors—the idleness, as it is called—by giving them good health, and developing their physical powers, had not in fact contributed to the ability afterward manifested, and enabled them to toil, and study, and perform great mental labor, without injury. Look at the great men of this and other countries. Can their greatness be attributed to early school education? Did they enjoy the advantages, as the phrase is, of infant-schools? Were they benefited by the labors of the illustrious Peter Parley & Co.? No! Ninety nine

in a hundred had no early school education, or none derived from the study of books, though they had the very best education in their early days; they were permitted to study men and things in the open air—in the fields, and gardens, and woods, at play or labor; and thus the brain, instead of being prematurely tasked, and rendered, like over-cultivated fields, incurably barren, was only equally exercised with the other parts of the system, and all were fully developed.

One of the most distinguished men of this country—distinguished alike for great and varied attainments, and for moral worth—favored me a few years since with the following interesting particulars of his early education:

‘I was brought up among the highlands and hilly parts of Connecticut, and was never kept on the *high pressure* plan of instruction. It was not then the fashion. I went to school, and studied in the easy, careless way, until I went to college. I was daily, and sometimes for a month or more, engaged in juvenilo play, and occasional efforts on the farm. I was roaming over the fields, and fishing, and sailing, and swimming, and riding, and playing ball, so as not to be but *very superficially learned*, when I entered college. I was not in college half the time. I was at home at leisure, or at gentle work, and much on horseback, but never in the least dissipated. I easily kept pace with my class, for it was in the midst of the American war, and there were no scholars, or much stimulus to learn. *Silent leges inter arma*. When I went to study law, I had my own leisure, and great exercise and relaxation in enchanting rides, and home visits, until I got to the bar.—

I lived plain—drank nothing but water—eat heartily of all plain, wholesome food that came in my way—was delighted with rural scenery, and active and healthy as I could be.— Here I laid the *basis of a sound constitution*, in which my brain had not been unduly pressed or excited, and only kept its symmetry with the rest of the animal system. It was not until I was twenty-four, that I found I was very superficially taught, and then *voluntarily betook myself to books*, and to learn the classics, and every thing else I could read. The ardor and rapidity with which I pursued my law and literary course, was great and delightful, and my *health and spirits* were sound and uniform, and neither has faltered, down to this day.\*

Let not these valuable facts excuse or encourage idleness in literary pursuits. They but serve to show, that intense and constant application of mind in early life is not necessary to the highest intellectual attainments in after years; but that much exercise of the body is required in childhood, in order to develop and invigorate the system, and enable it subsequently to endure severe and long-continued mental application. And these are truths so much disregarded at the present time, and yet of such vast importance to the welfare of the rising generation, that reference to the early lives of distinguished men is not only excusable, but necessary.

The truths which such facts serve to establish, are also supported by physiology; and it is pleasing to see

\* Chancellor Kent. This was written after reading a small volume presented to him in 1833, by the writer of this article, on the “Influence of Mental Cultivation upon Health;” and was not intended for publication.

that they are beginning to be regarded in the education of young children. A few years since, there was scarcely a more alarming evil than the rage for making learned prodigies of infants and young children.—But farther reform is necessary, especially as regards the education of females. While in no other country do females so generally receive good intellectual education, or spend as much time at school, as in this, their physical education is almost entirely disregarded. Hence the fact, noticed by all foreigners, that the females of this country, especially in our cities, appear more delicate and less healthy than in England. Hence the innumerable instances of narrow chests and curved spines, that a careful observer witnesses among the females of the large towns in this country. Crowded boarding schools for young girls are quite numerous, but to many of them I fear they prove the portals of the grave. At these schools, with few exceptions, but little pains are taken to develop the physical powers of the scholars, and the chief attention is given to rapidly improving the intellect. Often an amount of mental labor is required of young and delicate girls, sufficient to impair a strong constitution. All the rewards and praise, all the hopes and wishes of parents and teachers, are for intellectual progress. True, they exercise a little; but the *kind* allowed them is often a task, and is nearly useless. They occasionally walk abroad with their teachers, with a regulated, stereotyped pace, that does them little or no good. Plays and exercises that they naturally enjoy, and which call into action and benefit the whole system—that enlarge the chest, and strengthen the muscles of the back, and enable

them to support the spine—are considered rude and improper. Hence we see young ladies return from such schools, with minds much improved perhaps, but with chests no larger than when they left home, and not unfrequently one shoulder more elevated than the other, and with some curvature of the spine. Let it not be said, in refutation of this statement, that girls in boarding schools look animated and healthy. This is not generally true, and if it were, it would not prove that the course pursued at such schools was proper. The evil effects which result from want of exercise are not witnessed immediately in youth.

In a few years, a delicate girl thus educated, from a little more exposure or fatigue than she has been accustomed to, or even from the mental anxiety and conflict of feelings not unusual to young ladies who mix in society, she grows feeble, a slight cough ensues, scarcely noticed for a while, shortness of breath is experienced on a little exercise, and though the countenance appears brilliant and animated,

‘Tis the hectic spot that flushes there,’

and the work of death has already commenced. In a few months, she sinks into the grave, and the newspapers announce, that an interesting young lady—the pride of her parents and friends—whose mind had been improved by the most careful education, has been cut off by consumption. But such announcements, though frequently seen, make but little impression upon the community, and convey no warning to those who have the guardianship of young ladies.

I have dwelt longer on this subject than I should, did I not believe

that inattention to the physical education of females, and the rage for improving the intellect to the utmost extent, had become alarming evils; and did I not believe a reform in this respect would diminish the mortality from the disease we are considering, and that the children of feeble or consumptive parents might be rescued from the grave by more attention to the development and improvement of their bodies, by healthful and agreeable exercise, and by less attention to the advancement of the intellect by confinement at school.

The subject is one of vast interest to the patriot and philanthropist.—On good bodily organization depend not only individual health but national welfare. The subject, however, seems to be overlooked in this country. While great improvements are making in every thing else, but little thought is given to the improvement of man himself—to physical man.—But this is a neglect which sooner or later will lead to the most disastrous results, even to the ruin of those portions of the population that have from this neglect become effeminate. History assures us of this.—When the citizens of Rome changed their habits, neglected those exercises that improved the body, their physical temperament changed.—The men became effeminate in body and mind; the women became nervous, and were either barren or gave birth to a feeble race; and then, as was necessary for the good of humanity, “the fierce giants of the North broke in, and mended the puny breed.”

To avert such a fate from all civilized nations, it will be necessary, while striving for intellectual improvement, to keep constantly in

mind that physical improvement is equally necessary, and must not be neglected.

A. B.

#### ON NATURAL LAWS.

Extract from the “Constitution of Man,”  
by George Combe.

Man's faculties capable of ascertaining what exists, and the purpose of what exists, but not the will of the Deity in creation—All the departments in Nature act upon definite constitutions and fixed laws, imposed by the Deity—The term “law” defined and illustrated—Man's pleasure and pain depend, in this world, upon observance of and obedience to these constitutions and laws; an opinion supported by Bishop Butler—The Natural Laws divided into Physical, Organic, and Moral, and obedience or disobedience to each asserted to have distinct effects; while the whole are universal, invariable, unbending, and in harmony with the entire constitution of man—Death in certain circumstances appears desirable—Full and universal obedience not supposed to lead to perfect happiness on earth, or to interfere with the prospects of futurity—Benevolence not the exclusive, or immediate, but the ultimate principle on which the world is arranged; evil in no case the ultimate, but only in certain instances the immediate principle, and that for wise and benevolent ends—The will of the Deity in designing evil inscrutable, but the mental constitution shown by Phrenology to bear relation to it.

In natural science, three subjects of inquiry may be distinguished:—1st, What exists? 2dly, What is the purpose or design of what exists? and, 3dly, Why was what exists designed for such uses as it evidently subserves?

It is matter of fact, for instance, that arctic regions and the torrid zone exist—that a certain kind of moss is abundant in Lapland in winter—that the rein-deer feeds on it, and enjoys health and vigor in situations where most other animals would die; that camels exist in Africa—that they

have broad hooves, and stomachs fitted to retain water for a considerable time—and that they flourish amid arid tracts of sand, where the rein-deer would hardly live for a day. All this falls under the inquiry, What exists?

In contemplating these facts, the understanding is naturally led to infer that one object of the Lapland moss is to feed the rein-deer, and that one purpose of the deer is to assist man; and that broad feet have been given to the camel to allow it to walk on sand, and a retentive stomach, to fit it for arid places in which water is found only at wide intervals. These conclusions result from inquiries into the uses or purposes of what exists; and such inquiries constitute a legitimate exercise of the human intellect.

But, 3dly, we may ask, Why were the physical elements of nature created such as they are? Why were summer, autumn, spring, and winter introduced? Why were animals formed of organized matter? Why were trackless wastes of snow and burning sand called into existence? These are inquiries why what exists was made such as it is, or into the will of the Deity in creation.

Now, man's perceptive faculties are adequate to the first inquiry, and his reflective faculties to the second; but it may well be doubted whether he has powers suited to the third.—My investigations are confined to the first and second, and I do not discuss the third.

It cannot be too much insisted on, that the Creator has bestowed definite constitutions on physical nature, and on man and animals, and that they are regulated by fixed laws.—A law, in the common acceptation, denotes a rule of action; it implies

a subject which acts, and that the actions or phenomena which that subject exhibits take place in an established and regular manner; and this is the sense in which I shall use it, when treating of physical substances and beings. Water, for instance, when at the level of the sea, and combined with that portion of heat indicated by 32 deg. of Fahrenheit's thermometer, freezes or becomes solid; when combined with the portion denoted by 212 deg. of that instrument, it rises into vapor or steam. Here water and heat are the substances, and the freezing and rising into vapor are the appearances or phenomena presented by them; and when we say that these take place according to a Law of Nature, we mean only that these modes of action appear, to our intellects, to be established in the very constitution of the water and heat, and in their natural relationship to each other; and that the processes of freezing and rising in vapor are constant appearances, when they are combined in these proportions, other conditions being the same.

The ideas chiefly to be kept in view are, 1st, That all substances and beings have received a definite natural constitution; 2dly, That every mode of action, which is said to take place according to a natural law, is inherent in the constitution of the substance or being; and, 3dly, That the mode of action described is universal and invariable, wherever and whenever the substances or beings are found in the same condition.—For example, water, at the level of the sea, freezes and boils at the same temperature, in China, in France, in Peru, and in England; and there is no exception to the regularity with which it exhibits these appearances,

when all its other conditions are the same. This last qualification, however, must constantly be attended to in all departments of science. If water be carried to the top of a mountain 20,000 feet high, it will boil at a lower temperature than 212 deg.; but this depends on its relationship to the air, and takes place also according to fixed and invariable principles. The air exerts a great pressure on water. At the level of the sea the pressure is every where nearly the same, and in that situation the freezing and boiling points correspond all over the world; but on the top of a high mountain the pressure is much less, and the vapor, not being held down by so great a power of resistance, rises at a lower temperature than 212 deg. But this change of appearances does not indicate a change in the constitution of the water and the heat, but only a variation in the circumstances in which they are placed; and hence it is not correct to say, that water boiling on the tops of high mountains, at a lower temperature than 212 deg. is an exception to the general law of nature. There are no exceptions to the laws of nature; for the Creator is too wise and too powerful to make imperfect or inconsistent arrangements. The error is in the human mind inferring the law to be, that water boils at 212 deg. in every altitude; when the real law is only that it boils at that temperature, *at the level of the sea*, in all countries—and that it boils at a lower temperature the higher it is carried, because then the pressure of the atmosphere is less.

Intelligent beings are capable of observing nature and of modifying their actions. By means of their faculties, the laws impressed by the

Creator on physical substances become known to them; and, when perceived, constitute laws to them, by which to regulate their conduct. For example, it is a physical law, that boiling water destroys the muscular and nervous systems of man. This is the result purely of the constitution of the body, and the relation between it and heat; and man cannot alter or suspend the law. But whenever the relation, and the consequences of disregarding it, are perceived, the mind is prompted to avoid infringement, in order to shun the torture attached by the Creator to the decomposition of the human body by heat.

Similar views have been long taught by philosophers and divines. Bishop Butler, in particular, says:—"An Author of Nature being supposed, it is not so much a deduction of reason as a matter of experience, that we are thus under his government—under his government in the same sense as we are under the government of civil magistrates. Because the annexing pleasure to some actions, and pain to others, in our power to do or forbear, and giving notice of this appointment beforehand to those whom it concerns, is the proper formal notion of government. Whether the pleasure or pain which thus follows upon our behavior be owing to the Author of Nature's acting upon us every moment which we feel it, or to his having at once contrived and executed his own part in the plan of the world, makes no alteration as to the matter before us. For, if civil magistrates could make the sanctions of their laws take place, without interposing at all after they had passed them, without a trial and the formalities of an execution; if they were able to make their laws execute

themselves, or every offender to execute them upon himself, we should be just in the same sense under their government then as we are now; but in a much higher degree and more perfect manner. Vain is the ridicule with which one foresees some persons will divert themselves, upon finding lesser pains considered as instances of Divine punishment. There is no possibility of answering or evading the general thing here intended, without denying all final causes. For, final causes being admitted, the pleasures and pains now mentioned must be admitted too, as instances of them. And if they are, if God annexes delight to some actions and uneasiness to others, with an apparent design to induce us to act so and so, then he not only dispenses happiness and misery, but also rewards and punishes actions.— If, for example, the pain which we feel upon doing what tends to the destruction of our bodies, suppose upon too near approaches to fire, or upon wounding ourselves, be appointed by the Author of Nature to prevent our doing what thus tends to our destruction; this is altogether as much an instance of his punishing our actions, and consequently of our being under his government, as declaring, by a voice from heaven, that if we acted so, he would inflict such pain upon us, and inflicting it whether it be greater or less.”\*

If, then, the reader keep in view that God is the creator; that Nature, in the general sense, means the world which he has made—and, in a more limited sense, the particular constitution which he has bestowed on any special object, of which we may be treating; and that a Law of Nature

means the established mode in which the actions and phenomena of any creature or object exhibit themselves, and the obligation thereby imposed on intelligent beings to attend to it—he will be in no danger of misunderstanding my meaning.

Every natural object has received a definite constitution, in virtue of which it acts in a particular way.— There must, therefore, be as many natural laws as there are distinct modes of action of substances and beings, viewed by themselves. But substances and beings stand in certain relations to each other, and modify each other's action, in an established and definite manner, according to that relationship; altitude, for instance, modifies the effect of heat upon water. There must, therefore, be also as many laws of nature as there are *relations* between different substances and beings.

It is impossible, in the present state of knowledge, to elucidate all these laws: numberless years may elapse before they shall be discovered; but we may investigate some of the most familiar and striking of them. Those that most readily present themselves bear reference to the great classes into which the objects around us may be divided, namely, Physical, Organic, and Intelligent. I shall therefore confine myself to the physical laws, the organic laws, and the laws which characterize intelligent beings.

1st. The Physical Laws embrace all the phenomena of mere matter: a heavy body, for instance, when unsupported, falls to the ground with a certain accelerating force, in proportion to the distance which it falls, and its own density; and this motion is said to take place according to the law of gravitation. An

\* Butler's Works. vol. i. p. 44.

acid applied to a vegetable blue color, converts it into red, and this is said to take place according to a chemical law.

2dly. Organised substances and beings stand higher in the scale of creation, and have properties peculiar to themselves. They act, and are acted upon, in conformity with their constitution, and are therefore said to be subject to a peculiar set of laws, termed the Organic. The distinguishing characteristic of this class of objects is, that the individuals of them derive their existence from other organized beings, are nourished by food, and go through a regular process of growth and decay.—Vegetables and Animals are the two great subdivisions of it. The organic laws are different from the merely physical; a stone, for example, does not spring from a parent stone; it does not take food; it does not increase in vigor for a time, and then decay and suffer dissolution—all which processes characterise vegetables and animals.

The organic laws are superior to the merely physical. A living man or animal may be placed in an oven, along with the carcass of a dead animal, and remain exposed to a heat which will completely bake the dead flesh, and yet come out alive, and not seriously injured. The dead flesh is mere physical matter, and its decomposition by the heat instantly commences; but the living animal is able, by its organic qualities, to counteract and resist, to a certain extent, that influence. The Organic Laws, therefore, mean the established modes according to which all phenomena connected with the production, health, growth, decay, and death of vegetables and animals, take place. In the case of each ani-

mal or vegetable of the same kind, their action is always the same, in the same circumstances. Animals are the chief objects of my present observations.

3dly. Intelligent beings stand yet higher in the scale than merely organised matter, and embrace all animals that have distinct consciousness, from the lowest of the inferior creatures up to man. The two great divisions of this class are *Intelligent* and *Animal*, and *Intelligent* and *Moral* creatures. The dog, horse, and elephant, for instance, belong to the former class, because they possess some degree of intelligence, and certain animal propensities, but no moral feelings; man belongs to the second, because he possesses all the three. These various faculties have received a definite constitution, and stand in determinate relationship to external objects: for example, a healthy palate cannot feel wormwood sweet, nor sugar bitter; a healthy eye cannot see a rod partly plunged in water straight—because the water so modifies the rays of light, as to give to the stick the appearance of being crooked; a healthy sentiment of Benevolence cannot feel gratified with murder, nor a healthy Conscientiousness with fraud. As, therefore, the mental faculties have received a precise constitution, have been placed in fixed and definite relations to external objects, and act regularly;—we speak of their acting according to rules or laws, and call these the Moral and Intellectual Laws.

Several important principles strike us very early in attending to the natural laws, viz. 1st, Their independence of each other: 2dly, That obedience to each of them is attended with its own reward, and disobe-

dience with its own punishment;— 3dly, That they are universal, unbending, and invariable in their operation; 4thly, That they are in harmony with the constitution of man.

1. The *independence* of the natural laws may be illustrated thus:— A ship floats because a part of it being immersed displaces a weight of water equal to its whole weight, leaving the remaining portion above the fluid. A ship, therefore, will float on the surface of the water as long as these physical conditions are observed; no matter although the men in it should infringe other natural laws—as, for example, although they should rob, murder, blaspheme, and commit every species of debauchery: and it will sink whenever the physical conditions are subverted, however strictly the crew and passengers may obey the moral laws.— In like manner, a man who swallows poison, which destroys the stomach or intestines, will die, just because an organic law has been infringed, and because it acts independently of others; although he should have taken the drug by mistake, or have been the most pious and charitable individual on earth. Or, thirdly, a man may cheat, lie, steal, tyrannise, and, in short, break a great variety of the moral laws, and nevertheless be fat and rubicund, if he sedulously observe the organic laws of temperance and exercise; while, on the other hand, an individual who neglects these, may pine in disease, and be racked with torturing pains, although at the very moment he may be devoting his mind to the highest duties of humanity.

2. *Obedience to each law is attended with its own reward, and disobedience with its own punishment.* Thus,

the mariners who preserve their ship in accordance with the physical laws, reap the reward of sailing in safety; and those who permit a departure from them, are punished by the ship sinking. People who obey the moral law, enjoy the intense internal delights that spring from active moral faculties; they render themselves, moreover, objects of affection and esteem to moral and intelligent beings, who, in consequence, confer on them many other gratifications.— Those who disobey that law, are tormented by insatiable desires, which, from the nature of things, cannot be gratified: they are punished by the perpetual craving of whatever portion of moral sentiment they possess, for higher enjoyments, which are never attained; and they are objects of dislike and malevolence to other beings of similar dispositions with themselves, who inflict on them the evils dictated by their own provoked propensities. Those who obey the organic laws, reap the reward of health, and vigor of body, and buoyancy of mind; while those who break them are punished by sickness, feebleness, langor, and pain.

3. The natural laws are *universal, invariable, and unbending.* When the physical laws are infringed in China or Kamtschatka, there is no instance of a ship floating there more than in England; and when they are observed, there is no instance of a vessel sinking in any one of these countries more than another. There is no example of men, in any country, enjoying the mild and generous internal joys, and the outward esteem and love, that attend obedience to the moral law, while they give themselves up to the dominion of brutal propensities.—

There is no example, in any latitude or longitude, or in any age, of men who entered life with a constitution in harmony with the organic laws, and who continued to obey these laws throughout, being, in consequence of this obedience, visited with pain and disease; and there are no instances of men who were born with constitutions marred by the organic laws, and who lived in habitual disobedience to them, enjoying that sound health and vigor of body that are the rewards of obedience.

4. The natural laws are *in harmony with the whole constitution of man, the moral and intellectual powers* holding the supremacy. If ships in general had sunk when they were staunch, strong, and skilfully managed, this would have outraged the perceptions of reason; but as they float, the physical law is, in this instance, in harmony with the moral and intellectual law. If men, who rioted in drunkenness and debauchery had thereby established health and increased their happiness, this, again, would have been at variance with our intellectual and moral perceptions; but the opposite and actual result is in harmony with them.

It will be subsequently shown, that our moral sentiments desire universal happiness. If the physical and organic laws are constituted in harmony with them, it ought to follow that the natural laws, when obeyed, will conduce to the happiness of the moral and intelligent beings who are called on to observe them; and that the evil consequences or punishments, resulting from infringement of them, will be calculated to enforce stricter obedience, for the advantage those creatures themselves. According to this view, when a ship

sinks, in consequence of a plank starting, the punishment is intended to impress upon the spectators the absolute necessity of having every plank secure and strong before going to sea, this being a condition indispensable to their safety. When sickness or pain follow a debauch, the object of the suffering is to urge a more scrupulous obedience to the organic laws, that the individual may escape premature death, which is the inevitable consequence of too great and continued disobedience to these laws—and enjoy health, which is the reward of the opposite conduct. When discontent, irritation, hatred, and other mental annoyances, arise out of infringement of the moral law, this punishment is calculated to induce the offender to return to obedience, that he may enjoy the rewards attached to it.

When the transgression of any natural law is excessive, and so great that return to obedience is impossible, one purpose of death, which then ensues, may be to deliver the individual from a continuation of the punishment which could then do him no good. Thus, when, from infringement of a physical law, a ship sinks at sea, and leaves men immersed in water, without the possibility of reaching land, their continued existence in that state would be one of cruel and protracted suffering; and it is advantageous to them to have their lives extinguished at once by drowning, thereby withdrawing them from further agony. In like manner, if a man in the vigor of life so far infringe any organic law as to destroy the function of a vital organ—the heart, for instance, or the lungs, or the brain—it is better for him to have his life cut short, and his pain put an end to, than to have it pro-

tracted under all the tortures of an organic existence, without lungs, without a heart, or without a brain, if such a state were possible, which, for this wise reason, it is not.

I do not intend to predicate any thing concerning the absolute perfectibility of man by obedience to the laws of nature. The system of sublunary creation, so far as we perceive it, does not appear to be one of optimism; yet benevolent design, in its constitution, is undeniable. Paley says, "Nothing remains but the supposition, that God, when he created the human species, wished them happiness, and made for them the provisions which he has made, with that view and for that purpose. The same argument may be proposed in different terms: Contrivance proves design; and the predominant tendency of the contrivance indicates the disposition of the designer. The world abounds with contrivances; and all the contrivances which we are acquainted with, are directed to beneficial purposes." (Paley's *Mor. Phil.*, Edin. 1816, p. 51.) Many of the contrivances of the Creator, for effecting beneficial purposes, have been discovered by philosophers; but, so far as I am aware, no one has adverted to the foregoing principles according to which these contrivances operate, so that nothing like a systematic view of the moral government of the world has hitherto been presented to mankind.

Neither do I intend to teach that the natural laws, discernable by unassisted reason, are sufficient for the *salvation* of man without revelation. Human interests regard this world and the next. To enjoy this world, I humbly maintain that man must discover and obey the natural laws.

Revelation does not communicate complete information concerning the best mode of pursuing even our legitimate temporal interests; and numerous practical duties resulting from our constitution are discoverable, which are not treated of in detail in the inspired volume—the mode of preserving health, for example; of pursuing with success a temporal calling; of discovering the qualities of men with whom we mean to associate our interests; and so on. This is the case, probably, because faculties have been given to man to discover arts, sciences, and the natural laws, and to adapt his conduct to them; and because the physical, moral, and intellectual nature of man is itself left open to investigation by these faculties. My object, I repeat, is to investigate the natural constitution of the human body and mind, their relations to external objects and beings in this world, and the courses of action that, in consequence, appear to be beneficial or hurtful in this life.

Man's spiritual interests belong to the sphere of revelation; and I distinctly repeat, that I do not teach that obedience to the natural laws is sufficient for salvation in a future state. Revelation prescribes certain requisites for salvation, which may be divided into two classes—first, faith or belief; and, secondly, the performance of certain practical duties, not as entitling to salvation, but as the native result of that faith, and the necessary evidence of its sincerity. The natural laws form no guide as to faith: but as far as I can perceive, their dictates and those of revelation coincide in all matters relating to practical duties in temporal affairs.

It may be asked, whether mere

*knowledge* of the natural laws is sufficient to insure observance of them? Certainly not. Mere knowledge of music does not enable one to play on an instrument, nor of anatomy to perform skilfully a surgical operation. Practical training, and the aid of every motive that can interest the feelings, are necessary to lead individuals to obey the natural laws.—Religion, in particular, may furnish motives highly conducive to this obedience. But it must never be forgotten, that although mere knowledge is not not all-sufficient, it is a primary and indispensable requisite to regular observance; and that it is as impossible effectually and systematically to obey the natural laws without knowing them, as it is to perform any other complicated and important duty in ignorance of its principles and practical details.—Some persons are of opinion that Christianity alone suffices, not only for man's salvation—which I do not dispute—but for his guidance in all practical virtues, without knowledge of, or obedience to, the laws of nature; but from this notion I respectfully dissent. It appears to me that one reason why vice and misery do not diminish in proportion to preaching, is, that the natural laws are too much overlooked, and very rarely considered as having any relation to human conduct. The theological doctrine of the corruption and disorder of human nature, joined to the want of knowledge or real science, have probably been the causes why the professed servants of God have made so little use of his laws, as revealed in creation, in instructing the people to live according to his will. Before religion can yield its full practical fruits in this world, it must be wedded to a philosophy founded

on those laws; it must borrow light and strength from them, and in return communicate its powerful sanction in enforcing obedience to their dictates.

Connected with this subject, it is proper to state, that I do not maintain that the whole world is arranged on the principle of benevolence exclusively; my idea is, that it is constituted in harmony with the whole faculties of man; the moral sentiments and intellect holding the supremacy. What is meant by creation being constituted in harmony with the whole faculties of man, may be illustrated thus: Suppose we should see two men holding a third in a chair, and a fourth drawing a tooth from his head. While we contemplated this bare act, and knew nothing of the intention for which it was done, and of the consequences that would follow, we would set it down as purely cruel, and say, that, although it might accord with the propensity which prompts men to inflict pain and destroy, it could not harmonise with Benevolence. But when we are told that the individual in the chair was a patient and the operator a dentist, and that the object of all the parties was to deliver the first from violent torture, we would then perceive that an operation attended with pain had been used as a means to accomplish a benevolent purpose—or, in other words, that the operator had acted under the supremacy of moral sentiment and intellect—and we would approve of his conduct. If the world had been created on the principle of Benevolence exclusively, the toothache could not have existed; but, as pain does exist, a mental faculty, called by the phrenologists Destructiveness, has been given to place man

in harmony with its existence, when used for a benevolent end.

To apply this illustration to the works of Providence, I humbly suggest it as probable, that, if we knew *thoroughly* the design and whole consequences of such institutions of the Creator as are attended with pain, including death itself, we should find infliction is used as a *means*, subservient to Benevolence and Justice, to arrive at an end in harmony with the moral sentiments and intellect; in short, that no institution of the Creator has pure evil, or destruction alone, for its object. "In maturity of sense and understanding," says Lord Kames, "benevolence appears more and more; and beautiful final cases are discovered in many of nature's productions, that formerly were thought useless, or perhaps hurtful: and the time may come—we have solid ground to hope that it *will* come—when doubts and difficulties about the government of Providence will all of them be cleared up, and every event be found conducive to the *general good*."\*

The opposite of this doctrine, viz. that there are institutions of the Creator which have suffering for their exclusive object, is clearly untenable; for this would be ascribing malevolence to the Deity. As, however, the existence of pain is undeniable, it is equally impossible to believe that the world is arranged on the principle of Benevolence exclusively. The view now presented makes no attempt to explain why pain or evil exists, because I consider this enquiry to surpass the limits of the human understanding. It offers an explanation, however, of the use which pain serves—that of enforcing

obedience to the natural laws; and it shows that the human mind is constituted in harmony with this order of creation. Phrenology alone, of all systems of mental philosophy, admits faculties clearly related to difficulty, pain, and death, and thus enhances our perceptions of divine wisdom and goodness.

From Wilson's Tales of the Borders.

### THE FAITHFUL WIFE.

A PASSAGE FROM THE TALE OF FLODDEN.

There is very prevalent, along the Borders, an opinion, that the arms of the town of Selkirk represent an incident which occurred there at the time of the battle of Flodden. The device, it is well known, consists of a female bearing a child in her arms, seated on a tomb, on which is also placed the Scottish lion. Antiquaries tell us that this device was adopted in consequence of the melancholly circumstance of the wife of an inhabitant of the town having been found, by a party returning from the battle, lying dead at the place called Ladywood-edge, with a child sucking at her breast.

We have not the slightest wish to disturb this venerable legend. It commemorates, with striking force, the desolation of one of Scotland's greatest calamities; and, though the device is rudely and coarsely imagined, there is a graphic strength in the conception, which, independently of the truth of the story, recommends it to the lover of the bold and fervid genius of our countrymen. We must, at the same time, be allowed to say, that the very same story, with some changes of circumstances and localities, is to be found in the legends of others of the Scottish towns which have suffered by the

\* Sketches, B, 3, Sk. 3. ch. 2.

chariot wheels and scythes of war. Thus, it is reported, that the first thing that put an end to the indiscriminate murder which the soldiers of Monk, in their fury, committed in the storming of Durdee, was the corpse of a female, found lying in the street of that town, called the Murraygate, with an infant sucking at her breast. We do not mean to say that the one story destroys the authenticity of the other. Two corpses might have been found in these situations, and under these circumstances; but the generality of legends of that kind must, in the minds of the lovers of truth, detract, in some degree, from their authenticity; and, as regards that of Selkirk, we are the more inclined to call it in question, in consequence of having heard another version of the story possessing more of romance in its composition, and not much less of absolute probability than that which is so generally credited.

This new version we intend, shortly, now to lay before the public, without vouching for its superiority of accuracy over its more favored and cherished brother; and rather, indeed, cautioning the credulous lovers of old legends to be upon their guard, lest Dr Johnson's reproof of Richardson be applicable to us, in saying that we have it upon authority.

When recruits were required by King James the Fourth for the invasion of the English territory, which produced the most lamentable of all our defeats, it is well known that great exertions were used in the cause by the town-clerk of Selkirk, whose name was William Brydone, for which King James the Fifth afterwards conferred on him the honor of Knighthood. Many of the inhabitants of Selkirk, fired with the

ardor which the chivalric spirit of James infused into the hearts of his people, and with the spirit of emulation which Brydone had the art of exciting among his townsmen, as Borderers, joined the banners of their provost. Among these was one Alexander Hume, a shoemaker, a strong stalwart man, bold and energetic in his character, and extremely enthusiastic in the cause of the King. He was deemed of considerable importance by Brydone, being held the second best man of the hundred citizens who are said to have joined his standard. When he came among his companions, he was uniformly cheered. They had confidence in his sagacity and prudence, respected his valor, and admired his strength.

If Hume was thus courted by his companions, and urged by Brydone to the dangerous enterprise in which the King, by the wiles and flattery of the French Queen, had engaged, he was treated in a very different manner by Margaret, his wife, a fine young woman, who, fond to distraction of her husband, was desirous of preventing him from risking his life in a cause which she feared, with prophetic feeling, would bring desolation on her country.—Every effort which love and female cajolery could suggest, were used by this dutiful wife to keep her husband at home. She hung round his neck—held up to his face a fine child, five months old, whose mute eloquence softened the heart, but could not alter the purpose of the father—wept, prayed, implored. She asked him the startling question—who, when he was dead, and die he might, would shield her from injury misfortune, and cherish, with the tenderness and love which its beau-

ty and innocence deserved, the interesting pledge of their affection? She painted, in glowing colors—which the imagination, excited by love, can so well supply—the situation of her as a widow, and her child as an orphan. Their natural protector gone, what would be left to her but grief, what would remain for her child but destitution? His spirit would hear her wails; but beggary would array her in its rags, and hunger would steal from her cheek the vestiges of health, and the lineaments of beauty.

These appeals were borne by Hume by the panoply of resolution. He loved Margaret as dearly, as truly, as man could love woman, as a husband could love the partner of his life and fortunes. He answered with tears and embraces; but he remained true to the cause of his King and country.

“Would you hae me, Margaret,” he said, “to disgrace mysel’ in the face o’ my townsmen. Doesna our guid King intend to leave his fair Margaret, and risk the royal bluid o’ the Bruce, for the interests o’ auld Scotland; and doesna our honored provost mean to desert, for a day o’ glory, his braw wife, that he may deck her wimple wi’ the roses o’ England, and her name wi’ a Scotch title? Wharfore, then, should I, a puir tradesman, fear to put in jeopardy, for the country that bore me, the life that is hers as weel as yours, and sacrifice, sae far as the guid my

arm can produce, the glory o’ my king, and the character o’ my country? Fair as yer face is, Maggy, and dear as is to me the licht o’ that benny blue e’e reflectin, as it does, the smile o’ that bonny bairn, I canna permit ye to wile frae me the faith and the troth I hae pledged to my companions, and the character o’ loyalty I hae already earned in the estimation o’ the brave men o’ the Border.”

Margaret heard this speech with the most intense grief. She was incapable of argument. What loving woman is? She was inconsolable. Her husband remained inexorable, and entreaty gave way to anger. She had adopted the idea that Hume was buoyed up with the pride of leadership; and she told him, with some acrimony, that his ambition of being thought the bravest man of Selkirk, would not, in the event of his death, supply the child he was bound to work for, with a bite of bread. Her love and anger carried her beyond bounds. She used other language of a harsher character, which forced her good-natured husband to retaliate in terms unusual to him, unsuited to the serious subject they had in hand, and far less to the dangerous separation which they were about to experience. The conversation got more acrimonious. Words of a high cast produced expressions stronger still, and Hume left his wife in anger, to go to the field from which he might never return. (To be Continued.)

## EDITORIAL.

We presume that such as have seen the wanton and diabolical attack lately made upon our character in the Colonist (notorious for scurrility and libel) will be ready to apply to the worthy Editor the expression attributed to Aristophanes—“You have spoken roses.”

The public will wonder to see us implicated in a controversy with an individual so notorious for duplicity, scurrility, inconsistency, slander, libelism, glaring immorality, outrage on public feeling, and every thing that constitutes ill-fame, and that sinks and degrades the entire man, as the person who is nicknamed the Editor of the paper alluded to—that paper which died and rose again, furnishing the world with another instance of a Mahomedan resurrection. We would, however, endeavor to apologize to the public for thus tainting the moral atmosphere by reviving in the memory of our readers the vices of the alleged Editor, because, as a matter of course, the power of association will bring his delinquency and the slims of his character to mind so soon as his name is heard. We know that some of our squeamish readers will require a few lavender drops to rally their sinking spirits on hearing of the "British Colonist"—that engine of ribaldry, libel, corruption, revenge, and personal abuse, which owes its birth to presumption unconnected with worth or talent, and its continuance in existence to the boundless but misplaced generosity of the Irish population.

On hearing of Barbadoes, we naturally remember the great earthquake that shook that afflicted and devoted region, crushing thousands in its ire, and throwing shivering nature into a heap of ruins. When we hear of Mount Etna, do we not remember its spires of flame, bursting in awful grandeur from its fiery womb, and ascending with volcanic splendor, while lava in burning showers falls at a great distance from the yawning crater. When we hear of Niagara, do not roaring torrents and an awful precipice, where the prodigious strength and rapidity of one of the four elements astound the world, present themselves to our imagination. When we hear of the Vale of Hinnom, long the scene of Jewish atrocities and Pagan superstition, we shudder over the contemplation of that ancient spot. When we hear of the hangman, do we not recoil from the idea of the jail, the bolted gloomy cell, the gallows, and the executed victim of the laws suspended by the halter. And when we hear of Hooper and the Colonist, a whole group of vices rushes on the imagination and sickens the heart. It is impossible to contemplate him in his present relation to society, without indulging a fervent wish that this City had never been enlightened by such a burning bush as that which has been enkindled by the breath of the Church-street luminary. We again affirm, that it is impossible to turn the attention, or rather to have him forced on our attention, without remembering libel, slander, outrage on public feeling, aggression on social rights, and private malice, gratified through the polluted press controlled by his remorseless and ruffian hand. And worse than that, when we hear of him, we are,

by that tendency which there is in moral sentiment to be disgusted with vice, constrained to dwell upon the fact, that there are in the world many depraved characters, who keep up a sham establishment in marriage, embracing a numerous progeny of children, in opposition to the ordinance of Heaven and the laws of civil society. This, even in an abstract point of view, is bad enough; but much more so, combined with the fact, that some of the generation of vipers living in this brutal way, will be found impudent enough to tell the public in large print that an innocent neighbor is amorous. But perhaps they think that love, like religion, is best enjoyed in its most simple and unceremonious form, and that by passing through a legal process it imbibes the coldness of formality. But shall we suffer such characters to guide the pen of national instruction? Are they to be the directors of public opinion? Oh, shame! The Editor of the Colonist has told the public that we are amorous; but such allusions are as paradoxical as they are scurrilous, furnishing at the same time grounds for a retort upon himself, which he must feel if he has any little morsel of conscience. However, we shall not be too explicit, but from the hints we have given the public may draw their own inferences. We shall, from charity, suffer the mantle of oblivion to cover his most prominent vices, for, were we to exhibit the dark side of the picture in all its dread realities, the description would not be fit to meet the public eye.

Although it is natural for any individual, when a viper stings him, to apply or use such medicine as will best extract or counteract the poison, we shall not on this occasion follow the general rule, nor attempt to destroy the rattle-snake in order to preserve ourselves. Some reptiles are so small and feeble that while they hiss we never think of disturbing the grass that covers them. In answer to the charge of being amorous, we reply, that we may have a considerable share of the milk of human kindness—quite enough to give us those fervid and genial feelings of courtesy and respect for the fair sex, peculiar to our generous and enlightened countrymen, and which has given rise to the adage, "an Irishman's heart for the ladies;" but we trust our ardent feelings will never lure us beyond those bounds of modesty and decorum which all good men are anxious to observe. We no doubt have our passions, and he that has not, must be either a god or a savage—above the standard of human nature or below it: but our very dear friend has been for many years giving evidence of a mind tainted by the most odious influence of unrestricted passions. It may be observed that the passions, when well governed, make the man and the Christian, when misgoverned they constitute the monster—and in this light we must view the Editor of the Colonist. And is it this worthy, who lived for years

in the perpetration of a crime for which the Jews of old would have stoned him, that is privileged to abuse us in terms unprecedented for scurrility and falsehood, merely because we told the public in decent language that he misprinted our Magazine!

Such of our readers as have not seen the attack made upon our character and feelings, in language no doubt inspired by the inheritors of hell, we refer to the British Colonist of the 30th of August last. On reading it they will at once admit that the Editor wrote by inspiration drawn from the source already alluded to. Mere human ingenuity could never have invented such falsehoods, and such libels on the character of an innocent man could have been suggested only by the "father of lies." Such a malicious attempt to lower any individual in the estimation of the world had never before been made through the medium of the press; and as it is seldom that the injured reputation of any man is restored by miraculous or supernatural means, we conceive it imperative on us to have recourse to ordinary measures of defence, and to wield those weapons with a giant's arm, which the goodness of Heaven and the well known depravity of the Editor have so amply and so seasonably placed within our reach. By ignorance of his real character we were induced to deal with him; and, willing to "judge righteous judgment" of all men, we hoped he was honest, and competent to fulfill his engagement as a printer. In this opinion we were, however, lamentably mistaken; and when we complained of ill-treatment, stating the stubborn facts upon which our complaints were founded, we received, through the medium of the press, more abuse than has ever been dealt out to any man who has not been the subject of a lecture in Billingsgate.

The pranks and movements which he attributes to us in his office, are quite false.—There is nothing in our demeanor to warrant the idea of affectation, which we have ever considered as a true test of puppyism, and a presumptive evidence of bad breeding. In our general bearing, we endeavor to exhibit simplicity of character because we much admire it in others.

He says we sometimes call ourselves Pennett. What a willfull lie for the semi-demi-Editor! There is no such name under heaven. Since our emigration to America we have been much in the habit of writing in the the public papers, always signing our name Bennett—and how then could we call ourselves Pennett. It was his press, or rather his mint, (for it is a coiner) that first called us that name; and we can produce two respectable men, in whose presence he admitted that his boys, through a mistake, changed our name: and he would have the public believe that we go by that name as interest or occasion may require. What confidence can the public place in the editorial character

of a man, who would thus swerve from truth and the dictates of conscience, in order to gratify private malice, and to make his neighbor the victim of a rancorous libel.

And he goes further with his falsehoods—indeed, to what lengths will he not go with them. He says we sometimes pass for an Englishman—sometimes for an Irishman.—False! False!! We have no motive nor interest under heaven for wishing to be considered English, while to Ireland we look with pride of feeling and sublimity of emotion, as the hallowed region that smiles with perennial verdure under our native sky. The very recollection of that land calls forth a flow of patriotic feeling which it were idle to attempt so suppress. Patriotism is not a mere visionary idea that once gleamed upon the Greek and Roman—that paid a transient visit to the Theban heroes, or the Polish chiefs, and has not been heard of since.—No—it is a sound, solid principle, that entwines itself closely with our nature, and fixes its abode on the best feelings of the human heart. It has not been buried in the tomb with the illustrious Sobieski or the renowned Kosciuszko, with Epaminondus, Alfred, Emmet, or William Tell? No, it still sheds its divine ray over the human heart; and we trust that its influence will ever so fervidly bind us to our country, as to make us glory in being considered a native of Ireland, for "with all her faults we love her still." Ireland is rendered sacred by the abode of patriots, the tombs of heroes, by the poet and the chieftain, the lyre and the muse, as well as the Solons and Ciceros of modern times. Who can recount the antiquarian characteristics of that country without awakening the loneliest recollections of freedom's banner often raised and foiled on a thousand hills—of the cause of liberty, though often lost, yet always heroically defended—of men who squandered their treasures and their lives, and fought for their king with a devotion that would do honor to the proudest days of Sparta, that Britannia's name might be long known in the earth. Yes—and recollections, too, of 171 kings which Ireland enjoyed, within the space of two thousand years previous to the invasion of Henry the Second; and of classic temples, where the light of science was cherished by the natives and imparted to foreigners from all parts of the then civilized world, when every other country, including Britain, was buried in Gothic ignorance. But now those temples are mouldering in the dust, and as silent as the city of the dead. However, there are in the few vestiges that remain of them

traces of ancient greatness, that attach, even to the hoary head, the faded face, and the dying groans of Ireland, an importance which none but a furious bigot can treat with contempt.

With these views of Irish antiquity and Irish greatness shall we call ourselves English? God forbid. Our country, of course, produces many that are neither saints nor sages; and that other countries, too, have their ruffians, is sufficiently demonstrated by the existence of the Editor of the Colonist, who you will perceive is a pert little cockney, keeping a wholesale and retail slander shop in Cooper's Alley.

We ask you, men of Saint John, is this the apostle of the press whom you will encourage by your patronage in this enlightened age. We ask you, men and women of New-Brunswick, have you not been long ago over-gorged by the literary trash of the Colonist. "How can that which is unsavory be eaten." Would it not be time for you to feel a loathing at the stomach, sickened by the dregs and the sediment of the literature which the Editor has selected to choak and pollute you. If you can relish as intellectual food that unpalatable stuff, which you seem to swallow with so much avidity from the Colonist, your appetite will be gradually benumbed and blunted, until at length you will become canibals and devour the Editor himself instead of his paper. "Come let us reason together." Are you still willing to hold your mouths under such a spout to be filled with the *fruits of knowledge and the lights of science*? If so, you could bear all the inconvenience of a Bastile without a murmur, and gasconading would not make you wince or groan. By encouraging the Colonist you recognise its principles as legitimate, its literature as enlightened, and its Editor (but in reality there is no such thing) as pursuing a course which you highly approve. If you do not wish him to be abundant in his weekly production of scurrility, you would not pay him for furnishing it. If you did not wish him to abuse unoffending parties, and to carry his invasion, against peace and good will, into the sacredness of private as well as public life, you would not continue as subscribers, taking upon yourselves the responsibility of his misdeeds. You are placed in the same predicament with ten or a dozen conspirators, who would hire an assassin to per-

petrate the crime of murder. You are conspirators against peace and good will—against social order and moral sentiment; and the Editor is the agent whom you employ to put your designs into execution. He is your organ—he writes treason, slander, and blasphemy, and you respond a loud and hearty *amen*. Men of Saint John, open your eyes and see the error of your ways.

The Editor accuses us with preaching, and in virtue of the office we warn him and his subscribers "to flee from the wrath to come." But who are they that encourage this illiterate urchin? Unfortunately the generous Irish, always ready to do a liberal act; but who, in bestowing their favors, often misplace them, because they do not always act upon the cautious principle. But we can inform them that their former attachment (their present is out of the question) to the Colonist has been the means of keeping them from taking that stand in society which they might have occupied by encouraging any of the enlightened journals of the city. Five sixths of his subscribers are Irish; and when a certain gentleman asked him why he did not print the Magazine more correctly, his answer was, "Oh, it is good enough for an Irishman." This we can prove by respectable testimony.

What say ye, Irish? what say ye, English? what say ye, Scotch? what say ye, New-Brunswickers? Are you sick of this nuisance? If a half dozen Editors like this, had been introduced into Egypt at the time of the delivery of the Hebrews, no doubt but they would be considered, and very justly, as one of the plagues. And the tame, harmless, indulgent men of Saint John will not only tolerate, but encourage him. Shame, shame! Let him bind books; let him swab the deck of a man of war, as he once did; or, in the name of every thing that is near and dear to you, let the creature do any thing for a living, but divorce him from the press. A being so low should not be suffered to prostitute an engine so noble.

He would have the people believe that we came to him as a stranger, although it is now five years since he copied several articles written by us on the state of Ireland, and published in the St. Andrews papers, and to one of these articles in particular he earnestly called the attention of his readers. We give his own

words as they are recorded in the British Colonist, published in this city, and bearing date September 9, 1831:—

"*State of Ireland.*—We have much pleasure in laying before our readers an able paper, on the cause of the distresses in Ireland, written by a Mr. P. Bennett of St. Andrews. This gentleman treats the question philosophically, and free from that prejudice which few of his countrymen are wholly divested of. His opinions are perfectly in keeping with our own, and we think do honor to his head and heart. We strongly recommend its perusal to the notice of such of our readers as feel an interest in the welfare of that devoted land."

We have now before us the paper from which the above high encomiums are copied: our readers, by referring to it, will find that we are correct in our version of them.

At that time the Editor believed we had a good head and a good heart; but in his paper of the 30th August, he says he knew we were ignorant. Reader, please to mark this inconsistency, or rather the contradiction. And again, he has day after day been requesting us to deliver a lecture in the Mechanics' Institute; however, we did not think it prudent to do so.

If we had a good head five years ago, it is equally good now, aye, and a little better; for we are not old enough to doat, and our American experience has added a few pennyweights, perhaps ounces, to our wisdom and knowledge. And the Editor of the Colonist was not the only one who then paid high tributes of respect to our political letters. The St. Andrews papers were loud in their praise of them; and we have in our possession fifty newspapers printed in the United States and the Colonies, where honorable mention is made of our productions, and we are now charged with presumption for attempting to start a Magazine. Not half so much presumption, Mr. Editor, as you had, when a few days after the death of your paper, whose funeral notes were sounded even in the Upper Canada journals, you had the good courage to go from house to house, begging of them to roll back the stone from the mouth of the sepulchre, and make way for the resurrection of the Colonist. Well, the stone was rolled back; and up from the dusky chambers of the dead started the Colonist, carrying light of a divine cha-

acter to the mechanics of the city.— Well, to be sure, this is a mysterious paper; and highly privileged indeed are the people—the happy, happy people—who have the reading of it. Why, it looks like one of the prophets risen to enlighten the earth. However, to be serious, the Colonist is the offspring of presumption, the child of ignorance, and the herald of vindictive slander.

The Editor says he knows we were penniless: and with all this knowledge of our want of brass, we never could enter his slander shop without being plagued by his solicitations to purchase the establishment. Can he deny this? But we did not want his press—pardon us, we should have said mangle.

It is also gravely affirmed by him that we examined his type and found them bright from the foundry. This is a palpable falsehood. We would not know good type from bad type, unless by their impression: and as for their being bright, there is nothing bright in his establishment—the whole concern, Editor and all, looked more like a batch of gipsies than any thing else. He of course told us the type were new; but the printing will show what a delusion he practiced on our credulity.

It is also stated by the Editor that we delayed his printing by not attending to the proof sheet; and that the paper prepared for the Magazine dried before he could get the impression, which, as he says, was the cause why the printing was so bad. False, false, Mr. Printer. You delayed us day after day and week after week, as will appear by the fact that the Magazine was not published until the 18th of July, although you promised to have it done in the first of that month. How could we cause any delay, being always in town, and having no other employment at the time. Miserable, miserable subterfuge! This is indeed a poor attempt to cover himself with fig leaves.

It has been also stated that we were to be our own corrector. So far as the correction of our manuscript was concerned of course we were and ever shall be our own corrector; but, to say that we were to correct the erroneous printing, is entirely out of the question. By contract we were to have nothing whatsoever to do with it, although we, on a few occasions, looked over the proof sheet. And we will state another fact to bear ourselves out in the statement

we make. On one of the occasions alluded to, we handed him a proof sheet after hastily correcting it, which he again corrected and handed back to us, saying that it was impossible for any person but a printer to correct a proof sheet; and, by way of illustration, told us when he was printing a book for Doctor Gray, the Doctor corrected the proof sheets, but that a great multitude of errors always escaped his notice, which he, the printer, of course corrected with his usual fidelity. This was the fact he adduced to prove that we could not correct a proof sheet, to which we readily assented. However, we have been since informed, by a gentleman of well known honor and veracity, that the book printed for Doctor Gray, has been condemned and never sent before the public.

In measuring out his abuse to us he has not attempted to confute the stubborn fact, that he first printed our editorial in a correct form, but, having arranged the pages so that they would not come in proper rotation, he was obliged to reprint them, and in doing so he made the blunders, the omissions, and the forgeries which we have pointed out. The Editorial, as first printed, is in our possession—it is correct enough, but quite unlike that which appears in the Magazine.

And has he given any reasons for changing our name? None, excepting indirect ones, which appear to be malice and chicanery, and an intention to baffle the publication. The name was no doubt wilfully changed, which shows to what heights and depths of moral turpitude the nominal Editor can go in order to gratify his natural propensity for doing mischief. Has any person ever heard of a book appearing with a name different to that which the author has affixed to it? No—and it is strange that such a daring violation of duty and of trust reposed, should have escaped mankind for ages, and be reserved, as a prodigy of error and corruption, to be achieved by Hooper's press in the 19th century. It is, however, a mistake to call his instrument a *press-mangle* would be better, or rather *mint*, for it is exceeding clever at coining.

The Editor has also informed his readers that he requested us to take the job elsewhere. This assertion is of course, in keeping with his other falsehoods; and it is for us to set the public mind

right on that also. From the moment he commenced printing for us, we recognised in his conduct a disposition to baffle our undertaking. Jealousy, we presume, was the cause of this: he apprehending that we would attract Irish patronage from his paper, where it had been so long misplaced. However, he wanted to publish the Magazine on pages no larger than a child's primer, always telling us that we were foolish to give the public so much reading matter for a York shilling. At length we left him a pattern page, stating that the Magazine should be positively that size. Then he could not fold his paper in such a form as would answer; and he would still have the Magazine to suit his own taste, not ours. At length we wrote to him requesting that he would discontinue the printing unless he would give the pages the size we required. Next day we called, and he submissively complied to make them any size we should pitch upon.

What he says of our apostacy and preaching involves a subject too sacred to be discussed here. However, we deem it not foreign to our business to say, that if we could bring any talents which we may possess, to bear upon the great doctrines of Christianity, in such a manner as would improve the moral condition of mankind or promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, we should consider ourselves unspeakably happy and highly privileged indeed.

He says he was willing to give the poor parson (alluding to us) a chance of making a living. We can tell him, that in a great many ways, we can make an honest and a genteel living; and should consider ourselves wretched indeed if we depended upon the Magazine for support, or if we had no other source from which to derive food and raiment.

He also endeavors to throw a gloom over our character as a reporter, or a writer of short hand, saying it has been exploded. Let us ask who has exploded it? It certainly was not the Editor, although he attempted to do so while we were engaged in the arduous task of reporting last winter. It certainly was not the Member for York, for it is known to the public how triumphantly we refuted his objections and his slanderous insinuations. And the Editor of the Colonist has repeatedly congratulated us upon the masterly style in which our letters in reply to the Member for York

were written, and upon the signal and decisive victory which we gained over him. We will once more take the liberty of saying, that we would be proud of a fair trial of speed with any short hand writer now living. In our answer to the Member for York, we showed that even the London reporters are not always correct, and as a proof text adduced a late instance where O'Connell complained of a garbled report; and Lord Lyndhurst has more recently complained to the same effect. The reporter made his Lordship say, that the Irish were aliens in blood, aliens in language, and aliens in religion; but his Lordship has disavowed the language ascribed to him, in the most unqualified manner. We make these remarks to show that the best reporters in the world are, from various causes, liable to err, and should not be condemned for lack of punctuality in every instance. We are, however, far from admitting that our reports have been impeachable. By turning to the British Colonist, published in October, 1831, our readers will perceive how highly the Editor appreciated our stenographic powers, and what a tribute of respect he paid to them in the public prints.

Will not our readers now conclude that he has mistaken his man, when he waged a war of scurrility with us, who did not intend to provoke the fury of the giant by a few simple statements regarding his errors in printing. Goliath was not more mistaken in the stripling David, than the Editor of the Colonist has been in us. We must at all events pronounce him a strange being, at once a semi-Alderman, a semi-Briton, and a semi-demi-Editor of a paper that died and rose again. It would be no more than right to call his paper the *Lazarus*.

We believe it no exaggeration of his delinquency to say, that he has never treated with any degree of respect those sympathies that entwine human society, pointing out to the conductor of a newspaper or a periodical a latitude beyond which he shall not pass, saying "thus far shalt thou go and no further." But the person against whom we write is too ignorant to comprehend the majesty of his office, and never happy but when making his old type grind the flesh of his neighbors. He may be well classed with the persons of whom the poet says,

"Wretches!

To virtue, peace, and nature, foes."

Byron says, "'Tis sweet to win, no matter how, ones laurels, by blood or ink;" and our Editor was actuated by the spirit of this passage, when he endeavored to win his laurels by libelling us, and also when he endeavored to make a libel on the New-Brunswick Bar—a step-ladder to the temple of fame: and then expressed, in our own presence, great regret that he was not found guilty, saying, that in the event of a verdict against him, public sympathy would have been aroused to active exertion in his behalf; and while the prison doors would be open to receive him, the multitude would shout, "Lo, the conquering hero comes." In this instance he reminds us of a vagrant in London, who commits an offence against the laws, hoping to get a passport to Botony Bay at the expence of the government, and then curses the jury, who for want of presumptive evidence, or because of some informality, acquit him.

What think you now of this astounding Editor, who would strive to acquire his laurels by being pronounced in a court of justice an offender against the laws of his country. This proof of the downward tendency of his mind is unexampled in the history of human depravity. What a pity he did not live in the days of Titus Oates, they would be as well matched to co-operate in any dirty job as the pair of Arabian ponies the Spanish Ambassador used to drive in St. James' Park. But to be connected with the press—indeed, he is not so well calculated for that office as Hannibal Burns, mentioned by Mrs. Trollope as acting in the two-fold capacity of Editor and police officer.

A press not trust worthy ought to be demolished by the despotism of public opinion; and the sooner such demolition shall have been effected the sooner shall the suffering sacredness of social rights be rescued from the sway of an engine, both dangerous and destructive when prostituted by ruffian hands.—There can be no doubt but our worthy Editor would be more appropriately and beneficially employed at some of the rude occupations of savage life, (say racoon hunting, or rabbit catching,) than at the press, that great palladium of human liberty, from which the vulgar and the base should be kept aloof, and whose helm should not be touched but by an enlightened hand. A press that will

bend this way and that way, to suit the wayward and the downward propensities of its conductor—and assume as many shapes as the daughter of Erisicton in order to become an engine of personal revenge, and that will level its shafts at the most harmless and respectable members of society, to gratify rancorous feeling, and to fix some unmerited stigma upon a worthy citizen—instead of being supported, should be scouted and demolished by the stern attitudes of the community. The energies of a press thus prostituted, as our Editor's is, instead of being a canopy erected to shield the weak, redress the aggrieved, expose corruption, and vindicate social rights, and improve mankind by the diffusion of knowledge and the propagation of great moral principles, becomes a mass of deadly poison, and assumes a character like the Eupas tree, spreading destruction through the tainted atmosphere of its own unhallowed region. In fact, it infects and diseases the public mind, and throws a gloom over the effulgence of national intellect by effecting the defilement of literature.

Have we been too harsh with this hero of the Mechanics' Institute? No, we have not given him a dozen where he ought to have received five hundred lashes. Had he confessed that the work was not well executed, and that he was sorry for it, we would of course make every allowance, and take the odium upon ourselves sooner than expose him.—Oh! but that would involve too much humiliation for a high-minded Briton, who has never been known to do any thing low or nefarious in his life, and whose every word and action have been regulated by that standard of high-heating and moral rectitude which impartial Heaven has exhibited on earth for the guidance of man. Who could expect that a mind like the printer's, always at the highest pitch of the mental barometer, and propelled in the path of duty on the high pressure principle, would stoop to confess a catalogue of blunders which would sink him in the eyes of the world.

But have you marked, reader, the load of calumny and aspersion which he flings upon the character of Ireland—a country on whose soil the patriot breaths, and in whose bosom the hero sleeps—by the phrase *English Irish Editor*. Does he wonder that an Irishman should become an Editor? Ireland,

from the earliest eras of her history, has been celebrated for brave and learned men; and if it were not for Irish talent and Irish valor, the Goth and the Gaul, the furious Scythian or the semi-barbarous hords from the Ægean sea, would have been long ago inheritors of Britain. What say you, reader? knowing that you are impartial we hope you will come to the same conclusion.

The Editor, with a keen prophetic feeling, says that our Magazine will go down: and why shall we even then despair, since, according to the career of the Colonist, we may expect a resurrection. The Colonist has already died, but still it has the knack of living, like the snake, even after the head has been severed from the body, and the body itself cut to pieces. However, its moral character is now so low, and its constitution so slender, that there is good reason to hope it will not survive the ensuing winter. We are not very apt to fail in our undertakings; and if the Magazine should go down, we have on record the history of other Magazines, which have failed in the hands of very illustrious individuals even in large and populous cities.—For instance, Benjamin Franklin, in the year 1711, established a Magazine in Philadelphia which continued but six months; and a weekly Magazine, started in Boston, in the year 1713, continued but four weeks; and, in the course of twenty succeeding years, twenty others were started and failed, and in 1755 only one of them existed, and to that one the far famed Thomas Payne was a contributor.

The Editor has expressed a fear, to some of our friends, that we would employ others to assist us in writing against him: another instance of his childish folly. What nonsense to think that we would want an army to fight the giant.—We know of no individual on this side of the Atlantic, nor of many on the other, to whom we would confide our defence, while we enjoy the use of our own eyes and fingers.

We have now lashed him pretty well; but in some cases he has stooped so low that we cannot reach him, without descending into that slime and slough of scurrility, in which he is always at home, and which are his native elements. Our readers, now; if they are impartial, must confess that the field is ours, and that the foe is covered with confusion, unable to

lift his head above the torrent of argument whose force we have directed against him in plain matter of fact style. His abuse is forgotten, while our reasoning shall make a long and indelible impression on every mind that is alive to conviction or regards the vitality of truth. This exposition of his character will of course dissipate any prejudicial impression that might have been gathering in the arena of public feeling in consequence of his abuse, and also shield us from any stigmas which he may endeavor to fix on us for the future. Having already written falsehoods, he will of course do so again. Had we not thus defended ourselves, some individuals might be misled to believe his statements; for, as it has been observed by the poet—

"On eagle wings immortal scandals fly,  
While virtuous actions are but born and die."

To apologise for so long trespassing on the attention of our readers, we conceive to be an indispensable duty; but though we have occupied a large space with this subject, it is presumed that it will not be considered void of interest, inasmuch as it possesses an instructive character, conveying a lesson which may do much good to the public and particularly to the Editor himself. Could we make ourselves instrumental in giving him a better state of mind, much satisfaction would result to us from such a pleasing task. Vindictive feeling is not the motive that induces this course of action; far above such considerations we rebut the groundless calumnies of a wilful slanderer, whose every energy has been put forth in a diabolical attempt to lower us in public estimation. It will of course be painful to him to yield the victory to the *English Irish Editor*; but even giants have been conquered. In this instance, however, the party with whom we contend is so fallen, that the most decided triumph over him cannot bestow a particle of fame. All we want is to preserve ourselves from his slander, without wishing in the least degree to injure him. It is very possible and reasonable for us to defend ourselves, without cherishing revenge, or acting in opposition to that great authority which says—  
"Let not the sun go down upon thy wrath."

Our readers will do us the justice to say, that any language which we can use in retorting on the author of the libel pub-

lished in the *Colonist*, with a view to make us the victim of public scorn, cannot be too strong. It is for us to counteract the poison by furnishing an antidote, and to blunt the weapons of the enemy by interposing the armor of truth. The victory, if it were worth claiming, is now decidedly ours: the foe is completely defeated, having not even the chance of a well managed retreat. The simple circumstance of our complaining of his bad printing has given rise to this contest; and is it possible for him to make the public eye convey a false evidence to the public mind? The Magazine bears on its front, in large external marks, abundant proofs to vindicate our original complaint; and internal marks, tending to establish the same point, are numberless.

We would now ask him where he will begin to refute these strong arguments, or where will he end? Can he find a square inch of *terra firma* to stand upon? No—he is sinking, or rather sunk, in the mire of his own character; but he will still, in the words of David Crockett, "flutter like a duck in a puddle." So far as scutillity is concerned, we are proud to say, the victory is his; but it is an ignominious victory, and every one must cordially despise the man who would thus "stoop to conquer."

To remove any surprise which the public may feel at our being implicated with such a character, we would beg to state, that other individuals of high standing in society have, on former occasions, become entangled in a controversy with him, being, as we have been, ignorant of the scurrilous and base manner in which he would conduct the warfare. But if the public are to accord the laurels to him for language little short of blasphemy, then the most dissipated fishwoman in Billingsgate, or the most dissolute nymph of the pave or inmate of a brothel, would foil Lord Brougham or Daniel O'Connell.

Let us now, for a moment, turn to his mock criticism. The phrase, 'and though it yields no potatoes,' he says is metaphorical language. This is the most excessive absurdity we have ever heard from the Editor of a newspaper; and lest some of our readers might be misguided by the ignorance of the critic, we solemnly assure them that the phrase in question is purely literal, having not one metaphorical particle in its entire texture. It has not even one degree of affinity to

a figurative construction; and so evidently false is the sham criticism of the Church-street lunatic, that it proves his ignorance beyond the possibility of a doubt.

He also wishes to know if we mean to express any thing by the phrase 'behind or around such a mountain.' What the phrase is intended to express is inscribed upon its front. It is no metaphor, but a literal expression—clear and full, and conveying much in little. For instance, if you stand with a mountain intervening between you and any given object, such object may very properly be said to be behind the mountain: and in support of this position we may quote Burns, who says—

"Behind yon hill where Stinchars flow."

And should the given object encircle or encompass the mountain, then we might, according to the laws of our best idiomatic construction, and every acknowledged principle of the philosophy of grammar, say around the mountain.

He also thinks we have misplaced the word *monotony*, and that it has reference only to sound. Reader, if you have ever been accustomed to good books, or genteel company, you will easily give your concurring testimony in favor of the application which we have given the word in question, which, in its common acceptation, invariably means sameness or want of variety.

In a sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Richey in Halifax a few years ago, and since published, we find the following sentence:—"But when we ascend the mount of prophecy, on which the most brilliant rays of revelation reflect their lustre, how do all these difficulties vanish from the view, till they become indistinguishably blended with the monotony of the vale beneath." Now our readers will perceive that Mr. Richey has given the word *monotony* the same signification as we have, and to the lovers of literature and rhetoric, his name and fame must be familiar. Indeed, we know of no modern authority whom we could quote with more safety on the subject than Mr. Richey.

It may be well here to remark, that the best speakers and writers, unshackled by the bondage of rule, have repeatedly ventured, and with evident benefit to our language, to depart from the strict literal meaning of words, thereby establishing

a licence which has very much enlarged the facilities of utterance, and multiplied the resources and materials of the literary world. This is a fact well known to persons of breeding and extensive information; but not familiar to illiterate people, among whom we must class the Editor of the Colonist. To relieve the mind from the rapidness of monotony, he seems to think is unphilosophic, and presumes that we meant the eye. We ask him, can the eye be affected inseparably from the mind? Will he call it a detached portion of the human system, having no correspondence with the mental constitution. But we are soaring entirely beyond the reach of his low and narrow capacity. If we look at a disagreeable object, such as a pile of human bodies, mangled and bloody, is it only the eye that is affected? would not the mind be affected? The sympathetic relation, or communion between the different parts of the human system, causes one organ to act upon another, and in accordance with this physical arrangement, the eye conveys its evidence to the mind, and is one of the means obtained by heaven to make man the subject of impressions.—The Editor, poor man, cannot be expected to know these grand and peering doctrines, growing out of a close investigation of human nature, unaided as he is by the light of education. A proper knowledge of these truths requires a long course of instruction and study, of which it was impossible for a person in his sphere of life to avail himself: or perhaps the structure of his bodily system furnishes a strange anomaly and exception to the general rule, which enables us to recognise the most feeling sympathy between the different parts of the human frame. When he sees some horrid spectacle of woe or guilt, he but merely sees it, without feeling any internal influence produced by the disagreeable scene. Who knows but he is a monster, and that the little and the few vestiges of humanity he possesses, are stamped only on his outward man. He could see with his eye the worst atrocities perpetrated in the world, but his mind would not feel. His eye could see New York in flames, and Moscow burning to cinders, but his heart could not experience any inconvenience or pain. Perfectly in keeping is this strange insensibility with the general character of the Editor. Can any person look at an object without having some notion or idea of the thing upon which

he rests his eye? If you look at the ocean, have you not the idea of wave, and foam, and of a great fluid world or element, conveyed in the most natural picture to the mind? And is it the eye that thinks? Perhaps the Editor's brain is in his eye.

We have made these remarks to prove that the language which he condemns is philosophic; and to show the public what a despicable figure he makes in the character of a critic. Indeed, he might as well assume the character of an angel of light. Criticism is the most interesting department of literature; but it requires a peculiar natural tact, which even few scholars possess, to criticise with judgement or success. We may in a future number give a dissertation on literary criticism, that will open the eyes of our antagonist, and convince the public that we understand the subject. It must, however, be admitted that few writers have escaped criticism. Indeed, all the poets of antiquity have been criticised by modern pigmy scribblers endeavouring to write themselves into notice—reminding us of a few ants striving to master a lion. Yes—all the poets have been criticised, and “when cedars have fallen how shall osiers stand.”

Very fortunately, a green hill may be placed in comparison with the sterility of craggy cliffs. The Church-street luminary says not. In the course of our reading we have met many passages which would help to illustrate our position, but shall here quote only one and it is so decidedly in our favor, that our very dear friend must be ashamed of his frivolous objections. From the Life and Diary of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, of Edinburgh, we make the following extract—it has reference to the melancholly state of his wife's mind:—“Before she fell into these depths the Lord gave her such a discovery of the glory of Christ, as darkened the whole creation, and made all things appear as dung and ordure in comparison of him.” Here, now, Christ and earthly things are put in comparison: and is there as great a disproportion between a green hill and a barren rock, as as there is between Christ and earthly things? We hope not—it would be blasphemy to say there was. Some illiterate people think that things must be almost assimilated to each other, in quality and quantity, in order to admit of their being put in comparison. This, however, is a great mistake. When, by investigation, we endeavor to ascertain

what proportion one thing bears to another either in size, shape, or value, we may be said to be comparing such things; and hence it is that a pebble may be put in comparison with a mountain. We hope the gigantic critic will tell us through what process he would put a green hill and a barren rock in order to contrast and not compare them. How will he find a contrast unless, by deducting it from a comparison? It is to be hoped that these remarks will give him a better knowledge of things, and teach him the art of just thinking.

We have not said, as he asserts, that poetic rapture affords a prospect picturesque in the highest degree. Those who understand the transposition of language, can put him right, and testify to the accuracy of our construction. He is not able to trace the regimen existing between words in a sentence. He also criticises the following phrase—“The wilderness looks like a grove of spices,” and asks us, *How does a grove of spices look?* We really wonder why he would thus exhibit his own ignorance in all its nakedness. So far as the accounts, given by all celebrated orientlists, make us acquainted with groves of spices, they are formed of cinnamon, and of the mace, and nutmeg trees, mixed with cocoa, talipot, and also the sacred banian tree.—The cinnamon tree is one of peculiar beauty, and, from its lovely appearance, one might well conclude that it was a native of the ancient paradise. It now grows to great perfection in the island of Ceylon, and from it are extracted three kinds of oil. That which is obtained from the leaves, is called the oil of cloves; that from the fruit is very thick and fragrant, and made into candles, for the sole use of the king of the island; and the root affords an aromatic oil, called by the natives the oil of camphor, and also a species of gum camphor, very pure and white. Mace and nutmeg trees are also of a considerable height, and great beauty, and thickly interspersed with them are the immense cocoa tree, delightful to the eye; also the sacred banian tree, under whose shade the Hindoos worship at their Bamboo altars. The talipot tree also mingles in the same aromatic woodland with the cinnamon, the mace and nutmeg trees, and is described by travellers as the most beautiful perhaps in the world. From an article in Parley's Magazine, published in Boston, we make the following extract:—“The most beauti-

ful tree we met with in our journey was the talipot, which grows straight and tall, and as large as the mast of a ship. Its leaves are so large that one of them will sometimes shelter fifteen men. When dried they are round and fold like a fan. The natives wear a piece of a leaf of this tree on their head to defend themselves from the sun, and the leaf is so tough that it is not easily torn. Every soldier carries one with him for a tent: we did so too, and a pleasant green room it made." As we have already stated, this tree and the sacred banian, and the cocoa tree, are mixed, in the island of Ceylon and other oriental regions, with the cinnamon, and the mace, and nutmeg trees; and hence it is that our readers may easily form some idea of the beauty of groves of spices. Will they admit that our allusion was correct, and that our antagonist's criticism is founded in ignorance and malice? We shall follow him no further in his wandering, knowing that his illiterate character as an Editor, and vileness as a man, cannot be painted in more glowing colors.

But, before we close, let us view him in another point of view. He has been for years striving to ingratiate himself into the good graces of the present Colonial Government, but they could see no beauty in him "that they could desire him." In fact they have never recognised him as their organ, although he would libel them by saying they had. It is true, they were once going to give him the high and supreme office of Deputy Sheriff.—What a distinguished mark of respect for his great public services, performed with so much zeal, patriotism, and high talent. With the office of Deputy Sheriff, we find no fault in an abstract sense; but, to think that the government would give their alleged organ no higher situation, shows how well they could gauge the character of the sycophant. The Commissioner of Crown Lands is himself an Irishman, and consequently a good judge of blarney, which, by the process of analogization, he discovered to form the very essence of the sycophant's defence of government measures; and even the office of Deputy Sheriff would not be given. However, they were once minded to bestow that high post of honor upon him, reminding us of a man who, when plagued by an old fiddler scraping at the door, would fling him a copper, not because he supposed the musician had earn-

ed it, but to make him go elsewhere. In like manner did the government once contemplate the propriety of ridding themselves of the music of the Colonist, by pitching the Editor something in the nature of a copper, that he might go and play his tune elsewhere. But they retracted. We have already compared him to Hannibal Burns, the Editor and Police-officer, mentioned by Mrs. Trollope in her book entitled "The Refugees in America," and it appears the Executive of the Province have taken the same view of him.

If these remarks have the good effect which they are intended to produce, will he not say, "Behold I am vile, what shall I answer thee—I will lay my hand upon my mouth." However, we venture to say he will soon be without a subscriber; and the Mechanics' Institute will remind us of the few vestiges that remain of some old but deserted pagan temple, "as lone as some volcanic isle."

If his slanders did not extend beyond the social circles of this city, where his ill-fame is a matter of such great and general notoriety, we would, by noticing him, be giving presumptive evidence of the absence of those feelings of self-respect, which we are anxious to cherish and cultivate. But it is customary with Editors to exchange papers, and, in accordance with this rule, the Colonist is sent in exchange to Editors in different parts of America, and their ignorance of his base moral character, might induce them, to give some degree of credit to his assertions; and hence arises the propriety of counteracting their malignity. We are acquainted with a great number of the gentlemen connected with the press, both in the United States and the Colonies; and with many more of them, future events may bring us in contact. Of course we will send a copy of the Magazine to all the Editors whose *high privilege* it has been to read the Colonist. Taking this view of the case, it is presumed that the most rigid sticklers for forbearance, will consider us, in our defence, as pursuing a very reasonable course of action.

He has said something about shabby genteel. It is true, that foppery is, with us, no criterion of respectability; but we can, upon all occasions, appear in the garb and deportment of a gentleman; and an honest man has informed us that he wore a borrowed coat the day on

which he stood as candidate for the office of Alderman: perhaps the tailor disappointed him, and no doubt he has often disappointed the tailor. We would not notice this circumstance if it did not bring to our mind the words of Scott, which, with a little variation, we apply to the hero of Billingsgate:—"The bear hath the better of him,—the bear wears his own coat, but he wears the coat of his neighbor."

If we have been thus candid and explicit in our statements, it is because we did not wish, in the words of the author of Waverley, to "keep the sun from our readers with a candle."

Might we now invite the public to look at his paper, and wade, if they can, through the deep swamp of ignorance and error that presents itself in that dusky region. There the Editor's mind beams forth with all its native effulgence, accompanied by its two satellites, "shining more and more unto the perfect day:" but observe, it is like a day in the polar regions, where the sun does not shine for six weeks—"shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it." By the satellites, we mean his two coadjutors, employed in gathering materials for the Ragoo; we shall call them the Editor's crutches, as he cannot move without them, and even so, his pen will not spell a mouthful.

How dignified some pedants will strive to make themselves, by becoming subalterns to this fat famed literary chief—Captain Back in miniature. If the public think that he is his own Editor, they are mistaken; and those who have been at a puppet show in the old country, can figure to themselves a mode of action or movement similar to that adopted by the printer of the Colonist. The puppet moves by secret springs or wires, guided by an invisible hand, while some silly people wonder what magic little thing it is that plays such pranks. In like manner do invisible hands move the springs that impart his editorial movements to the printer of the Colonist, while himself is the puppet—base little being.

A slang dictionary is expected to accompany every succeeding number of his paper, otherwise it will be a dead letter. We have heard of people who could not read their own writing, which fact partakes a little of the marvelous; but what think you of the man who cannot read his own printing. This caps the climax.

To see him with his telescope to his peeper, striving to decypher the hieroglyphics in the Colonist, would remind you of Herschel staring at the family in the moon, to see whether they were Yankees or Patagonians, Indians or Hindoes, Jews or Niggers, or whether they wore silk or home-pun, moustaches, or long Scotch kilts. Ah! but this simile is too sublime, and we shall descend a little.—Then the Editor, with his magnifier, reading his paper, would suggest a comparison between him and a naturalist, investigating, by the aid of his microscope, the properties of a spider's egg. The parvitude of the objects, and intricacies of the regions to be explored by such a naturalist, almost baffle the visual ray; and so has reading the Colonist very much impaired the optic nerves of the Editor. But still he is an elevated character, having large, extended views, and a mind as high as Pompey's Pillar. He is a master-builder of castles in the air, and consequently must occupy a high station in the regions of fancy. Poor paper-kite Editor, we are sorry thus to clip his wings; but if he had not fluttered them so fiercely in our eyes, with a view to make us blind like himself, we would not use the scissors. Scott says, if you break a crow's leg, that every other crow that sees it will pick, and buffet, and worry it. If this be correct, the paper-kite may expect hard times; for, although we have not broken his leg, we have clipped his wings and spoiled his plumage.

At present we have not time more fully to explain the mysteries of Cooper's Alley; and we pledge ourselves never again to notice the person who is nicknamed the Editor of the Colonist, who, as it is called in Jacotot's System of Education, is the man of one book, and that book is not the Bible.

#### P. BENNETT.

P. S.—The printer has said that we have not paid him for printing the Magazine; and, even if that were true, the lecture we here give him is better than cash. But we have paid him £3 15s. not because he was entitled to any, but because we considered he was poor and much in need of it. However, we are determined that no more of our cash shall go towards the support of such a charitable institution. No doubt but the next Colonist will have as many stings as a swarm of locusts.

P. B.