

DEALINGS
WITH
THE DEAD.

BY
A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

VOLUME I.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
32 AND 35 CONGRESS STREET:
AND
TICKNOR AND FIELDS,
CORNER OF WASHINGTON AND SCHOOL STREETS.
MDCCLVI.

KE 8327



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1835, by
DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.



DEALINGS
with the
DEAD,
SEXION by a
of the OLD SCHOOL.



DUTTON & WENTWORTH.

BOSTON, 1856.

P R E F A C E .

THE following article, entitled "THE BURIAL SERVICE," was published, in the Boston Evening Transcript, in the year 1848; and, having occasioned some little controversy, which may as well be forgotten, led to the preparation of these essays—THE DEALINGS WITH THE DEAD—which, with some unimportant changes, are now republished, in their present form.

"THE BURIAL SERVICE."

THIS is a very solemn service, when it is properly performed. When I was a youngster, Grossman was Sexton of Trinity Church, and Parker was Bishop. Never were two men better calculated to give the true effect to this service. The Bishop was a very tall, erect person, with a deep, sonorous voice; and, in the earth-to-earth part, Grossman had no rival. I used to think, then, it would be the height of my ambition to fill Grossman's place, if I should live to be a man. When I was eight years old, I sometimes, though it frightened me half to death, dropped in, as an amateur, when there was a funeral at Trinity.

I am not, on common occasions, in favor of reviving the old way of performing a considerable part of the service, under the church, among the vaults. The women, and feeble, and nervous people will go down, of course; and getting to be buried becomes contagious. It does them no good, if they don't catch their deaths. But, as things are now managed, the most solemn part of the service is made quite ridiculous. In 1796, I was at a funeral, under Trinity Church. I went below with the mourners. The body was carried into a dimly-lighted vault. I was so small and short, that I could see scarcely anything. But the deep, sepulchral voice of Mr. Parker—he was not Bishop then—filled me with a most delightful horror. I listened and shivered. At length he uttered the words, "earth to earth," and Grossman, who did his duty, marvellously well, when he was sober, rattled on the coffin a whole

shovelful of coarse gravel—"ashes to ashes"—another shovelful of gravel—"dust to dust"—another: it seemed as if shovel and all were cast upon the coffin lid. I never forgot it. My way home from school was through Summer Street. Returning often, in short days, after dusk, I have run, at the top of my speed, till I had gotten as far beyond Trinity, as Tommy Russell's, opposite what now is Kingston Street.

A great change has taken place, since I became a sexton. I suppose that part of the service is the most solemn, where the body is committed to the ground; and it is clearly a pity, that anything should occur, to lessen the solemnity. As soon as the minister utters the words, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God," &c., the coffin being in the broad aisle, the sexton, now-a-days, steps up to the right of it, and makes ready by stooping down, and picking up a little sand, out of a box or saucer—a few more words, and he takes aim—"earth to earth," and he fires an insignificant portion of it on to the coffin—"ashes to ashes," and he fires another volley—"dust to dust," and he throws the balance, commonly wiping his hand on his sleeve. There is something, insufferably awkward, in the performance. I heard a young sexton say, last week, he had rather bury half the congregation, than go through this comic part. There is some grace, in the action of a farmer, sowing barley; but there is a feeling of embarrassment, in this miserable illustration of casting in the clods upon the dead, which characterizes the performance. The sexton commonly tosses the sand on the coffin, turning his head the other way, and rather downward, as if he were sensible, that he was performing an awkward ceremony. For myself, I am about retiring, and it is of little moment to me. But I hope something better will be thought of. What would poor old Grossman say!

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

Dealings with the Dead.

BY

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

NO. I.

THROW aside whatever I send you, if you do not like it, as we throw aside the old bones, when making a new grave; and preserve only what you think of any value—with a slight difference—you will publish it, and we shouldn't. I was so fond of using the thing, which I have now in my hand, when a boy, that my father thought I should never succeed with the mattock and spade—he often shook his head, and said I should never make a sexton. He was mistaken. He was a shrewd old man, and I got many a valuable hint from him. "Abner," said he to me one day, when he saw me bowing, very obsequiously, to a very old lady, "don't do so, Abner; old folks are never pleased with such attentions, from people of your profession. They consider all personal approaches, from one of your fraternity, as wholly premature. It brings up unpleasant anticipations." Father was right; and, when I meet a very old, or feeble, or nervous gentleman, or lady, I always walk fast, and look the other way.

Sextons have greatly improved within the last half century. In old times, they kept up too close an intimacy with young surgeons; and, to keep up their spirits, in cold vaults, they formed too close an alliance with certain evil spirits, such as gin, rum, and brandy. We have greatly improved, as a class, and are destined, I trust, to still greater elevation. A few of us are

thinking of getting incorporated. I have read—I read a great deal—I have carried a book, of some sort, in my pocket for fifty years—no profession loses so much time, in mere waiting, as ours—I have read, that the barbers and surgeons of London were incorporated, as one company, in the time of Henry VIII. There is certainly a much closer relation, between the surgeons and sextons, than between the barbers and surgeons, since we put the finishing hand to their work. And as every body is getting incorporated now-a-days, I see no good reason against our being incorporated, as a society of sextons and surgeons. And then our toils and vexations would, in some measure, be solaced, by pleasant meetings and convivial suppers, at which the surgeons would cut up roast turkeys, and the sextons might bury their sorrows. When sextons have no particular digging to do, out of doors, it seems well enough for them to dig in their closets. There is a great amount of information to be gained from books, particularly adapted to their profession, some of which is practical, and some of which, though not of that description, is of a much more profitable character than police reports of rapes and murders, or the histories of family quarrels, or interminable rumors of battles and bloodshed. There is a learned blacksmith; who knows but there may spring up a learned sexton, some of these days.

The dealings with the dead, since the world began, furnish matter for curious speculation. What has seemed meet and right, in one age or nation, has appeared absurd and even monstrous in another. It is also interesting to contemplate the many strange dispositions, which certain individuals have directed to be made, in regard to their poor remains. Men, who seem not to have paid much attention to their souls, have provided, in the most careful and curious manner, for the preservation of their miserable carcasses. It may also furnish matter for legitimate inquiry, how far it may be wise, and prudent, and in good taste, to carry our love of finery into the place, appropriated for all living. Aristocracy among the dead! What a thought. Sump-tuary considerations are here involved. The rivalry of the tomb! The pride—not of life—but of death! How frequently have I seen, especially among the Irish, the practice of a species of pious fraud upon the baker and the milk man, whose bills were never to be paid, while all the scrapings of the defunct were bestowed upon the “birril!” The principle is one and

the same, when men, in higher walks, put costly monuments over the ashes of their dead, and their effects into the hands of assignees. And then the pageantry and grandiloquence of the epitaph! In the course of fifty years, what outrageous lies I have seen, done in marble! Perhaps I may say something of these matters—perhaps not.

No. II.

CLOSING the eyes of the dead and composing the mouth were deemed of so much importance, of old, that Agamemnon's ghost made a terrible fuss, because his wife, Clytemnestra, had neglected these matters, as you will see, in your *Odyssey*, L. V. v. 419. It was usual for the last offices to be performed by the nearest relatives. After washing and anointing the body, the guests covered it with the *pallium*, or common cloak—the Romans used the *toga*—the Hebrews wrapped the body in linen. Virgil tells us, that Misenus was buried, in the clothes he commonly wore.

Membra toro deffeta reponunt,
 Purpureasque super vestes velamina nota
 Conjiciunt.

This would seem very strange with us; yet it is usual in some other countries, at this day. I have often seen the dead, thus laid out, in Santa Cruz—coat, neckcloth, waistcoat, pantaloons, boots, and gloves. I was never a sexton there, but noted these matters as an amateur. Chaplets and flowers were cast upon the dead, by the Greeks and Romans. The body was exhibited, or laid in state, near the entrance of the house, that all might see there had been no foul play. While thus lying, it was carefully watched. The body of every man, who died in debt, at Athens, was liable to be seized by creditors. Miltiades died in jail. His son, Cimon, could not pay his father's debts; he therefore assumed his debts and fetters, that his father might have funeral rites. Some time before interment, a piece of money, an *obolus*, was put in the mouth of the corpse, as Charon's fee. In the mouth was also placed a cake, made of flour and honey, to appease Cerberus. Instead of crape upon the knocker, some of the hair of the deceased was placed upon the door, to indicate a house of mourning. A vessel of water was

placed before the door, until the corpse was removed, that all who touched the dead might wash therein. This is in accordance with the Jewish usage. Achilles was burnt on the eighteenth day after his death. The upper ten thousand were generally burnt on the eighth, and buried on the ninth. Common folks were dealt with more summarily. When ready for the pile, the body was borne forth on a bier. The Lacedemonians bore it on shields. The Athenians celebrated their obsequies before sunrise. Funerals, in some of our cities, are celebrated in the morning. The Greeks and Romans were very extravagant, like the Irish. If baked meats and Chian and Falernian cost less than in more modern times—still sumptuary laws were found necessary. Pittacus made such, at Mytelene. The women crowded so abominably, at the funerals in Athens, that Solon excluded all women, under threescore years, from gadding after such ceremonies. Robes of mourning were sometimes worn; not always. Thousands followed the bodies of Timoleon and Aratus, in white garments, bedecked with garlands, with songs of triumph and dances, rejoicing, that they were received into Elysium.

After the funeral, they abstained from banquets and entertainments. Admetus says they avoided whatever bore an air of mirth or pleasure, for some time. They sequestered themselves from company. It is particularly stated, by Archbishop Potter, that "*wine was too great a friend of cheerfulness to gain admission into so melancholy a society.*" If Old Hundred had been known to the Jews, it would, I dare say, have been considered highly appropriate—but their good taste was such, that I much doubt, if, in the short space of eight and forty hours, they would have mingled *sacra profanis*, so very comically, as to bring champagne and Old Hundred together. The Greek mourners often cut off their hair, and cast it upon the funeral pile. This custom was also followed by the Romans. They sometimes threw themselves upon the ground, to express their sorrow, Like some of the Eastern nations, they put ashes upon their heads. They beat their breasts, tore their flesh, and scratched their faces, with their nails. For this, Dionysius says, the women were more remarkable, than the men.

Burning and embalming, the latter of which was a costly business, were practised among the Greeks and Romans; the latter much more frequently, among the Eastern nations. We

talk of getting these matters thoroughly discussed, ere long, before the Sextons' board, to see if it may not be well, to bring them into use again. I will send you the result.

In regard to the use of wine and other intoxicating drinks, at funerals, we much more closely resemble the Lacedemonians now, than we did some thirty years ago. When I was a boy, and was at an academy in the country, everybody went to everybody's funeral, in the village. The population was small—funerals rare—the preceptor's absence would have excited remark, and the boys were dismissed, for the funeral. A table with liquors was always provided. Every one, as he entered, took off his hat, with his left hand, smoothed down his hair, with his right, walked up to the coffin, gazed upon the corpse, made a crooked face, passed on to the table, took a glass of his favorite liquor, went forth upon the plat, before the house, and talked politics, or of the new road, or compared crops, or swapped heifers or horses, until it was time to lift. Twelve years ago, a clergyman of Newburyport told me, that, when settled in Concord, N. H., some years before, he officiated at the funeral of a little boy. The body was borne, as is quite common, in a chaise, and six little nominal pall-bearers, the oldest not thirteen, walked by the side of the vehicle. Before they left the house, a sort of master of ceremonies took them to the table, and mixed a tumbler of gin, water and sugar, for each.

There is in this city a worthy man—I shall not name him—the doctor's and the lawyer's callings are not more confidential than ours. He used to attend every funeral, as an amateur. He took his glass invariably, and always had some good thing to say of the defunct. "A great loss," he would say, with a sad shake of his head, as he turned off the heel-tap. I have not seen him at a funeral, for several years. We met about five months ago. "Ah, Mr. Abner," said he, "temperance has done for funerals."

No. III.

THE board of sextons have met, and we have concluded not to recommend a revival of the ancient custom of burning the dead. It would be very troublesome to do it, out of town, and

inconvenient in the city. I have always thought it wrong to bury in the city; and it would be much worse to burn there. The first law of the tenth table of the Romans is in these words—"Let no dead body be interred or burnt within the city." Something may be got to help pay for a church, by selling tombs below. When a church was built here, some years ago, an eminent physician, one of the proprietors, was consulted and gave his sanction. Yet more than one of our board is very sure, that, on a warm, close Sunday, in the spring, he has snuffed up something that wasn't particularly orthodox, in that church. The old Romans were very careful of the rights of their fellows, in this respect: the twelfth law of the tenth table runs thus—"Let no sepulchre be built, or funeral pile raised within sixty feet of any house, without the consent of the owner of that house." They certainly conducted matters with great propriety, avoiding extravagance and intemperance, as appears by the seventh law of the same table—"Let no slaves be embalmed; let there be no drinking round a dead body; nor any perfumed liquors be poured upon it." So also the second law—"Let all costliness and excessive wailings be banished from funerals." The women were so very troublesome upon these occasions, that a special law, the fifth, was made for their government—"Let not the women tear their faces, or disfigure themselves, or make hideous outcries."

It was not unusual for one person to have several funerals: to prevent this, however agreeable to the Roman undertakers, the tenth law of the tenth table was made—"Let no man have more than one funeral, or more than one bed put under him." There was also a very strange practice during the first Decemvirate; the friends often abstracted a finger of the deceased, or some part of the body, and performed fresh obsequies, in some other place; erecting there a *cenotaph* or *empty* sepulchre, in which they fancied the ghost of the departed took occasional refuge, when wandering about—in case of a sudden shower, perhaps; or being caught out too near daylight.

For the correction of this folly, the Decemvirs passed the sixth law of the tenth table—"Let not any part of a dead body be carried away, in order to perform other obsequies for the deceased, unless he died in war, or out of his own country." It was upon such occasions as these, in which an empty form was observed, and no actual inhumation took place, that the practice

of throwing three handfuls of earth originated. This usage was practised also by the Jews, and has come down to modern times. Baron Rothschild (Nathan Meyer) who died in Frankfort, July 28, 1836, was buried in the ground of the Synagogue, in Duke's Place, London. His sons, Lionel, Anthony, Nathaniel, and Meyer, his brother-in-law, Mr. Montefiore, and his ancient friend, Mr. Samuels, at the age of ninety-six, commenced the service of filling up the grave,—by casting in, each one of them, three handfuls of earth. Not satisfied with carrying a bottle of sal volatile to funerals, the women, and even the men, were in the habit of carrying pots of essences, which occasioned the enactment of the eighth law—"Let no crowns, festoons, perfuming pots, or any kind of perfume be carried to funerals."

Burning or interring was adopted, by the ancients, at the will of the relatives. This is manifest from the eleventh law, which prohibits the use of gold in all obsequies, with a single exception—"Let no gold be used in any obsequies, unless the jaw of the deceased has been tied up with a gold thread. In that case the corpse may be *interred* or *burnt*, with the gold thread." A large quantity of silver is annually buried with the dead. It finds its way up again, however, in the course of time.

Common as burning was, among the ancients, it was looked upon, by some, with great abhorrence. The body to be burned was placed upon a pile—if the body of a person of quality, one or more slaves or captives were burned with it. When not forbidden, all sorts of precious ointments and perfumes were poured upon the corpse. The favorite dogs and horses of the defunct were cast upon the pile. Homer tells us, that four horses, two dogs, and twelve Trojan captives were burnt upon the pile, with the dead body of Patroclus. The corpses, that they might consume the sooner, were covered with the fat of beasts. Some near relative lighted the pile, uttering prayers to Boreas and Zephyrus to increase the flame. The relatives stood around, calling on the deceased, and pouring on libations of wine, with which they finally extinguished the flames, when the pile was well burnt down. They then collected the bones and ashes. How they were ever able to discriminate between men, dogs, and horses, it is hard to say. Probably the whole was sanctified, in their opinion, by juxtaposition. The bones might be distinguished, but not the dust. Such bones as could be identified, were washed and anointed *by the nearest relatives*. What an

office! How custom changes the complexion of such matters! These relics were then placed in urns of wood, stone, earth, silver, or gold, according to the quality of the parties. Where are these memorials now! these myriads of urns! They were deposited in tombs—of which a very perfect account may be found in the description of the street of tombs, at Pompeii.

No. IV.

THE Greeks, when interment was preferred to burning, placed the body in the coffin, as is done at present, deeming it safer for the defunct to look upwards. To ridicule this superstition, Diogenes requested, that his body might be placed face downward, "for the world, erelong," said he, "will be turned upside down, and then I shall come right." The feet were placed towards the East. Those, who were closely allied, were buried together. The epitaph of Agathias, on the twin brothers, is still preserved—

"Two brothers lie interred within this urn,
They died together, as together born."

"They were lovely and pleasant in their lives," said David, of Saul and Jonathan, "and, in death, they were not divided."

Plato says, that the early Greeks buried their dead, in their own houses. There was a law in Thebes, that no person should build a house, without providing a repository for the dead therein. An inconvenient fashion this. In after-times they buried out of the city, and generally by the way-side. Hence, doubtless, arose the very common appeal, on their tablets—*Siste Viator!* On the road from Cape Ann Harbor to Sandy Bay, now Rockport, are a solitary grave and a monument—the grave of one, who chanced there to die. Our graveyards are usually on the roadside. Sometimes a common *cart-path* is laid out, through an ancient burying-ground. Such is the case in Uxbridge, in this Commonwealth. This is Vandalism. Sextons, who have had long experience, are of opinion, that the rights of the living and the decencies of life are less apt to be maintained, wherever the ashes of the dead are treated with disrespect. Burying, by the road-side, has been said to have been adopted, for the pur-

pose of inspiring travellers with thoughts of mortality—travellers in railway cars, perhaps! The first time I visited St. Peter's, in Philadelphia, I was much impressed with the tablets and their inscriptions, lying level with the floor of the church, and vertical, I supposed, to the relics below—but I soon became familiar, and forgetful.

Every family, among the Greeks, who could afford it, had its own proper burying-ground—as is the case, at the present day, in our own country, among the planters and others, living far apart from any common point. This might be well enough, where the feudal system prevailed, and estates, by the law of descent, continued long in families. If the old usage were now in vogue, in New York, for instance, what a carting about of family urns there would be, on May day! Estates will pass from man to man, and strangers become the custodiers of the dead friends and relatives of the alienors. It is not unusual to find, on such occasions, a special clause, in the conveyance, for their protection, and for the perpetual *tabooing* of the place of sepulture. The first graves of the Greeks were mere caverns or holes; but, in later times, they were capacious rooms, vaulted and paved—so large, indeed, that in some instances, the mourners assembled and remained in them, for days and nights together. Monuments of some sort were of very early date; so were inscriptions, containing the names, ages, virtues, and actions of the deceased, and the emblems of their calling. Diogenes had the figure of a snarling cur engraved upon his tablet. Lycurgus put an end to what he called “talkative gravestones.” He even forbade the inscription of the names, unless of men who died in battle, or women in childbirth.

Extravagance was, at one time, so notorious, in these matters, that Leon forbade the erection of any mausoleum, which could not be erected by ten men, in three days.

In Greece and Rome, panegyrics were often pronounced at the grave. Games were sometimes instituted in honor of the eminent dead. Homer tells us that Agamemnon's ghost and the ghost of Achilles had a long talk upon this subject, telling over the number they had attended. After the funeral was over, the company met at the house of some near relative, to divert their sorrow; and, notwithstanding the abstemiousness of the Lacedæmonians, they had, I am compelled to believe, what is commonly called a good time. The word, used to designate this kind of

gathering, *perideipnon*, indicates a very social meeting—Cicero translates this word *circumpotatio*.

Embalming was most in use with the Egyptians, and the process is described by Herodotus and Diodorus. The brain was drawn through the nostrils with an iron scoop, and the void filled with spices. The entrails were removed, and the abdomen filled with myrrh and cassia. The body was next pickled in nitre, for seventy days, and then enveloped in bandages of fine linen and gums. Among the repositories of the curious, are bodies embalmed some thousands of years ago. According to Herodotus, the place for the first incision having been indicated, by the priest, the operator was looked upon, with as much disgust, as we exhibit towards the common hangman,—for, no sooner had he hastily made the incision, than he fled from the house, and was immediately attacked with stones, by the bystanders, as one, who had violated the dead. Rather an undesirable office. After being embalmed, the body was placed in a box of sycamore wood, carved to resemble the human form.

The story of Diogenes, who desired to be buried face downward, reminds me of one, related by old Grossman, as we were coming, many years ago, from the funeral of an old lady, who had been a terrible termagant. She resembled, old Grossman said, a perfect fury of a woman, whose husband insisted upon burying her, face downward; and, being asked the reason, for this strange procedure, replied—"the more she scratches the deeper she goes."

No. V.

NIL de mortuis nisi bonum. You will wonder where I got my Latin. If my profession consisted of nothing but digging and filling up—dust to dust, and ashes to ashes—I would not give a fig for it. To a sexton of any sentiment it is a very different affair. I have sometimes doubted, if it might not be ranked among the fine arts. To be sure, it is rather a melancholy craft; and for this very reason I have tried to solace myself, with the literary part of it. There is a great amount, of curious and interesting reading upon these marble pages, which the finger of time is ever turning over. I soon found, that a

large part of it was in the Latin tongue, and I resolved to master so much of it, as impeded my progress. I have found, that many superb things are said of the defunct, in Latin, which no person, however partial, would venture to say, in plain English.

The Latin proverb, at the head of this article, I saw, on the gravestone of a poor fellow, who was killed, by a sort of devil incarnate, in the shape of a rumseller, though some persons thought he was worried to death, by moral suasion. *Nothing of the dead but what is good*: Well, I very much doubt the wisdom of this rule. The Egyptians doubted it; and their kings were kept in order, through a fear of the sentence to be passed upon their character and conduct, by an assembly of notables, summoned immediately after their decease. Montaigne says it is an excellent custom, and to be desired by all good princes, who have reason to be offended, that the memories of the wicked should be treated with the same respect, as their own.

In England and our own Commonwealth, we have, legislatively, repudiated this rule, in one instance, at least, until within a few years. I refer to the case of suicide. Instead of considering the account balanced by death, and treating the defunct with particular tenderness, because he was dead, the sheriff was ordered to bury the body of every person, *felo de se*, at the central point where four roads met, and to run a stake through his body. This, to say nothing of its cheating our brotherhood out of burial fees, seems a very awkward proceeding.

There is a pleasant tale, related of Sheriff Bradford, which I may repeat, without marring the course of these remarks. Mr. Bradford was the politest sheriff, that we ever had in Suffolk, not excepting Sheriff Sumner. Sheriff Bradford was a real gentleman, dyed in the wool. It did one's heart good to see him serve an attachment, or levy an execution. Instead of knocking one down, and arresting him afterwards, Mr. Bradford made a pleasant affair of it. It actually seemed, as if he employed a sort of official ether, which took away the pain—he used, while placing his bailiff in a lady's drawing-room, to bow and smile, so respectfully and sympathizingly, and, in a sotto voice, to talk so very clerically, of the instability of human affairs.

An individual, within the sheriff's precinct, cut his own throat. An officious neighbor, who was rather curious to see the stake part performed, brought tidings to Mr. Bradford, while at break-

fast. The informant ventured to inquire, at what time the performances would commence. At five o'clock precisely, this afternoon, the sheriff replied. He instantly dispatched a deputy to the son of the defunct, with a note, full of the most respectful expressions of condolence, and informing him, that the law required the sheriff to run a stake through his father's body, *if to be found within his precinct*, and adding that he should call with the stake, at 5 P. M. The body was, of course, speedily removed, and *non est inventus* was the end of the whole matter. Civilization advanced—several of the upper ten thousand cut their throats, or blew their brains out; and it would have been troublesome to carry out the provisions of the law, and cost something for stakes. The law was repealed.

Some sort of ignominious sepulture, for self-murderers, was in vogue, long ago. Plato speaks of it, *de legibus* lib. ix., p. 660. The attempt to shelter mankind from deserved reproach, by putting complimentary epitaphs upon their gravestones, is very foolish. It commonly produces an opposite effect. One would think these names were intended as a hint, for the Devil, when he comes for his own—a sort of *passercr*.

I am inclined to think, if a grand inquest of any county were employed, to discover the last resting places of their neighbors and fellow-citizens, having no other guide, but their respective epitaphs, the names and dates having been previously removed or covered up, that inquest would be very much at a loss, in the midst of such exalted virtues, and supereminent talents, and extraordinary charities, and unbroken friendships, and great public services.

Some inscriptions are, perhaps, too simple. In the burying-ground at the corner of Arch and Sixth streets, Philadelphia, and very near that corner, lies a large flat slab, with these words:

"Benjamin and Deborah Franklin,
1790."

In Exeter, N. H., I once read an epitaph in the graveyard, near the Railroad Depot, in these words:

"Henry's grave."

Pope's epitaph, in the garden of Lord Cobham, at Stow, on his Lordship's Italian friend, was, doubtless, well-deserved, though savoring of panegyric:

To the memory
 of
 SIGNOR FIDO;
 an Italian of good extraction,
 who came into England
 not to bite us, like most of his countrymen,
 but to gain an honest livelihood.
 He hunted not after fame,
 yet acquired it.
 Regardless of the praise of his friends,
 But most sensible of their love,
 Though he lived among the great,
 He neither learned nor flattered any vice.
 He was no bigot,
 Though he doubted not the 39 articles.
 And, if to follow nature,
 And to respect the laws of society
 Be philosophy,
 He was a perfect philosopher,
 A faithful friend,
 An agreeable companion,
 A loving husband,
 Distinguished by a numerous offspring,
 All which he lived to see take good courses.
 In his old age he retired
 To the house of a clergyman, in the country,
 Where he finished his earthly race,
 And died an honor and an example to the whole species.
 Reader
 This stone is guiltless of flattery;
 For he, to whom it is inscribed,
 Was not a man
 but a
 GREYHOUND.

No. VI.

It could not have been particularly desirable to be the cook,
 or the concubine, or the cup-bearer, or the master of the horse,
 or the chamberlain, or the gentleman usher of a Scythian king,
 for Herodotus tells us, book 4, page 280, that every one of these
 functionaries was strangled, upon the body of the dead monarch.

Castellan, in his account of the Turkish Empire, says, that a
 dying Turk is laid on his back, with his right side towards Mecca,
 and is thus interred. A chafing-dish is placed in the chamber of
 death, and perfumes burnt thereon. The Imam reads the thirty-
 sixth chapter of the Koran. When death has closed the scene, a

sabre is laid upon the abdomen, and the next of kin ties up the jaw. The corpse is washed with camphor, wrapped in a white sheet, and laid upon a bier.

The burial is brief and rapid. The body is never carried to the mosque. Unlike the solemn pace of our own age and nation, four bearers, who are frequently relieved, carry the defunct, almost on a run, to the place of interment. Over the bier is thrown a pall; and, at the head, the turban of the deceased. Women never attend. Mourning, as it is called, is never worn. Christians are not permitted to be present, at the funeral of a Mussulman.

It is not lawful to walk over, or sit upon, a grave. A post mortem examination is never allowed, unless the deceased is so near confinement, that there may be danger of burying the living with the dead. The corpse is laid naked in the ground. The Imam kneels in prayer, and calls the name of the deceased, and the name of his mother, thrice. The cemeteries of the Turks are without the city, and thickly planted with trees, chiefly cypress and evergreens. Near Constantinople there are several cemeteries—the most extensive are at Scutari, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. There, as here, marble columns designate the graves of the eminent and wealthy, but are surmounted with sculptured turbans. The inscriptions are brief and simple. This is quite common: “*This world is transient and perishable—today mine—tomorrow thine.*”

The funeral ceremonies of the Hindoos are minute, trivial, and ridiculous, in the extreme. A curious account may be found, in the Asiatic Researches, vol. 7, page 264. Formal, or nominal obsequies are performed, says Mr. Colebrooke, not less than ninety-six times, in every year, among the Hindoos.

We do, for the dead, that, which we would have done for ourselves. The desire of making a respectable corpse is quite universal. It has been so, from the days of Greece and Rome, to the present. Such was the sentiment, which caused the Romans to veil those, whose features were distorted in death, as in the case of Scipio Africanus: such obsequies were called *larvata funera*. Such has ever been the feeling, among the civilized and the savage. Such was the opinion of Pope's Narcissa, when she exclaimed—

One need not sure be ugly, though one's dead;
And Betty, give this cheek a little red.

The Roman female corpses were painted. So are the corpses of the inhabitants of the Polynesian Islands, and of New Zealand. When a New Zealand chieftain dies, says Mr. Polack, the relatives and friends cut themselves with muscle shells, and let blood profusely, because they believe that ghosts, and especially royal ghosts, are exceedingly partial to this beverage. The body is laid out by the priests. The head is adorned with the most valued feathers of the albatross. The hair is anointed with shark oil, and tied, at the crown, with a riband of *tapa*. The lobes of the ears are ornamented with bunches of white, down, from the sea-fowl's breast, and the cheeks are embellished with red ochre. The brow is encircled with a garland of pink and white flowers of the *kaikatoa*. Mats, wove of the silken flax, are thrown around the body, which is placed upright. Skulls of enemies, slain in battle, are ranged at its feet. The relics of ancestors, dug up for the occasion, are placed on platforms at its head. A number of slaves are slaughtered, to keep the chieftain company. His wives and concubines hang and drown themselves, that they also may be of the party. The body lies in state, three or four days. The priests flourish round it, with wisps of flax, to keep off the devil and all his angels. The *pihe*, or funeral song, is then chanted, which I take to be the Old Hundred of the New Zealanders, very much resembling the *nænia*, or funereal songs of the Romans. At last, the body is buried, with the favorite mats, muskets, trinkets, &c., of the deceased.

The Mandans, of the Upper Missouri, never inhume or bury their dead, but place their bodies, according to Mr. Catlin, on light scaffolds, out of the reach of the wolves and foxes. There they decay. This place of deposit is without the village. When a Mandan dies, he is painted, oiled, feasted, supplied with bow, arrows, shield, pipe and tobacco, knife, flint, steel, and food, for a few days, and wrapped tightly, in a raw buffalo hide. The corpse is then placed upon the scaffold, with its feet to the rising sun. An additional piece of scarlet cloth is thrown over the remains of a chief or medicine man. This cemetery is called, by the Mandans, the village of the dead. Here the Mandans, especially the women, give daily evidence of their parental, filial, and conjugal devotion. When the scaffold falls, and the bones have generally decayed, the skulls are placed in circles, facing inwards. The women, says Mr. Catlin, are able

to recognize the skulls of their respective husbands, by some particular mark ; and daily visit them with the best cooked dishes from their wigwams. What a lesson of constancy is here ! It is a pity, that so much good victuals should be wasted ; but what an example is this, for the imitation of Christian widows, too many of whom, it is feared, resemble Goldsmith's widow with the great fan, who, by the laws of her country, was forbidden to marry again, till the grave of her husband was thoroughly dry ; and who was engaged, day and night, in fanning the clouds. Some thirty years ago, my business led me frequently to pass a stonecutter's door, a few miles from the city ; and, in a very conspicuous position, I noticed a gravestone, sacred to the memory of the most affectionate husband, erected by his devoted and inconsolable widow. It continued thus, before the stonecutter's shop, for several years. I asked the reason. "Why," said the stonecutter, "the inconsolable got married, in four months after, and I have never got my pay. They pass this way, now and then, the inconsolable and her new husband, and, when I see them, I always run out, and brush the dust off."

No. VII.

I TOLD that anecdote of the inconsolable widow, related in my last, to old Grossman. He and Smith were helping me at a grave, in the Granary ground. Bless my heart, how things have changed ! We were digging near the Park Street side—the old Almshouse fronted on Park Street then—and the Granary stood where Park Street Church now stands, until 1809, and the long building, called the Massachusetts Bank, covered a part of Hamilton Place, and the house, once occupied by Sir Francis Barnard and afterwards by Mr. Andrews, with its fine garden, stood at the corner of Winter Street, on the site of the present granite block ; and—but I am burying myself, sexton like, in the grave of my own recollections—I say, I told Grossman that story—the old man, when not translated by liquor, was delightful company, in a graveyard—we were digging the grave of a young widow's third husband. Grossman said she poisoned them. Smith was quite shocked, and told him Mr. Deblois was looking over the Almshouse wall.

Grossman said he didn't mean, that she really gave all three of them ratsbane; but it was clear enough, she was the end of them all; and he had no doubt the widow would be a good customer, and give us two or three jobs yet, before she left off. This led me to tell that story. Smith said there was nothing half so restless, as an Irish widow. He said, that a young Tipperary widow, Nelly McPhee, I think he called her, was courted, and actually had an offer from Tooley O'Shane, on the way to her husband's funeral. "She accepted, of course," said Grossman. "No, she didn't," said Smith.—"Tooley, dear," said she, "y'are too late: foor waaks ago it was, I shook hands wi Patty Sweeney upon it, that I would have him, in a dacent time, arter poor McPhee went anunderbood." "Well," said Grossman, "widows of all nations are much alike. There was a Dutch woman, whose husband, Diedrick Van Pronk, kicked the bucket, and left her inconsolable. He was buried on Copp's Hill. Folks said grief would kill that widow. She had a figure of wood carved, that looked very like her late husband, and placed it in her bed, and constantly kept it there, for several months.

In about half a year, she became interested in a young shoemaker, who got the length of her foot, and finally married her. He had visited the widow, not more than a fortnight, when the servants told her they were out of kindling stuff, and asked what should be done. After a pause, the widow replied, in a very quiet way—"Maype it ish vell enough now, to sphlit up old Van Pronk, vat ish up shtair."

Some persons have busied themselves, in a singular way, about their own obsequies, and have left strange provisions, touching their remains. Charles V., according to Robertson and other writers, ordered a rehearsal of his own obsequies—his domestics marched with black tapers—Charles followed in his shroud—he was laid in his coffin—the service for the dead was chanted. This farce was, in a few days, followed by the real tragedy; for the fatigue or exposure brought on fever, which terminated fatally. Yet this story, which has long been believed, is distinctly denied, by Mr. Richard Ford, in his admirable handbook for Spain; and this denial is repeated, in No. 151 of the London Quarterly Review.

Several gentlemen, of the fancy, of the present age, and in this vicinity, have provided their coffins, in their life time. The late Timothy Dexter, commonly called Lord Dexter, of New-

buryport; there was also an eminent merchant, of this city. This is truly a Blue Beard business; and, beyond its influence, in frightening children and domestics, it is difficult to imagine the utility of such an arrangement. After a few visitations, these coffins would probably excite just about as much of the *memento mori* sensation, as the same number of meal chests.

Burton, in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, states that John Zisca, the general of the Hussites, ordered a drum to be made of his skin, after he was dead, persuaded, that the sound of it would terrify his foes.

When Edward I., of England, was dying, he bound his son, by an oath, to boil his body, and, separating the bones, to carry them always before him in battle, against the Scots; as though he believed victory to be chained to his joints.

The bodies of persons, executed for crime, have, in different ages, and among different nations, been delivered to surgeons, for dissection. It seems meet and right, that those, who have been worse than useless, in their lives, should contribute, in some small degree, to the common weal, by such an appropriation of their carcasses. In some cases, these miserable creatures have been permitted to make their own bargains, with particular surgeons, beforehand; who have, occasionally, been taken in, by paying a guinea to an unscrupulous fellow, who knew, though the surgeons did not, that he was sentenced to be hung in chains, or, as it is commonly called, gibbeted. The difficulty of obtaining subjects, for anatomical purposes, has led to outrages upon the dead. Various remedies have been proposed—none effectual. Surgical students, will not be deterred, by the "*Requiescat in pace*," and the judges, between the demands of science and of sympathy, have been in the predicament of asses, between two bundles of straw. A poor vagabond, *nullius filius vel ignoti*, was snatched, by some of these young medical dogs, some years ago, and Judge Parsons, who tried the indictment, with a leaning to science, imposed a fine of five dollars. Not many years after, a worthy judge, a reverencer of Parsons, and a devotee to precedent, imposed a fine of five dollars, upon a young sloven, who but half completed his job, and left a respectable citizen of Maine, half drawn out from his grave, with a rope about his neck.

It seems scarcely conceivable, that a pittance should tempt a man to take his fellow's life, that he might sell the body to a

surgeon. In 1809, Burke was executed in Edinburgh, for this species of murder. It was his trade. Victims were lured, by this vampyre, to "the chambers of death," strangled or suffocated, without any visible mark of murder, and then sold to the surgeons.

This trade has been attempted in London, at a much later day. Dec. 5, 1831, a wretch, named Bishop, and his accomplice, Williams, were hung, for the murder of an Italian boy, Carlo Ferrari, poor and friendless, whose body they sold to the surgeons. They confessed the murder of Ferrari and several others, whose bodies were disposed of, in a similar manner.

From a desire to promote the cause of science, individuals have, now and then, bequeathed their bodies to particular surgeons. These bequests have been rarely insisted upon, by the legates, and the intentions of the testator have seldom been carried out, by the executors; a remarkable exception, however, occurred, in the case of the celebrated Jeremy Bentham, an account of which I must defer for the present, for funerals are not the only things, which may be of unreasonable length.

No. VIII.

THAT eminent friend of science and of man, Jeremy Bentham, held the prejudice against dissection, in profound contempt, and bequeathed his body, for that object, to Dr. Fordyce, in 1769. Dr. Fordyce died, in 1792, and Mr. Bentham, who survived him, and seems to have set his heart upon being dissected, aware of the difficulties, that might obstruct his purpose, chose three friends, from whom he exacted a solemn promise, to fulfil his wishes. Accordingly, Mr Bentham's body was carried to the Webb Street School of Anatomy and Surgery, and publicly dissected, June 9, 1832, by Dr. Southwood Smith, who delivered an admirable lecture, upon that occasion. I wholly object to such a practice, not, upon my honor, from selfish motives, though it would spoil our business; but because the moral injury, which would result, from such a disposition of mortal remains, would be so much greater, than the surgical good. Mr Bentham's example is not likely to be commonly adopted.

A great amount of needless care is sometimes taken, by the living, in regard to their relics, and their obsequies, which care delongs, manifestly, to survivors. Akin to the preparation of one's coffin, and storing it in one's domicile, for years perhaps, is the preparation of one's shroud, and death cap, and all the *et cætera* of laying out. In ninety and nine cases, in every one hundred, these things are done, for the gratification of personal vanity, to attract attention, and to procure a small sample of that lamentation, which the desolate widower and orphans will pour forth, *one of these days*. It is observed, by one of the daughters, that the mother is engaged in some mysterious piece of needle work. "What is it, dear mother?" "Ah, my child, you should not inquire. We all must die—it is your poor mother's winding sheet." The daughter is convulsed, and pours forth a profluvium of tears. The judicious parent soothes, and moralizes, and is delighted. The daughter flies to her sisters; and, gathering in some private chamber, their tears are poured forth, as the fact is announced. The husband returns—the eyes of his household are like beet roots. They gather round their miserable meal. The husband has been informed. The sweet-breads go down, untasted. How grateful these evidences of sympathy to the wife and mother! A case occurred in my practice, of this very description, where the lady survived, married again, and the shroud, swallowed by thirty years' *non user*, was given, in an hour of need, to a poor family.

Montaigne, vol. 1, page 17, Lond., 1811, says, "I was by no means pleased with a story, told me of a relation of mine, that, being arrived at a very old age and tormented with the stone, he spent the last hours of his life in an extraordinary solicitude, about ordering the pomp and ceremony of his funeral, pressing all the men of condition, who came to see him, to promise their attendance at his grave."

Sophia Charlotte, the sister of George I., of England, a woman of excellent understanding, was the wife of Frederic I. of Prussia. When dying, one of her attendants observed how sadly the king would be afflicted by her death. "With respect to him," she replied, "I am perfectly at ease. His mind will be completely occupied in arranging the ceremonial of my funeral; and, if nothing goes wrong in the procession, he will be quite consoled for my loss."

Man goeth to his long home, as of yore, but the mourners do

not go about the streets, as they did, when I was young. The afternoons were given to the tolling of bells, and funeral processions. This was about the period, when the citizens began to feel their privations, as cow-yards grew scarce; and, when our old friend, Ben Russell, told the public, in his Centinel, that it was no wonder they were abominably crowded, and pinched for gardens, for Boston actually contained seventeen thousand inhabitants. I have seen a funeral procession, of great length, going south, by the Old South Church, passing another, of equal length, going north, and delaying the progress of a third, coming down School Street. The dead were not left to bury the dead, in those days. Invitations to funerals were sent round, as they are at present, to balls and parties. Othello Pollard and Domingo Williams had full employment then. I have heard it stated of Othello, that, having in hand two bundles of invitations, one for a fandango, of some sort, and the other for a funeral, and being in an evil condition, he made sad work in the delivery. Printed invitations are quite common, in some countries.

I have seen one, in handbill form, for the funeral of a Madame Barbut, an old widow, in Martinique, closing with these words, "*un de profundis, si vous,*" etc. Roman funerals were distinguished as *indictiva* and *tacita*: to the former, persons were invited, by a crier; the others were private. The calling out, according to a prearranged list, which always gave offence to somebody, was of old the common practice here. Such was the usage in Rome, where the director was styled *dominus fune-ris* or *designator*. I doubt, if martinets are more tenacious of their rank, in the army, than mourners, at a funeral.

There was a practice, in Rome, which would appear very grotesque, at the present time. Pipers, *tibicines*, preceded the corpse, with players and buffoons, who danced and sang, some of whom imitated the voice, manner and gestures of the defunct. Of these, Suetonius gives some account, in his lives of Tiberius, Vespasian, and Cæsar.

The practice of watching a corpse, until the time of burying or burning, was very ancient, and in use with the Greeks and Romans. The bodies of eminent men were borne to the grave, by the most distinguished citizens, not acting merely as pall bearers, but sustaining the body on their shoulders. Suetonius states, that Julius Cæsar was borne by the magistrates; Augustus by the senators. Tacitus, Ann. iii. 2, informs us, that German-

icus was supported, on the shoulders of the tribunes and centurions. Children, who died, before they were weaned, were carried to the pile by their mothers. This must have been a painful office.

No. IX.

WHEN I first undertook, there was scarcely any variety, either in the inscriptions, or devices, upon gravestones: death's heads and crossbones; scythes and hour glasses; angels, with rather a diabolical expression; all-seeing eyes, with an ominous squint; squares and compasses; such were the common devices; and every third or fourth tablet was inscribed:

Thou traveller that passest by,
As thou art now, so once was I;
As I am now, thou soon shalt be,
Prepare for death and follow me.

No wonder people were wearied to death, or within an inch of it, by reading this lugubrious quatrain, for the hundredth time. We had not then learned, from that vivacious people, who have neither taste nor talent for being sad, to convert our graveyards into pleasure grounds.

To be sure, even in my early days, and long before, an audacious spirit, now and then, would burst the bonds of this mortuary sameness, and take a bolder flight. We have an example of this, on the tablet of the Rev. Joseph Moody, in the graveyard at York, Maine.

Although this stone may moulder into dust,
Yet Joseph Moody's name continue must.

And another in Dorchester:

Here lies our Captain and Mayor of Suffolk,
Was withall,
A godly magistrate was he, and major general.
Two troops of hors with him here came, such
Worth his love did crave.
Ten companyes also mourning marcht
To his grave.
Let all that read be sure to keep the faith as
He has don;
With Christ he lives now crowned, his name
Was HUMPHREY ATHERTON,
He dyed the 16 of September, 1661.

The following, also, in the graveyard at Attleborough, upon the tablet of the Rev. Peter Thacher, who died in 1785, is no common effort, and in the style of Tate and Brady :

Whom Papists not
With superstitious fire,
Would dare to adore,
We justly may admire.

And another, in the same graveyard, upon the slave, Cæsar, is very clever. The two last lines seem by another hand :

Here lies the best of slaves,
Now turning into dust,
Cæsar, the Ethiopian, craves
A place, among the just.
His faithful soul is fled
To realms of Heavenly light,
And by the blood that Jesus shed,
Is changed from black to white.
January 15, he quitted the stage,
In the 77 year of his age.

An erratum, ever to be regretted, is certainly quite unexpected, on a gravestone. In the graveyard at Norfolk, Va., there is a handsome marble monument, sacred to the memory of Mrs. Margaret, &c., wife of, &c., who died, &c. : "*Erratum, for Margaret read Martha.*"

In olden time, there was a provost of bonny Dundee, and his name was Dickson. He was a right jolly provost, and seemed resolved to have one good joke beyond the grave. He bequeathed ten pounds, apiece, to three men, remarkable above their fellows, for avarice, and dulness, on condition, that they should join in the composition of his epitaph, in rhyme and metre. They met—the task was terrible—but, Dr Johnson would have said, what will not a Scotchman undertake, for ten pounds ! It need not be long, said one—a line apiece, said the second—shall I begin ? said the third. This was objected to, of course ; for whoever commenced was relieved from the onus of the rhyme. They drew lots for this vantage ground, and he, who won, after a copious perspiration, produced the following line—

Here lies Dickson, Provost of Dundee.

This was very much admired—brief and sententious—his name, his official station, his death, and the place of his burial

were happily compressed in a single line. After severe exertion, the second line was produced :

Here lies Dickson, here lies he.

It was objected, that this was tautological ; and that it did not even go so far as the first, which set forth the official character of the deceased. It was said, in reply, by one of the executors, who happened to be present, and who acted as *amicus poete*, that the second line would have been tautological, if it *had* set forth the official station, which it did not ; and that as there had once been a female provost, the last word effectually established the sex of Dickson, which was very important. The third legatee, though he had leave of absence for an hour, and refreshed his spirit, by a ramble on the Frith of Tay, was utterly unable to complete the epitaph. At an adjourned meeting, however, he produced the following line,

Hallelujah ! Hallelujee !

There are some beautiful epitaphs in our language—there are half a dozen, perhaps, which are exquisitely so, and I believe there are not many more. I dare not present them here, in juxtaposition with such light matter. Swift's clever epitaph, on a miser, may more appropriately close this article :

Beneath this verdant hillock lies
Demer, the wealthy and the wise.
His heirs, that he might safely rest,
Have put his carcass in a chest—
The very chest, in which, they say,
His other self, his money, lay.
And if his heirs continue kind
To that dear self he left behind,
I dare believe that four in five
Will think his better half alive.

No. X.

CATACOMBS, hollows or cavities, according to the etymological import of the word, are, as every one knows, receptacles for the dead. They are found in many countries ; the most ancient are those of Egypt and Thebes, which were visited in 1813 and

1818, by Belzoni. Psamatticus was a famous fellow, in his time: he was the founder of the kingdom of Egypt; and, after a siege of nearly three times the length of that at Troy, he captured the city of Azotus. The flight of the house of our lady of Loretto from Jerusalem, in a single night, would have seemed less miraculous to the Egyptians, than the transportation of the sarcophagus of Psamatticus, by a travelling gentleman, from Egypt to London. So it fell out, nevertheless. Belzoni penetrated into one of the pyramids of Ghizeh; he obtained free access to the tombs of the Egyptian kings, at Beban-el-Malook; and brought to England the sarcophagus of Psamatticus, exquisitely wrought of the finest Oriental alabaster. Verily kings have a slender chance, between the worms and the lovers of *vertu*. "Here lie the remains of G. Belzoni"—these brief words mark the grave of Belzoni himself, at Gato, near Benin in Africa, where he died, in December, 1823, safer in his traveller's robes, than if surrounded with aught to tempt the hand of avarice or curiosity. The best account of the Egyptian catacombs may be found in Belzoni's narrative, published in 1820.

The catacombs of Italy are vast caverns, in the via Appia, about three miles from Rome. They were supposed to be the sepulchres of martyrs, and have furnished more capital to priestcraft, for the traffic in relics, than would have accrued, for the purposes of agriculture, to the fortunate discoverer of a whole island of guano. The common opinion is, that they were heathen sepulchres—the *puticuli* of the ancients. The catacombs of Naples, according to Bishop Burnet, are more magnificent than those of Rome. Catacombs have been found in Syracuse and Catanea, in Sicily, and in Malta.

Jahn, in his *Archæologia*, sec. 206, speaks of extensive sepulchres, among the Hebrews, otherwise called the *everlasting houses*; a term of peculiar inapplicability, if we may judge from Maundrell's account of the shattered and untenable state, in which they are found. They are all located beyond the cities and villages, to which they belong, that is, beyond their more inhabited parts. The sepulchres of the Hebrew kings were upon Mount Zion. Extensive caverns, natural or artificial, were the common burying-places or catacombs. Gardens and the shade of spreading trees were preferred, by some; these are objectionable, on the ground, suggested in a former number: to alienate the estate and leave the dead, without the right of re-

moval, reserved, is, virtually, a transfer of one's ancestors—and to remove them may be unpleasant. For this contingency the Greeks and Romans provided, by reducing them to such a portable compass, that a man might carry his grandfather in a quart bottle, and ten generations, in the right line, in a wheelbarrow. Numerous catacombs are to be found in Syria and Palestine. The most beautiful are on the north part of Jerusalem. The entrance into these was down many steps. Some of them consisted of seven apartments, with niches in the walls, for the reception of the dead.

Maundrell, in his travels, page 76, writing of the "grots," as they were styled, which have been considered the sepulchres of kings, denies that any of the kings of Israel or Judah were buried there. He describes these catacombs, as having necessarily cost an immense amount of money and labor. The approach is through the solid rock, into an area forty paces wide, cut down square, with exquisite precision, out of the solid mass. On the south is a portico, nine paces long, and four broad, also cut from the solid rock. This has an architrave, sculptured in the stone, of fruits and flowers, running along its front. At the end of the portico, on the left, you descend into the passage to the sepulchres. After creeping through stones and rubbish, Maundrell arrived at a large room, seven or eight yards square, cut also from the natural rock. His words are these:—"Its sides and ceiling are so exactly square, and its angles so just, that no architect, with levels and plummets, could build a room more regular." From this room you pass into six more, of the same fabric; the two innermost being deepest. All these apartments, excepting the first, are filled around with stone coffins. They had been covered with handsome lids, and carved with garlands; but, at the period of this visit, the covers were mostly broken to pieces, by sacrilegious hands. Here is a specimen of the "everlasting houses," and a solemn satire upon the best of all human efforts—impotent and vain—to perpetuate that, which God Almighty has destined to perish. But of this I shall have more to say, when I come to sum up; and endeavor, from these dry bones, to extract such wisdom as I can, touching the best mode, in which the living may dispose of the dead, whose *memories* they are bound to embalm, and whose *bodies* are entitled to a decent burial.

The catacombs of the Hottentots are the wildest clefts and

caverns of their mountains. The Greenlanders, after wrapping the dead, in the skins of wild animals, bear them to some far distant Golgotha. In Siberia and Kamtschatka, they are deposited in remote caverns, with mantles of snow, for their winding sheets. It is the valued privilege of the civilized and refined to snuff up corruption, and swear it is a rose—to bury their dead, in the very midst of the living—in the very tenements, in which they breathe, the larger part of every seventh day—in the vaults of churches, into which the mourners are expected to descend, and poke their noses into the tombs, to prove the full measure of their respect for the defunct. But the tombs are faithfully sealed; and, when again opened, after several months, perhaps, the olfactory nerves are not absolutely staggered—possibly a dull smeller may honestly aver, that he perceives nothing—what then? The work of corruption has gone forward—the gases have escaped—how and whither? Subtle as the lightning, they have percolated, through the meshes of brick and mortar; and the passages or gashes, purposely left open in the walls, have given them free egress to the outward air.

Very probably neither the eye nor the nose gave notice of their escape. Doubtless, it was gradual. The yellow fever, I believe, has never been seen nor smelt, during its most terrible ravages. I do remember—not an apothecary—but a greenhorn, who, in 1795, heard old Dr. Lloyd say the yellow fever was in the air, and who went upon the house top, next morning early, to look for it—but he saw it not; and, ever after, said he did not think much of Dr. Lloyd. I have something more to say of burials under churches, and in the midst of a dense population.

No. XI.

A FEW more words on the subject of burying the dead under churches, and in the midst of a dense population. If men would adopt the language of the prologue to Addison's Cato—*"dare to have sense yourselves"*—the folly and madness of this practice would be sufficiently apparent. Upon some simple subjects, one grain of common sense is better, than any quantity of the uncommon kind. But it is hard to make men think so.

They prefer walking by faith—they must consult the savans—the doctors. Now I think very well of a good, old-fashioned doctor—one doctor I mean—but, when they get to be gregarious, my observation tells me, no good can possibly come of it. At post mortems, and upon other occasions, I have, in my vocation, seen them assembled, by half dozens and dozens, and I have come to the conclusion, that no body of men ever look half so wise, or feel half so foolish.

Some of the faculty were consulted, in this city, about thirty years ago, upon the question of burying under churches; and, on the strength of the opinion given, a large church, not then finished, was provided with tombs, and the dead have been buried therein, ever since. Now I think the public good would have been advanced, had those doctors set their faces against the selfish proposition. That it is a nuisance, I entertain not the slightest doubt. The practice of burying in their own houses, among the ancients, gave place to burying without the city, or to cremation. The unhealthiness, consequent upon such congregations of the dead, was experienced at Rome. The inconvenience was so severely felt, in a certain quarter, that Augustus gave a large part of one of the cemeteries to Mæcenas, who so completely purified it, and changed its character, that it became one of the healthiest sites in Rome, and there he built a splendid villa, to which Augustus frequently resorted, for fresh air and repose. Horace alludes to this transformation, Sat. 8, lib. 1, v. 10, and the passage reminds one of the change, which occurred in Philadelphia, when the Potter's field was beautifully planted, and transformed into Washington Square.

*Hoc miseræ plebi stabat commune sepulchrum,
Pantolabo scurræ; Nomentanoque nepoti.
Mille pedes in fronte, trecentos cippus in agrum
Hic dabat, heredes monumentum ne sequeretur.
Nunc licet Esquiliis habitare salubribus, atque
Aggere in apprico spatium, quâ modo tristes
Albis informem spectabant ossibus agrum.*

Millingen, in his work on Medical jurisprudence, page 54, remarks—"From time immemorial medical men have pointed out to municipal authorities the dangers, that arise from burying the dead, within the precincts of cities, or populous towns."

The early Christians buried their martyrs, and afterwards eminent citizens, in their temples. Theodosius, in his celebrated code, forbade the practice, because of the infectious diseases.

Theodolphus, the Bishop of Orleans, complained to Charlemagne, that vanity and the love of lucre had turned churches into charnel houses, disgraceful to the church, and dangerous to man.

Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, first sanctioned the use of churches, for charnel houses, in 758—though Augustine had previously forbidden the practice. As Sterne said, in another connection, “they manage these matters much better, in France;” there Maret, in 1773, and Vicq d’Azyr, in 1778, pointed out the terrible consequences, so effectually, that none, but dignitaries, were suffered to be buried in churches. In 1804, inhumation, in the cities of France, was wholly forbidden, without any exception. The arguments produced, at that time, are not uninteresting, at this, or any other. In Saulien, about 140 miles from Paris, in the year 1773, the corpse of a corpulent person was buried, March 3, under the church of St Saturnin. April 20, following, a woman was buried near it. Both had died of a prevailing fever, which had nearly passed away. At the last interment a foul odor filled the church, and of 170 persons present, 149 were attacked with the disease. In 1774 at Nantes, several coffins were removed, to make room for a person of note; and fifteen of the bystanders died of the emanation, shortly after. In the same year, one third of the inhabitants of Lectouse died of malignant fever, which appeared, immediately after the removal of the dead from a burial-ground, to give place to a public structure.

The public mind is getting to be deeply impressed, upon this subject. Cities, and the larger towns are, in many instances, building homes for the dead, beyond the busy haunts of the living. The city of London has, until within a few years, been backward, in this sanatory movement. At present, however, there are six public cemeteries, in the suburbs of that city, of no inconsiderable area: the Kensall Green Cemetery, established by act 2 and 3 of William IV., in 1832, containing 53 acres—the South Metropolitan, by act 6 and 7 William IV., 1836, containing 40 acres—the Highgate and Kentish Town, by act 7 and 8 William IV., containing 22 acres—the Abney Park, at Stoke Newington, containing 30 acres, 1840—the Westminster, at Earls court, Kensington road, 1840—and the Nunhead, containing 40 acres, 1840. Paris has its beautiful Père La Chaise, covering the site of the house and extensive grounds, once belonging to

the Jesuit of that name, the confessor of Louis XIV., who died in 1709. New York has its Greenwood; Philadelphia its Laurel Hill; Albany its Rural Cemetery; Baltimore its Green Mount; Rochester its Mount Hope; we our Mount Auburn; and our neighboring city of Roxbury has already selected—and well selected—a local habitation for the dead, and wants nothing but a name, which will not long be wanting, nor a graceful arrangement of the grounds, from the hands of one, to whom Mount Auburn is indebted, for so much of all that is admirable there. I shall rejoice, if the governors of this cemetery should decree, that no *tomb* should ever be erected therein—but that the dead should be laid in their *graves*.

My experience has supplied me with good and sufficient reasons—one thousand and one—against the employment of tombs, some of which reasons I may hereafter produce, though the honor of our craft may constrain me to keep silence, in regard to others. Some very bitter family squabbles have arisen, about tombs. Two deacons, who were half brothers, had a serious and lasting dispute, respecting a family tomb. They became almost furious; one of them solemnly protesting, that he would never consent to be buried there, while he had his reason, and the other declaring, that he would never be put into that tomb, while God spared his life. This, however, is not one of those one thousand and one reasons, against tombs.

No. XII.

THE origin of the catacombs of Paris is very interesting, and not known to many. The stone, of which the ancient buildings of Paris were constructed, was procured from quarries, on the banks of the river Bièvre. No system had been adopted in the excavation; and, for hundreds of years, the material had been withdrawn, until the danger became manifest. There was a vague impression, that these quarries extended under a large part of the city. In 1774 the notice of the authorities was called to some accidents, connected with the subject. The quarries were then carefully examined, by skilful engineers; and the startling fact clearly established, that the southern parts of Paris

were actually undermined, and in danger of destruction. In 1777 a special commission was appointed, to direct such works, as might be necessary. On the very day of its appointment, the necessity became manifest—a house, in the Rue d'Enfer, sunk ninety-two feet. The alarm—the fear of a sudden engulfment—was terrible. Operatives were set at work, to prop the streets, roads, palaces, and churches. The supports, left by the quarriers, without any method or judgment, were insufficient—in some instances, they had given way, and the roof had settled. Great fear was felt for the aqueduct of Arcueil, which supplied the fountains of Paris, and which passed over this ground, for it had already suffered some severe shocks; and it was apprehended, not simply that the fountains would be cut off, but that the torrent would pour itself into these immense caverns. And now the reader will inquire, what relation has this statement to the catacombs? Let us reply.

For hundreds of years, Paris had but one place of interment, the Cemetery des Innocens. This was once a part of the royal domains; it lay without the walls of Paris; and was given, by one of the earlier kings, to the citizens, for a burying-place. It is well known, that this gift to the people was intended to prevent the continuance of the practice, then common in Paris, of burying the dead, in cellars, courts, gardens, streets, and public fields, within the city proper. In 1186 this cemetery was surrounded with a high wall, by Philip Augustus, the forty second king of France. It was soon found insufficient for its purpose; and, in 1218, it was enlarged, by Pierre de Nemours, Bishop of Paris. Generation after generation was deposited there, stratum super stratum, until the surrounding parishes, in the fifteenth century, began to complain of the evil, as an insufferable nuisance. Such a colossal mass of putrescence produced discomfort and disease. Hichesse speaks of several holes about Paris, of great size and depth, in which dead bodies were deposited, and left uncovered, till one tier was filled, and then covered with a layer of earth, and so on, to the top. He says these holes were cleared, once in thirty or forty years, and the bones deposited, in what was called "*le grand charnier des Innocens*;" this was an arched gallery, surrounding the great cemetery.

With what affectionate respect we cherish the venerated name of François Pontracil *Magnum et venerabile nomen!* He was the last—the last of the grave-diggers of *le grand charnier des*

Innocens! In the days of my novitiate, I believed in the mathematical dictum, which teaches, that two things cannot occupy the same place, at the same time. But that dictum appears incredible, while contemplating the operations of Pontraci. He was a most accomplished stevedore in his department—the Napoleon of the charnel house, the very king of spades. All difficulties vanished, before his magic power. Nothing roused his indignation so much, as the suggestion, that a cemetery was full—*c'est impossible!* was his eternal reply. To use the terms of another of the fine arts, the touch of Pontraci was irresistible—his *handling* masterly—his *grouping* unsurpassed—and his *fore-shortening* altogether his own. *Condense!* that word alone explained the mystery of his great success. Knapsacks are often thrown aside, *en route*, in the execution of rapid movements. In the grand march of death, Pontraci considered coffins an encumbrance. Those wooden surtouts he thought well enough for parade, but worse than useless, on a march. He had a poor opinion of an artist, who could not find room, for twenty citizens, heads and heels, in one common grave. Madame Pontraci now and then complained, that the fuel communicated a problematical flavor to the meat, while roasting—“*c'est odcur, qui a rapport à une profession particulière, madame,*” was the reply of Pontraci. The register, kept by this eminent man, shows, that, in thirty years, he had deposited, in this cemetery, ninety thousand bodies. It was calculated, that twelve hundred thousand had been buried there, since the time of Philip Augustus. In 1805, the Archbishop of Paris, under a resolve of the Council of State, issued a decree, that the great cemetery should be suppressed and evacuated. It was resolved to convert it into a market place. The happy thought of converting the quarries into catacombs fortunately occurred, at that period, to M. Lenoie, lieutenant general of police. Thus a receptacle was, at once, provided for the immense mass of human remains, to be removed from the Cemetery des Innocens. A portion of the quarries, lying under the *Plaine de Mont Souris*, was assigned, for this purpose. A house was purchased with the ground adjoining, on the old road to Orleans. It had, at one time, belonged to Isouard, a robber, who had infested that neighborhood. A flight of seventy-seven steps was made, from the house down into the quarries; and a well sunk to the bottom, down which the bones were to be thrown. Workmen were employed, in constructing pillars to

sustain the roof, and in walling round the part, designed for *le charnier*. The catacombs were then consecrated, with all imaginable pomp.

In the meantime, the vast work of removing the remains went forward, night and day, suspended, only, when the hot weather rendered it unsafe to proceed. The nocturnal scenes were very impressive. A strange resurrection, to be sure! Bonfires burnt brightly amid the gloom. Torches threw an unearthly glare around, and illuminated these dealings with the dead. The operatives, moving about in silence, bearing broken crosses, and coffins, and the bones of the long buried, resembled the agents of an infernal master. All concerned had been publicly admonished, to reclaim the crosses, tombstones, and monuments of their respective dead. Such, as were not reclaimed, were placed in the field, belonging to the house of Isouard. Many leaden coffins were buried there, one containing the remains of Madame de Pompadour. During the revolution, the house and grounds of Isouard were sold as national domain, the coffins melted, and the monuments destroyed. The catacombs received the dead from other cemeteries; and those, who fell, in periods of commotion, were cast there. When convents were suppressed, the dead, found therein, were transferred to this vast omnibus.

During the revolution, the works were neglected—the soil fell in; water found its way to the interior; the roof began to crumble; and the bones lay, in immense heaps, mixed with the rubbish, and impeding the way. And there, for the present, we shall leave them, intending to resume this account of the catacombs of Paris, in a future number.

No. XIII.

IN 1810, the disgusting confusion, in the catacombs of Paris, was so much a subject of indignant remark, that orders were issued to put things in better condition. A plan was adopted, for piling up the bones. In some places, these bones were thirty yards in thickness; and it became necessary to cut galleries through the masses, to effect the object proposed.

There were two entrances to the catacombs—one near the

barrier d'Enfer, for visitors—the other, near the old road to Orleans, for the workmen. The staircase consisted of ninety steps, which, after several windings, conducted to the western gallery, from which others branched off, in different directions. A long gallery, extending beneath the aqueduct of Arcueil, leads to the gallery of Port Mahon, as it is called. About a hundred yards from this gallery, the visitor comes again to the passage to the catacombs; and, after walking one hundred yards further, he arrives at the vestibule, which is of an octagonal form. This vestibule opens into a long gallery, lined with bones, from top to bottom. The arm, leg, and thigh bones are in front, compactly and regularly piled together. The monotony of all this is tastefully relieved, by three rows of skulls, at equal distances, and the smaller bones are stowed behind. How very French! This gallery leads to other apartments, lined with bones, variously and fancifully arranged. In these rooms are imitation vases and altars, constructed of bones, and surmounted with skulls, fantastically arranged. This really seems to be the work of some hybrid animal—a cross, perhaps, between the Frenchman and the monkey.

These crypts, as they are called, are designated by names, strangely dissimilar. There is the Crypte de Job, and the Crypte d'Anacreon—the Crypte de La Fontaine, and the Crypte d'Ezekiel—the Crypte d'Hervey, and the Crypte de Rousseau. An album, kept here, is filled with mawkish sentimentality, impertinent witticism, religious fervor, and infidel bravado.

The calculations vary, as to the number of bodies, whose bones are collected here. At the lowest estimate, the catacombs are admitted to contain the remains of three millions of human beings.

While contemplating the fantastical disposition of these human relics, one recalls the words of Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Hydriotaphia*—"Antiquity held too light thoughts from objects of mortality, while some drew provocatives of mirth from anatomies, and jugglers showed tricks with skeletons."

Here then, like "*broken tea-cups, wisely kept for show*," are the broken skeletons of more than three millions of human beings, paraded for public exhibition! Most of them, doubtless, received Christian burial, and were followed to their graves, and interred, with more or less of the forms and ceremonies of the Catholic church, and deposited in the earth, there to repose in

peace, till the resurrection! How applicable here the language of the learned man, whom we just quoted—"When the funeral pyre was out, and the last valediction over, men took a lasting adieu of their interred friends, little expecting the curiosity of future ages should comment upon their ashes; and having no old experience of the duration of their relics, held no opinion of such after-considerations. But who knows the fate of his bones, or how often he is to be buried! Who hath the oracle of his ashes, or whither they are to be scattered?" How little did the gay and guilty Jeane Antoinette Poisson, Marquise de Pompadour, imagine this rude handling of her mortal remains! She was buried in the Cemetery des Innocens, in 1764—and shared the common exhumation and removal in 1805.

It seems to have been the desire of mankind, in every age and nation, to repose in peace, after death. In conformity with this desire, the cemeteries of civilized nations, the morais of the Polynesian isles, and the cities of the dead, throughout the world, have been, from time immemorial, consecrated and tabooed. So deep and profound has been the sentiment of respect, for the feelings of individuals, upon this subject, that great public improvements have been abandoned, rather than give offence to a single citizen.

Near forty years ago, a meeting was held in Faneuil Hall, to consider a proposition for some change, in the Granary burying-ground, which proposition, was rejected, by acclamation. During the Mayoralty, of the elder Mr Quincy, it was the wish of very many to continue the mall, through the burial-ground, in the Common. The consent of all, but two or three, was obtained. They were offered new tombs, and the removal of their deceased relatives, under their own supervision, at the charge of the city. These two or three still objected, and this great public improvement was abandoned; and with manifest propriety. The basis of this sentiment is a deep laid and tender respect for the ashes of the dead, and an earnest desire, that they may rest, undisturbed, till the resurrection; and this is the very last thing, which is likely to befall the tenant of a tomb; for the owner—and tombs, like other tenements, will change owners—in the common phraseology of leases, has a right to enter, "to view, and expel the lessee"—if no survivor is at hand to prevent, and the new proprietor has other tenants, whom he prefers for the dark and gloomy mansion. And they, in process of time, shall

be served, in a similar manner, by another generation. This is no exception; it is the general rule, the common course of dealing with the dead. A tomb, containing the remains of several generations, may become, by marriage, the property of a stranger. His wife dies. He marries anew. New connections beget new interests. The tomb is *useless*, to him, because it is *full*. A general clearance is decreed. A hole is dug in the bottom of the tomb; the coffins, with an honorable exception, in respect to his late beloved, are broken to pieces; and the remains cast into the pit, and covered up. The tablet, overhead, perpetuates the lie—"Sacred to the memory," &c. However, the tomb is white-washed, and swept out, and a nice place he has made of it! All this, have I seen, again and again.

When a tomb is opened, for a new interment, dilapidated coffins are often found lying about, and bones, mud, and water, on the bottom. We always make the best of it, and stow matters away, as decently as we can. We are often blamed for time's slovenly work. Grossman said, that a young spendthrift, who really cared for nothing but his pleasures, was, upon such an occasion, seized with a sudden fit of reverence for his great grandfather, and threatened to shoot Grossman, unless he produced him, immediately. He was finally pacified by a plain statement, and an exhibition of the old gentleman's bones behind the other coffins. We could not be looked upon, more suspiciously, by certain inconsiderate persons, if we were the very worms that did the mischief. As a class, we are as honorable as any other. There are bad men, in every calling. There is no crime, in the decalogue, or out of it, which has not been committed, by some apostle, in holy orders. Doctors and even apothecaries are, occasionally, scoundrels. And, in a very old book, now entirely out of print, I have read, that there was, in the olden time, a lawyer, *rara avis*, who was suspected of not adhering, upon all occasions, to the precise truth. Tombs are nuisances. I will tell you why.

No. XIV.

Tombs are obviously more liable to invasion, with and without assistance, from the undertaker and his subalterns, than graves. There may be a few exceptions, where the sexton does not co-operate. If a grave be dug, in a suitable soil, of a proper depth, which is some feet lower than the usual measure, the body will, in all probability, remain undisturbed, for ages, and until corruption and the worm shall have done their work, upon flesh and blood, and decomposition is complete. An intelligent sexton, who keeps an accurate chart of his diggings, will eschew that spot. On the other hand, every coffin is exposed to view, when a tomb is opened for a new comer. On such occasions, we have, sometimes, full employment, in driving away idlers, who gather to the spot, to gratify a sickly curiosity, or to steal whatever may be available, however "sacred to the memory," &c. The tomb is left open, for many hours, and, not unfrequently, over night, the mouth perhaps slightly closed, but not secured against intruders. During such intervals, the dead are far less protected from insult, and the espionage of idle curiosity, than the contents of an ordinary toy-shop, by day or night. Fifty years ago, curiosity led me to walk down into a vault, thus left exposed. No person was near. I lifted the lid of a coffin—the bones had nearly all crumbled to pieces—the skull remained entire—I took it out, and, covering it with my handkerchief, carried it home. I have, at this moment, a clear recollection of the horror, produced in the mind of our old family nurse, by the exhibition of the skull, and my account of the manner, in which I obtained it. "What an awful thing it would be," the dear, good soul exclaimed, "if the resurrection should come this very night, and the poor man should find his skull gone!" My mother was informed; and I was ordered to take it back immediately: it was then dark; and when I arrived at the tomb, in company with our old negro, Hannibal, to whom the office was in no wise agreeable, the vault was closed. I deposited the skull on the tomb, and walked home in double quick time, with my head over my shoulder, the whole way. I relate this occurrence, to show how motiveless such trespasses may be.

There is a morbid desire, especially in women, which is rather difficult of analysis, to descend into the damp and dreary

tomb—to lift the coffin lid—and look upon the changing, softening, corrupting features of a parent or child—to gaze upon the mouldering bones; and thus to gather materials, for fearful thoughts, and painful conversations, and frightful dreams!

A lady lost her child. It died of a disease, not perfectly intelligible to the doctor, who desired a post mortem examination, which the mother declined. He urged. She peremptorily refused. The child was buried in the Granary ground. A few months after, another member of the same family was buried in the same vault. The mother, notwithstanding the remonstrances of her husband, descended, to look upon the remains of her only daughter; and, after a careful search, returned, in the condition of Rachel, who would not be comforted, because it was not. In a twofold sense, it was *not*. The coffin and its contents had been removed. The inference was irresistible. The distress was very great, and fresh, upon the slightest allusion, to the end of life. Cases of premature sepulture are, doubtless, extremely rare. That such, however, have sometimes occurred, no doubt has been left upon the mind, upon the opening of tombs. These are a few only of many matters, which are destined, from time to time, to be brought to light, upon the opening of *tombs*, and which are not likely to disturb the feelings of those whose deceased relatives and friends are committed to well-made *graves*. On all these occasions, ignorance is bliss.

Tombs, not only such as are constructed under churches, but in common cemeteries, are frequently highly offensive, on the score of emanation. They are liable to be opened, for the admission of the dead, at all times; and, of course, when the worms are riotous, and corruption is rankest, and the pungent gases are eminently dangerous, and disgusting. Even when closed, the intelligible odor, arising from the dissolving processes, which are going on within, is more than living flesh and blood can well endure. Again and again, visitors at Mount Auburn have been annoyed, by this effluvium from the tombs. By the universal adoption of well-made graves, this also may be entirely avoided.

When a family becomes, or is supposed to be, extinct, or has quitted the country, their dead kindred are usually permitted to lie in peace, in their *graves*. It is not always thus, if they have had the misfortune to be buried in *tombs*. To cast forth a dead tenant, from a solitary *grave*, that room might be found for a new

comer, would scarcely be thought of; but the temptation to seize five or six *tombs*, at once, for town's account, on the pretext, that they were the tombs of extinct families, has, once, at least, proved irresistible, and led to an outrage, so gross and revolting, in this Commonwealth, that the whole history of cemeteries in our country cannot produce a parallel. In April, 1835, the board of health, in a town of this Commonwealth, gave notice, in a *single* paper, that certain tombs were dilapidated; that no representative of former owners could be found; and that, if not claimed and repaired, within sixty days, those tombs would be sold, to pay expenses, &c. In fulfilment of this notice, in September following, the entire contents of five tombs were broken to pieces, and shovelled out. In one of these tombs there were thirty coffins, the greater part of which were so sound, as to be split with an axe. A portion of the silver plate, stolen by the operatives employed by the board of health, was afterwards recovered, bearing date, as recently as 1819. The board of health then advertised these tombs for sale, in *two* newspapers. Nothing of these brutal proceedings was known to the relatives, until the deed of barbarity was done. Now it can scarcely be credited, that, in that very town, a few miles from it, and in this city, there were then living numerous descendants, and relatives of those, whose tombs had thus been violated. Some of the dead, thus insulted, had been the greatest benefactors of that town, so much so, that a narrative of their donations has been published, in pamphlet form. Among the direct descendants were some of the oldest and most distinguished families of this city, whose feelings were severely tried by this outrage. The ashes of the dead are common property. The whole community bestirs itself in their defence. The public indignation brought those stupid and ignorant officials to confession and atonement, if not to repentance. They passed votes of regret; replaced the ashes in proper receptacles within the tombs; and put them in order, at the public charge. A meagre and miserable atonement, for an injury of this peculiar nature; and, though gracelessly accorded,—extorted by the stringency of public sentiment, and the fear of legal process,—yet, on the whole, the only satisfaction, for a wrong of this revolting and peculiar character. The insecurity of tombs is sufficiently apparent. An empty tomb may be attached by creditors; but, by statute of Mass., 1822, chap. 93, sec. 8, it cannot be, while in

use, as a cemetery. But no law, of man or nature, can prevent the disgusting effects, and mortifying casualties, and misconstructions of power, which have arisen, and will forever continue to arise, from the miserable practice of burying the dead, in *tombs*.

No. XV.

THERE is, doubtless, something not altogether agreeable, in the thought of being buried alive. Testamentary injunctions are not uncommon, for the prevention of such a calamity. As far, as my long experience goes, the percentage is exceedingly small. About twenty-five years ago, some old woman was certain, that a person, lately buried, was not exactly dead. She gave utterance to this certainty—there was no *evidence*, and ample room therefore for *faith*. The defunct had a little property—it was a clear case, of course—his relatives had buried him alive, to get possession! A mob gathered, in King's Chapel yard; and, to appease their righteous indignation, the grave was opened, the body exposed, doctors examined, and the mob was respectfully assured, that the man was dead—dead as a door nail. A proposition to bury the old woman, in revenge, was rejected immediately. But she did not give up the point—they never do. She admitted, that the party was dead, but persisted, that his death was caused, by being buried alive.

Some are, doubtless, still living, who remember the affair in the Granary yard. Groans had been heard there, at night. Some person had been buried alive, beyond all doubt. A committee was appointed to visit the spot. Upon drawing near, subdued laughter and the sounds of vulgar merriment arose, from one of the tombs—a light was seen glimmering from below—the strong odor, not of corruption, but of mutton chops, filled the air. Some vagabonds had cleared the tomb, and taken possession, and, with broken coffins for fuel, had found an appetite, among the dead. The occupation of tombs, by the outcasts of society, was common, long before the Christian era.

That the living have been buried, unintentionally, now and then, is undoubtedly true. Such has probably been the case, sometimes, under catalepsy or trance, the common duration of

which is from a few hours, to two or three days; but of which Bonet, *Medic., Septentrion, lib. 1, sec. 16, chap. 6*, gives an example, which lasted twenty days. Bodies have been found, says Millingen, in his *Curiosities of Medical Experience*, page 63, where the miserable victims have devoured the flesh of their arms; and he cites John Scott and the Emperor Zeno, as examples. Plato recites the case of a warrior, who was left ten days, as dead, upon the field of battle, and came to life, on his way to the sepulchre. In Chalmers' *Memoir of the Abbe Prevôt*, it is related, that he was found, by a peasant, having fallen in an apoplectic fit. The body was cold, and carried to a surgeon, who proceeded to open it. During the process, the Abbe revived, only, however, to die of the wound, inflicted by the operator.

The danger of burying alive has been noticed by Pineau, *Sur le danger des Inhumations précipitées, Paris, 1776*. Dr. John Mason Good, vol. 4, page 613, remarks, that catalepsy has been mistaken for real death; and, in countries where burial takes place speedily, it is much to be feared, that, in a few instances, the patient has been buried alive. A case of asphyxy, of a singular kind, is stated, by Mr. Pew, and recited by Dr. Good, of a female, whose interment was postponed, for a post mortem examination—most fortunately—for the first touch of the scalpel brought her to life. Diemerbroeck, *Tractat de Peste, Lib. 4, Hist. 8*, relates the case of a rustic, who was laid out for interment. Three days passed before the funeral. He was supposed to have died of the plague. When in the act of being buried, he showed signs of life, recovered, and lived many years. Dr. Good observes, that a critical examination of the region of the heart, and a clear mirror, applied to the mouth and nostrils, will commonly settle the question of life or death; but that even these signs will sometimes fail. What then shall be done? Matthæus Hildanus and others, who give many stories of this kind, say—wait for the infallible signs of putrefaction. It may be absurd to wait too long; it is indecorous to inhume too soon.

The case, recited by Mr. Pew, reminds me of Pliny's account of persons who came to life, on the funeral pile. "Aviola in rogo revixit: et, quoniam subveniri non potuerat, prævalente flamma, vivus crematus est. Similis causa in L. Lamia, prætorio viro, traditur."—Lib. 7, sec. 53.

Old Grossman's stories, in this connection, were curious enough. He gave a remarkable account of a good old deacon, who had a scolding wife. She fell sick and died, as was supposed, and was put in her coffin, and screwed down, and lifted. Everything, as Grossman said, went on very pleasantly, till they began to descend into the tomb, when the sexton, at the foot, slipped, and the coffin went by the run, and struck violently against the wall of the tomb. One instant of awful silence was followed, by a shrill shriek from the corpse—"Let me out—let me out!" The poor old deacon wrung his hands, and looked, as Grossman expressed it, "real melancholy." The lid was unscrewed, as soon as possible, and the lady, less in sorrow, than in anger, insisted on immediate emancipation. All attempts to persuade her to be still, and go home as she came, for the decency of the thing, were unavailing. The top of the coffin was removed. The deacon offered to help her out. She refused his proffered hand; and, doubling her fist in his face, told him he was a monster, and should pay for it, and insisted on walking back, in her death clothes. About six months after, she died, in good earnest. "The poor deacon," said Grossman, "called us into a private room, and reminding us of the sad turn things took, last time, begged us to be careful; and told us, if all things went right, he would treat us at his store, the next day. He retailed spirit, as all the deacons did, being the very persons, pointed at, by the finger of the law, as men of sober lives and conversations.

Grossman told another story. We could scarcely credit it. He offered to swear to it; but we begged he wouldn't. It was of a woman, who was a cider sot. Her husband had tried all sorts of preventive experiments, in vain. His patience was exhausted. He tapped a barrel, and let her drink her fill. She and the barrel gave out together. She was buried. The coldness of the tomb brought her to life. She felt around the narrow domicil, in which she lay. Her consciousness, that she was in her coffin, and that she had been buried, was clear enough; but her other impressions were rather cloudy. It never occurred to her, that she had been buried alive. She imagined herself, in another world, and, knocking, as hard as possible, against the lid and sides of her coffin, she exclaimed, "Good people of the upper world, if ye have got any good cider, do let us have a mug of it." Luckily, the mouth of the tomb had not been

closed, and, when the sexton came to close it, he was scandalized, of course, to hear a thirsty corpse, crying for cider; but the woman was soon relieved from her predicament. The Mandans, whose custom of never burying their dead, I have alluded to, may possibly be influenced, by a consideration of this very contingency. In some places, bodies have been placed in a lighted room, near the charnel house, there to remain, till the signs of corruption could no longer be mistaken. The tops of the coffins being loose; and a bell so connected with the body, as to ring on the slightest movement.

No. XVI.

My profession is very dear to me; and nothing would gratify me more, than to see my brother artists restored to their original dignity. It is quite common to look upon a sexton, as a mere grave-digger, and upon his calling, as a cold, underground employment, divested of everything like sentiment or solemnity.

In the olden time, the sexton bore the title of sacristan. He had charge of the sacristy, or vestry, and all the sacred vessels and vestments of the church. At funerals, his office corresponded with that of the Roman *dominus funeris* or *designator*, referred to by Horace, Ep. i., 7, 6—and by Cicero to Atticus, iv., 2. He was, in point of law, considered as having a freehold, in his office, and therefore he could not be deprived, by ecclesiastical censure. It was his duty to attend upon the rector, and to take no unimportant part, in all those inestimable forms, and ceremonies, and circumgyrations, and genuflections, which render the worship of the high church so exceedingly picturesque. The sexton of the Pope's chapel was selected, from the order of the hermits of St. Augustine, and was commonly a bishop. His title was *prefect of the Pope's sacristy*. When the Pope said mass, the sexton always tasted the bread and wine first. And, when the Pope was desperately sick, the sexton gave him extreme unction. I recite these facts, that the original dignity of our office may be understood.

The employment of sextons has been rather singular, in some countries. M. Outhier states, that, when he visited the church of

St. Clara, at Stockholm, he observed the sexton, during the sermon, with a long rod, waking those, who had fallen asleep.

I fully believe, that the sextons of this city are all honorable men; and yet it cannot be denied, that the solemn occasion, upon which their services are required, is one, upon which, pride and sensibility forbid all higgling, on the part of the customer. However oppressively the charge of consigning a relative to the ground may bear, upon one of slender means, the tongue of complaint is effectually tied. The consciousness of this furnishes a strong temptation to imposition. The same desire to promote the public good, which induced Mr. Bentham to give his body for dissection, has led distinguished individuals, now and then, to prescribe simple and inexpensive obsequies, for themselves.

Livy says, book 48, sec. 10, that Marcus Emilius Lepidus directed his sons to bury him without parade, and at a very small charge. As he was the Pontifex Maximus, possessed of wealth, and of a generous spirit, the promotion of the public good was the only motive. Cheating at funerals was as common at Athens, as at Rome. Demades, as Seneca relates, book 6, ch. 33, *de beneficiis*, condemned an unprincipled Athenian sexton, for extortion, in furnishing out funerals. The friends and relatives are so busy with their sorrow, that they have neither time nor taste, for the examination of accounts, and, least of all, such as concern the obsequies of near friends. I was never more forcibly impressed with the truth, that, where the carcass is, there the vultures will be gathered together, than in the little island of St. Croix, during the winter of 1840. I was there with a friend, a clergyman, who visited that island, for the restoration of his wife's health. She died. Her remains were never buried there, but brought to this city, and here interred. In that island there is a tribunal, called the *Dealing Court*, analogous to the court of probate, or orphan's court, in this country. In less than forty-eight hours, a bill was presented, from this court, for "*dealing*" with the estate of the deceased. She had no estate; no act had been done. "True, but such is the custom of our island—such is the law of Denmark." After taking counsel, the bill was paid. The Danish Lutheran is the established religion of the island. The Episcopal lives, by sufferance. A few days after this lady's decease, a bill was presented, from the officers of the *Danish Lutheran* church, for granting permission to dig her grave, in

the *Episcopal* ground. It was objected, that no permission had been asked, that no burial had been intended, that the body had been placed in spirits, for its removal to the United States. It was replied, "Such is the usage of the island; the permission is granted, and may be used or not; such is the law of Denmark."

Shortly after this, a bill was presented, for digging the grave. It was in vain to protest, as before, and to assert, that no grave had been dug. The answer was the same; "the grave must be paid for; it will be dug or not, as you wish; such is the usage of the island; such is the law of Denmark." In due time, another demand was made, for carrying round invitations, and attendance upon the funeral. It was useless to say, that no invitations were sent—no funeral was had. "Such is the custom of the island; such is the law of Denmark." The reader, by this time, will be satisfied, that something is rotten in Denmark; this narrative appears so very improbable, that I deem it right to assure the reader the circumstances are stated faithfully, and that the clergyman referred to, is still living.

In commending a respectable frugality, in our dealings with the dead, not only with regard to their obsequies, but in relation to sepulchral and monumental expenditure, I oppose the interest of our profession, and cannot be accused of any selfish motive. A chaste simplicity is due to the occasion; for surely no more illy chosen hour can be given to the gratification of pride, than that, in which the very pride of man is humbled in the dust. How often have my thoughts descended from the costly, sculptured obelisk, to the carnival of worms below!

A well-set example of comely modesty, in these matters, would be productive of much advantage to the community. The man of common means, if he happen to be also a man of common sense, will not imitate the man of opulence, in the splendor of his equipage or furniture. But he will too readily enter into what he deems a righteous rivalry of funereal parade, and leave his debts unpaid, rather than abate one cubit, in the height of his monument, or obelisk. It is not now the custom to bury with the dead, or deposit with their ashes, as in urn burial, articles of use and value to the living. We have been taught, that those graves are the least likely to be violated, in which are deposited little else than mortal remains. But, in a certain sense, the dead can no longer be said to carry nothing with them. The

silver and its workmanship alone, which are annually buried, furnish no inconsiderable item.

The outer coffin of Nathan Meyer Rothschild "was of fine oak, and so handsomely carved and decorated with massive silver handles, at both sides and ends, that it appeared more like a cabinet, or splendid piece of furniture, than a receptacle of the dead. A raised tablet of oak, on the breast, was carved with the arms of the deceased." The arms of the deceased! Very edifying to the worms, those cunning operatives, who work so skilfully, in silence and darkness! The arms of the deceased! Matthew Prior had some shrewd notions of heraldry. He wrote his own epitaph—

Heralds and nobles, by your leave,
Here lie the bones of Matthew Prior;
The son of Adam and of Eve;
Let Bourbon and Nassau go higher.

No. XVII.

My attention has been called, by a young disciple of the great Pontraci, "a sexton of the new school," to an interesting anecdote, which I have heard related, in days by-gone, and which has, more than once, appeared in print. It is, by many, believed, that the remains of Major Pitcairn, which were supposed to have been sent home to England, are still in this country, and that those of Lieutenant Shea were transmitted, by mistake. Whether *he* or *Shea* will ever remain doubtful. Major Pitcairn was killed, as is well known, at the battle of Bunker's Hill. Shea died of inflammation on the brain. They were alike in size. On the top of the head of the body, selected by the sexton of Christ Church, as the remains of Major Pitcairn, it is stated, there was a blistering plaster; and, from this circumstance, the impression has arisen, that the monument in Westminster Abbey, however sacred to the memory of Pitcairn, stands over the remains of Lieutenant Shea. There is not more uncertainty, in relation to the remains of Major Pitcairn, than has existed, in regard to the individual, by whose hands he fell; though it is now agreed, that he was shot by a black soldier, named Salem. Fifty men, at the lowest estimate, have died in the faith, that they killed Pit-

cairn. He was a man of large stature, fearless, and ever in the van, as he is represented by Marshall, at the battle of Lexington.

He was a palpable mark, for the muskets and rifles of the sharp-shooters. It is not improbable, that fifty barrels were levelled at his person, when he fell; and hence fifty claimants, for the merit of Pitcairn's destruction. Upon precisely similar grounds, rest the claims of Col. Johnson, for the killing of Tecumseh.

When the flesh has gone and nothing but the bones remain, it is almost impossible, to recognize the remains of any particular individual, buried hastily, as the fallen commonly are, after a battle, in one common grave; unless we are directed, by certain external indicia. In April, 1815, I officiated at the funeral of Dr. John Warren, brother of the patriot and soldier, who fell so gloriously, at Bunker's Hill, and whose death was said, by the British General, Howe, to be an offset, for five hundred men. Dr. James Jackson delivered the eulogy, on Dr. John Warren, in King's Chapel. General Warren was buried in the trenches, where he so bravely fell; and, when disinterred, in 1776, for removal to Boston, the remains were identified, by an inspection of the teeth, upon which an operation had been performed, the evidence of which remained. This testimony was doubtless corroborated, by the mark of the bullet on his forehead; for he was not a man to be wounded in the back. "The bullet which terminated his life," says Mr. A. H. Everett in his memoir, "was taken from the body, by Mr. Savage, an officer in the Custom House, and was carried by him to England. Several years afterwards, it was given by him at London, to the Rev. Mr. Montague of Dedham, Massachusetts, and is now in possession of his family."

These translations of the dead, from place to place, are full of uncertainty; and hence has arisen a marvellous and successful system of jugglery and priestcraft. The first translation of this kind, stated by Brady, in his *Clavis*, is that of Edward, king of the West Saxons. He was removed with great pomp from Wareham to the minster of Salisbury. Three years only had passed since his burial, and no error is imputed, in the relation. In the year 359, the Emperor Constantius was moved, by the spirit, to do something in this line; and he caused the remains of St. Andrew and St. Luke to be translated, from their original resting-places, to the temple of the twelve apostles, at Constan-

tinople. Some little doubt might be supposed to hang over the question of identity, after such a lapse of years, in this latter case. From this eminent example, arose that eager search for the remains of saints, martyrs, and relics of various descriptions, which, for many centuries, filled the pockets of imposters, with gold, and the world, with idolatry. So great was the success of those, engaged in this lucrative employment, that John the Baptist became a perfect hydra. Heads of this great pioneer were discovered, in every direction. Some of the apostles were found, upon careful search, to be centipedes; and others to have had as many hands as Briareus. These monstrosities were too vast to be swallowed, without a miracle. Father John Freand, of Anecy, assured the faithful, that God was pleased to multiply these remains for their devotion. Consecration has been refused to churches, unprovided with relics. Their production therefore became indispensable. All the wines, produced in *Oporto* and *Zeres de la Frontera*, furnish not a fourth part of the liquor, drunken, in London alone, under the names of Port and Sherry; and the bones of all the martyrs, were it possible to collect them, would not supply the occasions of the numerous churches, in Catholic countries. Misson says eleven holy lances are shown, in different places, for the true lance, that pierced the side of Christ.

Many egregious sinners have undoubtedly been dug up, and their bones worshipped, as the relics of genuine saints. Though not precisely to our purpose, it may not be uninteresting to the reader, to contemplate a catalogue of some few of the relics, exhibited to the faithful, as they are enumerated, by Bayle, Butler, Misson, Brady and others;—the lance—a piece of the cross—one of Christ's nails—five thorns of the crown—St. Peter's chain—a piece of the manger—a tooth of John the Baptist—one of St. Anne's arms—the towel, with which Christ wiped the feet of the apostles—one of his teeth—his seamless coat—the hem of his garment, which cured the diseased woman—a tear, which he shed over Lazarus, preserved by an angel, who gave it, in a vial, to Mary Magdalene—a piece of St. John the Evangelist's gown—a piece of the table cloth, used at the last supper—a finger of St. Andrew—a finger of John the Baptist—a rib of our Lord—the thumb of St. Thomas—a lock of Mary Magdalene's hair—two handkerchiefs, bearing impressions of Christ's face; one sent by our Lord, as a present to Aquarus,

prince of Edessa; and the other given by him, at the foot of the cross, to a holy woman, named Veronica—the hem of Joseph's garment—a feather of the Holy Ghost—a finger of the Holy Ghost—a feather of the angel Gabriel—the waterpots, used at the marriage in Galilee—Enoch's slippers—a vial of the sweat of St. Michael, at the time of his set-to with the Devil. This short list furnishes a meagre show-box of that immense mass of merchandise, which formed the staple of priestcraft. These pretended relics were not only procured, at vast expense, but were occasionally given, and received, as collateral security for debts. Baldwin II. sent the point of the holy lance to Venice, as a pledge for a loan. It was redeemed by St. Lewis, King of France, who caused it to be placed in the holy chapel at Paris. The importation of this species of trumpery, into England, was forbidden, by many statutes; and, by 3. Jac. i., cap. 26, justices were empowered to search houses for such things, and to burn them.

It is pleasant to turn from these shadowy records to matters of reality and truth. There was an exhumation, some years ago, of the remains of a highly honorable and truly gallant man, for the purpose of returning them to his native land. Suspicions of a painful nature arose, in connection with that exhumation. Those suspicions were cleared away, most happily, by a venerable friend of mine, with whom I have conversed upon that interesting topic. I will give some account of the removal of Major André's remains, in my next.

No. XVIII.

MAJOR John André, aid-de-camp to General Clinton, and adjutant general of the British army, was, as every well-read school-boy knows, hanged as a spy, October 2, 1780, at Tappan, a town of New York, about five miles from the north bank of the Hudson.

In June, 1818, by a vote of the Legislature of New York, the remains of that gallant Irishman, Major General Richard Montgomery, were removed from Quebec. Col. L. Livingston, his nephew, superintended the exhumation and removal. An old

soldier, who had attended the funeral, forty-two years before, pointed out the grave. These relics were committed to the ground, once more, in St. Paul's church-yard in New York; and, by direction of the Congress of the United States, a costly marble monument was erected there, executed by M. Cassieres, at Paris. Nothing was omitted of pomp and pageantry, in honor of the gallant dead.

Still the remains of André, whose fate was deeply deplored, however just the punishment—still they continued, in that resting place, humble and obscure, to which they had been consigned, when taken from the gallows. The lofty honors, bestowed upon Montgomery, operated as a stimulus and a rebuke. Mr James Buchanan, the British consul, admits their influence, in his memorable letter. He addressed a communication to the Duke of York, then commander-in-chief of the British army, suggesting the propriety of exhumating the remains of André, and returning them to England. The necessary orders were promptly issued, and Mr Buchanan made his arrangements for the exhumation.

Mr. Demarat, a Baptist clergyman, at Tappan, was the proprietor of the little field, where the remains of André had been buried, and where they had reposed, for forty-one years, when, in the autumn of 1821, Mr. Buchanan requested permission to remove them. His intentions had become known—some human brute—some Christian dog, had sought to purchase, or to rent, the field of Mr. Demarat, for the purpose of extorting money, for permission to remove these relics. But the good man and true rejected the base proposal, and afforded every facility in his power.

A narrow pathway led to the eminence, where André had suffered—the grave was there, covered with a few loose stones and briars. There was nothing beside, to mark the spot—I am wrong—woman, who was last at the cross, and first at the tomb, had been there—there was a peach tree, which a lady had planted at the head, and whose roots had penetrated to the very bottom of the shallow grave, and entered the frail shell, and enveloped the skull with its fibres. Dr. Thacher, in a note to page 225 of his military journal, says, that the roots of two cedar trees "had wrapped themselves round the skull bone, like a fine netting." This is an error. Two cedars grew near the grave, which were sent to England, with the remains.

The point, where these relics lay, commanded a view of the surrounding country, and of the head-quarters of Washington, about a mile and a half distant. The field, which contained about ten acres, was cultivated—a small part only, around the consecrated spot, remained untilled. Upon the day of the exhumation, a multitude had gathered to the spot. After digging three feet from the surface, the operative paused, and announced, that his spade had touched the top of the coffin. The excitement was so great, at this moment, that it became necessary to form a cordon, around the grave. Mr. Buchanan proceeded carefully to remove the remaining earth, with his hands—a portion of the cover had been decomposed. When, at last, the entire top had been removed, the remains of this brave and unfortunate young man were exposed to view. The skeleton was in perfect order. "There," says Mr. Buchanan, "for the first time, I discovered that he had been a small man."

One by one, the assembled crowd passed round, and gazed upon the remains of André, whose fate had excited such intense and universal sensibility. These relics were then carefully transferred to a sarcophagus, prepared for their reception, and conveyed to England. They now repose beneath the sixth window, in the south aisle of Westminster Abbey. The monument near which they lie, was designed by Robert Adam, and executed by Van Gelder. Britannia reclines on a sarcophagus, and upon the pedestal is inscribed—"Sacred to the memory of Major André, who, raised by his merit, at an early period of life, to the rank of Adjutant General of the British forces in America, and, employed in an important but hazardous enterprise, fell a sacrifice to his zeal for his king and country, on 2d of October, 1780, aged twenty-nine, universally beloved and esteemed by the army, in which he served, and lamented even by his foes. His generous sovereign, King George III., has caused this monument to be erected." Nothing could have been prepared, in better taste. Here is not the slightest allusion to that great question, which posterity, having attained full age, has already, definitively, settled—the justice of his fate. A box, wrought from one of the cedar trees, and lined with gold, was transmitted to Mr. Demarat, by the Duke of York; and a silver inkstand was presented to Mr. James Buchanan, by the surviving sisters of Major André.

Thus far, all things were in admirable keeping. It was,

therefore, a matter of deep regret, that Mr. James Buchanan should have thought proper to disturb their harmony, by suggestions, painfully offensive to every American heart. Those suggestions, it is true, have been acknowledged to be entirely groundless. But that gentleman's original letter, extensively circulated here, and transmitted to England, has, undoubtedly, conveyed these offensive insinuations, where the subsequent admission of his error is not likely to follow. Mr. Buchanan, on the strength of some loose suggestions, at Tappan, and elsewhere, corroborated by an examination of the contents of the coffin, had assumed it to be true, or highly probable, that the body of André had been stripped, after the execution, from mercenary, or other equally unworthy, motives. This impression he hastily conveyed to the world. I will endeavor to present this matter, in its true light, in my next communication.

No. XIX.

AFTER having removed the entire cover of André's coffin, "I descended," says Mr. Buchanan, "and, with my own hands, raked the dust together, to ascertain whether he had been buried in his regimentals, or not, as it was rumored, among the assemblage, that he was stripped: for, if buried in his regimentals, I expected to find the buttons of his clothes, which would have disproved the rumor; but I did not find a single button, nor any article, save a string of leather, that had tied his hair." Mr. Buchanan had evidently arrived at the conclusion, that André had been stripped. In this conclusion he was perfectly right. He had also inferred, that this act had been done, with base motives. In this inference, he was perfectly wrong. "Those," continues he, "who permitted the outrage, or who knew of it, had no idea, that the unfeeling act they then performed would be blazoned to the world, near half a century, after the event." All this is entirely gratuitous and something worse. General Washington's head-quarters were near at hand. Every circumstance was sure to be reported, for the excitement was intense; and the knowledge of such an act, committed for any unworthy purpose, would have been instantly conveyed to Sir Henry Clin-

ton, and blazoned to the world, some forty years before the period of Mr. Buchanan's discovery.

Dr. James Thacher, in his military journal, states, that André was executed "in his royal regimentals, and buried in the same." Dr. Thacher was mistaken, and when he saw the letter of Mr. Buchanan, and the offensive imputation it contained, he investigated the subject anew, and addressed a letter to that gentleman, which was received by him, in a becoming spirit, and which entirely dissipated his former impressions. In that letter, Dr. Thacher stated, that he was within a few yards of André, at the time of his execution, and that he suffered in his regimentals. Supposing, as a matter of course, that André would be buried in them, Dr. Thacher had stated that, also, as a fact, though he did not remain, to witness the interment. He then refers to a letter, which he has discovered in the Continental Journal and Weekly Advertiser, of October 26, 1780, printed in Boston, by John Gill. This letter bears date, Tappan, October 2, the day of the execution, and details all the particulars, and in it are these words—"He was dressed in full uniform; and, after the execution, his servant demanded the uniform, which he received. His body was buried near the gallows." "This," says Dr. Thacher, "confirms the correctness of my assertion, that he suffered in his regimentals, but not that they were buried with the body. I had retired from the scene, before the body was placed in the coffin; but I have a perfect recollection of seeing him hand his hat to the weeping servant, while standing in the cart."

Mr. Buchanan observes, that an aged widow, who kept the toll-gate, on hearing the object stated, was so much gratified, that she suffered all carriages to pass free. "It marks strongly," he continues, "the sentiments of the American people at large, as to a transaction, which a great part of the British public have forgotten." This passage is susceptible of a twofold construction. It may mean, that this aged widow and the American people at large were unanimous, in lamenting the fate of Major André—that they most truly believed him to have been brave and unfortunate. It may also mean, that they considered the fate of André to have been unwarranted. Posterity has adjusted this matter very differently. Nearly sixty-eight years have passed. All excitement has long been buried, in a deeper grave than André's. A silent admission has gone forth, far and wide, of the perfect justice of André's execution. A board of general

officers was appointed, to prepare a statement of his case. Greene, Steuben, and Lafayette were of that board. They were perfectly unanimous in their opinion. Prodigious efforts were made on his behalf. He himself addressed several letters to Washington, and one, the day before his death, in which he says: "Sympathy towards a soldier will surely induce your excellency and a military tribunal to adapt the mode of my death to the feelings of a man of honor." The board of officers, as Gordon states, were induced to gratify this wish, with the exception of Greene. He contended, that the laws of war required, that a spy should be hung; the adoption of any less rigorous mode of punishment would excite the belief, that palliatory circumstances existed in the case of André, and that the decision might thereby be brought into question. His arguments were sound, and they prevailed.

Major André received every attention, which his condition permitted. He wrote to Sir Henry Clinton, Sept. 29, 1780, three days before his execution—"I receive the greatest attention from his excellency, General Washington, and from every person, under whose charge I happen to be placed." Captain Hale, like Major André, was young, brave, amiable, and accomplished. He entered upon the same perilous service, that conducted André to his melancholy fate. Hale was hanged, as a spy, at Long Island. Thank God, the brutal treatment he received was not retaliated upon André. "The provost martial," says Mr. Sparks, "was a refugee, to whose charge he was consigned, and treated him, in the most unfeeling manner, refusing the attendance of a clergyman, and the use of a bible; and destroying the letters he had written, to his mother and friends."

The execution of Major André was in perfect conformity with the laws of war. Had Sir Henry Clinton considered his fate unwarranted, under any just construction of those laws, he would undoubtedly have expressed that opinion, in the general orders, to the British army, announcing Major André's death. These orders, bearing date Oct. 8, 1780, refer only to his *unfortunate fate*. They contain not the slightest allusion to any supposed injustice, or unaccustomed severity, in the execution, or the manner of it.

The fate of André might have been averted, in two ways—by a steady resistance of Arnold's senseless importunity, to bring him within the American lines—and by a frank and immediate

presentation of Arnold's pass, when stopped by Paulding, Williams, and Van Wart. His loss of self-possession, at that critical moment, is remarkable, for, as Americans, they would, in all human probability, have suffered him to pass, without further examination; and, had they been of the opposite party, they would certainly have conducted him to some British post—the very haven where he would be.

No. XX.

How shall *we* deal with the dead? We have considered the usages of many nations, in different ages of the world. Some of these usages appear sufficiently revolting; especially such as relate to secondary burial, or the transfer of the dead, from their primary resting-places, to vast, miscellaneous receptacles. The desire is almost universal, that, when summoned to lie down in the grave, the dead may never be disturbed, by the hand of man—that our remains may return quietly to dust—unobserved by mortal eye. There is no part of this humiliating process, that is not painful and revolting to the beholder. Of this the ancients had the same impression. Cremation and embalming set corruption and the worm at defiance. Other motives, I am aware, have been assigned for the former. The execution of popular vengeance upon the poor remains of those, whose memory has become odious, during a revolution, is not uncommon. A ludicrous example of this occurred, when Santa Anna became unpopular, and the furious mob seized his leg, which had been amputated, embalmed, and deposited among the public treasures, and cooled their savage anger, by kicking the miserable member all over the city of Montezuma.

In the time of Sylla, cremation was not so common as interment; but Sylla, remembering the indignity he had offered to the body of Marius, enjoined, that his own body should be burnt. There was, doubtless, another motive for this practice among the ancients. The custom prevailed extensively, at one time, of burying the dead, in the cellars of houses. I have already referred to the Theban law, which required the construction of a suitable receptacle for the dead, in every house. Interment

certainly preceded cremation. Cicero De Legibus, lib. 2, asserts, that interment prevailed among the Athenians, in the time of Cecrops, their first king. In the earlier days of Rome, both were employed. Numa was *buried* in conformity with a special clause in his will. Remus, as Ovid, Fast. iv. 356, asserts, was *burnt*. The accumulation of dead bodies in cellars, or subcellars, must have become intolerable. This practice undoubtedly gave rise to the whole system of household gods, Lares, Lemures, Larvæ, and Manes. Such an accumulation of ancestors, it may well be supposed, left precious little room for the amphoræ of Chian, Lesbian, and Falernian.

Young aspirants sometimes inwardly opine, that their living ancestors take up too much room. Such was very naturally the opinion of the ancients, in relation to the dead. Like François Pontraci, they began to feel the necessity of condensation; and cremation came to be more commonly adopted. The bones of a human being, reduced to ashes, require but little room; and not much more, though the decomposition by fire be not quite perfect. Let me say to those, who think I prefer cremation, as a substitute for interment, that I do not. It has found little favor for many centuries. It seems to have been employed, in the case of Shelley, the poet. However desirable, when the remains of the dead were to be deposited in the dwelling-houses of the living, cremation and urn burial are quite unnecessary, wherever there is no want of ground for cemeteries, in proper locations. The funereal urns of the ancients were of different sizes and forms, and of materials, more or less costly, according to the ability and taste of the surviving friends. Ammianus Marcellinus relates, that Gumbrates, king of Chionia, near Persia, burnt the body of his son; and placed the ashes in a *silver* urn.

Mr. Wedgewood had the celebrated Portland vase in his possession, for a year, and made casts of it. This was the vase, which had been in possession of the Barberini family, for nearly two centuries, and for which the Duke of Portland gave Mr. Hamilton one thousand guineas. In the minds of very many, the idea of considerable size has been associated with this vase. Yet, in fact, it is about ten inches high, and six broad. The Wedgewood casts may be seen, in many of our glass and china shops. This vase was discovered, about the middle of the sixteenth century, two and a half miles from Rome, on the Frescati

road, in a marble sarcophagus, within a sepulchral chamber. This, doubtless, was a funereal urn. The urns, dug up, in Old Walsingham, in 1658, were quite similar, in form, to the Portland vase, excepting that they were without ears. Some fifty were found in a sandy soil, about three feet deep, a short distance from an old Roman garrison, and only five miles from Brancaster, the ancient Branodunum. Four of these vases are figured, in Browne's *Hydriotaphia*; some of them contained about two pounds of bones; several were of the capacity of a gallon, and some of half that size. It may seem surprising, that a human body can be reduced to such a compass. "How the bulk of a man should sink into so few pounds of bones and ashes may seem strange unto any, who consider not its constitution, and how slender a mass will remain upon an open and urging fire, of the carnal composition. Even bones themselves, reduced into ashes, do abate a notable proportion." Such are the words of good old Sir Thomas.

It was an adage of old, "He that lies in a golden urn, will find no quiet for his bones." If the costliness of the material offered no temptation to the avarice of man, still, after centuries have given them the stamp of antiquity, these urns and their contents become precious, in the eyes of the lovers of *vertu*. There is no security from impertinent meddling with our remains, so certain, as a speedy conversion into undistinguishable dust. Sir Thomas Browne manifestly inclined to cremation. "To be gnawed," says he, "out of our graves, to have our skulls made drinking bowls, and our bones turned into pipes, to delight and sport our enemies, are tragical abominations, escaped in burning burials." Such anticipations are certainly unpleasant. An ingenious device was adopted by Alaricus—he appointed the spot for his grave, and directed, that the course of a river should be so changed, as to flow over it.

It has been said, that certain soils possess a preserving quality. I am inclined to think the secret commonly lies, in some peculiar, constitutional quality, in the dead subject; for, wherever cases of remarkable preservation have occurred, corruption has been found generally to have done its full day's work, on all around. If such quality really exist in the soil, it is certainly undesirable. Those who were opposed to the evacuation of the Cemetery des Innocens, in the sixteenth century, attempted to set up in its favor the improbable pretension, that it consumed

bodies in nine days. Burton, in his description of Leicestershire, states, that the body of Thomas, Marquis of Dorset, "was found perfect, and nothing corrupted, the flesh not hardened, but in color, proportion and softness, like an ordinary corpse, newly to be interred," after seventy-eight years' burial.

A remarkable case of posthumous preservation occurred, in a village near Boston. The very exalted character of the professional gentleman, who examined the corpse, after it had been entombed, for forty years, gives the interest of authenticity to the statement. Justice Fuller, the father-in-law of that political victim, General William Hull, *who was neither a coward nor a traitor*, was buried in a family tomb, in Newton Centre. It was ascertained, and, from time to time, reported, that the body remained uncorrupted and entire. Mr. Fuller was about 80, when he died, and very corpulent. About forty years after his burial, Dr. John C. Warren, by permission of the family, with the physician of the village, and other gentlemen, examined the body of Mr. Fuller. The coffin was somewhat decomposed. So were the burial clothes. The body presented, everywhere, a natural skin, excepting on one leg, on which there had been an ulcer. There decomposition had taken place. The skin was generally of a dark brown color, and hard like dried leather; and so well preserved, about the face, that persons, present with Dr. Warren, said they should have recognized the features of Justice Fuller. My business lies not with the physiology, however curious the speculation may be. Were it possible, by any means, to perpetuate the dead, in a similar manner, it would be wholly undesirable. Dust we are, and unto dust must we return. The question is still before us,—How shall we deal with the dead?

No. XXI.

It is commonly supposed, that the burial of articles of value with the dead, is a practice confined to the Indian tribes, and the inhabitants of unenlightened regions; who fancied, that the defunct were gone upon some far journey, during which such accompaniments would be useful. Such is not the fact. Chilperic, the fourth king of France, came to the throne A. D. 456.

In 1655 the tomb of Chilperic was accidentally discovered, in Tournay, "restoring unto the world," saith Sir Thomas Browne, vol. 3, p. 466, "much gold adorning his sword, two hundred rubies, many hundred imperial coins, three hundred golden bees, the bones and horse-shoes of his horse, interred with him, according to the barbarous magnificence of those days, in their sepulchral obsequies." Stow relates, in his survey of London, that, in many of the funeral urns, found in Spitalfields, there were, mingled with the relics, coins of Claudius, Vespasian, Commodus, and Antoninus, with lachrymatories, lamps, bottles of liquor, &c.

As an old sexton, I have a right to give my advice ; and the public have a right to reject it. If I were the owner of a lot, in some well-governed cemetery, I would place around it a neat, substantial, iron fence, and paint it black. In the centre I would have a simple monument, of white marble, and of liberal dimensions ; not pyramidal, but with four rectangular faces, to receive a goodly number of memoranda, not one of which should exceed a single line. I would have no other monument, slab, or tablet, to indicate particular graves. I would have a plan of this lot, and preserve it, as carefully, as I preserved my title papers. Probably I should keep a duplicate, in some safe place. When a body came to be buried, in that lot, I would indicate the precise location, on my plan, and engrave the name and the date of birth, and death, and nothing more, upon the monument. If the dryness and elevation of the soil allowed, I would dig the graves so deep, that the remains of three persons could repose in one grave, the uppermost, five or six feet below the surface. After the burial of the first, the grave would be filled up, and an even, sodded surface presented, as before, until re-opened. Thus, of course, those, who had been lovely and pleasant, in their lives, like Jonathan and Saul, would, in death, be not divided. This, so far from being objectionable, is a delightful idea, embalmed in the classical precedents of antiquity. It is a well-known fact, that urns of a very large size were, occasionally, in use, in Greece and Rome, for the reception and commingling of the ashes of whole families. The ashes of Achilles were mingled with those of his friend, Patroclus. The ashes of Domitian, the last, and almost the worst, of the twelve Cæsars, were inurned, as Suetonius reports, ch. 17, with those of Julia.

With the Chinese, it is very common to bury a comb, a pair

of scissors to pare the nails, and four little purses, containing the nail parings of the defunct. Jewels and coins of gold are sometimes inserted in the mouths of the wealthy. This resembles the practice of the Greeks and Romans, of placing an obolus, Charon's fee, in the mouth of the deceased. This arrangement, in regard to the nail parings, seems well enough, as they are clearly part and parcel, of the defunct. Rings, coins, and costly chalices have been found, with the ashes of the dead.

Avarice, curiosity, and revenge, personal or political, have prompted mankind, in every age, to desecrate the receptacles of the dead. The latter motive has operated more fiercely, upon the people of France, than upon almost any other. No nation has ever surpassed them, in that intense ardor, nor in the parade and magnificence, with which they *canonize*—no people upon earth can rival the bitterness and fury, with which they *curse*. Lamartine, in his history of the Girondists, states, that “dragoons of the Republic spread themselves over the public places, brandishing their swords, and singing national airs. Thence they went to the church of Val de Grace, where, enclosed in silver urns, were the hearts of several kings and queens of France. These funeral vases they broke, trampling under foot those relics of royalty, and then flung them into the common sewer.” And how shall *we* deal with the dead?

With a reasonable economy of space, a lot of the common area, at Mount Auburn, or Forest Hills, will suffice, for the occasion of a family of ordinary size, for several generations. In re-opening one of these graves, for a second or third interment, the operative should never approach nearer than one foot to the coffin beneath. The careless manner, in which bones are sometimes spaded up, by grave-diggers, results from their want of precise knowledge of previous inhumations. Common sense indicates the propriety of keeping a regular, topographical account of every interment.

But it is quite time to bring these lucubrations to a close. To some they may have proved interesting, and, doubtless, wearisome to others. The account is therefore balanced. Most heartily do I wish for every one of my readers a decent funeral, and a peaceful grave. I have tolled my last knell, turned down my last sod, and am no longer a Sexton of the Old School.

No. XXII.

SOME commendatory passages, in your own and other journals, my dear Mr. Transcript, seem very much to me like a theatrical *encore*—they half persuade me to reappear. There are other considerations, which I cannot resist. Twenty devils, saith the Spanish proverb, employ that man, who employeth not himself. I am quite sensible of my error, in quitting an old vocation prematurely. You have no conception of the severe depression of spirits, produced in the mind of an old sexton, who, in an evil hour, has cast his spade aside, and set up for a man of leisure. It may answer for a short time—a very short time. I can honestly declare, that I have led a wearisome life, since I gave up undertaking. Many have been the expedients I have adopted, to relieve the oppressive tedium of my miserable days. The funeral bell has aroused me, as the trumpet rouses an old war horse. How many processions I have followed, as an amateur! One or two young men of the craft have been exceedingly kind to me, and have given me notice, whenever they have been employed upon a new grave, and have permitted me to amuse myself, by performing a portion of the work.

My own condition, since I left off business, and tried the terrible experiment of living on my income, and doing nothing, has frequently and forcibly reminded me of a similar passage, in the history of my excellent old friend, Simon Allwick, the tallow-chandler, with whom I had the happiness of living, in the closest intimacy, and whom I had the pleasure of burying, about twenty years ago.

Mr. Allwick was a thrifty man; and, having acquired a handsome property, his ambitious partner persuaded him to abandon his greasy occupation, and set up for a gentleman. This was by no means, the work of a day. Mr. Allwick loved his wife—she was an affectionate creature; and, next to the small matter of having her own way in everything, she certainly loved Allwick, as her prime minister, in bringing that matter about. She was what is commonly called a devoted wife. Man is, marvellously, the creature of habit. So completely had Allwick become that creature, that, when his partner, upon the occasion of an excursion, as far as Jamaica Pond, for which Allwick literally tore himself away from the chandlery, could not restrain her admi-

ration of that pretty, pet lake, he candidly confessed, that he felt nothing of the sort. And, when Mrs. Allwick exclaimed, with uplifted hands and tears in her eyes, that, in a cottage, on the borders of such a lake, she should be the happiest of the happy—"So should I, my dear," said her husband, with a sigh, so heavily drawn, that it seemed four to the pound—"so should I, my dear, if the lake were a vat of clear melted tallow, and I had a plenty of sticks and wicks."

Suffice it to say, Mrs. Allwick had set her heart upon the measure. She had a confidential friend or two, to whom she had communicated the *projét*: her pride had therefore become enlisted; for she had given them to understand, that she meant to have her own way. She commenced an uncompromising crusade, against grease, in every form. She complained, that grease spots were upon everything. She engaged the services of a young physician, who gave it, as his deliberate opinion, that Mr. Allwick's headaches arose from the deleterious influence of the fumes of hot grease, acting through the olfactory nerves, upon the pineal gland.

He even expressed a fear, that insanity might supervene, and he furnished an account of an eminent tallow-chandler in London, who went raving mad, and leaping into his own vat of boiling grease, was drawn out, no better than a great candle. It was a perfect *coup de grace*, when Mrs. Allwick drove candles from her dwelling, and substituted oil. The chandlery adjoined their residence, in Scrap Court; and it must be admitted, that, with the wind at south, the odor was not particularly savory. Mrs. Allwick was what the world would style a smart woman, and she was in the habit of calling her husband a very *wicked* man and their mansion the most unclassical villa, though in the very midst of *grease*!

It is quite superfluous to say, the point was finally carried—the chandlery was sold—a country house was purchased, not on the lake, but in a sweet spot. There was some little embarrassment about the name, but two wild gooseberry bushes having been discovered, within half a mile, it was resolved, in council, to call it Mount Gooseberry. Since the going forth of Adam from Eden, in misery and shame, never was there such an exodus, as that of poor Allwick from the chandlery. I have not time to describe it. I am glad I have not. It was too much. Even Mrs. Allwick began to doubt the perfect wisdom of her

plan. But the die was cast. On they went to their El Dorado. It was a pleasant spot. It was "a bonnie day in June." The birds were in ecstasies—so was Mrs. Allwick—so were the children—the sun shone—the stream ran beautifully by—the leaves still glistened in the morning dew—there was a sprinkling of lambs on the hills—old Cato was at the door, to welcome them, and Carlo most affectionately covered the white frocks of the children with mud. "Was there ever anything like this?" exclaimed the delighted wife. "Isn't it a perfect pink, papa?" cried the children. In answer to all this, the *jecur ulcerosum* of poor Allwick sent forth a deep groan, that shook the very walls of his tabernacle.

The mind of man is a mill, and will grind chaff if nothing more substantial be supplied; and, peradventure, the upper will grind the nether millstone to destruction. For a brief space, Mr. Allwick found employment. Fences were to be completed—trees and bushes were to be set out—the furniture was to be arranged—but all this was soon over, and there was my good old friend, Simon Allwick, the busiest man alive, with nothing to do! Never was there a heart, in the bosom of a tallow-chandler, so perfectly "untravelled." Poor fellow, he went "up stairs and down stairs, and in my lady's chamber," but all to no other purpose, than to confirm him, in a sentiment of profound respect, for that homely proverb, *it is hard for an old dog to learn new tricks*.

"Where is your father?" said Mrs. Allwick to the children, after breakfast, one awful hot morning, near the end of June. The children went in pursuit—there he was—he had sought to occupy his thoughts, by watching the gambols of some half a dozen Byfield cokies—there he was—he had rested his arms upon the rail of the fence, and had been looking into the sty—his chin had dropped upon his hands—he had fallen asleep! He was mortified and nettled, at being found thus, and continued in a moody condition, through the day. On the following morning, he went to the city, and remained till night. His spirits were greatly improved, on his return; and to some felicitations from his wife and family, he replied—"My dear, I feel better, certainly; and I have made an arrangement, which, I think, will enable me to get along pretty comfortably—I have seen Mr. Smith, to whom I sold the chandlery, and have extended the term of payment. He still dips on Mondays, Wednesdays, and

Fridays, and has agreed to set a kettle of fat and some sticks for me, in the little closet, near the back door, that I may slip in, and amuse myself, on dipping days."

I ought to have been warned, by this example; but I had quite forgotten it. It is very agreeable to be thus welcomed back to the performance of my former duties. No one, but he, who is deprived of some long-cherished occupation, can truly comprehend the pleasure of occasionally handling a corpse.

No. XXIII.

Few things can be imagined, more thoroughly revolting and absurd, than the vengeance of the living, rioting among the ashes of the dead—rudely rolling the stone away from the door of the sepulchre—entering the narrow houses of the unresisting, *vi et armis*, with the pickaxe and the crowbar—and scattering to the winds the poor senseless remains of those, who were consigned to their resting-places, with all the honors of a former age. This, were it not awful, would be eminently ridiculous. For the execution of such posthumous revenge the French nation has the precedence of every other, civilized and savage. Frenchmen, if not, through all time, from the days of Pharamond to the present, remarkably zealous of good works, are clearly a peculiar people.

The history of the world furnishes no parallel to that preposterous crusade, carried on by that people, in 1794, against the dead bodies of kings and princes, saints and martyrs. This war, upon dead men's bones, was not projected and executed, by the rabble, on the impulse of the moment. A formal, deliberate decree of the Convention commanded, that the tombs should be destroyed, and they were destroyed, and their contents scattered to the winds, accordingly. Talk not of all that is furious and fantastical, in the conduct of monkeys and maniacs—a nation of chimpanzees would have acted with more dignity and discretion. A colony of grinning baboons, as Shakspeare calls them, bent upon liberty, equality, and fraternity, might have dethroned some tyrannical ourang outang, who had carried matters with too high a hand, and extorted too many cocoa nuts, for the support

of his civil list; but, after having cut off his head, it is not to be believed, that they would have gone about, scratching up the ashes of his ancestors, and wreaking their vengeance upon those unoffending relics.

This miserable onslaught upon the dead began, immediately after December 20, 1794. The new worship commenced on that day, and the goddess of reason then, for the first time, presented herself to the people, in the person of the celebrated actress, Mademoiselle Maillard. St. Genevieve, the patroness of the city of Paris, died in 512, and her remains were subsequently transferred to the church, which bears her name, and which was erected, by Clovis, in 517. The executive agents of the National Convention commenced their legalized fooleries, upon the ashes of this poor old saint. These French gentlemen—the politest nation upon earth—without the slightest regard for decency, or sanctification, or common sense, dug up Madame Genevieve's coffin, and, to aggravate the indignity, dragged the old lady's remains to the place of public execution, the *Place de Grève*; and, having burnt them there, scattered the ashes to the winds. The gates of bronze, presented by Charlemagne to the church of St. Denis, were broken to pieces. Pepin, the sire of Charlemagne and son of Charles Martel, was buried there, in 768. Nothing remained of Pepin but a handful of dust, which was served in a similar manner. It is stated by Lamartine, that the heads of Marshal Turenne, Duguesclin, Louis XII., and Francis I., were rolled about the pavement; sceptres, crowns, and crosiers were trampled under foot; and the shouts of the operatives were heard, when the blows of the axe broke through some regal coffin, and the royal bones were thrown out, to be treated with senseless insult.

Hugh Capet, Philip the bold, and Philip, the handsome, were buried beneath the choir. The ruthless hands of these modern vandals tore from the corpses those garments of the grave, in which they had reposed for centuries, and threw the relics upon beds of quicklime.

Henry IV. fell by the hands of Ravailiac, the assassin, May 14, 1610. His body, was carefully embalmed, by Italians. When taken from the coffin, the lineaments of the face fully corresponded with the numerous representations, transmitted by the hands of painters and statuaries. That cherished and perfumed beard expanded, as if it had just then received the last

manipulation of the friseur. The marks were perfectly visible, upon the breast, indicating the first and second thrust of Ravail-lac's stiletto. The popularity of this monarch protected his remains, though for a brief space. He was frank, brave, and humane. For two days, all that remained of this idol of the people—was exhibited to public view.

The exhumed king was placed at the foot of the altar, and a countless multitude passed, in mute procession, around these favored relics. This gave umbrage to Javogues, a member of the Convention. He denounced this partiality, and railed against the memory of Henri le Grand. The multitude, impressible by the slightest impulse, hurled the dead monarch into the common fosse of quicklime and corruption; execrating, under the influence of a few feverish words, from the lips of a republican savage, the memory and the remains of one, cherished by their predecessors, for nearly three hundred years. A similar fate awaited his son and grandson, Louis XIII. and XIV. The vault of the Bourbons was thoroughly ransacked, in the same spirit of desolation. Queens, dauphinesses, and princesses, says the historian of the Girondists, were carried away, in armsful, by the laborers, to be cast into the trench, and consumed by quicklime. In the vault of Charles V., surnamed the wise, besides the corpse were found, a hand of justice and a golden crown. In the coffin of his wife, Jeanne of Bourbon, were her spindles and marriage rings. These relics were thrown into the ditch—the corpses—not the articles of gold, however debased by their juxtaposition. Of the French gentlemen it may be affirmed, as of Madame Gilpin—

*"Though on pleasure she was bent,
She had a frugal mind."*

An economy, perfectly grotesque, mingled with an unmanly desecration. Even the lead was scraped together from these coffins, and converted into balls. In the vault of the Valois no bodies were discovered. The people were very desirous of showing some tokens of their wrath, upon the poor carcass of Louis XI., but it could not be found. Abbés, heroes, ministers of state were indiscriminately cast into the fosse. Upon the exhumation of Dagobert I., and his queen, Matilde, who had been buried twelve hundred years, her skeleton was found without a head. Such is said to have been the case with several other skeletons of the queens of France.

In one of the upper lofts of the cabinet of Natural History of the Jardin des Plantes, among stuffed beasts and birds, surrounded by mixed and manifold rubbish, and covered with dust, there lay a case or package, unexamined and unnoticed, for nine long years. This envelope contained the mortal remains of a Marechal of France, the hero of an hundred battles,—of no other than Henry de la Tour, Viscount de Turenne. He was killed by a cannon ball, July 27, 1675, at the age of 64. All France lamented the death of this great man. The admiration of all Europe followed him to the grave. Courage, modesty, generosity, science have embalmed his memory. The king, Louis le Grand, ordered a solemn service to be performed, for the Marechal de Turenne, in the Cathedral church at Paris, as for the first prince of the blood, and that his remains should be interred in the abbey of St. Denis, the burial-place of the royal personages of France, where the cardinal, his nephew, raised a splendid mausoleum to his memory. So much for glory—and what then? In 1794, the remains of this great man were upon the point of being cast into the common fosse, by the agents of the Convention, when some, less rabid than the rest, smuggled them away; and, for security, conveyed them to the lumber room of the cabinet of Natural History of the Jardin des Plantes. Having reposed, nine years in state, peradventure between a dilapidated kangaroo and a cast-off opossum—these remains of the great Turenne were, at length, committed, in a quiet way, to the military tomb of the Invalids.

No. XXIV.

BURNING dead saints, is a more pardonable matter, than burning living martyrs—the combustion of St. Genevieve's dry bones, than the fiery trial of Latimer and Ridley—the fantastical decree of the French Convention, than the cruel discipline of bloody Mary. Dark days were they, and full of evil, those years of bitterness and blood, from 1553 to Nov. 17, 1558, when, by a strange coincidence, this hybrid queen, whose sire was a British tyrant, and whose dam a Spanish bigot, expired on the same day with the Cardinal, Reginald Pole. From the

remarkable proximity of the events arose a suspicion of poison, of which the public mind has long since been disabused.

In this age of greater intelligence and religious freedom, the outrages, perpetrated, in the very city of London, within five brief years, are credible, only on the strength of well authenticated history. According to Bishop Burnet, two hundred and eighty-four persons were burnt at the stake, during four years of this merciless and miserable reign. Lord Burleigh makes the number of those, who died, in that reign, by imprisonment, torments, famine, and fire, to be near four hundred. Weever, in his *Funeral Monuments*, page 116, quotes the historian Speed, as saying, "In the heat of those flames, were burnt to ashes five bishops, one-and-twenty divines, eight gentlemen, eighty-four artificers, an hundred husbandmen, servants, and laborers, twenty-six wives, twenty widows, nine virgins, two boys, and two infants; one of them whipped to death by Bonner, and the other, springing out of the mother's womb from the stake, as she burned, thrown again into the fire." Here, in passing, suffer me to express my deep reverence for John Weever. I know of no book, so interesting to the craft, as his *Funeral Monuments*, a work of infinite labor and research. Weever died in 1632, and lies in St. James, Clerkenwell. His epitaph may be found in Strype's *Survey* :

Lancashire gave me birth,
And Cambridge education;
Middlesex gave me death,
And this church my humation;
And Christ to me hath given
A place with him in heaven.

The structure of these lines will remind the classical reader of Virgil's epitaph :

*Mantua me genuit : Calabri rapuere ; tenet nunc
Parthenope ; cecini pascua, rura, ducea.*

The short and sharp reign of Mary Tudor was remarkable for burning Protestant Christians and wax candles. That fountain of fun, pure and undefiled, that prince of wags, Theodore Hook, was offered, very young, for admission at the University; and, when the chancellor opened the book, and gravely inquired if he was ready to sign the thirty-nine articles, "Yes, sir," replied the young puppy, "forty, if you please." Now, in contemplation of the enormous consumption of wax, especially

upon the occasion of funeral obsequies, during Mary's reign, it would seem that a belief, in its vital importance, might have formed an additional article, in the Romish creed.

I have never thought well of grafting religion upon the selfishness of man's nature. Nominal converts, it is true, are readily made, in that way. In Catholic countries, wax chandlers are Romanists, to a man. I always considered the attempt, a few years since, to convert the inhabitants of Nantucket to Puseyism, by a practical appeal to their self interest, however ingeniously contrived, a very wicked thing. And I greatly lauded the good old bishop of this diocese, for rebuking those very silly priests, who promoted a senseless and extravagant consumption of one of the great staples of that island, by burning candles in the day time. He made good use of his mitre as an extinguisher.

On a somewhat similar principle, I have always objected to every attempt to augment the revenues of a state by taxing corpses—not upon the acknowledged principle, that taxation without representation is inadmissible—but because the whole system is a most miserable mingling of *sacra profanis*. I may not be understood by all, in this remark: I refer to those acts of Parliament, which, for the purposes of levying a tax, or promoting some particular branch of industry, have attempted to regulate a man's apparel, and the fitting up of his narrow house, after he is dead. The compulsory employment of flannel, by British statute, is an example of this legislative interference.

Nothing is more common, in Strype's Ecclesiastical Memorials, than entries, such as these: "1557, May 3. The Lord Shandois was buried with heralds, an herse of wax, four banners of images, and other appendages of funeral honor." "On the 5th, the Lady Chamberlain was buried with a fair herse of wax." "May 28, in the forenoon, was buried Mrs. Gates, widow, late wife, as it seems, to Sir John Gates, executed the first year of this queen's reign. She gave seventeen fine black gowns, and fourteen of broad russet for poor men. There were carried two white branches, ten staff torches, and four great tapers." "July 10th the Lady Tresham was buried at Peterborough, with four banners, and an herse of wax, and torches." "1558, September 14th, was buried Sir Andrew Judd, skinner, merchant of Muscovy, and late Mayor of Lon-

don, with ten dozen of escutcheons, garnished with angels, and an herse of wax." What is an herse of wax? This will be quite unintelligible to those, who have supposed that word to import nothing else than the vehicle, in which the dead are carried to the grave. Herse also signifies a temporary monument, erected upon, or near, the place of sepulture, and on which the corpse was laid, for a time, in state; and a herse of wax was a structure of this kind, surrounded with wax tapers. This will be made manifest, by some additional extracts from the same author: "1557. The 16th day of July, died the lady Anne, of Cleves, at Chelsey, sometime wife and queen unto King Henry VIII., but never crowned. Her corpse was cered the night following." "On the 29th began the herse at Westminster, for the Lady Anne of Cleves, consisting of carpenters' work of seven principals, being as goodly an herse as had been seen." "On the 3d of August the body of the Lady Anne of Cleves was brought from Chelsey, where her house was, unto Westminster, to be buried—men bore her, under a canopy of black velvet, with four black staves, and so brought her into the herse, and there tarried *Dirge*, remaining there all night, with lights burning." "On the 16th day of August the herse of the King of Denmark was begun to be set up, in a four-square house. August 18, was the King of Denmark's herse in St. Paul's finished with wax, the like to which was never seen in England, in regard to the fashion of square tapers." And on the 23d, also was the King of Denmark's herse, at St. Paul's, "taken down by the wax chandlers and carpenters, to whom this work pertained, by order of Mr. Garter, and certain of the Lord Treasurer's servants." These hersees were, doubtless, very attractive in their way. "Aug. 31, 1557. The young Dutchess of Norfolk being lately deceased, her herse began to be set up on the 28th, in St. Clements, without Temple bar, and was this day finished with banners, pensils, wax, and escutcheons."

The office of an undertaker, in those days, was no sinecure. He was an *arbiter elegantiarum*. A funeral was a festival then. Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you die, was the common phylactery.

"The funeral baked meats
Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables."

Baked meats shall be the subject of my next.

No. XXV.

PLINY, xviii. 30, refers to a practice among the Romans, very similar to that, in use among certain unenlightened nations, of depositing articles of diet upon tombs and graves, such as beans, lettuces, eggs, bread, and the like, for the use of ghosts. The stomachs of Roman ghosts were not supposed to be strong enough for flesh meat. Hence the lines of Juvenal, v. 85 :

Sed tibi dimidio constrictus cammarus ovo
 Ponitur, exigua feralis cœna patella.

The *silicernium* or *cœna funebris* was a very different, and more solid affair. At first blush—to use a common and sensible expression—there seems no respectable keeping, between the art of burying the dead, and that of feasting the living. Depositing those, whom we love, in their graves, is certainly the very last relish for an appetite. Something of this was undoubtedly done, of old, under the promptings of Epicurean philosophy—upon the *dum vivimus vivamus* principle—and, in that spirit which teaches the soldier, when he turns from the grave, to change the mournful, for the merry strain. The desire of equalling or excelling others, in the magnificence of funereal parade, has ever been a powerful motive. The eyes of others destroy us, said Franklin, and not our own. Grief for the departed, and sympathy with the bereaved, were not deemed sufficient, to insure an imposing parade. Games and festivals were therefore provided, for the people. Among other attractions, masses of uncooked meat were bestowed upon all comers. This was the *visceratio* of the Romans. This word seems to have a different import; *viscera*, however, signifies all beneath the skin, as may be seen by consulting Serv. in Virg., *Æn.* i., 211. Suetonius *Cæs.* 39, and Cicero *de Officiis* ii. 16, refer to this practice. It was by no means very common, but frequently adopted by those, who could afford the expense, and were desirous of the display.

Marcus Flavius had committed an infamous crime. He was popular, and the ædiles of the people had fixed a day for his absolution. Under pretence of celebrating his mother's funeral, he gave a *visceratio* to the people: *Populo visceratio data, a M. Flavio, in funere matris. Erant, qui, per speciem honorandæ parentis, meritam mercedem populo solutam interpreta-*

rentur; quod eum, die dicta ab ædilibus, crimine stupratæ matris familiæ absolvisset. Liv. viii. 22. A note upon this passage, in Lemaire's edition, fully explains the nature of this practice.

This was a very different affair from the *silicernum*, or feast for the friends, after the funeral. Upon such occasions, the Falernian flowed, and boars were roasted whole. The reader, by opening his Livy, xxxix. 46, will find an account of the funeral of P. Licinius: a *visceratio* was given to the people; one hundred and twenty gladiators fought in the arena; the funeral games lasted three days; and then followed a splendid entertainment. On that occasion, a tempest drove the company into the forum; this occurred, in the year U. C. 569. Through all time, the practice has prevailed, more or less, of providing entertainments, for those, who gather on such occasions. In villages, especially, and within my own recollection, the funeral has been delayed, to enable distant friends to arrive in season; and the interval has been employed, in the preparation of creature comforts, not only for such as attended, and observed the ceremonial of an hour, but for such, as came to the bereaved, like the comforters of the man of Uz, "every one from his place, and sat down with him, seven days and seven nights." Animal provision must surely be required, to sustain such protracted lamentation.

In the age, when Shakspeare wrote, and for several ages before and after, "baked meats," at funerals, were very common. So far, from contenting themselves with the preparation of some simple aliment, for such as were an hungered, the appetites of all were solicited, by a parade of the rarest liquors and the choicest viands. Tables were spread, in the most ample manner, and the transition was immediate from the tomb to the festal board. The *requiescat in pace* was scarcely uttered, before the blessing was craved, on the baked meats. It matters little, from what period of history we select our illustrations of this truth. Suppose we take our examples from the reign, preceding that, in which Shakspeare was born; comprehend some other incidents in our collection; and rely, for our authority, on good old John Strype, who was himself born in 1643. There is no higher authority. I will present a few specimens from his Ecclesiastical Memorials: "1557, May 5. Was the Lady Chamberlain buried. At the mass preached Dr. Chadsey. A great dole of money given at the church, and after, a great din-

ner. May 29, was buried Mrs. Gates; after mass a great dinner. June 7, began a stage play at the Grey Friars of the passion of Christ. June 10.—This day Sir John, a chantry priest, hung himself with his own girdle. The same day was the storehouse in Portsmouth burnt, much beer and victual destroyed. A judgment, perhaps, for burning so many innocent persons. June 29.—This same day was the second year's mind (i. e. yearly *obit*) of good master Lewyn, ironmonger; at his dirge were all the livery. After, they retired to the widow's place, where they had a cake and wine; and besides the parish, all comers treated." Aug. 3.—After giving a long account of the funeral of Ann of Cleves, Strype adds, "and so they went in order to dinner." After reciting the particulars of the King of Denmark's funeral, in London, Aug. 18, 1557, he adds: "After the dirge, all the heralds and all the Lords went into the Bishop of London's place, and drank. The next day was the morrow-mass, and a goodly sermon preached, and after, to my Lord of London's to dinner."

The account of the funeral of Thomas Halley is entitled to be presented entire: "On the 24th of this month, August, Mr. Thomas Halley, clarentieux, king-at-arms, was buried, in St. Giles's parish, without Cripplegate, with coat, armor, and pennon of arms, and scutcheons of his arms, and two white branches, twelve staff torches, and four great tapers, and a crown. And, after dirge, the heralds repaired unto Greenhill, the waxchandler, a man of note (being waxchandler to Cardinal Pole) living hard by; where they had spice-bread and cheese, and wine, great plenty. The morrow-mass was also celebrated, and sermon preached; and after followed a great dinner, whereat were all the heralds, together with the parishioners. There was a supper also, as well as a dinner." After a long account of the funeral of the Countess of Arundel, Oct. 5, 1557, follow the customary words—"and, after, all departed to my Lord's place to dinner." "Nov. 12, Mr. Maynard, merchant, was buried; and after, the company departed to his house, at Poplar, to a great dinner." "Oct. 19, died the Lord Bray; and so he went by water to Chelsea to be buried, &c. &c. Many priests and clerks attended. They all came back to this Lord's place, at Blackfriars, to dinner." At the funeral of Richard Capet, Feb. 1, "All return to dinner." "On the 16th, Mr. Pynohe, fishmonger, and a brother of Jesus, was buried. All being performed at the

church, the company retired to his house to drink." On the 24th, "a great dinner," after the funeral of Sir George Bowers. This testimony is inexhaustible. After the funeral of Lady White, March 2, Strype says "there was as great a dinner as had been seen." I will close with two examples. "Aug. 3, 1588. The Lady Rowlet was buried; and after mass, the company retreated to the place to dinner, which was plentifully furnished with venison, fresh salmon, fresh sturgeon, and many other fine dishes. On the 12th, died Mr. Machyl, alderman and clothesworker." After a sermon by a grey friar, "the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, and all the mourners and ladies went to dinner, which was very splendid, lacking no good meat, both flesh and fish, and an hundred marchpanes."

It is certain, that all this appears to us now to have been in very bad taste; and it is not easy to comprehend the principle, which conducted to the perpetration of such sensual absurdities; unless we suppose it to have been the design of all concerned, to felicitate the heir, upon his coming to possession; the widow, upon the fruition of an ample dower and abundant leisure; or the widower, upon the recovery of his liberty. This is not the only occasion, upon which man's features are required, from the extreme suddenness of the change, to undergo a process of moral distortion, amounting to grimace. Thus, grief, for the death of one monarch, is rudely expressed, by turbulent joy at the succession of another. Suffer me to conclude, in the words of father Strype—"The same day queen Mary deceased, in the morning between 11 and 12, the Lady Elizabeth was proclaimed queen: in the afternoon all the churches in London rang their bells; and at night were bonfires made, and tables set in the streets, and the people did eat, and drink, and make merry."

No. XXVI.

Among the dead—the mighty dead—there is one, in regard to whom, our national dealings may be fairly set forth, in the words of Desdemona—

In faith, 'twas strange, 'twas passing strange;
'Twas pitiful, 'twas wondrous pitiful:
She wish'd she had not heard it.

Forty-nine years have passed, since the interment of George Washington. Forty-nine years ago, "the joint committee," says Chief Justice Marshall, "which had been appointed to devise the mode, by which the nation should express its feelings, on this melancholy occasion, reported" a series of resolutions, among which was the following: "That a marble monument be erected, by the United States, at the city of Washington, and that the family of General Washington be requested to permit his body to be deposited under it; and that the monument be so designed, as to commemorate the great events of his military and political life." To the letter, transmitting the resolutions to Mrs. Washington, she replied, as follows: "Taught by the great example, which I have so long had before me, never to oppose my private wishes to the public will, I must consent to the request made by Congress, which you have had the goodness to transmit to me; and, in doing this, I need not, I cannot, say what a sacrifice of individual feeling I make, to a sense of public duty."

All this is very fine. The nation requested permission to remove the remains—Mrs. Washington consented—but that monument! The remains have slumbered quietly, where they first were interred, for nine and forty years—and the monument is like Rachel's first born—it is not! There is something better in prospect. Such, however, is the record thus far. It is very true he needs no monument. No immortal can say more justly, from his elevated sphere, to every inhabitant of this vast empire, *si monumentum quæris, circumspice!*

This fact, however, so far from taking the tithe of a hair from the balance of this account, illustrates the national delinquency. It may be matter of amusing speculation, to contrast the zeal, which prevails, especially in England, in relation to the most trifling memorials of Shakspeare, and the popular indifference, in regard to certain relics, known to have been the property of Washington, and to have been personally used by him.

All are familiar with the recent excitement, on the subject of Shakspeare's house—that mulberry tree—a hair of him, for memory.

Washington's library has lately been sold, for just about the price of four shares in one of the cotton mills at Lowell. A few years since, the cabinet of medals, struck at different times, in

honor of the Father of his country, and which had become the property of one of his representatives, was sold by him, for five hundred dollars, and purchased by an individual citizen of Massachusetts. There are some things, seemingly so vast—so very—very national—that one can scarcely believe it possible for any private cabinet to contain them gracefully.

Soon after the destruction of the Bastile, July 14, 1789, La Fayette sent its massive key to Washington—his political father—as the first fruits of those principles of liberty, which were then supposed to be bourgeoining forth, in a *free* French soil. This colossal key was suspended, in the front entry, at Mount Vernon. A short time ago, an aged friend, residing in a neighboring town, and once intimate in the family of Washington, told me he had often seen that famous key, in its well known position. This also became the property of Washington's representatives. A few years since, I saw it stated, in the public journals, that, among other effects, this key of the Bastile was sold at auction, and purchased for seventy-five cents, by a gentleman, who had the good taste to return it to some member of the family.

Eminent men, as they arise, are occasionally compared to Washington. Points of resemblance, now and then, may assuredly be found; but there never breathed a man, whose mental and moral properties combined, could endure a rigid comparison with his. Whoever attempts to run this parallel, between him and any other, will readily acknowledge the truth of the proverb, *nullum simile quatuor pedibus currit*. Select the example from the present, or the past, from our own or from other lands, and inquire, to which of them all would Erskine, so chary of his praise, so slow of faith in his fellow, have applied those memorable words, inscribed, in the presentation copy of his work, transmitted to Washington—*You, sir, are the only individual, for whom I ever felt an awful reverence*. Of whom else would Lord Brougham have pronounced this remarkable passage—"It will be the duty of the historian and the sage, in all ages, to omit no occasion of commemorating this illustrious man; and, until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress, which our race has made in wisdom and virtue, be derived, from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington."

I have not yet met with any gentleman of our calling, who is not decidedly in favor of the election of General Taylor, or who would not gratuitously attend, in a professional way, upon

Messieurs Cass and Van Buren. We perceive a resemblance between the first president and the present candidate, in their willingness to draw long bills on posterity for fame, in preference to numerous drafts, at sight, without grace, for daily applause. But we behold, in Washington, the image and superscription, not of Cæsar, but of a peerless mortal—of one, created, verily, a little lower than the angels—

"A combination, and a form, indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal,
To give the world assurance of a man."

No men have done more to bedim the reputation of Washington, than Jefferson and Randolph. Verily they have their reward. In no portion of our country has the memory of that great man been more universally cherished and beloved, than in New England. A sentiment, not only of reverence for his character, but of affection for his person, was very general, in this quarter; and manifested itself, in a remarkable manner, upon the occasion of his death. Nothing could have been more unexpected, than the announcement of that event, in Boston. I will close this article, with a simple illustration of the popular feeling, when the sad tidings arrived. At the close of that year, 1799—I was a small boy then—I was returning from a ride on horseback, to Dorchester Point—there was no bridge, and it was quite a journey. As I approached the town, I was very much surprised, at the tolling of the bells. Upon reaching home, I saw my old father, at an unusual hour for him, the busiest man alive, to be at home, sitting alone in our parlor, with his bandanna before his eyes. I ran towards him, with the thoughtless gayety of youth, and asked what the bells were tolling for. He withdrew the handkerchief from his face—the tears were rolling down his fine old features—"Go away child," said he, "don't disturb me; do you not know, that Washington is dead?"

The reader has surmised, that the worthy old man had sipped at the fountain of executive patronage. Not at all. He had never seen Washington, and never held an office civil or military, saving under Hancock's commission, as justice of the peace, which was accounted a very pretty compliment, in those days. No. He was nothing but an American, and he shed those American tears, upon the death of one, whose character and conduct had filled his heart with sentiments of pride, and love, and "awful reverence."

No. XXVII.

I AM rather inclined to suspect, that man is a selfish animal. A few days ago, I administered a merited rebuke to a group of young sextons, who had gathered together, after a funeral, and were seated upon a barrow bier, before an unclosed tomb. They had been discussing the subject of capital punishment, and were opposed to it unanimously. They frankly admitted, that they were not influenced, by any consideration of humanity, but looked simply to the fact, that, as the bodies of executed criminals went, commonly, to the surgeons, every execution deprived us of a job. One observed, that Boston was dreadfully healthy—another remarked, that homœopathy had proved a considerable help to us. Several compliments were paid to Thompson, Brandreth, and Mrs. Kidder. But they appeared to anticipate emolument from no source, so certainly, as from the approaching cholera.

I was greatly shocked, and expressed my opinion very freely. I reminded them of the primitive dignity of the sacristan's office. I should deeply regret, to see our calling reduced to the level of a mere trade, with its tariff—shrouds all rising—coffins looking up! We have a fair share of funerals, and the members of our profession have no just cause for complaint. Steam has helped us prodigiously. It has been said, that, comparing the amount of steam travel with the amount of ante-steam travel, i. e., the present with the past, the relative amount of deaths, from accident, is about the same. Suppose it to be so; the cheapness and facility of locomotion, at present, stimulate a much larger number to move—there is a vast increase of frivolous and pleasure travel—cars are filled with women, crates with bandboxes, and death is to be averaged over the integer—I therefore repeat, that steam has helped our profession. If steam had been known, in ancient Rome, it would have been reckoned a deity, whose diet, like the sacrifice of Juggernaut, would have been flesh and blood.

There is a very natural sensibility, on the part of steamboat and railroad proprietors, to the announcement of disasters, by steam. There is a wonderful eagerness to persuade the public to contemplate these catastrophes, with the larger end of the telescope toward the eye. This also is a great help to our profession. There is really no lack of business, and it is quite

abominable, for thoughtless young sextons to pray for the advent of the cholera.

We dwell in a region of the earth, seldom touched by this besom of destruction. Pestilence and famine have rarely come nigh unto us. It would be impious to envy the denizens of milder climes.

" With gold and gems if Chilian mountains glow,
If bleak and barren Scotia's hills arise;
There plague and poison, lust and rapine grow,
Here peaceful are the vales and pure the skies."

I thank heaven, I was not an undertaker, in London, in 1665, when there were scarcely enough of the living to bury the dead. When I used to wrap myself up, in the pages of Robinson Crusoe, how little I suspected, that Daniel Defoe was the writer of some twenty volumes beside. His inimitable history of the plague, of 1665, is admirable reading, for the members of our craft.

At irregular periods, plague, yellow fever, sweating sickness, and cholera have visited the earth, with terrible effect. Let us take a cursory view of these awful visitations. A. D. 78, 10,000 perished daily at Rome. The plague returned there A. D. 167. Terrible plague in Britain A. D. 430. A dreadful plague spread over Europe, Asia and Africa, A. D. 558, and continued, for several years. 200,000 died of the plague in Constantinople, A. D. 746. This plague raged for three years, and extended to Calabria, Sicily and Greece. William of Malmsbury states, that A. D. 772, an epidemic disease carried off 34,000 in Chichester, England. 40,000 died of pestilence in Scotland, A. D. 954. Hollingshed gives an account of a terrible plague among cattle, A. D. 1111, and in Ireland A. D. 1204. In this year a general plague raged in Europe. In London 200 persons were buried daily, in the Charterhouse yard. A dreadful mortality prevailed in London and Paris, A. D. 1362 and '7. Great pestilence in Ireland A. D. 1383. Endemic destroyed 30,000 in London A. D. 1407. Great numbers died of plague in Ireland, following famine, A. D. 1466. Dublin was severely visited with plague A. D. 1470. Rapin and Salmon give an account of the plague at Oxford, A. D. 1471, and throughout England A. D. 1478.

The sweating sickness, *sudor Anglicus*, first appeared, in England, in 1483, in the army of Henry VII., on his landing at

Milfordhaven. A year or two after, it travelled to London, and remained there, with intermissions, for forty years. It then passed over to the continent, and overran Holland, Germany, Flanders, France, Denmark, and Norway. It continued in those countries, from 1525 to 1530; it then returned to England; and was last known there, in 1551. It was a malignant fever, accompanied with very great thirst, delirium, and excessive sweat. Dr. Caius called it "a contagious, pestilential fever of one day, prevailing with a mighty slaughter, as tremendous as the plague of Athens." Dr. Willis says, "Its malignity was so extreme, that as soon as it entered a city, it made a daily attack, on five or six hundred persons, of whom scarcely one in a hundred recovered." Strype says, "The plague of sweat this summer, 1551, was very severe, and carried away multitudes of people, rich and poor, especially in London, where, in one day, July 10th, died an hundred people, and the next, one hundred and twenty. From the 8th of this month to the 19th, there died in London, of this sweat, 872."

Stowe says that, in the 9th year of Henry VII., 1517, half the population, in the capital towns of England, died of the sweating sickness: and that it proved fatal, in three hours. In the year 1500, Stowe also says, that the plague was so terrible in London, that Henry VII. and his court went over to Calais. The plague prevailed in England and Ireland, in 1603, and in London 30,000 persons died. In 1611, 200,000 died of pestilence, in Constantinople; 35,000 persons died of an epidemic in London, in 1625. In 1632 a general mortality prevailed in France; 60,000 died in Lyons. The plague was brought from Sardinia to Naples, in 1656, and 400,000 of the Neapolitans died, in six months. In the great plague of London, of 1665, described by De Foe, 68,596 persons died. In 1720, 60,000 perished of the plague at Marseilles.

An account is given, by the Abbe Mariti, of one of the most awful plagues ever known, which prevailed in Syria, in 1760. In Persia, 80,000 inhabitants of Bassorah, died of the plague, in 1773. In 1792, the plague destroyed 800,000 persons in Egypt. In 1799, 247,000 died of the plague at Fez; and in Barbary, 3000 daily, for several days. In 1804 and '5, an immense number were destroyed, by the plague, in Gibraltar. At the same place, in 1828, many were swept away, by an epidemic fever, scarce distinguishable from the plague. Verily the vocation of

an undertaker is anything but a sinecure ! But, in such terrible emergencies, as were hourly occurring, during the prevalence of the great plague of London, such an operator as Pontraci would have cast aside all thoughts of shrouds and coffins. In one single night 4000 died. The hearses were common dead carts ; and the continued cry, *bring out your dead*, rang through every heart. Defoe rates the victims of the plague of 1665, at 100,000.

At present, we have a deeper interest in the pestilence of modern times, though by some accounted of great antiquity. The Indian or Asiatic cholera traversed the north, east and south of Europe, and the countries of Asia, and, in two years, prostrated 900,000 victims. It subsequently appeared in England, at Sunderland, Oct. 26, 1831 ; in Scotland, at Edinburgh, Feb. 6, 1832 ; in Ireland, at Dublin, March 3, 1832. The mortality was great, but much less than upon the continent. Between March and August, 1832, 18,000 died of cholera, in Paris. In July and August, 1837, it reappeared in Rome, the Two Sicilies, Genoa, Berlin, and some other cities. Its ravages, in this country, were far less notable, than in many others. It is very wise to cast about us, and determine what we will do, if it should come again, and it is very likely to take us in its progress. But let us not forget, that it will most easily approach us, through our fears ; and probably, in no disease, are fear and grief more fatal *avant couriers*, than in affections of the abdominal viscera.

I am half inclined to the opinion of a charming old lady of my acquaintance, who, after listening to a learned discussion, as to the seat of the soul—the fountain of sensibility,—and whether or not it was seated in the conarion—the pineal gland—gave her decided opinion, that it was seated in the bowels.

No. XXVIII.

THE dead speak from their coffins—from their very graves—and verily the heart of the true mourner hath ears to hear. Gloves and rings are the valedictories of the dead—their *vales*, or parting tokens, received by the mourners, at the hand of some surviving friend. This appropriated word, *vale*, as almost every

one knows, is the leave-taking expression of the mourners ; and, when anglicised, and used in the plural number, as one syllable, signifies those *vales* or vails, tokens, in various forms, from shillings to crown pieces, bestowed by parting visitors, on domestics, from the head waiter to the scullion. They are intended as leave tokens. Every servant, in the families of the nobility, from the highest to the lowest, expects a *vale*, not in the classical sense of Menalcas—*Longum, formose, vale, vale*, but in lawful money, intelligible coin. This practice had become so oppressive to visitors, in the early part of the reign of George III., that Sir Jonas Hanway, remarkable, among other things, for his controversy with Dr. Johnson, on the subject of tea drinking, wrote and published eight letters to the Duke of Newcastle, against the custom of giving vails, in which he relates some very amusing anecdotes. Mr. Hanway, being quietly reproached, by a friend, in high station, for not accepting his invitations to dinner, more frequently, frankly replied, "Indeed, my Lord, I cannot afford it." He recites the manner of leaving a gentleman's house, where he had dined ; the servants, as usual, flocked around him—"your great coat, Sir Jonas"—a shilling—"your hat, sir:" a shilling—"stick, sir:" a shilling—"umbrella, sir:" a shilling—"sir, your gloves"—"well, keep the gloves, they are not worth the shilling." A remarkable example of the insolence of a pampered menial was related to Mr. Hanway, by Sir Timothy Waldo. He had dined with the Duke of Newcastle : as he was departing, and handing over his coin to the train of servants, that lined the hall, he put a crown into the hand of the chief cook, who returned it, saying, "I never take silver, sir." "Indeed"—Sir Timothy replied, returning the piece to his pocket, "I never give gold."

Sir Jonas was an excellent man ; and, whatever objections he may have had to the practice of giving extravagant vails to servants, I think he would have little or nothing to say, against the practice of giving such vails, as the dead may be supposed, vicariously, to bestow upon the living, in the form of rings and gloves. The dead, it must be conceded, seem not so much disposed to give vails, at present, as they were, one hundred years ago. In such dispensations, in the olden time, the good man, the clergyman, was seldom forgotten. Gloves and rings were showered down, upon the Lord's anointed, at weddings, christenings, and funerals. When a child, I was very much puzzled,

upon two points; first, what became of all the old moons, and, secondly, what the minister did with his gloves and rings. If he had had the hands of Briareus, he could not have worn them all.

An interesting little volume is now lying upon my table, which explains the mystery, not at all, in relation to the moons, but most happily, in respect to rings and gloves. It is the *Astronomical Diary or Almanac of Nathaniel Ames*, Boston, New England, printed by J. Draper, for the booksellers, 1748. This little book is interleaved; and the blank leaves are written over, in the handwriting of good old Andrew Eliot, who, April 14, 1742, was ordained pastor of the new North Church, in Boston, as colleague with Mr. Webb, where, possessing very little of the locomotive or migratory spirit of the moderns, this excellent man remained, till his death, Sept. 13, 1778. If gall and wormwood are essential to the perfection of Christian theology, Dr. Eliot was singularly deficient, as a teacher of religion. His sermons were very full of practical godliness, and singularly free from brimstone and fire. He was elected President of Harvard University, but his attachment to his people caused him to decline the appointment. After this passing tribute, let us return to the little *Almanac of 1748*. On the inside of the marble cover the first entry commences thus: "Gloves, 1748, January." The gloves, received by Dr. Eliot, are set against particular names, and under every month, in the year. Certain names are marked with asterisks, doubtless denoting, that the parties were dead, or *stelligeri*, after the fashion of the College catalogue; and thus the good doctor discriminated, between funerals, and weddings and christenings. Although a goodly number of rings are enrolled, together with the gloves, yet a page is devoted to rings, exclusively, in the middle of the book. This is not arranged, under months, but years; and commences, in 1741, the year before he was ordained, as colleague with Mr. Webb. At the bottom of the record, the good man states how many pairs were kid; how many were lambswool; and how many were long or women's gloves, intended, of course, for the parson's lady.

These rings and gloves were sold, by the worthy doctor, with the exception of such, as were distributed, in his own household, not a small one, for he left eleven children. A prejudice might have prevailed, an hundred years ago, against dead men's gloves, similar to that, recorded in the proverb, against dead men's shoes; certain it is, these gloves did not meet with a very ready market.

It appears by the record, in the doctor's own hand, that Mrs. Avis was entrusted with fifteen pairs of women's and three dozen of men's; and returned, unsold, eight pairs of women's, and one dozen and ten pairs of men's. A dozen pairs of men's were committed to Mrs. Langstaff; half a dozen women's to Mr. Langdon, and seventeen pairs to Captain Millens. What a glove and ring market the dear Doctor's study must have been. In thirty-two years, he appears to have received two thousand nine hundred and forty pairs of gloves, at funerals, weddings, and baptisms. Of these he sold to the amount of fourteen hundred and forty one pounds, eighteen shillings, and one penny, old tenor, equal to about six hundred and forty dollars. He also sold a goodly number of his rings. From all this, the conclusion is irresistible, that this truly good man and faithful minister must have been, if I may use the common expression, hand and glove with his parishioners. The little volume before me contains the record of other matters, highly interesting, doubtless, in their day but of precious little moment, at the present hour. Of what importance can it be, I beg leave to inquire, for any one to know, on what precise day, one hundred years ago, the worthy pastor borrowed a box of candles of Deacon Langdon, or a loaf of sugar of his own father, or ten shillings, old tenor, of Deacon Grant! Who, of the present generation, cares, on what day, one hundred years ago, he repaid those three pounds to Deacon Barrett! Of what consequence to any living mortal can it be, that, on the thirteenth day of April, one hundred years ago, Betty Bouvè came to live at the manse, as a maid! It is past. The last of that box of candles has burnt down into the socket, long ago. That sugar has dissolved, and lost its sweetness. And Betty Bouvè! The places that knew her know her no more. Her sweeping days are over; for time, with its irresistible broom, hath swept her from the face of the earth, and given her the grave for a dustpan.

The good old man himself has been called to the account of his stewardship. "It was a pleasant day," saith Father Gannett, on the fly-leaf of his almanac, "Sept. 15, 1778, when near four hundred couples and thirty-two carriages followed the remains of Dr. Andrew Eliot from his house, before the south side of his meeting-house, into Fore Street, up Cross Street, through Black Horse Lane, to Corpse Hill." I adopt Mr. Gannett's orthography, though rather less accurate than applicable.

No. XXIX.

THE true value of an enlightened conscience may be duly estimated by him, who has enjoyed the luxury of travelling in the dark, with the assistance of a lantern, without a candle. A man, who has a very strong sense of duty, and very little common sense, is apt to be a very troublesome fellow; for he is likely to unite the stupidity of an ass with the obstinacy of a mule. Yet such there are; and, however inconvenient, individually, the evil is immeasurably increased, when they become gregarious, and form a party, for any purpose whatever. Such conscience parties have existed, in every age and nation. A few individuals, of higher intelligence, dissatisfied with their civil, political, military, religious, or literary importance, and fatally bent upon distinction, are necessary to elevate some enormous green cheese high in the firmament, and persuade their followers, that it is neither more nor less than the moon, at full. Herod was the great director of that conscience party, that believed it to be their bounden duty, to murder all the little children in Judea, under a certain age. The terrible sacrifice, on St. Bartholomew's eve, was conducted by a conscience party. The burnings and starvings, in bloody Mary's reign, were planned and executed, by a conscience party. In no country has conscience been so very rampant, as in Ireland, from the days of Heremon and King Olam Fodla, to the present hour. Almost every reader is aware how conscientiously Archbishop Sharp was murdered, in presence of his daughter, in Scotland.

The widows of Hindostan, when they attempt to escape from the funeral pile, on which their late husbands are burning, are driven back into the flames, by a conscience party. It is well known, that certain inhabitants of India deposit their aged and decrepit parents, upon the very margin of the river, that the rising waters may bear them away. This is not the act of a few individuals; but the common practice, clearly indicating the existence of a conscience party, who undoubtedly believe they are acting, in a most filial and dutiful manner, and doing the very best thing in the world, for all parties. Infanticide is tolerated in China. Very little account is made of female babies there. This has been doubted and denied. Doubt and denial are of no use. There is a conscience party there, who believe

it to be their duty to their male babies, to drown the females, unless they are pretty, and then they have a chance for life, in being sold for concubines. Among the numerous and best modern authorities, on this point, is Gutzlaff, whose voyages, along the coast of China, were published, in London, 1834. "At the beach of Amoy," says he, "we were shocked, at the spectacle of a pretty, new-born babe, which, shortly before, had been killed. We asked some of the bystanders what this meant; they answered with indifference, 'it is only a girl.'" On page 174, Gutzlaff remarks, "It is a general custom among them to drown a large proportion of their new-born female children. This unnatural crime is so common, that it is perpetrated, without any feeling, and even in a laughing mood; and, to ask a man of distinction, whether he has daughters, is a mark of great rudeness." Earle, in his narrative of New Zealand, London, 1832, states that the practice existed there.

The insurrection of Shays, in this Commonwealth, in 1787, was a matter of conscience, beyond all doubt. He and many of his associates believed themselves a conscience party. After General Lincoln had suppressed the rebellion, great lenity was shown to the prisoners—not an individual was executed—and Shays, who died in 1825, at the age of 85, was even pensioned, in his old age, for his prior services in the revolution.

The revolt of the Pennsylvania line, in 1781, was, I admit, less an affair of the conscience, than of the stomach and bowels; for the poor fellows were nearly starved to death. The insurrection under Fries, commonly called the whiskey rebellion, in Western Pennsylvania, in 1792, was a different affair. A conscience party resolved to drink nothing but untaxed whiskey—they conscientiously believed the flavor to be utterly ruined, by the excise. It is certain, that, when General Washington moved against the rebels, there was conscience enough, among them, to make cowards of them all, for they scattered, in all directions.

A conscience party existed, in the early settlement of our country, when our pious ancestors, having fled to the howling wilderness, that they might enjoy liberty of thought, on religious subjects, began to hang the poor Quakers, for the glory of God.

Never before had there been such a conscience party in Massachusetts, as from 1689 to 1693. It was then Cotton Mather exclaimed from the pulpit, that witchcraft was the "most nefan-

dous high treason against the Majesty on high." It was then, that he satisfied himself, by repeated trials, that devils were skilled in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. It was then, that they hanged old women, for riding on broomsticks through the air; a mode of conveyance, which Lord Mansfield declared, long after, to be perfectly lawful, for all who preferred that mode of equitation.

A conscience party has recently appeared, in this country, which it is not easy to describe. Every other party seems to have contributed to its formation. It is a sort of political mosaic, made up of tag, rag, and bobtail. Some of the prominent members of this party were whigs, but yesterday; and yet they have put forth all their energies, to elect, as president, a man, whom they and all other whigs have hitherto opposed, and denounced, and who, it was manifest, from the beginning, could not possibly be elected. This man has been accounted, by the whigs, a political charlatan; and all that he has done, to obtain the support of this conscience party, such of them at least, as were once whigs, is to avow certain sentiments, on the subject of slavery, the very contrary of those, which he has hitherto maintained, most openly and zealously. No grave and reflecting whig puts any more confidence, in the promises of this political spin-button, than he would put, in the words of Nicholas Machiavelli. Nor could this candidate do more to check the progress of slavery, than every honest whig believes will be done, by the candidate of their party, who certainly resembles Washington, in three particulars; he is himself a slaveholder—he is an honest man—and he wears the same political phylactery, "*I will be the president of the people, not of a party.*"

In consideration of the limit of power, neither of these candidates can do more than the other, for the object in view, if they were equally honest, which nobody dreams of, unless he dreams in Sleepy Hollow. If there had been an anti-cholera party, Van Buren might have commanded suffrages, as sensibly, by pledging himself to do all in his power, to prevent its extension. The remaining candidate, it is agreed, would, if elected, have turned the hopes, one and all, of both whig and conscience parties topsy-turvy. His election, it is clear, was made more probable, by every vote, given by a whig to that candidate, whose election was clearly impossible. These irregular whigs, have, therefore, spent their ammunition, as profitably, as the old covenanter spent his, who fired a horse pistol against the walls of Sterling Castle. Such is the conscience party.

When I refer to the universal consent of the whigs, during the former canvass for Martin Van Buren, that he was, politically, the very devil incarnate; and, in making a selection of those, who were the loudest, and longest, and the most vehement of his antagonists, find them to be the very leaders of the present movement, in his favor; I am reminded of Peter Pindar's pleasant story of the chambermaid and the spider; and, not having my copy of Peter at hand, I will endeavor to relate the tale in prose, as well as I am able.

A chambermaid, in going her rounds, observed an enormous spider, black and bloated, so far from his hole of refuge, that, lifting her broom, she exclaimed, "Now, you ugly brute, I have you! You are such a sly, cunning knave, and have such a happy non-committal way with you, that I never have been able to catch you before; for, the moment I raised my broom, you were out of sight, forsooth, and perfectly safe, in that Kinderhook of a hole of yours—but, now prepare yourself, for your hour has come." The spider turned every one of his eight eyes down upon the chambermaid, and, extending his two fore-legs in a beseeching manner, calmly replied, "Strike, peerless maid, but hear me! I have given you infinite trouble, and have been a very bad fellow, I admit. Crafty and cruel, I have been an unmitigated oppressor of flies, and all inferior insects. I have sucked their blood, and lived upon their marrow. But now my conscience has awakened, and I am in favor of letting flies go free. It is not in quest of flies, that I am here, sweet maid; (and then he seemed perfectly convulsed;) I am changed at heart, and become a new spider. Pardon me for speaking the truth; my only object, in being here, is, from this elevated spot, to survey your incomparable charms." The chambermaid lowered her broom; and gently said, as she walked away, "Well, a spider is not such a horrid creature, after all."

I may be thought, in these remarks, to have offended against the dictum—*ne sutor ultra crepidam*. Surely I am not guilty—my dealings are with *the dead*. Perhaps I am mistaken. The conscience party may not be dead, but cataleptic—destined to rise again—to fall more feebly than before.

No. XXX.

FUNERALS, in the earlier days of Rome, must have been very showy affairs. They were torch-light processions, by night. You will gather some information, on this subject, by consulting a note of Servius, on Virg. *Æn.* xi. 143. Cicero, *de legibus*, ii. 26, says, that Demetrius ordered nocturnal funerals, to check the taste for extravagance, in these matters: "*Iste igitur sump-tum minuit, non solum pœna, sed etiam tempore; ante lucem enim jussit efferri.*" A more ancient law, of similar import, will be found recited, in the oration of Demosthenes, against Macartatus, viii., 82, Dove's London ed. *Orat. Attici.* *Funes* or *funiculi* were small ropes or cords, covered with wax or tal-low; such were the torches, used on such occasions; hence the word *funus* or funeral. A confirmation of this may be found in the note of Servius, *Æn.* i. 727. In a later age, funerals were celebrated in the forenoon.

There were some things done, at ancient funerals, which would be accounted very extraordinary at the present day. What should we say to a stuffed effigy of the defunct, composed entirely of cinnamon, and paraded in the procession! Plutarch says; "Such was the quantity of spices brought in by the women, at Sylla's funeral, that, exclusive of those carried in two hundred and ten great baskets, a figure of Sylla at full length, and of a lictor besides, was made entirely of cinnamon, and the choicest frankincense."

At the head of Roman funerals, came the *tibicines*, pipers, and trumpeters, immediately following the *designator*, or undertaker, and the lictors, dressed in black. Next came the "*præ-ficæ, quæ dabant cæteris modum plangendi.*" These were women hired to mourn, and sing the funeral song, who are popularly termed *howlers*. To this practice Horace alludes, in his *Art of Poetry*:

Ut, qui conducti plorant in funere, dicunt,
Et faciant prope plura dolentibus ex animo—

which Francis well translates:

As hirelings, paid for the funereal tear,
Outweep the sorrows of a friend sincere.

I once witnessed an exhibition of this kind, in one of the West India Islands. A planter's funeral occurred, at Christianstadt,

the west end of Santa Cruz. After the corpse had been lowered into the grave, a wild ululation arose, from the mouths of some hundred slaves, who had followed from the plantation—"Oh, what good massa he was—good, dear, old massa gone—no poor slave eber hab such kind massa—no more any such good, kind massa come agin." I noticed one hard-favored fellow, who made a terrible noise, and upon whose features, as he turned the whites of his big eyes up toward heaven, there was a sinister, and, now and then, rather a comical expression, and who, when called to assist in filling up, appeared to throw on the earth, as if he did it from the heart.

After the work was done, I called him aside. "You have lost an excellent master," said I. The fellow looked warily round, and, perceiving that he was not overheard, replied, in an undertone—"No massa, he bad mule—big old villain—me glad the debble got him." Having thus relieved himself of his feelings, he hastened to join the gang, and I soon saw him, as they filed off, on their way back to the plantation, throwing his brawny arms aloft, and joining in the cry—"Oh, what kind, good massa he was!" Upon inquiry, I learned, that this planter was a very bad mule indeed, a merciless old taskmaster.

Not more than ten flute players were allowed, at a funeral, by the Twelve Tables. The flutes and trumpets were large and of lugubrious tones; thus Ovid, *Fast.* vi. 660: *Cantabat mæstis tibia funeribus*; and *Am.* ii. 66: *Pro longa resonent carmina vestra tuba*.

Nothing appears more incomprehensible, in connection with this subject, than the employment of players and buffoons, by the ancients, at their funerals. This practice is referred to, by Suetonius, in his *Life of Tiberius*, sec. 57. We are told by Dyonisius, vii. 72, that these *Ludii*, *Histriones*, and *Scurræ* danced and sang. One of this class of performers was a professed mimic, and was styled *Archimimus*. Strange as such a proceeding may appear to us, it was his business, to imitate the voice, manner, and gestures of the defunct; he supported the dead man's character, and repeated his words and sayings. In the *Life of Vespasian*, sec. 19, Suetonius thus describes the proceeding: *In funere, Favor, archimimus, personam ejus ferens, imitansque, ut est mos, facta ac dicta vivi, etc.* This Favor must have been a comical fellow, and is as free with the dead, as Killigrew,

Charles the Second's jester, was, with the living; as the reader will perceive, if he will refer to the passage in Suetonius: for the fellow openly cracks his jokes, on the absurd expense of the funeral. This, we should suppose, was no subject for joking, if we may believe the statement of Pliny, xxxiii. 47, that one C. Cæcilius Claudius, a private citizen, left rather more than nine thousand pounds sterling, by his will, for his funeral expenses.

After the archimimus, came the freemen of the deceased, *pileati*; that is, wearing their caps of liberty. Men, not unfrequently, as a last act, to swell their funeral train, freed their slaves. Before the corpse, were carried the images of the defunct and of his ancestors, but not of such, as had been found guilty of any heinous crime. Thus Tacitus, ii. 32, relates, that the image of Libo was not permitted to accompany the obsequies of any of his posterity.

The origin of the common practice of marching at military funerals, with arms reversed, is of high antiquity. Thus Virgil xi. 93, at the funeral of Pallas—*versis Arcades armis*: and upon another occasion, *versi fasces* occur in Tacitus iii. 2, referring to the lictors.

In our cities and large towns, the corpse is commonly borne to the grave, in a hearse, or on the shoulders of paid bearers. Originally it was otherwise. The office of supporting the body to the grave was supposed to belong, of right, and duty, to relatives and friends; or, in the case of eminent persons, to public functionaries. Thus, in Tacitus, iii. 2, we find the expression, *tribunorum centurionumque humeris cineres portabantur*: and, upon the death of Augustus, Tac. i. 8, it was carried by acclamation, as we moderns say, *corpus ad rogam humeris senatorum ferendum*.

The conduct of both sexes, at funerals, was, in some respects, rather ridiculous, in those days. Virgil says of King Latinus, when he lost his wife,

— it, scissa veste, Latinus,
Canitiem immundo perfusam pulvere turpans;

which means, in plain English, that the old monarch went about, with his coat torn, defiling his white hair with filthy dust.

Cicero, in his Tusculan Questions, iii. 26, is entirely of this opinion: detestabilia genera lugendi, pædores, muliebres lacerationes genarum, pectoris, feminum, capitis percussiones—detestable

kinds of mourning, covering the body with filth, women tearing their cheeks, bosoms, and limbs, and knocking their heads. Tibullus, in the concluding lines of his charming elegy to Delia, the first of his first book, though he evidently derives much happiness, from the conviction, that she will mourn for him, and weep over his funeral pile, implores her to spare her lovely cheeks and flowing hair. No classical reader will censure me, for transcribing this very fine passage :

Te spectem, suprema mihi quum venerit hora,
 Te teneam moriens, deficiente manu.
 Flebis et arsuro positum me, Delia, lecto.
 Tristibus et lacrymis oscula mixta dabis.
 Flebis ; non tua sunt duro præcordia ferro,
 Vinceta, nec in tenero stat tibi corde silex.
 Illo non juvenis poterit de funere quisquam
 Lumina, non virgo, sicca referre domum.
 Tu manes ne læde meos : sed parce solutis
 Crinibus, et teneris, Delia, parce genis.

The *suttee*, or sacrifice of the widows of Hindostan, on the funeral pile of their husbands, was not more a matter of course, than the laceration of the hair and cheeks, among Roman women. It was undoubtedly accounted disreputable, for a widow to appear in public, after the recent funeral of her husband, with locks unpulled and cheeks unscratched. To such extremity had this absurd practice proceeded, that the fifth law of the tenth of the Twelve Tables, to which reference has been made, in a former number, was enacted to prevent it—*mulieres genas ne radunto*.

No discreet matron perpetrates any such absurdity, in modern times. The hair and cheeks of the departed have, occasionally, given evidence of considerable laceration, from some cause unknown ; but neither the law of the Tables, nor the pathos of a Tibullus is commonly required, to prevent a Christian widow, from laying violent hands, upon her cheeks or her hair.

No. XXXI.

THE cholera seems to be forgotten—but without reason—for the yellowest and most malignant of all yellow fevers is down upon us, proving fatal to the peace of many families, and sweep-

ing away our citizens, by hundreds. The distemper appears to have originated in California, and to have been brought hither, in letters from Governor Mason and others. It is deeply to be deplored, that these letters, which are producing all this mischief, had not been subjected to the process of smoking and sprinkling with vinegar; for the disease is highly contagious. This fever differs entirely from the *febris flava*—the *typhus icteroides* of *Savages*. The symptoms are somewhat peculiar. The pulse is quick and fluttering—the head hot—the patient neglects his business, bolts his food, and wanders about—sometimes apparently delirious, and, during the paroxysms, calls furiously for a pickaxe and a tin pan. But the most certain indication, that the disease has entered into the system, is, not that the patient himself becomes yellow, but that everything, upon which he turns his eyes, assumes the yellow appearance of gold. The nature of this distemper will, however, be much better understood, by the presentation of a few cases of actual occurrence.

I. Jeduthan Smink—a carpenter, having a wife and two children, residing at No. 9 Loafer's Lane. This is a strongly marked case. Mr. Smink, who is about five and twenty years of age, has always entertained the opinion, that work did him harm, and that drink did him good—labors—the only way in which he will labor—under the delusion, that all is gold that glistens—packed up his warming pan and brass kettle, to send them to the mint.

II. Laban Larkin, a farmer—caught the fever of a barber, while being shaved—persuaded that the unusual yellowness of his squashes and carrots can only be accounted for, by the presence of gold dust—turned a field of winter rye topsy turvy, in search of it—believes finally, in the sliding qualities of subterraneous treasure—thinks his gold has slipped over into his neighbor's field of winter rye—offers to dig it all up, at the halves—excited and abusive, because his neighbor declines the offer—told him he was a superannuated ass, and behind the times.

III. Molly Murphy resides, when at home, which is seldom, in Shelaly Court, near the corner, easily found by any one, who will follow his nose; has a husband and one child, a dutiful boy, who vends matches and penny papers, on week days, and steals, on Sundays, for the support of the family. Molly

can read; has read what Gov. Mason writes about pigs rooting up gold, by mistake, for groundnuts—her brain much disturbed—has an impression, that gold may be found almost anywhere—with a tin pan, and no other assistance but her son, Tooley Murphy, she has actually dug over and washed a pile of filth, in front of her dwelling, which the city scavengers have never been able materially to diminish—urges her husband to be “aff wid the family for Killyfarny, where the very wheelbarries is made out of goold.” Dreams of nothing but gold dust, and firmly believes it to be the very dust we shall all return to—while asleep, seized her husband by the ears, and could scarcely be sufficiently awakened, to comprehend that she had not captured the golden calf.

Let us be grave. I shall not inquire, if Bishop Archelaus was right in the opinion, that the original golden calf was made, not by the Israelites, but by Egyptians, who were the companions of their flight; nor if the modern idol be a descendant in the right line. It is somewhat likely, that the golden calf of 1848, will grow up to be a terrible bull, for some of the adventurers.

That there is gold in California, no one doubts. Governor Mason's standard of quantity is rather alarming—there is gold enough, says he, in the country, drained by the Sacramento and Joaquin rivers, and more than enough, “*to pay the cost of the present war with Mexico, a hundred times over.*” This is encouraging, and may lead us to look upon the prospect of another, with more complacency; though the whole of this treasure will not buy back a single slaughtered victim—not one husband to the widow—nor one parent to an orphan child—nor one stay and staff, the joy and the pride of her life, to the lone mother. *N'importe*—we have gold and glory! “The people,” says Mr. Mason, “before engaged in cultivating their small patches of ground, and guarding their herds of cattle and horses, have all gone to the mines. Laborers of every trade have left their work benches, and tradesmen their shops. Sailors desert their ships, as fast as they arrive on the coast.”

There is a marvellous fascination in all this, no doubt; and as fast and as far as the knowledge radiates, thousands upon thousands will be rushing to the spot. The shilling here, however, which procures a given amount of meat, fire and clothes, is equal to the sum, whatever it may be, which, there procures

the same amount and quality. Loafers and the lovers of ease and indolence, who are tobacco chewers, to a man, are desirous of flying to this *El Dorado*. Let them have a care: an ounce of gold dust, valued at \$12 there, though worth \$18 here, is said to have been paid, for a plug of tobacco. A traveller in *Caffraria*, having paid five cowries, (shells, the money of the country) for some article, complained, that forty were demanded, for a like article, in a village, not far off; and inquired if the article was scarce; "no," was the reply, "but cowries are very plenty."

Our adventurers intend to remain, perhaps, only till they obtain a competency. Even that is not the work of a day; and will be longer, or shorter, in the ratio of the consumption of means, for daily support, during the operation. There will, doubtless, be some difference also, as to the meaning of the word competency. An intelligent merchant, of this city, once defined it to mean a little more, in every individual's opinion, than he hath. Like the lock of hay, which Miss Edgeworth says is attached to the extremity of the pole, and which is ever just so far in advance of the hungry horses, in an Irish jaunting car, so competency seems to be forever leading us onward, yet is never fairly within our grasp.

John Graunt, of whom a good account may be found in Bayle, says, that, if the art of making gold were known, and put extensively in practice, it would raise the value of silver. Of course it would, and of everything else, so far as the quantity of gold, given in exchange for any article, is the representative of value. As gold becomes plenty, it will be employed for other uses, sauce-pans perhaps, as well as for the increase of the circulating medium. The amount of gold, which has passed through the British mint, from the accession of Elizabeth, 1558, to 1840, is, according to Professor Faraday, 3,353,561 pounds weight troy; and nearly one half of this was coined during the reign of George III.

Gold is a good thing, in charitable fingers; but it too frequently constructs for itself a chancel in our hearts. It then becomes the golden calf, and man an idolater. How dearly we get to love the chink and the glitter of our gold! How much like death it does seem, to go off 'change, before the last watch!

Three score years and ten, devoted to the turning of pennies! How many of us, after we have had our three warnings, still hobble up and down, day after day, infinitely more anxious about

pennies, than we were, fifty years ago, about pounds! An angel, the spirit, for example, of Michael de Montaigne, perched upon the City Hall—the eastern end of the ridge pole—must be tempted to laugh heartily. Without any angelic pretensions, I have done so myself, when, upon certain emergencies, the kegs, boxes, and bags of gold and silver, hand-carted and hand borne, have gone from bank to bank, backward and forward, often, in a morning, like the slipper, in the *jeu de pantoufle*! What an interest is upon the faces of the crowd, who gaze upon the very kegs and boxes; feasting upon the bald idea—the unprofitable consciousness—that gold and silver are within; and reminding one of old George Herbert's lines,—

"Wise men with pity do behold
Fools worship mules, that carry gold."

"Verily," saith an ancient writer, "traffickers and the getters of gain, upon the mart, are like unto pismires, each struggling to bear off the largest mouthful."

I am glad to see that the moderns are collecting the remains of good old George Herbert, and giving them an elegant *surtout*. His address to money is a jewel, and none the worse for its antique setting:

"Money! Thou bane of bliss, and source of woe!
Whence com'st thou, that thou art so fresh and fine?
I know thy parentage is base and low;
Man found thee, poor and dirty, in a mine

"Surely thou didst so little contribute
To this great kingdom, which thou now hast got,
That he was fain, when thou wert destitute,
To dig thee out of thy dark cave and grot.

"Then, forcing thee by fire, he made thee bright;
Nay, thou hast got the face of man, for we
Have, with our stamp and seal, transferred our right;
Thou art the man, and we but dross to thee!

"Man calleth thee his wealth, who made thee rich,
And, while he digs out thee, falls in the ditch."

The mere selfish getters of gain, who dispense it not, are, *civiliter et humaniter mortui*—dead as a door nail—dead dogs in the manger! I come not to bury them, at present; but, if possible, to awaken some of them with my penny trumpet; otherwise they may die in good earnest in their sins; their last breath giving evidence of their ruling passion—muttering not the *tête*

d'armée of Napoleon, but the last words of that accomplished Israelite, who caused his gold to be counted out, before his failing eyes—*per shent*.

No. XXXII.

Making mourning, as an abstract phrase, is about as intelligible, as *making fish*. These arbitrary modes of expression have ever been well enough understood, nevertheless, by those employed in the respective operations. *Making mourning*, in ancient times, was assigned to that class of hired women, termed *præfica*, to whom I have had occasion to refer. They are thus described, by Stephans—*adhiberi solebant funeri, mercede conductæ, ut flerent, et fortia facta laudarent*—they were called to funerals, and paid, to shed tears, and relate the famous actions of the defunct. Doubtless, by practice, and continual exercise of the will over the lachrymary organs, they acquired the power of forcing mechanical tears. We have a specimen of this power, in the case of Miss Sophy Streatfield, so often referred to, by Madame D'Arblay, in her account of those happy days at Mrs. Thrale's. *Making mourning*, in modern times, is, with a few touching exceptions, confined to that important class, the dress-makers.

The time allowed, for mourning, was determined, by the laws of Numa. Plutarch informs us, that no mourning was allowed, for a child, that died under three years, and for all others, a month, for every year it had lived, but never to exceed ten, which was the longest term, allowed for any mourning. We often meet with the term, *luctus annus*, the year of mourning; but the year of Romulus contained but ten months; and, though Numa added two, to the calendar, the term of mourning remained unchanged. The howlers, or wailing women, were employed also in Greece, and in Judea. Thus in Jeremiah ix. 17, *call for the mourning women, &c., and let them make haste and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, &c.*

By the laws of Numa, widows were required to mourn ten months or during the year of Romulus. Thus Ovid, *Fast.* i. 35:

*Per totidem menses a funere conjugis uxor
Sustinet in vidua tristitia signa domo.*

Numa was rather severe upon widows. The *tristia signa*, spoken of by Ovid, were sufficiently mournful. According to Kirchmaun de Fun. iv. 11, they were not to stir abroad in public—to abstain entirely from all entertainments—to lay aside every kind of ornament—to dress in black—and not even to kindle a fire, in their houses. Not content with stinting and freezing these poor, lone creatures, to death, Numa forbade them to repeat the matrimonial experiment, for ten months. Indeed, it was accounted infamous, for a widow to marry, within that period. As though he were resolved to add insult to injury, he, according to Plutarch, permitted those to violate this law, who would make up their minds, to sacrifice a cow with calf. This unnatural sacrifice was intended, by Numa, to frighten the widows. Doubtless, in many instances, the legislative bugbear was effectual; but it is quite probable there were some courageous women, in those days, as there are, at present, who would have slaughtered a whole drove, rather than yield the tender point.

The Jews expressed their grief, for the death of their near friends, by weeping, and crying aloud, beating their breasts, rending their clothes, tearing their flesh, pulling their hair, and starving themselves. They neither dressed, nor made their beds, nor washed, nor saw visitors, nor shaved, nor cut their nails, and made their toilets with sackcloth and ashes. The mourning of the Jews lasted commonly seven days, and never more than thirty—quite long enough, we should think, for such an exhibition of filth and folly. The Greeks also did much of all this—they covered themselves with dust and dirt, and rolled in the mire, and beat their breasts, and tore their faces.

The color of the mourning garb, among the Romans, was originally black—from the time of Domitian, white. At present, the color of the mourning dress, in Europe is black—in China white—in Turkey blue or violet—in Egypt yellow—in Ethiopia brown. There have come down to us two admirable letters from Seneca, 63, and 99, on the subject of lamentation for the dead; the first to Lucilius, after the death of his friend, Flaccus—the second to Lucilius, communicating the letter Seneca had written to Murullus, on the death of his son. These letters must be read, *cum grano salis*, on account of the stoical philosophy of the writer. He admits the propriety of decent sorrow, but is opposed to violent and unmeasured lamentations—*nec sicci sint oculi, amisso amico, nec fluant*—shed tears, if you have lost your friend, but

do not cry your eyes out—*lacrimandum est, non plorandum*—let there be weeping, but not wailing. He cites, for the advantage of Lucilius, the counsel of Ulysses to Achilles, whose grief, for the death of Patroclus, had become inordinate, to give one whole day to his sorrow, and have done with it. He considers it not honorable, for men, to exhibit their grief, beyond the term of two or three days. Such, upon the authority of Tacitus *De Mor. Germ.* 27, was the practice of the ancient Germans. *Funerum nulla ambitio: struem rogi nec vestibus, nec odoribus, cumulant: lamenta ac lacrimas cito, dolorem et tristitiam tarde, ponunt; feminis lugere honestum est; viris meminisse: there was no pride of funereal parade; they heaped no garments, no odors, upon the pile; they speedily laid aside their tears and laments; not so their grief and sorrow. It was becoming, for women to mourn; for men to cherish in their memories.*

In his letter to Lucilius, Seneca enters upon an investigation, as to the real origin of all this apparent sorrow, so freely and generally manifested, for the dead; and his sober conviction breaks forth, in the words—*Nemo tristis sibi est. O infelicem stultitiam! est aliqua et doloris ambitio!* No one mourns for himself alone. Oh miserable folly! There is ambition, even in our sorrow! This passage recalls Martial's epigram, 34, *De Gellia*:

*Amissum non flet, quum sola est Gellia, patrem;
Si quis adest, jussæ prosiliunt lacrymæ.
Non dolet hic, quisquis laudari, Gellia, querit;
Ille dolet vere, qui sine teste dolet.*

Arthur Murphy, in his edition of Dr. Johnson's works, ascribes to that great man the following extraordinary lines:

*If the man, who turnips cries,
Cry not, when his father dies,
'Tis a proof, that he had rather
Have a turnip than his father.*

Under the doctor's sanction, for a bagatelle, I may offer a translation of Martial's epigram:

*When no living soul is nigh,
Gellia's filial grief is dry;
Call, some morning, and I'll warrant
Gellia 'l abed a perfect torrent.
Tears unforc'd true sorrow draws;
Gellia weeps for mere applause.*

It is our fortune to witness not a little of this, in our line. We

are compelled to drop in, at odd, disjointed moments, when the not altogether disagreeable occupations of the survivors contrast, rather oddly, to be sure, with the graver duties to the dead. A rich widow, like Dr. Johnson's *protégè*, in his letter to Chesterfield, is commonly overburdened with help. It is quite surprising, to observe the solicitude about her health, and how very fervent the hope of her neighbors becomes, that she may not have taken cold. The most prominent personages, after the widow and the next of kin, are the coffin-maker and the dress-maker—both are solicitous of making an excellent fit. Those, who, like myself, have had long practice in families, are often admitted to familiar interviews with the chief mourners, which are likely to take place, in the midst of dress-makers and artists of all sorts. How many acres of black crape I have witnessed, in half a century! "Mr. Abner—good Mr. Abner," said Mrs. —, "dear Mr. Abner," said she, "I shall not forget your kindness—how pleasant it is, on these occasions, to see a face one knows. You buried my first husband—I thought there was nothing like that: and you buried my second husband—and, oh dear me, I thought there was nothing like that—and now, oh dear, dear me, you are going to bury my third! How I am supported, it is hard to tell—but the widow's God will carry me through this, and other trials, for aught I know—Miss Buddikin, don't you think that dress should be fuller behind?" "Oh dear ma'am, your fine shape, you know," said Miss Buddikin. "There now, Miss Buddikin, at any other time I dare say I should be pleased with your flattery, but grief has brought down my flesh and spirits terribly. Good morning, dear Mr. Abner—remember there will be no postponement, on account of the weather."

No. XXXIII.

New York, 1849

I AM sad. It is my duty to record an event of deep and universal interest. On Sunday night, precisely as the clock of the Old South Church struck the very first stroke of twelve, departed this life, of no particular malady, but from a sort of constitutional decay, to which the family has ever been periodically liable, and at the same age, at which his ancestors have

died, for many generations, A. Millesimus Octingentesimus Quadragesimus Octavus.

It has been a custom in France, and in other countries, to send printed invitations to friends and relatives, inviting them to funerals. I have heard of a thriving widow—*la veuve Berthier*—who added a short postscript—*Madame Berthier will be happy to furnish soap and candles, at the old stand, as heretofore.* I trust I shall not be deemed guilty of a like indiscretion, if I add, for general information, that the business will be conducted hereafter, in the name of A. M. O. Q. Nonus.

I did intend to be facetious, but, for the soul of me, I cannot. It is enough for me to know that the old year is dead and gone, and that the hopes and fears of millions are now lying in its capacious grave. Between the old year and the new, the space is so incalculably narrow, that, if those ancient philosophers were in the right, who contended, that an angel could not live in a vacuum, no angel, in the flesh, or out of it, could possibly get between the two: the partition is thin as tissue paper—thin as that between wit and madness, which is so exceedingly thin, as to be often undistinguishable, leaving us in doubt, on which side our neighbors may be found,—when at home.

I see, clearly, in the close of another year, another milestone, upon Time's highway, from chaos to eternity. Is it not wise, and natural, and profitable, for the pilgrim to pause, and mark his lessening way? He cannot possibly know the precise number of milestones, that lie between the present and his journey's end; but he may sometimes shrewdly guess from the number he has passed already. There is precious little certainty, however, in the very best of man's arithmetic, on a subject like this: for, at every milestone, from the very first, and at countless intermediate points, he will observe innumerable tablets, recording the fact, that myriads of travellers have stopped here and there, not for the want of willingness to go forward, but for the want of breath—not for the night, to be awakened at the morning watch, by the attentive host, or the railway whistle,—but for a long, long while, to be summoned, at last, by the piercing notes of a clarion, loud and clear, which, as the bow of Ulysses could be bent only by the master's hand, can be raised, only by the lips and the lungs of an archangel.

Well, Quadragesimus Octavus hath gone to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets—a motley group it is, that

band of melancholy followers! Upon this, as upon all other occasions of the same sort, true tears, from the very well-spring of the heart, fall, together with showers of hypocritical salt water. Little children, who must ever refer their orphanage to the year that is past, are in the van; and with them, a few widowers and widows, who have not been married quite long enough, to be reconciled to their bereavement. There are others, who also have been divorced from their partners by death, and who submit, with admirable grace; and wear their weeds—of the very best make and fashion, by the way—with infinite propriety.

It is quite amazing to see the great number of mourners, who, though, doubtless, natives, have a very Israelitish expression, and wear phylacteries, upon which are written three or four words whose import is intelligible, only to the initiated, but which, being interpreted, signify—*three per cent. a month*. None seem to wear an expression of more heartfelt sorrow, for the departure of *Quadragesimus Octavus*, during whose existence, being less greedy of honors than of gain, they were singularly favored, converting the necessities of other men into an abundance of bread and butter, for themselves.

In the melancholy train, we behold a goodly number of maiden ladies, dressed in yellow, which is the mourning color of the Egyptians, and some of these disconsolate damsels are really beginning to acquire the mummy complexion: it happened that, as the old year expired, they were just turned of thirty.

There are others, who have sufficient reason to mourn, and whose numerous writings have brought them into serious trouble. Their works, commencing with a favorite expression—*for value received I promise to pay*, owing to something rather pointed in the phraseology, were liable to be severely criticised, so soon as the old year expired.

The lovers of parade, and show, and water celebrations, and torch-light processions, trumpeting and piping merrymakings, and huzzaings, the brayings of stump orators, and the intolerable noise and farrago of electioneering; the laudings and vituperations of Taylor, Cass, and Van Buren; the ferocious lyings and vilifyings of partisans, politically drunk or crazy—the lovers of all or any of these things are one and all, attendants at the funeral of *Quadragesimus Octavus*.

The good old year is gone—and, in the words of a celebrated

clergyman, to a bereaved mother, who would not be comforted, but wailed the louder, the more he pressed upon her the duty of submission—"what do you propose to do about it?" I cannot answer for you, my gentle reader, but I am ready to answer for myself. As an old sexton, I believe it to be my duty to pay immediate attention to the very significant command—whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest. If good old Samuel had been an undertaker, he could not have said, more confidently than I do, at this moment, whose corpse have I taken, or whose shroud have I taken, or whom have I defrauded, or whom have I buried east for west, or wrong end foremost? Of what surgeon have I received a fee, for a skeleton, to blind mine eyes withal? I have neither the head nor the heart for mystical theology. I believe in the doctrine of election, as established by the constitution and laws of the United States, and of the States respectively, so far as regards the President, Vice President, and all town, county and state officers: and I respect the Egyptians, for one trait, recorded of them, by an eminent historian, who states, that those, who worship an ape, never quarrel with those, who worship an ox. A very fine verse, the thirteenth of the last chapter of Ecclesiastes—"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."

Let us try, during the year, upon whose threshold we are now standing, to do as much good, and as little harm, as possible. I respectfully recommend to all old men and women, who are as grey and grizzly as I am, to make themselves as agreeable as they can; and remember, that old age is proverbially peevish and exacting. In the presence of children, do not forget the wise sayings of Parson Primrose, who candidly confessed, when solicited to join in some childish pastime, that he complied, for he was tired of being always wise. Pray allow all you can for the vivacity and waywardness of youth. Nine young ladies, in ten, may find a clever fit, in Pope's shrewd line—

"Brisk as a flea, and ignorant as dirt."

All, that can be said about it, lies in a filbert shell, *ita lex scripta est, ita rerum natura*. You will not mend the matter, by scowling and growling, from morning to night. Can you not

remember, that you yourself, when a boy, were saluted now and then, with the title of "proper plague"—"devil's bird"—or "little Pickle?" I can. Some years ago, my very worthy friend, the Rev. John S. C. Abbott, did me the kindness to give me one of his excellent works, the *Path of Peace*. The preface contains a very short and clever incident, of whose applicability, you can judge for yourself.

"Mother," said a little boy, "I do not wish to go to Heaven."

"And why not, my son?"

"Why, grandfather will be there, will he not?"

"Yes, my son, I hope he will."

"Well, as soon as he sees us, he will come, scolding along, and say, 'Whew, whew, whew! what are these boys here for?' I am sure I do not wish to go to Heaven, if grandfather is to be there."

This is a short tale of a grandfather, but it is a very significant story, for its length; and calculated, I fear, for many meridians.

Well, here we are, in the very midst of bells and bonfires, screaming for joy, in honor of the new year, with our spandy new weepers on, for the old one.

No. XXXIV.

VIEWED in every possible relation, the most melancholy and distressing funerals, of which I have any knowledge, were a series of interments, which occurred in Charleston, South Carolina, not very many years ago, and of which, in 1840, I received, while sojourning there, a particular account, from an inhabitant of that hospitable city. These funerals were among the blacks; and, as there was no epidemic at the time, their frequency, at length, attracted observation. Every day or two, the colored population were seen, bearing, apparently, one of their number to the place, appointed for all living. Suspicion was, at last, awakened—a post mortem examination was resolved on—the graves, which proved to be uncommonly shallow, were opened—the coffins lifted out, and examined—and found to be filled, not with corpses, but with muskets, swords, pistols, pikes,

knives, hatchets, and such other weapons, as might be necessary, for the perfection of a deadly work, which had been long projected, and was then not far from its consummation.

These, I say, were the most melancholy funerals, of which I have any knowledge. This was burying the hatchet, in a novel sense. In 1840, the tumult of mind, resulting from immediate apprehension, had, in a great degree, subsided; yet a rigorous system of espionage continued, in full operation—the spirit of vigilance was still on tiptoe—the arsenal was in excellent working order, and capable, at any moment, of turning its iron shower, in every direction—the separate gathering of the blacks, for religious worship, had been, and still was, prohibited; for it was believed, that the little tabernacle, in which, before this alarming discovery, the colored people were in the habit of assembling, had been used, in some sort, for the purpose of holding insurrectionary conclaves; perhaps for the purpose also of muttering prayers, between their teeth, to the bondman's God, to give him strength to break his fetters.

At the time, to which I refer, the slaves, who attended religious services, on the Sabbath, entered the same temples with their masters, who paid their vows, on cushions, while many of the slaves worshipped, squatting in the aisles. At this time, slaves, *ex cautela*, were forbidden, under penalty of imprisonment and the lash, from being present at any conflagration. Under a like penalty, they were commanded to retire instantly, upon the very first stroke of the curfew bell, to their homes and cabins. At every quarter of an hour, through the whole night, the cry of *all's well* was sent forth by the armed sentinel, from the top of St. Michael's tower. Such was the state of things, in 1840, in the city of Charleston.

Melancholy as were these funerals, the undertakers were quite as ingenious, as those cunning Greeks, who contrived the Trojan horse, *divinâ Palladis arte*. Melancholy and ominous funerals were they—for they were incidents of slavery, the CURSE COLOSSAL—that huge, unsightly cicatrice, upon the very face of our heritage. Well may we say to the most favored nation of the earth, in Paul's proud words,—*would to God ye were not only almost, but altogether such as we are, saving these bonds.*

After taking a mental and moral *coup d'œil* of these matters, I remember that I lay long, upon my pillow, not consigning

my Southern friends and brethren, votively, to the devil; but thanking God, for that blessed suggestion, which led good, old Massachusetts, and the other states of the North, to abolish slavery, within their own domains.

Slavery is a curse, not only to the long-suffering slave, but to the mortified master. This chivalry of the South—what is it? Every man of the South, or the North, who comes to the blessed conclusion, that, while others own *jackasses, horses, and horned cattle*, he actually *owns men*—what a thought!—will soon become filled with this very chivalry. It is the lordly consciousness of dominion over one's fellow-man—a sort of Satrap-like feeling of power—a sentiment extremely oriental, which begets that important and consequential air of superiority, that marks the Southern man and the Southern boy,—Mr. Calhoun, diving, like one of Pope's heroes, after first principles, and fetching up, for a fact, the pleasant fancy, that *man is not born of a woman*—or the young, travelling gentleman, full of "Suth Cralina," who comes hither, to sojourn awhile, and carries in every look, that almost incomprehensible mixture of pride and sensitiveness, which is equally repulsive and ridiculous.

The bitterness of sectional feeling is a necessary incident of slavery. Civil and servile wars are among its terrible contingencies. Slavery cannot endure in our land, though the end be not yet. I had rather the cholera should spread, than this moral scourge, over our new domains—not, upon my honor, because the former would be a help to our profession, but because a dead is more bearable, than a living curse.

Of all the sciolists, who have offered their services, to remedy this evil, the conscience party is the most remarkable. A self-consecrated party, with their phlogistic system, would deal with the whole South, which, on this topic, is a perfect hornet's nest already, precisely as an intelligent farmer, in Vermont, dealt with a hornet's nest, under the eaves of his dwelling—he applied the actual cautery; his practice was successful—he destroyed the nest, and with it his entire mansion. There are men, of this party, to whom the constitution and laws of the Union are objects of infinite contempt; who despise the Bible; who would overthrow the civil magistrate; and unfrock the clergy. But there are many others, who abjure such doctrines—a species of conscience comeouters—who intend, after they

have unkennelled the whirlwind, to appoint a committee of three, from every county, to hold it by the tail, *ne quid detrimenti respublica caperet*. These are to be selected from the most careful and judicious, who, when the firebrand is thrown into the barrel of gunpowder, will have a care, that not more than a moderate quantity shall be ignited.

The constitution is a contract, made by our fathers, and binding on their children. Who shall presume to say that contract is void, for want of consideration, or because the subject is *malum in se*? Who shall decide the question of *nudum pactum* or not? Not one of the parties, nor two, nor any number, short of the whole, can annul this solemn contract; nor can a decision of the question of constitutionality come from any other tribunal, than the Supreme Judicial Court of the United States.

Lord Mansfield's celebrated dictum—*fiat justitia; ruat Cælum*, has been often absurdly applied, and in connection with this very question of slavery and its removal. *Justitia* is a broad word, and refers not solely to the rights of the slave, but to those of the freeman. The proposition of the full-bottomed abolitionist—immediate emancipation, or dissolution of the Union, and civil and servile war to boot, if it must be so—is fit to be taught, only to the tenants of a madhouse. But there is a spirit abroad, whose tendency cannot be mistaken. Slavery is becoming daily more and more odious, in the east, in the west, in the north, ay, and in the south. Individually, many slaveholders are becoming less attached to their *property*. There may be too much even of *this good thing*. Slavery would continue longer, in the present slave states, if it were extended to the new territories; for it would be rendered more bearable in the former, by the power of sloughing off the redundancy, on profitable terms. The spirit of emancipation is striding over the main land, walking upon the waters, and planting its foot, upon one dark island after another. *Let us hope*—better to do that, than mischief. Let us rejoice, that, as the Scotch say, *there is a God aboon a'*—better to do that, than spit upon our Bibles, and scoff at law and order. It is always better to stand still, than move rudely and rashly, in the dark. Such was the decided opinion of my old friend and fellow-sexton, Grossman, when he fell, head first, into an unclosed tomb, and broke his enormous nose.

No. XXXV.

IN looking up a topic, for my dealings with the dead, this afternoon, I can think of nothing more interesting, at the present time, than *Lot's wife and the Dead Sea*. I consider Lieutenant Lynch the most fortunate of modern discoverers. He has discovered the long lost lady of Lot—the veritable pillar of salt! There are some incredulous persons, I am aware, who are of opinion, that the account of this discovery should be received, *cum grano salis*; but my own mind is entirely made up. I should have been better pleased, I admit, if he had verified the suggestion, which led to the discovery, by bringing home a leg, or an arm. Possibly, it may be thought proper to send a Government vessel, for the entire pillar, to ornament the Rotunda at Washington. The identification of Lot's wife is rendered exceedingly simple, by the fact, that seventeen of her fingers, and not less than fourteen of her toes, broken off from time to time, by the faithful, as relics, are exhibited in various churches and monasteries.

Models of these, in plaster, could readily be obtained, I presume; and an application of their fractured parts to the salt corpse, discovered by Lieutenant Lynch, would settle the question, in the manner, employed to test the authenticity of ancient indentures. Besides, every one knows, that salt is a self preserver, and lasting in its character, especially the Attic. The very elements of preservation abound in the Dead Sea, and the region round about. Its very name establishes the fact—*Asphaltites*—so called from the immense quantity of *asphaltum* or bitumen, with which it abounds. This is called *Jews' Pitch*, and was used of old, for embalming; and the corpse of Mrs. Lot, after the salt had thoroughly penetrated, rolled up, as it probably was found by Lieutenant Lynch, in a winding sheet of bitumen, which readily envelopes everything it touches, would last forever. This pitch is often sold by the druggists, under the name of mummy.

In Judea, with the territory of Moab, on the East, and the wilderness of Judah, on the West, and having the lands of Reuben and Edom, or Idumea, on the North and South, lies that sheet of mysterious and unfrequented water, which has been called the East Sea—the Salt Sea—the Sea of the Desert—the

Sea of the Plain—the Sea of Sodom—and, more commonly, the Dead Sea. To this I beg leave to add another title, the Legendary lake, or Humbug water. More marvel has been marked, learned, and inwardly digested, by Christians, on the subject of this sheet of water, than the broad ocean has ever supplied, to stir the landman's heart. Its dimensions, in the first place, have been set down, with remarkable discrepancy. Pliny, lib. v. 15, says, *Longitudine excedit centum M. passuum, latitudine maxima xxv., implet, minima sex*, making the length one hundred miles, and the breadth, from twenty-five miles, to six. Josephus estimates its length at five hundred and eighty furlongs, from the mouth of the Jordan, to the town of Segor, at the opposite end; and its greatest breadth one hundred and fifty furlongs. The Rev. Dr. William Jenks, of whose learning and labors a sexton of the old school may be permitted to speak, with great respect, sets down the length, in his *New Gazetteer of the Bible*, appended to his *Explanatory Bible Atlas*, of 1847, at thirty-nine miles, and its greatest breadth at nine. Carne, in his *Letters from the East*, says the length is sixty miles, and the breadth from eight to ten. Stephens states the length to be thirty miles, in his *Incidents of Travel*.

The origin of this lake was ascribed to the submersion of the valley of Siddim, where the cities stood, which were destroyed, in the conflagration of Sodom and Gomorrah. This tremendous gallimaufry or hotch potch, produced, as some suppose, an intolerable stench, and impregnated the waters with salt, sulphur, and bitumen.

Pliny, in the passage quoted above,—observes—*Nullum corpus animalium recipit*—no animal can live in it. Speaking of these waters, Dr. Jenks remarks—"no animals exist in them." On the other hand, Dr. Pococke, on the authority of a monk, tells us, that fish have been caught in the Dead Sea. *Per contra* again, Mr. Volney affirms, that it contains neither animal nor vegetable life. M. Chateaubriand, on the other hand, who visited the Dead Sea, in 1807, remarks—"About midnight, I heard a noise upon the lake, and was told by the Bethlehernites, who accompanied me, that it proceeded from legions of small fish, which come out, and leap upon the shore." The monks of St. Saba assured Dr. Shaw, as he states in his travels, that they had seen fish caught there.

In the passage quoted from Pliny, he says—*Tauri camelique*

fluitant. Inde fama nihil in eo mergi—bulls and camels float upon this lake: hence the notion, that nothing will sink in it. It is true, that the water of the Dead Sea is specifically heavier than any other, owing to the great quantity of salt, sulphur, and bitumen; but Dr. Pococke found not the slightest difficulty, in swimming and diving in the lake. Sir Thomas Browne, treating of this, in his *Pseudodoxia*, vol. iii., p. 341, London, 1835, observes—"As for the story, men deliver it variously. Some, I fear too largely, as Pliny, who affirmeth that bricks will swim therein. Mandevil goeth further, that iron swimmeth and feathers sink." "But," continueth Sir Thomas, "Andrew Thevet, in his *Cosmography*, doth ocularly overthrow it, for he affirmeth he saw an ass with his saddle cast therein and drowned."

Another legend is equally absurd, that birds, attempting to fly over the lake, fall, stifled by its horrible vapors. "It is very common," says Volney, "to see swallows skimming its surface, and dipping for the water, necessary to build their nests." Mr. Stephens, in his *Incidents of Travel*, vol. ii. chap. 15, gives an interesting account of the Dead Sea, and says—"I saw a flock of gulls floating quietly on its bosom."

It has been roundly asserted, that, in very clear weather, the ruins of the cities, destroyed by the conflagration, are visible beneath the waters. Josephus soberly avers, that a smoke constantly arose from the lake, whose waters changed their color three times daily.

The waters of Jordan and of the brooks Kishon, Jabbok, and Arnon, flow into the Dead Sea, yet produce no perceptible rise of its surface. The influx from these mountain streams is considerable. Hence another legend, to account for this mystery—a subterraneous communication with the Mediterranean—which would surely make the matter worse, for Dr. Jenks and other writers state, that "the waters lie in a deep caldron, many hundred feet *below* the Mediterranean." Evaporation, which is said to be very great, explains the mystery entirely. At the rising of the sun, dense fogs cover the lake.

Chateaubriand says—"The first thing I did, on alighting, was to walk into the lake, up to my knees, and taste the water. I found it impossible to keep it in my mouth. It far exceeds that of the sea, in saltness, and produces, upon the lips, the effect of a strong solution of alum. Before my boots were completely dry, they were covered with salt; our clothes, our hats, our hands

were, in less than three hours, impregnated with this mineral." "The origin of this mineral," says Volney, "is easy to be discovered, for, on the southwest shore, are mines of fossil salt. They are situated, in the sides of the mountains, which extend along the border; and, for time immemorial, have supplied the neighboring Arabs, and even the city of Jerusalem."

"Whoever," says Mr. Carne, in his Letters from the East, "has seen the Dead Sea, will have its aspect impressed upon his memory. It is, in truth, a gloomy and fearful spectacle. The precipices, in general, descend abruptly to the lake, and, on account of their height, it is seldom agitated by the winds. Its shores are not visited, by any footstep, save that of the wild Arab, and he holds it in superstitious dread. On some parts of the rocks, there is a thick, sulphureous incrustation, and, in their steep descents, there are several deep caverns, where the benighted Bedouin sometimes finds a home. The sadness of the grave was on it and around it, and the silence also. However vivid the feelings are, on arriving on its shores, they subside, after a time, into languor and uneasiness; and you long, if it were possible, to see a tempest wake on its bosom, to give sound and life to the scene."

"If we adopt," says Chateaubriand, "the idea of Professor Michaelis, and the learned Busching, in his memoir on the Dead Sea, physics may be admitted, to explain the catastrophe of the guilty cities, without offence to religion. Sodom was built upon a mine of bitumen, as we know from the testimony of Moses and Josephus, who speak concerning wells of bitumen, in the valley of Siddim. Lightning kindled the combustible mass, and the cities sank in the subterranean conflagration." In Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iii., article Lot, it is stated, that the Mahometans have added many circumstances to his history. They assert, that the angel Gabriel pried up the devoted cities so near to Heaven, that the angels actually heard the sound of the trumpets and horns, and even the yelping of puppies, in Sodom and Gomorrah: and that Gabriel then let the whole concern go with a terrible crash. Upon this, Calmet remarks,— "Romantic as this account appears, it preserves traces of an earthquake and a volcano, which were, in all probability, the *natural secondary cause* of the overthrow of Sodom, and of the formation of the Dead Sea." Lot's wife in my next.

No. XXXVI.

THE conversion of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt has given rise to as much learned discussion, as the question, so zealously agitated, between Barcephas and others, whether the forbidden fruit were an *apple* or a *fig*. *But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt.* Gen. xix. 26. Very little account seems to have been made of this matter, at the time. The whole story, and without note or comment, is told in these fifteen words. It would have seemed friendly, and natural, and proper, for Abraham to have said a few words of comfort to Lot, on this sudden and singular bereavement; but, instead of this, we are told, in the following verse, that Abraham got up, next morning, and looked, very philosophically, at the smoke, which went up from the cities of the plain, like the smoke of a furnace. This neglect of Lot's wife is, too frequently, a wife's lot. Some of the learned have been sorely perplexed, to understand, why this unfortunate lady has not long since melted away, under the influence of the rains; for a considerable quantity of water has fallen, since the destruction of Sodom. But they seem to forget, that there is no measure of limitation, for a miracle; and that the salt might have been purposely designed, like *caoutchouc*, to resist the action of water. The departure from Sodom was sudden, to be sure; but the lady was clothed, in some sort, doubtless; yet nothing has been said, by travellers, about her drapery, and whether that also was converted into salt, or cast off, by the mere energy of the miracle, is unknown.

This pillar of salt Josephus says he has seen; and, though he does not name the time, it is of little consequence, as, in such a matter, we can well afford to throw in a century or two; but it must have been between A. D. 37, and a point, not long after the 13th year of Domitian. Such being the term of the existence of Josephus, as nearly as can be ascertained. The cities of the plain were destroyed, according to Calmet's reckoning, 1893 years before Christ; therefore, *the pillar*, which Josephus saw, must have then been standing more than nineteen centuries. These are the words of Josephus: "*But Lot's wife, continually turning back, to view the city, as she went from it, and being too nicely inquisitive what would become*

of it, although God had forbidden her so to do, was changed into a pillar of salt, for I have seen it, and it remains at this day." *Antiq.*, vol. i. p. 32, Whiston's translation, Lond. 1825. The editor, in a note states, that Clement of Rome, a cotemporary of Josephus, also saw it, and that Irenæus saw it, in the next century. Mr. Whiston prudently declines being responsible for the statements of modern travellers, who say they have seen it. And what did they see?—a pillar of salt. This is quite probable. Volney remarks, "At intervals we met with misshapen blocks, which prejudiced eyes mistake for mutilated statues, and which pass, with ignorant and superstitious pilgrims, for monuments of the adventure of Lot's wife; though it is nowhere said that she was metamorphosed into stone, like Niobe, but into salt, which must have melted the ensuing winter." Volney forgets, that the salt itself was miraculous, and, doubtless, water proof.

- Mr. Stephens, in his *Incidents of Travel*, though he gives a description of the Dead Sea, in whose waters he bathed, says not a syllable of Lot's wife, or the pillar of salt.

Some of the learned have opined, that Lot's wife, like Pliny, during the eruption of Vesuvius, was overwhelmed, by the burning and flying masses of sulphur and bitumen; this is suggested, under the article, *Lot's Wife*, in *Calmet*. "Some travellers in Palestine," says he, "relate that Lot's wife was shown to them, i. e. the rock, into which she was metamorphosed. But what renders their testimony very suspicious is, that they do not agree, about the place, where it stands; some saying westward, others eastward, some northward, others southward of the Dead Sea; others in the midst of the waters; others in Zoar; others at a great distance from the city." In 1582, Prince Nicholas Radziville took a vast deal of pains to discover this remarkable pillar of salt, but all his inquiries were fruitless. Dr. Adam Clarke suggests, that Lot's wife, by lingering in the plain, may have been struck dead with lightning, and enveloped in the bituminous and sulphureous matter, that descended. He refers to a number of stories, that have been told, and among them, that this pillar possessed a miraculous, reproductive energy, whereby the fingers and toes of the unfortunate lady were regenerated, instantaneously, as fast as they were broken off, by the hands of pilgrims. Irenæus, one of the fathers, asserts, that this pillar of salt was *actually alive in his*

time! Some of those fathers, I am grieved to say it, were insufferable story-tellers. This tale is also told, by the author of a poem, *De Sodoma*, appended to the life of Tertullian. Some learned men understand the Hebrew to mean simply, that "*she became fixed in the salsuginous soil*"—anglice, *stuck in the mud*. If this be the real meaning of the passage, it must have been some other lady, that was seen by Josephus, Clement, Irenæus, and Lieut. Lynch.

Sir Thomas Browne, credulous though he was, had, probably, no great confidence in the *literal* construction of the passage in Genesis. In vol. iii. page 327, of his works, London, 1835, he says—"We will not question the metamorphosis of Lot's wife, or whether she were transformed into a real statue of salt; though some conceive that expression metaphorical, and no more thereby than a lasting and durable column, according to the nature of salt, which admitteth no corruption. This is evidently the opinion of Dr. Adam Clarke. In other words, God, by her destruction, while her husband and daughters were saved, made her a *pillar or lasting memorial* to the disobedient. In this sense a pillar of *salt* means neither more nor less than an *everlasting memorial*. Salt is the symbol of perpetuity; thus Numbers xviii. 19. *It is a covenant of salt forever*: and 2 Chron. xvii. 5, the kingdom is given to David and his sons forever, *by a covenant of salt*. If this be the true construction, those four gentlemen, to whom I have referred, have been entirely misled, in supposing that any one of those masses of salt, which Volney says may be mistaken, for the remains of mutilated statues, has ever, at any period of the world, been the object of Lot's devotion, or the partner of his joys and sorrows.

In vol. ii. page 212, of his *Incidents of Travel*, New York, 1848, Mr. Stephens, referring to an account, received by him, respecting what he supposed to be an island in the Dead Sea, writes thus—"It comes from one who ought to know, from the only man, who ever made the tour of that sea, and lived to tell of it." If Mr. Stephens will look at Chateaubriand's *Travels*, and his fine description of the Dead Sea, he will find there the following passage: "*No person has yet made the tour of it but Daniel, abbot of St. Saba. Nau has preserved in his travels the narrative of that recluse. From his account we learn,*" &c.

"The celebrated lake," says Chateaubriand, "which occu-

pies the site of Sodom, is called in Scripture the Dead or Salt Sea." Not so: it is no where called the Dead Sea, in the sacred writings. By the Turks, it is called Ula Deguisi, and by the Arabs, Bahar Loth and Almotanah.

It is quite desirable for travellers to be well apprized of all, that is previously known, in regard to the field of their peregrination. Goldsmith once projected a plan of visiting the East, for the purpose of bringing to England such inventions and models, as might be useful. Johnson laughed at the idea, and denounced Goldsmith, as entirely incompetent, from his ignorance of what already existed—"he will bring home a wheelbarrow," said Johnson, "and think he had made a great addition to our stock." Mr. Stephens has preserved a respectable silence, on the subject of Lot's wife.

The island, which is above referred to, turned out, like Sancho's in *Barrataria*, to be an optical illusion. The Maltese sailor, who said he had rowed about the lake with his employer, a Mr. Costigan, who died on its shores, was disposed, after fingering his fee, to enlarge and improve his former narrative. Mr. Stephens does not give the date of Costigan's visit to the Dead Sea. He, however, furnishes a linear map of its form. This also is drawn by the Maltese sailor, from memory. All that can be said of it is, that it corresponds with other plans, in one particular,—the Jordan enters the sea, at its northern extremity. Probably, no very accurate plan is to be found, such have been the impediments in the way of any deliberate examination—unless Lieutenant Lynch has succeeded in the work. The figure of the Dead Sea, in the *Atlas* of Lucas, has no resemblance to the figure, in the late *Bible Atlas* by Dr. Jenks.

No. XXXVII.

DR. JOHNSON said, if an atheist came into his house, he would lock up his spoons. I have always distrusted a sexton, who did not cherish a sentiment of profound and cordial affection, for his bell. It did my heart good, when a boy, to mark the proud satisfaction, with which Lutton, the sexton of the Old Brick, used to ring for fire. I have no confidence in a fellow,

who can toll his bell, for a funeral, and listen to its deep, and solemn vibrations, without a gentle subduing of the spirit. I never had a great affection for Claffin, the sexton of Berry Street Church; but I always respected the deep feeling of indignation he manifested, if anybody meddled with his bellrope.

Bells were treated more honorably in the olden time, and ringing was an art—an accomplishment—then. Holden tells us some fine stories of the societies of ringers. In his youth, Sir Matthew Hale was a member of one of those societies. In 1687, Nell Gwinne—and it may be lawful to take the devil's water, as Dr. Worcester said, to turn the Lord's mill—Nell Gwinne left the ringers of the church bells of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, where there is a peal of twelve, a sum of money, for a weekly entertainment. I never shall get the chime of the North Church bells out of my ears—I hope I never shall—more than half an hundred years ago, my mother used to open the window, of a Christmas eve, that we might hear their music!

In the olden time, bells were baptized—*rantized* I presume—and wore *posies* on their collars. They were first cast in England, in the reign of Edmund I., and the first tunable set, or peal, for Croyland Abbey, was cast A. D. 960. Weever tells us, in his *Funeral Monuments*, that, in 1501, the bells of the Priory of Little Dunmow, in Essex, were baptized, by the names of St. Michael, St. John, Virgin Mary, &c. As late as 1816, the great bell of Notre Dame, in Paris, was baptized, by the name of the Duke of Angoulême. Bells were supposed to be invested with extraordinary powers. They were employed, not only to call the congregation together, to give notice of conflagrations, civil commotions, and the approach of an enemy, and to ring forth the merry holiday peal—but to quell tempests, pacify the restless dead, and arrest the very lightning. Bells often bore inscriptions like these:

Laudo Deum verum, plebem voco, conjugo clerum,
Defunctos ploro, pestem fugo, festa decoro.

Fuera plango; Fulgura frango; Sabbata pango;
Excito lentos; Dissipo ventos; Peco cruentos.

The *passing bell* was the bell, which announced to the people, according to Mabillon, that a spirit was taking its flight, or *passing away*, and demanding their prayers. Bells were also used to frighten away evil spirits, that were supposed to be on the watch, for their customers. The learned Durandus affirms,

that all sorts of devils have a terror of bells. This, of course, can only be true of bells, that have been received into the flock, that is, baptized. Such was the Popish belief, and that the very devil, himself, cared not a fig, for an unbaptized bell. De Worde, in his Golden Legend, sayeth "it is said the evill spirytes that ben in the regyon of the ayre doubte moche, when they here the belles rongen, and this is the cause why the belles ben rongen, whan it thondreth, and when grate tempests and outrages of wether happen, to the ende that the feinds and wycked spirytes should be abashed and flee, and cease of the movinge of tempests."

Compared with the big bells of the earth—ours—the very largest—are cowbells, at best. The great bell of St. Paul's weighs 8400 pounds—a small affair; Great Tom of Lincoln, 9894—Great Tom of Oxford, 17,000. This is precisely the weight of the bell of the Palazzo, at Florence;—St. Peter's at Rome, 18,607—the great bell at Erfurth, 28,224—St. Joan's bell, at Moscow, 127,836—the bell of the Kremlin, 443,772. The last is the marvel of travellers, and its metal, at a low estimate, is valued at £66,565. During the fusion of this bell, considerable quantities of gold and silver were cast in, the pious contribution of the people. This enormous mass has never been suspended.

There was a bell—*parvis componere magna*—a very little bell indeed—very—a perfect *tintinabulum*. It made a most ridiculous noise. An account of this bell may be found, in a pamphlet, entitled Historical Notices, &c., of the New North Religious Society, in the town of Boston, 1822. It weighed, says the writer, "*between three and four hundred*," Twelve or thirteen hundred such bells, therefore, would just about counterpoise the bell of the Kremlin. "Its tone," says the writer, "*was unpleasant*." The preposterous clatter of this bell was, nevertheless, the gathering cry of the worshippers, at the New North Church, for the term of eighty-three years, from 1719 to 1802, when it was purchased by the town of Charlton, in the county of Worcester; probably to frighten the *evyll spirytes*, in the shape of wolves and foxes, abounding there, that would be likely to *doubte moche*, when this bell was *ben rongen*. "Not to look a gift horse in the mouth is a proverb—not to criticise the tone of a gift bell may be another. This bell, which a stout South Down wether might almost have carried off, was the gift

of *Mr. John Frizzell*, a merchant of Boston, to the New North Church, *on the island of North Boston*, as all that portion of the town was then called, lying North of Mill Creek. On the principle which gave the title of Bell the Cat to the famous Archibald, Frizzell should have borne the name of Bell the Church. Let it pass: Frizzell and his little bell are both translated. The tongue of the former is still; that of the latter still waggeth, I believe, in the town of Charlton.

The authenticity of the statements in the pamphlet to which I have referred, admits not of a doubt. The name of its highly respectable author, though not upon the title-page, appears in the certificate of copyright; and, in the range of my limited reading, I have met with nothing, more curious and grotesque, than his account of the installation of the Rev. Peter Thacher, over the New North Church, Jan. 27, 1720. Upon no less respectable evidence, would I have believed, that our amiable ancestors could have acted so much like *evil spirytes*, upon such an occasion. I have not elbow room for the farce entire—one or two touches must suffice. After agreeing upon a mode of choosing a colleague, for the Rev. Mr. Webb, and pitching upon Mr. Thacher, a quarrel arose, among the people. The council met, on the day of installation, at the house of the Rev. Mr. Webb, at the corner of North Bennet and Salem Streets. The aggrieved assembled, at the house of Thomas Lee, in Bennet Street, next to the Universal meeting-house. A knowledge of these points is necessary, for a correct understanding of the subsequent strategy. If the Council attempted to go to the New North Church, through the street, in the usual way, they must necessarily pass Lee's house. The aggrieved waited on the Council, by a committee, requesting them not to proceed with the installation of Mr. Thacher; and assuring them, that, if they persisted, force would be used, to prevent their occupation of the church.

Instead, therefore, of proceeding through the street, the Rev. Mr. Webb led the Council, by his back gate, through Love Lane, and a little alley, leading to the meeting-house, and thus got possession of the pulpit. Thus, by a knowledge of by-ways, so important in the *petite guerre*, the worthy clergyman outwitted the malcontents. A mob, to whom an installation, in such sort, was highly acceptable, had already gathered. The party at Lee's house, being apprised of the ruse, and perceiving they

were in danger of the council, flew to the rescue. They rushed into the church; vociferously forbade the proceedings, and were "indecent," says the writer, "almost beyond credibility." "However incredible," continues the narrator, "it is a fact, that some of the most unruly did sprinkle a liquor, which shall be nameless, from the galleries, upon the people below." The wife of Josiah Langdon used to tell, with great asperity, of her being a sufferer by it. This good lady retained her resentment to old age—the filthy creatures entirely spoiled a new velvet hood, which she had made for the occasion, and she could not wear it again.

In the midst of this uproar, Mr. Thacher was installed. "The malcontents," says the writer, "went off in a bad humor. They proceeded to the gathering of another church. In the plenitude of their zeal, they first thought of denominating it the *Revenge Church of Christ*; but they thought better of it, and called it the New Brick Church. However, the first name was retained, for many years, among the common people. Their zeal was great, indeed, and descended to puerility. They placed the figure of a cock, as a vane, upon the steeple, out of derision of Mr. Thacher, whose Christian name was Peter. Taking advantage of a wind, which turned the head of the cock towards the New North Meeting-house, when it was placed upon the spindle, a merry fellow straddled over it, and crowed three times, to complete the ceremony." The solemn, if not the sublime, and the ridiculous, seem, not unfrequently, to have met together at ordinations, in the olden time. "I could mention an ordination," says the Rev. Leonard Woods, of Andover, in a letter, written and published, a few years since, "that took place about twenty years ago, at which I, myself, was ashamed and grieved, to see two aged ministers literally drunk; and a third indecently excited with strong drink. These disgusting and appalling facts I should wish might be concealed. But they were made public, by the guilty persons; and I have thought it just and proper to mention them, in order to show how much we owe to a compassionate God, for the great deliverance he has wrought. Legitimate occasion for a *Te Deum* this, most certainly.

No. XXXVIII.

THE *præfice*, or mourning women, were not confined to Greece, Rome, and Judea. In 1810, Colonel Keatinge published the history of his travels. His account of Moorish funerals, is, probably, the best on record. The dead are dressed in their best attire. The ears, nostrils, and eyelids are filled with costly spices. Virgins are ornamented with bracelets, on their wrists and ankles. The body is enfolded in sanctified linen. If a male, a turban is placed at the head of the coffin; if a female, a large bouquet. Before a virgin is buried, the *loo loo loo* is sung, by hired women, that she may have the benefit of the wedding song. "When a person," says Mr. Keatinge, "is thought to be dying, he is immediately surrounded by his friends, who begin to scream, in the most hideous manner, to convince him that there is no more hope, and that he is already reckoned among the dead."

Premature burial is said to be very common, among the Moors. For this, Mr. Keatinge accounts, in this manner: "As, according to their religion, they cannot think the departed happy, till they are under ground, they are washed instantly, while yet warm; and the greatest consolation the sick man's friends can have, is to see him smile, while this operation is performing; not supposing such an appearance to be a convulsion, occasioned by washing and exposing the unfortunate person to the cold air, before life has taken its final departure."

When a death occurs, the relations immediately set up the *wooliah woo*, or death scream. This cry is caught up, from house to house, and hundreds of women are instantly gathered to the spot. They come to scream and inourn with the bereaved. This species of condolence is very happily described by Colonel Keatinge, page 92. "They," the howlers, "take her," the mother, widow or daughter, "in their arms, lay her head on their shoulders, and scream without intermission for several minutes, till the afflicted object, stunned with the constant howling and a repetition of her misfortune, sinks senseless on the floor. They likewise hire a number of women, who make this horrid noise round the bier, over which they scratch their faces, to such a degree, that they appear to have been bled with a lancet. These women are hired at burials, weddings and feasts.

Their voices are heard at the distance of half a mile. It is the custom of those, who can afford it, to give, on the evening of the day the corpse is buried, a quantity of hot-dressed victuals to the poor. This, they call "the supper of the grave."

Dr. E. D. Clarke observes, in his *Travels in Egypt*, Lond., 1817, that he recognized, among the Egyptians, the same notes, and the repetition of the same syllables, in their funeral cries, that had become familiar to his ear, on like occasions, among the Russians and the Irish.

Dr. Martin, in his account of the Tonga Islands, in the South Pacific, compiled from Mariner's papers, in his narrative of the funeral of a chief, states, that the women mourned over the corpse, through the whole night, sitting as near as possible, singing their dismal death song, and beating their breasts and faces.

The desire, to magnify one's apostleship, is, doubtless, at the bottom of all extravagant demonstrations of sorrow, at funerals, in the form of screaming, howling, yelling, personal laceration, and disfigurement. In the highly interesting account of the missionary enterprise, upon which the Duff was employed, in 1796, it was stated, that, at the funeral of a chief of Tongataboo, the people of both sexes continued, during two days, to mangle and hack themselves, in a shocking manner;—some thrust spears, through their thighs, arms, and cheeks; others beat their heads, till the blood gushed forth in streams; one man, having oiled his hair, set it on fire, and ran about the area, with his head in a blaze. This was a burning shame, beyond all doubt. I never forget old Tasman's bowl, when I think of this island. Tasman discovered Tongataboo, in 1643. At parting, he gave the chief a wooden bowl. Cook found this bowl, on the island, one hundred and thirty years afterwards. It had been used as a divining bowl, to ascertain the guilt or innocence of persons, charged with crimes. When the chief was absent, at some other of the Friendly Islands, the bowl was considered as his representative, and honored accordingly. Captain Cook presented the reigning chief with a pewter platter, and the bowl became immediately *functus officio*, the platter taking its place, for the purposes of divination.

In 1818, Captain Tuckey published the account of his expedition, to explore the Zaire, or Congo river. He describes a funeral, at Embomma, the chief mart, on that river. In returning to their vessel, after a visit to the chief, Chenoo, the party

observed a hut, in which the corpse of a female was deposited, dressed as when alive. On the inside were four women howling lustily, to whom two men, outside, responded; the concert closely resembling the yell, at an Irish funeral. Captain Tuckey should not have spoken so thoughtlessly of the *keena*, the funeral cry of the wild Irish, the most unearthly sound, that ever came from the agonized lungs of mortal. For the most perfect description of this peculiar scream, this inimitable hellabaloo, the reader may turn to Mrs. Hall's incomparable account of an Irish funeral. In close connection with this incident, Captain Tuckey, p. 115, remarks, that, in passing through the burying ground, at Embomma, they saw two graves, recently prepared, of monstrous size, being not less than nine feet by five.

This he explains as follows:—"Simmons (a native, returned from England to his native country) requested a piece of cloth to envelop his aunt, who had been dead seven years, and was to be buried in two months. The manner of preserving corpses, for so long a time, is by enveloping them in the cloth of the country, or in European cotton. The wrappers are successively multiplied, as they can be procured by the relations of the deceased, or according to the rank of the person; in the case of a rich and very great man, the bulk being only limited, by the power of conveyance to the grave." When the Spaniards entered the Province of Popayan, they found a similar practice there, with this difference, that the corpse was partially roasted, before it was enveloped. When a chief dies, among the Caribs of Guyana, his wives, the whole flock of them, watch the corpse for thirty days, to keep off the flies,—a task which becomes daily more burdensome, as the attraction becomes greater. At the expiration of thirty days, it is buried, and one of the ladies, probably the best beloved, with it.

Some of the Orinoco tribes were in the practice of tying a rope to the corpse, and sinking it in the river; in twenty-four hours, it was picked clean to the bones, by the fishes, and the skeleton became a very convenient and tidy memorial. This is decidedly preferable to the mode, adopted by the Parsees. Their sacred books enjoin them not to pollute *earth, water, or fire*, with their dead. They therefore feel authorized to pollute the air. They bury not; but place the corpses at a distance, and leave them to their fate. It was the opinion of Menu, that the body

was a tenement, scarcely worth inhabiting; "a mansion," says he, "with bones for beams and rafters,—nerves and tendons for cords; muscles and blood for mortar; skin for its outward covering; a mansion, infested by age and sorrow, the seat of many maladies, harassed with pains, haunted with darkness, and utterly incapable of standing long—such a mansion let the vital soul, its tenant, always quit cheerfully."

This contempt for the tabernacle—the carcass—the outer man—strangely contrasts with that deep regard for it, evinced by the Egyptians, and such of the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, as were in the practice of embalming. When that extraordinary man, Sir Thomas Browne, exclaimed, in his *Hydriotaphia*, "who knows the fate of his bones or how oft he shall be buried? Who hath the oracle of his ashes, or whither they are to be scattered?" he, doubtless, was thinking of Egyptian mummies, transported to Europe, forming a part of the *materia medica*, and being actually swallowed as physic. A writer, in the *London Quarterly*, vol. 21, p. 363, states, that, when the old traveller, John Sanderson, returned to England, six hundred pounds of mummies were brought home, for the Turkey Company. I am aware, that it has been denied, by some, that the Egyptian mummies were broken up, and sent to Europe, for medicinal uses. By them it is asserted, that what the druggists have been supplied with is the flesh of executed criminals, or such others, as the Jews can obtain, filled with bitumen, aloes and other things, and baked, till the juices are exhaled, and the embalming matter has fitted the body for transportation. The Lord deliver us from such "*doctors' stuff*" as this.

No. XXXIX.

Non sumito, nisi vocatus: let no man presume to be an undertaker, unless he have a *vocation*—unless he be *called*. If these are not the words of Puddifant, to whom I shall presently refer, I have no other conjecture to offer. Though, when a boy, I had a sort of hankering after dead men's bones, as I have already related, I never felt myself truly called to be a sexton, until June, 1799. It was in that month and year, that Governor

Sumner was buried. The parade was very great, not only because he had been a Governor, but because he had been a very good man. All the sextons were on duty, but Lutton, as we called him—his real name was Lemuel Ludden. He was the sexton of the Old Brick, where my parents had worshipped, under dear parson Clarke, who died, the year before. He had the cleverest way, that man ever had, of winning little boys' hearts—he really seemed to have the key to their little souls. Lutton was sick—he was not able to officiate, on that memorable day; and no recently appointed ensign ever felt such a privation more keenly, on the very day of battle. He was a whole-souled sexton, that Lutton. He, most obligingly, took me into the Old Brick Church, where Joy's buildings now stand, to see the show. There was a half-crazy simpleton, whom it was difficult to prevent from capering before the corpse—a perfect Davie Gelatly. An awkward boy, whose name was Reuben Rankin, came from Salem, with a small cart-load of pies, which his mother had baked, and sent to Boston, hoping for a ready sale, upon the occasion of such an assemblage there. Like Grouchy, at Waterloo, he lost his *tête*; followed the procession, through every street; and returned to Salem, with all his wares.

It was, while contemplating the high satisfaction, beaming forth, upon the features of the chief undertaker, that I first felt my *vocation*. I ventured, timidly, to ask old Lutton, if he thought I had talents for the office. He said, he thought I might succeed, clapped me on the shoulder, and gave me a smile of encouragement, which I never shall forget, till my poor old arm can wield a spade no more, and the sod, which I have so frequently turned upon others, shall be turned upon me.

Old Grossman said, in my hearing, the following morning, that it had been the proudest day of his life. It is very pardonable, for an undertaker, on such occasions, to imagine himself the observed of all observers. This fancy is, by no means, confined to undertakers. Chief mourners of both sexes are very liable to the same impression. An over-estimate of one's own importance is pretty universal, especially in a republic. I never did go the length of believing the tale, related, by Peter, in his letter to his kinsfolk, who says he knew a Scotch weaver, who sat upon his stoop, and read the Edinburgh Review, till he actually thought he wrote it. I see nothing to smile at, in any man's belief, that he is the object of public attention, on occasions of pa-

rade and pageantry. It rather indicates the deep interest of the individual—a solemn sense of responsibility. At the late water celebration, I noticed many examples of this species of personal enthusiasm. The drivers of the Oak Hall and Sarsaparilla expresses were no mean illustrations; and when three cheers were given to the elephant, near the Museum, in Tremont Street, I was pleased to see several of the officials, and one, at least, of the water commissioners, touch their hats, and smile most graciously, in return.

Puddifant, to whom I have alluded, officiated as sexton, at the funeral of Charles I. What a broad field, for painful contemplation, lies here! It is a curious fact, that, while preparations were being made, for depositing the body of King Charles in St. George's Chapel, at Windsor, a common foot soldier is supposed to have stolen a bone from the coffin of Henry VIII., for the purpose of making a knife-handle. This account is so curious, that I give it entire from Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, folio edit. vol. ii., p. 703. "Those gentlemen, therefore, Herbert and Mildmay, thinking fit to submit, and leave the choice of the place of burial to those great persons, (the Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Hertford, and Earl of Lindsey) they, in like manner, viewed the tomb house and the choir; and one of the Lords, beating gently upon the pavement with his staff, perceived a hollow sound; and, thereupon ordering the stones to be removed, they discovered a descent into a vault, where two coffins were laid, near one another, the one very large, of an antique form, and the other little. These they supposed to be the bodies of Henry VIII., and his third wife, Queen Jane Seymour, as indeed they were. The velvet palls, that covered their coffins, seemed fresh, though they had lain there, above one hundred years. The Lords agreeing, that the King's body should be in the same vault interred, being about the middle of the choir, over against the eleventh stall, upon the sovereign's side, they gave orders to have the King's name, and year he died, cut in lead; which, whilst the workmen were about, the Lords went out, and gave Puddifant, the sexton, order to lock the chapel door, and not suffer any to stay therein, till further notice."

"The sexton did his best to clear the chapel; nevertheless, Isaac, the sexton's man, said that a foot soldier had hid himself so as he was not discovered; and, being greedy of prey, crept into the vault, and cut so much of the velvet pall, that covered

the great body, as he judged would hardly be missed, and wimble a hole through the said coffin that was largest, probably fancying that there was something well worth his adventure. The sexton, at his opening the door, espied the sacrilegious person; who, being searched, a bone was found about him, with which he said he would haft a knife. The girdle or circumscription of capital letters of lead put upon the King's coffin had only these words—"King Charles, 1648." This statement perfectly agrees with Sir Henry Halford's account of the examination, April 1, 1813, in presence of the Prince Regent.

Cromwell had a splendid funeral: good old John Evelyn saw it all, and describes it in his diary—the waxen effigy, lying in royal robes, upon a velvet bed of state, with crown, sceptre and globe—in less than two years suspended with a rope round the neck, from a window at Whitehall. Evelyn says, the "funeral was the joyfullest ever seen: none cried but the dogs, which the soldiers hooted away with a barbarous noise, drinking and taking tobacco in the streets as they went." Some have said that Cromwell's body was privately buried, by his own request, in the field of Naseby: others, that it was sunk in the Thames, to prevent insult. It was not so. When, upon the restoration, it was decided, to reverse the popular sentiment, Oliver's body was sought, in the middle aisle of Henry VII's chapel, and there it was found. A thin case of lead lay upon the breast, containing a copper plate, finely gilt, and thus inscribed—*Oliverius, Protector reipublicæ Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Hiberniæ, natus 25 April, 1599—inauguratus 16 Decembris 1653—mortuus 3 Septembris ann—1658. Hic situs est.* This plate, in 1773, was in possession of the Hon George Hobart of Nocton in Lincolnshire. By a vote of the House of Commons, Cromwell's and Ireton's bodies were taken up, Jan. 26, 1660—and, on the Monday night following, they were drawn, on two carts, to the Red Lion Inn, Holborn, where they remained all night; and, with Bradshaw's, which was not exhumed, till the day after, conveyed, on sledges, to Tyburn, and hanged on the gallows, till sunset. They were then beheaded—the trunks were buried in a hole, near the gallows, and their heads set on poles, on the top of Westminster Hall, where Cromwell's long remained.

The treatment of Oliver's character has been in perfect keeping, with the treatment of his carcass. The extremes of censure and of praise have been showered upon his name. He has been

canonized, and cursed. The most judicious writers have expressed their views of his character, in well-balanced phrases. Cardinal Mazarin styled him a *fortunate mad-man*; and, by Father Orleans, he was called a *judicious villain*. The opinion of impartial men will probably vary very little from that of Clarendon, through all time: he says of Cromwell—"he was one of those men, *quos vituperare ne inimici quidem possunt, nisi ut simul laudent*;" and again, vol. vii. 301, Oxford ed. 1826: "In a word, as he was guilty of many crimes, against which damnation is denounced, and for which hell-fire is prepared, so he had some good qualities, which have caused the memory of some men, in all ages, to be celebrated; and he will be looked upon by posterity as a *brave wicked man*." Oliver had the nerve to do what most men could not: he went to look upon the corpse of the beheaded king—opened the coffin with his own hand—and put his finger to the neck, where it had been severed. *He could not then doubt that Charles was dead.*

At the same time, when the authorized absurdities were perpetrated upon Oliver's body, every effort was ineffectually made to discover that of King Charles, for the purpose of paying to it the highest honors. This occurred at the time of the restoration, or about ten years after the death of Charles I. In 1813, i. e. one hundred and sixty-five years after that event, the body was accidentally discovered. To this fact, and to the examination by Sir Henry Hallford, President of the Royal College of Physicians, I shall refer in my next.

No. XL.

THE passage, quoted in my last, from the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, shows plainly, that Charles I. was buried in 1648, in the same vault with the bodies of Henry VIII. and Jane Seymour; and this statement is perfectly sustained, by the remarkable discovery in 1813, which proves Lord Clarendon to have been mistaken in his account, *Hist. Reb.*, Oxford ed., vol. vi. p. 243. The Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, and the Earls of Southampton and Lindsey, who had been of the bed chamber, and had obtained leave, to perform the last duty to the decollated

king, went into the church, at Windsor, to seek a place for the interment, and were greatly perplexed, by the mutilations and changes there—"At last," says Clarendon, "there was a fellow of the town, who undertook to tell them the place, where he said there was a vault, in which King Harry, the Eighth, and Queen Jane Seymour were interred. As near that place, as could conveniently be, they caused the grave to be made. There the king's body was laid, without any words, or other ceremonies, than the tears and sighs of the few beholders. Upon the coffin was a plate of silver fixed with these words only: 'King Charles, 1648.' When the coffin was put in, the black velvet pall, that had covered it, was thrown over it, and then the earth thrown in." *Such, clearly, could not have been the facts.*

Lord Clarendon then proceeds to speak of the impossibility of finding the body ten years after, when it was the wish of Charles II. to place it, with all honor, in the chapel of Henry VII., in Westminster Abbey. For this he accounts, by stating, that most of those present, at the *interment*, were dead or dispersed, at the restoration; and the memories of the remaining few had become so confused, that they could not designate the spot; and, after opening the ground, in several places, without success, they gave the matter up. Now there can be no doubt, that the body was placed in the vault, where it was found, in 1613, and that no *interment* took place, in the proper sense of that word. Had Richmond, Hertford, Southampton, or Lindsey been alive, or at hand, the *vault itself*, and not a spot *near the vault*, would, doubtless, have been indicated, as the resting place of King Charles. Wood, in the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, states, that the royal corpse was "well coffined, and all afterwards wrapped up in lead and covered with a new velvet pall." All this perfectly agrees with the account, given by Sir Henry Halford, and certified by the Prince Regent, in 1813.

Sir Henry Halford states, that George the Fourth had built a mausoleum, at Windsor; and, while constructing a passage, under the choir of St. George's Chapel, an opening was unintentionally made into the vault of Henry VIII., through which, the workmen saw, not only those two coffins, which were supposed to contain the bodies of Henry VIII. and Jane Seymour, but a third, covered with a black pall. Mr. Herbert's account, quoted in my last number, from the *Athenæ*, left little doubt, that this was the coffin of Charles I.; notwithstanding the state-

ments of Lord Clarendon, that the body was interred *near* the vault. An examination was made, April 1, 1813, in the presence of George IV., then Prince Regent, the Duke of Cumberland, Count Munster, the Dean of Windsor, Benjamin Charles Stevenson, Esq., and Sir Henry Halford; of which the latter published an account. London, 1831. This account is exceedingly interesting. "On removing the pall, a plain leaden coffin, with no appearance of ever having been enclosed in wood, and bearing an inscription, KING CHARLES, 1648, in large legible characters, on a scroll of lead encircling it, immediately presented itself to view.

"A square opening was then made, in the upper part of the lid, of such dimensions, as to admit a clear insight into its contents. These were an internal wooden coffin, very much decayed, and the body carefully wrapped up in cere-cloth, into the folds of which a quantity of unctuous or greasy matter, mixed with resin, as it seemed, had been melted, so as to exclude, as effectually as possible, the external air. The coffin was completely full; and from the tenacity of the cere-cloth, great difficulty was experienced, in detaching it successfully from the parts, which it enveloped. Wherever the unctuous matter had insinuated itself, the separation of the cere-cloth was easy; and when it came off, a correct impression of the features, to which it had been applied, was observed in the unctuous substance. At length the whole face was disengaged from its covering. The complexion of the skin of it was dark and discolored. The forehead and temples had lost little or nothing of their muscular substance; the cartilage of the nose was gone; but the left eye, in the first moment of exposure, was open and full, though it vanished, almost immediately; and the pointed beard, so characteristic of the period of the reign of King Charles, was perfect. The shape of the face was a long oval; many of the teeth remained; and the left ear, in consequence of the interposition of the unctuous matter, between it and the cere-cloth, was found entire.

"It was difficult, at this moment, to withhold a declaration, that, notwithstanding its disfigurement, the countenance did bear a strong resemblance to the coins, the busts, and especially to the pictures of King Charles I., by Vandyke, by which it had been made familiar to us. It is true, that the minds of the spectators of this interesting sight were well prepared to receive this

impression ; but it is also certain, that such a facility of belief had been occasioned, by the simplicity and truth of Mr. Herbert's narrative, every part of which had been confirmed by the investigation, so far as it had advanced ; and it will not be denied, that the shape of the face, the forehead, an eye, and the beard, are the most important features, by which resemblance is determined.

"When the head had been entirely disengaged from the attachments, which confined it, it was found to be loose, and without any difficulty was taken up and held to view. It was quite wet, and gave a greenish and red tinge to paper and to linen, which touched it. The back part of the scalp was entirely perfect, and had a remarkably fresh appearance ; the pores of the skin being more distinct, as they usually are, when soaked in moisture ; and the tendons and ligaments of the neck were of considerable substance and firmness. The hair was thick, at the back part of the head, and in appearance, nearly black. A portion of it, which has since been cleansed and dried, is of a beautiful dark brown color. That of the beard was of a redder brown. On the back part of the head it was not more than an inch in length, and had probably been cut so short, for the convenience of the executioner, or perhaps, by the piety of friends, soon after death, in order to furnish memorials of the unhappy king."

"On holding up the head to examine the place of separation from the body, the muscles of the neck had evidently retracted themselves considerably ; and the fourth cervical vertebra was found to be cut through its substance transversely, leaving the surfaces of the divided portions perfectly smooth and even, an appearance, which could have been produced only by a heavy blow, inflicted with a very sharp instrument, and which furnished the last proof wanting to identify King Charles, the First. After this examination of the head, which served every purpose in view, and without examining the body below the neck, it was immediately restored to its situation, the coffin was soldered up again, and the vault closed."

"Neither of the other coffins had any inscription upon them. The larger one, supposed, on good grounds, to contain the remains of Henry VIII., measured six feet ten inches in length, and had been enclosed in an elm one, of two inches in thickness ; but this was decayed, and lay in small fragments. The

leadern coffin appeared to have been beaten in by violence about the middle, and a considerable opening in that part of it, exposed a mere skeleton of the king. Some beard remained upon the chin, but there was nothing to discriminate the personage contained in it."

This is, certainly, a very interesting account. Some beard still remained upon the chin of Henry VIII., says Sir Henry Halford. Henry VIII. died Jan. 28, 1547. He had been dead, therefore, April 1, 1813, the day of the examination, two hundred and sixty-six years. The larger coffin measured six feet ten inches. Sir Henry means top measure. We always allow seven feet lid, or thereabouts, for a six feet corpse. Henry, in his History, vol. xi. p. 369, Lond. 1814, says that King Henry VIII. was tall. Strype, in Appendix A., vol. vi. p. 267, Ecc. Mem., London, 1816, devotes twenty-four octavo pages to an account of the funeral of Henry VIII., with all its singular details; and, at the last, he says—"Then was the vault uncovered, under the said corpse; and the corpse let down therein by the vice, with help of sixteen tal yeomen of the guard, appointed to the same." "Then, when the mold was brought in, at the word, *pulverem pulveri et cinerem cineri*, first the Lord Great Master, and after the Lord Chamberlain and al others in order, with heavy and dolorous lamentation brake their staves in shivers upon their heads and cast them after the corps into the pit. And then the gentlemen ushers, in like manner brake their rods, and threw them into the vault with exceeding sorrow and heaviness, not without grievous sighs and tears, not only of them, but of many others, as well of the meaner sort, as of the nobility, very piteous and sorrowful to behold."

No. XLI.

My attention was arrested, a day or two since, by a memorial, referred to, in the Atlas, from the owner of the land, famous, in revolutionary history, as the birth-place of LIBERTY TREE; and, especially, by a suggestion, which quadrates entirely with my notions of the fitness of things. If I were a demi-millionaire, I

should delight to raise a monument, upon that consecrated spot—it should be a simple colossal shaft, of Massachusetts granite, surmounted with the cap of liberty. I would not inscribe one syllable upon it—but, if any grey-headed *Boston boy*—born here, within the limits of the old peninsula—should be moved, by the spirit, to write below—

Hæc olim meminisse juvabit—

I should not deem that act any interference with my original purpose.

What days and nights those were! 1765! then, the man, who has now passed on to ninety-four, was the boy of ten! How perfectly the tablet of memory retains those impressions, made, by the pressure of great events, when the wax was soft and warm!

It is quite common, with the present generation, at least, to connect the origin of LIBERTY TREE with 1775-6. This is an error. It became celebrated, ten years earlier, during the disturbances in Boston, on account of the Stamp Act, which passed March 22, 1765, and was to be in force, on the first of November following. Intelligence arrived, that Andrew Oliver, Secretary of the Province, was to be distributor of stamps.

There was a cluster or grove of beautiful elms, in HANOVER SQUARE—such was the name, then given to the corner of Orange, now part of Washington Street, and Auchmuty's Lane, now Essex Street. Opposite the southwesterly corner of Frog Lane, now Boylston Street, where the market-house now stands, there was an old house, with manifold gables, and two massive chimneys, and, in the yard, in front of it, there stood a large, spreading elm. This was LIBERTY TREE. Its first designation was on this wise. During the night of August 13, 1765, some of the SONS OF LIBERTY, as they styled themselves, assuming the appellation bestowed on them in the House of Commons, by Col. Barre, in a moment of splendid but unpremeditated eloquence, hung, upon that tree, an effigy of Mr. Oliver, and a boot, with a figure of the devil peeping out, and holding the stamp act in his hand; this boot was intended as a practical pun—wretched enough—upon the name of Lord Bute. In the morning of the 14th, a great crowd collected to the spot. Some of the neighbors attempted to take the effigy down. The *Sons of Liberty* gave them a forcible hint, and they desisted. The Lieutenant Governor, as Chief Justice, directed the sheriff to take it down: he

reconnoitred the ground, and reported that it could not be done, without peril of life.

Business was suspended, about town. After dark, the effigy was borne, by the mob, to a building, which was supposed to have been erected, as a stamp-office. This they destroyed, and, bearing the fragments to Fort Hill, where Mr. Oliver lived, they made a bonfire, and burnt the effigy before his door. They next drove him and his family from his house, broke the windows and fences, and stoned the Lieutenant Governor and Sheriff, when they came to parley—all this, upon the night of August 14, 1765. On the 26th, they destroyed the house of Mr. Story, register-deputy of the Admiralty, and burnt the books and records of the court. They then served the house of Mr. Hollowell, Contractor of the Customs, in a similar manner, plundering and carrying away money and chattels. They next proceeded to the residence of the Lieutenant Governor, and destroyed every article not easily transported, doing irreparable mischief, by the destruction of many valuable manuscripts. The next day, a town meeting was held, and the citizens expressed their *detestation of the riots*—and, afterwards manifested their silent sympathy with the mob, by punishing nobody.

Nov. 1, 1765, the day, when the stamp act came into force, the bells were muffled and tolled; the shipping displayed their colors, at half mast; the stamp act was printed, with a death's head, in the place of the stamp, and cried about the streets, under the name of the FOLLY OF ENGLAND, AND THE RUIN OF AMERICA. A new political journal appeared, having for its emblem, or political phylactery, a serpent, cut into pieces, each piece bearing the initials of a colony, with the ominous motto—JOIN OR DIE. More effigies were hung, upon "*the large old elm*," as Gordon terms it—LIBERTY TREE. They were then cut down, and escorted over town. They were brought back, and hung up again; taken down again; escorted to the Neck, by an immense concourse; hanged upon the gallows tree; taken down once more; and torn into innumerable fragments. Three cheers were then given, and, upon a request to that effect, every man went quietly home; and a night of unusual stillness ensued.

Hearing that Mr. Oliver intended to resume his office, he was required, through the newspaper, by an anonymous writer, to acknowledge, or deny, the truth of that report. His answer proving unsatisfactory, he received a requisition, Nov. 16th, to

appear "*tomorrow, under LIBERTY TREE, to make a public resignation.*" Two thousand persons gathered then, beneath that TREE—not the rabble, but the selectmen, the merchants, and chief inhabitants. Mr. Oliver requested, that the meeting might be held, in the town house; but the SONS OF LIBERTY seemed resolved, that he should be *treed*—no place, under the canopy of Heaven, would answer, but LIBERTY TREE. Mr. Oliver came; subscribed an ample declaration; and made oath to it, before Richard Dana, J. P. This exactitude and circumspection, on the part of the people, was not a work of supererogation: Andrew Oliver was a most amiable man, in private, but a most lubricious hypocrite, in public life; as appears by his famous letters, sent home by Dr. Franklin, in 1772. After his declaration under the TREE, he made a short speech, expressive of his "*utter detestation of the stamp act.*" What a spectacle was there and then! The best and the boldest were there. Samuel Adams and John—Jerry Gridley, Samuel Sewall, and John Hancock, *et id genus omne* were in Boston then, and the busiest men alive: their absence would have been marked—they must have been there. What an act of daring, thus to defy the monarch and his vicegerents! I paused, this very day, and gazed upon the spot, and put the steam upon my imagination, to conjure, into life and action, that little band of sterling patriots, gathered around; and that noble elm in their midst:—

"In medio ramos annosaque brachia pandit
Ulmus opaca, ingens."

Thenceforward, the SONS OF LIBERTY seem to have taken the TREE, under their special protection. On Valentine's day, 1776, they assembled, and passed a vote, that *it should be pruned after the best manner.* It is well, certainly, now and then, to lop off some rank, disorderly shoots of licentiousness, that will sometimes appear, upon LIBERTY TREE. It was pruned, accordingly, by a party of volunteer carpenters, under the direction of a gentleman of skill and judgment, in such matters.

News of the repeal of the stamp act arrived in Boston, May 16, 1766. The bells rang merrily—and the cannon were unlimbered, around LIBERTY TREE, and bellowed for joy. The TREE, so skilfully pruned, in February, must have presented a beautiful appearance, bourgeoning forth, in the middle of May!

The nineteenth of May was appointed, for a merrymaking. At one, in the morning, the bell of the Hollis Street Church, says a zealous writer of that day, "*began to ring*"—*sua sponte*, no doubt. The slumbers of the pastor, Dr. Byles, were disturbed, of course, for he was a tory, though a very pleasant tory, after all. Christ Church replied, with its royal peal, from the North, and *God save the king*, rang pleasantly again, in colonial ears. The universal joy was expressed, in all those unphilosophical ways, enumerated by Pope,

With gun, drum, trumpet, blunderbuss and thunder.

LIBERTY TREE was hung with various colors. Fireworks and illuminations succeeded. Gov. Hancock treated the people with "*a pipe of Madeira*;" and the SONS OF LIBERTY raised a pyramid, upon the Common, with two hundred and eighty lamps. At twelve o'clock—midnight—a drum, upon the Common, beat the *tattoo*; and men, women, and children retired to their homes, in the most perfect order: verily, a soberness had come over the spirit of their dreams, and method into their madness. On the evening of the twentieth of May, it was resolved to have a festival of lanterns.

The inhabitants vied with each other; and, about dusk, they were seen streaming, from all quarters, to HANOVER SQUARE, every man and boy with his lamp or lantern. In a brief space, LIBERTY TREE was converted into a brilliant constellation. Like the sparkling waters, during the burning of Ucalegon's palace, described by Homer, the boughs, the branches, the veriest twigs of this popular idol

—————"were bright,
With splendors not their own, and shone with sparkling light."

It appears, by the journals of that day, from which most of these particulars are gathered, that our fathers—what inimitable, top-gallant fellows they were!—took a pleasant fancy into their heads, that these lamps would shed a brighter lustre, if the poor debtors, in jail, could join in the general joy, under LIBERTY TREE. Accordingly they made up a purse and paid the debts of them all! There was a general jail delivery of the poor debtors, for very joy. Well: a Boston boy, of the old school, was a noble animal—how easily held by the heart-strings!—with how much difficulty, by the head or the tail!

An antiquarian friend, to whom I am already under sundry

obligations, has obligingly loaned me an interesting document, in connection with the subject of *LIBERTY TREE*; under whose shade I propose to linger a little longer.

No. XLII.

MARCH 22, 1765. George III. and his ministers took it into their heads to sow the wind; and, in an almost inconceivably short time, they reaped the whirlwind. They scattered dragons' teeth, and there came up armed men. They planted the stamp act, in the Colonial soil, and there sprang into life, mature and full of vigor, the *LIBERTY TREE*, like Minerva, fully developed, and in perfect armor, from the brain of Jupiter. Whoever would find a clear, succinct, and impartial account of the effect of the stamp act, upon the people of New England, may resort to Dodsley's Annual Register, page 49, of that memorable year. "The sun of liberty has set," wrote Franklin home, "but you must light up the candles of industry and economy."

The life of that act of oppression was short and stormy. March 18, 1766, its miserable requiem was sung in Parliament—"an event," says the Annual Register, of that year, page 46, "that caused more universal joy, throughout the British dominions, than, perhaps, any other, that can be remembered." How such a viper ever found its way into the cradle of liberty is quite a marvel—certain it is, the genius of freedom, with the power of Hercules, speedily strangled it there.

In America, and, especially, in Boston, the joy, as I have already stated, was very great; and some there were, beyond all doubt, who were delighted, to find an apology, for going back to monarchical usages. Even liberty may be, sometimes, irksome, at first, to him, who has long lived a slave; and it is no small grievance, I dare say, to such, to be deprived of the luxury of calling some one, Lord and Master, after the flesh. However monstrous, and even ridiculous, the idea of a king may seem to us, republicans, born in this wonderfully bracing atmosphere—there are some, who have a strong taste for *booing* and genuflection, and the doffing of beavers, and throwing up of "greasy caps," and rending their throats, for very ecstasy, when the royal

coach is coming along, bearing the heir apparent, in diapers. This taste, I suppose, like that for olives, must be acquired; it cannot be natural.

May 19, and 20, 1766, the face of the town of Boston was dressed in smiles—a broad grin rather, from ear to ear, from Winnisimmet to Roxbury. Nothing was talked of but “*a grateful people*,” and “*the darling monarch*”—which amounts to this—the “*darling monarch*” had graciously desisted, from grinding their faces any longer, simply because he was convinced, that the “*grateful people*” would kick the grindstone over, and peradventure the grinder, should the “*darling*” attempt to give it another turn.

Under LIBERTY TREE, there was erected, during the rejoicings, an obelisk with four sides. An engraving of those four sides was made at the time, and is now, doubtless, very rare. A copy, loaned me by the friend, to whom I referred, in my last number, is lying before me. I present it, *verbatim, literatim, et punctuatim*.

It is thirteen and an half inches long, and nine and an half wide. On top are these words—“A VIEW of the OBELISK erected under LIBERTY TREE in BOSTON on the Rejoicings for the Repeal of the — Stamp Act 1766.” At the bottom—“To every Lover of LIBERTY this Plate is humbly dedicated by her true born SONS in BOSTON, New England.” The plate presents, apparently, four obelisks, which are, in reality, the four sides of one. Every side, above the base, is divided horizontally, and nearly equally, into three parts. The superior division of each contains four heads, many of which may be readily recognized, and all of which have indicating letters. The middle division of each contains ten decasyllabic lines. The inferior division of each contains a sketch, of rude execution, and rather more patriotic, than tasteful, in the design. The principal portraits are of George III.; Queen Charlotte; Marquis of Rockingham; Duke of York; Gen. Conway; Lord Townshend; Colonel Barré; W. Pitt; Lord Dartmouth; Charles Townshend; Lord George Sackville; John Wilkes; Alderman Beckford; Lord Camden; &c. The first side is subscribed thus: “*America in distress, apprehending the total loss of LIBERTY;*” and is inscribed thus:

Oh thou, whom next to Heaven we most revere
Fair LIBERTY! thou lovely Goddess hear!

Have we not woo'd thee, won thee, held thee long,
 Lain in thy Lap and melted on thy tongue.
 Thro' Deaths and Dangers rugged paths pursu'd
 And led thee smiling to this SOLITUDE,
 Hid thee within our hearts' most golden cell
 And brav'd the Powers of Earth and Powers of Hall,
 GODDESS ! we cannot part, thou must not fly,
 Be SLAVES ! we dare to scorn it, dare to die.

Beneath is the sketch—America recumbent and dejected, in the form of an Indian chief, under a pine tree, the angel of Liberty hovering over ; the Prime minister advancing with a chain, followed by one of the bishops, and others, Bute clearly designated by his Scotch plaid, and gaiters ; over head, flying towards the Indian, with the stamp act in his right claw, is the Devil ; of whom it is manifest our patriotic sires had a very clever conception.

The second side is subscribed thus : "*She implores the aid of her patrons ;*" and is inscribed thus :

While clanking chains and curses shall salute
 Thine Ears remorseless G——le, and thine O B——e,
 To you blest PATRIOTS, we our cause submit,
 Illustrious CAMDEN, Britain's Guardian, PITT.
 Recede not, frown not, rather let us be
 Deprived of being than of LIBERTY,
 Let fraud or malice blacken all our crimes,
 No disaffection stains these peaceful climes.
 Oh save us, shield us from impending woes,
 The foes of Britain only are our foes.

Beneath is the sketch—America, on one knee, pointing over her shoulder towards a retreating group, composed, as the chain and the plaid inform us, of the Prime Minister Bute, and company, upon whose heads a thunder cloud is bursting. At the same time America—the Indian, as before—supplicates the aid of others, whose leader is being crowned, by Fame, with a laurel wreath. The enormous nose—a great help to identification—marks the Earl of Chatham ; Camden may be known by his wig ; and Barré by his military air.

The third side is subscribed thus : "*She endures the Conflict, for a short Season,*" and is inscribed thus :

Boast foul Oppression, boast thy transient Reign,
 While honest FREEDOM struggles with her Chain,
 But know the Sons of Virtue, hardy, brave,
 Disclaim to lose thro' mean Despair to save ;
 Arrowed in Thunder awfull they appear,
 With proud Deliverance stalking in their Rear,

While Tyrant Foes their pallid Fears betray,
Shrink from their Arms, and give their Vengeance way.
See in the unequal War OPPRESSORS fall,
The hate, contempt, and endless Curse of all.

Beneath is the sketch—The TREE OF LIBERTY, with an eagle feeding its young, in the topmost branches, and an angel advancing with an ægis.

The fourth side is subscribed thus: "*And has her LIBERTY restored by the Royal hand of GEORGE the Third;*" and is inscribed thus:

Our FAITH approv'd, our LIBERTY restor'd,
Our Hearts bend grateful to our sov'reign Lord;
Hail darling Monarch! by this act endear'd,
Our firm affections are thy best reward—
Sh'd Britain's self against herself divide,
And hostile Armies frown on either side;
Sh'd hosts rebellious shake our Brunswick's Throne,
And as they dar'd thy Parent dare the Son.
To this Asylum stretch thine happy Wing,
And we'll contend who best shall love our KING.

Beneath is the sketch—George the Third, in armor, resembling a Dutch widow, in a long-short, introducing America to the goddess of liberty, who are, apparently, just commencing the Polka—at the bottom of the engraving are the words—*Paul Revere Sculp.* Our ancestors dealt rather in fact than fiction—they were no poets.

Gordon refers to LIBERTY TREE, i. 175.

The fame of LIBERTY TREE spread far beyond its branches. Not long before it was cut down, by the British soldiers, during the winter of 1775-6, an English gentleman, Philip Billes, residing at Backway, near Cambridge, England, died, seized of a considerable fortune, which he bequeathed to two gentlemen, not relatives, on condition, that they would faithfully execute a provision, set forth in his will, namely, that his body should be buried, under the shadow of LIBERTY TREE, in Boston, New England. This curious statement was published in England, June 3, 1774, and may be found in the Boston Evening Gazette, first page, Aug. 22, 1774, printed by Thomas & John Fleet, sign of the Heart and Crown, Cornhill.

No. XLIII.

JOSIAH CARTER died, at the close of December, 1774. Never was there a happier occasion, for citing the *Quis desiderio*, &c., and I would cite that fine ode, were it not worn threadbare, like an old coverlet, by having been, immemorially, thrown over all manner of corpses, from the cobbler's to the king's.

If good old Dr. Charles Chauncy were within hearing, I would, indeed, apply to him a portion of its noble passages :

Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
Nulli flebilior quam tibi ———.

For good Josiah many wept, I fancy ;
But none more fluently than Dr. Chauncy.

Josiah Carter was sexton of the Old Brick. He died, in the prime of life—fifty only—a martyr to his profession—conscientious to a fault—standing all alone in the cold vault, after the last mourner had retired, and knocking gently upon the coffin lid, seeking for some little sign of animation, and begging the corpse, for Heaven's sake, if it were alive, to say so, in good English.

Carter was one of your real *integer vitæ* men. It is said of him, that he never actually lost his self-government, but once, in his life.

He was finishing a grave, in the Granary yard, and had come out of the pit, and was looking at his work, when a young, surgical sprig came up, and, with something of a mysterious air, shadowed forth a proposition, the substance of which was, that Carter should sell him the corpse—cover it lightly—and aid in removing it, by night. In an instant, Carter jerked the little chirurgeon into the grave—it was a deep one—and began to fill up, with all his might. The screams of the little fellow drew quite a number to the spot, and he was speedily rescued. When interrogated, years afterwards, as to his real intentions, at the time, Carter always became solemnized ; and said he considered the preservation of that young doctor—a particular Providence.

Carter had a strong aversion to unburying—so have I—especially a hatchet. I have a rooted hatred of slavery ; and I hope our friends, on the sunny side of Mason's and Dixon's line, will

not censure me, for digging up the graves of the past, and exposing unsightly relics, while I solicit the world's attention to the following literary *bijoux*.

To be sold, a young negro fellow, fit for country or other business.—Will be sold to the highest bidder, a very good gold watch, a negro boy, &c.—Cheap, for cash, a negro man, and woman, and two children.—A very likely negro wench, about 16 years of age.—A likely negro woman, about 30, cheap for cash.—A likely negro boy, about 13.—Sold only for want of employ, a healthy, tractable negro girl, about 18 years of age.—To be sold, for want of employ, a strong, hearty negro fellow, about 25 years of age.—Ran away, a negro, named Dick, a well-looking, well-shaped fellow, right negro, little on the yellow, &c.—A likely negro woman, about 33 years old, remarkable for honesty and good temper.—Grant Webster has for sale new and second hand chaises, rum, wines, and male and female negroes.—At auction, a negro woman that is used to most sorts of house business.—A likely, healthy negro man, a good cook, and can drive a carriage.—Ran away, a negro man, named Prince, a tall, straight fellow; he is about 33 years old, talks pretty good English; his design was to get off in some vessel, so as to go to England, under the notion, if he could get there, he should be free, &c.—Ten dollars reward: ran away, negro Primus, five feet ten inches high, long limbs, very long finger nails, &c.—To be sold, for no fault, a negro man, of good temper.—A valuable negro man.—Ran away, my negro, Cromarte, commonly called Crum, &c., &c.; whoever will return said runaway to me, or secure him in some public jail, &c.—The cash will be given for a negro boy of good temper.—A fine negro male child, to be given away.—To be sold, a Spanish Indian woman, about 21 years old, also a negro child, about two years old. To be sold, a strong, hearty negro girl, and her son, about a week old.—Ran away, my negro man, Samson; when he speaks has a leering look under his eyes; whoever will return him, or secure him in any of the jails, shall receive ten dollars reward. For sale, a likely negro man; has had the smallpox.—A likely negro boy, large for his age, about 13.—To be sold, very reasonably, a likely negro woman, about 33 or '4 years of age.—To be sold or hired, for a number of years, a strong, healthy, honest, negro girl, about 16 years of age.

Ah, my dear, indignant reader, I marvel not, that you are

grieved and shocked, that man should dare, directly under the eye of God, to offer his fellow for sale, as he would offer a side of mutton, or a slaughtered hog—that he should offer to sell him, from head to heel, liver and lights, and lungs, and heart, and bone, and muscle, and presume to convey over, to the buyer, the very will of the poor black man, for years, and for aye; so that the miserable creature should never draw in one single breath of freedom, but breathe the breath of a slave forever and ever. This is very damnable indeed—very. You read the advertisements, which I have paraded before you, with a sentiment of disgust towards the men of the South—*nimum ne crede colori*. These are northern negroes! these are northern advertisements!

————— Mutato nomine, de te
Fabula narratur —————.

Every one of these slaves was owned in Boston: every one of these advertisements was published in the Boston Gazette, and the two last on December 10, 1781. They are taken from one only of the public journals, and are a very Flemish sample of the whole cloth, which may be examined by him, who has leisure to turn over the several papers, then published here.

There is one, however, so awfully ridiculous, when we consider the profession of the deceased owner, and the place of sale, and which, in these connections, presents such an example of *sacra, commixta profanis*, that I must give the advertisement without defalcation. John Moorhead, the first minister of Bury, afterwards Berry Street Church, died Dec. 2, 1773. About a year after, his effects were sold, and the following advertisement appears, in the Boston Gazette, Jan. 2, 1775: "To be sold by Public Auction, on Thursday next, at ten o'clock in the Forenoon, all the Household Furniture, belonging to the Estate of the Rev. Mr. John Moorhead, deceased, consisting of Tables, Chairs, Looking Glasses, Feather Beds, Bedsteads and Bedding, Pewter, Brass, sundry Pieces of Plate, &c., &c. A valuable collection of Books—Also a likely Negro Lad—The sale to be at the House in Auchmuty's Lane, South End, not far from Liberty Tree."—Moses and the Prophets! *A human being to be sold as a SLAVE, not far from LIBERTY TREE*, in 1775!

Let me be clearly comprehended. Two wrongs cannot, like

two negatives, neutralize each other. It is true, there was slavery in Massachusetts, and probably more of it, than is supposed to have existed, by many of the present generation. Free negroes were not numerous, in Boston, in those years. In the Boston Gazette of Jan. 2, 1775, it is stated, that 547 whites and 52 blacks were buried in the town in 1774; and 533 whites and 62 blacks in 1773. Such was the proportion then.

The energy of our northern constitution has exorcised the evil spirit of slavery. Common sense and the grace of God put it into the minds and hearts of our fathers, when the accursed *Bohun Upas* was a sapling, to pull it up, by the roots. It follows not, therefore, that the people of the South are entitled to be treated by us, their brethren, like *outside barbarians*, because they do not cast it out from their midst, as promptly, and as easily, now that it has stricken down its roots into the bowels of the earth, and become a colossus, and overshadowed the land. Slavery, being the abomination that it is, in the abstract, and in the relative, we may well regret, that it ever defiled our peninsula; especially that a slave market, for the sale of one slave only, ever existed, "*not far from Liberty Tree.*" In sober truth, we are not quite justified, for railing at the South, as we have done. The sins of our dear, old fathers are still so comparatively recent, in regard to slavery, that I am absolutely afraid to fire canister and grape, among the group of offenders, lest I should disturb the ashes of my ancestors. Neither may we forget, that we, of the North, consented, aided and abetted, constitutionally, in the confirmation of slavery. Some of the most furious of the abolitionists, in this fair city, are *descendants in the right line, from Boston slaveholders*—their fathers did not recognize the sinfulness of holding slaves!

The people of the South are entitled to civility, from the people of the North, because they are citizens of one common country; and, if there is one village, town, or city of these United States, that, more than any and all others, is under solemn obligations to cherish a sentiment of grateful and affectionate respect for the South, it is the city of Boston. I propose to refresh the reader's recollection, in my next.

No. XLIV.

Delenda est Carthago—abolendum est servitium.—No doubt of it; slavery must be buried—decently, however. I cannot endure rudeness and violence, at a funeral. John Cades, in Charter Street, lost his place, in 1789, for letting old Goody Smith go by the run. The *naufragium* of Erasmus, was nothing at all, compared with that of the old lady's coffin. Our Southern confederates are entitled to *civility*, because they are men and brethren; and they are entitled to *kindness and courtesy from us, of Boston*, because we owe them a debt of gratitude, which it would be shameful to forget. Since we, of the North, have presumed to be *undertakers* upon this occasion, let us do the thing "*decenter et ornate*." Besides, our friends of the South are notoriously testy and hot-headed: they are, geographically, children of the sun. John Smith's description of the Massachusetts Indians, in 1614, Richmond ed., ii. 194, is truly applicable to the Southern people, "*very kind, but, in their fury, no less valiant*."

I am no more inclined to uphold the South, in the continued practice of a moral wrong, because they gave us bread when we were hungry, as they certainly did, than was Sir Matthew Hale, to decide favorably for the suitor, who sent him the fat buck. *Nullum simile quatuor pedibus currit*—the South, when they bestowed their kindness upon us, during the operation of the *Boston Port Bill*, had no possible favor to ask, in return.

This famous Port Bill, which operated like *guano* upon LIBERTY TREE, and caused it to send forth a multitude of new and vigorous shoots, was an act of revenge and coercion, passed March 31, 1774, by the British Parliament.

No government was ever so *penny wise* and *pound foolish*, as that of Great Britain, in 1773-'4. They actually sacrificed thirteen fine, flourishing colonies for *three pence*! In 1773 the East India Company, suffering from the bad effects of the smuggling trade, in the colonies, all taxation having been withdrawn, by Great Britain, excepting on tea, proposed, for the purpose of quieting the strife, to sell their tea, free of all duties, in the Colonies, and that sixpence a pound should be retained by the Government, on exportation. But the Government insisted upon *three pence* worth of dignity; in other words, for the honor of

the Crown, they resolved, that the colonists *should pay three pence* a pound, import duty. This was a very poor bargain—a *crown for three pence!* Well; I have no room for detail—the tea came; some of it went back again; and the balance was tossed into the sea. It was not suffered to be landed, at Philadelphia and New York. Seventeen chests, brought to New York, on private account, says Gordon, vol. i. page 333, were thrown overboard, Nov. 18, 1773, and combustibles were prepared to burn the ships, if they came up from the Hook. Dec. 16, 1773, three hundred and twenty-four chests of tea were broken open, on board the ships, in Boston, and their contents thrown into the salt water, by a “number of persons,” says Gordon, vol. i. page 341, “chiefly masters of vessels and ship-builders from the north end of the town, dressed as Indians.

In consequence of this, the *Port Bill* was passed. The object of this bill was to beggar—commercially to neutralize or nullify—the town of Boston, by shutting the port, and cutting off all import and export, by sea, until full compensation should be made, for the tea destroyed, and to the officers of the revenue, and others, who had suffered, by the riots, in the years 1773 and 1774. Such was the *Port Bill*, whose destructive operation was directed, upon the port of Boston alone, under a fatal misunderstanding of the British government, in relation to the real unanimity of the American people.

It is no easy matter, to describe the effect of this act of folly and injustice. The whole country seemed to be affected, with a sort of political *neuralgia*; and the attack upon Boston, like a wound upon some principal nerve, convulsed the whole fabric. The colonies resembled a band of brothers—“born for affliction:” a blow was no sooner aimed at one, than the remaining twelve rushed to the rescue, each one interposing an ægis. In no part of the country, were there more dignified, or more touching, or more substantial testimonies of sympathy manifested, for the people of Boston, than in the Southern States; and especially in Virginia, Maryland, and both the Carolinas.

The *Port Bill* came into force, June 1, 1774. The Marylanders of Annapolis, on the 25th of May preceding, assembled, and resolved, that Boston was “*suffering in the common cause of America.*” On the 30th, the magistrates, and other inhabitants of Queen Anne’s County resolved, in full meeting, that they would “*make known, as speedily as possible, their senti-*

ments to their distressed brethren of Boston, and that they looked upon the cause of Boston to be the common cause of America." The House of Burgeases, in Virginia, appointed the day, when the Boston Port Bill came into operation, as a day of fasting and prayer, throughout the ancient dominion. A published letter, from Kent County, Maryland, dated June 7, 1774, says—"The people of Boston need not be afraid of being starved into compliance; if they will only give a short notice, they may make their town the granary of America."

June 24, 1774.—Twenty-four days after the Port Bill went into operation, a public meeting was held at Charleston, S. C. The moving spirits were the Trapiers and the Elliots, the Horries and the Clarksons, the Gadsdens and the Pinkneys of that day; and resolutions were passed, full of brotherly love and sympathy, for the inhabitants of Boston.

"Baltimore, July 16th, 1774.—A vessel hath sailed from the Eastern Shore of this Province, with a cargo of provisions as a free gift to our besieged brethren of Boston. The inhabitants of all the counties of Virginia and Maryland are subscribing, with great liberality, for the relief of the distressed towns of Boston and Charlestown. The inhabitants of Alexandria, we hear, in a few hours, subscribed £350, for that noble purpose. Subscriptions are opened in this town, for the support and animation of Boston, under their present great conflict, for the common freedom of us all. A vessel is now loading with provisions, as a testimony of the affection of this people towards their persecuted brethren."

"Salem, Aug. 23, 1774.—Yesterday arrived at Marblehead, Capt. Perkins, from Baltimore, with 3000 bushels of corn, 20 barrels of rye meal, and 21 barrels of bread, for the benefit of the poor of Boston, and with 1000 bushels of corn from Annapolis, for the same benevolent purpose."

"New York, Aug. 15, 1774.—Saturday last, Capt. Dickerson arrived here, and brought 376 barrels of rye from South Carolina, to be sold, and proceeds remitted to Boston, a present to the sufferers; a still larger cargo is to be shipped for the like benevolent purpose."

"Newport, R. I.—Capt. Bull, from Wilmington, North Carolina, arrived here last Tuesday, with a load of provisions for the poor of Boston; to sail again for Salem."

These testimonies of a kind and brotherly spirit, came from all quarters of the country. These illustrations might be multi-

plied to any extent. I pass by the manifestations of the most cordial sympathy from other colonies, and the contributions from the towns and villages around us—my business lies, at present with the South—and my object is to remind some of the more rampant and furious of my abolition friends, who are of yesterday, that the people of the South, however hasty they may be, living under the sun's fiercer rays, and however excited, when a Northern man, however respectable, comes to take up his quarters in their midst, and gather evidence against them, under their very noses—are not precisely *outside barbarians*.

Let the work of abolition go forward, in a dignified and decent spirit. Let us argue; and, so far as we rightfully may, let us legislate. Let us bring the whole world's sympathy up to the work of emancipation. But, let us not revile and vituperate those, who are, to all intents and purposes, our brethren, as certainly as if they lived just over the Roxbury line, instead of Mason's and Dixon's. Such harsh and unmitigated scoffing and abuse, as we too often witness, are equally ungracious, ungentlemanly, and ungrateful.

There is something strangely grotesque, to be sure, in the idea of calling a state, in which there are more slaves than freemen, the *land of liberty*. Our Massachusetts ancestors had a very good *theoretical* conception of its inconsistency and absurdity, as early as 1773; when the first glimmerings of independence began to come over the spirit of their dreams. In that year, the Massachusetts negroes caught the liberty fever, and presented a petition to have their fetters knocked off. May 17, 1773, the inhabitants of Pembroke addressed a respectfully suggestive letter to their representative in the General Court, John Turner; the last paragraph of which is well worthy of republication. The entire letter may be found in the Boston Gazette of June 14, 1773—"We think the negro petition reasonable—agreeable to natural justice and the precepts of the Gospel; and therefore advise that, in concurrence with the other worthy members of the assembly, you endeavor to find a way, in which they may be freed from slavery, without wrong to their present masters, or injury to themselves—and that a total abolition of slavery may in due time take place. Then we trust we may with humble confidence, look up to the Great Arbiter of Heaven and earth, expecting that he will in his own due time, look upon our affliction, and in the way of his Providence, deliver us from the

insults, the grievances, and impositions we so justly complain of." This, as the reader will remember, had reference to slavery in Massachusetts.

No. XLV.

IN 1823, and in the month of May, something, in my line, caused me to visit the first ex-President Adams, at the old mansion in Quincy. By some persons, he was accounted a cold man; and his son, John Quincy, even a colder man: yet neither was cold, unless in the sense, in which Mount Hecla is cold—belted in everlasting ice, though liable, occasionally, to violent eruptions of a fiery character.

As I was taking my leave, being about to remove into a distant State, my daughter, between five and six years old, stepped timidly towards Mr. Adams, and placing her little hand upon his, and looking upon his venerable features, said to him—"Sir, you are so old, and I am going away so far, that I do not think I shall ever see you again—will you let me kiss you before I go?" His brow was suddenly overcast—the spirit became gently solemnized—"Certainly, my child," said he, "if you desire to kiss a very old man, whom it is quite likely you will never see again."—He bowed his aged form, and the child, rising on tip-toe, impressed a kiss upon his brow. I would give a great deal more than I can afford, for a fair sketch of that old man's face, as he resumed his position—I see it now, with the eye of a Swedenborgian. His features were slightly flushed, but not discomposed at all; tears filled his eyes; and, if one word must suffice to express all that I saw, that word is *benevolence*—that same benevolence, which taught him, on the day of his death, July 4, 1826, when asked if he knew what day it was, to exclaim—"Yes, it is the glorious Fourth of July—God bless it—God bless you all."

At the time of the little occurrence, which I have related, Mr. Adams was eighty-eight years old. I ventured to say, that I wished we could give him the years of Methuselah—to which he replied, with a faint smile,—"*My friend, you could not wish me a greater curse.*"—As we wax older and grayer, this expression, which, in the common phrase, is *Greek* to the young and

uninitiated, becomes sufficiently translated into every man's vernacular. Mr. Adams was born October 19, 1735, and had therefore attained his ninety-first year, when he died.

Nothing like the highest ancient standard of longevity is attained, in modern times. Nine hundred, sixty, and nine years, is certainly a long life-time. When baby Lamech was born, his father was a young fellow of one hundred and eighty-seven. Weary work it must have been, waiting so long, for one's inheritance!

The records of modern longevity will appear, nevertheless, somewhat surprising, to those, who have given but little attention to the subject. The celebrated Albert De Haller, and there can be no higher authority, enumerated eleven hundred and eleven cases of individuals, who had lived from 100 to 169. His classification is as follows:—

1000 from 100 to 110	15 from 130 to 140
60 “ 110 to 120	6 “ 140 to 150
29 “ 120 to 130	1 of 169.

The oldest was Henry Jenkins, of Yorkshire, who died in 1670. Thomas Parr, of Wilmington, in Shropshire, died in 1635, aged 152. He was a poor yeoman, and married his first wife, when he was in his 88th year, or, as some say, his 80th, and had two children. He was brought to Court, by the Earl of Arundel, in the reign of Charles I., and died, as it was supposed, in consequence of change of diet. His body was examined by Dr. Harvey, who thought he might have lived much longer, had he adhered to his simple habits. Being rudely asked, before the King, what more he had done, in his long life, than other old men, he replied—“*At the age of 105, I did penance in Alderbury Church, for an illegitimate child.*” When he was 120, he married a second wife, by whom he had a child. Sharon Turner, in his *Sacred History of the World*, vol. iii. ch. 23, says, in a note, that Parr's son (by the second wife, the issue by the first died early) lived to the age of 113—his grandson to that of 109—his great-grandson to that of 124; and two other grandsons, who died in 1761 and 1763, to that of 127.

Parr's was a much longer life than Reuben's, Judah's, Issachar's, Abner's, Simeon's, Dan's, Zebulon's, Levi's, or Naphthali's. Dr. Harvey's account of the post mortem examination is extremely interesting. The quaint lines of Taylor, the water poet, as he was styled, I cannot omit:—

"Good wholesome labor was his exercise,
 Down with the lamb, and with the lark would rise ;
 In mire and toiling sweat he spent the day,
 And to his team he whistled time away :
 The cock his night-clock, and till day was done,
 His watch and chief sundial was the sun.
 He was of old Pythagoras' opinion,
 That green cheese was most wholesome with an onion ;
 Coarse meslin bread, and for his daily swig,
 Milk, buttermilk, and water, whey and whig.
 Sometimes metheglin, and by fortune happy,
 He sometimes sipp'd a cup of ale most nappy,
 Cider or perry, when he did repair
 T'a Whitsun ale, wake, wedding or a fair ;
 Or, when in Christmas time he was a guest
 At his good landlord's house, among the rest.
 Else he had very little time to waste,
 Or at the alehouse buff-cap ale to taste.
 His physick was good butter, which the soil
 Of Salop yields, more sweet than candy oil.
 And garlic he esteemed, above the rate
 Of Venice treacle or best Mithridate.
 He entertained no gout, no ache he felt,
 The air was good and temperate, where he dwelt ;
 While mavis and sweet-tongued nightingales
 Did sing him roundelays and madrigals.
 Thus, living within bounds of nature's laws
 Of his long, lasting life may be some cause.
 From head to beel, his body had all over
 A quickset, thickset, nat'ral, hairy cover."

Isaac lived to the age of 180, or five years longer than his father Abraham. I now propose to enter one or more well-known old stagers, of modern times, who will beat Isaac, by five lengths. Mr. Easton, of Salisbury, England, a respectable bookseller, and quoted, as good authority by Turner, prepared a more extensive list than Haller, of persons, who had died aged from 100 to 185. His work was entitled *Human Longevity*—1600 of his cases occurred, within the British Isles, and 1687 between the years 1706 and 1799. He sets down three between 170 and 185, giving their names and other particulars.

Mr. Whitehurst's tables contain several cases, not in Mr. Easton's work, from 134 years to 148. Some twenty other cases are stated, by Turner, from 130 to 150. I refer, historically, to the case of Jonathan Hartop, not because of the very great age he attained, but for other reasons of interest : "1791.—Died, Jonathan Hartop, aged one hundred and thirty-eight, of the village of Aldborough, Yorkshire. He could read to the last, without spectacles, and play at cribbage, with the most perfect

recollection. He remembered Charles II., and once travelled to London, with the facetious Killegrew. He ate but little; his only beverage was milk. He had been married five times. Mr. Hartop lent Milton fifty pounds, which the bard returned, with honor, though not without much difficulty. Mr. Hartop would have declined receiving it; but the pride of the poet was equal to his genius, and he sent the money with an angry letter, which was found, among the curious possessions of that venerable old man."

On the 4th of July, 1846, I visited Dr. Ezra Green, at his residence, in Dover, N. H. He showed me a couple of letters, which he had received, a short time before, from Daniel Webster and Thomas H. Benton, congratulating him, on having completed his one hundredth year, on the 17th of the preceding June, the anniversary of the battle of Bunker's Hill, and remarked, that those gentlemen had not regarded the difference, between the old style and the new. He told me, that in 1777, he had been a surgeon, in the Ranger, with John Paul Jones. Upon my taking out my glasses, to read a passage in a pamphlet, to which he called my attention, he told me he had never used spectacles, nor felt the need of any such assistance, in reading. Dr. Green died, in 1847.

He graduated, at Harvard, in 1765. At the time of his death, every other member of his own class, numbering fifty-four, was dead.

Previously to 1765, two thousand and seventy-five individuals are named, upon the catalogue. They were all dead at the time of his decease, though he died so recently, as 1847. Yet, from the year, when he graduated, to 1786, a period of twenty years, of seven hundred and seventy-three graduates, fifteen only appear, upon the catalogue of 1848, without the fatal star. One of the fifteen, Harrison Gray Otis, has recently died, leaving three survivors only, in his class of 1783, Asa Andrews, J. S. Boies, and Jonathan Ewins. Another of the fifteen has also recently died, being the oldest graduate, Judge Timothy Farrar, of the class of 1767. The oldest living graduate of Harvard is James Lovell, of the class of 1776.

I send my communication to the press, as speedily as possible, lest he also should be off, before I can publish.

No. XLVI.

A FEW days ago, I saw, in the hands of the artist, Mr. Alvan Clarke, a sketch, nearly completed, from Stuart's painting of John Adams, in his very old age. This sketch is to be engraved, as an accompaniment of the works of Mr. Adams, about to be published, by Little & Brown. I scarcely know what to say of this sketch of Mr. Adams. His fine old face, such as it was in the flesh, and at the very last of his long and illustrious career, is fixed in my memory—rivetted there—as firmly as his name is bolted, upon the loftiest column of our national history. Never have I seen a more perfect fac simile of man, without the aid of relief—it is the resurrection and the life. If I am at a loss what to say of the sketch, I am still farther at fault, what to say of the artist. Like some of those heavenly bodies, whose contemplation occupies no little portion of his time, it is not always the easiest thing in the world, to know in what part of his orbit he may be found; if I desire to obtain a portrait, or a miniature, or a sketch, he can scarcely devote his time to it, he is so very busy, in contriving some new improvement, for his already celebrated rifle; or if it is a patent muzzled rifle that I want, he is quite likely to be occupied, in the manufacture of a telescope. Be all these matters as they may, I can vouch for it, after years of experience, Alvan Clarke is a very clever fellow, *Anglice et Americane*; and this sketch of Mr. Adams does him honor, as an artist.

It was in the year 1822, I believe, that a young lady sent me her album, with a request, that I, of all people in the world, would occupy one of its pages. Well, I felt, that after all, it was quite in my line, for I had always looked upon a young lady's album, as a kind of cemetery, for the burial of anybody's bantlings, and I began to read the inscriptions, upon such as reposed in this place, appointed for the still-born. I was a little startled, I confess, at my first glance, upon the autograph of the late Bishop Griswold, appended to some very respectable verses. My attention was next drawn to some lines, over the name of Daniel Webster, *manu propria*. I forget them now, but I remember, that the American Eagle was invoked for the occasion, and flapped its wings, through one or more of the stanzas. Next came an article in strong, sensible prose, from John Adams,

written by an amanuensis, but signed with his own hand. Such a hand—the “*manu deficiente*” of Tibullus. The letters, formed by the failing, trembling fingers, resembled the forked lightning. A solemnizing and impressive autograph it was : and, under the impulse of the moment, I had the audacity to spoil three pages of this consecrated album, by appending to this venerable name the following lines :—

High over Alps, in Dauphine,
There lies a lonely spot,
So wild, that ages rolled away,
And man had claimed it not :
For ages there, the tiger's yell
Bay'd the hoarse torrent as it fell.

Amid the dark, sequestered glade,
No more the brute shall roam ;
For man, unsocial man, hath made
That wilderness his home :
And convent bell, with notes forlorn,
Is heard, at midnight, eve, and morn.

• For now, amid the Grand Chartreuse,
Carthusian monks reside ;
Whose lives are passed, from man recluse,
In scourging human pride ;
In matins, vespers, aves, creeds,
With crosses, masses, prayers, and beads.

When hither men of curious mood,
Or pilgrims, bend their way,
To view this Alpine solitude,
Or, heav'nward bent, to pray,
Saint Bruno's monks their ALBUM bring,
Inscrib'd by poet, priest, and king.

Since pilgrim first, with holy tears,
Inscrib'd the tablet fair,
On time's dark flood, some thousand years,
Have pass'd like billows there.
What countless names its pages blot,
By country, kindred, long forgot !

Here chaste conceits and thoughts divine
Unclaim'd, and nameless, stand ;
Which, like the Grecian's waving line,
Betray some master's hand.
And here Saint Bruno's monks display,
With pride, the classic lines of Gray.

While pilgrim ponders o'er the name,
He feels his bosom glow ;
And counts it nothing less than fame,
To write his own below.
So, in this Album, fain would I,
Beneath a name, that cannot die.

Thrice happy book ! no tablet bears
 A nobler name than thine ;
 Still followed by a nation's pray'rs,
 Through ling'ring life's decline.
 The wav'ring stylus scarce obey'd
 The hand, that once an empire away'd !

Not thus, among the patriot band,
 That name enroll'd we see—
 No falt'ring tongue, no trembling hand
 Proclaim'd an empire free !—
 Lady, retrace those lines, and tell,
 If, in thy heart, no sadness dwell ?

And, in those fainting, struggling lines,
 Oh, see'st thou naught sublime !
 No tott'ring pile, that half inclines !
 No mighty wreck of time !
 Sighs not thy gentle heart to save
 The sage, the patriot, from the grave !

If thus, oh then recall that sigh,
 Unholy 'tis, and vain ;
 For saints and sages never die,
 But sleep, to rise again.
 Life is a lengthened day, at best,
 And in the grave tir'd travellers rest ;

Till, with his trump, to wake the dead,
 Th' appointed angel flies ;
 Then Heav'n's bright album shall be spread,
 And all who sleep, shall rise ;
 The blest to Zion's Hill repair,
 And write their names immortal there.

I had as much pleasure, in composing these lines, as I ever had, in composing the limbs or the features of a corpse ; and now that they are fairly laid out, the reader may bury them in oblivion, as soon as he pleases. The lines of Gray, referred to, in the sixth stanza, may be found in the collections of his works, and were written in the album of the Chartreuse, in 1741.

My recollections of John Adams, are very perfect, and pre-eminently pleasant. I knew nothing of him personally, of course, in the days of his power. I had nothing to ask at his hands, but the permission to sit and listen. How vast and how various his learning !—" Qui sermo ! quæ præcepta ! quanta notitia antiquitatis ! . . . Omnia memoria tenebat, non domestica solum, sed etiam externa bella : cujus sermone ita tum cupide fruebar, quasi jam divinarem id, quod evenit, illo extincto, fore, unde discerem, neminem." Surpassingly delightful were the outpourings, till some thoughtless wight, by an ill-timed allusion,

opened the fountain of bitter waters—then, history, literature, the arts, all were buried in *gurgite vasto*, giving place to Jefferson's injustice, the Mazzei letters, and Callender's prospect before us—*quantum mutatus ab illo!*

How forcibly the dead are quickened, upon the retina of memory, by the exhibition of some well known and personally associated article—the little hat of Napoleon—the mantle of Cæsar—"you all do know this mantle!" I have just now drawn, from my treasury, an autograph of John Adams, bearing date, Jan. 31, 1824, and a lock of strong hair, cut from his venerable brow, the day before. In October of that year, he was eighty-nine years of age; and that lock of hair is a dark iron gray. I have also taken from its casket a silver pen, and small portable inkstand attached, which also were his. The contemplation of these things—I came honestly by them—seems almost to raise that venerable form before me. I can almost hear him repeat those memorable words—"THE UNION IS OUR ROCK OF SAFETY AS WELL AS OUR PLEDGE OF GRANDEUR."

No. XLVII.

I AM rather surprised, to find how little is known, among the rising generation, about slavery, in the Old Bay State. One might delve for a twelve month, and not gather together the half of all, that is condensed, in Dr. Belknap's replies to Judge Tucker's inquiries, Mass. H. C., iv. 191.

I never was a sexton in the Berry Street Church, but I knew Dr. Jeremy Belknap well, in 1797, when he lived on the south-easterly side of Lincoln Street, near Essex. He died the following year. His garden was overrun with spiders. I had a great veneration for the doctor—he gave me a copy of his *Foresters*—and, to repay a small part of the debt, I was proceeding, one summer morning, with a strong arm, to demolish the spiders, when he pleasantly called to me to desist, saying, that he preferred them to the flies.

Slavery was here—negro slavery—at a very early day. Joselyn speaks of three slaves, in the family of Maverick, on Noddle's Island, Oct. 2, 1639, M. H. C., xxiii. 231. These were

probably brought directly from Africa. In 1645, the General Court of Massachusetts ordered Mr. Williams, at Pascataqua, over which Massachusetts exercised jurisdiction, to send the negro he had of Captain Smith, to them, that he might be sent home; as Smith had confessed, that the negroes he brought were stolen from Guinea. *Ibid.* iv. 195. In the same year, a law was passed, against the traffic in slaves, those excepted, who were taken in war, or cast into servitude, for crime. *Ibid.*

The slave trade was carried on, in Massachusetts, to a very small extent. "In 1703," says Dr. Belknap, "a duty of £4 was laid on every negro imported." He adds—"By the inquiries which I have made of our oldest merchants, now living, I cannot find that more than three ships in a year, belonging to this port, were ever employed in the African trade. The rum distilled here, was the mainspring of this traffic. Very few whole cargoes ever came to this port. One gentleman says he remembers two or three. I remember one, between thirty and forty years ago, which consisted almost wholly of children. At Rhode Island the rum distillery and the African trade were prosecuted to a greater extent than in Boston; and I believe no other seaport, in Massachusetts, had any concern in the slave business." *Ibid.* 196. Dr. Belknap drew up his answers to Judge Tucker's inquiries, April 21, 1795: "*between thirty and forty years ago*," therefore, was between 1755 and 1765. Dr. Belknap remembered the arrival in Boston of a "*whole cargo*" of slaves, "*almost wholly children*," between the years 1755 and 1765! If we have ever had an accurate and careful narrator of matters of fact, in New England, that man was Jeremy Belknap. The last of these years, 1765, was the memorable year of the Stamp Act, and LIBERTY TREE! Let us hope the arrival was nearer to 1755.

"About the time of the Stamp Act," says Dr. Belknap, "this trade began to decline, and, in 1788, it was prohibited by law. This could not have been done previous to the Revolution, as the governors sent hither from England, it is said, were instructed not to consent to any acts made for that purpose." *Ibid.* 197. In 1767, a bill was brought into the House of Representatives, "to prevent the unnatural and unwarrantable custom of enslaving mankind, and the importation of slaves into the Province:" but it came to nothing. "Had it passed both houses in any form whatever," says Dr. B., *ibid.* page 202, "Gov. Bernard

would not have consented to it." One scarcely knows which most to admire, the fury against the South, of gentlemen, whose ancestors imported cargoes of slaves, or bought and sold them, at retail, or the righteous indignation of Great Britain, who instructed her colonial governors, to veto every attempt of the Massachusetts Legislature, to abolish the traffic in human flesh. A disposition existed, at an earlier period, to abolish the brutal traffic. In a letter to the Rev. Dr. Freeman from Timothy Pickering, which may found in M. H. C., xviii. 183, he refers to the following transcript, from the records of the Selectmen of Boston: "1701, May 26. The Representatives are desired to promote the encouraging the bringing of white servants, and to put a period to negroes being slaves."

"A few only of our merchants," says Dr. B., M. H. C., iv. 197, "were engaged in this traffic. It was never supported by popular opinion. A degree of infamy was attached to the characters of those, who were employed in it. Several of them, in their last hours, bitterly lamented their concern in it." Chief Justice Samuel Sewall wrote a pamphlet against it. Many, says Dr. B., who were wholly opposed to the traffic, would yet buy a slave, when brought here, on the ground that it was better for him to be brought up in a Christian land! For this, Abraham and the patriarchs were vouched in, of course, as supporters.

Our winters were unfavorable to unacclimated negroes; white laborers were therefore preferred to black. "*Negro children*," says Dr. B., *ibid.* 200, "*were reckoned an incumbrance in a family; and, when weaned, were given away like puppies. They have been publicly advertised in the newspapers, to be given away.*"

In answer to the question, how slavery had been abolished in Massachusetts? Dr. Belknap answered—"by public opinion." He considers, that slavery came to an end, in our Commonwealth, in 1783. After 1781, there were, certainly, very few, who had the brass to offer negroes, for sale, openly, in the newspapers of Boston. Public opinion, as Dr. Belknap says, was accomplishing this work: and every calm, impartial person may opine for himself, how patiently we of the North should have endured, at that time, even a modicum of the galling abuse, of which such a *profuvium* is daily administered, to the people of the South. It seems to me, that such rough treatment would

have been more likely to addle, than to hatch the ovum of public opinion in 1783.

Dr. Belknap's account, *ibid.* 203, is very clear. He says—“The present constitution of Massachusetts was established in 1780. The first article of the declaration of rights asserts that ‘*all men are born free and equal.*’ This was inserted, not merely as a moral or political truth, but with a particular view to establish the liberation of the negroes, on a general principle; and so it was understood, by the people at large; but some doubted whether this were sufficient. Many of the blacks, taking advantage of the *public opinion*, and of this general assertion, in the bill of rights, asked their freedom and obtained it. Others took it without leave. Some of the aged and infirm thought it most prudent to continue in the families, where they had been well used, and experience has proved that they acted right. In 1781, at the court in Worcester County, an indictment was found against a white man for assaulting, beating, and imprisoning a black. He was tried at the Supreme Judicial Court, in 1783. His defence was that the black was his slave, and that the beating, &c., was the necessary restraint and correction of the master. This was answered by citing the aforesaid clause in the declaration of rights. The Judge and Jury were of opinion that he had no right to beat or imprison the negro. He was found guilty and fined forty shillings. This decision was a mortal wound to slavery in Massachusetts.”

The reader will perceive, that a distinction was maintained, between the *slave trade*, *eo nomine*, and the *holding of slaves*, inseparably connected as it was, with the incidents of sale and transfer from man to man, in towns and villages. He, who was engaged in the *trade*, so called, was supposed *per se* or *per alium* to *steal* the slaves; but, contrary to the proverb, the *receiver* was, in this case, not accounted so bad as the *thief*! The prohibition of the *traffic*, in 1788, grew out of public indignation, produced by the act of one Avery, from Connecticut, who decoyed three black men on board his vessel, under pretence of employing them; and while they were at work below, proceeded to sea, having previously cleared for Martinico. The knowledge of this outrage produced a great sensation. Gov. Hancock, and M. L'Etombe, the French Consul, wrote in favor of the kidnapped negroes, to all the West India Islands. A petition was presented to the Legislature, from the members of the association

of the Boston Clergy ; another from the blacks ; and one, at that very time, from the Quakers, was lying on the table, for an act against equipping and insuring vessels, engaged in the traffic, and against kidnappers. Such an act was passed March 26, 1788.

The poor negroes, carried off by that arch villain, Avery, were offered for sale, in the island of St. Bartholomew. They told their story publicly—*magna est veritas*—the Governor heard and believed it—the sale was forbidden. An inhabitant of the island—a Mr. ATHERTON, of blessed memory—became their protector, and gave bonds for their good behavior, for six months. Letters, confirming their story, arrived. They were sent on their way home rejoicing, and arrived in Boston, on the following 29th day of July.

In 1763, according to Dr. Belknap, *ibid.* 198, there was 1 black to every 45 whites in Massachusetts ; in 1776, 1 to every 65 ; in 1784, 1 to every 80. The whole number, in the latter year, 4377 blacks, 354,133 whites.

It appears, by a census, taken by order of Government, in the last month of 1754, and the first month of 1755, that there were then in the Province of Massachusetts Bay 2717 negro slaves of and over 16 years of age. Of these, 989 belonged to Boston. This table may be found in M. H. C. xiii. 95.

No. XLVIII.

Of all sorts of affectation the affectation of happiness is the most universal. How many, whose domestic relations are full of trouble, are, abroad, apparently, the happiest of mortals. How many, after laying down the severest sumptuary laws, for their domestics, on the subject of *sugar* and *butter*, go forth, in all their personal finery, to inquire the prices of articles, which they have no means to purchase, and return, comforted by the assurance, that they have the reputation of fashion and wealth, with those, at least, who have, so deferentially, displayed their diamonds and pearls !

Who would not be thought wealthy, and wise, and witty, if he could !

Happiness is every man's *cynosure*, when he embarks upon

the ocean of life. No man would willingly be thought so very unskilful, as that ill-starred Palinurus, who made the shores of Norway, on a voyage to the coast of Africa. Whether wealth, or fame, or fashion, or pleasure be the principal object of pursuit, no one is willing to be accounted a disappointed man, after the application of his best energies, for years. The man of wealth—the man of ambition, for example, are desirous of being accounted happy. It would certainly be exceedingly annoying to both, to be convinced, that they were believed, by mankind, to be otherwise. Their condition is rendered tolerable, only by the conviction, that thousands suppose them happy, and covet their condition accordingly. There is something particularly agreeable, in being envied, of course. Now, it is the common law of man's nature—a law, that executes itself—that *possession makes him poor* as Horace says, Sat. i. 1, 1.

"Nemo, quam sibi sortem,
Seu ratio dederit, seu fors objecerit illi,
Contentus vivat."

All experience has demonstrated, that happiness is not to be bought, and that what there is of it, in this present life, is a home-made article, which every one produces for himself, in the workshop of his own bosom. It no more consists, in the accumulation of wealth, than in snuffing up the east wind. The poor believe the rich to be happy—they become rich, and find they were mistaken. But they keep the secret, and affect to be happy, nevertheless.

Seneca looked upon the devotion of time and talent to the acquirement of money, beyond the measure of a man's reasonable wants, with profound contempt. He called such, as gave themselves up to the unvarying pursuit of wealth, *short lived*; meaning that the hours and years, so employed, were carved out of the estate of a man's life, and utterly thrown away. There is a fine passage, in ch. 17, of Seneca's book, *De Brevitate Vitæ*.

"Misserrimam ergo necesse est, non tantum brevissimam, vitam eorum esse, qui magno parant labore, quod majore possideant: operose assequuntur quæ volunt, anxii tenent quæ assecuti sunt. Nulla interim nunquam amplius redituri temporis est ratio"—It is clear, therefore, that the life must be very miserable, and very brief, of those, who get their gains with

great labor, and hold on to their gettings with greater—who obtain the object of their wishes, with much difficulty, and are everlastingly anxious for the safe keeping of their treasures. They seem to have no true estimate of those hours, thus wasted, which never can return.

In one of his admirable letters to Lucilius, the eightieth, on the subject of poverty, he says—"Si vis scire quam nihil in illa mali sit, compara inter se pauperum et divitum vultus. Sæpius pauper et fidelius ridet; nulla sollicitudo in alto est; etiamsi qua incidit cura, velut nubes levis transit Horum, qui felices vocantur, hilaritas ficta est, au gravis et suppurata tristitia; eo quidem gravior, quia interdum non licet palam esse miseros, sed inter ærumnas, cor ipsum exedentes, necesse est agere felicem"—If you wish to know, that there is no evil therein, compare the faces of the rich and the poor. The poor man laughs much oftener, and more heartily. There is no wearying solicitude pressing upon his inmost soul, and when care comes, it passes away, like a thin cloud. But the hilarity of these rich men, who are called happy, is affected, or a deep-seated and rankling anxiety, the more oppressive, because it never would answer for them to appear as miserable, as they are, being constrained to appear happy, in the midst of harassing cares, gnawing at their vitals.

If Seneca had been on 'Change, daily, during the last half year, and watched the countenances of our wealthy money-lenders, he could not have portrayed the picture with a more masterly pencil. The rate of usury has, of course, a relation to the hazard encountered, and that hazard is ever uppermost in the mind of the usurer: and it is extremely doubtful, if the hope, however sanguine, of realizing two per cent. a month, is always sufficient, to quiet those fears, which will occasionally arise, of losing the principal and interest together.

I never buried an old usurer, without a conviction, as I looked upon his hard, corrugated features, that, if he could carry nothing else with him, he certainly carried upon his checkered brow the very phylactery of his calling. We may talk about money, as an article of commerce, till we are tired—we may weary the legislature, by our importunity, into a repeal of the existing laws against usury—we may cudgel our brains, to stretch the mantle of the law over our operations, and make it appear a *regular business transaction*—it is a case, in which no refinement of the culinary art will ever be able to disguise, or neutralize, the odor

of the opossum—there ever was—there is—there ever will be, I am afraid, a certain touch of moral nastiness about it, which no casuistical chemistry will ever be able entirely to remove.

Doubtless, there are men, who take something more, during a period of scarcity, than legal interest, and who are very worthy men withal. There are others, who are descendants, in the right line, from the horse-leech of biblical history—who take all they can get. Now, there is but one category: *they are all usurers*; and those, who are respectable, impart of their respectability to such, as have little or none; and give a confidence to those, who would be treated with contempt, for their merciless gripings, were they not banded together, with men of character, in the same occupation, as usurers. Those, who take seven or eight per cent. per annum, and those who take *one per cent. a day*, and such things have been, are not easily distinguished; but the question, who come within the category, as usurers, is a thing more readily comprehended. All are such, who exceed the law.

Usurer, originally, was not a term of reproach; for *interest* and *usury* meant one and the same thing. The earlier statutes against *usury*, in England, were directed chiefly against the Jews—whose lineal descendants are still in our midst. Usury was forbidden, by act of Parliament, in 1341. The rate then taken by the Jews, was enormous. In 1545, 37 Henry VIII., the rate established was ten per cent. This statute was confirmed by 13 Eliz. 1570. Reduced to eight per cent., 21 James I. 1623, when the word *interest* was first employed, instead of *usury*. Again reduced, by Cromwell, 1650, to six per cent. Confirmed by Charles II. 1660. Reduced to five per cent., 5 Anne, 1714.

There are not two words about it; extortion and usury harden the heart; soil the reputation; and diminish the quantum of happiness, by lowering the standard of self-respect. That unconscionable griper, whose god is Mammon, and who fattens upon misery, as surely as the vulture upon carrion, stalking up and down like a commercial buzzard, tearing away the substance of his miserable victim, by piecemeal—*two per cent. a month*—can he be happy! However much like a human being he may have looked, in his youth, the workings of his mercenary soul have told too truly upon his iron features, until that visage would form an appropriate figure-head for the portal of 'Change alley, or the Inquisition.

"Is your name Shylock?
Shylock is my name."

To how many, in this age of *anxious inquirers*, may we hold up this picture, and propound this interrogatory!

God is just, though Mahomet be not his prophet. Instead of exclaiming, that God's ways are past finding out, let us go doggedly to work, and study them a little. Some of them, I humbly confess, appear sufficiently intelligible, with common sense for an expositor. Does not the All-wise contriver say, in language not to be mistaken, to such as worship, at the shrines of avarice and sensuality—you have chosen idols, and your punishment shall consist, in part, in the ridicule and contempt, which the worship of these idols brings upon your old age. You—the victim of intemperance—shall continue, with your bloated lips, to worship—not a stone image—but a stone jug; and grasping your idol with your trembling fingers, literally stagger into the grave! And you, though last, not least, of all vermicular things, whose whole time and intellectual powers are devoted to no higher object than making money—shall still crawl along, heaping up treasure, day after day—day after day—to die at last, not knowing who shall come after you, a wise man or a fool!

"Constant at Church and 'Change; his gains were sure,
His givings rare, save farthings to the poor!
The Dev'l was piq'd such saintship to behold,
And long'd to tempt him, like good Job of old;
But Satan now is wiser than of yore,
And tempts, by making rich, not making poor."

No. XLIX.

SELF-CONCEIT and vanity are very pardonable offences, till, stimulated by flattery, or aggravated by indulgence, they assume the offensive forms of arrogance and insolence. If we should drive, from the circle of our friends, all, who are occasionally guilty of such petty misdemeanors, we should restrict ourselves to the solitude of Selkirk. There are some worthy men, with whom this little infirmity is an intermittent, alternating, like fever and ague, between self-conceit and self-abasement. Like some estimable people, of both sexes, who, at one moment, proclaim

themselves the chief of sinners, and the next, are in admirable working condition, as the spiritual guides and instructors of all mankind; these persons, under the influence of the wind, or the weather, or the world's smiles, or its frowns, or the state of their digestive organs, indicate, by their air and carriage, today, a feeling, far on the sunny side of self-complacency, and of deep humility, tomorrow.

William Boodle has been dead, some twenty years. He was my school-fellow. I would have undertaken anything, for Boodle, while living, but I could not undertake for him, when dead. The idea of burying Billy Boodle, my playmate from the cradle—we were put into breeches, the very same day—with whom I had passed, simultaneously, through all the epocha—rattles—drums—go-carts—kites—tops—bats—skates—the idea of shovelling the cold earth upon him, was too much. I would have buried the Governor and Council, with the greatest pleasure, but Billy Boodle—I couldn't. So I changed works, that day, with one of our craft, who comprehended my feelings perfectly.

I never shall forget my sensations, the first time he called me *Mr. Wycherly*. We had ever been on terms of the greatest intimacy, and had never known any other words of designation, than Abner and Bill. I was very much amazed; and he seemed a little confused, himself, when I laughed in his face, and asked him what the devil he meant by it. But he grew daily more formal in his manners, and more particular in his dress. His voice became changed—he began to use longer words—assumed an unusual wave of the hand, and a particular movement of the head, when speaking—and, while talking, on the most common-place topics, he had a way, quite new with him, of bringing down the fore-finger of his right hand, frequently and forcibly, upon the ball of the uplifted thumb of the left. He was a leather-breeches maker; and I caught him, upon two or three occasions, spouting in his shop, all by himself, before a small looking-glass. He once made a pair of buckskins, for old General Heath—they did not fit—the General returned them, and Boodle said he would have them *taken into a new draft*—I thought he was a little deranged: “taken where?” said the old General. Boodle colored, and corrected himself, saying he would have them *let out*. He had two turns of this strange behavior, in one year, during which, he was rather neglectful of his business, pompous in his family, and talked to his wife, who

was a plain, notable woman, of nothing but first principles, and political economy. In the intervals between these attacks, he was perfectly himself again, and it was Abner and Bill, as in former days.

I have often smiled, at my own dullness, in not sooner apprehending the solution of this little enigma. Boodle was a member of the Legislature; and the fits were upon him, during the sessions. No man, probably, was ever more thoroughly confounded, than my old friend, when, it having been deemed expedient to compliment the leather-breeches interest, the committee requested him to permit his name to be put upon the list of candidates, as one of the representatives of the city of Boston, in the General Court. He could not think of it—the committee averred the utter impossibility of doing without him—he was ignorant of the duties—they could be learned in half a day—he was without education—the very thing, a self-taught man! He consented.

How much more easily we are persuaded to be great men, than to be Christians! There is but a step from conscious insignificance to the loftiest pretension. Boodle was elected, and awoke the next morning, less surprised by the event, than at the extraordinary fact, that his talents had been overlooked, so long. He spoiled three good skins that day, from sheer absence of mind.

However disposed we may be to laugh at the airs of men, who so entirely misapprehend themselves and their constituents, our laughter should be tempered with charity. They are not honestly told, that they are wanted, only as makeweights—to keep in file—to follow, *en suite*—to register an edict: and their vanity is pardonable, in the ratio of that ignorance of themselves, which leads them to rely, so implicitly, upon the testimony of others.

Comparative mensuration is a very popular process, and a very comforting process, for all, who have made small progress in self-knowledge; and this category comprehends all, but a very small minority. There are a few, I doubt not, who think humbly of themselves; but there are very few, indeed, who cannot perceive, in themselves, or their possessions, some one or more points of imaginary superiority, over their fellows. This is an inexpensive mode of enjoying one's self, and I cannot see the wisdom, or the wit, of disturbing the self-complacency of any one, upon such an occasion, unless the delusion is of vital im-

portance to somebody. What, if your neighbor prefers his Dutch domicil, with its overhanging gable, to your classic chateau—or sees more to admire, in his broad-faced squab of a wife, than in your faultless Helen—or vaunts the superiority of his short-legged cob, over your famous blood horse! Let him. Such things should be passed, with great forbearance, were it only for the innocent amusement they afford us. So far, however, is this from the ordinary mode of treating them, that I am compelled to believe vanity is often more apt, than criminality, to excite our irritable principle, and stimulate the spirit of resentment.

I have known some worthy men, generous and humane, whose very gait has rendered them exceedingly unpopular. I once heard a pious and reverend clergyman say, of one of his very best parishioners, but whose unfortunate air of hauteur was rather remarkable, that, with all his excellent qualities, “it would do the flesh good to give him a kick.”

From a thousand illustrations, which are all around us, I will select one only. The anecdote, which I am about to relate, may be told without any apprehension of giving offence; as the parties have been dead, some thirty years. A worthy clergyman, residing in a neighboring state, grew old; and the parish, who entertained the most cordial respect and affection, for this venerable soldier of the cross, resolved to give him a colleague. After due inquiry, and a *quantum sufficit* of preaching on probation, they decided on giving a call to Parson Brocklebank. He was a little, red, round man, with a spherical head, a Brougham nose, and a gait, the like of which had never been seen, in that parish, before. It had not attracted particular notice, until after he was settled. To be sure, an aged single lady, of the parish, was heard to say, that she saw something of it, at the ordination, when Parson Brocklebank stepped forward, to receive the right hand of fellowship. Suffice it to say, for the reader's particular edification, that it was indescribable. It became the village talk, and is thought to have had an injurious influence, in retarding a revival, which seemed to be commencing, just before the period of the ordination. However lowly in spirit, the new minister may have been, all who ever beheld him move, were satisfied, at a glance, that he had a most exalted opinion of himself. And yet he was an excellent man.

This unfortunate trick of jerking out the hips, and those rotundities of flesh connected therewith, however it might have

originated in "curs'd pride, that busy sin," had become, with Parson Brocklebank, an unchangeable habit. We often see it in a slight degree, but, as it existed in his particular case, it was a thing not known among men. I think I have seen it among women. Dr. Johnson would have called it a fundamental undulation, elaborated by the ostentatious workings of a pompous spirit. Whatever it was, it was fatal to the peace and prosperity of that parish. Every one talked of it. The young laughed at it; the old mourned over it; the middle aged were vexed by it; boys and girls were whipped, for imitating it; children were forbidden to look at it, for fear of their catching it; the very dogs were said to have barked at it.

The parish began to dissolve, *sine die*. The deacons waited upon their old clergyman, Father Paybody, and the following colloquy ensued :

"We're in a bad way, Father Paybody; and, if folks keep going off so, we don't see how we shall be able to pay the salaries.—Dismiss me: I am of little use now.—No, no, Father Paybody, while there's a potato in this parish, we'll share it together. We call'd for advice. Ever since Parson Brocklebank was settled, the parish has been going to pieces: what is the cause of it?—The shrewd old man shook his head, and smiled.—Parson Brocklebank is a good man, Father Paybody.—Excellent.—Sound doctrine.—Very.—Amazing ready at short notice.—Very.—Great at clearing a knotty passage.—Very.—We think him a very pious Christian.—Very.—In the parochial relation he is very acceptable.—Very.—I hear he has a winning way, and always has candy or gingerbread in his pockets, for the children, which helps the word greatly, with the little ones.—Well, nearly half our people are dissatisfied, and have left, or will leave soon. What is the cause of it, Father Paybody?—I will tell you: it's owing to no other cause under the sun, than that wriggle of Brother Brocklebank's behind."

No. L.

I SINCERELY hope, that Daniel H. Pearson, now in prison, under suspicion of having murdered his wife and twin daughters, at Wilmington, in this Commonwealth, in the month of

April last, may be proved to be an innocent man. For, should he be convicted, he will certainly be sentenced to be hung; and it is quite probable, that Governor Briggs, and his iron-hearted Council may do, as they recently did, in the case of poor Washington Goode, a most unfortunate man, who, unhappily, committed a most infernal murder, of which, after an impartial trial, he was duly convicted. Will it be believed, in this age of improved contrivances, moral and physical, that the Governor and Council of our Commonwealth have actually refused, to rush between the sentence and the execution, and save this egregious scoundrel from the gallows! They have solemnly decided, not to interfere with the operation of that ancient law of this Commonwealth, which decrees, that he, who kills his fellow man, with malice prepense, shall be hanged, by the neck, till he is dead!

It really seems to me, that the time has arrived when Massachusetts should be governed, by some compassionate person, who will prove himself, upon such unpleasant occasions, the murderer's friend. I am not unapprized of the fact, that there is a strong opposition to these opinions, among the wisest and best men in the community; and that, irrespectively of the operation of the *lex talionis* upon the murderer, his death is accounted necessary, *in terrorem*, for the rest of mankind; as Cicero has said—"ut pœna ad paucos, metus ad omnes perveniat"—that the punishment may reach the few, and fear the many. But Cicero was a heathen. There are also some individuals, having very little of that contempt for old wives tales, which characterizes those profound thinkers, our interesting fellow-citizens of the Liberty Party, and who still venture, in these enlightened days, to cite the word of God—WHOSO SHEDDETH MAN'S BLOOD, BY MAN SHALL HIS BLOOD BE SHED. In the present condition of society, when there are so very few of us, who do not feel, that we are wise above what is written, this precept, delivered by God Almighty, to Noah, appears exceedingly preposterous, greatly resembling some of those *blue laws*, which were in operation, in the olden time, in a sister state. What was Noah to Jeremy Bentham! Although I am pained to confess the shortcomings of Jeremy; for, though he did much to meliorate the severity of the British penal code, he went not, by any means, to those happy lengths, which we approve, in shielding the unfortunate murderer from the halter.

There was a very amiable, old gentleman in England, who lived, through the times of Charles I., both Cromwells, and Charles II. He was reputed so wise, and learned, and just, and pious, that his judgment was highly prized, by all men. He was esteemed the greatest lawyer and the most upright, in all England; so much so, that, in 1671, he was created Lord Chief Justice of the realm. I desire to reason impartially, upon this subject, and therefore admit, that this great and good man, Sir Matthew Hale, believed death to be a very just punishment, for certain crimes, inferior to murder. Although Sir Matthew's crude notions are rapidly going out of fashion, it is but fair, to transcribe his words—"When offences grow enormous, frequent, and dangerous to a kingdom or state, destructive or highly pernicious to civil societies, and to the great insecurity and danger of the kingdom or its inhabitants, severe punishment and even death itself is necessary to be annexed to laws, in many cases, by the prudence of lawgivers." In all candor, we must admit, that Sir Matthew Hale was notoriously the very reverse of a sanguinary Judge. But Sir Matthew's days were the days of small things. We cannot sufficiently bless the Great Disposer of human affairs, for raising up the foolish, as He has done, in these latter days, and in such great numbers withal, to confound the wise. It is now no longer necessary, as of old, to pursue a particular course of study, to qualify mankind, for the work of legislation, or the practice of law, or physic, or the exposition of the more subtle points of religion, or ethics, or political economy.

This truly is an age of intuition. He, who learns, or half learns, one profession, is, instantanèly, competent to perform the duties of all. It is a heavenly stream of universal light and power, somewhat analogous to the miraculous gift of tongues. Nothing, in this connection, is more remarkable, than the rapid turgescence of every man's confidence, in his own abilities, upon the slightest encouragement, from his neighbor. There has been scarcely a blacksmith in New England, since the remarkable and merited success of Elihu Burritt, who, if you ask his opinion of the efficacy of pennyroyal for the stomach-ache, will not, with your permission, of course, prescribe for any acute or chronic complaint, with which you are afflicted. Tailors, in full measure, nine to a man, will readily solve you a point of theology, which would have been fearfully

approached, by Tillotston or Horne. And, upon this solemn subject of capital punishment, there is scarcely a man-midwife in the land, who is not ready, with his instruments, to deliver the community of all their scruples at once.

This, certainly, is a blessed condition of things, for which we cannot be sufficiently thankful.

That we may do abundant justice to our opponents, I propose to offer, in this place, a quotation from the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 86, p. 216. The article is entitled—“*What is to be done with our criminals?*” The passage runs thus—“Another circumstance, which renders legislation on this subject peculiarly difficult, is the lamentably perverted sentimentality, which is extensively diffusing itself among the people, and which may soon render it problematical, whether any penal code, really calculated to answer its objects, can be devised; a sentimentality, which weeps over the criminal, and has no tears to spare for the miseries he has caused—which transforms the felon into an object of interest and sympathy, and forgets the innocent sufferers from his cruelty or perfidy. So far as pity for the criminal is consistent with a more comprehensive compassion for those he has wronged, and is limited by the necessity of obtaining them redress and providing for the safety of society—so far as it prompts to a desire to see the statute-book cleared of every needless severity, and that no punishments shall be inflicted for punishment’s sake it is laudable.

“But we must, with regret, profess our belief, that it has often far transcended these limits; and has exhibited itself in forms and modes, which, if permitted to dictate the tone of our criminal legislation, would tend to the rapid increase of crime. The people in question belong to a class, always numerous, who are led by the imagination, and not by their reason—by emotion rather than reflection. They see the felon in chains, and they are dissolved in commiseration; they do not stop to realize all the miseries, which have at last made *him* miserable—perhaps, in the present apathy of his conscience, much less miserable than many of those whom he has injured.”

This is from an article, ably written, of some fifty-eight pages, published in 1847. I give it a place here, lest I should be suspected of suppressing all arguments, on the other side.

The idea of hanging a murderer, by form of law, instead of placing him for a few years, in some *anxious seat*, the treadmill

or the state prison, where he might be converted perhaps—cutting him off, in the midst of his days, without time allowed for repentance, is a terrible thing. I am perfectly aware, that it will be replied—this is the very thing which he did for his wretched victim.

We are told, that the highest penalty known to the law is demanded. *All that a man hath will he give for his life*; and we are opposed, in our humane endeavors, by the scriptural edict referred to already. It is averred to be an all-important object in capital punishment, to operate upon the fears of others, *ut metus*, as we said before, *ad omnes perveniat*, which would be less likely to be the case, if the halter were abolished. It is true, that, while there is life, there is hope—hope of pardon; hope even of a natural and less horrible death; a fond, fearful hope of cutting the keeper's throat, and escaping from thralldom! How truly the poor murderer deserves our compassion!

What a revolting spectacle this hanging is! Here, however, I confess, the answer is complete—nobody, but the functionaries, is suffered to see it. It is much less of an entertainment, than it was, in the days of George Selwyn, who was in the habit of seeing the keeper of Newgate, for due notice of every execution, and a reservation of the best seat, nearest the gallows. It has been said, that hanging has become more unpopular, since it ceased to be a public amusement. It may be so—I rather doubt it.

In former times, there were very few inexpensive public amusements, in Boston, beside the Thursday lectures; and a hanging has always been highly attractive, in town and country. I well remember, not very many years ago, while riding into the city, in my chaise, having been compelled to halt, and remain at rest, for twenty minutes, in Washington, near Pleasant Street, while the immense mass of men, women and children rushed by, on their way to the execution of an Irishman, which took place at the gallows, near the grave-yard, on the Neck. The prisoner was in an open barouche, dressed in a blue coat and gilt buttons, white waistcoat, drab breeches, and white top boots, and his hair was powdered. He was accompanied by Mr. Larassy, the Catholic priest, and the physician of the prison.

During the afternoon of July 30, 1794, on the morning of which day the great fire occurred in Boston, three pirates, brought home in irons, on board the brig Betsey, Captain Saun-

ders, belonging to Daniel Sargent, were hung on the Common; and three governors, sitting in their chairs, would not have drawn half the concourse, then and there assembled.

No. LI.

*"Thy Clarence he is dead that stabb'd my Edward;
And the beholders of this tragic play
Untimely smothered in their dusky graves."*

THERE were no humane and gentle spirits, in those days of old, to speak soft words of comfort in the ears of murderers and midnight assassins. Poor fellows! after they had let out the last drop of blood, in the hearts of their innocent victims, and reduced wives to widowhood, and children to orphanage—after the parricide had plunged the dagger in his father's heart—after the husband had murdered her, whom he had sworn, under the eye of God, to love and to cherish—after the wife, with the assistance of her paramour, had stealthily administered the poisonous draught to her confiding husband—they were respectively indicted—arraigned—publicly and deliberately tried—abundantly defended—and, when duly convicted at last, they were hanged, forsooth, by their necks, till they were dead!

Merciful God! where were the Marys and the Marthas! Was there no political lawyer, in those days, whom the desire of personal aggrandizement could induce to befriend the poor, afflicted cut-throat, by which parade of philanthropy he might ride into notice, as the patriot of the Anti-capital-punishment party! Was there no tender-hearted doctor, whose leisure hours, neither few nor far between, might have been devoted to the blessed work of relieving the murderer, from the gallows, and himself, from the excruciating misery of nothing to do!

Truly we live in a tragi-comical world. During the late trial of John Brown, the other day, for the murder of Miss Coventry, at Tolland, in regard to which the jury could not agree, a requisition arrived from the Governor of New York, for the prisoner, to answer, for the murder of Mrs. Hammond.—Dr. V. P. Coolidge, who murdered Matthews, at Waterville, committed suicide in prison, a few days since.—A precocious boy, eight years old,

has, this month, chopped off the head of his sleeping father, with an axe, in the town of Lisle, N. Y.—Matthew Wood is to be hung in New York, June 22, for the murder of his wife.—Alexander Jones is to be hung, in the same State, on the same day, for arson.—Goode is to be hung here, in a few days.—On the 27th day of the last month, a man, named Newkirk, near Louisville, Kentucky, shot and killed his mother, near one hundred years of age.—On the third day of the present month, Mr. Carroll, near Philadelphia, murdered his lady, by choking and pitching her down stairs.—J. M. Riley is to be hung, June 5, for the murder of W. Willis, in Independence, Tennessee.—Vintner is under sentence of death, for murdering Mrs. Cooper, in Baltimore.—Elder Enos G. Dudley is to be hung, in New Hampshire, May 23, for the murder of his wife.—The wife of John Freedly, of Philadelphia, is now in jail, for helping her husband, to murder his first wife.—Pearson is now in prison, under charge of murdering his wife and twin daughters, at Wilmington, in this Commonwealth, in April last.—Mrs. McAndrew has been convicted of murder, for killing her sister-in-law, in Madison, Mississippi.—Elisha N. Baldwin is to be hung, June 5, for the murder of his brother-in-law, Victor Matthews, at St. Louis.—The girl, Blaisdell, is to be hung, in New Hampshire, Aug. 30, for poisoning a little boy, two and a half years old. She was on trial for this act only. She had previously poisoned the child's grandmother, her friend and protectress, and subsequently attempted to poison both its parents. This "*misguided young lady*" was engaged to be married, and wanting cash, for an outfit, had forged the note of the child's father, for four hundred dollars.

Of Wood's case I know little more, than that he murdered his wife. Surely he is to be pitied, poor fellow. The case of Elder Enos is deeply interesting. This worthy Elder took his partner out, to give her a sleigh-ride, in life and health, and brought home her lifeless body. She had knocked her head against a tree—such, indeed, was the opinion, expressed by Elder Enos. He was also of opinion that it was not good for an Elder to be alone, for one minute; and he exhibited rather too much haste, perhaps, in taking to himself another partner. The jury were unanimously of opinion, that Elder Enos was mistaken, and that Mrs. Dudley came to her death, by the hands of Elder Enos himself. The Elder and the jury differed in opinion; and therefore, forsooth, Elder Enos must be hanged by the neck till he

is dead! How much better to change this punishment, for perpetual imprisonment—and that, after a few years of good behavior, upon a petition, subscribed by hundreds, who care not the value of a sixpence, whether Elder Enos is in the State Prison, or out of it, for a pardon. Then the church will again be blessed with his services, as a ruling Elder; and the present Mrs. Dudley may herself be favored with a sleigh-ride, at some future day.

The case of the “*misguided*” Miss Blaisdell is truly affecting. It is quite inconceivable how the people of New Hampshire can have the heart to hang such an interesting creature by the neck, till she is dead. I am of opinion, that the remarks, with which Judge Eastman prefaced his sentence, must have hurt Miss Blaisdell’s feelings. It seems that she only made use of the little innocent, as aeronauts employ a pet balloon, to try the wind. She wished to ascertain, if her poison was first proof, before she tried it, upon the parents. Although it had worked to perfection, upon the old lady, Miss Blaisdell, who appears to have acted with consummate prudence, was not quite satisfied of its efficacy, upon more vigorous constitutions. It is quite surprising, that Judge Eastman should have talked so unkindly to Miss Blaisdell, in open court—“*An experiment is to be made; the efficiency of your poison is to be tried; and the helpless innocent boy is selected. He is left in your care, with all the confidence of a mother. He plays at your feet, he prattles at your side. You take him up, and give him the fatal morphia; and, when you see him sicken and dizzy, and stretching out his little arms to his mother, and trying to walk, your heart relents not. May God soften it.*” What sort of a Judge is this, to harrow up the delicate feelings of “*a misguided young lady,*” after this fashion!

It has been proposed, by a medical gentleman, whose philanthropy has assumed the appearance of a violent eruption, breaking out in every direction, that, if this abominable punishment, this destruction of life, which God Almighty has prescribed, in the case of murder, must continue to be inflicted, the “*misguided young ladies*” and “*unfortunate men,*” who commit that crime, shall be executed under the influence of ether. This may be considered the happiest suggestion of the age. A tract may be expected from the pen of this gentleman, ere long, entitled “*Crumbs of comfort for Cut-throats, or Hanging made easy.*” Jeremy Bentham gave his body to be dissected, for the

good of mankind. Oh, that this worthy doctor, who has struck out this happy thought of hanging, under the influence of ether, would *verify the suggestion!*

There are some individuals, who had rather be hanged, than talked to, in such an unfeeling manner, as Judge Eastman talked to the unfortunate and misguided Miss Blaisdell: it has therefore been decided to improve, upon the suggestion of hanging murderers, under the influence of ether; and we propose to apply for an act, authorizing the sponge to be applied to the nostrils of the condemned, by the clerk *ex officio*, during the time, when the judge is pronouncing the sentence. The time of the murderer is short, and there are many little comforts, and even delicacies, which would greatly tend to soften the rigor of his imprisonment. We have it, upon the testimony of more than one experienced keeper of Newgate, that, with some few exceptions, the appetite of the misguided, who are about to be hanged, is remarkably good.

I fully comprehend the objections, which will be made to the use of ether, and granting such other little indulgences, to those, who are about to be sentenced, or are already condemned to be hanged. The Ciceronian argument,—*ut metus ad omnes perveniat*, will be neutralized. How many, it will be said, are now upon the earth, without God in this world, without the least particle of religious sensibility, disappointed men, desperate, degraded, men of utterly broken hopes, broken hearts, and broken fortunes, to whom nothing would be more acceptable, than an easy transition from this wide-awake world of pain and sadness to that region of negative happiness, which they anticipate, in their fancied state of endless oblivion beyond. They may be, nevertheless, disturbed, in some small degree, *in articulo*, by that indestructible doubt, which hangs over the mind, even the mind of the most sceptical, and deepens and darkens as death draws near,—SUPPOSE THERE SHOULD BE A GOD!—what then! They are therefore unwilling to cut their own throats, however willing to cut the throats of other people. But, if the State will take the responsibility, and furnish the ether, there are not a few, who would very complacently embrace the opportunity.

That fear, which it is desirable to keep before the eyes of all men, say our opponents, is surely not the fear of the easiest of all imaginable deaths—the fear of meeting, not the King of terrors, but the very thing, which all men pray for, a placid

exit from a world of care—a welcome spirit—an *etherial* deliverer. On the contrary, we wish, say they, to hold up to the world the fear of a terrible, as well as a shameful death: and we desire to give a certainty to this fear, which we cannot do, while the frequent exercise of the power of commutation and of pardon teaches that portion of our race, which is fatally bent upon mischief, that the gibbet is nothing but a bugbear; and that, let them commit as many murders, as they will, there is not one chance, in fifty, of their coming to the gallows, at last.

It is not easy to answer this argument, upon the spur of the moment; and it has been referred to a committee of our society, with instructions to prepare a reply, in season for the next execution.

We have the satisfaction of knowing, that no efforts have been spared by us, to save Washington Goode, one of the most interesting of murderers, from the gallows. We have endeavored to get up an excitement in the community, by posting placards, in numerous places—"A MAN TO BE HANGED!" By this we intended to put an execution upon the footing of a puppet-show or play, and thereby to excite the public indignation. But, most unfortunately, there is too much common sense among the people of Boston, and too little enthusiasm altogether, for the successful advancement of our philanthropic views. However, importunity, if we faint not, will certainly prevail. The right of petition is ours. Let us follow, in the steps of Amy Darden and William Vans. The Legislature, at their last session, indefinitely postponed the consideration of the subject of the abolition of capital punishment. The Legislature is made of flesh and blood, and must finally give way, as a matter of course.

It cannot be denied, that gentlemen make use, occasionally, of strange arguments, while opposing our efforts, in favor of those *misguided* persons, who *unfortunately* commit rape, treason, arson, murder, &c. A few years since, when a bill was before our House of Representatives, for the abolition of capital punishment, in the case of rape, while it was proposed to retain it in the case of highway robbery—"Let us go home, Mr. Speaker," exclaimed an audacious orator, "and tell our wives and our daughters, that we set a higher value upon our purses, than upon the security of their persons, from brutal violation."

No. LII.

To my anonymous correspondent who inquires, through the medium of the post-office, in what respect my "dealings with extortioners can fairly be entitled *"dealings with the dead,"* I reply, because they are *alive* unto sin, and *dead* unto righteousness.

In Lord Bacon's *Life of Henry VII.*, London edition of 1824, vol. v. 51, the Lord Chancellor Morton says to the Parliament—"His Grace prays you to take into consideration matters of trade, as also the manufactures of the kingdom, and to repress the bastard and barren employment of moneys to usury and unlawful exchanges, that they may be, as their natural use is, turned upon commerce, and lawful, and royal trading." Henry VIII. came to the throne, in 1509, and the rate of interest was fixed, in 1545, the 37th of that king's reign; and that rate was ten per cent. per annum. Before that time, no Christian was allowed to take interest for money; and the Jews had the matter of usury, all to themselves. It was shown, before Parliament, that, in 1260, two shillings was the rate, demanded and given, for the loan of twenty shillings for one week; and Stowe states, that the people were so highly excited against the Jews, on account of their extortion, as to massacre seven hundred of them, in London, in 1262. In 1274, a law was passed, compelling every Jew, lending money on interest, to wear a plate on his breast, signifying, that he was an usurer, or to quit the realm. What an exhibition we should have, in State Street, and the alleys, if this edict should be revived, against those, whose uncircumcision would avail them nothing, to disprove their Levitical propinquity.

In 1277, two hundred and sixty-seven Jews were hung, in London, for clipping the coin. Their usurious practices, at last, so highly exasperated the nation, that, according to Rapin, Lond., 1757, vol. iii. 246, 15,000 were banished the realm, in 1290. They had obtained great privileges from King Edward; but, says Rapin, "lost all these advantages, by not curbing their insatiable greediness of enriching themselves, by unlawful means, as usury, &c." I find Sir Edward Coke denies the fact of their banishment. His version is this: "They were not banished, but their usury was banished, by the statute,

enacted in this parliament, and that was the cause they banished themselves into foreign countries, where they might live by their usury; and because they were odious to the nation, that they might pass out of the realm in safety, they made a petition to the king, that a certain day might be prefixed for them to depart the realm, that they might have the king's writ to his sheriffs, for their safe conduct." 2d Institute, 507. Hume, nevertheless, Oxford ed., ii. 210, reaffirms the statement of Rapin.

Hume says, *ibid.*, the practice of usury was afterwards carried on, "by the English themselves upon their fellow-citizens, or by the Lombards and other foreigners;" and he adds—"It is very much to be questioned, whether the dealings of these new usurers were equally open and unexceptionable with the old." Perhaps it may be questioned, whether the community would not fare better, at the present day, if some of the circumcised could be imported hither, from the Jews' Quarter, in Istampol. The following remark of Hume, on the same page, is of importance to the political economist:—"But as the canon law, seconded by the municipal, permitted no Christian to take interest, all transactions of this kind must, after the banishment of the Jews, have become more secret and clandestine, and the lender, of consequence, be paid both for the use of his money, *and for the infamy and danger, which he incurred by lending it.*" This is not from Aristotle, nor one of the school divines, but from David Hume, whose liberality is sufficiently notorious.

The English usurers, in those days, were more excusable, because they were not permitted to take *any interest whatever*, for the loan of money, while money lenders here have not the same excuse for being usurers, as they may lawfully take six per cent. per annum, or one per cent. above the legal rate of Great Britain, as established in 1714, the 13th of Queen Anne, and which has remained unaltered, to the present day.

I have heard of a fellow, who, upon being asked, after conviction of larceny, if he did not regret his conduct, replied, with an air of great sincerity, that he certainly did—for, instead of stealing a few pieces of gold, as he had done, he might easily have stolen enough, to bribe the court and jury. The Jews were wiser in their day and generation—they never suffered themselves to be placed in a predicament, which might cause them to suffer from any such regret. For many years, there

subsisted a delightful understanding, between them and Edward I. Longshanks. Longshanks granted them many and various indulgencies; by his permission, they even had a synagogue in London. On their part, they were willing to relieve the necessities of Longshanks. In short, Longshanks was, vicariously, and upon the principle, that *qui facit per alium facit per se*, the very Apollyon of all usurers. He countenanced the extortion of the Jews, and shared the spoils. Sir Edward Coke, in his Second Institute, 506, states that, in seven years, covering portions of the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., the Crown had four hundred and twenty thousand pounds, fifteen shillings, and four pence from the Jews.

After treating of the advantages and disadvantages of taking interest, on money loans, and arriving at the sensible conclusion, that it is impossible for society to get along without them, Lord Bacon remarks, ii. 354—"Let usury (the term for interest in those days) in general be reduced to five in the hundred, and let the rate be proclaimed to be free and current: and let the State shut itself out to take any penalty for the same. This will preserve borrowing from any stop or dryness. This will ease infinite borrowers in the country, &c." Lord Bacon was therefore in favor of an universal rate of interest, established by law. Of usury, in the opprobrious sense of the word, the taking of excessive and unlawful interest, this great man speaks in his tract on Riches, ii. 340, in no very complimentary terms—"Usury is the certainest means of gain, though one of the worst, as that whereby a man doth eat his bread, in *sudore vultus alieni*," by the sweat of another's brow.

I have heard it said of a rural governor of Massachusetts, now sleeping with his fathers, that, although addicted to the practice of virtual usury, he scrupulously abstained from lending money, at any rate, beyond six per cent. It became a by-word, in his district, however, when a farmer became straitened for a little money, and was inquiring among his neighbors—that it was quite likely his excellency might have a yoke of cattle, that he did not care to winter over! The cattle were sold at a high price to the needy man, who sold them forthwith, at auction, or otherwise, for a small one, giving the worthy governor his note in payment, and a mortgage on his farm, if required. The note was payable in six months, or a year, with "lawful interest."

This moral manœuvre appears to have been of ancient origin.

There is the draught of a law for the punishment of it, in Lord Bacon's works, iv. 285. The preamble runs thus—"Whereas it is an usual practice, to the undoing and overthrowing of many young gentlemen and others, that where men are in necessity, and desire to borrow money, they are answered, that money cannot be had, but that they may have commodities sold unto them, upon credit, whereof they may make money, as they can: in which course it ever comes to pass, not only that such commodities are bought at extreme high rates, and sold again far under foot, at a double loss; but also that the party which is to borrow, is wrapt in bonds and counter bonds; so that upon a little money, which he receiveth, he is subject to penalties and suits of great value." Then follows the statute, taking away legal remedy, and punishing the broker or procurer with six months' imprisonment, and the pillory.

It has been commonly understood, that, before the act of 37th Henry VIII., though Christians were forbidden to take any interest for money, the Jews were not restrained; yet Lord Chief Baron Hale, Hard. 420, says that Jewish usury was forbidden, at common law, being forty per cent. and upwards, per annum, but no other. Lea, C. J., Palm. 292, says, that the usury, condemned at common law, was the "*biting usury*" of the Jews. To comprehend this expression, it must be understood, that, among the Jews, of old, there were two Hebrew words, signifying *usury*, *terebit*, which meant simply *increase*, and *Neshec*, which meant *devouring* or *biting usury*. Of this distinction, an account may be found in Calmet, vol. iii. Fragment 46.

When the statute of James I. was passed, in 1623, reducing the rate from ten to eight per cent., Orde says, in his *Law of Usury*, p. 5, that the Bishops "would not, at first, agree to it, for the sole reason, that there was no clause that disgraced usury, as in former statutes; and then the clause at the end of that statute was added, for their satisfaction." Usury was punished more severely in France, than in England. For the first offence, the usurer "was punished by a public and ignominious acknowledgment of his offence, and was banished. His second offence was capital, and he was hanged." Coke's 3d Institute, 152.

No. LIII.

OUR society, whose object is nothing less than the entire and unqualified abolition of capital punishment, have derived the greatest advantage, from an ample recognition of the rights of women—not only by a free participation of counsel with the softer sex, after the example of certain other societies, the value of whose services can never be understood, by the present generation; but by assigning equally to both sexes, all offices of honor and trust. We have adhered to this principle, with the most perfect impartiality, in the composition of our committees. Thus, our committee, for visiting the condemned, consists of the Rev. Mr. Puzzlepot, and the five Miss Frizzles—the committee on public excitement, prior to an execution, consists of Dr. Omnibus, Squire Farrago, Mrs. Pickett, and her daughters, the Misses Patience and Hopestill Pickett. In like proportion, all our committees are constructed.

We think proper, in this public manner, to express our warmest acknowledgments to Mrs. Negoose, Madam Moody, and Squire Bodkin, for their able report, on the iniquity of presumptive or circumstantial evidence. The notes, appended to this report, are invaluable—their authorship cannot be mistaken—every individual, acquainted with the peculiar style of the gifted author, will recognize the powerful hand of the justly celebrated Mrs. Folsom.

This committee are of opinion, that, under the show or pretence of punishing murder, our legal tribunals are constantly committing it. They *presume*, forsooth, that is, they *guess*, that the prisoner is guilty, and therefore take the awful responsibility of hanging him by the neck, till he is dead! This, says Mrs. Negoose, is *presumption* with a vengeance.

The committee refer to the statement of Sir Matthew Hale, as cited by Blackstone, iv. 358–9, that he had known two cases, in which, after the accused had been hung for murder, the individuals, supposed to have been murdered, had re-appeared, in full life. Upon this, the committee reason, with irresistible force and acumen. How many judges, say they, there have been, since the world began, we know not. *Two cases*, in which innocent persons were executed, on presumptive or circumstantial evidence, are proved to have occurred, within the knowledge of

one judge. It is reasonable, say the committee, to conclude that, at a moderate calculation, *three cases* more, remaining undiscovered, occurred within the jurisdiction of that *one judge.* Now, we have nothing to do, but to ascertain the number of judges, who have ever existed, and then multiply that number by *five*; and thus, say the committee, "by the unerring force of figures, which cannot lie, we have the sanguinary result." "Talk not of ermine," exclaims Mrs. Negoose, the chairwoman of the committee, in a gush of scorching eloquence, "these blood-stained judges, gory with the blood of the innocents, let them be stripped of their ermine, and robed with the skins of wild cats and hyenas."

It has excited the highest indignation in the society, that Sir Matthew Hale, who has ever borne the name of a humane and upright judge, should have continued to decide questions, involving life, upon circumstantial evidence, after the cases, referred to above, had come to his knowledge, and in the very same manner, that he had been accustomed to decide them, in earlier times. Mrs. Moody openly expresses her opinion, that he was no better than he should be; and Squire Bodkin only wishes, that he could have had half an hour's conversation with Sir Matthew. The only effect, produced upon the mind of Sir Matthew Hale, by these painful discoveries, seems to have been to call forth an expression of opinion, that circumstantial evidence should be received with caution; and that, in trials for murder and manslaughter, no person should ever be convicted, till the body of the individual, alleged to have been killed, had been discovered.

An opinion, often repeated, as having been expressed by Chief Justice Dana, after the conviction of Fairbanks, for the murder of Miss Fales, at Dedham, in 1801, has frequently been a topic of conversation, among the members of our society, and Mrs. Negoose is satisfied, that if Chief Justice Dana expressed any such opinion, he must have been out of his head. Fairbanks was convicted and hung, on circumstantial evidence entirely. The concatenation, or linking together, of circumstances, in that remarkable case, was very extraordinary.

The sympathy for Fairbanks was very great, and began to exhibit itself, almost as soon, as the spirit had fled from the body of his victim. After his condemnation, his zealous admirers, for such they seemed to be, assisted him successfully, to break jail.

He was retaken, on the borders of Lake Champlain; and, as the jail in Boston was of better proof, than the jail in Dedham, he was committed to the former. The genealogy of Fairbanks was shrouded in a sort of mystery. Ladies, of respectable standing, visited him, in his cell, and one, in particular, of some literary celebrity, in our days of small things, was supposed to have supplied him with a knife, of rather expensive workmanship, for the purpose of self-destruction. This knife was found upon his person, after her visits. There was no positive proof, to establish the guilt of Jason Fairbanks—not a tittle. Yet a merciless jury found him guilty, by a process, which our society considers mere *guess work*,—and after the execution, Judge Dana is reported to have said, that he believed Fairbanks murdered Miss Fales, more certainly, from the circumstantial evidence, produced at the trial, than if he had had the testimony of his own eyesight, at a short distance, in a dusky day. What sort of a Judge is this? cried Mrs. Negoose—sure enough, exclaimed Madam Moody.

I have no objection to give our opponents all the advantage, which they can possibly derive from a full and fair exposition of their arguments. When a witness, for example, swears, directly and unhesitatingly, that he saw the prisoner inflict a wound, with a deadly weapon, upon another person—that he saw that other person instantly fall, and die shortly after, this is *positive evidence of something*. Yet the act may be murder, or it may be manslaughter, or it may be justifiable homicide. Murder consists of three parts, the malice prepense, the blow inflicted or means employed, and the death ensuing, within a time prescribed by law. There can be no *murder*, if either of these parts be absent. Now, it is contended, by such as deem it lawful and right to hang the unfortunate, misguided, upon circumstantial evidence, that, however *positive* the evidence may be, upon the two latter points—the act done and the death ensuing—it is necessary, from the nature of things, in every case to depend on *circumstantial* evidence, to prove the malice prepense.

One or more of the senses enable the witness to swear positively to either of the two latter points. But the malice prepense must be *inferred*, from words, deeds, and *circumstances*. Upon this Dr. Omnibus sensibly observes, that this very fact proves the impropriety of hanging upon all occasions: and Mrs. Negoose remarks, that she is of the same opinion, on the authority of that ancient dictum, the authorship of which seems to be equally

ascribed to Solomon and Sancho Panza—that “*circumstances alter cases.*”

It is really surprising, that so grave and sensible a man, as Mr. Simon Greenleaf, should have made the remark, which appears on page 74, vol. i., of his Treatise on Evidence,—“*In both cases (civil and criminal) a verdict may well be founded on circumstances alone; and these often lead to a conclusion far more satisfactory than direct evidence may produce.*” Mr. Greenleaf refers, for illustration of this opinion, to the case of Bodine, N. Y. Legal Observer, vol. iv. p. 89, et seq. Lawyer Bodkin's work on evidence will, doubtless, correct this error.

Let us reason impartially. Compunction, in a dying hour, we cannot deny it, has established the fact, that innocent persons have been hung, now and then, upon *positive* evidence, the false witness confessing himself the murderer, *in articulo mortis*. Well, says Madam Moody, here is fresh proof of the great sinfulness of hanging.—To be sure.—But let our opponents have fair play. A. is found dead, evidently stabbed.—B. is seized upon suspicion.—C. heard B. declare he would have the heart's blood of A.—D. saw B. with a knife in his hand, ten minutes before the murder.—E. finds a knife bloody, near the place of the murder.—F. recognizes the knife as his own, and by him lent to B. just before the time of the murder.—G. says the size of the wound is precisely the size of the knife.—H. says, that, when he arrested B. his hand and shirt-sleeve were bloody.—I. says he heard B. say, just after the murder, “I've got my revenge.” In the case supposed, C. D. E. F. G. H. and I. swear *positively*, each one to a particular fact. Here are seven witnesses. Here then is a chain of evidence, whereof each witness furnishes a single link. It is the opinion of Peake, Chitty, Starkie, Greenleaf, and all other writers, on the law of evidence, that this chain is often as strong or stronger, than it would be, were it fabricated by one man only. I will not deny, that Dr. Omnibus and Mrs. Nemoose think differently.

An extraordinary example of circumstantial evidence, in a capital case, was related by Lord Eldon. A man was on trial for murder. The evidence against him, which was wholly circumstantial, was so very insufficient, that the prisoner, confident of acquittal, assumed an air of easy nonchalance. The officer, who had arrested the prisoner, and conducted the customary search, had exhibited, in court, the articles, found upon his per-

son, at the time of his capture—a few articles of little value, and, among them, a fragment of a newspaper. The surgeon, who examined the body of the victim after death, produced the ball, which he had extracted from the wound, precisely as he found it. Enveloped in a wrapper of some sort, and with the blood dried upon it, it presented an almost unintelligible mass.

A basin of warm water was brought into court—the mass was softened—the wrapper carefully detached—it was the fragment of a newspaper, and fitted like the counterpart of an indenture to the fragment, taken by the officer from the prisoner's person. He was hung. Dear me! says Mrs. Negroose, what a pity!

I regret to learn from the late London papers, that Mr. Horace Twiss is recently dead. No one, I am confident, will fail to join in this feeling of regret, who has enjoyed, as I have done, the perusal of his truly delightful work, "The Public and Private Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon."

No. LIV.

A PLEASANT anecdote is related by Nichols, of Dean Swift, who, when his servant apologized for not cleaning his boots, on a journey, because they would soon be dirty again, directed him to get the horses in readiness immediately: and, upon the fellow's remonstrance, that he had not eaten his breakfast, replied, that it was of little consequence, as he would soon be hungry again.

The American Irish are, undoubtedly, a very sweet people, when they are thoroughly washed; but they rarely think of washing themselves or their children—they are so soon dirty again. Hydrophobia is an Irish epidemic; and there are also some of the Native American Party, I fear, who have not been into water, since the Declaration of Independence.

When Peter Fagan applied to me, a few days since, to read for him a letter, from his cousin, Eyley Murphy, of Ballyconnel, in the county of Cavan, he was so insufferably filthy, that I gave him a quarter of a dollar, to be spent in sacrificing to the graces, that is, in taking a warm bath. While he was absent, I examined the letter; and found it to be a very interesting account of

the execution of Fagan's fourth cousin, Rory Mullowny, for murder. As I thought its publication might be of importance here, at this time, I obtained Mr. Fagan's permission to place it before the community. I was, at first, disposed to correct the spelling, and give it rather more of an English complexion, but have, upon the whole, decided to publish it, as it is. Fagan tells me, that Eyley Murphy was the daughter of the hedge school-master, at Ballyconnel. The letter is written in a fair hand, and directed, "For Mither Pether Fagan, these—Boston, Capital of Amerriky."

Ballyconnel, Cavan, March 19, 1849.—Fagan dear, bad news and throe for ye it is; Rory Mullowny, your own blood cousin o'the forth remove, by the mither's side, was pit up yestreen for the murther o' Tooley O'Shane, and there was niver a felly o' all that's been hung in Ballyconnel, with sich respectible attendance. The widdy Magee pit the divle into both the poor fellies, no more nor a waak arter the birril o' her forth husband, and so she kipt a flarting wid the one and the tither, till she flarted um out o' the world this away.

Poor Rory—what a swaat boy he was—jist sax foot and fore inches in his brogans—och, my God! it's myself that wush'd I'd bin pit up along wid im. But he's claan gane now; whin we was childer together how we used to gather the pirriwincles by the brook, and chase the fire-flaughts in the pasture o' a June evening—och my God—Pether—Pether—but there's no use waaping anyhow, so I'll be telling ye the shtory.

Poor Mullowny was found guilty o' what they call circumstan-shul ividuncc. A spaach it was he made whin the cussid sherry was pittin im up, and he swore he died more innisent o' the crime nor the mither o' God, and he called God to witness what he sed. Himself it was that was rather hasty onyhow, in makin a confission to father Brian Bogle o' this very murther, and some other small mathers, a rape or too, may be, and sich like.

But the socyety that's agin pittin a body up—God bliss their sowls—they perswaded im to spaak at the gallows, and till the paaple how it was, and they rit im a spaach, in wich he toul't 'em a body's last wull was the only wull that was gud in the law, and sure it was a poor body's last words and dyin spaach that was gud anunder the tree. And whin he had dun, the cursed divelsbird o' a sherry, wid a hart as coult as bog mud, swung im off in a minnit. It was himsilf was spaakin; and I

jist pit my apurn to my face to wipe aff the saut wather, whin I heerd a shreek and a howl, louder and wilder nor ten thousand keenas at a birril, whin I lookd up and saw poor, daar Mullowny a swingin in the air. The like o' that yersilf niver saad, Pether Fagan, nor the mither that brot ye into this world o' care and confushon. The wimmin screamed loud enuff to friten the iittle childer claan away in Ballymahon. The min swung their shillalies ovr their heds. Father Brian Bogle was crossing himself, and a stone hurld by Jimmy Fitzgerald at the infarnal sherry, knocked father Bogle's taath down his throte. By the same token ye see, they was pit in for im the dee afore at considerable cost. Father Brian fell back, head foremost, ye see, on top o' Molly Mahoney's little bit table o' refreshments, and twas the wark o' a minnit.

Molly, who jist afore was wall to do in the world, was a brucken marchant, immadiately, all claan gane; tumblers o' whiskey, cakes, custards, and cookies was all knocked in the shape o' bit o'chalk; and all the pennies she had took since bick o'dee—for more nor ten thousan was on the spot to see poor Rory pit up afore dee—was scattered and clutched up, by hundreds o' little childher that was playing prop and chuck farding anunder the gallus. A jug o' buttermilk was capsized ower the widdy Magee's bran new dress, that was made for the hanging precesely, and ruinated it pretty considerably intirely. It was not myself that pittied the hussy—she to be there, as nuar to the gallus as she could squaze hersel, and the very cause o' the dith o' poor Rory, and Tooley O'Shane into the bargain.

Och, Fagan, niver ye see was the likes o' it in Ballyconnel afore. Whin the sherry was for cuttin the alter and littin the corps o' poor, daar Mullowny down into the shell, that was all riddy below, the Mullownys swore they would have the body, for a riglar birrill, and a wake, and a keena, ye see—and the O'Shanes swore it should go to the risirictioners, to be made into a menotomy. Then for it, it was—sich a cursin and swaring and howling—sich a swingin o' shillalies, sich a crackin o' pates, sich callin upon Jasus and the blissid mither, sich a screamin o' wimmin and childer, niver was herd afore in county Cavan. The sherry he gat on Molly Mahoney's little table to read the ryot act, and whin he opunt his mouth Phelim Macfarland flung a rottun egg atwaan his taath precesely, and brot im to a spaady conclushon.

Poor Rory's vinrable ould mither was carried aff and murdered in the side o' the hid, wid a stone mint for the sherry, o' which she recovered diricly. They tried to kaap her quiet in her shanty, but she took on so gravous, that they let her attind the pittin up—poor ould sowl—she sed she had attinded the last moments o' her good man, and both her childer, Patrick and Pether, whin they wur pit up the same way, and it was not the like o' her to hart poor daar Rory's faalings onyhow.

Dolly Macabe was saved by a myrrikle, ye see. She took out wid her her siven childer, leading little Phelim by the hand, wid her babe at the brist, and hersilf in a familiar way into the bargain. She was knocked ower and trampled under the faat o' the fellies as was yellin and fitin, and stunted out o' her raason intirely. Only jist think o' it, Fagan daar, when she kim too, not one o' the childher was hart in the laast, nor Dolly naather; and the first thing she asked wos, whose was the two swaat babes, lyin together, and they toul her they war her own. Ye see, Patrick O'Shane and some more trod upon Dolly Macabe and hastened matters a leetle, and she was delivered o' twins, widout knowin anything about it. They gied her a glass o' whiskey, and O'Flaherty, the baker, pit the swaat babes in his brid cart, and Dolly, who priffird walking, wint home as well as could be expected. All the Macabes have ixcellint constitushons, and make no moor o' sich thrifles, than nothing at all.

But its for tellin the petiklars I'm writin. As I toul ye, twas about the widdy Magee. Rory toul more nor fifty, for a waak afore, that he'd have Tooley's hart's blood. When Tooley was found, it was ston ded he was, and his hed was bate all to paces, and Rory was o' tap o' im houltin im by the throate, wid a shillaly nigh by, covered wid blud, and the blood was rinnin out o' his eyes, and nose, and aars. Lawyer McGammon definded Rory, the poor unfortunit crathur, and he frankly admitted, that it was onlocky for him to be found jist that away, but he toul the jewry, that as he hoped for salvashun, Rory was an innysunt man, and he belaaved the foreman as guilty nor he. He brot half Ballyconnel to prove that Tooley was liable to blaad fraly at the nose, and was apt to have a rush o' blood to the hed, and he compared Rory to the good Summeritan, and sed he was there by the marest axidunt in the

world, and was tryin to stop the flow o' blud by houltin Tooley by the throate.

As to the bloody shillaly, McGammon brot more nor twenty witnesses, and ivery one a Mullowny, to sware it was more like Tooley's own shillaly nor two paas in a pud; and then he had three lunatic doctors, they call'd em, to prove that the O'Shane's were o' the silf-destructive persuashun. As to what Rory had sed about havin Tooley's hart's blud, lawyer McGammon provd that it was a common mode o' spakin in Ballyconnel and all ovr the contree, among frinds and neybors, and thin he hinted, in a dillikit wey, that all the Mullownys wuld be after sayin that virry same thing o' the jewry, if thay brot Rory to the gallus by thair vardic, and that he was guilty o' nothin but circumstanahul ividunce. But the jewry brot in the poor felly guilty o' murder, and its all ovr wid poor Rory.

It's no more I can rite—Your sister Betty Macnamarra has nine fine boys, at thraa births it is. From yours ever till the dee,

EYLEY MURPHY.

No impartial reader of Miss Eyley Murphy's letter will hesitate to pronounce Rory Mullowny an unfortunate man, and his case another example of the abominable practice of hanging innocent persons, upon circumstantial evidence.

No. LV.

POOR ELI—as the old man was familiarly called by the Boston sextons of his time. He was a prime hand, at the shortest notice, in his better days. He has been long dead—died by inches—his memory first. For a year or more before his death, he was troubled with some strange hallucinations, of rather a professional character—among them, an impression, that he had committed a terrible sin, in putting so many respectable people under ground, who had never done him any harm. He said to me, more than once, while attempting to dissipate this film from his mental vision—“Abner, take my advice, and give up this wicked business, or you'll be served so yourself, one of these days.” I was, upon one occasion, going over one of our farms, with the old man—the Granary burying-ground—and he flew

into a terrible passion, because no grave had been dug for old Master Lovell—the father. We tried to remind him, that Master Lovell, many years before, in 1776, had turned tory, and gone off with the British army; but poor old Eli was past conviction. He took his last favorite walk, among the graves on Copp's Hill, one morning in May—he there met a very worthy man, whom he was so fully persuaded he had buried, twenty years before, that he hobbled home, in the greatest trepidation, took to his bed, and never left it, but to verify his own suggestion, that we are all to be finally buried. During his last, brief illness, his mental wanderings were very manifest:—"Poor man—poor man"—he would mutter to himself—"I'm sure I buried him—deep grave, very—estate's been settled—his sons—very fast young men, took possession—gone long ago—poor weeping widow—married twice since—what a time there'll be—oh Lord forgive me, I'll never bury another." He was eighty-two then, and used to say he longed to die, and get among his old friends, for all, that he had known, were dead and gone.

A feeling, somewhat akin to this, is apt to gather about us, and grow stronger, as we march farther forward on our way, the numbers of our companions gradually lessening, as we go. Our ranks close up—those, with whom we stood, shoulder to shoulder, are cut down by the great leveller—and their places are filled by others. As we grow older, and the friends and companions of our earlier days are removed, we have a desire to do the next best thing—we cannot supply their places—but there are individuals—worthy people withal—whose faces have been familiar to our eyes, for fifty or sixty years—we have passed them, daily, or weekly—we chance to meet, no matter where—the ice is broken, by a mutual agreement, that it is very hot, or that it is very cold—very wot, or very dry—an allusion follows to the great number of years we have known each other, by name, and this results, frequently, in a relation, which, if it be not entitled to the sacred name of friendship, is not to be despised by those, who are deep in the valley:—out of such materials, an old craft, near the termination of its voyage, may rig up a respectable jury-mast, at least, and sail on comfortably, to the haven where it would be.

The old standard merchants, who transacted business, on the Long Wharf, Boston Pier, when I was a boy—are dead—*stelligeri*—almost every one of them; and, if all, that I have known and heard of them, were fairly told, it would make a very

readable volume, highly honorable to many of their number, and calculated to operate, as a stimulus, upon the profession, in every age.

One little narrative spreads itself before my memory, at this moment, which I received from the only surviving son of the individual, to whom it especially refers. A merchant, very extensively engaged in commerce, and located upon the Long Wharf, died February 18, 1806, at the age of 75, intestate. His eldest son administered upon the estate. This old gentleman used pleasantly to say, that, for many years, he had fed a very large number of the Catholics, on the shores of the Mediterranean, during Lent, referring to his very extensive connection with the fishing business. In his day, he was certainly well known; and, to the present time, is well remembered, by some of the "*old ones down along shore*," from the Gurnet's Nose to Race Point. Among his papers, a package, of very considerable size, was found, after his death, carefully tied up, and labelled as follows: "*Notes, due-bills, and accounts against sundry persons, down along shore. Some of these may be got by suit or severe dunning. But the people are poor: most of them have had fishermen's luck. My children will do as they think best. Perhaps they will think with me, that it is best to burn this package entire.*"

"About a month," said my informant, "after our father died, the sons met together, and, after some general remarks, our elder brother, the administrator, produced this package, of whose existence we were already apprized; read the superscription; and asked what course should be taken, in regard to it. Another brother, a few years younger than the eldest, a man of strong, impulsive temperament, unable, at the moment, to express his feeling, by words, while he brushed the tears from his eyes with one hand, by a spasmodic jerk of the other, towards the fireplace, indicated his wish to have the package put into the flames. It was suggested, by another of our number, that it might be well, first, to make a list of the debtors' names, and of the dates, and amounts, that we might be enabled, as the intended discharge was for all, to inform such as might offer payment, that their debts were forgiven. On the following day, we again assembled—the list had been prepared—and all the notes, due-bills, and accounts, whose amount, including interest, exceeded thirty-two thousand dollars, were committed to the flames."

"It was about four months after our father's death," continued my informant, "in the month of June, that, as I was sitting in my eldest brother's counting-room, waiting for an opportunity to speak with him, there came in a hard-favored, little, old man, who looked as if time and rough weather had been to windward of him, for seventy years. He asked if my brother was not the executor. He replied, that he was administrator, as our father died intestate. 'Well,' said the stranger, 'I've come up from the Cape, to pay a debt I owed the old gentleman.' My brother," continued my informant, "requested him to take a seat, being, at the moment, engaged with other persons, at the desk."

"The old man sat down, and, putting on his glasses, drew out a very ancient, leather pocket-book, and began to count over his money. When he had done—and there was quite a parcel of bank notes—as he sat, waiting his turn, slowly twisting his thumbs, with his old gray, meditative eyes upon the floor, he sighed; and I knew the money, as the phrase runs, *came hard*—and secretly wished the old man's name might be found, upon the forgiven list. My brother was soon at leisure, and asked him the common questions—his name, &c. The original debt was four hundred and forty dollars—it had stood a long time, and, with the interest, amounted to a sum, between seven and eight hundred. My brother went to his desk, and, after examining the forgiven list attentively, a sudden smile lighted up his countenance, and told me the truth, at a glance—the old man's name was there! My brother quietly took a chair, by his side, and a conversation ensued, between them, which I never shall forget.—'Your note is outlawed,' said my brother; 'it was dated twelve years ago, payable in two years; there is no witness, and no interest has ever been paid; you are not bound to pay this note, we cannot recover the amount.' 'Sir,' said the old man, 'I wish to pay it. It is the only heavy debt I have in the world. It may be outlawed here, but I have no child, and my old woman and I hope we have made our peace with God, and wish to do so with man. I should like to pay it'—and he laid his bank notes before my brother, requesting him to count them over. 'I cannot take this money,' said my brother. The old man became alarmed. 'I have cast simple interest, for twelve years and a little over,' said the old man. 'I will pay you compound interest, if you say so. The debt ought to have

been paid, long ago, but your father, sir, was very indulgent—he knew I'd been unlucky, and told me not to worry about it.'

"My brother then set the whole matter plainly before him, and, taking the bank bills, returned them to the pocket book, telling him, that, although our father left no formal will, he had recommended to his children, to destroy certain notes, due-bills, and other evidences of debt, and release those, who might be legally bound to pay them. For a moment the worthy old man appeared to be stupefied. After he had collected himself, and wiped a few tears from his eyes, he stated, that, from the time he had heard of our father's death, he had raked, and scraped, and pinched and spared, to get the money together, for the payment of this debt.—'About ten days ago,' said he, 'I had made up the sum, within twenty dollars. My wife knew how much the payment of this debt lay upon my spirits, and advised me to sell a cow, and make up the difference, and get the heavy burden off my spirits. I did so—and now, what will my old woman say! I must get back to the Cape, and tell her this good news. She'll probably say over the very words she said, when she put her hand on my shoulder as we parted—I have never yet seen the righteous man forsaken, nor his seed begging bread.' After a hearty shake of the hand, and a blessing upon our old father's memory, he went upon his way rejoicing.

"After a short silence—taking his pencil and making a cast—'there,' said my brother, 'your part of the amount would be so much—contrive a plan to convey to me your share of the pleasure, derived from this operation, and the money is at your service.'"

Such is the simple tale, which I have told, as it was told to me.

No. LVI.

"Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them; otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in Heaven. Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do, in the synagogues, and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But when thou doest alms,

let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth. That thine alms may be in secret : and thy Father, which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly."

This ancient word—*alms*—according to its derivative import, comprehends not only those *oboli*, which are given to the wandering poor, but all bestowments, great and small, in the blessed cause of charity.

In the present age, how limited the number, whose moral courage and self-denial enable them to do their alms in secret, and without sounding a trumpet, as the hypocrites do! How many, impatient of delay, prefer an immediate reward—to have *glory of men*—rather than a long draft, upon far futurity, though God himself be the paymaster!

The ability, to plan a magnificent, prospective charity, to provide the means for its consummation, to preserve inviolate the secret of this high and holy purpose, except from some confidential friend perhaps, until the noble and pure-minded benefactor himself is beyond the reach of all human praise—this is indeed a celestial and a rare accomplishment.

My thoughts have been drawn hitherward, by the public announcement of certain testamentary donations of the late Theodore Lyman—ten thousand dollars to the Horticultural Society—ten thousand dollars to the Farm School—and fifty thousand dollars to the Reform School at Westborough. The public have been long in doubt, who was the secret patron of that excellent establishment, upon which he had previously bestowed two and twenty thousand dollars.—While we readily admit, that, in these unostentatious and posthumous benefactions, there is every claim upon the grateful respect of the community—while we delight to cherish a sentiment of reverence, for the memory of a good man, who would not suffer the sound of his munificence to go forth, till he had descended to that grave, where there is no device, nor work, and where his ears must be closed forever to the world's applause—still there are some, who, doubtless, will marvel at these magnificent, noiseless, and posthumous appropriations. With a very small portion of the amounts, bestowed upon these institutions, what glory might have been had of men, aye, and in his own life time! By distributing the aggregate into comparatively petty sums—by the exercise of rather more than ordinary vigilance and cunning, in the selection of fitting opportunities, what a reputation Mr. Lyman might have obtained! He

would not only have been preceded, by the sound of a trumpet, but every penny paper would have readily converted itself into a penny trumpet, to spread the fame of his showy benefactions. His name would have been in every mouth—aye, and on every omnibus and engine. Add to all this a very small amount—a few hundred dollars, devoted to the procurement of plaster casts of himself, to be skilfully distributed, and verily he would have had his reward.

• The Hon. Theodore Lyman is dead, and, today, my grateful and respectful dealings are with his memory. The practical benevolence of this gentleman has been well known to me, for years. There are quiet, unobtrusive charities, which are not likely to figure, in the daily journals, or to be known by any person, but the parties. For such as these I have occasionally solicited Mr. Lyman, and never in vain. On the other hand, there are individuals, whose names are forever before the public, in connection with some work, to be seen of men; but whose gold and silver, unless they are likely to glitter, *in transitu*, before the eye of the community, are parted with, reluctantly, if at all.

This great public benefactor, upon the present occasion, seems to have said, in the gentle, unobtrusive whisperings of his noble spirit—"A portion of that, which God has permitted me to gather, I believe it is my bounden duty to return, into the treasury of the Lord. This will I do. The secret shall remain, while I live, between God, who gives me this willing heart, and myself. And, when the world shall, at last, become unavoidably apprized of the fact, I shall have taken sanctuary in the grave, where the fulsome applause of the multitude can never reach me."

Between such apostolic charity as this, and certain flashy munificence, whose authors seem to be forever drawing drafts, at sight, and always *without grace*, upon the public, for fresh laudation—more votes of thanks—additional resolutions of all sorts of societies—and a more copious supply of vapid editorial adulation—between these, I say, there is all that real difference which exists, between the "gem of purest ray serene," and the wretched Bristol imitation—between the flower that blooms and sends abroad its perfume in secret, and that corruption whose veritable character can never be concealed; and I may be suffered to say, as truly as Jock Jabos of his professional relations,

that one of my calling may be supposed to know something of corruption, by this time.

—— "My ear is pained,
My soul is sick with every day's report"

of *ad captandum* benefactions. Today, that generous benefactor, Mr. Pipkin, endows some village Lyceum, which is destined forever to glory in the euphonious name of Pipkin. Tomorrow our illustrious fellow-citizen, Mr. Snooks, presents a bell to some village church, and, the very next week, we are told, that the bell was cracked, while ringing peals in honor of the munificent Snooks. Even the Tonsons, whose ubiquity is a proverb, and whose inordinate relish for all sorts of notoriety surpasses their powers of munificence, are always in, for a pen'worth of this species of titillating snuff, at small cost.

The Hon. Theodore Lyman was born in Boston, in 1792. His father was Theodore Lyman, a shrewd, enterprising, and eminently successful merchant of this city. His mother's maiden name was Lydia Williams. She was a sister of Samuel Williams, the celebrated London Banker. The subject of this brief notice received his preparatory education, at Phillips Exeter Academy, under the charge of the venerable Dr. Abbott. He entered Harvard University in 1806, and took his degrees in the usual course.

In 1812, Mr. Lyman went to England, upon a visit to his maternal uncle, Mr. Williams, and, during his absence, travelled on the continent, with Mr. Edward Everett, visiting Greece, Palestine, &c., and remaining abroad, until 1816. He was in Paris, when the allied armies entered that city. Of this event he subsequently published an account, in a work, very pleasantly written, entitled *Three Weeks in Paris*.

In 1820, or very near that period, Mr. Lyman married Miss Mary Henderson of New York, a lady of rare personal beauty and accomplishments, who died in 1836. The issue of this marriage were three daughters and a son, Julia, Mary, Cora and Theodore. The two last survive. The elder children, Julia and Mary, in language of beautiful significancy, have "gone before."

Mr. Lyman published an octavo volume, on Italy, and compiled two useful volumes, on the Diplomacy of the United States with Foreign Nations. In 1834 and 1835, Mr. Lyman was

Mayor of the City of Boston. He brought to that office the manners of a refined and polished gentleman; the independence of a man of spirit and of honor; a true regard for justice and the rights of all men; a lofty contempt for all time-serving policy; talents of a highly respectable order; a mind well stored and well balanced; and a cordial desire, exemplified in his own personal and domestic relations, and by his encouraging word and open hand, of promoting the best interests of the great temperance reform.

To the duties of this office, in which there is something less of glory than of toil, he devoted himself, during those two years, with great personal sacrifice and privation to those, whom he loved most. The period of his mayoralty was, by no means, a period of calm repose. Those years were scored, by the spirit of misrule, with deep, dark lines of infamy. Those years are memorable for the Vandal outrage upon the Ursuline Convent, and the Garrison riot; in which, a portion of the people of Boston demonstrated the terrible truth, that they were not to be outdone in fury, even by the most furious abolitionist, who ever converted his stylus into a harpoon, and his inkhorn into a vial of wrath.

Mr. Lyman, even in comparatively early life, filled the offices of a Brigadier and Major General of our Militia; and was in our Legislative Councils.

The temperament of Mr. Lyman was peculiar. Frigid, and even formal, before the world, he was one of the most warm-hearted men, among the noiseless paths of charity, and in the closer relations of life. I have sometimes marvelled, where he bestowed his keen sensibility, while going through the rough and wearying detail of official duty. In the spring of 1840 we met accidentally, at the South—in the city of Charleston. He was ill. His mind was ill at ease. He seemed to me, at that time, a practical illustration of the truth, that it is not good for man to be alone. Yet he had been long stricken then, in his domestic relation. His chief anxiety seemed to be about the health of his little boy. He told me, that he lingered there on his account. I never knew a more devoted father.

A gentleman, well-known to the community, by his untiring practical benevolence, to whom I applied for information, has sent me a reply, from which I must be permitted to extract one passage, for the benefit of the world—"I have known much of

his benevolent acts, having been the frequent almoner of his bounty, with the injunction, '*Keep it to yourself.*' He often called, and spent one or two hours, to converse on temperance, and the poor, and would spend a long winter evening in my office, to learn of me what my situation enabled me to communicate, and always left a check for \$50 or \$100, to give to the Howard, or some other society. In the severe winter weather, I remarked that he would say, '*This weather makes one feel for the poor.*' He often sent his man with provisions to the houses of the destitute, and had a heart to feel for others' woe."

He has gone! But the memory of this good man shall never go! It shall be embalmed in the grateful tears of the reformed, from age to age. Thousands, now unborn, shall be snatched, like brands from the burning, through the agency of this heavenly charity; and, as they turn from the walls of this noble institution, in a moral sense, regenerate, they shall bless the name of their noble benefactor; and thus raise and perpetuate, to the memory of THEODORE LYMAN, the *monumentum ære perennius*.

No. LVII.

It is scarcely credible, for what peccadilloes, life was forfeited, by the laws of England, within the memory of men, now living. One hundred and sixty offences, which may be committed by man, have been declared, by different acts of parliament, to be felony, without benefit of clergy; that is, punishable with death. It is truly wonderful, that, in the eighteenth century, it should have been a capital offence, in England, to break down the mound of a fish pond—to cut down a cherry tree in an orchard—or to be seen, for one month, in the company of those, who called themselves Egyptians.

We constantly refer to the laws of Draco, the Archon of Athens, as a code of unequalled cruelty; under whose operation, crimes of the highest order, and the most trifling offences, were punished, with equal severity. Draco punished murder with death, and he punished idleness with death. The laws of England punished murder with death, and they punished theft, over the value of twelve pence, with death. What is the necessity of

going back to the time of Draco, 624 years before Christ, for examples of inhuman, and absurdly inconsistent legislation?

The Marquis of Beccaria, in his treatise, *De Delitti e Delle Pene*, seems to have awakened legislators from a trance, in 1764, by propounding the simple inquiry—*Ought not punishments to be proportioned to crimes, and how shall that proportion be established?* A matter, so apparently simple, seems not to have been thought of before.

Sir Samuel Romilly, Sir James Mackintosh, and Sir Robert Peel are entitled to great praise, for their efforts to soften and humanize the criminal code of Great Britain.

The distinction, between grand and petty larceny, was not abolished, until 1827, when, by the act 7th and 8th Geo. IV. chap. 29, theft was made punishable by transportation, or imprisonment and whipping. By this statute, robbery from the person, burglary, stealing in a dwelling-house to the value of £5, stealing cattle, and sheep-stealing are made punishable with death. So that the punishment was, even then, the same, for murdering a man, and stealing a sheep, or £5 from a dwelling-house. Death, by this statute, was also the punishment for arson, for setting fire to coal mines, and ships; and for riotously demolishing buildings or machinery.

In the following year, 1828, by the act 9th Geo. IV. ch. 31, death is made the punishment, for murder, maliciously shooting, cutting and maiming, administering poison, attempting to drown, suffocate, &c., and for rape and sodomy. By this act, more than fifty statutes, relative to offences against the person, are repealed.

The act 11th Geo. IV. and 1st Will. IV. ch. 66, passed in 1830, abolishes capital punishment, in all cases of forgery, excepting forgery of the royal seals, exchequer bills, bank notes, wills, bills of exchange, promissory notes, or money orders, transfers of stock, and powers of attorney. Death remained the penalty for all these forgeries, in 1830, and, for all other forgeries, transportation and imprisonment.

Two years after, in 1832, another step was taken. By 2d Will. IV. ch. 34, capital punishment was abolished, and transportation and imprisonment substituted, for all offences, relative to the coin. This was a prodigious stride.

This gave us a great hope, that misguided murderers might finally be suffered to live in security, at least, from the halter :.

for no object had been of greater moment with the British nation, than the coin of the realm, and the death penalty had often been exacted from those, who had dared to clip or counterfeit that sacred representative of majesty. The principle is well established, that men, who fly from one extreme, *in contraria currunt*. We trusted, therefore, that extremely lenient legislation would supervene, upon its very opposite.

We had great confidence in a system of "indefatigable teasing," as Butler calls it. In the same year, 1832, by 2d and 3d Will. IV. ch. 62, capital punishment was abolished, in cases of stealing from a dwelling-house to the value of £5, and sheep-stealing; and by the same act, ch. 123, capital punishment was abolished, in all cases of forgery, excepting in the cases of wills, and powers of attorney for stock.

In 1833, by 3d and 4th Will. IV. ch. 44, capital punishment was abolished in case of dwelling-house robbery; repealing so much of the larceny act of 1827.

Our good friends in England next thought it expedient to divest the process of hanging, of all its postmortuary terrors. I have heard of condemned persons, who expressed a greater horror, at the thought of being dissected, than of being hanged. It was deemed proper, therefore, to relieve the unfortunates, on this tender point. Accordingly, in 1834, by 4th Will. IV. ch. 26, dissecting murderers, and hanging them, in chains, were abolished.

It had been the law of England, that all persons returning, *sua sponte*, after transportation, should be hanged. But experience has shown how deep is the affection, which convicts bear to their former haunts, their native land. It is a perfect *nostalgia*. This law was therefore repealed, in 1834, by 4th and 5th Will. IV. ch. 67.

In 1835, by 5th and 6th Will. IV. ch. 33, sundry felonies, never before deemedailable offences, were made so, notwithstanding the parties confessed themselves guilty.

Sacrilege and letter-stealing had long been capital offences in England. In the same year, they were no longer punished with death.

We had great hopes from Victoria. In 1837, 1 Vic. ch. 23, she began, by abolishing the pillory entirely;—and ch. 84, capital punishment is abolished, in all cases of forgery;—ch. 85, capital punishment is inflicted, for administering poison, or doing

bodily injury with intent to mutilate ; but other acts, with intent to murder, or maim, or disfigure, are punished with different degrees of transportation and imprisonment.—Ch. 86 takes away capital punishment, in burglary, unless accompanied with violence.—Ch. 87 takes away capital punishment, in case of robbery, unless attended with cutting or wounding. Ch. 88 leaves the punishment of death, transportation or imprisonment, to the discretion of the court, in case of piracy, where murder is attempted. Ch. 89 varies the laws of arson, making arson a capital offence, in regard to a dwelling-house, *any person being therein*.—Ch. 91 abolishes capital punishment in cases of riotous assemblies, seducing from allegiance, and certain offences against the revenue laws.

It is rather surprising, that there is such a general prejudice throughout the world, in favor of putting murderers to death. The Bible is an awful stumbling block, in this respect. We are also reminded that Solon, when he abolished the code of Draco, retained the punishment of death, in the case of murder. I have never thought much of Solon, since I became acquainted with this weak point in his character.

A writer in the Edinburgh Review, vol. 86, p. 217, speaking of death as the punishment for murder, observes—"The intense desire which now actuates a portion of the community, to get rid of capital punishment even for murder, may be taken as an indication of this excessive sensibility. The propriety of that punishment in the given case, would certainly appear to be distinctly sanctioned by that book, to which its opponents professedly appeal—by reason—and by the all but universal practice of nations. It is the only certain guarantee which society can have for the security of its members." Here we have it again—"that book"—the Bible. It cannot be denied that the Bible, or Solon, or Sir Matthew Hale, or somebody else, is everlastingly in the way of this and other modern, philanthropic movements. What was Solon, in comparison with David Crockett—we are sure we are right, and why should we not go ahead ?

For my own part, I have never been able to perceive the wisdom of attempting to conceal any of our prospective movements. Indeed, our future course must be sufficiently apparent, at a glance. When we have *agitated*, until capital punishment is abolished, and we have had a commemorative celebration, with emblematical banners, and an hundred guns on the Common,

nothing will be further from our thoughts, than a dissolution, sine die. One of our chief arguments in favor of abolishing capital punishment, is the greater hardship of a life-long imprisonment. Availing of this argument, we shall be able to show, that we have placed these unfortunates, in a worse condition than before. A petition will be presented to the Governor and Council, from five thousand unhappy murderers, ravishers, house-burners, burglars and highway robbers—such we think will be the number, in a few years—representing their miserable condition, and respectfully requesting to be hanged, under the influence of ether or otherwise, as to the Governor and Council may seem fit. We shall then *agitate* anew, and endeavor, through public meetings and the press, to exhibit the barbarity of refusing their humble request.

This, we well enough know, will not be granted; and the only escape from the dilemma, will be to suffer them, to go at large, upon their parole of honor. It will not, of course, be expected, that this parole will be received from any, who cannot produce a certificate, under the hand of the warden, that they have committed no murder, rape, arson, burglary, or highway robbery, during the period of their confinement in the State Prison.

No. LVIII.

THE late Archbishop of Bordeaux, when Bishop of Boston, Dr. Cheverus, told me, that he had very little influence with his people, in regard to their extravagance at funerals. It is very hard to persuade them to abate the tithe of a hair, in the cost of a *birril*.

This post-mortuary profligacy, this pride of death, is confined to no age or nation of the world. It has prevailed, ever since chaos was licked into shape, and throughout all Heathendom and Christendom, begetting a childish and preposterous competition, who should bear off the corpses of their relations, most showily, and cause them to rot, most expensively.

This amazing folly has often required, and received, the sumptuary curb of legislation. I have briefly referred, in a former

number, to the restraining edicts of the law-givers of Greece, and the laws of the Twelve Tables at Rome.

Even here, and among the earlier records of our own country, evidences are not wanting, that the attention of our worthy ancestors had been attracted to the subject of funereal extravagance. At a meeting, held in Faneuil Hall, October 28, 1767, at which the Hon. James Otis was the Moderator, the following resolution was passed: "*And we further agree strictly to adhere to the late regulations respecting funerals, and will not use any gloves but what are manufactured here, nor procure any new garments, upon such occasions, but what shall be absolutely necessary.*" This resolution was passed, *inter alia similia*, with reference to the Stamp Act of 1765, and as part of the system of non-importation.

There is probably no place like England—no city like London, for funereal parade and extravagance. The Church, to use the fox-hunting phrase, must be *in at the death*; and how truly would a simple funeral, without pageantry, in some sort—a cold, unceremonious burial, without mutes, and streamers, and feathers—without bell, book, or candle—flout and scandalize the gorgeous Church of England! The Church and the State are connected, so intimately and indissolubly connected, that he, who dies in the arms of Mother Church, must permit that particular old lady, in the matter of his funeral, to indulge her ruling passion, for costly forms and ceremonies.

It is more than forty years, since, with infinite delight, I first read that effusion—outpouring—splendid little eruption, if you like—of Walter Scott's, called Llewellyn. Apart from all context, a single stanza is to my present purpose; I give it from memory, where it has clung, for forty years:

When a prince to the fate of a peasant has yielded,
The tapestry waves dark, round the dim lighted pall,
With scutcheons of silver the coffin is shielded,
And pages stand mute in the canopied hall.
Through the vault, at deep midnight, the torches are gleaming,
In the proudly arched chapel the banners are beaming,
Far adown the long aisle sacred music is streaming,
Lamenting a chief of the people should fall.

In all this, the nobility ape royalty, the gentry the nobility, the commonalty the gentry: and there is no estate so low, as not, in this particular, to account the death of a near relative a perfect justification of extravagance.

There is scarcely one in a thousand, I believe, who has any just idea of the amount, annually lavished upon funerals, in Great Britain; or of the extraordinary fact, that joint stock burial companies exist there, and declare excellent dividends.

In 1843, at the request of her Majesty's principal Secretary of State, for the Home Department, Edwin Chadwick, Esquire, drew up "a report on the results of a special inquiry into the practice of interment, in towns."

Mr. Chadwick states, that, *upon a moderate calculation, the sum annually expended in funeral expenses, in England and Wales, is five millions of pounds sterling*, and that four of these millions may be justly set down as expended on the mere superfluities of death.

Evelyn says, that his mother requested his father, on her death bed, to bestow upon the poor, whatever he had designed, for the expenses of her funeral.

Speaking of this abominable misapplication of money, a writer, in the London Quarterly Review, vol. 73, p. 466, exclaims—"To what does it go? To silk scarfs and brass nails—feathers for the horses—kid gloves and gin for the mutes—white satin and black cloth for the worms. And whom does it benefit? Not those, whose unfeigned sorrow makes them callous, at the moment, to its show, and almost to its mockery—not the cold spectator, who sees its dull magnificence give the lie to the preacher's equality of death—but the lowest of all hypocrites, the hired mourner, &c." It is calculated by Mr. Chadwick, that £60 to £100 are necessary to bury an upper tradesman—£250 for a gentleman—£500 to £1500 for a nobleman.

High profits were obtained, by the joint stock burial companies in England, in 1843. The sale of graves in one cemetery was at the rate of £17,000 per acre, and a calculation, made for another, gave £45,375 per acre, not including fees for monuments, &c. One company, says Mr. Chadwick, has set forth an estimate, that seven acres, at the rate of ten coffins, in one grave, would accommodate 1,335,000—one million three hundred and thirty-five thousand—paupers. The following interrogatory was put, and repeated by members of the Parliamentary Committee, to the witnesses: "*Do you think there would be any objection to burying bodies with a certain quantity of quick lime, sufficient to destroy the coffin and the whole thing in a given time?*"

In 1843, Mr. J. C. Loudon published, in London, his work on the Managing of Cemeteries and the Improvement of Churchyards. The cool, philosophic style, in which Mr. Loudon handles this interesting subject, is rather remarkable. On page 50, he expatiates, as follows: "*This temporary cemetery may be merely a field, rented on a twenty-one years' lease, of such an extent, as to be filled with graves in fourteen years. At the end of seven years more it may revert to the landlord, and be cultivated, planted, or laid down in grass, or in any manner that may be thought proper. Nor does there appear to us any objection to union workhouses having a portion of their garden ground used as a cemetery, to be restored to cultivation, after a sufficient time had elapsed.*"

This certainly is doing the utilitarian thing, with a vengeance. Quite a novel rotation of crops—cabbages following corpses. My long experience assures me, that the rapidity of decomposition depends, upon certain qualities in the subject and in the soil. Skeletons are sometimes found, in tolerably perfect condition, after an inhumation of two hundred years. Perhaps Mr. Loudon, in his eager festination for a crop, may have determined to bury in quicklime. Paupers and quicklime would make a capital compost, and scarcely require a top-dressing, of any kind, for years. What beets! what carrots, for the cockney market! Notwithstanding the quicklime, I should rather fear an occasional envelopment of some *unlucky* relic, in the guise of a *lucky* bone—a grinder, perhaps. And, when these vegetables shall again have been converted into animals, and these animals shall have served their day and generation, they shall again be converted into cabbages and carrots, as all their predecessors were. Well, this Mr. Loudon is a practical fellow; and his metastasis is admirable. Here are thousands of miserable wretches—*nullorum filii*, many of them—they have contributed scarcely anything to the common weal, while living; now let us put them in the way, with the assistance of a little quicklime, of doing something for their fellow-beings, after they are dead. The pauper squashes and cabbages must have been at a premium, in Leadenhall Market. Imagination is clearly worth something. After all my reason can accord, in the way of respect, for these utilitarian notions, I solemnly protest against marrowfats, cultivated in Mr. Loudon's pauper hotbeds. No doubt they would be larger, and the flavor richer and more pecul-

iar—nevertheless, Mr. Loudon must excuse me—I say I protest. He gives an alternative permission, to lay down his mixture of dead bodies and quicklime to grass, or for the pasture of cows. Even then the milk would have a suspicious flavor, or *post-mortem* smell, I apprehend; it would be the same thing, by second intention, as the surgeons say.

The explanation of Mr. Loudon's monstrous proposition can be found nowhere, but in his concentrated interest in agriculture, to which he would have the living and the dead alike contribute. When contemplating the corpse of a portly pauper, he seems to think of nothing, but the readiest mode of converting it into cabbages.

I have heard of a cutaneous fellow, who had an irresistible fancy, for skinning animals—it had become a passion. Nothing came amiss to him. He sought with avidity, for every four-footed and creeping thing, that died within five miles of his dwelling, for the pleasure of skinning it. The insides of his apartments were covered with the expanded skins, not only of beasts and the lesser vermin, but of birds, serpents and fishes. His house was an exuvial museum. He had a little son, a mere child, who assisted his father, on these occasions, in a small way. He had the misfortune to lose his grandmother—a fine old lady—and the following brief colloquy occurred, between the father and the child, the day before she was buried: "I say, father." "What, Peter?" "When are you going to skin Granny?"

No. LIX.

LAST Sabbath morning, I read Cicero's *Dialogus de Amicitia*—simple Latinity, and very short—27 sections only. It seemed like enjoying the company of an old friend. It is now just forty-seven years, since I first read it, at Exeter. I marvel at Montaigne, for not thinking highly of it—but find some little motive, in the fact, that he had written a tract upon the subject, himself, which may be found, in his first volume, page 215, London, 1811, and which can no more be compared to the *Dialogus*, than—to use George Colman's expression—a mummy to Hy-perion.

The *Dialogus de Amicitia*, of a Sabbath morning! Aye, my reverend, orthodox brother. Not having, in my system, one pulse of sympathy for disorganization, and liberty parties, I reverence the holy Sabbath, as much as you do yourself; and, to prevent the *Dialogus* from hurting me, I read one sermon before, and another immediately after—Jeremy Taylor's *Apples of Sodom*, and Fléchier's *Sur La Correction Fraternelle*—such sermons, as, in the concoction, would, perhaps, be very likely to burst your mental boiler, and which would not suit the appetites of many, modern congregations, who have ruined their powers of inwardly digesting such strong meat, by dieting upon theological *fricandises faites avec du sucre*.

And you was not at meeting then! Right again, my dear brother. I am deaf as a haddock; though Sir Thomas Browne has annihilated this favorite standard of comparison, by assuring us, that a haddock has as good ears, as any other fish in the sea. Mine, however, are quite unscriptural—ears not to hear. My ear is all in my eye.

Roscius boasted of his power to convey his meaning, by mute gesticulation. Our modern clergy have so little of this gift, that, with my impracticable ears, it is all dumb show for me. Now and then, when the wind is fair, I catch a word or two; and no cross-readings were ever more grotesque and comical, than my cross-hearings. I am convinced, that I do not always have the worst of it. When, in reply to an old lady, who once asked me how I liked the preacher, I told her I heard not a syllable—what a mercy! she exclaimed. But consider the example! True, there is something in that. Try the experiment—stop the *meatus auditorius* with beeswax, and try it, for half a dozen Sabbaths, even with the knowledge, that you can remove the impediment at will, which I cannot!

After I had finished the *Dialogus*, I found myself successfully engaged, in the process of mental exhumation:—up they came, one after another, the playmates of my childhood, with their tee-totums and merry-andrews—the companions of my boyhood, with their tops, kites, and marbles—the friends and associates of my youth, with their skates, bats, and fowling pieces. It is really quite pleasant to gather a party, upon such short notice, and with so little effort; and without the trouble of providing wine and sweetmeats. Upon the very threshold of manhood, how they scatter and disperse! There is a passage of the Dia-

logus—the tenth section—which is so true to life, at the present hour, that one can scarcely realize it was written, before the birth of Christ:—"Ille (Scipio) quidem nihil difficilius esse dicebat, quam amicitiam usque ad extremum vitæ permanere. Nam vel ut non idem expediret utrique, incidere sæpe; vel ut de republica non idem sentirent; mutari etiam mores hominum sæpe dicebat, alias adversis rebus, alias ætate ingravescente. Atque earum rerum exemplum ex similitudine capiebat ineuentis ætatis, quod summi puerorum amores sæpe una cum prætexta ponerentur; sin autem ad adolescentiam perduxissent, dirimi tamen interdum contentione, vel uxoriæ conditionis, vel commodi allucijus, quod idem adipisci uterque non posset. Quod si qui longius in amicitia proveci essent, tamen sæpe labefactari, si in honoris contentionem incidissent: pestem esse nullam amicitii, quam in plerisque pecuniæ cupiditatem, in optimis quibusque honoris certamen et gloriæ: ex quo inimicitias maximas sæpe inter amicissimos extitisse." Lord Rochester said, that nothing was ever benefited, by translation, but a bishop. This, nevertheless, I believe, is a fair translation of the passage—

He (Scipio) said, that nothing was more difficult, than for friendship to continue to the very end of life: either because its continuance was found to be inexpedient for one of the parties, or on account of political differences.

He remarked, that men's humors were apt to be affected, sometimes, by adverse fortune, and at others, by the heavy listlessness of age. He drew an example of these things, from a similar condition in youth—the most vehement attachments, among boys, were commonly laid aside with the prætexta, or at the age of maturity; or, if continued beyond that period, they were occasionally interrupted, by some contention about the state or condition of the wife, or the possessions or advantages of somebody, which the other party was unable to equal. Indeed, if some there were, whose friendship was drawn along to a later period, it was very apt to be weakened, if they became rivals, in the path of fame. The greatest bane of friendship, among the mass, was the love of money, and among some, of the better sort, the thirst for glory; by which the bitterest hatred had been generated, between those, who had been the greatest friends.

Unless it be orthodoxy, nothing has been so variously defined, as *friendship*. A man who stands by, and sees another mur-

dered, in a duel, is his *friend*. Mutual endorsers are *friends*. Partisans are the *friends* of the candidate. Those gentlemen, who give their time and talents to eat and drink up some wealthy fool, who would pass for an Amphytrion, and laugh at the fellow's simplicity, behind his back, are his *friends*. The patrons of players and buffoons, signors and signorinas, are their *friends*. The venders of Havana cigars and Bologna sausages inform their *friends* and patrons, that they have recently received a fresh supply. Marat was the *friend* of the people. Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar were the *friends* of Job; and he told them rather uncivilly, I think, that they were miserable comforters. Matthew speaks of a *friend* of publicans and sinners.

Monsieur Megret, who, as Voltaire relates, the instant Charles XII. was killed, exclaimed—*Voila la piece finie, allons souper*—see, the play is over, let us go to supper, was the king's *friend*. William the First, like other kings, had many *friends*, who, the moment he died, ran away, and literally left the dead to bury the dead; of which a curious account may be found, in the Harleian Miscellany, vol. iii. page 160, London, 1809. Friendship flourishes, at Christmas and New Year, for every one, we are told, in the book of Proverbs, is a *friend* to him that giveth gifts. There seems to be no end to this enumeration of *friends*. The name is legion, to say nothing of the whole society of *Friends*. What then could Aristotle have meant, when he exclaimed, as Diogenes Laertius says he did, lib. v. sec. 21, *My friends, there is no such thing as a friend?* Menander is stated by Plutarch, in his tract, on Brotherly Love, cap. 3, to have proclaimed that man happy, who had found even *the shadow of a friend?*

It would be hard to describe the friend, whom Aristotle and Menander had in mind. Cicero has employed twenty-seven sections, and given us an imperfect definition after all. Such a friend comes not, within any one of the categories I have named.

Friends, in the common acceptance of that word, may be readily lost and won. The direction, ascribed to Rochefoucault, seems less revolting, when applied to such *friends* as these—*to treat all one's friends, as if, one day, they might be foes, and all one's foes, as if, one day, they might be friends*. This cold-blooded axiom is Rochefoucault's, only by adoption. Aristotle, in his Rhetoric, lib. ii. cap. 13, and Diogenes Laertius, in his life of Bias, lib. i. sec. 7, ascribe something like this say-

ing to him. Cicero, in the sixteenth section of the *Dialogus de Amicitia*, after referring to the opinion—"ita amare oportere, ut si aliquando esset ossurus," and stating Scipio's abhorrence of the sentiment, expresses his belief, that it never proceeded from so good and wise a man, as Bias. Aulus Gellius, lib. i. cap. 3, imputes to Chilon, one of the seven wise men of Greece, substantially, the same sentiment—"Love him, as if you were one day to hate him, and hate him, as if you were one day to love him." Poor Rochefoucault, who had sins enough to answer for, is as unjustly held to be author of this infernal sentiment, as was Dr. Guillotin of the instrument, that bears his ill-fated name.

Boccacio was in the right—*there is a skeleton in every house*. We have, all of us, our crosses to carry; and should strive to bear them as gracefully, as comports with the infirmity of human nature; and among the most severe is the loss of an old friend. Aristotle was mistaken—there is such a thing as a friend. Some fifty years ago, I began to have a friend—our professions and pursuits were similar. For some fifty years, we have cherished a feeling of mutual affection and respect; and, now that we have retired from the active exercise of our craft, we daily meet together, and, like a brace of veteran grasshoppers, chirp over days bygone. I believe I never asked of my friend an unreasonable or unseemly thing. God knows he never did of me. Thus we have obeyed Cicero's first law of friendship—*Hæc igitur prima lex in amicitia sancitur, ut neque rogemus res turpes, nec faciamus, rogati*.

We are most happily adapted to each other. I have always taken pleasure in regurgitating, from the fourth stomach of the mind, some tale or anecdote, and chewing over the cud of pleasant fancy. No man ever had a friend with a more willing ear, or a shorter memory. But for this, which I have always accounted a Providence, my stock would have been exhausted, long ago. After lying fallow, for two or three months, every tale is as good as new.

God bless my friend, and compensate the shortness of his memory, by giving him length of days, and every good thing, in this and a better world.

No. LX.

Much has been said and written, of late, here and elsewhere, on the subject of *intra mural* interment—burial within the *walls* or *confines* of cities. This term, though commonly employed by British writers, is wholly inapplicable, in all those rural cities, which have recently sprung up among us, and in which there are still many broad acres of meadow and pasture, plough-land and forest. In these almost nominal cities, the question must be, in relation to the propriety of burying the dead, not within the confines, but in the more densely peopled portions—in the very midst of the living.

I have an opinion, firmly fixed, and long cherished, upon this important subject; and, considering myself, professionally, an expert, in these matters, I shall devote the present article to their consideration.

There is no doubt, that a cemetery, from its improper location, or the mass of putrefying material, which the madness, or folly, or avarice of its proprietors has accumulated there, or from the indecent and almost superficial deposition of half-buried corpses, may become, like the burden of our sins—*intolerable*. It is not less certain, that it may become a *public nuisance*—not merely in the *popular* sense—but *legally*, and, as such, indictable at common law. Neither can there be any doubt, that the city authorities, without a resort to the process of indictment, and as conservators of the public health, have full power, to prevent all future interments in that cemetery. This is true of a cemetery in the suburbs—a *fortiori*, of a cemetery in the city.

At the present day, it may seem astonishing to many, that any doubt ever prevailed, in the minds of respectable members of the medical faculty, as to the unhealthy influences of the effluvia, arising from *animal* corruption. Orfila, Parant Duchâtelet, and other Frenchmen, of high professional reputation, have maintained, that such effluvia are perfectly innocuous. It seems to be almost universally agreed, at the present day, to reject such extraordinary doctrines entirely; although it is admitted, by the highest authorities, that the exhalations from *vegetable* corruption are the more pernicious of the two.

So far as the decision of this question concerns the remedy, by legal process, it is of no absolute importance. The popular

impression, that exhalations, of any kind, cannot constitute a *public nuisance*, in the technical import of those words, unless those exhalations are injurious to health, is erroneous. Lord Mansfield held this not to be necessary; and that it was enough, if the air were so affected, as to be breathed by the public, with less comfort and pleasure, than before.

Interment, beyond the confines of the city, was enjoined, some eighteen hundred years ago. It was decreed in Rome, by the twelve tables—*hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito*.

A writer, in the London Quarterly Review, vol. 73, p. 446, has written, very ably, on this interesting topic. He supplies some facts of importance, connected with the history of interment. A. D. 381.—The Theodosian code forbade all interment within the walls of the city, and even ordered, that all the bodies and monuments, already placed there, should be carried out.

A. D. 529.—The first clause was confirmed by Justinian. A. D. 563.—The Council of Brague decreed, that no dead body should be buried, within the circle of the city walls.

A. D. 586.—The Council of Auxerre decreed, that no one should be buried in their temples. A. D. 827.—Charlemagne decreed, that no person should be buried in a church. A. D. 1076.—The Council of Winchester decreed, that no person should be buried in the churches. A. D. 1552.—Latimer, on Saint Luke vii. ii., says, "the citizens of Nain had their burying places without the city; and I do marvel, that London, being so great a city, hath not a burial place without," &c. A. D. 1565.—Charles Borromeo, the good bishop of Milan, ordered the return to the ancient custom of suburban cemeteries.

Sir Matthew Hale used to say, "churches were made for the living, not for the dead." The learned Anthony Rivet observed—"I wish this custom, which covetousness and superstition first brought in, were abolished; and that the ancient custom were revived to have burying places, in the free and open fields, without the gates of cities." In 1832, fifteen Archbishops, Bishops, and others, ecclesiastical commissioners, in London, recommended the abolition of all burials in churches.

At great expence, the City Government of Roxbury have judiciously selected a spot, eminently beautiful, and remote from the peopled portion of the city, for the burial of the dead. The great argument—the manifest motive—was a *just regard for the health of their constituents*. If the present nuisance should

continue much longer, and grow much greater, may not the question be respectfully asked, with some little pertinency, *what has become of that just regard?*

Surely there is no lack of power. In 1832, the government of Boston said to the town of Roxbury, not in the language of David to Moab—thou shalt be "*my wash pot*"—but thou shalt be the receptacle of our offal—of all, that is filthy, and corruptible, within our borders. The City Government of Boston went extensively then into the carrion and garbage business, and furnished the provant for a legion of hogs, the property of an influential citizen of Roxbury. This awful hoggerly was located on the road, now called East Street. The carrion carts of the metropolis of New England, *eundo, redeundo, et manendo*, dropping filth and fatness, as they went, became an abominable nuisance; and, as Commodore Trunnion beat up to church, on his wedding day, so every citizen, as soon as he discovered one of those aromatic vehicles, drawn by six or eight horses, tossing up their heads, and snorting sympathetically, was obliged to close-haul his nose, and struggle for the weather gage.

Then again, the proprietor of this colossal hog-sty, with his burnery of bones, and other fragrant contrivances, created a stench, unknown among men, since the bituminous conflagration of the cities of the plain—Sodom and Gomorrah; and which terrible stench, in the language of Sternhold & Hopkins, "*came flying all abroad.*" In the keeping of the varying wind, this "*arria cattiva,*" like that from a graveyard, surcharged with half-buried corpses, visited, from day to day, every dwelling, and nauseated every man, woman, and child in the village. Four town meetings were held, upon this subject. Roxbury calmly remonstrated,—Boston doggedly persisted; and, at last, patience having had its perfect work, the carrion carts, while attempting to enter Roxbury, were met, by the yeomanry, on the line, and driven back to Boston. Chief Justice Shaw having refused an application for an *injunction*, the complaint was brought before the grand jury of Norfolk. Bills were found, against the owner of the hogs, and the city of Boston. My learned and amiable friend, the late John Pickering, then the City Solicitor, defended them both, with great ability; and the present Judge Merrick, then County Attorney, opposed the whole swinish concern, with the spirit of an Israelite, and the power of a Rabbi. The owner of the hogs and the city of Boston were both duly convicted, and,

entering into a written obligation to sin no more, in this wise, the indictment was held over them, for a reasonable period, until they had given satisfactory evidence of their sincerity.

In the testimony of Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck, which was published, at the time, after sustaining the prosecutors amply, in their allegation, in respect to the deleterious effect of the nuisance, he remarks—“*The Creator has established, in the sense of smelling, a sentinel, to descry distant danger of life. The alarm, sounded through this organ, seldom passes unheeded, with impunity.*”

Dr. John C. Warren and sixteen other respectable physicians concurred in this opinion.

No. LXI.

How LONG—oh Lord—how long will thy peculiar people disregard the simple, unmistakable teachings of common sense, and the admonitions of their own, proper noses, and bury the dead, in the very midst of the living!—Above all, how long will they continue to perpetrate that hideous folly of burying the dead, in tombs! What a childish effort, to keep the worm at bay—to stave off corruption, yet a little while—to procrastinate the payment of nature's debt, at maturity—DUST THOU ART AND UNTO DUST THOU SHALT RETURN!—For what? That the poor, senseless tabernacle may have a few more months or years, to rot in—that friends and relatives may, from time to time, be enabled, upon every re-opening of the tomb, to gratify their morbid curiosity, and see how the worms are getting on—that, whenever the tomb is unbarred, for another and another tenant, as it may often happen, at the time, when corruption is doing its utmost—its rankest work—the foul quintessence—the reeking, deleterious gases may rush back upon the living world; and, blending with ten thousand kindred stench, in a densely peopled city, promote the mighty work of pestilence and death.

Who does not sympathize with Cowper!

Oh for a lodge, in some vast wilderness,
Some boundless contiguity of shade,
Where the atrocious smells of docks, and sewers,
Eruptive gas, and rank distillery

May never reach me more. My lungs are pain'd,
My nose is sick, with this eternal stench
Of corpse and carrion, with which earth is fill'd.

I am not unmindful, that, in a former number of these Dealings with the Dead, I have passed over these burial-grounds, and partially exhibited the interior of these tombs already. But there really seems to be a great awakening, upon this subject, at the present moment, at home and abroad; and I rejoice, that it is so.

I am aware, that, within the bounds of old, peninsular Boston, no inhumations—*burials in graves*—are permitted. This is well.—*Burials in tombs* are still allowed.—Why? This mode of burial is much more offensive. In *grave burial*, the gases percolate gradually; and a considerable portion may be reasonably supposed to be neutralized, *in transitu*. This is unquestionably the case, unless the grave is kept open, or opened, six times, or more, on the speculation principle, for the reception of new customers. In *tomb burial*, it is otherwise. The tomb is opened for new comers, and sometimes, most inopportunately, and the horrible smell fills the atmosphere, and compels the neighboring inhabitants, to close their windows and doors.

As, with some persons, this may seem to require authentication, without leading the reader to every offensive graveyard in this city, I will take a single, and a sufficient example—I will take the oldest graveyard in the Commonwealth, and the most central, in the city of Boston. I refer to Isaac Johnson's lot, where, in 1630, his bones were laid—the Chapel burying-ground. The Savings Bank building bounds upon that cemetery. The rooms of the Massachusetts Historical Society are over the Bank.

The stench, produced, by burials in the tombs, in that yard, during the summer of 1849, has compelled the Librarian to close his windows. *Tomb burial*, in this yard, has not been limited to deceased proprietors, and their relatives; it has, in some instances, been a matter of traffic. I have been struck with the present arrangement of the gravestones, in this yard. Some ingenious person has removed them all, from their original positions, and actually planted them, "*all of a row*," like the four and twenty fiddlers—or rather, in four straight rows, near the four sides of the graveyard. This is a queerer metamorphosis, than any I ever read of. Ovid has nothing to compare with it.

There they are, every one, with its "*Here lies*," &c., compelled to stand forever, a monument of falsehood.

Of all the pranks, ever perpetrated in a graveyard, this, surely, is the most amusing. In defiance of the *lex loci*, which rightfully enjoins solemnity of demeanor, in such a place—and of all my reverence for Isaac Johnson, and those illustrious men, who slumber there, I was actually seized with a fit of uncontrollable laughter; and came to the conclusion, that this sacrilegious transposition must have been the work of Punch, or Puck, or some Lord of misrule. As I proceeded to read the inscriptions, my merriment increased, for the gravestones seemed to be conferring together, upon the subject of these extraordinary changes, which had befallen them; and repeating over to one another—"As you are now, so once was I." As it happened, in the case of Major Pitcairn, should any person desire to remove the ashes of his ancestor, these misplaced gravestones would surely lead to the awakening of the wrong passenger; and some venerable old lady, who died in her bed, may be transported to England, and buried under arms, for a major of infantry, who died in battle.

Why continue to bury in tombs? *Surely the sufferance on the part of the City Government, does not arise, from a respect for vested rights!!!* If the City Government has power to close the offensive cellars in Broad Street, and elsewhere, being private property, because they are accounted injurious to public health, why may they not close the tombs, being private property, for the very same reason? Considerations of public health are paramount. When, upon an application from a number of the liquor-sellers, wholesale and retail, in this city, Chancellor Kent gave his opinion, adverse to their hearts' desire, that the license laws were *constitutional*, he alluded, analogically, to the power of the Commonwealth, to pass sanatory laws. If the municipal power were deemed inadequate, legislation would give all the power required. For it would, indeed, be monstrous, having settled the fact, that the public health suffered, from burial in tombs, to suppose it a remediless evil.

The slaughter-houses and tanneries, which once existed, in Kilby Street and Dock Square, would not be tolerated now. Originally, they were not nuisances. Population gathered around them—their precedency availed them nothing—they became nuisances, by the force of circumstances. The tombs, in the

churchyard, were not nuisances, when population was sparse—though they are so now. But the fact I have stated will increase the evil, from day to day: there can be no more burials, in graves, within the city proper—people will die—and, as we have not the taste nor courage to burn—they must be buried—where? In the tombs—which, as I have stated, is the most offensive and mischievous mode of burial. I have already alluded to some instances of traffic, connected with certain tombs, in the Chapel yard. If some plan be not adopted, a new line of business will spring up, in which the members of my profession will figure, to some extent: many of the present owners of tombs will sell out, and move their dead to Mount Auburn, or Forest Hills; and the city tombs will be crammed with as many corpses, as they can hold, by their speculating proprietors. Rather than this, it would have been better to continue the old mode of earth burial. The remedy is plain—the fields are before you—*carry out “your dead!”*

A famous preacher of eternal torment, and who always, in addition to the sulphurous complexion of his discourses throughout, devoted three or four pages, at the close, exclusively to brimstone and fire; is said, upon a special occasion, to have produced a prodigious effect, upon the more devoted of his intensely agitated flock, by causing the sexton, when he heard the preacher scream BRIMSTONE, at the top of his lungs, to throw two or three rolls, into the furnace below, whose fumes speedily ascended into the church.

This anecdote came instantly to my recollection, some twenty years ago, one Sabbath morning, while attending the services in St. Paul's church, in this city. The rector was absent, and a very worthy clergyman supplied his place. In the course of his sermon, he repeated, in a very solemn tone, pointing downward with his finger, in the direction of the tombs below, those memorable words of Job—*If I wait, the grave is mine house: I have made my bed in darkness. I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister.* Almost immediately—the coincidence was wonderful—I was oppressed by a most offensive stench, which certainly seemed to be *germain* to the subject. It became more and more powerful. It seemed to me, and I call myself a pretty good judge, to be posthumous, decidedly. I certainly believed it proceeded from the charnel house below. My eyes turned right and left, to see

how my neighbors were impressed. The females bowed their heads, and used their handkerchiefs—the males were evidently aware of it; but, with a slight compression of their noses, kept their eyes fixed upon the preacher. Two medical gentlemen, then present, and yet living, pronounced it to be *the worm and corruption*, and connected it with the burial of a particular individual, not long before.

The case was carefully investigated, by the wardens and others; who were perfectly satisfied, that this horrible effluvium was, very probably, produced, by the burning of a heretic, in the form of a church mouse, that had taken up his quarters, in the pipe or flue, and was thus converted into an unsavory *pastille*.

No. LXII.

DRACO, I think, would have been perfectly satisfied with some portions of the primitive, colonial and town legislation of Massachusetts. Hutchinson, i. 436, quotes the following decree—“Captain Stone, for abusing Mr. Ludlow, and calling him *Justass*, is fined an hundred pounds, and prohibited coming within the patent, without the Governor's leave, upon pain of death.”

Hazard, Hist. Coll. i. 630, has preserved a law against the Quakers, published in Boston, by beat of drum. It bears date Oct. 14th, 1656. The preamble is couched, in rather strong language—“Whereas there is a cursed sect of heretics lately risen up in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God,” &c. The statute inflicts a fine of £100 upon any person, who brings one of them into any harbor, creek, or cove, compels him to carry such Quaker away—the Quaker to be put in the house of correction, and severely whipped; no person to speak to him. £5 penalty, for importing, dispersing, or concealing any book, containing their “devilish opinions;” 40 shillings for maintaining such opinions. £4 for persisting. House of correction and banishment, for still persisting.

The poor Quakers gave our intolerant ancestors complete vexation. Hazard, ii. 589, gives an extract from a law, for the special punishment of two of these unhappy people, Peter Pier-

son and Judah Brown—"That they shall, by the constable of Boston, be forthwith taken out of the prison, and stripped from the girdle upwards, by the executioner, tied to the cart's tail, and whipped through the town, with twenty stripes; and then carried to Roxbury, and delivered to the constable there, who is also to tie them, or cause them to be tied, in like manner, to the cart's tail, and again whip them through the town with ten stripes; and then carried to Dedham, and delivered to the constable there, who is again, in like manner, to cause them to be tied to the cart's tail, and whipped, with ten stripes, through the town, and thence they are immediately to depart the jurisdiction, at their peril."

The legislative designation of the Quakers was *Quaker rogues, heretics, accursed rantors, and vagabonds*.

In 1657, according to Hutchinson, i. 197, "an additional law was made, by which all persons were subjected to the penalty of 40 shillings, for every hour's entertainment, given to a known Quaker, and every Quaker, after the first conviction, if a man, was to lose an ear, and a second time the other; a woman, each time, to be severely whipped; and the third time, man or woman, to have their tongues bored through, with a red-hot iron." In 1658, 10 shillings fine were levied, on every person, present at a Quaker meeting, and £5 for speaking at such meeting. In October of that year, the punishment of death was decreed against all Quakers, returning into the Colony, after banishment. Bishop, in his "New England Judged," says, that the ears of Holden, Copeland, and Rous, three Quakers, were cut off in prison. June 1, 1660, Mary Dyer was hanged for returning, after banishment. Seven persons were fined, some of them £10 apiece, for harboring, and Edward Wharton whipped, twenty stripes, for piloting the Quakers. Several persons were brought to trial—"for adhering to the cursed sect of Quakers, not disowning themselves to be such, refusing to give civil respect, leaving their families and relations, and running from place to place, vagabond-like." Daniel Gold and Robert Harper were sentenced to be whipped, and, with Alice Courland, Mary Scott, and Hope Clifford, banished, under pain of death. William Kingsmill, Margaret Smith, Mary Trask, and Provided Southwick were sentenced to be whipped, and Hannah Phelps admonished.

Sundry others were whipped and banished, that year. John

Chamberlain came to trial, with his hat on, and refused to answer. The verdict of the jury, as recorded, was—"much inclining to the *curst opinions of the Quakers*." Wendlock Christopherson was sentenced to death, but suffered to fly the jurisdiction. March 14, 1660.—William Ledea, "*a curst Quaker*," was hanged. Some of these Quakers, I apprehend, were determined to exhibit the naked truth to our Puritan fathers. "Deborah Wilson," says Hutchinson, i. 204, "went through the streets of Salem, naked as she came into the world, for which she was well whipped." At length, Sept. 9, 1661, an order came from the King, prohibiting the capital, and even corporal, punishment of the Quakers.

Oct. 13, 1657.—Benedict Arnold, William Baulston, Randall Howldon, Arthur Fenner, and William Feild, the Government of Rhode Island, addressed a letter, on the subject of this persecution, to the General Court of Massachusetts, in reply to one, received from them. This letter is highly creditable to the good sense and discretion of the writers—"And as concerning these Quakers, (so called)" say they, "which are now among us, we have no law, whereby to punish any, for only declaring by words, &c., their mindes and understandings concerning the things and ways of God, as to salvation and an eternal condition. And we moreover finde that in those places, where these people aforesaid, in this Coloney, are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely, and are only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come; and we are informed they begin to loath this place, for that they are not opposed by the civil authority, but with all patience and meekness are suffered to say over their pretended revelations and admonitions, nor are they like or able to gain many here to their way; and surely we find that they delight to be persecuted by the civil powers, and when they are soe, they are like to gaine more adherents by the consyete of their patient sufferings than by consent to their pernicious sayings."

One is taken rather by surprise, upon meeting with such a sample of admirable common sense, in an adjoining Colony, and on such a subject, at that early day—so opposite withal to those principles of action, which prevailed in Massachusetts.

The laws of the Colony, enacted from year to year, were first collected together, and ratified by the General Court, in 1648. Hutchinson, i. 437, says, "Mr. Bellingham of the magistrates,

and Mr. Cotton of the clergy, had the greatest share in this work."

This code was framed, by Bellingham and Cotton, with a particular regard to Moses and the tables, and a singular piece of mosaic it was. "Murder, sodomy, witchcraft, arson, and *rape of a child*, under ten years of age," says Hutchinson, i. 440, "were the only crimes made capital in the Colony, which were capital in England." Rape, in the general sense, not being a capital offence, by the Jewish law, was not made a capital offence, in the Colony, for many years. High treason is not even named. The worship of false gods, was punished with death, with an exception, in favor of the Indians, who were fined £5 a piece, for powowing.

Blasphemy and reproaching religion were capital offences. Adultery with a married woman, whether the man were married or single, was punished with the death of both parties; but, if the woman were single, whether the man were married or single, it was not a capital offence, in either. Man-stealing was a capital offence. So was wilful perjury, with intent to take away another's life. Cursing or smiting a parent, by a child over sixteen years of age, unless in self-defence, or provoked by cruelty, or having been "unchristianly neglected in its education," was a capital offence. A stubborn, rebellious son was punished with death. There was a conviction under this law; "but the offender," says Hutchinson, *ibid.* 442, "was rescued from the gallows, by the King's commissioners, in 1665." The return of a "cursed Quaker," or a Romish priest, after banishment, and the denial of either of the books, of the Old or New Testament, were punished with banishment or death, at the discretion of the court. The jurisdiction of the Colony was extended, by the code of Parson Cotton and Mr. Bellingham, over the ocean; for they decreed the same punishment, for the last-named offence, when committed upon the high seas, and the General Court ratified this law. Burglary, and theft, in a house, or in the fields, on the Lord's day, were, upon a third conviction, made capital crimes. The distinction, between grand and petty larceny, which was recognized in England, till 1827, 7th and 8th Geo. IV., ch. 29, was abolished, by the code of Cotton and Bellingham, in 1648; and theft, without limitation of value, was made punishable, by fine or whipping, and restitution of treble value. In some cases, only double. Thus, *ibid.* 436, we have

the following entry—"Josias Plaistowe, for stealing four baskets of corn from the Indians, is ordered to return them eight baskets, to be fined five pounds, and hereafter to be called by the name of Josias, and not Mr., as formerly he used to be."

This lenity, in regard to larceny, Mr. Cotton seems to have been willing to counterbalance, by a terrible severity, on some other occasions.

Mr. Hutchinson, *ibid.* 442, states, that he has seen the first draught of this code, in the hand-writing of Mr. Cotton, in which there are named six offences, made punishable with death, all which are altered, in the hand of Gov. Winthrop, and the death penalty stricken out. The six offences were—"Prophaning the Lord's day, in a careless or scornful neglect or contempt thereof—Reviling the magistrates in the highest rank, viz., the Governor and Council—Defiling a woman espoused—Incest within the Levitical degrees—The pollution, mentioned in Leviticus *xx.* 13 to 16—Lying with a maid in her father's house, and keeping secret, till she is married to another." Mr. Cotton would have punished all these offences with death.

On the subject of divorce, the code of 1648 differed from that of the present day, *with us*, essentially. Adultery in the wife was held to be sufficient cause, for divorce *a vinculo*: "but male adultery," says Hutchinson, *i.* 445, "after some debate and consultation with the elders, was judged not sufficient." The principle, which directed their decision, was, doubtless, the same, referred to and recognized, by Lord Chancellor Eldon, in the House of Lords, in 1801, as reported by Mr. Twiss, in his *Memoirs*, vol. *i.* p. 383.

No. LXIII.

If the materials, of which history and biography are made—the sources of information—were accessible to every reader, and the patience and ability were his, to examine for himself, there is, probably, no historian nor biographer, in whose accuracy and impartiality, his confidence would not be occasionally weakened. The statement or assertion, the authority for which lies scattered, among the pages of fifty different writers, perhaps,

and which the historian has compressed within ten short lines, would, now and then, be found tintured, and its true complexion materially altered, by the religious or political coloring of the writer's mind.

The entire history of one or more ages has been written, to support a particular code of religious or political tenets. The prejudices of an annalist have, occasionally, from long indulgence, become so habitual, that his offences, in this wise, become almost involuntary.

It is very probable, that the devoted followers—the wholesale admirers—of William Penn, who have presented their conceptions of his character, and their constructions of his conduct, to the world, from time to time, have been led into some little excesses, by the force of habitual idolatry. On the other hand, few readers, I believe, have failed to be surprised, by some of the statements and opinions, in regard to Penn, which are presented, on the pages of Mr. Macaulay's History of England.

In my last number, I alluded to the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts. It is my purpose, to say something more of these "*cursed*" Quakers, and, particularly, of William Penn. My remarks may extend over several consecutive numbers of these Dealings with the Dead; and, I flatter myself, that, from the nature of the subject, they will not be wholly uninteresting to the reader.

I have always cherished a feeling of regard and respect, for these "*cursed*" Quakers, originating in early impressions, and increased, by some personal intercourse, with certain members of the Society of Friends.

It appears, by the Salem Records, that John Kitchen was fined thirty pence, for "unworthy and malignant carriages and speeches, in open court, Sept. 25, 1662." I was very much chagrined, when I first glanced at this record; for he was my great, great, great-grandfather, by the mother's side; and grandfather of the Hon. Col. John Turner, of Salem, who commanded, at the battle of Haverhill. Great was my satisfaction, when I discovered, that John Kitchen's offence was neither more nor less, than an absolute refusal to take off his hat, in presence of the magistrate. For the luxury of keeping it on, and absenting themselves from the ordinances, he appears to have paid £40 sterling, in fines, for himself and Elizabeth, his wife. The

"*cursed*" Quakers appear to have had a hard time of it, about the middle of the seventeenth century. Felt tells us, in his *Annals*, p. 204, that Robinson and Stevenson were hung in 1659, for returning from banishment; and, on p. 206, that Mary Dyer, of the Friends, was hung, June 1, 1660.

The deposition of John Ward and Thomas Mekens, is still of record, taken in that very month and year, showing that they saw Mrs. Kitchen pulled off her horse, and heard one Batter tell her, she was "*a base, quaking slut*," and had been "*a powowing*."

Now, John Kitchen was a good Quaker, doubtless, so far as regarded the essential qualification of obstinately wearing his hat, and refusing to take an oath. But he was made of flesh and blood, like all other Quakers; and this outrage, in pulling my gr. gr. gr. grandmother down from her horse, was more than flesh and blood could bear. A copy of the deposition of Giles Corey is now before me, showing, that John, upon other occasions, was not so pacific, as he might have been—and that, upon one occasion, "*he struck up Mr. Edward Norris his heels*"—and, upon another, he beat Giles Corey himself, "*till he was all bloody*." He seems to have been moved, by the spirit, to thrash them both. I take this Giles Corey to be the man, or the father of the man, who, as Felt says, p. 308, was pressed to death, in Salem, for standing mute, during the witch mania, September 19, 1692.

William Penn was, for many years, engaged in controversy, chiefly in defence of the peculiar, religious opinions of the Quakers. Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iv. p. 647, Lond. 1820, gives the titles of fifty-two tracts and pamphlets, published by Penn, between 1668 and 1690. In the heat of controversy, his character was rudely assailed, and his conduct grossly misrepresented. The familiar relation, subsisting between him and James II., gave color, with some persons, to the report, that Penn, at heart, was a Papist and a Jesuit. These groundless imputations have, long ago, been swallowed up, in their own absurdity. So strong, however, was the hold, which these ridiculous fancies had taken of the public mind, that, after the revolution of 1688, he was examined before the Council, and obliged to give bond, for his appearance, from time to time; till, at last, he obtained a hearing before King William, and effectually established his innocence.

Among the few men, of elevated standing, who gave, or pretended to give credit to the rumor, that Penn was a Papist, Burnet appears in the foremost rank. He, who could speak of Prior, as "*one Prior*," might be expected to speak of William Penn, as "*Penn the Quaker*." The appearance of Penn, at the Court of the Prince of Orange, could, on no account, have been agreeable to a Bishop, and, least of all Bishops, to Burnet; who saw, in the new comer, the confidential agent of his bitterest enemy, King James the Second; and who might, on other scores, have been jealous of the influence, even of "*Penn the Quaker*." Burnet's words are these, vol. ii. p. 318, Lond., 1818—"Many suspected that he was a concealed Papist; it is certain he was much with father Peter, and was particularly trusted by the Earl of Sunderland." On the preceding page Burnet thus describes the Quaker—"He was a talking vain man, who had been long in the King's favor, he being the Vice Admiral's son. He had such an opinion of his own faculty of persuading, that he thought none could stand before it; though he was singular in that opinion; for he had a tedious, luscious way, that was not apt to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience." It is impossible not to perceive, in this description, some touches, which, historians have told us, were singularly applicable to Burnet himself.

William, who perfectly comprehended the character of Halifax and Burnet, perceived the propriety of keeping them apart, when the former came to Hungerford, as a commissioner from the King, Dec. 8, 1688. How far I judge rightly, in applying a part of Burnet's description of Penn, to Burnet himself, may appear, in the following passage from Macaulay, vol. ii. p. 538: "Almost all those, who were admitted to his (William's) confidence, were men, taciturn and impenetrable as himself. Burnet was the only exception. He was notoriously garrulous and indiscreet. Yet circumstances had made it necessary to trust him; and he would, doubtless, under the dexterous management of Halifax, have poured out secrets, as fast as words. William knew this well; and, when he was informed, that Halifax was asking for the Doctor, could not refrain from exclaiming, '*If they get together, there will be fine tattling.*'"

Mr. Macaulay remarks, that—"To speak the whole truth, concerning Penn, is a task, which requires some courage." He then, vol. i. page 505, delivers himself as follows—"The integ-

rity of Penn had stood firm against obloquy and persecution. But now, attacked by royal wiles, by female blandishments, by the insinuating eloquence and delicate flattery of veteran diplomatists and courtiers, his resolution began to give way. Titles and phrases, against which he had often borne his testimony, dropped occasionally from his lips and his pen. It would be well, if he had been guilty of nothing worse than such compliances with the fashions of the world. Unhappily it cannot be concealed, that he bore a chief part in some transactions, condemned, not merely by the rigid code of the society, to which he belonged, but by the general sense of all honest men. He afterwards solemnly protested that his hands were pure from illicit gain, and that he had never received any gratuity from those, whom he had obliged, though he might easily, while his interest at court lasted, have made a hundred and twenty thousand pounds. To this assertion full credit is due. But bribes may be offered to vanity, as well as to cupidity; and it is impossible to deny that Penn was cajoled into bearing a part, in some unjustifiable transactions of which others enjoyed the profits."

This passage will tend, in the ratio of Mr. Macaulay's influence, to disturb the popular opinion of William Penn. It is very carefully written, and will not always be so carefully read. It is, perhaps, unfortunate for Penn, that Mr. Macaulay felt obliged, in pursuing the course of his history, to postpone the presentation of the facts, upon which his opinions rest, until they arise, in their chronological order. Thus the impression, instead of being removed, qualified, or confirmed, by instant examination, is suffered to become imbedded in the mind. Having carefully collated this passage, with every other passage, relative to Penn, in Mr. Macaulay's work, I must confess, that the exceedingly painful impression, produced by the paragraph, presented above, has been materially relieved, by a careful consideration of all the evidence, subsequently offered, by Mr. Macaulay himself, and by the testimony of other writers. Perhaps the reader will consent to go along with me, in the examination of this question.

No. LXIV.

MR. MACAULAY'S second mention of William Penn may be found, vol. i. page 650. A number of young girls, acting under the direction of their school-mistress, had walked in procession, and presented a standard to Monmouth, at Taunton, in 1635. Some of them had expiated their offence already. That hell-hound of a judge, Jeffreys, had literally frightened one of them to death. It was determined, under menace of the gibbet, to extort a ransom from the parents of *all* these innocent girls. Who does not apply those lines of Shakspeare to this infernal judge!

"Did you say all? What, all? Oh, hell-kite, all?
What, all my pretty chickens and their dam,
At one fell swoop?"

"The Queen's maids of honor," says Mr. Macaulay, "asked the royal permission, to wring money out of the parents of the poor children; and the permission was granted." They demanded £7000, and applied to Sir Francis Warre, to exact the ransom. "He was charged to declare, in strong language, that the maids of honor would not endure delay," &c.

Warre excused himself. Mr. Macaulay proceeds as follows: "The maids of honor then requested William Penn to act for them, and Penn accepted the commission. Yet it should seem that a little of the pertinacious scrupulosity, which he had often shown, about taking off his hat, would not have been altogether out of place on this occasion. He probably silenced the remonstrances of his conscience, by repeating to himself, that none of the money, which he extorted, would go into his own pocket; that, if he refused to be the agent of the ladies, they would find agents less humane; that by complying he should increase his influence at the court; and that his influence at the court had already enabled him, and might still enable him to render greater services to his oppressed brethren. The maids of honor were at last forced to content themselves with less than a third part of what they had demanded."

Now it seems to me, that no clear-headed, whole-hearted, *impartial* reader will draw the inference, from this passage, which Mr. Macaulay would manifestly have him draw. Penn well understood the resolute brutality of Jeffreys, the never-

dying obstinacy and vindictive malevolence of James, and the heartless greediness of these maids of honor. He knew, as Mr. Macaulay says, that "*if he refused to be the agent of the ladies they would find agents less humane.*" There was no secrecy here—this thing was not done in a corner. Mr. Macaulay says, "they charged Sir Francis Warre," &c. : and after he refused, they "*requested William Penn,*" &c. Penn acted as a peace-maker. He stood between these she wolves—these shameless maids of honor—and the Taunton lambs; and, instead of £7000, he persuaded those vampyres, who, under the royal grant, had full power in their hands to do their wicked will—to receive less than £2300. Mr. Macaulay admits, that Penn received not a farthing; and, that, had he refused, matters might have been worse for the oppressed.

The known character of Penn demands of us the presumption, in his favor, that he entered upon this business conscientiously, and not as an *extortioner*—and that he made, as the result leads us to believe he did, the very best terms for the parents. Wherein was ever the sin or the shame of negotiating, between the buccaneers of the Tortugas, and the parents of captive children, for their ransom? Does not Mr. Macaulay present the reign of James II. before us, as blotted all over, with official piracy and judicial murder? If the adjustment of this odious business increased the influence of Penn, at court, and thereby enabled him to "*render great services to his oppressed brethren*"—these were the natural consequences of the act; without them, there was enough of just and honorable motive, for a mediator, to step between the oppressor and the oppressed, and lessen, as much as possible, the weight of the oppression.

If the conduct of William Penn, upon this occasion, was the humane and Christian thing, which it certainly appears to have been, "*the pertinacious scrupulosity, which he had often shown, about taking off his hat*" would have been wholly out of place. And if so, what justification can be found for Mr. Macaulay's expressions—"the remonstrances of his conscience," and "*the money, which he extorted.*"

It is proverbially hard, for an old dog to learn new tricks. He, to whose hand the hatchet is familiar, when he substitutes the rapier, will still hack and hew with it, as though it were a hatchet. It may well be doubted, if an impartial history,

especially those parts of it, wherein the writer deals with character and motive, can ever be trustworthily and impartially written, by a veteran, professional reviewer, of the tomahawk school, however splendid his talents may be.

Upon this occasion, Penn, doubtless, persuaded the maids of honor to moderate their demands; at the same time, representing to the parents the uncompromising character of those, with whom they had to deal, and the unavoidable necessity of making terms. It is impossible to judge of the transaction aright, without taking into view the character of those dark days of tyranny and misrule, and the little security, then enjoyed by the subject.

On page 659, *ibid.*, Mr. Macaulay, once more, introduces Penn to his readers—"William Penn, for whom exhibitions, which humane men generally avoid, seem to have had a strong attraction, hastened from Chopside, where he had seen Cornish hanged, to Tyburn, in order to see Elizabeth Gaunt burned. He afterwards related that, when she calmly disposed the straw about her, in such a manner, as to shorten her sufferings, all the bystanders burst into tears." Here is another attempt to lower the Quaker, in public estimation.

That Penn ever, from the cradle to the grave, gazed, unsympathizingly, upon human suffering, nobody, but a madman, will credit, for a moment. Nor would Mr. Macaulay, notwithstanding the rather peculiar construction of the paragraph, venture *directly* so to represent him. It has been my fortune to know several men, of kind and warm affections, who have confessed, without reserve, a strong desire to witness the execution of criminals. Cornish and Gaunt were executed on the same day, and their fate excited universal attention. Penn's account of the last moments of both was very minute; and shows him to have been a deeply interested observer. I am not aware, that he ever attended any other execution. And if he did not, the remark of Mr. Macaulay, which is *general*, can never be justified, in relation to Penn; though it would fairly apply to the celebrated George Selwyn, who, though remarkable for the keenness of his sensibility, and the kindness of his heart, was in the habit of attending every execution in London; and who, upon one remarkable occasion of this kind, actually embarked for the Continent.

Why could not Mr. Macaulay, who often refers to Clarkson,

have adopted some of his charitable and gentlemanly constructions of Penn's conduct, upon this occasion? Clarkson says—"Men of the most noted benevolence have felt and indulged a curiosity of this sort. They have been worked upon, by different motives; some, perhaps, by a desire of seeing what human nature would be, at such an awful crisis; what would be its struggles; what would be the effects of innocence or guilt; what would be the power of religion on the mind." * * * * "I should say that he consented to witness the scenes in question, with a view to do good; with a view of being able to make an impression on the King's mind, by his own relation," &c.

In vol. ii. page 222, 1687, Mr. Macaulay says—"Penn had never been a strong-headed man: the life which he had been leading, during two years, had not a little impaired his moral sensibility; and, if his conscience ever reproached him, he comforted himself by repeating, that he had a good and noble end in view, and that he was not paid for his services in money."

Again, *ibid.*, page 227, referring to the effort of the King, to propitiate William Kiffin, a great man, among the Baptists, no phraseology would suit Mr. Macaulay, but this—"Penn was employed in the work of seduction." What seduction? Indeed, whenever a good chance presents itself to reach the Quaker, anywhere and anyhow, through the joints of the harness, the phylactery of Mr. Macaulay seems to have been—*semper paratus*.

It was enough, that Penn was, in some sense, the confidant, and, occasionally, the *unconstrained and perfectly conscientious* agent of this most miserable King.

That posterity will sanction these politico-historical flings, at the character of William Penn, I cannot believe.

Tillotson knew him well. He had once expressed a suspicion that Penn was a Papist. A correspondence ensued. "In conclusion," says Chalmers, "Tillotson declared himself fully satisfied, and, as in that case he had promised, he heartily begs pardon of Penn."

Chalmers himself, who had no sympathy with the "*cursed Quakers*," closes his account of Penn, as follows—"It must be evident from his works, that he was a man of abilities; and from his conduct through life, that he was a man of the purest conscience. This, without acceding to his opinions in religion, we are perfectly willing to allow and to declare."

No. LXV.

THERE was a couple of unamiable, maiden ladies, who had cherished, for a long time, an unkindly feeling to the son of their married sister; and, whenever her temporary absence afforded a fitting opportunity, one of them would inquire of the other, if it was not a *good time to lick Billy*. Mr. Macaulay suffers no convenient occasion to pass, without exhibiting a practical illustration of this opinion, that it is a *good time to lick Billy*.

In vol. ii. page 292, Mr. Macaulay says—"Penn was at Chester (in 1687,) on a pastoral tour. His popularity and authority among his brethren had greatly declined since he had become a tool of the King and the Jesuits." In proof of this assertion Mr. Macaulay refers to a letter, from Bonrepaux to Seignelay, and to Gerard Croese's Quaker History. Let us see, for ourselves, what Bonrepaux says—"Penn, chef des Quakers, qu'on sait être dans les intérêts du Roi d'Angleterre, est si fort décrié parmi ceux de son parti qu'ils n'ont plus aucune confiance en lui."

NOW I ask, in the name of historical truth, if Mr. Macaulay is sustained in his assertion, by Bonrepaux? Is there a jot or tittle of evidence, in this reference, that Penn "*had become a tool of the King and of the Jesuits*;" or that Bonrepaux was himself of any such opinion?

Let us next present the passage from Croese—"Etiam Quakeri Pennum non amplius, ut ante, ita amabant ac magnificiebant, quidam aversabantur ac fugiebant."

I ask, in reference to this quotation from Croese, the same question? No possible version of these passages into English will go farther, than to show, that the Quakers were dissatisfied with Penn, about that time: in neither is there the slightest reference to Penn, as "*a tool of the King and of the Jesuits*." Mr. Macaulay's passage is so constructed, that his citation of authorities goes, not only to the fact of Penn's unpopularity, for a time, but to the cause of it, as assigned by Mr. Macaulay himself, namely, that Penn "*had become a tool of the King and of the Jesuits*."

Now it is well known, that Penn, in 1687, was in bad odor with some of the Quakers. He was *suspected*, by some persons, of being a Jesuit—George Keith, the Quaker renegade,

called him a deist—he was said by others to be a Papist. Even Tillotson had given countenance to this foolish story, which Penn's intimacy with King James tended to corroborate. How far Tillotson believed Penn to be a *Papist*, or a *tool* of the King, or of the *Jesuits*, will appear, upon the perusal of a few lines from Tillotson to Penn, written in 1686, the year before that, of which Mr. Macaulay is writing—"I am very sorry that the suspicion I had entertained concerning you, of which I gave you the true account in my former letter, hath occasioned so much trouble and inconvenience to you: and I do now declare with great joy, that I am fully satisfied, that there was no just ground for that suspicion, and therefore do heartily beg your pardon for it." Clarkson's *Memoirs*, vol. i. chap. 22.

If the authorities, cited, sustained the statement of Mr. Macaulay, their credibility would still form a serious question. In vol. ii. pages 305-7-8, Mr. Macaulay refers to Bonrepaux's "complicity with the Jesuits." It would have been quite agreeable to that crafty emissary of Lewis, to have had it believed, that Penn was of their fraternity. As for Gerard Croese, Chalmers speaks of him and his history, with very little respect; and states, that it dissatisfied the Quakers. However this may have been, there is not a syllable in Gerard Croese's *Historia Quakeriana*, giving color to Mr. Macaulay's assertion, that Penn "*had become a tool of the King and of the Jesuits.*" On the contrary, Croese, as I shall show hereafter, speaks of Penn, with great respect, on several occasions.

In the same paragraph, of which a part is quoted, at the commencement of this article, Mr. Macaulay, after stating, that, when the King and Penn met at Chester, in 1687, Penn preached, or, to use Mr. Macaulay's word, *harangued*, in the tennis court, he says—"It is said indeed, that his Majesty deigned to look into the tennis court, and to listen, with decency, to his friend's melodious eloquence." What does Mr. Macaulay mean?—that the King did not laugh outright?—that he made some little exertion, to suppress a disposition to make a mock of Penn and his preaching? No intelligent reader, though he may not catch the invidious spirit of this remark, can fail to perceive the writer's design, to speak disparagingly of Penn.

Well: what is Mr. Macaulay's authority for this? He quotes "Cartwright's Diary, Aug. 30, 1687, and Clarkson's *Life of William Penn*"—but without any indication of volume, chapter, or

page. This loose and unsatisfactory kind of reference is quite common with Mr. Macaulay; and one might almost as well indicate the route to the pyramids, by setting up a finger post in Edinburgh, pointing in the direction of Cairo. No eminent historian, English or Scotch, has ever been thus regardless of his reader's comfort; neither Rapin nor Tindal, Smollett nor Hume, nor Henry, nor Robertson, nor Guthrie, nor any other. Of this the reader may well complain. This may all be well enough, in a historical romance—but in a matter, pretending to be true and impartial history, no good reader will walk by faith, altogether, and upon the staff of a single narrator; and he will too often find, that the spirit of the context, in the authority, is very different, from that of the citation.

He, who imparts to any historical fact the coloring of his own prejudice, and *dresses up* a statement, after his own fancy, has no right to vouch in, as his authority, for the *whole thing*, however grotesque he may have made it—the writer, who has stated the *naked fact*. If Clarkson said simply, that the King had listened to Penn's preaching, Mr. Macaulay has no right to quote Clarkson, as having said so, in a manner to lower Penn, the tithe of a hair, in the estimation of the world. *A fortiori*, if Clarkson has said, that the King listened to Penn's preaching, *on several occasions, with respect*, Mr. Macaulay had no right to quote Clarkson, as his authority, for the sneering and ill-natured statement, to which I have referred. This is not history, it is gross misrepresentation; and, the more forcibly and ingeniously it is fabricated, the more unjust and the more ungenerous the libel, upon the dead.

The reader, if he will, may judge of Mr. Macaulay's impartiality, by comparing his words with the *only words* uttered by Clarkson, on this point. They may be found, vol. i. chap. 23—"Among the places he (Penn) visited, in Cheshire, was Chester itself. The King, who was then travelling, arriving there at the same time, went to the meeting-house of the Quakers, to hear him preach. This mark of respect the King showed him also, at two or three other places where they felt in with each other, in the course of their respective tours."

This is the only passage, which can be referred to, in Clarkson, by Mr. Macaulay, to sustain his ill-natured remark, whose evil spirit is entirely neutralized, by the very authority he cites. But there will be many, who will rather give Mr. Macaulay credit,

for stating the point impartially ; and few, I apprehend, who will take the trouble to look, through two octavo volumes, for a passage, thus vaguely referred to, without any indication of the volume, chapter, or page.

This rude assault, upon the character and motives of William Penn, Mr. Macaulay commences, by saying—" *To speak the whole truth, concerning Penn, is a task, which requires some courage.*" It is becoming, in every historian, to speak the truth, the whole truth, and *nothing but the truth*. It certainly requires some courage—audacity, perhaps, is the better word—to present citations, in French and Latin, to sustain an assertion, which those citations do not sustain ; and to refer to a highly respectable author, as having stated that, which he has nowhere stated.

It may not be amiss, to present my views of Mr. Macaulay's injustice, more plainly than I have done. It is obvious to all, that a fact—the same fact—may, by the very manner of stating it, raise or lower the character of him, in regard to whom it is related. The *manner* of representing it may become *material*, or, substantially, part and parcel of the fact, as completely, as the coloring is part and parcel of a picture. No man has a right to take the sketch or outline of an angel, and, having given it the sable complexion of a devil, ascribe the entire thing, such as he has made it, to the author of the original sketch. No man, surely, has a right to seize a wreath, respectfully designed for the brows of his neighbor ; distort it into the shape of a fool's cap ; clap it upon that neighbor's head ; and then charge the responsibility upon him, who prepared the original chaplet, as a token of respect.

Mr. Macaulay represents King James, as listening to the preaching of Penn, with concealed contempt—such are the force and meaning of his words ; and he quotes Clarkson, as authority for this, who says precisely the contrary.

Every reader, who is uninstructed in the French and Latin languages, will view the quotations from Bonrepaux and Croese, as authorities for Mr. Macaulay's assertion, that Penn had "*become the tool of the King and the Jesuits*"—for, whether carelessly, or cunningly, contrived, the sentence will certainly be understood to mean precisely this. A large number, even of those, who understand the languages, will take these quotations, as evidence, upon Mr. Macaulay's word, without examination. Now, as I have stated, there is not the slightest authority, in these passages, for Mr. Macaulay's assertion.

No. LXVI.

MR. MACAULAY'S last attack upon William Penn will be found, in vol. ii., pages 295-6-7. The Fellows of Magdalen College had been most abominably treated, by James II., in 1687. The detail is too long for my limits, and is, withal, unnecessary here, since there is neither doubt nor denial of the fact. The mediatorial agency of Penn was employed. The King was enraged, and resolved to have his way. His obstinacy was a proverb. There were three courses for Penn—right, left, and medial—to side with the King—to side with the Fellows—or to act as a mediator. Mr. Macaulay is pleased, in his Index, to speak of the transaction, as "*Penn's mediation*."

Had he sided with the Fellows entirely, he would have lost his influence utterly, to serve them, with the King. Had he sided with the King entirely, he would have lost all confidence with the Fellows. Mr. Macaulay, here, as elsewhere, is evidently bent upon showing up Penn, as the "*tool of the King*:" and, if there is anything more unjust, upon historical record, I know not where to look for it.

* With manifest effort, and in stinted measure, Mr. Macaulay lets down a few drops of the milk of human kindness, in the outset, and says of Penn—"He had too much good feeling to approve of the violent and unjust proceedings of the government, and even ventured to express part of what he thought." Here,

* The palpable reluctance of Mr. Macaulay to deal in liberal construction, and to award the smallest praise, on such occasions, is not confined to Penn. A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine*, for October, 1849, page 509, after referring to the glorious defeat of the Dutch fleet, off Harwich, when the Duke of York, afterwards James II., commanded in person, remarks—"Mr. Macaulay, in his late published *History of England*, has not deigned even to notice this engagement—a remarkable omission, the reason of which omission it is foreign to our purpose to inquire. This much we may be allowed to say, that no historian, who intends to form an accurate estimate of the character of James II., or to compile a complete register of his deeds, can justly accomplish his task, without giving that unfortunate monarch the credit for his conduct and intrepidity, in one of the most important and successful naval actions, which stands recorded, in our annals."

Other English historians have related it. Hume, Oxford ed. 1826, vol. vii. page 355.—Smollett, Lond. ed. 1769, vol. viii. page 31.—Rapin, Lond. ed. 1760, vol. xi. page 272. "The Duke of York," says Smollett, "was in the hottest part of the battle, and behaved with great spirit and composure, even when the Earl of Falmouth, the Lord Muskerry, and Mr. Boyle, were killed at his side, by one cannon ball, which covered him with the blood and brains of these three gallant gentlemen."

that which proceeded from *fixed and lofty principle*, is ascribed to a less honorable motive—"good feeling," or *bonhomie*; and the "*part of what he thought*," was neither more nor less, than a bold and frank remonstrance, committed to writing, and sent to the King, by Penn.

When they met at Oxford, says Clarkson, vol. i. chap. 23, "William Penn had an opportunity of showing not only his courage, but his consistency in those principles of religious liberty, which he had defended, during his whole life." After giving an account of the Prince's injustice, Clarkson says—"Next morning William Penn was on horseback, ready to leave Oxford, but knowing what had taken place, he rode up to Magdalen College, and conversed with the Fellows, on the subject. After this conversation, he wrote a letter, and desired them to present it to the King." * * * * "Dr. Sykes, in relating this anecdote of William Penn, by letter to Dr. Chazlett, who was then absent, mentions that Penn, after some discourse with the Fellows of Magdalen College, wrote a short letter, directed to the King. He wrote to this purpose—that their case was hard, and that, in their circumstances, they could not yield obedience."

This was confirmed by Mr. Creech, as Clarkson states, and by Sewell, who states, in his History of the Rise and Progress of the Quakers, that Penn told the King the act "*could not in justice be defended, since the general liberty of conscience did not allow of depriving any of their property, who did what they ought to do, as the Fellows of the said College appeared to have done*." This is the "*part of what he thought*," referred to by Mr. Macaulay, who has not found it convenient, upon this occasion, to quote a syllable from Clarkson, nor from Sewell, of whose work Chalmers and others have spoken with respect.

I know of no better mode of presenting this matter fairly, than by laying before the reader contrasted passages, from Mr. Macaulay, and from Clarkson, relating to the conduct of Penn, upon this occasion. Mr. Macaulay shall lead off—"James, was as usual, obstinate in the wrong. The courtly Quaker, therefore, did his best to seduce the college from the path of right."—Therefore!—Wherefore? Penn did his best to *seduce* the college from the path of right, *because* James was, as usual, obstinate in the wrong! This is based, of course, upon Mr. Macaulay's favorite hypothesis, that Penn was "*the tool of the King and*

the Jesuits."—"He tried first intimidation. Ruin, he said, impended over the society. The King was highly incensed. The case might be a hard one.* Most people thought it so. But every child knew that his Majesty loved to have his own way, and could not bear to be thwarted. Penn, therefore, exhorted the Fellows not to rely on the goodness of their cause, but to submit, or at least to temporize. Such counsel came strangely from one, who had been expelled from the University for raising a riot about the surplice, who had run the risk of being disinherited, rather than take off his hat to the princes of the blood, and who had been more than once sent to prison, for haranguing in conventicles. He did not succeed in frightening the Magdalen men."

It may be thought scarcely worth while, to charge a Quaker, at the age of *forty-three*, with inconsistency, because his views had somewhat altered, since he was a wild young man, at *twenty-one*.

It is also clear, that Penn viewed the Magdalen question, as one quite as much of *property* as of *conscience*; and that he could see no good reason, with his eyes of toleration wide open, why all the great educational institutions should be forever, in the hands of one denomination.

Mr. Macaulay again—"Then Penn tried a gentler tone. He had an interview with Hough and some of the Fellows, and after many professions of sympathy and friendship, began to hint at a compromise. The King could not bear to be crossed. The college must give way. Parker must be admitted. But he was in very bad health. All his preferments would soon be vacant. 'Dr. Hough,' said Penn, 'may then be Bishop of Oxford. How should you like that, gentlemen?' Penn had passed his life in declaiming against a hireling ministry. He held, that he was bound to refuse the payment of tithes, and this even when he had bought lands, chargeable with tithes, and had been allowed the value of the tithes in the purchase money. According to his own principles, he would have committed a great sin, if he had interfered, for the purpose of obtaining a benefice, on the most honorable terms, for the most pious divine. Yet to such a degree had his manners been corrupted by evil communications, and his understanding obscured by inordinate zeal for a single object, that he did not scruple to become a broker in simony of a peculiarly

discreditable kind, and to use a bishopric as a bait to tempt a divine to perjury."

Are these the words of truth and soberness? I rather think they are not. In the sacred name of common sense—did Penn become a *broker in simony of a peculiarly discreditable kind, and use a bishopric, as a bait to tempt a divine to perjury*, by stating, that Parker was very infirm, and, that, should he die, Hough might be his successor! If this is history, give us fiction, for Heaven's sake, which is said to be less marvellous than fact. There is not the least pretence, that he offered, or was authorized to offer, any such "*bait*." He spoke of a mere contingency; and did the best he could to mediate, between the King and the Fellows, both of whom were highly incensed.

As to the matter of tithes, Penn was mediating, between men, *who had no scruples about tithes*. He recognized, *pro hac vice*, the usages of the parties; and a Christian judge may, as shrewdly, be charged with infidelity, for conforming to the established law of evidence, and permitting a disciple of Mahomet to be sworn, upon the Koran.

When Hough replied, that the Papists had robbed them of University College, and Christ Church, and were now after Magdalen, and would have all the rest, "Penn," says Mr. Macaulay, "was foolish enough to answer, that he believed the Papists would now be content. 'University,' he said, 'is a pleasant college. Christ Church is a noble place. Magdalen is a fine building. The situation is convenient. The walks by the river are delightful. If the Roman Catholics are reasonable, they will be satisfied with these.'"

And now I will present Clarkson's just and sensible view of this transaction. Mr. Macaulay has said, vol. ii. page 295, that "*the agency of Penn was employed*," meaning, as the context shows, *employed by the King*. Clarkson, vol. i. chap. 23, says expressly, that, Oct. 3, 1687, Dr. Bailey wrote to Penn, "stated the merits of the case, and solicited his mediation." Penn told the Fellows, as appears from *Dr. Hough's own letter, written the evening after their last interview*, that he "feared they had come too late. He would use, however, his endeavors; and, if they were unsuccessful, they must attribute it to want of power in him, and not of good will to serve them." The mediation came to nothing. The Fellows grew dissatisfied with Penn; falling, doubtless, into the very common error of parties,

highly excited, and differing so widely, that all, who are not *for them, in toto, are against them*. They seem to have been specially offended, by the following liberal remark of Penn's—"For my part, I have always declared my opinion, that the preferments of the Church should not be put into any other hands but such as they at present are in; but I hope you would not have the two Universities such invincible bulwarks of the Church of England, that none but they must be capable of giving their children a learned education."

In the same volume and chapter, Clarkson remarks—"They (the delegates from Magdalen) thought, strange to relate, that Penn had been rambling; and because he spoke doubtfully, about the success of his intended efforts, and of the superior capacity of the established clergy, that they alone should monopolize education, that his language was not to be depended upon as sincere. How this could have come into their heads, except from the terror, into which the situation of the College had thrown them, it is not easy to conceive; for certainly William Penn was as explicit, as any man could have been, under similar circumstances. He informed them, that, after repeated efforts with the King, he feared they had come too late. This was plain language. He informed them again, that he would make another trial with the King; that he would read their papers to him, unless peremptorily commanded to forbear; but that, if he failed, they must attribute his want of success not to his want of will, but want of power."

"This, though expressive of his doubts and fears, was but a necessary caution, when his exertions had already failed; and it was still more necessary, when there was reason to suppose, that, though the King had a regard for him, and was glad to employ him, as an instrument, in forwarding his public views, yet that he would not gratify him, where his solicitations directly opposed them. That William Penn did afterwards make a trial with the King, to serve the College, there can be no doubt, because no instance can be produced, wherein he ever forfeited his word or broke his promise. But all trials with this view must of necessity have been ineffectual. The King and his ministers had already determined the point in question."

Such were the sentiments of Clarkson.

No. LXVII.

CHARLES I. was King, when William Penn was born; and, when he died, George I. was on the throne. Penn therefore lived in the reins of nine rulers of the realm—Charles I.—the Cromwells, Oliver and Richard—Charles II.—James II.—William and Mary as joint sovereigns—William alone—Anne—and George I.

He was the son of Admiral, Sir William Penn, and was born on Tower Hill, London, Oct. 4, 1644. The spirit and the flesh strove hard for the mastery, before young William came forth a Quaker, fully developed. He was remarkable at Oxford, for his fine scholarship, and athletic performances.

Penn believed, that the Lord appeared to him, when he was very young. The devil seems to have made him a short visit afterwards, if we may rely upon the testimony of Penn's biographers. Wood, in his *Athenæ*, iv. 645, gives this brief account of the Lord's visit—Penn was "educated in puerile learning, at Chigwell in Essex, where, at eleven years of age, being retired in a chamber alone, he was so suddenly surprised with an inward comfort, and, as he thought, an external glory in the room, that he has, many times, said that, from that time, he had the seal of divinity and immortality, that there was also a God, and that the soul of man was capable of enjoying his divine communications."

His biographer, Clarkson, says, that Penn, at the age of sixteen, was led to a sense of the corruptions of the established faith, by the preaching of Thomas Loe, a Quaker; and broke off at the chapel, and began to hold prayer meetings. For this he was fined and admonished. It is remarkable, that Wood, though he states, that Penn, after he became a Quaker, in good earnest, was imprisoned, once in Ireland, once in the Tower, and three times in Newgate, does not even allude, in his *Athenæ*, to the expulsion from Oxford, which is related, by Chalmers, Clarkson, and others.

It seems, that, after he had become impressed, by Loe's preaching, an order came down from court, that the students should wear surplices. This so irritated Penn, that, instead of letting his yea be yea, and his nay nay—in company with others, says Clarkson, "he fell upon those students, who appeared in

surplices, and tore them everywhere over their heads." On the subject of his conversion, Wood says—"If you'll believe a satirical pamphlet—*The history of Will Penn's conversion from a gentleman to a Quaker*,' printed at London, in 1682—you'll find, that the reason of his turning Quaker was the loss of his mistress, a delicate young lady, that then lived in Dublin; or, as others say, because he refused to fight a duel."

For two, good and sufficient reasons, this statement, contained in the "*satirical pamphlet*," and referred to by Wood, is unworthy of the slightest credit. In the first place, though Penn met Loe, in Dublin, after the expulsion from Oxford, and became more fully impressed, yet his first meeting with Loe was at Oxford, before the expulsion, and the serious impression, produced by his preaching, led, albeit rather oddly, to the affair of the surplices.

In the second place, the notion, that Penn would put on Quakerism, to avoid a duel, is still more incredible. Nothing could be more unfortunate, than any imputation upon Penn's courage, moral or physical. We have seen, that he was famous for his athletic exercises. Strange, though it may seem, to such as have contemplated Penn, as the quiet non-combatant, he was an accomplished swordsman, and, upon one occasion, was actually engaged in an affair, which had all the aspect, and all the peril, of the *duellium*, however it may have lacked the preliminary forms and ceremonies. "During his residence in Paris," says Chalmers, "he was assaulted in the street, one evening, by a person with a drawn sword, on account of a supposed affront; but among other accomplishments of a gay man, he had become so good a swordsman, as to disarm his antagonist."

After his expulsion from Oxford, in 1662, he returned home. His father, the Admiral, was greatly provoked, to see his son resorting to the company of religious people, who were, of all, the least likely, in the licentious reign of Charles II., to advance his worldly interest. The old gentleman tried severity, and finally, as Penn himself relates, gave the Quaker neophyte a thrashing, and turned him out of doors.

Ere long, the father got the better of the admiral. He relented: and, probably, supposing there was as little vitality in Paris, for a Quaker, as some of the old philosophers fan-

cied there might be, in a vacuum, for an angel, he sent young William thither, as one of a fashionable travelling party.

After his return, he was admitted of Lincoln's Inn, and continued there, till the year of the plague, 1665. The following year, his father sent him to Ireland, to take charge of an estate. At Cork, he met Loe once more—attended his meetings, became an unalterable Quaker, preached in conventicles—was committed to prison—released upon application to the Earl of Orrery—and summoned home, by his indignant father. The old Admiral loved his accomplished son, then twenty-three years old—but abhorred his Quakerish airs and manners. In all points, save one—the point of conscience—William was unexceptionably dutiful. At length, the Admiral agreed to compound, on conditions, which seem not to have been very oppressive: in short, he consented to waive all objections, and let William do as he pleased, in regard to his religion, provided he would yield, in one particular—doff his broad brim—take off his hat—in presence of the King, the Duke of York, and his own father, the Admiral. Young William demanded time for consideration. It was granted; and he earnestly sought the Lord, on an empty stomach, as he says himself, with prayer. He finally informed his father, that he *could not do it*; and, once again, the Admiral, in a paroxysm of wrath, turned the rebellious young Quaker out of doors, broad brim and all.

William Penn now began to figure, as a preacher, at the Quaker meetings. The *friends*, and the fond mother, ever on hand, in such emergencies, supplied his temporal necessities. Even the old Admiral, becoming satisfied of William's perfect sincerity, although too proud to tuck about, hoisted private signals, for his release, when imprisoned, for attending Quaker meetings; and evidently lay by, ready to bear down, in the event of serious difficulty.

In 1668, Penn's brim grew broader and broader, and his coat became buttonless behind. He was a writer and a preacher, and a powerful defender of the "*cursed and depised*" Quakers. The titles of his various works may be found in Clarkson, and in Wood's *Athenæ*. They conformed to the fashion of the age, and were, necessarily, quaint and extended. I have room for one only, as a specimen,—the title of his first tract—"*Truth exalted, in a short but sure testimony, against all those religious faiths and worships, that have been formed and followed*

in the darkness of apostacy ; and for that glorious light, which is now risen, and shines forth in the life and doctrine of the despised Quakers, as the alone good old way of life and salvation ; presented to princes, priests, and people, that they may repent, believe, and obey. By William Penn ; whom Divine love constrains, in an holy contempt, to trample on Egypt's glory, not fearing the King's wrath, having beheld the majesty of Him, who is invisible." In this same year 1668, he was imprisoned in the Tower, for publishing his *SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN*. There he was confined seven months, doing infinitely more mischief, for the cause of lawn sleeves and white frocks, forms, ceremonies, and hat-worship, as he calls it, than if he had been loose. For, then and there, he wrote his most able pamphlets, especially, *NO CROSS NO CROWN*, which gained him great praise, far beyond the pale of Quakerdom. His treatise has been often reprinted, and translated into foreign tongues.

In 1670, his influence was so great, that he obtained an order in Council, for the release of the Quakers then in prison. At a later day, he again assumed the office of St. Peter's angel, and set three thousand captives free. In 1685, says Mr. Macaulay, "he strongly represented the sufferings of the Quakers to the new King," &c. "In this way, about fifteen hundred Quakers, and a still greater number of Roman Catholics regained their liberty." No wonder he was mistaken for a Papist, by those, who adopt that bastard principle, that charity begins at home, and ends there ; whose religious circle forms the exclusive line of demarcation, for the exercise of that celestial principle ; and who look, with the eye of a Chinaman, upon all beyond the holy sectarian wall, as outside barbarians. I was delighted and rather surprised, that Mr. Macaulay suffered the statement of this fact to pass, without some ill-natured expression, in regard to Penn—who, I say it reverentially, was less the tool of the King, than of Jesus Christ.

No. LXVIII.

IN 1670, William Penn was, for the third time, committed to Newgate, for preaching. His fines were paid by his father, who died this year, entirely reconciled to his son; and, upon his bed of death, pronounced these comforting words—*"Son William, let nothing in this world tempt you to wrong your conscience: I charge you, do nothing against your conscience. So will you keep peace at home, which will be a feast to you in a day of trouble."*

Penn inherited from his father an estate, yielding about £1500 per annum. About this time he wrote his *"Seasonable caveat against Popery;"* though he knew it was the faith of the Queen and his good friend, the Duke of York. Shortly after, he travelled in Holland and Germany. In 1672, he married Gulielma Maria Springett. In 1675, he held his famous dispute with Richard Baxter; and, in 1677, he again visited the continent, in company with George Cox and Robert Barclay, constantly preaching, and writing, and importuning, in behalf of his despised and oppressed brethren. About this period, and soon after his return to England, we find him petitioning Parliament, in their behalf. Twice, he was permitted to address the committee of the House of Commons, upon this subject.

Whoever coveted the honor of being the creditor of royalty found a willing customer, in Charles the Second. In 1681, that monarch, in consideration of £16,000 due from him to the estate of Admiral Penn, conveyed to William the district, now called Pennsylvania. He himself would have given it the name of Sylvania, but the King insisted, on prefixing the name of the grantee. Full powers of legislation and government were bestowed upon the proprietor. The only limitation was a power, reserved to the Privy Council, to rescind his laws, within six months, after they were laid before that body. The charter bears date March 4, 1681. He first designed to call his domain "New Wales," and nothing saved the Philadelphians from being Welchmen, but an objection, from the under-secretary of state, who was himself a Welchman, and was offended at the Quaker's presumption.

He encouraged emigrants, judiciously selected, to embark for his Province; and followed, himself, with about a hundred Quakers, in September, 1682. His arrival in the Delaware,

his beneficent administration, and the whole story of his negotiation, with the Indians, are full of interest, and overflowing. It is a long story withal, too long, altogether, for our narrow boundaries. I have indicated the sources of information, and this is all my limits will allow.

After two years, he returned to England, and became a greater favorite than ever, with James II.—was calumniated, of course—pursued by the unholy alliance of churchmen, and sectaries, and apostate Quakers—grossly insulted—“chastened but not killed”—and finally deprived of his government. Justice, at length, prevailed. Penn’s rights were restored, by William III. Having lost his wife and son, he went again, upon his travels, and again married. In 1699, he returned to Pennsylvania, and remained there, for the term of two years. He then went home to England; and, after continuing to employ his tongue and his pen, as freely as ever, for several years, he died, July 30, 1718, at the age of seventy-two years, at Jordan, near Beaconsfield, in Buckinghamshire.

Such is the mere *skeleton* of this good man’s life; and it is my purpose to *flesh it up*, with some few of those highly interesting, and well authenticated, incidents, which may be found, on the pages of trust worthy writers.

I do not believe, that the pen of any past, present, or future historian, or biographer, however masterly the hand that holds it—however bitter and pungent the gall of bigotry or political venom, in which it may dipped—will ever be able, very grievously, or lastingly, to soil the character of William Penn.* The world’s opinion has settled down, upon firm convictions. If new facts can be produced, then, indeed, a writer may justly move, for a reconsideration of the public sentiment—but Mr. Macaulay does not present a *single fact*, in relation to William Penn, not known before—he gives a *construction* of his own, so manifestly tinged with ill nature, as, at once, to excite the suspicion of his reader.

I wear a narrow brim, and have buttons behind—I am no Quaker—and, indeed, have a quarrel with them all—chiefly grammatical—though I esteem and respect the principles of that moral and religious people—but I simply describe the impulse of my own heart, when I say, that Mr. Macaulay’s ill natured treatment of William Penn painfully disturbed my confidence, in his impartiality; and constrained me to “read, mark, learn

and inwardly digest," the highly seasoned *provant*, which he has furnished—*cum grano salis*; and with great care, not to swallow the *flummery*. Scotchmen have not always written thus of William Penn; and the sentiments of mankind, now and hereafter, if I do not strangely err, will be found, embodied in the concluding passage of an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xxi. page 462.

"We shall not stop to examine what dregs of ambition, or what hankerings after worldly prosperity may have mixed themselves with the pious and philanthropic principles, that were undoubtedly his chief guides in forming, that great settlement, which still bears his name, and profits by his example. Human virtue does not challenge nor admit of such a scrutiny: and it should be sufficient for the glory of William Penn, that he stands upon record, as the most humane, the most moderate, and most pacific of all governors." All this may be enough for his *glory*. But there are some simple, touching truths, to be told of William Penn, and some highly interesting personal details; which, though they may have little about them, in accordance with the ordinary estimate of *glory*, will long continue to envelop the memory of this extraordinary man, with a purer and a milder light.

I know no better mode of concluding the present article, than by presenting a few extracts, from the valedictory letter of William Penn to his wife and children, written on the eve of his first visit to Pennsylvania, September, 1682. If the *saints* write such admirable love letters, it would greatly benefit the *sinners*—the men of this world—to follow the example, and surpass it, if they can.

"My dear wife and children. My love, which neither sea, nor land, nor death itself can extinguish nor lessen towards you, most endearingly visits you, with eternal embraces, and will abide with you forever. My dear wife! remember thou wast the love of my youth, and much the joy of my life; the most beloved, as well as most worthy of all my earthly comforts; and the reason of that love was more thy inward than thy outward excellencies, which yet were many. God knows, and thou knowest it, I can say it was a match of Providence's making; and God's image in us both was the first thing, and the most amiable and engaging ornament in our eyes. Now I am to leave thee, and that, without knowing whether I shall

ever see thee more in this world. Take my counsel into thy bosom, and let it dwell with thee, in my stead, while thou livest."

Here follows some domestic advice. Penn then proceeds—"And now, my dearest, let me recommend to thy care, my dear children, abundantly beloved of me, as the Lord's blessings, and the sweet pledges of our mutual and endeared affection. Above all things, endeavor to breed them up, in the knowledge and love of virtue, and that holy plain way of it, which we have lived in, that the world, in no part of it, get into my family. * * *

"For their learning, be liberal. Spare no cost. For by such parsimony all is lost, that is saved: but let it be useful knowledge, such as is consistent with truth and godliness, not cherishing a vain conversation, or idle mind. * * * I recommend the useful parts of mathematics, &c., but agriculture is especially in my eye: let my children be husbandmen and housewives: it is industrious, healthy, honest and of good example. * * * Be sure to observe their genius, and do not cross it as to learning. * * * I choose not they should be married to earthly, covetous kindred; and of cities and towns of concourse, beware. The world is apt to stick close to those, who have lived and got wealth there. A country life and estate, I like best for my children. I prefer a decent mansion, of an hundred pounds per annum, before ten thousand pounds, in London, or such like place, in a way of trade."

He then addresses his children, and finally his elder boys, in the following admirable strain, honorable alike to his understanding and his heart.

"And, as for you, who are likely to be concerned, in the government of Pennsylvania, I do charge you, before the Lord God and his holy angels, that you be lowly, diligent and tender, fearing God, loving the people, and hating covetousness. Let justice have its impartial course, and the law free passage. Though to your loss, protect no man against it—for you are not above the law, but the law above you. Live therefore the lives, yourselves, you would have the people live; and then you have right and boldness to punish the transgressor. Keep upon the square, for God sees you: therefore do your duty, and be sure you see with your own eyes, and hear with your own ears. Entertain no lurchers; cherish no informers for gain or revenge; use no tricks; fly to no devices, to support or cover injustice: but let

your heart be upright before the Lord, trusting in him, above the contrivances of men, and none shall be able to hurt or supplant."

The letter, from which I have made these few extracts, concludes—"So farewell to my thrice dearly beloved wife and children! Yours as God pleaseth, in that, which no waters can quench, no time forget, nor distance wear away."

It is truly pleasant to get behind the curtain of form and ceremony, and look at these eminent men, in their night-gowns and slippers, and listen to them thus, while talking to their wives and their children.

No. LXIX.

It is remarkable, that such a genuine Quaker, as William Penn, should have sprung from such a belligerent stock. His father, as I have stated, was a British admiral; and his grandfather, Giles, was a captain in the navy. William Penn may, nevertheless, have derived, from this origin, and from his Dutch mother, Margaret Jasper, of Rotterdam—a certain quality, eminently characteristic of the Quaker—that resolute determination, which the coarser man of the world calls *pluck*, and the Quaker, *constancy*.

This constancy of purpose, in William Penn, seems never to have been shaken. It appeared, in his refusal to doff his brim, before his father, the Duke of York, and the King. It was manifested, when, being imprisoned in the Tower, for printing his *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, and hearing, that the Bishop of London had declared the offender should publicly recant, or remain there, for life; he replied, "*he would weary out the malice of his enemies by his patience, and that his prison should be his grave, before he would renounce his just opinions, for he owed his conscience to no man.*"

This same constancy was signally exhibited, during the disputation, between himself and George Whitehead, for the Quakers, and Thomas Vincent and others, for the Presbyterians. Vincent had a parish, in Spitalfields. Two of his parishioner swent to listen, perhaps to laugh, at the Quakers. Like Goldsmith's

scoffers, who came to laugh, and remained to pray—they went in, Presbyterians, and came out, Quakers. They were converted. At this, Vincent lost his patience; and seems to have become a persecutor of the *cursed Quakers*; and, as Clarkson states, said all manner of “*unhandsome*” things of them, and their *damnable* doctrines. Penn and Whitehead invited Vincent to a public discussion. After much delay and evasion, Vincent consented. As every fowl is bravest on his own *stercorium*, Vincent selected his own Presbyterian meeting-house, as the place for the discussion; and, before the appointed hour, filled it with his own people, so completely, that the disputants themselves, Penn and Whitehead, could scarcely gain admittance. They were instantly insulted, by a charge, suddenly made, that the Quakers held “*damnable doctrines*.” Whitehead began a reply; Vincent interrupted him, and proposed, as the proper course, that he should put questions to the Quakers. He put the motion, and, as almost all present were of his party, it was agreed to, of course. He then put a question concerning the Godhead, which he knew the Quakers would answer in the negative. Whitehead and Penn attempted to explain. Several rose on the other side. Whitehead desired to put a question to Vincent. This the Presbyterians refused. They proceeded to laugh, hiss and stigmatize. Penn they called a Jesuit. Upon an answer from Whitehead, to a question from Vincent, uproar ensued, and Vincent “went instantly to prayer,” that the Lord would *come short* with heretics and blasphemers.

When he had, by this manœuvre, discharged his battery upon the Quakers, effectually securing himself from interruption—for no one would presume to interrupt a minister at prayer—he cut off all power of reply, by telling the people to go home immediately, at the same moment setting them the example.

The closing part, which especially exhibits that constancy, for which the Quakers have ever been remarkable, cannot be more happily related, than in the language of Mr. Clarkson himself.

“The congregation was leaving the meeting-house, and they had not yet been heard. Finding they would soon be left to themselves, some of them, at length, ventured to speak; but they were pulled down, and the candles, for the controversy had lasted till midnight, were put out. They were not, however, prevented by this usage, from going on: for, rising up, they continued their defence in the dark; and what was extraordinary,

many staid to hear it. This brought Vincent among them with a candle. Addressing himself to the Quakers, he desired them to disperse. To this, at length, they consented, but only, on the promise, that another meeting should be granted them, for the same purpose, in the same place."

Vincent did not keep his promise. He was, doubtless, fearful that more of his parishioners would be converted. Penn and Whitehead, at last, went to Vincent's meeting-house, on a lecture day; and, when the lecture was finished, rose and begged an audience: but Vincent went off, as fast as possible; and the congregation, as speedily, followed. Finding no other mode before him, Penn wrote and published his celebrated *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, which caused his imprisonment in the Tower, as already related.

Another remarkable example of the constancy of Penn is recorded, in the history of his trial, before the Lord Mayor, for a breach of the conventicle act, in 1670. Mr. Macaulay is pleased to say, Penn had never been "*a strong-headed man*." This is one of those sliding phrases, that may mean anything, or nothing. It may mean, that not being a *strong-headed man*, he necessarily belonged to the other category, and was a *weak-headed man*. Or, it may mean, that he was not as strong-headed as Lord Verulam, or Mr. Macaulay. I wish the reader would decide this question for himself; and, for that end, read the history of this interesting trial, as given by Clarkson, in the first volume, and sixth chapter of his *Memoirs of Penn*. If the evidences of a strong head and a strong heart were not abundantly exhibited, by the accused, upon that occasion, I know not where to look for them.

The jury returned a verdict of *guilty of speaking in Grace Street Church*. Sir Samuel Starling, the Mayor, and the whole court abused the jurors, after the example of Jeffreys, and sent them back to their room. After half an hour, they returned the same verdict, in writing, signed with their names. The court were more enraged than before; and, Mr. Clarkson says, the Recorder addressed them thus—"You shall not be dismissed, till we have a verdict, such as the court will accept; and you shall be locked up without meat, drink, fire, and tobacco; you shall not think thus to abuse the court; we will have a verdict, by the help of God, or you shall starve for it." After being out all night, the jury returned the same verdict, for the third time.

They were severely abused by the court, after the fashion of that day, and sent to their room, once more. A fourth time, they returned the same verdict. Penn addressed the jury, and the court ordered the jailor to stop his mouth, and bring fetters, and stake him to the ground. Friend William, for an instant, merged the Quaker in the Englishman, and exclaimed—"Do your pleasure, I matter not your fetters."

On the fifth of September, the jury, who had received no refreshment, for two days and two nights, returned a verdict of *not guilty*. Such was the condition of things, at that day, that, for the rendition of that verdict, the jury were fined forty marks apiece, and imprisoned in Newgate. Penn was, at this time, five-and-twenty years of age.

The peculiar position of William Penn, at the court of Charles and James the Second, may be explained, without laying, at his door, the imputation of being a time-server, and a man of the world. Between the latter monarch and the Quaker, there existed a relation, akin to friendship. Penn, in keeping with his Quaker principles, was forgetful of injuries, and mindful of benefits. It is impossible to say, how long he would have remained in the tower, when imprisoned there, through the agency of the Bishop of London, had he not been released, upon the unsolicited importunity of James II., when Duke of York. When the Admiral, his father, was near his end, "he sent one of his friends," says Mr. Clarkson, "to the Duke of York, to desire of him, as a death-bed request, that he would endeavor to protect his son, as far as he consistently could, and to ask the King to do the same, in case of future persecution. The answer was gratifying, both of them promising their services, upon a fit occasion."

Perhaps it would not be going too far—with Mr. Macaulay's permission, of course—to ascribe that personal consideration, which Penn exhibited, for Charles and James—a part of it, at least—to a grateful recollection of their favors, to his father and himself.

"*Titles and phrases*," says Mr. Macaulay, "*against which he had often borne his testimony, dropped occasionally from his lips and his pen.*" I rather doubt, if the recording angel, who will never "*set down aught in malice*," has noted the unquakerish sins of William Penn, in doing grammatical justice to personal pronouns. This, truly, is a mighty small matter. If Penn was

not so particular, in these little things, as some others of his brotherhood, his birth and education may be well considered. He was not a Quaker born. His residence in France may also be taken into the account. "He had contracted," says Clarkson, "a sort of polished or courtly demeanor, which he had insensibly taken from the customs of the people, among whom he had lately lived."

In the matter of the hat, even Mr. Macaulay will never charge William Penn with inconsistency. In Granger's Biographical History of England, iv. 16, I find the following anecdote—"We are credibly informed, that he sat with his hat on before Charles II., and that the King, as a gentle rebuke for his ill manners, put off his own: upon which Penn said to him—'Friend Charles, why dost thou not put on thy hat?' The King answered, 'Tis the custom of this place, that never above one person should be covered at a time.'" This tale is told also, in a note to Grey's *Hudibras*, on canto ii. v. 225, and elsewhere.

No. LXX.

The pride of life—that omnipresent frailty—that universal mark of man's congenital naughtiness—in William Penn, seemed scarcely an earthly leaven, springing, as it did, from a comforting consciousness of the purity of his own. *The pride of life*, with him, was essentially *humility*; for, when compelled to rest his defence, in any degree, upon his individual character, he vaunted not himself, but gave all the glory to the Giver.

No man, however, more keenly felt the assaults, which were made upon his character, by the tongue and the pen of envy and hatred, ignorance and bigotry, because he knew, that the shaft, though aimed, ostensibly, at him, was frequently designed, for that body, whose prominent leader he was.

In the very year of his father's death, and shortly after that event, he was seized, by a file of soldiers, sent purposely, for his apprehension, while preaching, in a Quaker meeting-house, and carried before Sir John Robinson, who treated him roughly, and sent him, for six months, to Newgate. In the course of the trial, Robinson said to Penn—"You have been as bad as other

folks"—to which Penn replied—"When and where? I charge thee to tell the company to my face." Robinson rejoined—"Abroad, and at home too." This was so notoriously false and absurd, that an ingenuous member of the court, Sir John Shelden, exclaimed—"No, no, Sir John, that's too much." Penn, turning to the assembly, and with all the chastened indignation of an insulted Christian—Quaker as he was—delivered himself, with a strength and simplicity, which would have done honor to Paul, in the presence of Agrippa; and which must forever, so long as the precious record shall remain, touch a responsive chord—even in the bosoms of those, whose practice it is, upon ordinary occasions, to let their yea be yea, and their nay—nay.

I am sure it would have cheered the old Admiral's heart, and elevated his respect for the broad brim, to have heard the manly language of his Quaker son, that day.

"I make this bold challenge to all men, women, and children upon earth, justly to accuse me, with having seen me drunk, heard me swear, utter a curse, or speak one obscene word, much less that I ever made it my practice. I speak this to God's glory, who has ever preserved me from the power of these pollutions, and who, from a child, begot an hatred in me, towards them."

"But there is nothing more common, than, when men are of a more severe life than ordinary, for loose persons to comfort themselves with the conceit, that these were once as they themselves are; as if there were no collateral or oblique line of the compass or globe, by which men might be said to come to the Arctic pole, but directly and immediately from the Antarctic. Thy words shall be thy burden, and I trample thy slanders, as dirt, under my feet."

Mr. Clarkson is quoted, as good authority, by Mr. Macaulay. Such he has ever been esteemed. A brief quotation may not be amiss, in regard to Penn's relation to James II. Having referred to the Admiral's dying request to Charles and James, to have a regard for his Quaker son, Clarkson says—"From this period a more regular acquaintance grew up between them (William Penn and James II.) and intimacy followed. During this intimacy, however William Penn might have disapproved, as he did, of the King's religious opinions, he was attached to him, from a belief, that he was a friend to liberty of conscience. Entertaining this opinion concerning him, he conceived it to be his

duty, now that he had become King, to renew this intimacy with him, and that, in a stronger manner than ever, that he might forward the great object, for which he had crossed the Atlantic, namely, the relief of those unhappy persons, who were then suffering, on account of their religion. * * * * He used his influence with the King solely in doing good."

The relation, between William Penn and the Papist King, was indeed remarkable. Gerard Croese published his *Historia Quakeriana*, at Amsterdam, in 1695, which was translated into English, in the following year. It was greatly disliked, by the Quakers; and, in 1696, drew forth an answer from one of the society. The testimony of Croese, in relation to Penn, may therefore be deemed impartial. He says—"The king loved him, as a singular and entire friend, and imparted to him many of his secrets and counsels. He often honored him with his company in private, discoursing with him of various affairs, and that not for one but many hours together."

When a peer, who had been long kept waiting for Penn to come forth, ventured to complain, the King simply said—"Penn always talked ingeniously and he heard him willingly." Croese says, that Penn was unwearied, as the suitor on behalf of his oppressed people, making constant efforts for their liberation, and paying their legal expenses, from his private purse. The King's remark certainly does not quadrate with Burnet's statement, that Penn "*had a tedious luscious way of talking.*" With Queen Anne he was a great favorite; and Clarkson says, vol. ii. chap. 15, "she received him always in a friendly manner, and was pleased with his conversation." So was Tillotson. So was a better judge than Queen Anne, Tillotson, or Burnet. In Noble's continuation of Granger, Swift is stated to have said—"Penn talked very agreeably and with much spirit."

- Somewhat of Penn's relation to King James may be gathered, from Penn's answer, when examined, in 1690, before King William, in regard to an intercepted letter from King James to Penn. In that letter, James desired Penn to "*come to his assistance and express to him the resentments of his favor and benevolence.*" When asked what *resentments* were intended, he replied that "he did not know, but he supposed the King meant he should compass his restoration. Though, however he could not avoid the suspicion of such an attempt, he could avoid the guilt of it. He confessed he had loved King James; and, as he had loved him,

in his prosperity, he could not hate him, in his adversity—yes, he loved him yet, for the many favors he had conferred on him, though he could not join with him, in what concerned the state or kingdom.” This answer, says Pickart, “*was noble, generous, and wise.*”

One of the most able and eloquent compositions of William Penn is his justly celebrated letter of October 24, 1688, to William Popple. Mr. Popple was secretary to the Lords Commissioners, for the affairs of trade and plantations, and a particular friend of Penn and of his schoolfellow, John Locke. Had Mr. Macaulay flourished then, he would have had readier listeners to these cavils, than he has at present. Penn, in 1688, was excessively unpopular. He was not only *the tool of the King and the Jesuits*, but a rank *Papist* and *Jesuit* himself—the *friend of arbitrary power*,—*bred at St. Omers in the Jesuits College*—he had *taken orders at Rome*—*married under a dispensation*—*officiated as a priest at Whitehall*—no charge against William Penn was too absurd, to gain credit with the people, at the period of the Revolution.

Upon this occasion, Mr. Popple addressed to Penn a letter, eminently beautiful, in point of style, and containing a most forcible appeal to Penn's sense of duty to himself, to the society of Friends, to his children, and the world, to put down these atrocious calumnies, by some public written declaration. His letter will be found, in Clarkson's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. chap. i. I truly regret, that I have space only, for some brief disconnected extracts, from William Penn's reply.

“Worthy Friend ; it is now above twenty years, I thank God, that I have not been very solicitous what the world thought of me, &c. The business, chiefly insisted on, is my Popery and endeavors to promote it. I do say then, and that, with all simplicity, that I am not only no Jesuit, but no Papist ; and which is more, I never had any temptation upon me to be so, either from doubts in my own mind, about the way I profess, or from the discourses or writings of any of that religion. And in the presence of Almighty God I do declare, that the King did never once directly or indirectly, attack me or tempt me upon that subject.” * * * * “I say then solemnly, that so far from having been bred at St. Omers, and having received orders at Rome, I never was at either place ; nor do I know anybody there, nor had I ever a correspondence with anybody in those places.” After

alluding to the absurdity of charging him with having officiated as a Catholic Priest, he adverts to his opinion of the views of King James, on the subject of toleration—"And in his honor, as well as in my own defence, I am obliged in conscience to say, that he has ever declared to me it was his opinion; and on all occasions, when Duke, he never refused me the repeated proof of it, as often as I had any poor sufferers for conscience' sake to solicit his help for." * * * * "To this let me add the relation my father had to this King's service; his particular favor in getting me released out of the Tower of London in 1669, my father's humble request to him, upon his death-bed, to protect me from the inconveniences and troubles my persuasion might expose me to, and his friendly promise to do it, and exact performance of it, from the moment I addressed myself to him. I say, when all this is considered, anybody, that has the least pretence to good nature, gratitude, or generosity, must needs know how to interpret my access to the King."

This letter contains sentiments, on the subject of religious toleration, which would be highly ornamental, if placed in golden characters, upon the walls of all our churches—"Our fault is, we are apt to be mighty hot upon speculative errors, and break all bounds in our resentments; but we let practical ones pass without remark, if not without repentance! as if a mistake about an obscure proposition of faith were a greater evil, than the breach of an undoubted precept. Such a religion the devils themselves are not without, for they have both faith and knowledge; but their faith doth not work by love, nor their knowledge by obedience." * * * "Let us not think religion a litigious thing; nor that Christ came only to make us disputants." * * * "It is charity that deservedly excels in the Christian religion." * * * "He that suffers his difference with his neighbor, about the other world, to carry him beyond the line of moderation in this, is the worse for his opinion, even if it be true. It is too little considered by Christians, that men may hold the truth in unrighteousness; that they may be orthodox, and not know what spirit they are of."

Verily, this "*courtly Quaker*"—this *tool of the King and the Jesuits*," who was "*never a strong-headed man*"—was quite a Christian gentleman after all.

No. LXXI.

IN the latter days of William Penn, *the sun and the light were darkened—the clouds returned after the rain—the grasshopper became a burden*—and the years had drawn nigh, when he could truly say he had *no pleasure in them*. No mortal, probably, ever enjoyed a more continual feast from the consciousness of a life, devoted to the glory of God, and the welfare of man; but many of his temporal reliances had crumbled under him; and trouble had gathered about his path, and about his bed.

He had not much more comfort in his government, I fear, than Sancho Panza enjoyed, in that of Barataria. Its commencement was marked, by a vexatious dispute with Lord Baltimore; and the Governor's absence was ever the signal for altercation, between different cliques and parties, and vexatious neglect, on the part of his tenants and agents. In his letters to Thomas Lloyd, the President of his Council, he complains of some in the government, for drinking, carousing, and official extortion.

In his letters to Lloyd and Harrison in 1686, he complains of the Council, for neglecting and slighting his letters; that he cannot get "*a penny*" of his quit-rents; and adds—"God is my witness, I lie not. I am now above six thousand pounds out of pocket, more than ever I saw by the province; and you may throw in my pains, cares, and hazard of life, and leaving of my family and friends to serve them."

It is even stated by Clarkson, vol. i. ch. 22, that want of funds from the Province prevented his returning to America, in 1686. In the following year, he renews these complaints.

In 1688, and after the revolution, he was examined, before the Lords of Council, on the charge of being a Papist and a Jesuit; gave bonds for his attendance, on the first day of the next term; and, no witness then appearing against him, he was discharged.

In 1690, he was again arrested, and bound over as before, and, no witness appearing, was again discharged. In the same year, he was once more arrested, and committed to prison. On the day of trial, no witness appeared, and he was again discharged. He resolved to fly from such continual persecution, to America, and, while making his preparation, he was again arrested, upon the information of one Fuller, who was afterward set in the pillory, for his crime.

Penn sought safety, in privacy and retirement from the world. In 1691, a new proclamation was issued for his arrest; and his American affairs wore a gloomy aspect. In 1693, he was deprived of his government, by King William; and pursued with unrelenting rage, by his enemies. In the words of Clarkson, he was "*a poor, persecuted exile.*"

"*Canonized to-day and cursed to-morrow*"—such seems to have been the fortune of William Penn. His only prudent course seemed to be to bow down, before the wrath of that popular hurricane, which swept furiously over him, and went upon its way. This good and great man was not wholly forgotten. He had never forfeited the affectionate respect of some persons, who have left bright names, for the admiration of future ages. Such were Locke and Tillotson. They marked their time, and moved in behalf of the oppressed. Lords Ranelagh, Rochester, and Sidney went to King William—they "*considered it a dishonor to the Government, that a man, who had lived such an exemplary life, and who had been so distinguished for his talents, disinterestedness, generosity, and public spirit, should be buried in an ignoble obscurity, and prevented from rising to future eminence and usefulness, in consequence of the charge of an unprincipled wretch, whom Parliament had publicly stigmatized, as a cheat and an impostor.*"

King William replied to these truly noble lords, "that William Penn was *an old friend of his, as well as theirs*, and that he might follow his business, as freely as ever, for he had nothing to say against him." The principal Secretary of State, Sir John Trenchard, and the Marquis of Winchester bore these joyful tidings to William Penn. And how did he receive them? He went instantly, of course, to tender the homage of his humble acknowledgments to King William—not so. He was then greatly embarrassed in his pecuniary affairs. Foes were on every side. The wife whom, in his parting letter, he bade remember, that she was *the love of his youth and the joy of his life*, was on her death-bed, prostrated there, according to Clarkson, in no small degree, by her too keen sympathy for her long suffering husband. His *heart* was broken—his *spirit* was not. He preferred rights before favors, and desired permission publicly to defend himself, before the King in council. This was granted, and he was abundantly acquitted, after a deliberate hearing.

The last hours of his wife, Gulielma Maria, were cheered by

this intelligence. In about a month after this event, she died. "She was an excelling person," said he, "as wife, child, mother, mistress, friend, and neighbor."

In 1694, a complete reconciliation took place between Penn and the society of Friends; and, in the same year, he was restored to the Government of Pennsylvania. In 1696, he married Hannah Callowhill, of Bristol. These gleams of returning happiness were soon obscured. A few weeks after this marriage, he lost his eldest son. This young man was upon the eve of twenty-one. His father's simple narrative of the dying hour is truly affecting. "His time drawing on apace, he said to me—'My dear father, kiss me. Thou art a dear father. How can I make thee amends?' He also called his sister, and said to her, 'poor child, come and kiss me,' between whom seemed a tender and long parting. I sent for his brother, that he might kiss him too, which he did. All were in tears about him. Turning his head to me, he said softly, 'Dear father, hast thou no hope for me?' I answered, 'My dear child, I am afraid to hope, and I dare not despair, but am and have been resigned, though one of the hardest lessons I ever learned.'" When the doctor came, he was very weak, and the narrative continues thus. "He said—'Let my father speak to the doctor, and I'll go to sleep,' which he did and waked no more; breathing his last upon my breast, the tenth day of the second month, between nine and ten in the morning, 1696. So ended the life of my dear child and eldest son, much of my comfort and hope, and one of the most tender and dutiful, as well as ingenuous and virtuous youths I knew, if I may say so of my own dear son, in whom I lost all that any father can lose in a child; since he was capable of anything, that became a sober young man, my friend and companion, as well as most affectionate and dutiful child."

About this time Penn was sorely grieved, by the conduct of George Keith, the apostate Quaker, who had been excommunicated, and now spent his time, in abusing the society.

Penn had become well convinced of many solemn truths, presented in the last chapter of Ecclesiastes, and of none more fully, than that there is no end of making books. He continued to pour forth pamphlets, on various subjects. In this year, 1696, he became acquainted, and had several interviews, with Peter the Great, who was then working, as a common shipwright, in the dock yards at Deptford. In 1699 he once more visited Pennsyl-

vania. In 1701 he returned to England. In 1702 and 1703 he continued to preach and publish, as vigorously as ever.

In 1707 he became involved in a lawsuit, with the executors of one Ford, his former steward, or agent. Ford was undoubtedly a knave. Penn suffered severely from this cause. The decision was against him; and, though Chancery could not relieve, many thought him greatly wronged. He was compelled, in 1708, to live within the rules of the Fleet. This, doubtless, was the occasion of Mr. Burke's erroneous statement, many years after, that Penn died in the Fleet Prison. An amusing anecdote may be referred to this period, which, though not mentioned by Clarkson, nor in the life by Chalmers, may be found in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, of 1798, and is repeated, in Napier's edition of 1842. Penn is said to have had a peep-hole, through which, unseen, he could see every visitor. A creditor, having often knocked, and becoming impatient, knocked more violently; "will not your master see me?" said he, when the door was opened—"He hath *seen* thee, friend," the servant replied, "but he doth not like thee."

In 1709, his necessities were such, that he mortgaged his whole Province of Pennsylvania, for £6600. This necessity, as Oldmixon says, in his "Account of the British Empire in America," arose from "his bounty to the Indians, his generosity in minding the public affairs of the Colony more than his own private ones, his humanity to those, who have not made suitable returns, his confidence in those, who have betrayed him."

In 1712, he had three apoplectic fits, followed by those painful effects, which are usual in such cases. His friend, Thomas Story, the first recorder of Philadelphia, made him yearly visits, after this period, till his death, which took place July 30, 1718. It is impossible to read the account of these visits, as given by Thomas Story himself, and presented by Clarkson, vol. ii. chap. 18, without emotion.

It has too often befallen those, whose lives have been devoted to the benefit of mankind, to be outraged, after they were dead and buried. Malice delights to meddle with their ashes. Political prejudice and priestly bigotry seek, in graves, undisturbed by ages, for something to gratify their unnatural appetites, and satisfy the gnawings of a mean, vindictive spirit.

Penn had not long been committed to the tomb, when a wretch, Henry Pickworth, an excommunicated renegade, spread

abroad, with all the industry and energy of a malicious spirit, the report that Penn had died a raving maniac, at Bath. This rumor became so general, that it was thought necessary to destroy it, by the publication of certificates from those, who had ministered about his dying bed.

For one hundred and thirty years, William Penn has slumbered in the grave. That *hutesium et clamor*, that spirit of persecution, by which this excellent man was pursued, vilified, impoverished, and exiled, has long been hushed. The high churchman, the bigot, the Quaker renegade, the false accuser, have worn out their viperous teeth upon the file. All, that bore the primeval impress of human weakness, in William Penn, had well nigh perished, and departed from the minds of men. All, that was excellent, and lovely, and of good report, had become case-hardened, as it were, into a sort of precious immortality. That his spirit had found a celestial niche, among the just made perfect, was the firm faith of all, who believe, that their Father in Heaven is a God of toleration and of mercy. I have paid my imperfect tribute of affectionate respect to the memory of William Penn.

Notwithstanding Mr. Macaulay's efforts to disturb the popular opinion, in regard to William Penn, his History of England is one of the most amusing books, in the English language. Relationship is worth something, even in a library; I have placed the two volumes, already published, between the works of Sir Walter Scott, and a highly prized edition of the Arabian Nights.

No. LXXII.

DEATH has taken away, within a brief space, several of our estimable citizens—Mr. Joseph Balch, an excellent and amiable man, who filled an official station, honorably for himself, and profitably for others—Mr. Samuel C. Gray, a gentleman of taste and refinement, who graduated at Harvard College, in 1811, and, at the time of his death, was President of the Atlas Bank—Mr. John Bromfield, a man of a sound head, and a kind heart. Having bestowed five and twenty thousand dollars, in his lifetime, upon the Boston Athenæum, he modestly left the more

extended purposes of his benevolent heart, to be proclaimed, after his decease; and, by his will, distributed, among eight charitable institutions, and his native town, the sum of one hundred and ten thousand dollars.

The features of these good men are still upon the retina of our memories; the tones of their voices yet ring in our ears; we almost expect their wonted salutation, upon the public walk. But there is no mockery here—they are gone—the places, that knew them, shall know them no more!

Death has laid his icy hand upon these men, as he has ever laid the same cold palm upon their fathers, since time began. Such exits are common. Disease triumphed over the flesh, and they ceased to be.

But Death has done his dismal work, of late, in our very midst, by the hand of cruel violence—not sitting like the King of Terrors, in quiet dignity, upon his throne, and casting his unerring shafts abroad; but darting down upon his unsuspecting victim, and, with a murderous grasp, crushing him at once. I allude, as every reader well knows, to the fate of the late Dr. George Parkman.

As the Coroner's Inquest, after long and laborious investigation, has declared, that he was "*killed*," we must assume it to be so. I have known this gentleman, for more than forty years; and have had occasion to observe some of the peculiarities of his character, in the relations of business, as well as in those of ordinary intercourse—I say the *peculiarities* of his character, for he certainly must be classed in the category of *eccentric* men. Having heard much of this ill-fated gentleman, for many years, before the late awful occurrence, and still more since the event—for he was extensively known, and all, who knew him, have something to relate—I am satisfied, that those very traits of eccentricity, to which I refer, have led the larger part of mankind, to form erroneous impressions of his character.

Dr. George Parkman was the son of Samuel Parkman, an enterprising, and successful merchant, of Boston, who was a descendant of Ebenezer Parkman, who graduated at Harvard College, in 1721, and was ordained Oct. 28, 1724, the first minister of Westborough; and who, after a ministry of sixty years, died, Dec. 9, 1782, at the age of 79, and whose wife was the daughter of Robert Breck, minister of Marlborough, who

was the grandson of Edward Breck, one of the early settlers of Dorchester, in 1636.

Dr. George Parkman graduated, at Harvard College, in 1809. When he commenced his junior year, John White Webster, now Erving Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy, entered the University, as freshman. Dr. Webster, who is now in prison, charged with the "*killing*" of Dr. Parkman, will, in due time, be tried, by a jury of his countrymen. Will it not be decorous, and humane, and in accordance with the golden rule, for the men, women, and children of Massachusetts, to permit the accused to have an impartial trial? Can this be possible, if, upon the *on dits* of the day, of whose value every man of any experience can judge, this individual, whose past career seems not to have been particularly bloodthirsty, is to be morally condemned, without a hearing?

Hundreds, whose elastic intellects have been accustomed to jump in judgment, are already assured, that we believe Dr. Webster innocent. Now we *believe* no such thing—nor do we *believe* he is guilty. His reputation and his life are of some little importance to himself, and to his family; and we should be heartily ashamed, to carry a head upon our shoulders, which would not enable us to suspend our judgment, until all the *true facts* are in, and all the *false facts* are out.

How much beautiful reasoning has been utterly and gratuitously wasted, upon premises, which have turned out to be not a whit better, than stubble and rottenness! The very readiness, with which everybody believes all manner of evil, of everybody, furnishes evidence enough, that the devil is in everybody; and goes not a little way, in support of the doctrine of original sin.

Let us, by all means, and especially, by an avoidance of the topic, give assurance to the accused of a fair and impartial trial. If he shall be proved to be innocent, who will not blush, that has contributed to fill the atmosphere, with a presentiment of this poor man's guilt? If, on the other hand, he shall be proved to be guilty of an incomparably foul and fiendish murder—let him be hanged by the neck till he is dead, for God's sake—aye, for God's sake—for God hath said—WHOSO SHEDDETH MAN'S BLOOD, BY MAN SHALL HIS BLOOD BE SHED.

The personal appearance of Dr. Parkman was remarkable—so much so, that his identity could not well be mistaken, by

any one, who had carefully observed his person. His body was unusually attenuated, and I have often, while looking at his profile, perceived a resemblance to Hogarth's sketch of his friend Fielding, taken from memory, after death.

The talents of Dr. George Parkman were highly respectable. His mind was of that order, which took little rest—its movements, like those of his body, were always quick; more so, perhaps, upon some occasions, than comported with the formation of just and permanent judgment. He was a respectably well read man, not only in his own profession, but he possessed a very creditable store of general information, and was an entertaining and instructive companion. In various ways, he promoted the best interests of medical science; and nothing, probably, prevented him from attaining very considerable eminence, in his calling, but the accession of hereditary wealth; whose management occupied, for many years, a large portion of his time and thoughts.

By some persons, he has been accounted over sharp and hard, in his pecuniary dealings—mean and even miserly. No opinion can be more untrue. Dr. Parkman's eccentricity was nowhere so manifest, as in his money relations. The line was singularly well defined, in his mind, between charity, or liberality, and traffic. He adhered to the time-honored maxim, that *there is no love in trade*. There are persons, who, in their dealings, give up fractions, and suffer petty encroachments, for the sake of popularity; and who make, not only their own side of a bargain, but, in a very amiable, patronizing way, a portion of the other. Dr. Parkman did none of these things. He gave men credit, for a full share of selfishness and cunning—made his contracts carefully—performed them strictly—and expected an exact fulfilment, from the other party.

It is perfectly natural, that the promptness and the pertinacity of Dr. Parkman, in exacting the punctual payment of money, and the strict performance of contracts, should be equally surprising and annoying to those, whose previous dealings had been with men, of less method and vigilance. But no man, however irritated by the daily repetition of the dun, has ever charged, upon Dr. Parkman, the slightest departure from the line of strict integrity. He was a man of honor, in the true acceptation of that word. His domestic arrangements were of the most liberal kind—his manners were courteous—and he possessed the high

spirit of a gentleman—and, with all the occasional evidences, which his conduct *openly* supplied, of his particular care, in the gathering of units; he could be *secretly* liberal, with hundreds.

It may well be doubted, if any individual has ever lived, for sixty years, in this city, whose real character has been so little understood, by the community at large. The reason is at hand—he exposed that regard for pittances, which most men conceal—and he concealed many acts of charity, which most men expose. He had many tenants of the lower order—he was frequently his own collector, and brought upon himself many murmurs and complaints, which are commonly the agent's portion.

The charities of Dr. Parkman wore an aspect, now and then, of whimsicality, and were strangely contrasted with *apparent* meanness. Thus, upon one occasion, he is said to have insisted upon being paid a paltry balance of rent, some twenty-five cents, by a poor woman, who assured him it was all she had to buy her dinner. "*Now we have settled the rent,*" said he, and immediately gave her a couple of dollars.

A gentleman, an old college acquaintance of Dr. Parkman's, told me, a day or two since, that the Dr. came to him, after this gentleman's failure, some years ago, and said to him, with great kindness and delicacy—"You want a house—there is mine in — street, empty and repaired—take it—you shall pay no rent for a year, and as much longer, as may suit your convenience."

In 1832, this city was visited by the cholera. Mr. Charles Wells was Mayor, and a very good Mayor was he. Had his benevolence induced him to labor, for the more extensive diffusion of the blessing of alcohol, among the poor, the liquor trade would certainly have voted him a punch-bowl, for his vigorous opposition to the cholera. Upon the occasion, to which I refer, Dr. Parkman said to the city authorities—"You are seeking for a cholera hospital—take any of my houses, that may suit you, rent free, in welcome. If you prefer that, which I occupy, I will move out, with pleasure."

When Dorcas died, the good people of Joppa began to display her handiwork. I am surprised, though much of it was known to me before, at the amount of evidence, which is now produced, from various quarters, to prove, that this unfortunate gentleman was a man of the most kind affections, and of extensive, practical benevolence.

Let me close these remarks, with one brief anecdote; which, though once already related of Dr. Parkman, by the editor of the Transcript, is worthy of many republications, and is not at all like news, on the stock exchange, good only while it is new.

"A politician stopped the Doctor in the street and asked him to subscribe for the expense of a salute, in honor of some political victory. The Doctor put his arm in his, and invited him to take a little walk. He led him round the corner into a dismal alley, and then up three flights of rickety stairs into a room where a poor woman was sitting, propped by pillows, feebly attempting to sew. Some pale, hungry-looking children were near. The Doctor took six dollars out of his pocket-book, and handed it to the politician, and, simply remarking, "do with it as you please," he darted out of the room in his usually impulsive way."

I must close this feeble tribute of respect to the memory of one, who truly deserved a milder fate and an abler pen. Had we the power of recall—how well and wisely might we pay his ransom, with scores of men, quite as *eccentric* in their way, but whose *eccentricity* has very rarely assumed the charitable type!

No. LXXIII.

WHEN I was a very young man, I had the honor of a slight acquaintance with a most worthy gentleman, my senior by many years, who represented the town of Hull, in the Legislature of our Commonwealth. As I marked the solemn step, with which he moved along the public way, towards the House of Representatives, and the weight of responsibility, which hung upon his anxious brow—if such, thought I, is the effect, produced upon the representative of Hull—what an awful thing it must be, to represent the whole United States of North America, at the court of the greatest nation in the world!

In harmony with this opinion, every nation of the earth has selected, from the *élite* of the whole country, for the high and responsible employment of standing before the world, as the legitimate representative of itself, a man of affairs—I do not

mean the affairs of trade, and discounts, and invoices, and profits—I use the word, in its most ample diplomatic sense—a man of great wisdom, and knowledge, and experience—a man familiar with the laws of nations—a man of dignity—not that arrogated dignity, which looks supremely wise, while it feels supremely foolish—but that conscious dignity, which is innate, and sits upon the wearer, like an easy garment—a man of liberal education, and great familiarity, not with the whole circle of sciences, but with the whole circle of historical and correlative knowledge—a man of classical erudition, and a scholar, competent to bear a becoming part, in that elevated intercourse of mind, which forms the dignified and delightful recreation of the diplomatist, in the first society of Europe.

Men, who have been bred up, amid the pursuits of trade, have been, with great propriety, selected, to fill the offices of *consuls*, in foreign lands; agreeably to the long established distinction, that *consuls* represent the *commercial affairs*—*ambassadors* the *state and dignity* of the country, from whence they come.

Oh! for the wand of that enchantress, the glorious witch of Endor! to turn up the sod of memory, and conjure, from their honorable graves, the train of illustrious, and highly gifted men, who, from time to time, have been sent forth, to represent this great Republic, before the throne of England!

First, on that scroll of honor, is a name, which shall prove coeval with the first days, and with the last, of this Republic. It shall never perish, till the whole earth itself shall be rolled up, like a scroll. On the second day of June, 1785, JOHN ADAMS was presented to King George, the third. The very man, whom that obstinate, old monarch had never contemplated, in his royal visions, but as a rebel, suing for pardon, with a rope about his neck, then stood before him, calm and erect—the equal of that king, in all things, that became a man, and his mighty superior in many—the representative of a nation, which his consummate wisdom, and invincible, moral courage had contributed, so materially, to render free and independent.

What a tribute was conveyed, in the words of Jefferson, his political rival—"The great pillar and support to the declaration of independence, and its ablest advocate and champion on the floor of the house was JOHN ADAMS. He was the Colossus of that Congress: not graceful, not eloquent, not always fluent, in

his public addresses, he yet came out with a power both of thought and expression, which moved the hearers from their seats."

In those thoughtful days, secretaries of legation were carefully selected, and with some reference, of course, to their contingent responsibilities, in the event of the absence, or illness, of their principals. When, in 1779, Mr. Adams went, on his mission to France, a gentleman of high qualifications, Mr. Francis Dana, gave up his seat, *as a member of Congress*, to follow that great man, *as secretary of legation*. Mr. Dana subsequently figured, ably and gracefully, in the highest stations. In 1780, he was minister to Russia. In 1784, he was a delegate to Congress. In 1797, he declined the office of envoy extraordinary to France. From 1792 to 1806, he was the able, impartial, and eminently dignified Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

In 1794, it was thought, by the appointing power, that John Jay might be trusted to represent our Republic, at the British Court. With what a reputation, for wisdom, and talents, and learning, that great man crossed the sea! Mr. Jay, an eminent lawyer, uniting the wisdom and dignity of years, with the vigor and zeal of early manhood, was a member of the first American Congress, at the age of twenty-nine. Chairman of the Committee, of which Lee and Livingston were members, he was the author of the eloquent "*Address to the People of Great Britain*." He was Chief Justice of the State of New York, from 1777 to 1779, and relinquished that elevated station, as incompatible with the due performance of his duties, as President of Congress. From his skilful hand came the stirring address of that assembly, to its constituents, of Sept. 8, 1779. He was appointed minister plenipotentiary to Spain, at the close of that year—a commissioner, to negotiate peace with Great Britain, in 1782—Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of the United States, in 1789—Governor of New York, in 1795, being then abroad, as minister plenipotentiary of the United States, to Great Britain, to which office he was appointed in 1794—and again Governor of New York, in 1798.

Rufus King graduated at Harvard College, in 1777, with a high reputation, as a classical scholar and an orator; and studied his profession, with the late Chief Justice Parsons. In 1784, he was a delegate to Congress. He was a member of the Convention of 1787, to form the Constitution of the United States. In

1789, he was a member of the United States Senate. Of the celebrated Camillus papers, commonly ascribed to Hamilton, all, excepting the ten first, were from the pen of Rufus King. In 1796, he was nominated, by Washington, minister plenipotentiary to the Court of Great Britain. He filled that high station, till the close of the second year of the Jefferson administration. After a long retirement, he was again in the Senate of the United States, in 1813. After quitting the Senate, in 1825, he was once more appointed minister to Great Britain; but, after remaining abroad, about a year, in ill health, he returned, and died at Jamaica, Long Island, April 29, 1827.

"*And what shall I more say?* For the time would fail me, to tell of" Pinckney, and Gore, and the younger Adams, that incarnation of wisdom and learning, and Gallatin, and Maclean, and Everett, and Bancroft, every one of whom has been preceded, by the well-earned reputation of high, intellectual powers and attainments, whatever may have been the difference of their political opinions.

Knowledge is power; talent is power; and fine literary tastes and acquirements are, preëminently, power; and, in no spot, upon the surface of the earth, are they more truly so, than in the great British metropolis. The wand of a man of letters can there do more, than can be achieved, by the power of Midas, or the wonder-working lamp of Aladdin.

Our fathers, therefore, preferred, that the nation should be represented, in its simplicity and strength, by men of long heads, strong hearts, and short purses. They considered a regular, thorough, and polished education, literary attainments of a very high order, a clear and comprehensive knowledge of the law of nations, and an extensive store of general information, absolutely essential, in a minister plenipotentiary, from this Republic, to the Court of Great Britain; for our *state and dignity* were to be represented there, not less than our *commercial relations*.

They well knew, that our representative should be qualified to represent the refined and educated portions of our community, in the presence of those elevated classes, among whom he must frequently appear; and "*whose talk,*" to use the expression of Dr. Johnson, was not likely to be "*of bullacks.*" They therefore invariably selected, for this exalted station, one, who would be abundantly able to represent the nation, with gravity, and dignity, and wisdom, and knowledge, and power; and who

would never be reduced, whatever the subject might be, to believe his safety was in sitting still, or of suffering the secret of his impotency to escape, by opening his mouth.

If I have passed too rapidly for the reader's willingness to linger, over the names of some highly distinguished men, who have so ably represented our country, at the British Court, and who still *survive*—it is because *my dealings are with the dead*.

No. LXXIV.

“An immense quantity of fuel was always of necessity used, when dead bodies were burned, instead of buried; and a friend, learned in such lore, as well as in much that is far more valuable, informs us that the burning of a *martyr* was always an expensive process.”

This passage was transferred, from the New York Courier and Enquirer, to the Boston Atlas, December 29, 1849, and is part of an article having reference to the partial cremation of Dr. Parkman's remains.

I must presume, as a sexton of the old school, to doubt the accuracy of this statement, in the very face of the averment, that the editor's authority is “*a friend, learned in such lore*.”

To enable my readers to judge of the comparative expense of burial, in the ordinary mode, by interment or entombment, and by cremation, I refer, in the first place, to Mr. Chadwick's Report, made by request of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State, for the Home Department, Lond. 1843, in which it is stated, that a Master in Chancery, when dealing with insolvent estates, will pass, “*as a matter of course*,” such claims as these—from £60 to £100 for burying an upper tradesman—£250 for burying a gentleman—£500 to £1500 for burying a nobleman.

But let us confine our remarks to the particular allegation. The “*friend, learned in such lore*,” has greatly diminished the labor of refutation, by confining his statement to the burning of *martyrs*—“*the burning of a martyr was always an expensive process*,” requiring, says the Courier and Enquirer, “*an immense quantity of fuel*.”

I well remember to have read, though I cannot recall the authority, that aromatic woods and spices were occasionally used in the East, during the *suttees*, to correct the offensive odor. In addition to the reason, assigned by Cicero, *De Legibus*, ii. 23, for the law against intramural burning, that conflagration might be avoided—Servius, in a note, on the *Æneis*, vi. 150, states another, that the air might not be infected with the stench. To prevent this, we know that costly perfumes were cast upon the pile; and the respect and affection for the defunct came to be measured, at last, by this species of extravagance; just as the funereal sorrow of the Irish is supposed to be graduated, by the number of coaches, and the quantity of whiskey.

But our business is with the *martyrs*. What was the cost of burning John Rogers I really do not know. I doubt if the process was very expensive; for good old John Strype has told us, almost to a fagot, how much fuel it took, to burn Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley. The fuel, employed to burn Latimer and Ridley, cost fifteen shillings and four pence sterling for both; and the fuel for burning Cranmer, nine shillings and four pence only. Then there were chains, stakes, laborers, and cartage; and the whole cost for burning all three, was *one pound, sixteen shillings, and six pence!* Not a very expensive process truly. The authority is not at every one's command: I therefore give it entire, from Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, Oxford ed., 1840, vol. i. p. 563:—

	<i>s. d.</i>
“ For three loads of wood fagots to burn	
Ridley and Latimer,	12 0
Item, one load of furs fagots,	3 4
For the carriage of these four loads,	2 0
Item, a post,	1 4
Item, two chains,	3 4
Item, two staples,	0 6
Item, four laborers,	2 8
“ FOR BURNING CRANMER.	
For an 100 of wood fagots,	6 0
For an 100 and half of furs fagots,	3 4
For the carriage of them,	0 8
To two laborers,	1 4.”

£1500 to *bury* a nobleman, and £1 16 6, to *burn* three martyrs! Leaving the Courier and Enquirer, and the "*friend, learned in such lore,*" to *bury* or to *burn* this record, as they please, I turn to another subject, referred to, on the very same page of Strype's Memorials, and which is not without some little interest, at the present moment.

A prisoner, charged with any terrible offence, innocent or guilty, lies under the *surveillance* of all eyes and ears. The slightest act, the shortest word, the very breath of his nostrils are carefully reported. The public resolves itself into a committee of anxious inquirers, to ascertain precisely how he eats, and drinks, and sleeps. There are persons of lively fancies, whose imaginations fire up, at the mere sight of his prison walls, and start off, under high pressure, filling the air with rumors, too horribly delightful, to be doubted for an instant.

If the topic were not the terrible thing that it is, it would be difficult to preserve one's gravity, while listening to some portion of the testimony, upon which, it may be our fortune, one of these days, to be convicted of murder, by the charitable public.

Of the guilt or innocence of John White Webster I *know* nothing, and I *believe* nothing. But it has been currently reported, that, since his confinement, he has been detected, in the crime of eating oysters. I doubt, if this ordeal would have been considered entirely satisfactory, even by Dr. Mather, in 1692. Man is a marvellous monster, when sitting, self-placed, in judgment, on his fellow! The very thing, which is a sin, in the commission or observance, is no less a sin, in the omission and the breach—for who will doubt the blood-guiltiness of a man, that, while confined, on a charge of murder, can partake of an oyster pie! And if he cannot do this, who will doubt, that a consciousness of guilt has deprived him of his appetite!

I have heard of a drunken husband, who, while staggering home, after midnight, communed with himself, as follows—"If my wife has gone to bed, before I get home to supper, I'll beat her,—and if she is sitting up, so late as this, burning my wood and candles, I'll beat her."

Good John Strype, *ibid.* 562, says of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, while in the prison of Bocardo—"They ate constantly suppers as well as dinners. Their meals amounted to about three or four shillings; seldom exceeding four. Their bread and ale commonly came to two pence or three pence; they had

constantly cheese and pears for their last dish, both at dinner and supper; and always wine." It is not uninteresting to note the prices, paid for certain articles of their diet, in those days, 1555. While describing the *provant* of these martyrs, Strype annexes the prices, "*it being an extraordinary dear time.*—A goose, 14d. A pig, 12 oz. 13d. A cony, 6d. A woodcock, 3d. and sometimes 5d. A couple of chickens, 6d. Three plovers, 10d. Half a dozen larks, 3d. A dozen of larks and 2 plovers, 10d. A breast of veal, 11d. A shoulder of mutton, 10d. Roast beef, 12d." He presents one of Cranmer's bills of fare:—

"Bread and ale,	2.d.
Item oisters,	1.d.
Item butter,	2.d.
Item eggs,	2.d.
Item lyng,	8.d.
Item a piece of fresh salmon, . . .	10.d.
Wine,	3.d.
Cheese and pears,	2.d."

Two bailiffs, Wells and Winkle, upon their own responsibility, furnished the table of these martyrs, and appear never to have been reimbursed. Strype says, *ibid.* 563, that they expended £63 10s. 2d., and never received but £20, which they obtained from Sir William Petre, Secretary of State. Ten years after, a petition was presented to the successor of Cranmer, that these poor bailiffs might receive some recompense.

After the pile had burnt down, in the case of Cranmer, upon raking among the embers, his heart was found entire. Upon this incident, Strype exclaims—"Methinks it is a pity, that his heart, that remained sound in the fire, and was found unconsumed in his ashes, was not preserved in some urn; which, when the better times of Queen Elizabeth came, might, in memory of this truly good and great Thomas of Canterbury, have been placed among his predecessors, in his church there, as one of the truest glories of that See."

In 1821, Mr. William Ward, of Serampore, published, in London, his "*Farewell Letters.*" Mr. Ward was a Baptist missionary; and, at the time of the publication, was preparing to return to Bengal. This work was very favorably reviewed in the *Christian Observer*, vol. xxi. p. 504. I have never met with a description, so exceedingly minute, of the *sultee*, the process of

burning widows. He thus describes the funeral pile—"The funeral pile consists of a quantity of fagots, laid on the earth, rising, in height, about three feet from the ground, about four feet wide, and six feet in length." Admitting these fagots to be closely packed, the pile contains seventy-two cubic feet of wood, or fifty-six less than a cord. "*A large quantity of fagots are then laid upon the bodies,*" says Mr. Ward. As the widow often leaps from the pile, and is chased back again, into the flames, by the benevolent Bramins, the fagots, which are not heaped *around* the pile, but "*laid on the bodies,*" cannot be a very oppressive load; and the quantity, thus employed in the *suttee*, is for the cremation of two bodies, at least, the dead husband, and the living widow.

There can be no doubt of the superior economy of cremation, over earth-burial. The notions of an "*expensive process,*" and the "*immense quantities of fuel,*" have no foundation in practice. If the ashes, as has been sometimes the case, were given to the winds, or cast upon the waters, the expense of cremation would be exceedingly small. But cremation, however inexpensive, in itself, has led to unmeasured extravagance, in the matter of urns of the most costly materials, and workmanship, of which an ample account may be found, in the *Hydriotaphia* of Sir Thomas Browne, London, 1835, vol. iii. p. 449.

More remarkable changes have occurred, in modern times, than a revival of the practice of cremation. It is an error, however, to suppose this practice to have been the original mode of dealing with the dead. It was very general about the year 1225, B. C., but the usage, at the present day, was, doubtless, the primitive practice of mankind. So thought Cicero, *De Legibus* ii. 22. "*Ac mihi quidem antiquissimum sepulturæ genus id fuisse videtur, quo apud Xenophontem Cyrus utitur. Reddatur enim terræ corpus, et ita locatum ac situm, quasi operimento matris obducitur.*"

Nevertheless, there is a strong cremation party among us. Who would not save sixpence, if he could, even in a winding-sheet! Should the wood and lumber interest be fairly represented, in our city councils, it would not be surprising, if there should be a majority, in favor of taking the remains of our citizens to Nova Scotia, to be burnt, rather than to Malden, to be buried. My friends, Birch, Touchwood, and Deal, are of this opinion; and would be happy to receive the citizens on board

their regular coasters, for this purpose, at a reasonable price, per hundred, or by the single citizen—packed in ice.

An experienced person will be always on hand, to receive the corpses. Religious services will be duly performed, during the burning, without extra charge; and, should the project find favor with the public, a regular line of funeral coasters, with appropriate emblems, and figure-heads, will, in due time, be established. Those, who prefer the more economical mode of water-burial, for their departed relatives, thereby saving the expense of fuel altogether, will be accommodated, if they will leave orders in writing, with the masters on board, who will personally superintend the dropping of the bodies, off soundings.

No. LXXV.

WHILE attempting to rectify the supposed mistakes of other men, we sometimes commit egregious blunders ourselves. In turning over an old copy of John Josselyn's *Voyages to New England*, in 1638 and 1663, my attention was attracted, by a particular passage, and a marginal manuscript note, intended to correct what the annotator supposed, and what some readers might suppose, to be a blunder of the printer, or the author. The passage runs thus—"In 1602, these North parts were further discovered by Capt. *Bartholomew Gosnold*. The first *English* that planted there, set down not far from the *Narragansetts Bay*, and called their Colony *Plimouth*, since old *Plimouth, An. Dom., 1602.*" The annotator had written, on the margin, "*gross blunder,*" and, in both instances, run his indignant pen through 1602, and substituted 1620. There are others, doubtless, who would have done the same thing. The first aspect of the thing is certainly very tempting. The text, nevertheless, is undoubtedly correct. It is altogether likely, that the matter, stated by Josselyn, can be found, so stated by no other writer. In 1602, Gosnold discovered the Elizabeth Islands, and built a house, and erected palisades, on the "Island Elizabeth," the westernmost of the group, whose Indian name was Cuttyhunk. In 1797, Dr. Jeremy Belknap visited this interesting spot. "*We had the supreme satisfaction,*" says he, *Am. Biog.* ii. 115, "*to find the cellar of Gosnold's store-house!*"

Hutchinson, i. 1, refers expressly to the passage, in Josselyn; and after stating that Gosnold discovered the Elizabeth Islands, in 1602, and built a fort there, and intended a settlement, but could not persuade his people to remain, he adds, in a note—*"This, I suppose, is what Josselyn, and no other author, calls the first colony of New Plimouth, for he says it was begun in 1602, and near Narragansett Bay."*

The writer of a "Topographical Description of New Bedford," M. H. C., iv. 234, states, that the island, on which Gosnold built his fort and store-house, was *Nashaun*, and refers to Dr. Belknap's Biography. The New Bedford writer is wrong, in point of fact, and right, in point of reference. Dr. Belknap published the first volume of his Biography, in 1794, containing a short notice of Gosnold, in which, p. 236, he says—"The island, on which Gosnold and his companions took up their abode, is now called by its Indian name, *Nashaun*, and is the property of the Hon. James Bowdoin, of Boston, to whom I am indebted for these remarks on Gosnold's journal." The writer of the description of New Bedford published his account, the following year, and relied on Dr. Belknap, who unfortunately relied on his informant, who, it seems, was entirely mistaken.

Dr. Belknap published his second volume, in 1798, with a new and more extended memoir of Gosnold, in which, p. 100, he remarks—"The account of Gosnold's voyage and discovery, in the first volume of this work, is so erroneous, from the misinformation, which I had received, that I thought it best to write the whole of it anew. The former mistakes are here corrected, partly from the best information which I could obtain, after the most assiduous inquiry; but principally from *my own observations*, on the spot; compared with the journal of the voyage, more critically examined than before."

Here is abundant evidence of that scrupulous regard for historical truth, for which that upright and excellent man was ever remarkable. With most writers, the pride of authorship would have revolted. The very thought of these *vestigia retrorsum*, would not have found toleration, for a moment. Some less offensive mode might have been adopted, by the employment of *errata*, or *appendices*, or *addenda*. Not so: this conscientious man, however innocently, had misled the public, upon a few historical points, and nothing would give him satisfaction, but a public recantation. His right hand had not been the agent, like

Cranmer's, of voluntary falsehood, but of unintentional mistake, like Scævola's; and nothing would suffice, in his opinion, but the actual cautery.

In this second life of Gosnold, p. 114, after describing "the island Elizabeth," or Cuttyhunk, Dr. Belknap says—"To this spot I went, on the 20th day of June, 1797, in company with several gentlemen, whose curiosity and obliging kindness induced them to accompany me. The protecting hand of nature had reserved this favorite spot to herself. Its fertility and its productions are exactly the same, as in Gosnold's time, excepting the wood, of which there is none. Every species of what he calls 'rubbish,' with strawberries, pears, tansy, and other fruits, and herbs, appear in rich abundance, unmolested by any animal but aquatic birds. We had the supreme satisfaction to find the cellar of Gosnold's store-house."

"*We had the supreme satisfaction to find the cellar of Gosnold's store-house!*"—A whole-souled ejaculation this! I reverence the memory of the man, who made it. It is not every other man we meet on 'Change, who can estimate a sentiment like this. My little Jew friend, in Griper's Alley, entirely mistakes the case. Never having heard of Bart Gosnold before, he takes him, for the like of Kidd; and the venerable Dr. Jeremy Belknap, for a gold-finder. What *supreme satisfaction* could there be, in discovering the cellar of a store-house, nearly two hundred years old, unless hidden treasures were there concealed! How, in the name of two per cent. a month, and all the other gods we worship, could a visit down to Cuttyhunk ever *pay*, only to stare at the stones of an ancient cellar!

Dr. Belknap's ejaculation reminds one of divers interesting matters—of Archimedes, when he leaped from his bath, and ran about naked, for joy, with *eureka* on his lips, having excogitated the plan, for detecting the fraud, practised upon Hiero.—It also recalls—*parvis componere magna*—Johnson's memorable exclamation, upon walking over the graves, at Icolmkill—"To abstract the mind from all local emotion would be impossible, if it were endeavored, and would be foolish, if it were possible. Whatever withdraws us from the power of our senses; whatever makes the past, the distant or the future predominate over the present, advances us in the dignity of thinking beings. Far from me and from my friends be such frigid philosophy, as may conduct as indifferent and unmoved over any ground,

which has been dignified by wisdom, bravery or virtue. That man is little to be envied, whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plains of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona."

Dr. Jeremy Belknap was a Boston boy, born June 4, 1744. He learned his rudiments, under the effective birch of Master Lovell; graduated A. M. at Harvard, 1762, S. T. D. 1792. He was ordained pastor of the church in Dover, N. H. 1767; and in 1787, he became pastor of the church in Berry Street, formerly known as Johnny Moorehead's, who was settled there in 1730, and succeeded, by David Annan, in 1783, and which is now Dr. Gannett's.

Dr. Belknap was the founder of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and one of the most earnest promoters of the welfare of Harvard College.

Dr. Belknap published sermons, on various occasions; a volume of dissertations, on the character and resurrection of Christ; his history of New Hampshire, in three volumes; his American Biography, in two volumes; and the Foresters, an American Tale, well worthy of republication, at the present day. He wrote extensively, in the newspapers, and published several essays, on the slave trade, and upon the early settlement of the country.

I have the most perfect recollection of this excellent man; for I saw him often, when I was very young; and I used to wonder, how a man, with so rough a voice, could bestow such a benign and captivating smile, upon little boys.

The churchman prays to be delivered from *sudden* death. Dr. Belknap prayed for *sudden* death—that he might be translated "*in a moment*"—such were his words. Yet here is no discrepancy. No man, prepared to die, will pray for a lingering death—and to him, who is not prepared, no death, however prolonged, can be other than *sudden* and premature. On the ninth of February, 1791, Dr. Belknap was called to mourn the loss of a friend, whose death was immediate. Among the Dr's papers, after his decease, the following lines were found, bearing the date of that friend's demise, and exhibiting, with considerable felicity of language, his own views and aspirations:—

"When faith and patience, hope and love
Have made us meet for Heav'n above;
How blest the privilege to rise,
Snatch'd, in a moment, to the skies!"

Unconscious, to resign our breath,
 Nor taste the bitterness of death!
 Such be my lot, Lord, if thou please
 To die in silence, and at ease;
 When thou dost know, that I'm prepar'd,
 Oh seize me quick to my reward.
 But, if thy wisdom sees it best,
 To turn thine ear from this request;
 If sickness be th' appointed way,
 To waste this frame of human clay;
 If, worn with grief, and rack'd with pain,
 This earth must turn to earth again;
 Then let thine angels round me stand;
 Support me, by thy powerful hand;
 Let not my faith or patience move,
 Nor aught abate my hope or love;
 But brighter may my graces shine,
 Till they're absorb'd in light divine."

The will of the Lord coincided with the wish of this eminent disciple; and his was the sudden death, that he had asked of God. At 4 o'clock in the morning of June 20, 1798, paralysis seized upon his frame, and, before noon, he was no more.

Personal considerations of the flesh cannot be supposed, alone, to have moved the heart of this benevolent man. Who would not wish to avoid that pain, which is reflected, for days, and weeks, and months, and years, from the faces of those we love, who watch, and weep, about the bed of disease and death! Who can imagine this veteran soldier of the cross, with his armor of righteousness, upon the right hand and upon the left, awaiting the welcome signal to depart—without adopting, in the spiritual, and in the physical, sense, the language of the prophet—" *Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.*"

No. LXXVI.

I NEVER dream, if I can possibly avoid it—when the thing is absolutely forced upon me, why that is another affair. On the evening of the second day of January, 1850, from some inexplicable cause, I lost all appetite for my pillow. I had, till past eleven, been engaged, in the perusal of Goethe's Confessions of a Fair Saint. After a vain trial of the commonplace expedi-

ents, such as counting leaping sheep, up to a thousand and one ; humming Old Hundred ; and fixing my thoughts upon the heads of good parson Cleverly's last Sabbath sermon, on perseverance ; I, fortunately, thought of Joel Barlow's Columbiad, and, after two or three pages, went, thankfully, to bed. I threw myself upon my right side, as I always do ; for, being deaf—very—in the sinister ear, I thus exclude the nocturnal cries of fire, oysters, and murder.

I think I must have been asleep, full half an hour, by a capital Shrewsbury clock, that I keep in my chamber. It was, of course, on the dawning side of twelve—the very time, when dreams are true, or poets lie, which latter alternative is impossible. I was aroused, by the stroke of a deep-toned bell ; and, in an instant, sat bolt upright, listening to the sound. I should have known it, among a thousand—it was the old passing bell of King's Chapel. I am confident, as to the bell—it had the full, jarring sound, occasioned by the blockhead of a sexton, who cracked it, in 1814. I counted the strokes—one—two—three—an adult male, of course—and then the age—seventy-four was the number of the strokes of that good old bell, corresponding with the years of his pilgrimage—and then a pause—I almost expected another—so, doubtless, did he, poor man—but it came not !—Some old stager, thought I, has put up, for the long night ; and the power of slumber was upon me, in a moment.

I slept—but it was a fitful sleep—and I dreamt such a dream, as none but a sexton of the old school can ever dream—

—————"velut ægri somnia, vanæ
Finguntur species, ut nec pes, nec caput uni
Reddatur formæ."

"Funeral baked meats," and bride's cake, and weepers, and wedding rings seemed oddly consorted together. At one moment, two very light and airy skeletons seemed to be engaged, in dancing the polka ; and, getting angry, flung their skulls furiously at each other. I then fancied, that I saw old Grossman, driving his hearse at a full run, with the corpse of an intemperate old lady, not to the graveyard, but, by mistake, to the very shop, where she bought her Jamaica. I dare not relate the half of my dream, lest I should excite some doubt of my veracity. For aught I know, I might have dreamt on till midsummer, had not a hand been laid on my shoulder, and a change come over the spirit of my dream, in a marvellous manner—for I actually

dreamt I was wider awake, than I often am, when Sirius rages, of a summer afternoon, and I am taking my comfort, in my post-prandial chair.

Starting suddenly, I beheld the well known features of an old acquaintance and fellow-spadesman—"Don't you know me?" "Yes," said I—"no, I can't say I do"—for I was confoundedly frightened—"Not know me! Haven't we lifted, head and foot, together, for six and thirty years?" "Well, I suppose we have; but you are so deadly pale; and, will you be so kind as to take your hand from my shoulder; for it's rather airy, at this season, you know, and your palm is like the hand of death." "And such it is," said he—"did you not hear my bell?" "*Your bell?*" I inquired, gazing more intently, at the little, white-haired, old man, that stood before me. "Even so, Abner," he replied; "your old friend, and fellow-laborer, Martin Smith, is dead. I always had a solemn affection, for the passing bell. It sounded not so pleasantly, to be sure, in the neighborhood of theatres and gay hotels; and its good, old, solemnizing tones are no longer permitted to be heard. I longed to hear it, once more; and, after they had laid me out, and left me alone, I clapped on my great coat, over my shroud, as you see, and ran up to the church, and tolled my own death peal. When, more than one hundred years ago, in 1747, Dr. Caner took possession, in the old way, by entering, and closing the doors, and tolling the bell, as the Rev. Roger Price had done before, in 1729, he did not feel, that the church belonged to him, half so truly as I have felt, for many years, whenever I got a fair grip of that ancient bell-rope."

"Martin," said I, "this is rather a long speech, for a ghost; and must be wearying to the spirit; suppose you sit down." This I said, because I really supposed the good, little, old man, contrary to all his known habits, was practising upon my credulity—perhaps upon my fears; and was playing a new year's prank, in his old age: and I resolved, by the smallest touch of sarcasm in the world, to show him, that I was not so easily deceived. He made no reply; but, drawing my hand between his great coat and shroud, placed it over the region of his heart—"Good God! you are really dead then, Martin!" said I, for all was cold and still there. "I am," he replied. "I have lived long—did you count the strokes of my bell?"—I nodded assent, for I could not speak.—"Four years beyond the scriptural measure of man's

pilgrimage. You are not so old as I am"—"No," I replied.—"No, not quite," said he.—"No, no, Martin," said I, adjusting my night cap, "not by several years."—"Well," said the old man, with a sigh, "a few years make very little difference, when one has so many to answer for; those odd years are like a few odd shillings, in a very long account. I have come to ask you to go with me."—A cold sweat broke through my skin, as quickly, as if it had been mere tissue paper; and my mind instantly sprang to the work of finding devices, for putting the old man off. "Surely," said he, observing my reluctance, "you would not deny the request of a dying man." "Perhaps not," I replied, "but now that you are dead, dear Martin, for Heaven's sake, what's the use of it?"

The old man seemed to be pained, by my hesitation—"Abner," said he, after a short pause, "you and I have had a goodly number of strange passages, at odd hours, down in that vault—are ye afeard, Abner—eh!"—"Why, as to that, Martin," said I, "if you were a real, live sexton, I'd go with pleasure; but our relations are somewhat changed, you will admit. Besides, as I told you before, I cannot see the use of it." I felt rather vexed, to be suspected of fear.

"You have the advantage of me, Abner Wycherly," said Martin Smith, "being alive; and I have come to ask you to do a favor, for me, which I cannot do, for myself."—"What is it?" said I, rather impatiently, perhaps.—"I want you to embalm my"—"Martin," said I, interrupting him—"I can't—I never embalmed in my life." "You misunderstand me"—the old man replied—"I want you to embalm my memory; and preserve it, from the too common lot of our profession, who are remembered, often, as resurrectionists, and men of intemperate lives, and mysterious conversations. I want you to allow me a little *niche*, among your *Dealings with the Dead*. I shall take but little room, you see for yourself"—and then, in an under-tone, he said something about thinking more of the honor, than he should of a place in Westminster Abbey; which was very agreeable, to be sure, notwithstanding the sepulchral tone, in which it was uttered. Indeed I was surprised to find how very refreshing, to the spirits of an author, this species of extreme unction might be, administered even by a ghost.

"Martin," said I, "I have always thought highly of your good opinion; but what can I say—how can I serve you?"

"I am desirous," said he, "of transmitting to my children a good name, which is better than riches."—"Well, my worthy, old fellow-laborer," I replied, "if that is all you want, the work is done to your hand, already. You will not suspect me of flattering you to your face, now that you are dead, Martin; and I can truly say, that I have heard thousands speak of you, with great kindness and respect, and never a lisp against you. All this I am ready to vouch for—but, for what purpose, do you ask me to go with you?"

"I wish you to go with me, and examine for yourself," said the old man; "and then you can speak, of your own knowledge. Don't refuse me—let us have one more of those cozy walks, Abner, under the old Chapel, and over that yard. I desire to talk over some things with you there, which can be better understood, upon the spot—and I want to explain one or two matters, so that you may be able to defend my reputation, should any censure be cast upon it, after I am gone."—"I cannot go with you tonight, Martin," said I; "I see a gleam in the East, already."—"True," said he, "I may be missed."—For not more than the half of one second, I closed my eyes—and, in that twinkling of an eye, he was gone—but I heard him whisper, distinctly, as he went—"tomorrow night!"

No. LXXVII.

I VERILY believe, that ghosts are the most punctual people in the world, especially if they were ever sextons, after the flesh. The last stroke of twelve had not ceased ringing in my ears, when that icy palm was again laid upon my shoulder; and Martin Smith stood by the side of my bed.

"Well, Martin," said I, "since you have taken the trouble to come out again, and upon such a stormy night withal, I cannot refuse your request."—It seemed to me, that I rose to put on my garments, and found them already on; and had scarcely prepared to go, with my old friend, to the Chapel, before we were in the middle of the broad aisle. Dreams are marvellous things, certainly—all this was a dream, I suppose—for, if it was not—what was it?

There seemed to be an oppressive weight, upon the mind of my old friend, connected, doubtless, with those explanations, which he had proposed to make, upon the spot. We sat down, near Governor Shirley's monument. "Abner," said he, "I wish, before I am buried, to make a clean breast, and to confess my misdeeds."—"I cannot believe, Martin," I replied, "that there is a very heavy, professional load upon your conscience. If there is, I know not what will become of the rest of us. But I will hearken to all you may choose to reveal."—"Well," resumed the old man, with a sigh, "I have tried to be conscientious, but we are all liable to error—we are all fallible creatures, especially sextons. I have been sexton here, for six and thirty years; and I am often painfully reminded, that, in the year 1815, I was rather remiss, in dusting the pews."—"Have you any other burden upon your conscience?"—"I have," he replied; and, rising, requested me to follow him.

He went out into the yard, and walked near the northerly corner, where Dr. Caner's house formerly stood, which was afterwards occupied, as the Boston Athenæum, and, more recently, gave place to the present Savings Bank. "Here," said he, "thirty years ago, Dinah Furbush, a worthy, negro woman, was buried. The careless carpenter made her coffin one foot too short; and, to conceal his blunder, chopped off Dinah's head, and, clapping it between her feet, nailed down the lid. This scandalous transaction came to my knowledge, and I grieve to say, that I never communicated it to the wardens."—"Well, Martin," said I, "what more?"—"Nothing, thank Heaven!" he replied. Giving way to an irresistible impulse, I broke forth into a roar of laughter, so long and loud, that three watchmen gathered to the wall, and seeing Martin Smith, whom they well knew, with the bottom of his shroud, exhibited below his great coat, they dropped their hooks and rattles, and ran for their lives. Martin walked slowly back to the church, and I followed.

He walked in, among the tombs—thousands of spirits seemed to welcome his advent—but, as I crossed the threshold, at the tramp of a living foot, they vanished, in a moment.

"How many corpses have you lifted, my old friend, in your six and thirty years of office?" "About five thousand," he replied, "exclusive of babies. It is a very grateful employment, when one becomes used to it."

"I have heard," continued Martin, "that the office of executioner, in Paris, is highly respectable, and has been hereditary, for many years, in the family of the Sansons. I have done all in my power, to elevate our profession; and it is my highest ambition, that the office should continue in my family; and that my descendants may be sextons, till the graves shall give up their dead, and death itself be swallowed up in victory." I was sensibly touched, by the enthusiasm of this good old official; for I honor the man, who honors his calling. I could not refrain from saying a few kind and respectful words, of the old man's son and successor. He was moved—"The eyes of ghosts," said he, "are tearless, or I should weep. You have heard," continued the old man, in a low, tremulous voice, "that, when the mother of Washington was complimented, by some distinguished men, upon the achievements of her son, she went on with her knitting, saying, '*Well, George always was a good boy*'—now, I need say no more of Frank; and, in truth, I can say no less. I knew he would be a sexton. He has forgotten it, I dare say; but he was not satisfied with the first go-cart he ever had, till he had fashioned it, like a hearse. He *took hold right*, from the beginning. When I resigned, and gave him the keys, and felt, that I should no more walk up and down the broad aisle, as I had done, for so many years, I wept like a child."

"Yours has been a hale old age. You have always been *temperate*, I believe," said I.—"No," the old man replied, "I have always been *abstinent*. Like yourself, I use no intoxicating drink, upon any occasion, nor tobacco, in any of its forms, and we have come, as you say, to a hale old age. I have seen drunken sextons squirt tobacco juice over the coffin and pall; and let the corpse go by the run; and I know more than one successor of St. Peter, in this city, who smoke and chew, from morning to night; and give the sextons great trouble, in cleaning up after them."

We had advanced midway, among the tombs.—"It is awfully cold and dark here, Martin," said I, "and I hear something, like a mysterious breathing in the air; and, now and then, it seems as if a feather brushed my cheek."—"Is it unpleasant?" said the old man.—"Not particularly agreeable," I replied.—"The spirits are aware, that another is added to their number," said he, "and even the presence of one, in the flesh, will

scarcely restrain them from coming forth. I will send them back to their dormitories." He lighted a spirit lamp, not in the vulgar sense of that word, but a lamp, before whose rays no spirit, however determined, could stand, for an instant.

There is comfort, even in a farthing rush light—I felt warmer. "What a subterranean life you must have had of it," said I, "and how many tears and sighs you must have witnessed!" "Why yes," he replied, with a shake of the head, and a sigh, "the duties of my office have given to my features an expression of universal compassion—a sort of omnibus look, which has caused many a mourner to say—'Ah, Mr. Smith, I see how much you feel for me.' And I'm sure I did; not perhaps quite so keenly as I might, if I had been less frequently encoined in the performance of my melancholy part. "Yes," continued the old man—"I have witnessed tears and sighs, and deep grief, and shallow, and raving—for a month, and life-long; very proper tears, gushing from the eyes of widows, already wooed and won; and from the eyes of widowers, who, in a right melancholy way, had predetermined the mothers, for their orphan children. But passages have occurred, now and then, all in my sad vocation, pure and holy, and soul-stirring enough, to give pulse to a heart of stone."

The old man took from his pocket a master key, and beckoned me to follow. He opened an ancient tomb. The mouldy shells were piled one upon another, and a few rusty fragments of that flimsy garniture, which was in vogue of old, had fallen on the bricks below.

"*Sacred to the memory!*" said the old man, with a sad, significant smile, upon his intelligent features, as he removed the coffin of a child. I looked into the little receptacle, as he raised the lamp. "This," said he, "was the most beautiful boy I ever buried." "This?" said I, for the little narrow house contained nothing but a small handful of grayish dust. "Aye," he replied, "I see; it is all gone now—it is twelve years since I looked at it last—there were some remnants of bones then, and a lock or two of golden hair. This small deposit was one of the first that I made, in this melancholy savings bank. Six-and-thirty years! So tender and so frail a thing may well be turned to dust.

"Time is an alchymist, Abner, as you and I well know. If tears could have embalmed, it would not have been thus. I

have never witnessed such agony. The poor, young mother lies there. She was not seventeen, when she died. In a luckless hour, she married a very gentlemanly sot, and left her native home, for a land of strangers. Hers was the common fate of such unequal bargains. He wasted her little property, died of intemperance, and left her nothing, but this orphan boy. And all the love of her warm, young heart was turned upon this child. It had, to be sure, the sweetest, catching smile, that I ever beheld.

"Their heart strings seemed twisted together—the child pined; and the mother grew pale and wan. They waned together. The child died first. The poor, lone, young mother seemed frantic; and refused to part with her idol. After the little thing was made ready for the tomb, she would not suffer it to be removed. It was laid upon the bed, beside her. On the following day, I carried the coffin to the house; and, leaving it below, went up, with a kind neighbor, to the chamber, hoping to prevail upon the poor thing, to permit us to remove the body of the child. She was holding her little boy, clasped in her arms—their lips were joined together—"It is a pity to awaken her," said the neighbor, who attended me—I put my hand upon her forehead—"Nothing but the last trump will awaken her," said I—"she is dead."

"Well, Martin," said I, "pray let us talk of something else—where is old Isaac Johnson, the founder of the city, who was buried, in this lot, in 1630?"—"Ah"—the old man replied—"the prophets, where are *they*! I believe you may as well look among the embers, after a conflagration, for the original spark."

"You must know many curious things, Martin," said I, "concerning this ancient temple."—"I do," said he, "of my own knowledge, and still more, by tradition; and some things, that neither the wardens nor vestry wot of. If I thought I might trust you, Abner, in a matter of such moment, but"—"Did I ever deceive you, Martin," said I, "while living; and do you think I would take advantage of your confidence, now you are a ghost?"—"Pardon me, Abner," he replied, for he saw, that he had wounded my feelings, "but the matter, to which I allude, were it made public, would produce terrible confusion—but I will trust you—meet me here, at ten minutes before twelve, on Sabbath night—three low knocks upon the outer door—at present I can reveal no more."—"No postponement, on account of

the weather?" I inquired.—"None," the old man replied, and locked up the tomb.

"Did you ever see Dr. Caner," I inquired, as we ascended into the body of the church.—"That," replied Martin Smith, "is rather a delicate question. In the very year, in which I was born, 1776, the Rev. Doctor Henry Caner, then an old man, carried off the church plate, 2800 ounces of silver, the gift of three kings; of which not a particle has ever been recovered: and, in lieu thereof, he left behind his fervent prayers, that God would *"change the hearts of the rebels."* This the Almighty has never seen fit to do—so that the society have not only lost the silver, but the benefit of Dr. Caner's prayers. No, Abner, I have never seen Dr. Caner, according to the flesh, but—ask me nothing further, on this highly exciting subject, till we meet again."

I awoke, sorely disturbed—Martin had vanished.

No. LXXVIII.

I KNOW not why, but the idea of another meeting with Martin Smith, notwithstanding my affectionate respect, for that good old man, disturbed me so much, that I resolved, to be out of his way, by keeping awake. But, in defiance of my very best efforts, strengthened by a bowl of unsugared hyson, at half past eleven, if I err not, I fell into a profound slumber; and, at the very appointed moment, found myself, at the Chapel door. At the third knock, it opened, with an almost alarming suddenness—I quietly entered—and the old man closed it softly, after me.

"In ten minutes," said he, "the congregation will assemble."—"What," I inquired, "at this time of night?"—"Be silent," said he, rather angrily, as I thought; and, drawing me, by the arm, to the north side of the door, he shoved me against the Vassal monument, with a force, that I would not have believed it possible, for any modern ghost to exert. "Be still and listen," said he. "In 1782, my dear, old pastor, Dr. Freeman, came here, as Reader; and became Rector, in 1787. Dr. Caner was inducted, in 1747, and continued Rector, twenty-nine years; for,

as I told you, he went off with the plate, in 1776. There were no Rectors, between those two. Brockwell and Troutbeck were Caner's assistants only: the first died in 1755, and the last left, the year before Dr. Caner."

"Well," continued the old man, "never reveal what I am about to tell you, Abner Wycherly—the Trinitarians have never surrendered their claims, upon this Church; and, precisely at midnight, upon every Sabbath, since 1776, Dr. Caner and the congregation have gathered here; and the Church service has been performed, just as it used to be, before the revolution. They make short work of it, rarely exceeding fifteen minutes—hush, for your life—they are coming!"

A glare of unearthly light, invisible through the windows, as Martin assured me, to all without, filled the tabernacle, in an instant—exceedingly like gas light; and, at the same instant, I heard a rattling, resembling the down-sitting, after prayers, in a village meeting-house, where the seats are clappers, and go on hinges. Observing, that my jaws chattered, Martin pressed my hand in his icy fingers, and whispered, that it was nothing but Dr. Caner's congregation, coming up, rather less silently, of course, than when they were in the flesh.

Being the first Sunday in the month, all the communion plate, that Caner carried off, was paraded, on the altar. I wish the twelve apostles could have seen it. It glittered, like Jones, Ball & Poor's bow-window, viewed from the old, Donnison corner. The whole interior of the Chapel was marvellously changed. I was much struck, by a showy, gilt crown, over the organ, supported by a couple of gilt mitres. This was the famous organ, said to have been selected by Handel, and which came over in 1756.

At this moment, a brief and sudden darkness hid everything from view; succeeded, instantly, by a brighter light than before; and all was changed. The organ had vanished; the monuments of Shirley and Aphthorp, and the tablet of Price, over the vestry door, were gone; I looked behind me, for the Vassal monument, against which I had been leaning; it was no longer there. Martin Smith perceived my astonishment, and whispered, that Dr. Caner was never so partial to the Stone Chapel, which was opened in 1754, as he was to the ancient King's Chapel, in which he had been inducted in 1747, and in which we then were.

The pews were larger than any Hingham boxes I ever saw; but very small. The pulpit was on the north side. In front of it was the governor's pew, highly ornamented, lined with China silk; the cushions and chairs therein were covered with crimson damask, and the window curtain was of the same material. Near to this, I saw an elevated pew, in which were half a dozen fine looking skeletons, with their heads up and their arms akimbo. This pew, Martin informed me, was reserved, for the officers of the army and navy. A small organ was in the western gallery, said to be the first, ever heard in our country. From the walls and pillars, hung several escutcheons and armorial bearings. I distinguished those of the royal family, and of Andros, Nicholson, Hamilton, Dudley, Shute, Belcher, and Shirley.

I had always associated the *hour-glass* with my ideas of a Presbyterian pulpit, in the olden time, when the very length of the discourse gave the hearer some little foretaste of eternity. I was rather surprised to see an hour-glass, of large proportions, perched upon the pulpit, in its highly ornamented stand of brass. The altar-piece was at the easterly end of the Church, with the Glory, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and some texts of Scripture.

The congregation had taken their seats; and a slender, sickly looking skeleton glided into the reading desk. "Dr. Caner?" said I. "Brockwell, the assistant," replied Martin, in a whisper, "the very first wardens, of 1686, are in the pew, tonight, Bullivant and Banks. They all serve in rotation. Next Sabbath, we shall have Foxcroft and Ravenscroft. Clerke Hill, and Rutley are sextons, tonight."

The services were very well conducted; and, taking all things into consideration, I was surprised, that I comprehended so well, as I did. The prayer, for the royal family, was very impressively delivered. The assistant made use, I observed, of the Athanasian creed, and every one seemed to understand it, at which I was greatly surprised. Dr. Caner seemed very feeble, and preached a very short discourse upon the loss of Esau's birthright, making a pointed application, to the conversion of King's Chapel, by the Unitarians. He made rather a poor case of it, I thought. Martin was so much offended, that he said, though being a ghost, he was obliged to be quiet, he wished I would call the watch, and break up the meeting. I told him, that I did not believe Dr. Caner's arguments would have any

very mischievous effect; and it seemed not more than fair, that these ancient worshippers should have the use of the church, at midnight, so long as they conducted themselves orderly—consumed no fuel—and furnished their own light.

One of the sextons, passing near me, accidentally dropped a small parcel. I was seized with a vehement desire of possessing it; and, watching my opportunity, conveyed it to my pocket. When Dr. Caner pronounced his final amen, light was instantly turned into darkness—a slight noise ensued—“*the service is over!*” said Martin, and all was still. I begged Martin to light his lamp; and, by its light, I examined the parcel the sexton had dropped. It was a small roll, containing some extracts from the records. They were not without interest. “Sept. 21, 1691.—It must not be forgot that Sir Robert Robertson gave a new silk damask cushion and cloth pulpit-cover.” “1697.—Whit Sunday. Paid Mr. Coneyball, for buying and carting Poses and hanging the Doares 8s.” “Dec. 20.—Paid for a stone Gug Clark Hill broak.” “March 29, 1698.—Paid Mr. Shelson for Loucking after the Boyes £1.” “1701, Aug. 4.—Paid for scouring the brass frame for the hour-glass 10s.” “1733, Oct. 11.—Voted that the Brass Stand for the hour-glass be lent to the church of Scituate, as also three Diaper napkins, provided Mr. Addington Davenport, their minister, gives his note to return the same to the Church wardens of the Church, &c.” “April 3, 1740.—Rec’d of Mr. Sylvester Gardner Sixteen Pounds Two Shills, in full for wine for the Chapple for the year past. John Hancock.”

I was about to put this fragment of the record into my pocket—“If,” said Martin, “you do not particularly covet a visit from Clark Hill, or whichever of the old sextons it was, that dropped that paper, leave it, as you found it.” I did so, most joyfully.

“If you have any questions to ask of me,” said the old man, “ask them now, and briefly, for we are about to part—to meet no more, until we meet, as I trust we shall, in a better world.” “As a mere matter of curiosity,” said I, “I should like to know, if you consider your venerable pastor, now dead and gone, Dr. Freeman, as the successor of Saint Peter?” “No more,” said Martin Smith, with an expression almost too comical for a ghost, “than I consider you and myself successors of the sexton, who, under the directions of Abraham, buried Sarah, in the cave of the field of Machpelah, before Mamre.” “Do you consider the

Apostolical succession broken off, at the time of Dr. Freeman's ordination?" "Short off, like a pipe stem," he replied. "And so you do not consider the laying on of a Bishop's hand necessary, to empower a man to preach the Gospel?" "No more," said he, "than I consider the laying on of spades, necessary to empower a man, to dig a grave. We were a peculiar people, but quite as zealous for good works, as any of our neighbors. The Bishop of New York declined to ordain our pastor, because we were Unitarians; and we could not expect this service from our neighbors, had it been otherwise, on account of our adherence to the Liturgy, though modified, and to certain Episcopal forms—so we ordained him ourselves. The senior warden laid his hands upon the good man and true—said nothing of the thirty-nine articles—but gave him a Bible, as the sole compass for his voyage, in full confidence, that, while he steered thereby, we should be upon our course, to the haven, where we would be. We have never felt the want of the succession, for a moment, and, ever since, we have been a most happy and u——."

Just then a distant steam whistle struck upon the ear, which Martin, undoubtedly, mistook, for cock-crowing—for his lamp was extinguished, in an instant, and he vanished. ●

If my confidence in dreams needed any confirmation, nothing more could be required, than a careful comparison of many of these incidents, with the statements, in the history of King's Chapel, published by the late, amiable Rector, seventeen years ago. A copy is, at this moment, beneath my eye; and, upon the fly leaf, in the author's own hand writing, under date Jan. 1, 1843, I read—"Presented to Martin Smith, for many years, a sexton of this church, from his friend F. W. P. Greenwood." Aye; every one was the friend of good old Martin Smith. Here, deposited among the leaves of this book, is an order, from that excellent man, my honored friend, Colonel Joseph May, then junior warden. It bears date "Saturday, 18 June, 1814." It is laconic, and to the point. "Toll slow!" This also is subscribed "Your friend."

Yes, every one was the friend of Martin Smith. He was a spruce, little, old man—especially at Christmas.

No. LXXIX.

NOTHING can be more entirely unfounded, than the popular notion, that circumstantial evidence is an inferior quality of proof. The most able writers, on the law of evidence, have always maintained the contrary.

Sir William Blackstone and Sir Matthew Hale, it is true, have expressed the very just and humane opinion, that circumstantial evidence should be weighed with extreme caution; and the latter has expressly said, that, in trials, for murder and manslaughter, no conviction ought ever to be had, until the fact is clearly proven, or the body of the person, alleged to have been killed, has been discovered; for he stated, that two instances had occurred, within his own knowledge, in which, after the execution of the accused, the persons, supposed to have been murdered, had reappeared alive.

Probably, one of the most extraordinary cases of fatal confidence in circumstantial evidence, recorded, in the history of British, criminal jurisprudence, is that, commonly referred to, as the case of "*Hayes and Bradford*." In that case, a murder was certainly committed; the body of the murdered man was readily found; the murderer escaped; and, after many years, confessed the crime, in a dying hour; and another person, who had designed to commit the murder, but found his intended victim, already slain, was arrested, as the murderer; and, after an elaborate trial, suffered for the crime, upon the gallows.

There is a case in the criminal jurisprudence of our own country, in all its strange particulars, far surpassing the British example, to which I have referred; and attended by circumstances, almost incredible, were the evidence and vouchers less respectable, than they are. I refer to the case of Stephen and Jesse Boorn, who were tried, for the murder of Russell Colvin, and convicted, before the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Vermont, in October, 1819. In this remarkable case, it must be observed, that the Judges appeared to have acted, in utter disregard of that merciful caution of Sir Matthew Hale, to which I have alluded; and that these miserable men were rescued, from their impending fate, in a most remarkable manner.

It is my purpose to present a clear and faithful account of this occurrence; and, to enable the reader to go along with me, step

by step, with perfect confidence, in a matter, in which, from the marvellous character of the circumstances, to doubt would be extremely natural, I will first exhibit the sources, from which the elements of this narrative are drawn. I. The public journals of the day, published in Vermont. II. "Mystery developed, &c., by the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, Hartford, 1820." III. A sermon, on the occasion, by the same. IV. "A brief sketch of the Indictment, Trial, and Conviction of Stephen and Jesse Boorn, for the murder of Russell Colvin, by S. Putnam Waldo, Hartford." V. "A Collection of remarkable events, by Leonard Deming. Middlebury, 1825." VI. "Journals of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, for 1819, October session, in which, page 185, may be found the minutes of the testimony, taken on the trial, and certified up, by Judge Chace, to the Legislature, by request, on petition, for a commutation of punishment. VII. Law Reporter, published in Boston, vol. v. page 193. VIII. Trial of Stephen and Jesse Boorn, Rutland, 1820. IX. Remarks thereon, N. A. Review, vol. x. page 418. X. Greenleaf's Treatise on Evidence, vol. i. page 320, note 2. XI. Cooley's Memoir of Rev. Lemuel Haynes, N. Y., 1839.

In the village of Manchester, Bennington County, and State of Vermont, there resided in 1812, an old man, whose name was Barney Boorn, who had two sons, Stephen and Jesse, and a daughter Sarah, who had married Russell Colvin. Like the conies of the Bible, these people were a *feeble folk*—their mental powers were slender—they grew up in ignorance—their lot was poverty. Colvin, in particular, was, notoriously, an *imbecile*. He had been, for a long period, partially deranged. He was incompetent to manage the concerns of his family. He moved about in an idle, wandering way, and was perfectly inoffensive; and the wilful destruction of such a man would have been the murder of an *innocent*.

In May, 1812, Russell Colvin was missing from home. This, in consideration of his uncertain habits, occasioned, at first, but little surprise. But his continued absence, for days, and weeks, and months, produced very considerable excitement, in the village of Manchester. This excitement naturally increased, with the term of his absence; and the contagion began, ere long, to catch upon the neighboring towns; until the most exciting topic of the day, throughout that portion of the Hampshire Grants, in the absence of mad dogs and revivals, was the mysterious disappearance of Russell Colvin.

Rumors began to spread, from lip to lip. Suspicion, like a hungry leech—"a German one"—fastened upon the Boorns. Nor was this suspicion groundless. Thomas Johnson, a neighbor of all the parties, a credible witness, who swore to the facts, seven years after, on the trial, reported, that the last time he saw Russell Colvin was immediately before his remarkable disappearance, and that he and the Boorns were then quarrelling, while engaged in picking up stones.

Lewis Colvin, the son of Russell, with manifest reluctance, stated, that, just before his father's disappearance, a quarrel took place, between his father and Stephen—that his father struck Stephen first—that Stephen then knocked his father down twice with a club—that he, the boy, was frightened and ran away—that Stephen told him never to mention what had happened—and that he had never seen his father since.

Here, doubtless, was legitimate ground, for suspicion, and the village of Manchester, on the Battenkill, was in a state of universal fermentation—the very atmosphere seemed redolent of murder. It is marvellous, in what manner the Boorns escaped from being lynched, without trial; and, more especially, how Stephen was preserved, from the fate of his namesake, the martyr. A shortlived calm followed this tempest of popular feeling—parties were formed—some were sure the Boorns were the murderers of Colvin—some were inclined to believe they were not. The Boorns continued to dwell in the village, *without any effort to escape*; and the evidence against them was not deemed legally sufficient then, even to authorize their arrest.

It appeared, upon the statement of Mrs. Colvin, that Stephen and Jesse, her brothers, had told her, upon a certain occasion, that she might be satisfied her husband was dead, and that *they knew it*. This additional fact gave fresh impulse to the popular excitement.

In such miserable society, as may be supposed to have remained to these suspected men, it is not wonderful, that they should often have encountered the most unsparing allusions, and vulgar interrogatories—nor that they should have met this species of persecution, with equally vulgar and unflinching replies. It became well established, ere long, upon the declarations of a Mr. Baldwin and his wife, that, when asked where Colvin had gone, one of the Boorns replied, that he had "*gone to hell*"—

and the other that he had "*gone where potatoes would not freeze.*"

It is not wonderful, that, upon such evidence, the daughters of Manchester should begin to prophecy, and the young men to see visions, and the old men to dream dreams. In the language of one, who has briefly described the condition of that village, during this period of intense excitement—" *Every house was haunted with the ghost of Colvin.*"

At length, a respectable man, a paternal uncle of the Boorns, began to dream, in good earnest. The ghost of Colvin appeared to him, and told him, upon his honor, that he had been murdered; and indicated the place, with unmistakable precision, where his body lay concealed. Like a bill, which cannot pass to enactment, until after a third reading, the declarations of a ghost are not entitled to the slightest regard, until after a third repetition. Every sensible ghost knows this, of course. The ghost of Colvin seems to have understood his business perfectly; and he manifested a very commendable delicacy, in selecting one of the family, for his confidant. Three times, in perfect conformity with acknowledged precedent, the ghost of Colvin announced the fact of his murder, and indicated the place, where his body was concealed.

To put a slight upon a respectable ghost, in perfectly good standing, who had taken all this trouble, was entirely out of the question. Accordingly, the uncle of the Boorns summoned his neighbors—announced these revelations—gathered a posse—proceeded to dig in the hole, so particularly indicated by the ghost—and, after digging to a great depth, succeeded completely, in discovering nothing of any human remains. Indeed he was as unsuccessful, as our worthy friend, the Warden of the Prison, in his recent search for hidden treasure—excepting, that it does not appear, that the ghost made the slightest effort to bury him alive.

This movement was productive, nevertheless, of additional testimony, against the Boorns. In the hole, were found a jack-knife and a button, both which Mrs. Colvin solemnly declared to have belonged to her husband.

In regard to the location of the body, the ghost was certainly mistaken; perhaps Mr. Boorn, the uncle, being dull of hearing, might have misunderstood the revelation; and perhaps the memory of the ghost was treacherous. Evidence, gathered up by piecemeal, was, nevertheless, gradually enveloping the fate of

these miserable men—evidence of a much more substantial material, than dreams are made of.

Thomas Johnson, the witness, above referred to, having purchased the field, where the quarrel took place, between Colvin and the Boorns, the children of Johnson found, while playing there, an old mouldy hat; which Johnson asserted, at the time, and afterwards, at the trial, swore, positively, had belonged to Colvin.

Nearly seven years had passed, since the disappearance of Russell Colvin. Stephen Boorn had removed from Manchester, about five years after the supposed murder; and resided in Denmark, Lewis County, New York; at the distance of some two hundred miles. Jesse still continued in Manchester; and *neither of these wretched men, upon any occasion, appears to have attempted flight, or concealment.*

Stephen Boorn, who, as the sequel will abundantly show, seems not to have been entirely deficient, in natural affection, had discovered, after a bitter experience of five long years, that the burden of his sins was not more intolerable, than the oppressive consciousness of the tenure, by which he lived, and moved, and had his being; which tenure was no other, than that, by which Cain walked upon the earth, after the murder of Abel. Stephen Boorn gathered up the little, that he had, and went into a far country—not hastily, nor by night—but openly, and in the light of day.

Jesse, who was, evidently, the weaker brother—the poorer spirit—remained behind; deeming it easier, doubtless, to endure the continued suspicion and contempt of mankind, than to muster enough of energy, to rise and walk.

Well nigh seven years, as I have stated, had passed, since the disappearance of Colvin. A discovery was made, at this period, which left very little doubt, upon the minds of the good people of Manchester, that the Boorns were guilty of the murder of this unhappy man, and of attempting to conceal his remains, by cremation.

No. LXXX.

At this period, about seven years after the disappearance of Russell Colvin, a lad, walking near the house of Barney Boorn, was attracted, by the movements of a dog, that seemed to have discovered some object of interest, near the stump of an ancient tree, upon the banks of the Battenkill river. This stump was about sixty rods from the hole, in which, upon the suggestion of the ghost, the uncle of the Boorns, and his curious neighbors had sought for the body of Colvin. The lad examined the stump, and discovered the cavity to be filled with bones!

Had the magnetic been then in operation, the tidings could not have been telegraphed more speedily. The affair was definitively settled—the bones of Colvin were discovered; and the ghost appeared to have been only sixty rods out of the way, after all. Murder will find a tongue. Manchester found thousands. The village was on fire. Young men and maidens, old men and children came forth, to gaze upon the bones of the murdered Colvin; and to praise the Lord, for this providential discovery! Whatever the value of it might be—the merit seemed clearly to belong, in equal moieties, to the dog and the ghost.

How prone we are—the children of this generation—to reason upon the philosophy, before we weigh the fish! This was a case, if there ever was a case, for the recognition of the principle, *cuique in sua arte credendum est*. Accordingly the medical magi of Manchester and of its highly excited neighborhood were summoned, to sit in judgment, upon these bones. The question was not—“*can these dry bones live?*”—but are they the bones of the murdered Colvin? One, thoughtful practitioner believed there was a previous question, entitled to some little consideration—are these bones the bones of a man, or of a beast? Never were scruples more entirely out of place. Imagine the indignation of the good people of Manchester, at the bare suggestion, that they had wasted so much excellent sympathy, upon the bones, peradventure, of a horse or a heifer!

The doubter, as might have been expected, stood alone: but he sturdily persisted. The regular faculty, with the eyes of their well-persuaded patients riveted, encouragingly, upon theirs, expressed their clear conviction, that the bones were human

bones, and, if human bones, whose—aye whose—but the murdered Colvin's! This gave universal satisfaction, of course.

It was evident, that some of these bones had been broken and pounded—the quantity was small, for an entire skeleton—some few bones had been found, beneath a barn, belonging to the father of the Boorns, which had been, previously, consumed by fire—and some persons may have supposed, that the murderers, having deposited the dead body there, had destroyed the barn, to conceal their crime—and, finding a part of the body unconsumed, after the conflagration, had deposited that part, in the hollow stump, to be disposed of, at some future moment of convenience.

A very plausible theory, beyond all doubt. But the doubting doctor continued to turn over these bones, with an air of provoking unbelief; now and then, perhaps, holding aloft, in significant silence, the fragment of a cranium, of remarkably sheepish proportions.

This was not to be endured. Anatomical knowledge appears not to have made uncommon strides, in that region, in 1819; for, when it was finally decided to compare these bones with those of the human body, there actually seems to have been nothing in that region, which would serve the purpose of the faculty, but the leg of a citizen, long before amputated, and committed to the earth. I will here adopt the words of the Rev. Mr. Haynes—“*A Mr. Salisbury, about four years ago, had his leg amputated, which was buried, at the distance of four or five miles. The limb was dug up, and, by comparing, it was universally determined that the bones were not human.*” This was a severe disappointment, undoubtedly; but not absolutely total: for two nails, or something, in the image thereof, were found, amid the mass, which nails, says Mr. Haynes, “*were human, and so appeared to all beholders.*”

Let us now turn to the murderers, or rather to Jesse, for Stephen was two hundred miles away, entirely unsuspecting of the gathering cloud, which was destined, ere long, to burst upon his devoted head.

When the discovery of these bones had excited the feelings and suspicions of the people, to the utmost, it was deemed proper to take Jesse into custody. An examination took place, on Tuesday, May 27, 1819, and continued, till the following Saturday. This examination was conducted, in the meeting-house, as it appears, from the testimony of Truman Hill, upon

the subsequent trial; who says of Jesse, that—"when the knife was presented to him, in the meeting-house, and also when the hat was presented to him, his feelings were such, as to oblige him to take hold of the pew, to steady himself—he appeared to be much agitated—I asked him what was the matter—he answered there was matter enough—I asked him to state—he said he feared, that Stephen had killed Colvin—that he never believed so, till the spring or winter, when he went into William Boorn's shop, where were William and Stephen Boorn—at which time he gained a knowledge of the manner of Colvin's death; and that he thought he knew, within a few rods, where Colvin was buried."

Such was the evidence of Truman Hill, upon the trial; and he related the facts, very naturally, at the time, to his neighbors. The statement was considered, by the community, as tantamount to a confession. At this time, the examination of Jesse Boorn had nearly closed—no ground for detention appeared against him—the bones, discovered in the stump, were acknowledged to have belonged to some brute animal—it was the general opinion, that Jesse should be released; when this declaration of his to Truman Hill, turned the tide of popular sentiment entirely; and Jesse Boorn was remanded to prison.

Truman Hill was the jailer; or, in his own conservative phraseology, he "*kept the keys of the prison.*" Jailers are rather apt to look upon their prisoners, as great curiosities, in proportion to the crimes, with which they are charged, and themselves as showmen. Most men are sufficiently willing to be distinguished, for something or other:—to see Jesse Boorn—to catechise the wretched man—to set before him the fear of death, and the hope of pardon—to beg him to confess—nothing but the truth, of course—these were privileges—favours—and Truman Hill had the power of granting them. Thus he says—he "*let in*" Mr. Johnson; and, when Mr. Johnson came out, he went in himself, and found Jesse "in great agitation"—and then he, himself, urged Jesse to confess—the truth of course—if he said anything—assuring him, that every falsehood he told, would sink him deeper in trouble. It must have been evident to the mind of Jesse, that a confession of the murder would be particularly agreeable to the public, and that a continued protestation of his innocence would disappoint the reasonable expectations of his fellow-citizens.

Jesse confessed to Judge Skinner, that Stephen had, probably, buried Colvin's body in the mountain; and that the knife, found with the button, in the hole, indicated to his uncle by the ghost, was, doubtless, Colvin's; for he had often seen Colvin's mother use it, to cut her tobacco. Judge Skinner and Jesse took an edifying walk up the mountain, in search of the body—they did not find it, which is very surprising.

About the middle of the month of May, 1819, Mr. Orange Clark, a neighbor of Stephen Boorn, in the town of Denmark, some two hundred miles from Manchester, entered his dwelling, in the evening. He took a chair, and commenced a friendly conversation with Stephen and his wife—for Stephen had married a wife—the sharer of all his sorrows—his joys, probably, were few, and far between, and not worth the partition. Shortly after, a Mr. Hooper, another neighbor, dropped in. He had scarcely taken his seat, before another entered the apartment, Mr. Sylvester, the innkeeper, who, upon some grave testimony, then recently imported into Denmark, had arrived at the solemn conclusion, that there was something rotten there.

Stephen and his helpmate were, doubtless, somewhat surprised, at this unusual gathering, in their humble dwelling. Their surprise was greatly increased, of course, by the appearance, almost immediately after, of Messieurs Anderson and Raymond, worthy men of Manchester. If the ghost of Russell Colvin had stalked in, after them, Stephen Boorn could not have been more astonished, than he was, when he beheld, closing up the rear of all this goodly company—no less a personage, than Captain Truman Hill, the jailer of Manchester—the gentleman, I mean, who "*kept the keys of the prison.*"

To Stephen there must have been something not wholly incomprehensible in this. His ill-starred partner was not long left in doubt. The very glances of the party were of evil omen. Their business was soon declared. The gentleman, that *kept the keys*, kept also the *handcuffs*. They were speedily produced. Stephen Boorn must go back to the place, from whence he came—and from thence—so opined the men, women and children of Manchester—to the place of execution. But, when the process commenced, of putting the irons upon that wretched man—the poor woman—the wife of his bosom—for he had a bosom, and a human heart therein, full of tenderness, as the sequel will demonstrate, for her; however inconceivable to the gentleman, that

"*kept the keys*"—and to those learned judges, who, in the very teeth, and in utter contempt, of the law, so clearly laid down by Sir Matthew Hale, of glorious memory, would have hanged this miserable man, but for the signal Providence of Almighty God—this poor woman was completely overwhelmed with agony.

The estimate of many things, in this nether world, is a vastly relative affair. That, which would be in excellent taste, among a people, without refinement, however moral, will frequently appear to the enlightened portion of mankind, as absolutely barbarous.

The idea of allaying the anguish of a wife, produced by the forcible removal of her husband, in chains, on a charge of murder, by *making her presents*, hurries one's imagination to the land of the Hottentots, or of the Caffres; where the loss of a child is sometimes forgotten, in the contemplation of a few glass beads—and no consolation proves so effectual for the loss of wife, as a nail or a hatchet.

And yet it is impossible—and it ought to be—to read the short and simple statement of that good man, the Rev. Mr. Haynes, without emotion—" *The surprise and distress of Mrs. Boorn, on this occasion, are not easily described: they excited the compassion of those, who came to take away her husband; and they made her some presents.*"

"The prisoner," continues Mr. Haynes, "was put in irons, and brought to Manchester, on the 15th of May. He peremptorily asserted his innocence, and declared he knew nothing about the murder of his brother-in-law. The prisoners were kept apart, for a time. They were afterwards confined in one room. Stephen denied the evidence, brought against him by Jesse, and treated him with severity."

These men, imprisoned in May, 1819, were not tried, until October of that year. The *evidence*, upon which they were convicted of murder, in the first degree, lies now before me, *certified up to the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, upon their request, by Judge Dudley Chace, Nov. 11, 1819.* Let us now turn from *on dits*, and dreams, and ghosts, and doubtful relics, to the *duly certified testimony, upon which these men were sentenced to be hung.*

No. LXXXI.

THE grand jurors of Bennington County found a bill of indictment, against Stephen and Jesse Boorn, September 3, 1819, for the murder of Russell Colvin, May 10, 1812, charging Stephen, as principal, in the first count, and Jesse, in the second.

The facts, proved, upon the trial, by witnesses, whose testimony was unimpeached, and which facts appear, in the minutes of evidence, certified by Judge Dudley Chace to the General Assembly, November 11, 1819, were, substantially, these. Before the time of the alleged murder, Stephen had complained that his brother-in-law, Colvin, was a burden to the family; and Stephen had said, if there was no other way of preventing him from multiplying children, for his father-in-law, Barney Boorn, to support, he would prevent him himself.

At the time of the alleged murder, Stephen and Jesse Boorn had a quarrel with Colvin. The affair, in part, was seen and heard, by a neighbor, from a distance. Lewis Colvin, then ten years old, the son of Russell, was present; and, when seventeen, testified at the trial, that the last time he saw his father was, when the quarrel took place, which arose, at the time they were all engaged, in picking up stones—that Colvin struck Stephen first, with a small stick—that Stephen then struck Colvin, on his neck, with a club, and he fell—that Colvin rose and struck Stephen again—that Stephen again struck Colvin with the club, and knocked him down—whereupon the witness, being frightened, ran away; and was afterwards told, by Stephen, that he would kill him, if he ever told of what had happened. The witness further stated, that he ran, and told his grandmother.

Stephen appears to have been gifted with a lively fancy. It was testified, that, before this occurrence, speaking of his sister and her husband, he had said he wished Russell and Sal were both dead; and that he would *kick them into hell if he burnt his legs off*. This piece of evidence, after having produced the usual effect upon the jury, was rejected.

Upon another occasion, four years after the alleged murder, Stephen stated to Daniel D. Baldwin, and Eunice, his wife, that Colvin went off very strangely; that the last he saw of him was when he, Stephen, and Jesse were together, and Colvin went off to the woods; that Lewis, the son of Colvin, upon returning

with some drink, for which he had been sent, asked where his father was, and that he, Stephen, replied, that Colvin had gone to hell; and Jesse, that they had put him where potatoes would not freeze; and Stephen added, while making this statement to the Baldwins, that it was not likely he or Jesse would have said this to the boy, if they had killed his father.

When the body was sought for, before the bones were discovered, which were mistaken for human remains, a girl said to Stephen, "they are going to dig up Colvin for you; aren't they?" He became angry, and said, that Colvin often went off and returned—and that, when he went off, the last time, he was crazy; and went off without his hat.

About four years after his disappearance, an old mouldy hat was discovered, in the field, where the quarrel took place; and was identified, positively, as the hat of Colvin, by the witness who had seen the quarrel, from a distance, as I have stated.

Stephen denied, to Benjamin Deming, that he, Stephen, was present, when Colvin went off, and stated, that he was then, at a distance.

To Joseph Lincoln he said, that he never killed Colvin—that he, and Colvin, and Jesse were picking up stones, and that Colvin was crazy, and went off into the woods, and that they had not seen nor heard from him since.

To William Wyman, Stephen reaffirmed his statement, made to Benjamin Deming—called on Wyman to clear up his statement, that he, Stephen, had killed Colvin—asserted, that he knew nothing of what had become of Colvin; and that he had never worked with him an hour.

The minutes of the Judge furnish other examples of similar contradiction and inconsistency, on the part of Stephen Boorn.

But the reader will bear constantly in mind, that, through a period of seven years, during which the suspicion of the vicinage hung over them, like an angry cloud, sending forth occasional mutterings of judgment to come, and threatening to burst upon their heads, at any moment; *neither of these miserable men attempted flight or concealment.* Two years before his arrest, Stephen removed from Manchester, as I have related; but, in an open manner. There was not the slightest disguise, in regard to his abode; and there, when it was thought proper to arrest him, he was readily found, in the bosom of his family.

In 1813, Jesse Boorn was asked, by Daniel Jacobs, where

Russell Colvin was ; and replied, that he had enlisted, as a soldier in the army.

Thus far, the evidence, certified by Judge Chace, appears to have proceeded from perfectly credible witnesses. Silas Merrill, *in jail, on a charge of perjury*, testified to the following confession—that, when Jesse returned to prison, after his examination, he told Merrill, that “*they*” had encouraged him to confess, *with promise of pardon*, and that he, Merrill, had told him, that, perhaps, he had better confess the whole truth, and *obtain some favor*. In June, 1819, Jesse’s father visited him in jail—after he went away, Jesse seemed much afflicted. After falling asleep, Jesse awoke, and shook the witness, Merrill—told him that he, Jesse, was frightened—had seen a vision—and wished the witness to get up, for he had something to tell him. They both arose ; and Jesse made the following disclosure. He said it was true, that he, and Stephen, and Colvin, and Lewis were in the lot, picking stones—that Stephen struck Colvin with a club—that the boy, Lewis, ran—that Colvin got up—that Stephen struck him again, above the ear, and broke his skull—that his, Stephen’s father came up, and asked if Colvin was dead ; and that he repeated this question three times—that all three of them carried Colvin, not then dead, to an old cellar, where the father cut Colvin’s throat, with a small penknife of Stephen’s—that they buried him, in the cellar—that Stephen wore Colvin’s shoes, till he, Jesse, told him it would lead to a discovery.

Jesse, as the witness stated, informed him, that he had told his brother Stephen, that he had confessed. When Stephen came into the room, witness asked him, if he did not take the life of Colvin ; to which he replied, that “*he did not take the main life of Colvin.*” Stephen, as the witness stated, said, that Jesse’s confession was true ; and that he, Stephen, had made a confession, which would only make manslaughter of it. The witness, Merrill, then proceeded to say, that Jesse further confessed, that, eighteen months after they had buried the body, they took it up, and placed it under the floor of a barn, that was afterwards burnt—that they then pounded the bones, and put them in the river ; excepting a few, which their father gathered up, and hid in a hollow stump.

At this stage of the trial, the prosecuting officer offered the written confession of Stephen Boorn, dated Aug. 27, 1819. The document was authenticated. An attempt was made by the pris-

oners' counsel, to show, that this confession was made, under the fear of death and hope and prospect of pardon. Samuel C. Raymond testified, that he had often told the prisoner to confess, *if guilty*, but not otherwise. Stephen said he was *not guilty*. The witness then told him *not to confess*. The witness said he had heard Mr. Pratt, and Mr. Sheldon, the prosecuting officer, tell Jesse, that, if he would confess, *in case he was guilty*, they would petition the legislature in his favor. The witness had made the same proposition to Stephen himself, and *always told him he had no doubt of his guilt; and that the public mind was against him*.

The court, of course, rejected the *written confession* of Stephen, made, obviously, under the fear of death, and the hope and prospect of pardon. William Farnsworth was then produced, to prove the *oral confession* of Stephen, much to the same effect. To this the prisoners' counsel objected, very properly, as it occurred after the very statement and proposal, made to the prisoner, by Mr. Raymond. *The court, nevertheless, permitted the witness to proceed.* Mr. Farnsworth then testified, that, about two weeks *after* the date of the written confession, Stephen confessed, that he killed Russell Colvin—that Russell struck at him; and that he struck Russell and killed him—hid him in the bushes—buried him—dug him up—buried him again, under a barn, that was burnt—threw the unburnt bones into the river—scraped up some few remains, and hid them in a stump—and that the nails found he knew were Russell Colvin's. The witness told him his case looked badly; and, probably, gave him no encouragement. Stephen then said they should have done well enough, had it not been for Jesse, and wished he "*had back that paper*," meaning the written confession.

After Mr. Farnsworth had been, thus absurdly, permitted to testify, there was no cause for withholding the written confession; and the prisoners' counsel called for its production. This confession embodies little more, with the exception of some particulars, as to the manner of burying the body; but is entirely inconsistent with the confession of Jesse. It is a full confession, that he killed Russell Colvin, and buried his remains. But, unlike the confession of Jesse, there is not the slightest implication of their father.

The evidence, in behalf of the prisoners, was of very little importance, excepting in relation to the fact, that *they were per-*

sueded, by divers individuals, that the only chance of escaping the halter was, by an ample confession of the murder. They were told to confess nothing but the truth—but this was accompanied, by ominous intimations, that their case “looked dark”—that they were “gone geese”—or, by the considerate language of Squire Raymond—as he is styled in the minutes—that he “had no doubt of their guilt;” and if they would confess the truth—that is, what the Squire had no doubt of—he would petition the legislature in their favor! What atrocious language to a prisoner, under a charge of murder!

It would be quite interesting to read the instructions of Judge Dudley Chace, while submitting the case of Stephen and Jesse Boorn to the jury; that we might be able to comprehend the measure of his respect, for the law, touching the inadmissibility of such extra judicial confessions, and for the solemn, judicial declaration of Sir Matthew Hale, that *no conviction ought ever to take place in trials, for murder or manslaughter, until the fact was clearly proven, or the dead body of the person, alleged to have been killed, was discovered.*

In “*about an hour,*” the jury returned a verdict of guilty, against Stephen and Jesse Boorn. And, in “*about an hour*” after, the prisoners were brought into court again, and sentenced to be hung, on the twenty-eighth day of January, 1820. Judge Chace is said to have been “*quite moved,*” while passing sentence on Stephen and Jesse Boorn. It would have been well, for the cause of humanity, and not amiss, for the honor of his judicial station, if he had shed tears of blood, as the reader of the sequel will readily admit.

No. LXXXII.

SENTENCED, on the last day of October, 1819, to be hung, on the 28th of January following, the Boorns were remanded to their prison, and put in irons.

From this period, their most authentic and interesting prison history is obtained, from the written statement of the clergyman, who appears to have performed his sacred functions, in regard to these men, with singular fidelity and propriety. This clergy-

man, the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, belonged to that class of human beings, commonly denominated *colored people*—a term, to which I have always sturdily objected, because drunkards, who are often a highly-colored people, may thus be confounded with temperate and respectable men of African descent.

*Mr. Haynes was, in part, of African parentage; and the author of the narrative, and occasional sermon, to which I have referred, at the commencement of these articles. There flourished, in this city, some five and thirty years ago, a number of very respectable, negro musicians, associated, as a band; and Major Russell, the editor of the *Centinel*, was in the habit of distinguishing the music, by the color of the performers. He frequently remarked, in his journal, that the "*black music*" was excellent. If this phraseology be allowable, I cannot deny, that the black, or colored, narrative of Mr. Haynes is very interesting; and that I have seldom read a black or colored discourse, with more satisfaction; and that I have read many a white one, with infinitely less.

Previously to their trial, and after the arrest of Stephen, the Rev. Mr. Haynes expressly states, that Jesse, having had an interview with Stephen, positively denied his own former statement, that Stephen had admitted he killed Colvin. These are the words of Mr. Haynes—"During the interval, the writer frequently visited them, in his official capacity; and did not discover any symptoms of compunction; but they persisted, in declaring their innocence, with appeals to Heaven. Stephen, at times, appeared absorbed in passion and impatience. One day, I introduced the example of Christ, under sufferings, as a pattern, worthy of imitation: he exclaimed—'I am as innocent, as Jesus Christ!' for which extravagant expression I reproved him: he replied—"I don't mean I am guiltless, as he was, I know I am a great sinner; but I am as innocent of killing Colvin, as he was." "

* The editor of the New York Sun, under date, Jan. 25, 1850, says—"Yesterday, we were waited on, by the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, of this city, the person, who, convinced of the innocence of the condemned parties, aided in finding the man, supposed to be murdered."—"The Sun must have been under a total eclipse. This very worthy man, the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, who figured, honorably for himself, in the affair of the Boorns, was born July 18, 1753, and died Sept. 28, 1833, at the age of 80—as the gentleman, who conducts the chariot of the Sun, will discover, by turning to Cooley's "Sketches of the life and character of the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, N. Y. 1839," p. 312. Some dark object must have passed before the editor's eye.

The condition of the Boorns, immediately after sentence, cannot be more forcibly exhibited, than in the language of this worthy clergyman—"None can express the confusion and anguish, into which the prisoners were cast, on hearing their doom. They requested, by their counsel, liberty to speak, which was granted. In sighs and broken accents, they asserted their innocence. The convulsion of nature, attending Stephen, at last, was so great, as to render him unable to walk, and he was supported to the prison."

Compassion was excited, in the hearts of some—doubts, peradventure, in the minds of others. A petition was presented to the General Assembly; and the punishment of Jesse was changed to imprisonment, for life. Ninety-seven deadly noes, against forty-two merciful ayes, decided the fate of Stephen.

On the 29th of October, 1819, Jesse bade Stephen a last farewell; and was transferred to the State prison, at Windsor.

"I visited him"—Stephen—says Mr. Haynes, "frequently, with sympathy and grief; and endeavored to turn his mind upon the things of another world; telling him, that, as all human means had failed, he must look to God, as the only way of deliverance. I advised him to read the Holy Scriptures; to which he consented, if he could be allowed a candle, as his cell was dark. This request was granted; and I often found him reading. He was at times calm, and again impatient."

Upon another occasion, still nearer the day of the prisoner's doom—"the last of earth"—Mr. Haynes remarks, that Stephen addressed him thus—"Mr. Haynes, I see no way but I must die: everything works against me; but I am an innocent man: this you will know, after I am dead.' He burst into a flood of tears, and said—'What will become of my poor wife and children; they are in needy circumstances; and I love them better than life itself.'—I told him, God would take care of them. He replied—'I don't want to die. I wish they would let me live, even in this situation, somewhat longer: perhaps something will take place, that will convince people I am innocent.' I was about to leave the prison, when he said—'will you pray with me?'—He arose with his heavy chains on his hands and legs, being also chained down to the floor, and stood on his feet, with deep and bitter sighings."

On the 26th day of November, 1819—two brief months before the time, appointed, for the execution of Stephen Boorn, the

following notice appeared in the Rutland Herald—"MURDER.—*Printers of Newspapers, throughout the United States, are desired to publish, that Stephen Boorn of Manchester, in Vermont, is sentenced to be executed for the murder of Russell Colvin, who has been absent about seven years. Any person, who can give information of said Colvin, may save the life of the innocent, by making immediate communication. Colvin is about five feet five inches high, light complexion, light hair, blue eyes, about forty years of age. Manchester, Vt., Nov. 26, 1819.*"

This notice, published by request of the prisoner, was, doubtless, prepared, by one of his counsel:—by whomsoever prepared, it bears, in its very structure, unmistakable evidence of the writer's entire confidence, in the innocence, of Stephen Boorn, of the murder of Russell Colvin. No man, who had a doubt upon his mind, could have put these words together, in the very places, where they stand. Had it been otherwise, some little hesitancy of expression—some conservative syllable—one little *if, ex abundanti cautela*, to shelter the writer from the charge of a most miserably weak and merciful credulity, would have characterized this last appeal—this short, shrill cry for mercy—as the work of a doubter, and a hireling.

There may have been a few, whose strong confidence, in the bloodguiltiness of Stephen Boorn, had become slightly paralyzed, by his entire and absolute retraction of all his confessions, made before trial. There may have been a few, who believe, that they, themselves, might have confessed, though innocent, in the same predicament—assured by the *squires*, the *magnates* of the village, whom they supposed powerful to save, that *no doubt existed of their guilt*—that they were *gone geese*—and who proffered an effort in their favor—to save them from the gallows—if they would confess *the truth*, which *truth* could, of course, be nothing, but their *guilt*. If they would confess a crime, though innocent, they might still live! If not, they must be deemed liars, and murderers, and die the death!

The prisoner, Stephen Boorn, even supposing him to be innocent, but of humble station in society, and of ordinary mental powers—oppressed by the chains he wore, and, more heavily, by the dread of death—clinging to life—not only because it is written, by the finger of God, in the members of man, that all a man hath will be given for his life—but because, as the statement of Mr. Haynes convincingly shows, poor degraded outcast as Stephen

was, he was deeply and tenderly attached to his wife and children—might well fall under the temptation, so censurably spread before him.

There may have been a few, who were compelled to doubt, if Stephen were a murderer, upon hearing the simple narrative, spread through the village, by the worthy clergyman, of the fervent and awful declaration of Stephen Boorn, in a moment of deep and energetic misery—"I am as innocent of the murder of Russell Colvin, as Jesus Christ."

But the strong current of popular indignation ran, overwhelmingly, against him. By a large number, the brief notice, published in the Rutland Herald, was, undoubtedly, accounted a mere personal, or professional attempt, to produce an impression of the murderer's innocence, in the hope of commutation, or of pardon—and, with many, it certainly tended to confirm the prejudice against him. Days of unutterable anguish were succeeded, by nights of frightful slumber. The cell was feebly lighted, by the taper allowed him—with unpractised fingers, the prisoner turned over the pages of God's holy word—but a kind, faithful guide was at his elbow—the voice of fervent prayer, amid the occasional clanking of the prisoner's fetters, went up to that infallible ear, that is ever ready to hear.—The Judicial power had consigned this victim to the gallows—the general sense had decided, that Stephen Boorn ought not to live—to prepare him to die was the only remaining office, for the man of God.

No. LXXXIII.

IN April, 1813, about a year after poor Colvin was murdered, by the Boorns, according to the indictment—there came to the house of a Mr. Polhamus, in Dover, Monmouth County, New Jersey, a wandering man—he was a stranger, and Mr. Polhamus was a good man, and took him in—he was hungry, and he fed him—he was ragged, if not absolutely naked, and he clothed him. He was a man of mean appearance, rapid utterance, and disordered understanding. He was harmless withal, perfectly tractable, capable of light service, and grateful for kindness. In the family of Mr. Polhamus, this poor vagrant had continued, to

to the very time, when the Boorns were convicted of the murder of Russell Colvin.

Not far from Dover, lies the town of Shrewsbury, near Long Branch, the Baïe of the Philadelphians. There dwelt in Shrewsbury, in the year 1819, Mr. Taber Chadwick, the brother-in-law of Mr. Polhamus, and familiarly acquainted with the domestic affairs of his relative. He also was a man of kind and generous feelings. He had accidentally read in the New York Evening Post, a paper which he rarely met with, the account of the conviction of the Boorns, for the murder of Colvin. The notice in the Rutland Herald, he had never seen. He was firmly persuaded, that the stranger, who arrived at the house of his brother-in-law, some six years before, was Russell Colvin. What reasons he had, for this conviction, the reader will gather from a perusal of the following letter, which appeared in the Evening Post:—

“SHREWSBURY, Monmouth, N. J., Dec. 6, 1819. To the Editor of the New York Evening Post: Sir. Having read in your paper of Nov. 26th last, of the conviction and sentence of Stephen and Jesse Boorn, of Manchester, Vermont, charged with the murder of Russell Colvin, and from facts, which have fallen within my own knowledge, and not knowing what facts may have been disclosed on their trial, and wishing to serve the cause of humanity, I would state as follows, which may be relied on. Some years past, (I think between five and ten), a stranger made his appearance in this county: and, upon being inquired of, said his name was Russell Colvin, (which name he answers to at this time)—that he came from Manchester, Vermont—he appeared to be in a state of mental derangement; but, at times, gave considerable account of himself—his connections, acquaintances, &c.—He mentions the names of Clarissa, Rufus, &c.—Among his relations he has mentioned the Boorns above—Jesse as Judge (I think,) &c., &c. He is a man rather small in stature—round favored—speaks very fast, and has two scars on his head, and appears to be between thirty and forty years of age. There is no doubt but that he came from Vermont, from the mention that he has made of a number of places and persons there, and probably is the person supposed to have been murdered. He is now living here, but so completely insane, as not to be able to give a satisfactory account of himself, but the connections of Russell Colvin might know, by

seeing him. If you think proper to give this a place in your columns, it may possibly lead to a discovery, that may save the lives of innocent men—if so, you will have the pleasure, as well as myself, of having served the cause of humanity. If you give this an insertion in your paper, pray be so good as to request the different editors of newspapers, in New York, and Vermont, to give it a place in theirs. I am, sir, with sentiments of regard, yours, &c.,

TABER CHADWICK."

To render a certain part of this letter intelligible to the reader, it is proper to state, that *Clarissa* and *Rufus*, as it appeared from the evidence, were the names of *Colvin's* children; and that "*the judge*" was a title, or sobriquet, frequently bestowed upon *Jesse*, by *Stephen*.

Upon the arrival of a printed copy of *Mr. Chadwick's* letter, in *Manchester*, it produced little or no effect. Very few of the inhabitants gave any credit to the story; and it might have been very reasonably supposed, that *St. Thomas* had begotten a large majority of the population. *Squire Raymond* was certain of *Stephen's* guilt; and to differ from *Squire Raymond*, was probably accounted, by the villagers, as one of the presumptuous sins. Besides, if a doubt of their guilt had existed, would not those most learned judges have given the prisoners the full advantage of that doubt! How little the good people of *Manchester* imagined, that, upon the trial of the *Boorns*, the well established rules of evidence had been outrageously violated, and a great fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence shamefully disregarded, by the court! Such, however painful and disgraceful the admission, was manifestly the fact. Judges, who sit thus, in judgment, upon the lives of men, would do well to doff their ermine, and assume the robe, commended by *Faulconbridge* to *Austria*. To the enforcement of this simple truth I shall turn hereafter.

Let us now go to the dungeon, taking with us, of course, the newspaper, containing these living lines—these tidings of exceeding great joy. But the details of all that occurred within the prison, are related with great simplicity and power, by the good clergyman, who stood by *Stephen Boorn*, in his deepest need. Let *Mr. Haynes*, himself, describe in a few words, the effect of this communication, upon the prisoner—" *Mr. Chadwick's* letter was carried to the prison, and read to *Stephen*. The news was so overwhelming, that, to use his own language, nature could scarcely sustain the shock; but, as there was some doubt, as to

the truth of the report, it tended to prevent an immediate dissolution. He observed to me, that, if Colvin had then made his appearance before him, he believed it would have caused immediate death. Even now a faintness was created, that was painful to endure."

Not a few very charitable people, who shrink, instinctively, from the very thought of giving pain, marvelled at the cruelty of those, who presumed to raise the poor prisoner's hopes, upon such frail and improbable grounds.

Soon, intelligence arrived in Manchester, that a Mr. Whelpley, of New York, formerly of Manchester, who knew Colvin well, having seen Mr. Chadwick's letter, had gone to New Jersey, to settle the question of identity. This, according to Mr. Deming's account, was done, at the instance of the city authorities of New York.

Doubt fell, fifty per cent., in the market of Manchester, when a brief letter, in the well known handwriting of Mr. Whelpley, was received, in that village, immediately upon his return to New York, containing these vital words—"I HAVE COLVIN WITH ME!" This letter was immediately followed by another from a Mr. Rempton, who knew him well, in which he says—"while writing, Russell Colvin is before me!" The New York journals now published the notice, that *Colvin had arrived, and would soon proceed to Vermont*. Doubt dies hard, in the bosoms of those, whose pride of opinion forbids them to recant. Squire Raymond, and his tail, as the Scotch call a great man's followers, could not believe the story. "Their honors, who sentenced the Boorns to death, in one hour, after the verdict had been delivered—were very naturally inclined to take a longer time, for consideration, before they sentenced themselves to merited reproach, for their rash and unjustifiable conduct. Bets were made, says Mr. Haynes, that the man, on his way to Vermont, notwithstanding the positive averments of Whelpley and Rempton, was not the true Colvin, but an impostor.

Whoever he was, he was soon upon his way. He passed through Albany. The streets, says Mr. Deming, were literally crowded to get a glimpse of the man, who was dead and alive again. He passed through Troy. The Trojan horse could not have produced a greater measure of amazement, in the days of Priam. Dec. 22, he arrived with Mr. Whelpley, at Bennington. The court then in session, suspended business, to look upon him, for several hours.

Towards evening, upon that memorable day, Dec. 22, 1819, the stage was seen, driving into Manchester, and the driving was like the driving of Jehu, for it drove furiously. When the dust cleared away, sufficiently, to enable the excited population to obtain a clearer view, an unusual signal was observed floating above the advancing vehicle. A shout broke forth from the crowd—COLVIN HAS COME! Hundreds ran to their houses to communicate the tidings—*Colvin has come!* The stage drove up to the tavern door; and a little man, of mean appearance, and wild, disordered look, came forth into the middle of the eager multitude. His bewildered eyes turned, rapidly and feverishly, in all directions, encountering eyes innumerable, that seemed to drink him in, with the strong relish of wonder and delight. Hundreds upon hundreds pressed forward, to grasp this poor, little, demented creature, by the hand; and enough of sense and memory remained, to enable him, feebly, to return the smiles of his former neighbors, and to call them, by their names. All was uproar and frantic joy. The people of Manchester believed it to be their bounden duty to go partially mad; and they did their duty to perfection. Guns were fired, amid wild demonstrations of excitement; and Colvin was tumultuously borne to the cell of the condemned. The meeting shall be described by Mr. Haynes—*“The prison door was unbolted—the news proclaimed to Stephen, that Colvin had come! The welcome reception, given it by the joyful prisoner, need not be mentioned. The chains, on his arms, were taken off, while those on his legs remained. Being impatient of an interview with him, who had come to bring salvation, they met. Colvin gazed upon the chains, and asked—‘What is that for?’—Stephen answered—‘Because, they say, I murdered you—‘You never hurt me’—replied Colvin.”*

Colvin recognized his children; but marvelled how they came in Manchester, asserting, that he left them, at the house of his kind benefactor, Mr. Polhamus, in New Jersey. Of his wife, who came to see him, he took little notice, asserting, that she did not belong to him. There may have been enough of method, in his madness, to enable him to appreciate, correctly, the value of his marital relation. The breath of Manchester may have blown the truth into his ear. An ingenious person may find some little resemblance between the wanderings of Ulysses and those of Colvin the *Oudeis* of Manchester—but the testimony, upon the trial, peremptorily forbids the slightest comparison, between Pe-

nelope and Mrs. Colvin, who appears not to have embarrassed her suitors, with the preliminary ordeal of the bow.

There is an admirable painting, in the Boston Athenæum, by Neagle, of Patrick Lyon, the blacksmith, who was long imprisoned, in Philadelphia, for the robbery of a bank, of which crime he was perfectly innocent, as it finally appeared, to the entire satisfaction of the government, by whom he was, consequently, discharged. Lyon is represented, at his forge; and he desired the artist to introduce the Walnut Street prison in the rear, where he had suffered, so unjustly, and so long.

The graphic hand of a master might do something here. I would pay more than I can well afford, for a couple of illustrative paintings—I. The Judges, with tears in their eyes, sentencing Stephen and Jesse to be hanged, for the murder of Colvin—the best books on evidence, before them, and open at the pages where it is expressly stated that extra-judicial confession, under fear of death, and hope of pardon, shall never be received—and the leaf turned down, at the authority of Sir Matthew Hale, that no conviction ought ever to take place, upon trials for murder and manslaughter, till the fact be clearly proven, or the *dead body* be discovered.

II. The dungeon, Dec. 22, 1819, just thirty-six days, before the time, appointed for the execution of Stephen—the murderer and the murdered man, standing face to face, in full life—Squire Raymond still avowing his conviction of Stephen's guilt, and holding aloft his written confession—Judge Chace seen in the distance, burying the "*certified minutes of evidence*" in the very hole, pointed out, to Nathaniel Boorn, by Colvin's ghost—and Judge Doolittle evidently regretting, that he had not done less, in this unhappy transaction, which came so near the consummation of judicial murder.

In the succeeding number, I shall endeavor to present a simple version of the motives and conduct of the parties—and some brief remarks, upon this extraordinary trial.

No. LXXXIV.

AFTER a little reflection, the true explanation of this apparent mystery appears to be exceedingly simple. Colvin had become

an object of contempt and hatred to the Boorns; and especially to Stephen. His mental feebleness had produced their contempt—the burdensomeness of himself and his family had begotten their hatred. The poor, semi-demented creature happened, in a luckless hour, to boast, most absurdly, no doubt, of his great importance and usefulness, as a member of this interesting family. This gave a doubly keen edge to the animosity of Stephen; and he berated his brother-in-law, in terms, almost as vulgar and abusive, as those we daily meet with, in so many of our leading political journals, of all denominations.

Forgetful of his inferiority, this miserable worm exemplified the proverb, and turned upon his oppressor, in a feeble way. He struck Stephen with "*a small riding stick.*" This was accounted sufficient provocation by Stephen; and, in the language of the witness, "*Stephen then struck Russell on his neck with a club, and knocked him down.*" He rose, and made a slight effort to renew the battle, and then Stephen again knocked him down. Upon this, Colvin rambled off, towards the mountain, and was seen in that region, no more, till he was brought back, after the expiration of seven years, in December, 1819.

He went off without his hat and shoes; whether, in his effort to shake off the dust of that city, he unconsciously shook off his shoes, is unknown. The discovery of the hat, some years after, formed a part of that wretched *rope of sand*, for it is not worthy of being called a *chain of evidence*, upon which Stephen and Jesse were sentenced to death. Colvin had, doubtless, long been aware, that he was an object of hatred to the Boorns. The blows, inflicted upon this occasion, undoubtedly, aggravated his insanity; yet enough remained of the instinctive love of life, to teach him, that his safety was in flight. How he found his way to that part of New Jersey, which lies near the Atlantic Ocean, is of little importance. He was, notoriously, a wanderer. It was the spring of the year. He moved onward, without plan, camping out, among the bushes, or sleeping in barns; the world before him, and Providence his guide. He, probably, rambled from Manchester, which is in the southwest corner of Vermont, into the State of New York, which lies very near; and, wandering, in a southerly direction, along the westerly boundary lines of Massachusetts and Connecticut, he would, before many days, have entered the northerly part of New Jersey.

Accustomed to his occasional absences, the Boorns, undoubt-

edly, expected his return, for weeks and months, even though the summer had past, and the harvest had ended. But, after the snows of winter had come, and covered the mountains; and the spring had returned, and melted them away; and Colvin came not; then Stephen Boorn, doubtless, began to fear, that he had, unintentionally, killed him—that he had wandered away, and died of the effects of the blows he had received—and that his bones were bleaching, in some unknown part of the mountain, whither he had wandered, immediately after the occurrence.

Upon this hypothesis, alone, can we explain one remarkable word, in the answer of Stephen to Merrill's question, in the jail, as certified, by Judge Chace, in his minutes—"I asked him, if he did take the life of Colvin.—He said he did not take the main life of Colvin. He said no more at that time."

Does any reflecting man inquire—what could have induced these men to confess the crime, with such a particular detail of minute, and extraordinary, circumstances? The answer has already been given, in part.—Stephen, doubtless, believed it to be quite probable, that he had been the means of Colvin's death. To explain the motive for confession, more fully, it is only necessary to stand, for one moment, in the prisoner's shoes. He was assured, by "Squire Raymond," and others, in whom he confided, that no doubt was entertained of his guilt—that his case was dark—and that his only hope lay in confession.

His mind was brought to the full and settled belief, that he should be hung, before many days, *unless he confessed*. If he had confessed the simple truth—the quarrel—the blows—the departure of Colvin—all this would have availed him nothing. It was not this, of which "Squire Raymond," and others, had *no doubt he was guilty*. They had no doubt he was guilty of the murder of Colvin. No confession of anything, short of the *murder of Colvin*, would satisfy "Squire Raymond," and induce him to "petition the legislature in favor" of the prisoner! Stephen well knew, that, if he confessed the murder of Colvin, it would be immediately asked—where he had buried the body—a puzzling question, it must be confessed, for one, who had committed no murder. But it was a delicate moment, for Stephen. It was necessary for him to stand, not only *rectus in curia*—but *rectus* with "Squire Raymond," and all his other attentive patrons. He therefore, to save his life, and secure the patronage

of the "Squire," strung together a terrible tissue of lies, too manifestly preposterous and improbable, even for the credulous brain of Cotton Mather, in 1692. He relieved himself of all embarrassment, in regard to the dead body of the *living* Colvin, by *confessing*, that he first buried it, in the earth—then took it up and reburied it, under a barn—and, after the barn had been burnt, took up the bones again, and cast them into the Battenkill river.

The confession of Jesse was made, when he was aroused from sleep, at midnight, under the impression, as he stated, at the time, that "*something had come in at the window, and was on the bed beside him*"—somewhat extra-judicial, this confession, to be sure. This Jesse appears to have been a most unfilial scoundrel; for, instead of *confessing*, as Stephen had *confessed*, that Stephen himself killed Colvin, single-handed and alone; Jesse catered, more abundantly, to the popular appetite for horrors, by *confessing* that his old father, Barney Boorn, "*damned*" his son-in-law, Colvin, very frequently, and "*cut his throat with a small penknife.*" All this clotted mass of inconsistent absurdity, extorted by hope and fear, his honor, Judge Chace, received, as legal evidence, and gravely certified up to the General Assembly of Vermont.

It is true, Judge Chace, as we have stated, rejected the written confession of Stephen, because Raymond swore, as follows—"*I have heard Mr. Pratt and Mr. Sheldon tell Jesse Boorn, that if he would confess, in case he was guilty, they would petition the legislature for him—I have made the same proposition to Stephen myself, and always told him I had no doubt of his guilt, and that the public mind was against him.*" It is needless to expatiate on the gross impropriety of addressing such language to a prisoner, under such circumstances.

But the witness, Farnsworth, was then produced to prove Stephen's oral confession, that he killed Colvin. It appears, by the minutes, certified by Judge Chace, that he put the preliminary questions, and that the witness swore, "that neither he nor anybody else, *to his knowledge*, had done anything, directly or indirectly, to influence the said Stephen to the *talk* he was about to communicate." In vain, the prisoners' counsel protested, that the evidence was inadmissible, because the "*talk*" between Stephen and Farnsworth was subsequent to the proposition made to Stephen by Raymond. In vain they pressed the consideration,

that if, on this ground, the written confession had been rejected, the oral confession should also be rejected. In vain they offered to prove other proposals and promises, made to the prisoners, at other times, *before* the conversation, now offered to be proved. Nothing, however, would stay their honors, from gibbetting their judicial reputation, in chains, which no time will ever knock off. They suffered Farnsworth to testify ; and he swore, that Stephen told him, "about two weeks *after* the written confession, that he killed Colvin," &c. This must have been about September 10, 1819, and, of course, before the trial, when he was still relying on the promises of Squire Raymond, and others.

The prisoners' counsel very judiciously moved, for the reception of the written confession, and it was read accordingly. Unable to restrain the judicial antics of the Court, it appeared to be the only course, for the prisoners' counsel, to throw the whole crude and incongruous mass before the jury, and leave its credibility, or rather, its palpable incredibility, to their decision. It would be desirable, as a judicial curiosity, to possess a copy of Judge Chace's charge. Of his instructions to the jury he says nothing, in his certified statement to the General Assembly.

Now, apart from the confessions of these men, extorted, so clearly, by the fear of death, and the hope of pardon, there was evidence enough to excite *suspicion*, and there was no more : but, the law of our country convicts no man of murder, or manslaughter, upon *suspicion*. I shall conclude my remarks, upon this interesting case, in the following number.

No. LXXXV.

THE chains of Stephen Boorn were stricken off, and Jesse was liberated from prison. They were men of note. If there were not *giants*, there were *lions*, in those days. Colvin soon became weary of standing upon that dizzy eminence, where circumstances had placed him. He had a painful recollection, no doubt, more or less distinct, of the past : and, after he had served the high purpose, for which he had been brought from New Jersey, he expressed an earnest wish to return to the home of his adoption ; where he had found, in the good Mr. Polhamus, a

friend, who had considered the necessities and distresses of his body and mind; and, who had, been willing, in return for his feeble services, to give him shelter and protection.

The Boorns had, undoubtedly, a fortunate, and, almost a miraculous, escape. So had their honors, the Judges, Chace and Doolittle. Their first meeting, after the *denouement*, must have been perfectly tragi-comical.

Their escape from an awful precipice may admonish all, who sit, in judgment, upon the lives of their fellow-men, to administer the law, with extreme caution, and with a high and holy regard, for those well-established principles, and rules, which can never be disregarded, with impunity. God forbid, that any humble phraseology of mine should, for an instant, be perverted, to mislead the meanest understanding—to foster those principles, which, for the purpose of extending mercy, undeserved, to the murderer, would heap gross injustice and cruelty, upon the whole community—to break down the positive law of God, which Jesus Christ declared, that he came to confirm; and, in its place and stead, to erect the sickly decrees of a society of philandering puppets, whose wires are notoriously pulled, by certain professional and political managers.

In the commencement of my remarks, upon this romance of real life, I endeavored to forefend, against the suspicion of undervaluing that species of evidence, which is called presumptive, or circumstantial. It is accounted, by the most able writers, on this branch of jurisprudence, of the highest quality. Thus, in his admirable work, on Evidence, vol. i. sec. 13, Professor Greenleaf remarks, that, in both civil and criminal cases, "*a verdict may well be founded on circumstances alone; and these often lead to a conclusion, far more satisfactory than direct evidence can produce.*"

The errors, committed by the Judges, upon the trial of the Boorns—and those errors were egregious—were twofold—the admission of extra-judicial confessions, manifestly extorted by hope and fear—and suffering a conviction to take place, before the dead body of the person, alleged to have been murdered, had been discovered.

The rule, on the subject of confessions, is sufficiently plain. "*Deliberate confessions of guilt,*" says Mr. Greenleaf, *ibid.* sec. 215, "*are among the most effectual proofs in the law.*" But they should be received and weighed with caution; for, as he

remarks, sec. 214—"it should be recollected, that the mind of the prisoner himself, is oppressed by the calamity of his situation, and that he is often influenced by motives of hope or fear, to make an untrue confession." Mr. Greenleaf then proceeds to say, in a note on this passage—"of this character was the remarkable case of the two Boorns," &c., and proceeds to give a summary of the case.

"In the United States," says Mr. Greenleaf, *ibid.* sec. 217, "the prisoner's confession, when the *corpus delicti* is not otherwise proved, has been held insufficient, for his conviction; and this opinion, certainly, best accords with the humanity of the criminal code, and with the great degree of caution, applied in receiving and weighing the evidence of confessions, in other cases; and it seems countenanced by approved writers, on this branch of the law."

Again, *ibid.* sec. 219, he remarks—"Before any confession can be received, in evidence, in a criminal case, it must be shown, that it was *voluntary*. * * * * 'A free and voluntary confession,' said Eyre, C. B., 'is deserving of the highest credit, because it is presumed to flow from the strongest sense of guilt, and therefore it is admitted as proof of the crime, to which it refers; but a confession forced from the mind, by the flattery of hope, or by the torture of fear, comes in so questionable a shape, when it is to be considered as the evidence of guilt, that no credit ought to be given to it; and therefore it is rejected.'" Unfortunately, Judges Chace and Doolittle thought otherwise; and brought themselves and the condemned, upon the very threshold of a terrible catastrophe.

Mr. Greenleaf, in the note, above referred to, alludes to an article, in the *North American Review*, vol. 10, p. 418, in which this case of the Boorns is examined. It was from the pen of a gentleman, whose high professional prospects were blasted, by an early death. This writer had seen nothing, however, but "*a very imperfect report of the trial*." His article was published, in April, 1820, about four months after the discovery of Colvin. The conclusions, at which he arrives, that the confessions ought not to have been admitted, would have gained additional strength, had he inspected the *certified minutes*, taken on the trial, by the Chief Justice.

Had he seen those certified minutes of the evidence, he would scarcely have described the utter inconsistency of the two con-

fessions, by the inadequate phrase—"there are differences between them:" for Stephen's claims the whole act of killing to himself—while Jesse's charges the father, who was notoriously not present, with cutting Colvin's throat, while he was yet living, and after Stephen had given him a blow.

This writer relies strongly, upon the humane caution of Sir Matthew Hale, to which I have alluded, that no conviction in case of murder or manslaughter should ever take place, till the fact were proved—or the dead body had been discovered.

A perfect horror of induction seems to have settled down, like a dense cloud, upon the southwestern corner of Vermont. Judges and jurymen appear to have been stupefied, by its power. The important *consequence*, vital to the whole, they assumed to be true, without trial or experiment. I have looked, attentively, into every document, that I could lay my hands upon, connected with this subject; and I cannot discover, that any effort whatever was made, by any one, *till after the trial*, to discover the *living* body of Colvin. The interesting ramble of Jesse and Judge Skinner, upon the mountain, was in search of Colvin's *dead* body! But, upon the publication of the notice, in the Rutland Herald, Nov. 26, 1819, stating the facts, and calling for information, in regard to Colvin, and a similar notice, of the same date, in the New York Evening Post—in ten days, that is, Dec. 6, the most ample and satisfactory information was published, by Mr. Taber Chadwick, in regard to the *living* body of Russell Colvin!

The great caution of Sir Matthew Hale was meant, not less for the prisoner, than for the whole community; no one of whom can be sure, through a long life, of escaping from the oppressive influence of circumstances, accidentally, or purposely, combined against him. His *discreet* humanity spread no mantle of imitation charity or morbid philanthropy over the guilty. He was a bold practitioner—too bold, by far, occasionally, as in the case of Cullender and Duny. But this great, good man, well knew, that prisoners, charged with murder, were entitled to all the benefit of *reasonable* doubt. He well knew, that no judicial caution could go farther, to save, than the fierce suspicion of an excited community would go, to destroy. He well knew, that, with not a small number, the very enormity of the crime seems to supply the want of legal evidence; and, that, in many cases, to be suspected is to be condemned. We have all heard of the

jury, who, having convicted a prisoner of murder, in direct opposition to the Judge's instructions, and being questioned and reproved—replied, that an enormous crime had been committed, and ought to be atoned for; and they saw no good reason, why the prisoner, the only person *suspected*, should not be selected, as the victim!

Sir Matthew Hale's forbearance extended to cases of reprieve, after conviction, before another judge. Thus in H. P. C., vol. ii. ch. lvi., he says—"I have generally observed this rule, that I would never give judgment, or award execution, upon a person, reprieved by any other judge but myself, because I could not know, upon what ground or reason he reprieved him."

Upon this, there is the following pertinent note—"The usefulness of this caution may be seen, from what is observed, by Sir John Hawles, in his remarks on Cornish's trial, where he relates the case of some persons, who had been convicted of the murder of a person absent, barely by inferences from foolish words and actions; but the judge, before whom it was tried, was so unsatisfied in the matter, because the body of the person, supposed to be murdered, was not to be found, that he reprieved the persons condemned; yet, in a circuit afterwards, a certain unwary judge, without inquiring into the reasons of the reprieve, ordered execution, and the persons to be hanged in chains, which was done accordingly; and afterwards, to his reproach, the person, supposed to be murdered, appeared alive."

The death of the person, alleged to have been murdered, is, manifestly, not less a constituent part of the crime, than the malice prepense, or the employment of the means. These three things are necessary to constitute murder, in the eye of the law. Thus, an acquittal has taken place, where the *murder* was alleged to have been committed, *on the high seas*; and the *malice* and the *blow* only were proved to have occurred *on the high seas*—and the *death*, in the harbor of Cape François. Such was the case of the U. S. against McGill, reported in Dallas. This extreme particularity appears, to some persons, exceedingly ridiculous; but not quite as much so, as certain commentaries, upon legal proceedings which we sometimes meet with, in the ordinary journals of the day.

Aaron Burr, whom I desire not to quote, too frequently, once shrewdly remarked—"he, who despises forms, knows not what he despises." To infer the death, from the malice, and the employ-

ment of the means, in all cases, would be absurd. If one man maliciously knocks another into the sea, here is, certainly, a violent assault and battery—perhaps an assault with intent to kill. But, before we join, in the popular *hutesium et clamor*, we have two important points to settle, beyond all *reasonable* doubt—first, if the person, knocked overboard, be dead, for he may have swum to land, or have been picked up, at sea, alive, in which case, unless he die of the blow, within the time prescribed, there can be neither murder nor manslaughter. And, secondly, if he be proved to have died of the injury within that time, we must duly weigh the previous circumstances and the provocation, to ascertain, if the act done be manslaughter or murder.

Those, who vociferate, most loudly, against the law, for its hesitancy, and demand the immediate descent of the executioner's axe, upon the neck of the victim, will be the very first fervently to supplicate, for the law's most merciful carefulness of life, should a father, a brother, or a son be charged with crime, and involved in the complicated meshes of presumptive evidence.

No. LXXXVI.

THE transition state, when the confidence of youth begins to give place to that wholesome distrust, which is the usual—by no means, the invariable—accompaniment of riper years, is often a state of disquietude and pain. It is no light matter to look upon the visions of our own superiority, and imaginary importance, as they break, like bubbles, one after another, and leave us abundantly convinced, that we are of yesterday, and know nothing.

The confidence of ignorance, however venial in youth, is not altogether so excusable, in full grown men. Its exhibitions, however ridiculous and absurd, are daily manifested, by mankind, in relation to those arts and sciences, which have little or nothing in common with their own respective vocations. The physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, the deeper they descend into their respective, professional wells, where truth is proverbially said to abide, proceed with increasing caution. Yet it is quite amazing, to witness the boldness, with which they dive into the very depths, that lie entirely beyond their professional pre-

cincts. The physician, who proceeds, in the cure of bodies, with the extremest caution, seems to be quite at home, in the cure of souls; and has very little doubt or difficulty, upon points, which have perplexed the brains of Hale and Mansfield. The lawyer, who, in his own department, moves warily; weighs evidence with infinite care; and consults authorities, with great deliberation—looks upon physic and theology, as rather speculative matters, and of easy acquirement. The clergyman frequently practises physic gratuitously; and holding the doctrine in perfect contempt, that the *viginti studia annorum* are necessary to make a tolerable lawyer, he rather opines, that, as *majus implicat minus*, so his knowledge of the Divine law necessarily comprehends a perfect knowledge of mere human jurisprudence.

This confidence of ignorance is nowhere more perfectly, or more briefly, expressed, than in four oft-repeated lines, in Pope's Essay on Criticism:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring:
These shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again."

The editors of public journals are, in many instances, men of education and highly respectable abilities—men of taste and learning—men of integrity, and refinement, cherishing a just regard for the rights of individuals, and of the community. There is a very different class of men, who, however incompetent to improve the minds or the manners of the public, have a small smattering of knowledge; hold a reckless, rapid pen; and, by the aid of the scavengers, whom they employ, to rake the gutters for slander and obscenity, cater, daily, to the foulest appetites of mankind. There are some, who descend not thus, to the very nadir of all filth and corruption, but whose columns, nevertheless, are ever open, like the mouths of so many *cloacæ*, for the filthy contributions of every dirty depositor; and who are ever on hand, like the Scotch cloak-man, in *Auld Reekie*, to serve the occasions of a customer.

The very phraseology of the craft has a tendency to the amplification of an editor; and to give confirmation to the confidence of ignorance. The broken merchant, the ambitious weaver, the briefless lawyer, the literary tailor are speedily sunk, in "we," and "our sheet," and "our columns," and "our-self."

This confidence of ignorance has rarely been manifested, more extensively, upon any occasion, than in connection with the indictment, trial, and condemnation of Dr. Webster, for the murder of Dr. George Parkman.

The indictment was no sooner published, than three *religious* journals began to criticise this *legal* instrument, which had been carefully, and, as the decision of the learned Chief Justice and of the Court has decided, sufficiently, prepared, by the Attorney General of the Commonwealth. This indictment contained several counts, a thing by no means unusual, the object of which is well understood, by professional men. "If the crime was committed with a knife, or with the fists, how could it be committed with a hammer?" It would not be an easy task to convince these worthy ministers of the Gospel, how exceedingly ridiculous such commentaries appear, to men of any legal knowledge.

Judge, Jurymen, and Counsellors are severely censured, for the parts they have borne, in the trial and condemnation of Dr. Webster. By whom? By the editors of certain far-away journals, upon the evidence, *as it has reached them*. The evidence has been very variously reported. A portion of the evidence, however deeply graven upon the hearts, and minds, and memories of the highly respectable jury, and of the court, and of the multitude, present at the trial, is, from its peculiar nature, not transferable. I refer to the appearance, the air, the manner, the voice of the prisoner, especially, when, in opposition to the advice of his counsel, he fatally opened his mouth, and said precisely nothing, that betokened innocence.

I do not believe there was ever, in the United States, a more impartial trial, more quietly conducted, than this trial of Dr. Webster. Party feeling has had no lot, nor share, in this matter. The whole dealing has been calmly and confidently surrendered to the laws of the land. With scarcely an exception, from the moment of arrest to the hour of trial, the public journals, in this vicinity, have borne themselves, with great forbearance to the prisoner. The family connexions of Dr. Parkman have held themselves scrupulously aloof, unless summoned to bear witness to facts, within their knowledge.

It has been asserted, in one or more journals, that even the body of Dr. Parkman has not been discovered. The reply is short, and germane—the coroner's jury, twenty-four grand jurors, and twelve jurors in the Supreme Judicial Court have decided,

that the mutilated remains were those of the late George Parkman; and that John White Webster was his murderer; and the Court has gravely pronounced the opinion, that the verdict is a righteous verdict, and in accordance with the law and the evidence. This opinion appears to meet with a very general, affirmative response, in this quarter. The jury—and the members of that panel, one and all, after twelve days' concentration of thought, upon this solemn question of life and death, appear to have been conscientious men—the jury have not recommended the prisoner, as a person entitled to mercy.

In view of all this, the editor of a distant, public journal may be supposed to entertain a pretty good opinion of his qualifications, who ventures to pronounce his *ex-cathedra* decree, either that Dr. Webster is innocent, or, if guilty, that, on technical grounds, he has been illegally convicted. There is something absolutely melancholy in the contemplation of such presumption as this. But, under all the circumstances of this heart-sickening occurrence, it is impossible to behold, without a smile, the extraordinary efforts of some exceedingly benevolent people, in the city of New York, who are circulating a petition to the Governor of Massachusetts, not merely for a commutation of punishment, but for a pardon. This, to speak of it forbearingly, may be safely catalogued among the works of supererogation.

If the Governor of Massachusetts needs any guidance from man, upon the present occasion, his Council is at hand. The highest judicial tribunal of the Commonwealth, entirely approving the verdict of an impartial and intelligent jury, has sentenced Dr. Webster to be hung, for a murder, as foul and atrocious, as was ever perpetrated, within the borders of New England. Talents, education, rank aggravate the criminality of the guilty party. "To kill a man, upon sudden and violent resentment, is less penal than upon cool deliberate malice."

If there be any substantial reasons, for pardon or commutation of punishment—any new matter, which has not been exhibited, before the court and jury—those reasons will be duly weighed—that matter will be gravely considered, by the Governor and Council. But, if the objections to the execution of the sentence, upon the present occasion, rest upon any imaginary misdirection, on the part of the Court, or any misunderstanding, on the part of the jury, those objections must be unavailing. After a careful comparison of the evidence, in the case

of Dr. Webster, with the evidence, in the case of Jason Fairbanks, who was executed, for the murder of Betsy Fales, the *concatena*—the chain of circumstances—seems even less perfect in the latter case. Yet, after sentence, in that memorable trial, Chief Justice Dana, who sat in judgment, upon that occasion, was reported to have said, that he believed Fairbanks to be the murderer, more firmly, upon the evidence before the court, than he should have believed the very same thing, upon the evidence of his own eyesight, in a cloudy day—the first could not have deceived him—the latter might.

If an application, for pardon or commutation, be grounded, on the objection to all capital punishment, that objection has been too recently disposed of, in the case of Washington Goode. The majesty of the law, the peace of society, the decree of Almighty God call for impartial justice—WHOSO SHEDDETH MAN'S BLOOD BY MAN SHALL HIS BLOOD BE SHED!

With the eye of mercy turned upon all—aye upon all—who have any relation to the murderer, the better course is Christian submission to the decrees of God and man. What may be the value of a few more years of misery and contempt! God's high decree, that the murderer shall die, is merciful and just. His judgment upon Cain was far more severe—not that he should die—but *that he should live!*—that he should walk the earth, and wear the brand of terrible distinction forever—“*And now thou art cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be upon the earth. And Cain said unto the Lord, my punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold thou hast driven me out, this day, from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven fold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any one finding him should slay him.*”

No. LXXXVII.

It may be said of a proud, poor man—especially, if he be a fearless, godless man, as Dirk Hatteraick said of himself, to Glossin—that he is “*dangerous*.” It is quite probable, there are men, even in our own limited community, of an hundred and thirty thousand souls, who would rather die an easy death, than signify abroad their inability to maintain, any longer, their expensive relations to the fashionable world.

What will not such a man occasionally do, rather than submit gracefully, under such a trial, to the will of God? He will beg, and he will borrow—he will lie, and he will steal. Is there a crime, in the decalogue, or out of it, which he will not, occasionally, perpetrate, if its consummation be likely to save him from a confession of his poverty, and from ceasing to fill his accustomed niche, in the *beau monde*? Not one—*no, not one!*

Well may we, who profess to be Republicans, adopt the wisdom and the words of Montesquieu—“*The less luxury there is in a Republic, the more it is perfect.* * * * * *Republics end with luxury.*”

A significant illustration of these remarks will readily occur, to every reader of American History, in the conduct and character of Benedict Arnold. Among the dead, who, with their own hands, have prepared themselves graves of infamy, there are men of elevated rank, who have made shipwreck of the fairest hopes, in a similar manner. But, far in advance of them all, Arnold is entitled to a terrible preëminence.

The last turn of the screw crushes the victim—it is the last feather, say the Bedouins, that breaks the camel's back—and the train, which has been in gradual preparation for many years, may be exploded, in an instant, by a very little spark, at last.

There are periods, in the lives of certain individuals, when, upon the approach of minor troubles—baleful stars, doubtless, but of the third or fourth magnitude—it may be said, as Rochefoucault said of the calamities of our friends, that there is something in them, not particularly disagreeable to us. A man, whose afflictions, especially when self-induced, are chafing, at every turn, against his already lacerated pride, and who is seeking some apology, for deeds of desperation, often discovers, with

a morbid satisfaction, in some petty offence, or imaginary wrong, ample excuse, for deeds, absolutely damnable.

Such were the influences, at work, in the case of Benedict Arnold. In 1780, in obedience to the sentence of a court martial, he was reprimanded by the Commander-in-Chief; but in terms so highly complimentary, that it is impossible to read them, without a doubt, whether this official reprimand were a crown of thorns, or a crown of glory. At that very time, Arnold's pecuniary embarrassments were overwhelming. Without the rightful means of supporting a one-horse chaise, he rattled up and down, in the city of Philadelphia, in a chariot and four. The splendid mansion, which he occupied, had, in former times, been the residence of the Penns. Here he gave a sumptuous repast to the French ambassador, and entertained the minister and his suite, for several days.

Hunger, it is said, will break through stone walls; even this is a feeble illustration of that force and energy, which characterized Arnold's *passion* for parade. To support his career of unparalleled extravagance and folly, he resorted to stratagems, which would have been contemptible, in a broker of the lowest grade—petty traffic and huckstering speculation—the sale of permits, to do certain things, absolutely forbidden—such were among the last, miserable shifts of this “brave, wicked” man, when his conscience came between the antagonist muscles of poverty and pride. For some of these very offences, he had been condemned, by the court martial. Even then, he had secretly become, at heart, a scoundrel and a renegade; and, covertly, under a feigned name, had already tendered his services to the enemy.

The sentence of the court, sheer justice, but so graciously mingled with mercy, as scarcely to wear the aspect of punishment, supplied him with the very thing he coveted—a pretence, for complaining of injustice and oppression. He sought the French ambassador; and, after a plain allusion to his own needy condition, shadowed forth, in language, not to be mistaken, his willingness to become the secret servant of France. The prompt reply of the French minister is of record, most honorable for himself, and sufficiently humiliating to the spirit of the applicant.

The result is before the world—Arnold became a traitor, detested by those, whose cause he had forsaken, and utterly despised by those, whose cause he affected to espouse—trusted by

them, only, because they well knew he might safely be employed against an enemy, who would deal with him, if captured, not as a prisoner of war, but as a traitor. I have, thus briefly, alluded to the career of Arnold, only for the purpose of illustration.

No truth is more simple—none more firmly established by experience—none more universally disregarded—than, that the growth of luxury must work the overthrow of a republic. As the largest masses are made up of the smallest particles, so the characteristic luxury of a whole people consists of individual extravagance and folly. The ambition to be foremost becomes, ere long, the ruling, and almost universal, passion—in still stronger language, "*it is all the rage.*" In a certain condition of society, talent takes precedence of virtue, and men would rather be called knaves than fools: and, where luxury abounds, as the poorer and the middling classes will imitate the wealthier, there must be a large amount of indebtedness, and many men and women of desperate fortunes. We cannot strut about, in unpaid-for garments, nor ride about, in unpaid-for chariots, nor gather the world together, to admire unpaid-for furniture, without an inward sense of personal degradation.

It would be a poor compliment to our race, to deny the truth of this assertion. True or false, the argument goes steadily forward—for, if not true, then that callous, case-hardened condition of the heart exists, which takes off all care for the common weal, and turns it entirely upon one's self, and one's own aggrandizement. Nothing can be more destructive of that feeling of independence, which ever lies, at the bottom of republican virtue.

This condition of things is the very hot-bed of hypocrisy,—and it makes the heart a forcing-house, for all the evil and bitter passions, envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. Pastors, of all denominations, may well unite, in the chorus of the churchman's prayer, and cry aloud—*Good Lord deliver us!*

A very fallacious and mischievous estimate of personal array, equipage, and furniture has always given wonderful preëminence to this species of emulation. It is perfectly natural withal. Distinction, of some sort, is uppermost, in most men's minds. It is comforting to many to know there is a *tapis*—"the field of the cloth of gold"—on which the wealthy fool is more than a match, for the poor, wise man; and, as this world contains such an

overwhelming majority of the former class, the ayes have it, and luxury holds on, *vires acquirens eundo*.

None but an idiot will cavil, because a rich man adorns his mansion, with elegance and taste, and receives his friends in a style of liberal hospitality. Even if he go beyond the bounds of republican simplicity, and waste his substance, it matters not, beyond the circle of his creditors and heirs; if the example be not followed by thousands, who are unable, or unwilling, to be edified, by Æsop's pleasant fable of the ox and the frog.

But it never can be thus. The machinery is exceedingly simple, in these manufactories, from which men of broken fortunes are annually turned out upon the world.

When once involved in the whirl of fashion, extrication is difficult and painful—the descent is wonderfully easy—*sed revocare gradum!* The maniac hugs not his fetters, more forcibly, than the devotee of fashion clings, with the assistance, occasionally, of his better half, to his *position in society*.

These remarks are, by no means, exclusively applicable to those, who move in the higher circles. This is a world of gradation, and there are few so humble, as to be entirely without their imitators.

What shall we do to be saved? This anxious inquiry is not always offered, I apprehend, in relation to the concerns of a better world. How often, and how oppressively, the spirit of this interrogatory has agitated the bosom of the impoverished man of fashion! What shall I do to be saved, from the terrible disgrace of being exposed, in the court of fashion, as being guilty of the awful crime of *poverty*, and disfranchised, as one of the *beau monde*? And what will he not do, to work out this species of salvation, with fear and trembling? We have seen how readily, under the influence of pride and poverty, treason may be committed by men of lofty standing. It would be superfluous, therefore, to inquire, if there be any crime, which men, heavily oppressed by their embarrassments, and restrained thereby, from drinking more deeply of that luxury, with which they are already drunk, will hesitate to commit.

No. LXXXVIII.

THERE is a popular notion, that sumptuary laws are applicable to monarchies—not to republics. The very reverse is the truth. Montesquieu says, Spirit of Laws, book vii. ch. 4, that "*luxury is extremely proper for monarchies, and that, under this government, there should be no sumptuary laws.*"

Sumptuary laws are looked upon, at present, as the relics of an age gone by. These laws, in a strict sense, are designed to restrain pecuniary extravagance. It has often been attempted to stigmatize the wholesome, prohibitory laws of the several States, in regard to the sale of intoxicating liquor, by calling them *sumptuary laws*. The distinction is clear—sumptuary laws strike at the root of extravagance—the prohibitory, license laws, as they are called, strike, not only at the root of extravagance, but at the root of every crime, in the decalogue.

The *leges sumptuariae* of Rome were numerous. The Locrian law limited the number of guests, and the Fannian law the expense, at festivals. The Didian law extended the operation of all these laws over Italy.

The laws of the Edwards III., and IV., and of Henry VIII., against shoes with long points, short doublets, and long coats, were not repealed, till the first year of James I. Camden says, that, "in the time of Henry IV., it was proclaimed, that no man should wear shoes, above six inches broad, at the toes." He also states, "that their other garments were so short, that it was enacted, 25 Edward IV., that no person, under the condition of a lord, should wear any mantle or gown, unless of such length, that, standing upright, it might cover his buttocks."

Diodorus Siculus, lib. xii. cap. 20, gives an amusing account of the sumptuary laws of Zeleucus, king of the Locrians. His design appears to have been to accomplish his object, by casting ridicule upon those practices, against which his laws were intended to operate. He decreed, that no free woman should have more than one maid to follow her, unless she was drunk; nor should she stir out of the city by night, nor wear jewels of gold, or an embroidered gown, unless she was a professed strumpet. No men, but ruffians, were allowed to wear gold rings, nor to be seen, in one of those effeminate vests of the manufacture of Miletum.

The very best code of sumptuary laws is that, which may be found in the common sense of an enlightened community. Nothing, that I have ever met with, upon this subject, appears more just, than the sentiments of Michael De Montaigne, vol. i. ch. 43—"The true way would be to beget in men a contempt of silks and gold, as vain and useless; whereas we add honor and value to them, which sure is a very improper way to create disgust. For to enact, that none but princes shall eat turbot, nor wear velvet or gold lace, and interdict these things to the people, what is it, but to bring them into greater esteem, and to set every one more agog to eat and wear them?"

No truth has been more amply demonstrated, than that a republic has more to fear from internal than from external causes—less from foreign foes, than from enemies of its own household.

To the ears of those, who have not reflected upon the subject, it may sound like the croaking note of some ill boding *ab ilice cornix*—but I look upon extravagant parade, and princely furniture of foreign manufacture, the introduction of courtly customs, transatlantic servants in livery, *et id genus omne nugarum*, as so many premonitory symptoms of national evil—as part and parcel of that luxury, which may justly be called the gangrene of a republic.

But does any one seriously fear, that an extravagant fandango, now and then, will lead to revolution, or produce a change in our political institutions? Probably not. But it will provoke a spirit of rivalry—of emulation, not unmingled with bitterness, and which will cost many an aspirant a great deal more, than he can afford. It will lead the community to turn their dwellings into baby houses, and to gather vast assemblies together, not for the rational purposes of social intercourse, but for the purpose of exhibiting their costly toys and imported baubles. It will tend to harden the heart; and render us more and more insensible to the cries of the poor; for whose keen occasions we cannot afford one dollar, having, just then, perhaps, invested a thousand, in some glittering absurdity. It will, ultimately, produce numerous examples of poverty, and fill the community with desperate men.

The line of distinction, between the liberality of a patrician and the flashy, offensive ostentation of a parvenu, at Rome, or at Athens, was as readily perceived, as the difference between the manners of a gentleman, and those of a clown.

Every rank of society, like the troubled sea, casts forth upon the strand, from year to year, its full proportion of wrecked adventurers—men, who have gone beyond their depth; lived beyond their means; and who cherish no care, *ne quid detrimenti Respublica caperet*; but, on the contrary, who are quite ready for oligarchy, or monarchy; and some of whom would prefer even anarchy, to their present condition of obscurity and poverty.

Law and order are of the first importance to every proprietor; for, on their preservation, the security of his property depends; but they are of no importance to those, who are thus, virtually, denationalized, through impoverishment, produced by a career of luxury. Such, if not already the component elements of Empire clubs, are always useless, and often dangerous men.

It was a well known saying of Jefferson's, that *great cities* were *great sores*. "In proportion," says Montesquieu, "to the populousness of towns, the inhabitants are filled with notions of vanity, and actuated by an ambition of distinguishing themselves, by trifles. If they are very numerous, and most of them strangers to one another, their vanity redoubles, because there are greater hopes of success." According to the apothegm of Franklin, it is the eyes of others, and not our own, that destroy us.

"Every body agrees," says Mandeville in his Fable of the Bees, i. 98, "that, as to apparel and manner of living, we ought to behave ourselves suitable to our conditions, and follow the example of the most sensible and prudent, among our equals in rank and fortune; yet how few, that are not either universally covetous, or else proud of singularity, have this discretion to boast of? We all look above ourselves, and, as fast as we can, strive to imitate those that, some way or other, are superior to us."

"The poorest laborer's wife in the parish, who scorns to wear a strong wholesome frize, will half starve herself and her husband, to purchase a second-hand gown and petticoat, that cannot do her half the service, because, forsooth, it is more genteel. The weaver, the shoemaker, the tailor, the barber, has the impudence, with the first money he gets, to dress himself like a tradesman of substance; the ordinary retailer, in the clothing of his wife, takes pattern from his neighbor, that deals in the same commodity by wholesale, and the reason he gives for it is, that, twelve years ago, the other had not a bigger shop than himself.

The druggist, mercer, and draper, can find no difference, between themselves and merchants, and therefore dress and live like them. The merchant's lady, who cannot bear the assurance of those mechanics, flies for refuge to the other end of the town, and scorns to follow any fashion, but what she takes from thence. This haughtiness alarms the court—the women of quality are frightened to see merchants' wives and daughters dressed like themselves. This impudence of the city, they cry, is intolerable; mantua-makers are sent for; and the contrivance of fashions becomes all their study, that they may have always new modes ready to take up, as soon as those saucy cits shall begin to imitate those in being. The same emulation is contrived through the several degrees of quality, to an incredible expense; till, at last, the prince's great favorites, and those of the first rank, having nothing else left, to outstrip some of their inferiors, are forced to lay out vast estates in pompous equipages, magnificent furniture, sumptuous gardens, and princely palaces."

Like an accommodating almanac, the description of Mandeville is applicable to other meridians, than that, for which it was especially designed.

The history of all, that passes in the bosom of a proud man, unrestrained by fixed religious and moral principles, during his transition from affluence to poverty, must be a very edifying history. With such an individual the fear of God is but a pack-thread, against the unrelaxing, antagonist muscle of pride. The only *Hades*, of which he has any dread, is that abyss of obscurity and poverty, in which a man is condemned to abide, who falls from his high estate, among the upper ten thousand. What plans, what projects, what infernal stratagems occasionally bubble up, in the overheated crucible! Magnanimity, and honor, and humanity, and justice are unseen—unfelt. The dust of self-interest has blinded his eyes—the pride of life has hardened his heart.

If the energies of such men are not mischievously employed, they are, at best, utterly lost to the community.

No. LXXXIX.

I NOTICED, in a late, English paper, a very civil apology from Sheriff Calcraft, for not hanging Sarah Thomas, at Bristol, as punctually as he ought, on account of a similar engagement, with another lady, at Norwich. The hanging business seems to be *looking up* with us, as the traders say of their cotton and molasses; though, in England, it has fallen off prodigiously. According to Stowe, seventy-two thousand persons were executed there, in one reign, that of Henry VIII. That, however, was a long reign, of thirty-eight years. Between 1820 and 1830, there were executed, in England alone, seven hundred and ninety-seven convicts. But we must remember, for what trifles men were formerly executed *there*, which *here* were at no time, capital offences. According to authentic records, the decrease of executions in London, since 1820, is very remarkable. Haydn, in his Dictionary of Universal Reference, p. 205, gives the ratio of nine years, as follows—1820, 43—1825, 17—1830, 6—1835, none—1836, none—1837, 2—1838, none—1839, 2—1840, 1. There is a solution for this riddle—a key to this *lock*, which many readers may find it rather difficult to pick, without assistance. Before the first year, named by Haydn, 1820, Sir Samuel Romilly, who fell, by his own hand, in a fit of temporary derangement, in 1818, occasioned by the death of his wife, had published—not long before—his admirable pamphlet, urging a revision of the criminal code, and a limitation of capital punishment. In consequence of his exertions, and of those of Sir James Mackintosh afterwards, and more recently of Sir Robert Peel and others, a great change had taken place, *in the mode of punishment. Crime had not diminished*, in London—it was *differently dealt with*. I advise the reader, who desires light, upon this highly important and interesting subject, to read, with care, the entire article, from which I transcribe the following short passage—

“*The enormous number of our transported convicts—five thousand annually, for many years past—accompanied, at the same time, with a large increase of crime in general, would seem, prima facie, to be no very conclusive argument, in favor of the efficiency of the present system.*” Ed. Rev., v. 86, p. 257, 1847. “*WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH OUR CRIMINALS?*” Such is the caption of

the able article, to which I refer. Lord Grey, and the most eminent statesmen of Great Britain have been terribly perplexed, by this awful interrogatory.—Well: *we* are a very great people.—Dr. Omnibus, Squire Farrago, and Mrs. Negoose have no difficulty upon this point; and there is some thought in our society, of sending out Mrs. Negoose, in the next steamer, to have a conference with Lord Brougham. Lord Grey's plan was, after a short penitentiary confinement, to distribute the malefactors, among their own colonies, and among such other nations, as might be willing to receive them. Sending them to Canada, therefore, would be sending them, pretty directly, to the States. Dr. Omnibus is greatly surprised, that Lord Grey has never thought of building prisons of sufficient capacity to hold them all, since there are no more than five thousand transported, per annum, in addition to those, who have become tenants of prisons, for crimes, which are yet capital, in England, and for crimes, whose penalty is less than transportation.

It seems to be the opinion of the writer in the Edinburgh Review, whom I last quoted, that, under the anti-capital punishment system, there has been "*a large increase of crime in general.*" This he states *as a fact*. Facts are stubborn things—so are Mrs. Negoose—Dr. Omnibus—and Squire Farrago. They contend, that our habits of life and education, and the great difference of our political institutions entirely nullify the British example. They show, with great appearance of truth, that the perpetrators of murder, rape, and other crimes, in our own country, are more religiously brought up, than the perpetrators of similar crimes, in Great Britain. The statistics, on this point, are curious and interesting. They present an imposing array of educated laymen, physicians, lawyers, bishops, priests, deacons, ruling elders, professors, and candidates, in the United States, who have been tried, for various crimes, by civil or ecclesiastical courts; deposed, or acquitted, on purely technical grounds; or sentenced to imprisonment, for a shorter or longer term, or to the gallows, and duly executed. Now we contend, that the ignorant felon, and such he is apt to be, in all countries, where there is but little diffusion of knowledge, and especially of religious knowledge, when again let loose upon the community, whether by a full pardon, or by serving out his term, returns, commonly, to his evil courses, as surely as the dog to his vomit, or the sow to her wallowing in the mire. But we find, that men of talent and

education, and particularly men, who have figured, as preachers, and professors of religion, who commit any crime, in the decalogue, or out of it, become objects of incalculably deeper and stronger interest, with a certain portion of the community—after they repent, of course—which they invariably do, in an inconceivably short space of time. Thus, when strong liquor, and lust, and prelatical arrogance turn bishops, priests, and deacons, into brutes, and prodigals, and sometimes into murderers, they, *invariably*, excite an interest, which they never could have excited, by preaching their very best, to the end of their lives.

I have sometimes thought, that, in the matter of temperance, for which I cherish a cordial respect, a lecturer, as the performer is called, though the thing is not precisely an abstract science, cannot do a better thing, for himself and the cause, when he finds, that he is wearing out his welcome with the public, than to get pretty notoriously drunk. Depend upon it, he will come forth, purified from the furnace. He will take a new departure, for his temperance voyage. His deep-wrought penitence will enlist a very large part of the army of cold-water men, in his favor. A small sizzle will be of no use; but the drunker he gets, the more marvellous the hand of God will appear, in his restoration.

From these considerations, our Anti-Punishment Society reason onward, to the following conclusions: that, whatever the penalty imposed may be, deposition, imprisonment, or death, it is all wrong, radically wrong. For, thereby, the community is deprived, for a time, or forever, of the services of a true penitent. They all become penitent, if a little time be allowed, or they are persecuted innocents, which is better still.

Besides, how audacious, for mere mortals to lessen the sum total of joy, among the immortals! As religious men, who, when *misguided*, commit rape or murder, invariably repent, if there is any prospect of pardon; hanging may be supposed, in many cases, to prevent that great joy, which exists in Heaven—rather more than ninety-nine per cent.—over one sinner that repenteth.

To be convicted of some highly disgraceful or atrocious crime, or to be acquitted, upon some technical ground, though logically convicted, in the impartial chancel of wise and good men's minds, is not such a terrible thing, after all, for a vivacious bishop, priest, or deacon; provided, in the former case, he can con-

trive to escape the penalty. Such an one is sometimes more sure of a parish, than a candidate, of superior talents, and unspotted reputation. It is manifest, therefore, that a serious injury is done to society, by shutting up, for any great length of time, these penitent, misguided murderers, ravishers, &c., and, especially, by hanging them by the neck, till they are dead.

This phrase, *hanging by the neck, till they are dead*, imports something more, than some readers are aware of. It was not uncommon, in former times, for culprits to come—*usque ad*—to the gallows, and be there pardoned, with the halter about their necks. Occasionally, also, criminals were actually hung, the halter having been so mercifully adjusted, as not to break their necks, and then cut down, and pardoned. Of thirty-two gentlemen, traitors, who were taken, in the reign of Henry VI., 1447, after Gloucester's death, five were drawn to Tyburn on a hurdle, hanged, cut down alive, marked with a knife for quartering, and then spared, upon the exhibition of a pardon. This matter is related, in Rymer's *Fœdera*, xi. 178; also by Stowe, and by Rapin, Lond. ed. 1757, iv. 441.

We are a cruel people. Our phraseology has become softened, but our practice is merciless, and our lawgivers are Dracos, to a man. When a poor fellow, urged by an impulse, which he cannot resist, seizes upon the wife or the daughter of some unlucky citizen, commits a rape upon her person, and then takes her life to save his own—and what can be more natural, for all that a man hath will he give for his life—with great propriety, we call this poor fellow a *misguided man*. This is as it should be. He certainly committed a mistake. No doubt of it. But are we not all liable to mistakes? We call him a *misguided man*, which is a more Christian phrase than to say, in the coarser language of the law, that he was *instigated by the devil*. But, nevertheless, we hang this *misguided man* by the neck, till he is dead. How absurd! How unjust!

A needy wanderer of the night breaks into the house of some rich, old gentleman; robs his dwelling; breaks his skull, *ex abundanti cautela*; and sets fire to the tenement; thus combining burglary, murder, and arson. He well knew, that ignorance was bliss; and that the neighborhood would be happier, in the belief, that accident was at the bottom of it all, than that such enormities had been committed, in their midst. Instead of calling this individual, by all the hard names in an indictment, we

charitably style him an *unfortunate person*—provided he is caught and convicted—if not, he deems himself a *lucky fellow*, of course. Now, can anything be more barbarous, than to hang this *unfortunate person*, upon a gallows!

A desperate debtor rouses the indignation of a disappointed creditor, by selling to another, as unincumbered, the very property, which had been transferred, as collateral security, to himself. Irritated by the creditor's reproaches, and alarmed by his menaces of public exposure, the debtor decides to escape, from these compound embarrassments, by taking the life of his pursuer. He affects to be prepared for payment; and summons the creditor, to meet him, at a *convenient* place, where he is *quite at home*, and at a *convenient* hour, when he is *quite alone*—*bringing with him the evidences of the debt*. He kills this troublesome creditor. He is suspected—arrested—charged with murder—indicted—tried—defended, as ably as he can be, by honorable men, oppressed by the consciousness of their client's guilt—and finally convicted. He made no attempt, by inventing a tale of angry words and blows, to merge this murder, in a case of manslaughter: for, before his arrest, and when he fancied himself beyond the circle of suspicion, he had *framed the tale*, and reduced it to writing, in the form of a brief, portable memorandum, found upon his person. *He had paid the creditor, who hastily grasped the money and departed—returning to perform the unusual office of dashing out the debtor's name from a note delivered up, on payment, into the debtor's possession!* Thus he cut short all power to fabricate a case of manslaughter.

Why charge such a man with *malice prepense*? Why say, that he was *instigated by the devil*? Not so; he was an *unfortunate, misguided, unhappy* man. And yet the judges, with perfect unanimity, have sentenced this unhappy man to be hanged! The liberties of the people appear to be in danger; and it is deeply to be deplored, that those gentlemen of various crafts, who are sufficiently at leisure, to sit in judgment, upon the judges themselves, have not appellate jurisdiction, in these high matters, with power to invoke the assistance of the Widow's society, or some other male, or female, auxiliary *ne tutor ultra crepidam* society.

Dealings with the Dead.

DEALINGS

WITH

T H E . D E A D .

BY

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

VOLUME II.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
83 AND 85 CONGRESS STREET:
AND
TICKNOR AND FIELDS,
CORNER OF WASHINGTON AND SCHOOL STREETS.
MDCCCLVI.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855, by
DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Dealings with the Dead.

II

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

No. XC.

MY earliest recollections of some, among the dead and buried aristocracy of Boston, find a ready embodiment, in cocked hats of enormous proportions, queues reaching to their middles, cloaks of scarlet broadcloth, lined with silk, and faced with velvet, and just so short, as to exhibit the swell of the leg, silk stockings, and breeches, highly polished shoes, and large, square, silver buckles, embroidered vests, with deep lappet pockets, similar to those, which were worn, in the age of *Louis Quatorze*, shirts ruffled, at the bosoms and sleeves, doeskin or beaver gloves, and glossy, black, Surinam walking canes, six feet in length, and commonly carried by the middle.

Of the last of the Capulets we know nearly all, that it is desirable to know. Of the last of the cocked hats we are not so clearly certified.

The dimensions of the military cocked hat were terrible; and, like those enormous, bear skin caps, which are in use, at present, eminently calculated to put the enemy to flight. I have seen one of those enormous cocked hats, which had long been preserved, as a memorial of the wearer's gallantry. In one corner, and near the extremity, was a round hole, said to have been made by a musket ball, at the battle of White Plains, Nov. 30, 1776. As I contemplated this relic, it was impossible to avoid

the comforting reflection, that the head of the gallant proprietor was at a very safe distance from the bullet.

After the assassination of Henry IV., and greatly to the amusement of the gay and giddy courtiers of his successor, Louis XIII.—old Sully obstinately adhered to the costume of the former reign. Colonel Barnabas Clarke was very much of Sully's way of thinking. "And who," asks the reader, "was Colonel Barnabas Clarke?" He was a pensioner of the United States, and died a poor, though highly respected old man, in the town of Randolph, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts. For several years, he commanded the third Regiment of the first Brigade, and first Division of infantry; and he wore the largest cocked hat and the longest queue in the known world. He was a broad-shouldered, strong-hearted Revolutioner. Let me take the reader aside, for a brief space; and recite to him a pleasant anecdote of old Colonel Barnabas Clarke, which occurred, under my own observation, when John Brooks—whose patent of military nobility bears date at Saratoga, but who was one of nature's noblemen from his cradle—was governor of Massachusetts.

There was a militia muster of the Norfolk troops, and they were reviewed by Governor Brooks. They were drawn up in line. The Governor, bare headed, with his suite, had moved slowly down, in front of the array, each regiment, as he passed, paying the customary salute.

The petty *chapeau militaire* had then become almost universal, and, with, or without, its feather and gold edgings, was all over the field. Splendid epaulettes and eaglets glittered, on the shoulders of such, as were entitled to wear them. Prancing horses were caracoling and curvetting, in gaudy trappings. In the midst of this showy array, in front of his regiment, bolt upright, upon the back of his tall, chestnut horse, that, upon the strength of an extra allowance of oats, pawed the ground, and seemed to forget, that he was in the plough, the day before, sat an old man, of rugged features, and large proportions. Upon his head was that enormous cocked hat, of other days—upon his shoulders, scarcely distinguishable, was a small pair of tarnished epaulettes—the gray hairs at the extremity of his prodigious queue lay upon the crupper of his saddle—his ancient boots shaped to the leg, his long shanked spurs, his straight silver-hilted sword, and lion-headed pistols were of 1776. Such was the outer man of old Colonel Barnabas Clarke.

As the Governor advanced, upon the line of the third Regiment of the first Brigade, the fifes of that regiment commenced their shrill whistle, and the drums began to roll; and, at the appropriate moment, the veteran saluted his excellency, in that rather angular style, which was common, in the days of our military fathers.

At that moment, Governor Brooks checked his horse, and, replacing his hat upon his head, dismounted, and walked towards the Colonel, who, comprehending the intention, returned his sword to its scabbard, and came to the ground, with the alertness of a much younger man. They met midway, between the line and the reviewing cortege—in an instant, each grasped the other's hand, with the ardor of men, who are mutually endeared, by the recollection of partnership, in days of danger and daring—they had been fellow lodgers, within the intrenchments of Burgoyne, on the memorable night of October 7, 1777. After a few words of mutual respect and affection, they parted—the review went forward—the fifers and drummers outdid themselves—the beholders sent forth an irrepressible shout—and when old Colonel Barnabas got up once again, upon his chestnut horse, I thought he looked considerably more like old Frederick, hat, queue, and all, than he did, before he got down. He looked as proud as Tamerlane, after he had caged the Sultan, Bajazet—yet I saw him dash a tear from his eye, with the sleeve of his coat—I found one in my own. How frail we are!—there is one there now!

While contemplating the remarkable resurrection that has occurred, within a few years, of old chairs and tables, porcelain and candlesticks, I confidently look forward to the resurrection of cocked hats. They were really very becoming. I speak not of those vasty beavers, manufactured, of yore, by that most accomplished, gentlemanly, and facetious of all hatters, Mr. Nathaniel Balch, No. 72 old Cornhill; but such as he made, for his excellent friend, and boon companion, Jeremiah Allen, Esquire, high Sheriff of Suffolk. When trimmed with gold lace, and adorned with the official cockade, it was a very becoming affair.

No man carried the fashion, as I have described it, in the commencement of this article, to a greater extent, than Mr. Thomas Marshall, more commonly known as *Tommy Marshall*. He was a tailor, and his shop and house were in State Street,

near the present site of the Boston Bank. In London, his leisurely gait, finished toilette, admirable personal equipments, and exceedingly composed and courtly carriage and deportment would have passed him off, for a gentleman, living at his ease, or for one of the nobility. Mr. Marshall was remarkable, for the exquisite polish, and classical cut of his cocked hat. He was much on 'change, in those primitive days, and highly respected, for his true sense of honor. Though the most accomplished tailor of his day, no one ever suspected him of cabbage.

When I began the present article, it was my design to have written upon a very different subject—but since all my cogitations have been "*knocked into a cocked hat*," I may as well close this article, with a short anecdote of Tommy Marshall.

There was a period—there often is, in similar cases—during which it was doubtful, if the celebrated James Otis was a sane or an insane man. During that period, he was engaged for the plaintiff, in a cause, in which Mr. Marshall was a witness, for the defendant. After a tedious cross examination, Mr. Otis perceived the impossibility of perplexing the witness, or driving him into any discrepancy; and, in a moment of despair, his mind, probably, not being perfectly balanced, he lifted his finger, and shaking it, knowingly, at the witness, exclaimed—"Ah, Tommy Marshall, Tommy Marshall, I know you!" "And what do you know of me, sir?" cried the witness, doubling his fist in the very face of Mr. Otis, and stamping on the floor—"I know you're a tailor, Tommy!"

No. XCI.

WAKE—Vigil—Wæcan—import one and the same thing. So we are informed, by that learned antiquary, John Whitaker, in his History of Manchester, published in 1771. Originally, this was a festival, kept by watching, through the night, preceding the day, on which a church was dedicated. We are told, by Shakspeare—

He that outlives this day, and sees old age,
Will yearly, on the vigil, feast his neighbors,
And say tomorrow is Saint Crispian.

These vigils, like the *agapæ*, or love-feasts, fell, crelong, into

disrepute, and furnished occasion, for disgraceful revelry and riot.

The *Irish Wake*, as it is popularly called, however it may have sprung from the same original stock, is, at present, a very different affair. Howling, at a wake, is akin to the ululation of the mourning women of Greece, Rome, and Judea, to which I have alluded, in a former number. The object of the *Irish Wake* is to rouse the spirit, which, otherwise, it is apprehended, might remain inactive, unwilling, or unable, to quit its mortal frame—to *wake* the soul, not precisely, "by tender strokes of art," but by long-continued, nocturnal wailings and howlings. In practice, it has ever been accounted extremely difficult, to get the Irish soul fairly off, either upward or downward, without an abundance of intoxicating liquor.

The philosophy of this is too high for me—I cannot attain unto it. I know not, whether the soul goes off, in a fit of disgust, at the senseless and insufferable uproar, or is fairly frightened out of its tabernacle. This I know, that boon companions, and plenty of liquor are the very last means I should think of employing, to induce a true-born Irishman, to give up the ghost. I have read with pleasure, in the *Pilot*, a Roman Catholic paper of this city, an editorial discommendation of this preposterous custom.

However these barbarous proceedings may serve to outrage the dignity, and even the decency, of death, they have not always been absolutely useless. If the ravings, and rantings, the drunkenness, and the bloody brawls, that have sometimes occurred, during the celebration of an *Irish wake*, have proved unavailing, in raising the dead, or in exciting the lethargic soul—they have, certainly, sometimes sufficed, to restore consciousness to the cataleptic, who were supposed to be dead, and about to be committed to the grave.

In April, 1804, Barney O'Brien, to all appearance, died suddenly, in the town of Ballyshannon. He had been a terrible bruiser, and so much of a profligate, that it was thought all the priests, in the county of Donegal, would have as much as they could do, of a long summer's day, to confess him. It was concluded, on all hands, that more than ordinary efforts would be required, for the *waking* of Barney O'Brien's soul. A great crowd was accordingly gathered to the shanty of death. The mountain dew was supplied, without stint. The howling was

terrific. Confusion began. The altercation of tongues was speedily followed, by the collision of fists, and the cracking of shelalahs. The yet uncovered coffin was overturned. The shock, in an instant, terminated the trance. Barney O'Brien stood erect, before the terrified and flying group, six feet and four inches in his winding sheet, screaming, at the very top of his lungs, as he rose—"For the love o' the blissed Jasus, jist a dhrap o' the crathur, and a shelalah!"

In a former number, I have alluded to the subject of premature interment. A writer, in the London Quarterly, vol. lxiii. p. 458, observes, that "there exists, among the poor of the metropolitan districts, an inordinate dread of premature burial." After referring to a contrivance, in the receiving houses of Frankfort and Munich,—a ring, attached to the finger of the corpse, and connected with a lightly hung bell, in the watcher's room—he significantly asks—"Has the corpse bell at Frankfort and Munich ever yet been rung?"—For my own part, I have no correspondence with the sextons there, and cannot tell. It may possibly have been rung, while the watcher slept! After admitting the possibility of premature burial, this writer says, he should be content with Shakspeare's test—"This feather stirs; she lives." This may be a very good affirmative test. But, as a negative test, it would be good for little—*this feather stirs not; she is dead.* In cases of catalepsy, it often happens, that a feather will not stir; and even the more trustworthy test—the mirror—will furnish no evidence of life.

To doubt the fact of premature interment is quite as absurd, as to credit all the tales, in this connection, fabricated by French and German wonder-mongers. During the existence of that terrible epidemic, which has so recently passed away, the necessity, real or imagined, of removing the corpses, as speedily as possible, has, very probably, occasioned some instances of premature interment.

On the 28th of June, 1849, a Mr. Schridieder was supposed to be dead of cholera, at St. Louis, and was carried to the grave; where a noise in the coffin was heard, and, upon opening it, he was found to be alive.

In the month of July, 1849, a Chicago paper contained the following statement:—

"We know a gentleman now residing in this city, who was attacked by the cholera, in 1832, and after a short time, was

supposed to have died. He was in the collapsed state, gave not the least sign of life, and when a glass was held over his mouth, there was no evidence that he still breathed. But, after his coffin was obtained, he revived, and is now living in Chicago, one of our most estimable citizens."

"Another case, of a like character, occurred near this city, yesterday. A man who was in the collapsed state, and to all appearances dead, became reanimated after his coffin was procured. He revived slightly—again apparently died—again revived slightly—and finally died and was buried."

I find the following, in the Boston Atlas of August 23, 1849 :—
 "A painful occurrence has come to light in Baltimore, which creates intense excitement. The remains of the venerable D. Evans Reese, who died suddenly on Friday evening, were conveyed to the Light Street burying-ground, and while they were placed in the vault, the hand of a human being was discovered protruding from one of the coffins deposited there. On a closer examination, those present were startled to find the hand was firmly clenched, the coffin burst open, and the body turned entirely over, leaving not a doubt that the unfortunate being had been buried alive. The corpse was that of a very respectable man, who died, apparently, very suddenly, and whose body was placed in the vault on Friday last."

The *Recherches Medico-legales sur l'incertitude des risques de la mort, les dangers des inhumations précipitées, les moyens de constater les décès et de rappeler à la vie ceux qui sont en état de mort apparente*, by I. de Fontenelle, is a very curious production. In a review of this work, and of the *Recherches Physiologiques, sur la vie et la mort*, by Bichat, in the London Quarterly, vol. lxxxv. page 369, the writer remarks—"A gas is developed in the decaying body, which mimics, by its mechanical force, many of the movements of life. So powerful is this gas, in corpses, which have laid long in the water, that M. Devergie, the physician at the Morgue, at Paris, says that, unless secured to the table, they are often heaved up and thrown to the ground."

Upon this theory, the writer proposes, to account for those posthumous changes of position, which are known, sometimes to have taken place. It may serve to explain some of these occurrences. But the formation of this gas, in a greater or less degree, must be universal, while a change in the position is comparatively rare. The curiosity of friends often leads to an in-

spection of the dead, in every stage of decomposition. However valuable the theory, in the writer's estimation, the generation of the most powerful gas would scarcely be able to throw the body entirely out of the coffin, with its arms outstretched towards the portal of the tomb; of which, and of similar changes, there exist well authenticated records.

It is quite probable, that the *Irish wake* may have originated, in this very dread of premature interment, strangely blended with certain spiritual fancies, respecting the soul's reluctance to quit its tenement of clay.

After relating the remarkable story of Asclepiades of Prusa in Bithynia, who restored to life an individual, then on his way to the funeral pile—Bayle, vol. ii. p. 379, Lond. 1735, relates the following interesting tale. A peasant of Poitou was married to a woman, who, after a long fit of sickness, fell into a profound lethargy, which so closely resembled death, that the poor people gathered round, and laid out the peasant's helpmate, for burial. The peasant assumed a becoming expression of sorrow, which utterly belied that exceeding great joy, that is natural to every man, when he becomes perfectly assured, that the tongue of a scolding wife is hushed forever.

The people of that neighborhood were very poor; and, either from economy or taste, coffins were not used among them. The corpses were borne to the grave, simply enveloped in their shrouds, as we are told, by Castellan, is the custom, among the Turks. Those who bore the body, moved, inadvertently, rather too near a hedge, at the roadside, and, a sharp thorn pricking the leg of the corpse, the trance was broken—the supposed defunct sprang up on end—and began to scold, as vigorously as ever.

The disappointed peasant had fourteen years more of it. At the expiration of that term, the good woman pined away, and appeared to die, once more. She was again borne toward the grave. When the bearers drew near to the spot, where the remarkable revival had occurred, upon a former occasion, the widower became very much excited; and, at length, unable to restrain his emotions, audibly exclaimed—"don't go too near that hedge!"

In a number of the London Times, for 1821, there is an account of the directions, given by an old Irish expert in such matters, who was about to die, respecting his own *wake*—"Recol-

lect to put three candles at the head of the bed, after ye lay me out, two at the foot, and one at each side. Mind now and put a plate with the salt on it, just atop of my breast. And d'ye hear—have plinty o' tobacky and pipes enough; and remimber to have the punch strong. And—blundenoons, what the devil's the use o' pratin t'ye—sure it's mysilf knows ye'll be after botching it, as I'll not be there mysel."

No. XCII.

THAT man must be an incorrigible *fool*, who does not, occasionally, like the Vicar of Wakefield, find himself growing weary of being always *wise*. In this sense, there are few men of sixty winters, who have not been guilty of being over-wise—of assuming, at some period of their lives, the port and majesty of the bird of Minerva—of exercising that talent, for silence and solemnity, ascribed by the French nobleman, as More relates, in his travels, to the English nation. A man, thus protected—dipped, as it were, in the waters of Lethe, *usque ad calcem*—is truly a pleasant fellow. There is no such thing as getting hold of him—there he is, conservative as a tortoise, *unguibus retractis*. He seems to think the exchange of intellectual commodities, entirely out of the question; he will have none of your folly, and he holds up his own superlative wisdom, as a cow, of consummate resolution, holds up her milk. If society were thus composed, what a concert of voices there would be, in unison with Job's—*we would not live alway*. Life would be no other, than a long funeral procession—the dead burying the dead. I am decidedly in favor of a cheerful philosophy. Jeremy Taylor says, that, "*the slightest going off from a man's natural temper is a species of drunkenness.*" There are some men, certainly, who seem to think, that total abstinence, from every species of merriment, is a wholesome preparative, for a residence in Paradise. The Preacher saith of laughter, *it is mad, and of mirth, what doeth it?* But in the very next chapter, he declares, *there is a time to dance and a time to sing*. We are told in the book of Proverbs, that *a merry heart doeth good, like a medicine*.

There has probably seldom been a wiser man than Democritus of Abdera, who was called the laughing philosopher; and of whom Seneca says, in his work *De Ira*, ii. c. 10, *Democritum aiunt nunquam sine risu in publico fuisse; adeo nihil illi videbatur serium eorum, quæ serio gerebantur*: Democritus never appeared in public, without laughter in his countenance; so that nothing seemed to affect him seriously, however much so it might affect the rest of mankind.—The Abderites, with some exceptions, thought him mad; or, in Beattie's words, when describing his minstrel boy—

"Some deem'd him wondrous wise, and some believ'd him mad."

These Abderites, who were, notoriously, the most stupid of the Thracians, looked upon Democritus precisely as the miserable monks, about Oxford, looked upon Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century—they believed him a magician, or a madman.

To laugh and grow fat is a proverb. Whether Democritus grew fat or not, I am unable to say; but he died at a great age, having passed one hundred years; and he died cheerfully, as he had lived temperately. Lucretius says of him, lib. iii. v. 1052—

"Sponte sua letho caput obrivius obtulit ipse."

The tendency of his philosophy was to ensure longevity. The grand aim and end of it all were comprehended, in one word, *ευφροσυνα*, or the enjoyment of a tranquil state of mind.

There is much good-natured wisdom, in the command, and in the axiom of Horace—

*"Misce stultitiam consiliis brevem
Dulce est desipere in loco"—*

which means, if an off-hand version will suffice—

Mix with your cares a little folly,
'Tis pleasant sometimes to be jolly.

One of the most acceptable images, presented by Sir Walter Scott, is that of Counsellor Pleydell, perched upon the table, playing at high jinks, who compliments Colonel Mannering, by continuing the frolic, and telling him, that, if a fool had entered, instead of a man of sense, he should have come down immediately.

My New England readers would be very much surprised, if they had any personal knowledge of the late excellent and venerable Bishop Griswold, to be told, that, among his works, there

was an edition of Mother Goose's Melodies, with *prolegomina, notæ, et variæ lectiones*; well—there is no such thing there. But every one knows, that the comic romance of Bluebeard, as it is performed on the stage, was written by Bishop Heber, and is published in his works. Every one knows that Hannah More wrote tolerable plays, and was prevented, by nothing but her sex, from being a bishop. Every one knows that bishops and archbishops have done very funny things—in *loco*. And every one knows, that all this is quite as respectable, as being very reverently dull, and wearing the phylactery for life—*stand off, for I am stupider than thou*.

I have now before me a small octavo volume—a very *bijou* of a book, with the following title—*Arundines Cami, sive Musarum Cantabrigiensium Lusur Canori*, and bearing, for its motto—*Equitare in arundine longa*. This book is printed at Cambridge, England; and I have never seen a more beautiful specimen of typography. The work is edited by Henry Drury, Vicar of Wilton: and it contains a collection of Greek and Latin versions; by Mr. Drury himself, and by several good, holy, and learned men—Butler, late Bishop of Litchfield—Richard Porson—Hodgson, S. J. B. of Eton College—Vaughan, Principal of Harrow—Macaulay—Hallam—Law—and many others.

The third edition of this delightful book was published in 1846. And now the reader would know something of the originals, which these grave and learned men have thought it worthy of their talents and time, to turn into Greek and Latin. I scarcely know where to select a specimen, among articles, every one of which is prepared, with such exquisite taste, and such perfect knowledge of the capabilities of the language employed. Among the readers of the Transcript, I happen to know some fair scholars, who would relish a Greek epigram, on any subject, as highly, as others enjoy a pointed paragraph in English, on the subject of rum and molasses. Here is a Greek version of the ditty—"What care I how black I be," by Mr. Hawtrey, Principal of Eton, which I would transcribe, were it not that a Greek word, now and then, presented in the common type, suggests to me, that you may not have a Greek font. It may be found by those, who are of the fancy, on page 49 of the work.

Here is a version by Mr. Hodgson—how the shrill, thready voice of my dear old nurse rings in my ears, while reading the original! God reward her kind, untiring spirit—she has gone

where little Pickles cease from troubling, and where weary nurses are at rest :—

Pat a cake, pat a cake, baker's man,
So I do, master, as fast as I can.
Pat it, and prick it, and mark it with C,
Then it will answer for Charley and me.

Tunde mihi dalcem pistor, mihi tunde farinam.
Tunditur, O rapida tunditur illa manu.
Punge decenter scu, tituloque inscribe magistri;
Sic mihi, Carolulo, sic erit esca meo.

The contributions of Mr. H. Drury, the editor, are inferior to none—

There was an old man in Tobago,
Who liv'd on rice gruel and sago;
Till, much to his bliss,
His physician said this :
'To a leg, sir, of mutton you may go.'

Senex æger in Tarento
De oryza et pulmento
Vili vixerat invento;
Doucee medicus
Seni inquit valde læto,
'Senex æger, o gaudeto,
Crus ovinum, jam non veto
Tibi benedicna.'

Decidedly the most felicitous, though by no means the most elaborate in the volume, is the following, which is also by the editor, Mr. Drury—

Hey diddle diddle! The cat and the fiddle!
The cow jumped over the moon;
The little dog laughed to see such sport;
And the dish ran away with the spoon.

Hei didulum—atque iterum didulum! Felisque fidesque!
Vacca super lune cornua prosiluit.
Nescio qua catulus risit dulcedine ludi;
Abstulit et turpi lanx cochleare fuga.

A Latin version of Goldsmith's mad dog, by H. J. Hodgson, is very clever, and there are some on solemn subjects, and of a higher order.

How sturdily these little ditties, the works of authors dead, buried, and unknown, have breasted the current of time! I had rather be the author of *Hush-a-bye baby, upon the tree top*, than of Joel Barlow's *Vision of Columbus*—for, though I have always perceived the propriety of putting babies to sleep, at proper times,

I have never entirely appreciated the wisdom of doing the very same thing to adults, at all hours of the day.

What powerful resurrectionists these nursery melodies are! Moll Pitcher of Endor had not a greater power over the dry bones of Samuel, than has the ring of some one of these little chimes, to bring before us, with all the freshness of years ago, that good old soul, who sat with her knitting beside us, and rocked our cradle, and watched our progress from petticoats to breeches; and gave notice of the first tooth; and the earliest words; and faithfully reported, from day to day, all our marvellous achievements, to one, who, had she been a queen, would have given us her sceptre for a hoop stick.

No. XCIII.

BYLES is a patronymic of extraordinary rarity. It will be sought for, without success, in the voluminous record of Alexander Chalmers. It is not in the *Biographia Britannica*; though, even there, we may, occasionally, discover names, which, according to Cowper, were not born for immortality—

*"Oh fond attempt to give a deathless lot
To names ignoble, born to be forgot!"*

Even in that conservative record of choice spirits, the Boston Directory for 1849, this patronymic is nowhere to be found.

Henry Byles came from Sarum in England; and settled at Salisbury in this Commonwealth, as early as 1640. I am not aware, that any individual, particularly eminent, and bearing this uncommon name, has ever existed among us, excepting that eccentric clergyman, who, within the bounds of our little peninsula, at least, is still occasionally mentioned, as "*the celebrated Mather Byles*." I am aware, that he had a son, who bore the father's prænomen, and graduated at Harvard, in 1751; became a doctor of divinity, in 1770; was a minister, in New London, and dismissed from his charge, in 1769; officiated, as an Episcopal clergyman, in Boston, for several years; went to St. Johns, N. B., at the time of the revolution; officiated there; and died, March 12, 1814.

But my dealings, this evening, are with "*the celebrated Mather*

Byles," who was born of worthy parents, in the town of Boston, March 26, 1706. His father was an Englishman. Through the maternal line, he had John Cotton and Richard Mather, for his ancestors. He graduated, at Harvard, in 1725; was settled at the Hollis Street Church, Dec. 20, 1733; created D. D. at Aberdeen, in 1765; was, on account of his toryism, separated from his people, in 1776; and died of paralysis, July 5, 1788, at the age of 82. He was twice married; a niece of Governor Belcher was his first, and the daughter of Lieut. Governor Tailer, his second wife.

I should be faithless, indeed, were I to go forward, without one passing word, for precious memory, in regard to those two perennial damsels, the daughters of Dr. Byles. How many visitations, at that ancient manse in Nassau Street! To how many of the sex—young—aye, and of no particular age—it has occurred, at the nick of time, when there was nothing under Heaven else to be done, to exclaim—"What an excellent occasion, for a visit to Katy and Polly!" And the visit was paid; and the descendants of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*" were so glad to see the visitors—and it was so long since their last visit—and it must not be so long again—and then the old stories, over and over, for the thousandth time—and the concerted merriment of these amiable visitors, as if the tales were quite as new, as the year itself, upon the first January morn—and the filial delights, that beamed upon the features of these vestals, at the effect, produced, by the recitation of stories, which really seemed to be made of that very *everlasting* of which the breeches of our ancestors were made—and then the exhibition of those relics, and *heir looms*, or what remained of them, after some thirty years' presentation to all comers, which, in one way and another, were associated with the memory of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*,"—and then the oh don't gos—and oh fly not yet—and when will you come again!

The question naturally arises, and, rather distrustingly, demands an answer—what was "*the celebrated Mather Byles*"—celebrated for? In the first place, he was *Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor*. But his degree was from Aberdeen; and the Scotch colleges, at that period, were not particularly coy. With a cousin at court, and a little gold in hand, it was somewhat less difficult, for a clergyman, without very great learning, or talent, to obtain a doctorate, at Aberdeen, in 1765, than for a

camel, of unusual proportions, to go through the eye of a very small needle. Even in our cis-atlantic colleges, these bestowments do not always serve to mark degrees of merit, with infallible accuracy—for God's sun does not more certainly shine, upon the just and upon the unjust, than doctorates have, in some cases, fallen upon wise men, and upon fools. That, which, charily and conservatively bestowed, may well be accounted an honor, necessarily loses its value, by diffusion and prostitution. Not many years ago, the worthy president of one of our colleges, being asked, how it happened, that a doctorate of divinity had been given to a certain person of ordinary talents, and very little learning; replied, with infinite *naïveté*—“*Why ——— had it; and ——— had it; and ——— had it; and we didn't like to hurt his feelings.*”

Let us not consider the claims of Mather Byles as definitely settled, by the faculty at Aberdeen.—He corresponded with Pope, and with Lansdowne, and with Watts. The works of the latter were sent to him, by the author, from time to time; and, among the treasures, highly prized by the family, was a presentation copy, in quarto, from Pope, of his translation of the *Odyssey*. This correspondence, however, so far as I was ever able to gather information from the daughters, many years ago, did not amount to much; the letters were very few, and very far between; on the one side complimentary, and bearing congratulations upon the occasion of some recent literary success; and, on the other, fraught with grateful civility; and accompanied, as is often the case, with copies of some of the author's productions.

Let me here present a somewhat disconnected anecdote: At the sale of the library of Dr. Byles, a large folio Bible, in French, was purchased, by a private individual. This Bible had been presented to the French Protestant Church, in Boston, by Queen Anne; and, at the time, when it came to the hands of Dr. Byles, was the last relic of that church, whose visible temple had been erected in School Street, about 1716. Whoever desires to know more of these French Protestants, may turn to the “*Memoir*,” by Dr. Holmes, or to vol. xxii. p. 62, of the Massachusetts Historical Collections.

Dr. Byles wrote, in prose and verse, and quite *respectably* in both. There is not more of the spirit of poetry, however, in his metrical compositions, than in his performances in prose. His versification was easy, and the style of his prose works was un-

affected; his sentences were usually short, and never rendered unintelligible, by the multiplication of adjuncts, or by any affectation of sententious brevity. Yet nothing, that I have ever met with, from the pen of Dr. Byles, is particularly remarkable for its elegance; and it is in vain to look, among such of his writings, as have been preserved, for the evidences of extraordinary powers of thought. Some dozen of his published sermons are still extant. We have also several of his essays, in the *New England Weekly Journal*; a poem on the death of George I., and the accession of George II., in 1727; a sort of monodial address to Governor Belcher, on the death of his lady; a poem called the *Conflagration*; and a volume of metrical matters, published in 1744.

If his celebrity had depended upon these and other literary labors, he would scarcely have won the appellation of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*."

The correspondent of Byles, Isaac Watts, never imagined, that the time would arrive, when his own voluminous lyrics and his address to "*Great Gouge*," would be classed, in the *Materia Poetica*, as soporifics, and scarcely find one, so poor, as to do them reverence; while millions of lisping tongues still continued to repeat, from age to age, till the English language should be forgotten,

"Let dogs delight
To bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let bears and lions
Growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature so."

Dr. Byles himself could not have imagined, while putting the finishing hand to "*The Conflagration*," that, if he had embarked his hopes of reaching posterity, in that heavy bottom, they must surely have foundered, in the gulf of oblivion—and that, after all, he would be wafted down the stream of time, to distant ages, astride, as it were, upon a feather—and that what he could never have accomplished, by his grave discourses, and elaborate, poetical labors, would be so certainly and signally achieved, by the never-to-be-forgotten quips, and cranks, and bon mots, and puns, and funny sayings, and comical doings of the reverend pastor of the Hollis Street Church.

The reader must not do so great injustice to Dr. Byles, as to suppose, that he mingled together *sacra profanis*, or was in the

habit of exhibiting, in the pulpit, that frolicsome vein, which was, in him, as congenital, as is the tendency, in a fish, to swim in water.

The sentiment of Horace applies not here—

ridentem dicere verum
Quid vetat ?

The serious writings of Dr. Byles are singularly free from everything, suggestive of frivolous association. In his pulpit, there was none of it; not a jot; while, out of it, unless on solemn occasions, there was very little else. I have heard from those, who knew him well, that he ransacked the whole vocabulary, in search of the materials for punning. Yet of his attempts, in this species of humor, few examples are remembered. The specimens of the wit and humor of this eccentric divine, which have been preserved, are often of a different character; and not a few of them of that description, which are called practical jokes. Some of these pleasantries were exceedingly clever, and others supremely ridiculous. It is now more than half a century, since I listened to the first, amusing anecdote of Mather Byles. Many have reached me since—some of them quite as clever, as any we have ever had—I will not say from Foote, or Hook, or Matthews; for such unclerical comparisons would be particularly odious—but quite as clever as anything from Jonathan Swift, or Sydney Smith. Suppose I convert my next number into a penny box, for the collection and safe keeping of these petty records—I know they are below the dignity of history—so is a very large proportion of all the thoughts, words, and actions of Kings and Emperors—I'll think of it.

No. XCIV.

THERE were political sympathies, during the American Revolution, between that eminent physician and excellent man, Dr. James Lloyd, and Mather Byles; yet, some forty-three years ago, I heard Dr. Lloyd remark, that, in company, the Reverend Mather Byles was a most troublesome puppy; and that there was no peace for his punning. Dr. Lloyd was, doubtless, of opinion, with Lord Kaimes, who remarked, in relation to this inveterate habit, that few might object to a little salt upon their

plates, but the man must have an extraordinary appetite, who could make a meal of it.

The daily employment of our mental powers, for the discovery of words, which agree in sound, but differ in sense, is a species of intellectual huckstering, well enough adapted to the capacities of those, who are unfit for business, on a larger scale. If this occupation could be made *to pay*, many an oysterman would be found, forsaking his calling, and successfully competing with those, who will not suffer ten words to be uttered, in their company, without converting five of them, at least, to this preposterous purpose.

No conversation can be so grave, or so solemn, as to secure it from the rude and impertinent interruption of some one of these pleasant fellows; who seem to employ their little gift upon the community, as a species of laughing gas. A little of this may be well enough; but, like musk, in the gross, it is absolutely suffocating.

The first story, that I ever heard, of Mather Byles, was related, at my father's table, by the Rev. Dr. Belknap, in 1797, the year before he died. It was upon a Saturday; and Dr. John Clarke and some other gentlemen, among whom I well remember Major General Lincoln, ate their salt fish there, that day. I was a boy; and I remember their mirth, when, after Dr. Belknap had told the story, I said to our minister, Dr. Clarke, near whom I was eating my apple, that I wished he was half as funny a minister, as Dr. Byles.

Upon a Fast day, Dr. Byles had negotiated an exchange, with a country clergyman. Upon the appointed morning, each of them—for vehicles were not common then—proceeded, on horseback, to his respective place of appointment. Dr. Byles no sooner observed his brother clergyman approaching, at a distance, than he applied the whip; put his horse into a gallop; and, with his canonicals flying all abroad, passed his friend, at full run. "*What is the matter?*" he exclaimed, raising his hand in astonishment—"Why so fast, brother Byles?"—to which the Dr., without slackening his speed, replied, over his shoulder—"It is Fast day!"

This is, unquestionably, very funny—but it is surely undesirable, for a consecrated servant of the Lord, thus lavishly to sacrifice, upon the altars of Momus.

The distillery of Thomas Hill was at the corner of Essex and

South Streets, not far from Dr. Belknap's residence in Lincoln Street. Dr. Byles called on Mr. Hill, and inquired—"Do you still?"—"That is my business," Mr. Hill replied—"Then," said Dr. Byles—"will you go with me, and still my wife?"

As he was once occupied, in nailing some list upon his doors, to exclude the cold, a parishioner said to him—"the wind bloweth wheresoever it listeth, Dr. Byles."—"Yes sir," replied the Dr. "and man listeth, wheresoever the wind bloweth."

He was intimate with General Knox, who was a bookseller, before the war. When the American troops took possession of the town, after the evacuation, Knox, who had become quite corpulent, marched in, at the head of his artillery. As he passed on, Byles, who thought himself privileged, on old scores, exclaimed, loud enough to be heard—"I never saw an ox fatter in my life." But Knox was not in the vein. He felt offended by this freedom, especially from Byles, who was then well known to be a tory; and replied, in uncourtly terms, that he was a "—— fool."

In May, 1777, Dr. Byles was arrested, as a tory, and subsequently tried, convicted, and sentenced to confinement, on board a guard ship, and to be sent to England with his family, in forty days. This sentence was changed, by the board of war, to confinement in his own house. A guard was placed over him. After a time, the sentinel was removed—afterwards replaced—and again removed—when the Dr. exclaimed, that *he had been guarded—regarded—and disregarded*. He called his sentry *his observ-a-tory*.

Perceiving, one morning, that the sentinel, a simple fellow, was absent, and seeing Dr. Byles himself, pacing before his own door, with a musket on his shoulder, the neighbors stepped over, to inquire the cause—"You see," said the Dr., "*I begged the sentinel to let me go for some milk for my family, but he would not suffer me to stir. I reasoned the matter with him; and he has gone, himself, to get it for me, on condition that I keep guard in his absence.*"

When he was very poor, and had no money to waste on follies, he caused the little room, in which he read and wrote, to be painted brown, that he might say to every visitor—"You see I am in a brown study."

His family, having gone to rest, were roused one night, by the reiterated cry of *thieves!—thieves!* in the doctor's loudest

voice—the wife and daughters sprang instantly from their beds, and rushed into the room—there sat the Dr. alone, in his study chair—“*Where, father?*” cried the astonished family—“*there!*” he exclaimed, pointing to the candles.

One bitter December night, he called his daughters from their bed, simply to inquire if they lay warm.

He had a small collection of curiosities. Some visitors called, one morning; and Mrs. Byles, unwilling to be found at her ironing board, and desiring to hide herself, as she would not be so caught, by these ladies, for the world, the doctor put her in a closet, and buttoned her in. After a few remarks, the ladies expressed a wish to see the Dr's curiosities, which he proceeded to exhibit; and, after entertaining them very agreeably, for several hours, he told them he had kept the greatest curiosity to the last; and, proceeding to the closet, unbuttoned the door, and exhibited Mrs. Byles.

He had complained, long, often, and fruitlessly, to the selectmen, of a quagmire, in front of his dwelling. One morning, two of the fathers of the town, after a violent rain, passing with their chaise, became stuck in this bog. As they were striving to extricate themselves, and pulling to the right and to the left, the doctor came forth, and bowing, with great politeness, exclaimed—“*I am delighted, gentlemen, to see you stirring in this matter, at last.*”

A candidate for fame proposed to fly, from the North Church steeple, and had already mounted, and was clapping his wings, to the great delight of the mob. Dr. Byles, mingling with the crowd, inquired what was the object of the gathering—“*We have come, sir,*” said some one, “*to see a man fly.*”—“*Poh, poh,*” replied the doctor, “*I have seen a horse-fly.*”

A gentleman sent Dr. Byles a barrel of very fine oysters. Meeting the gentleman's wife, an hour or two after, in the street, the doctor assumed an air of great severity, and told her, that he had, that morning, been treated, by her husband, in a most *Bilingsgate* manner, and then abruptly left her. The lady, who was of a nervous temperament, went home in tears, and was quite miserable, till her husband returned, at noon, and explained the occurrence; but was so much offended with the doctor's folly, that he cut his acquaintance.

A poor fellow, in agony with the toothache, meeting the doctor, asked him where he should go, to have it drawn. The doctor

gave him a direction to a particular street and number. The man went, as directed; and, when the occupant came to the door, told him that Dr. Byles had sent him there, to have his tooth drawn. "*This is a poor joke, for Dr. Byles,*" said the gentleman; "*I am not a dentist, but a portrait painter—it will give you little comfort, my friend, to have me draw your tooth.*" Dr. Byles had sent the poor fellow to Copley.

Upon the 19th of May, 1780, the memorable dark day, a lady wrote to the doctor as follows—"Dear doctor, how do you account for this darkness?" and received his immediate reply—"Dear Madam, I am as much in the dark, as you are." This, for sententious brevity, has never been surpassed, unless by the correspondence, between the comedian, Sam Foote, and his mother—"Dear Sam, I'm in jail"—"Dear Mother, So am I."

He had, at one time, a remarkably stupid, and literal, Irish girl, as a domestic. With a look and voice of terror, he said to her, in haste—"Go and say to your mistress, Dr. Byles has put an end to himself." The girl flew up stairs, and, with a face of horror, exclaimed, at the top of her lungs—"Dr. Byles has put an end to himself!" The astonished wife and daughters rushed into the parlor—and there was the doctor, calmly walking about, with a part of a cow's tail, that he had picked up, in the street, tied to his coat, or cassock, behind.

From the time of the stamp act, in 1765, to the period of the revolution, the cry had been repeated, in every form of phraseology, that our *grievances* should be *redressed*. One fine morning, when the multitude had gathered on the Common, to see a regiment of red coats, paraded there, who had recently arrived—"Well," said the doctor, gazing at the spectacle, "*I think we can no longer complain, that our grievances are not red dressed.*" "True," said one of the laughers, who were standing near, "*but you have two ds, Dr. Byles.*" "To be sure, sir, I have," the doctor instantly replied, "I had them from *Aberdeen*, in 1765."

These pleasantries will, probably, survive "THE CONFLAGRATION." Had not this eccentric man possessed some very excellent and amiable qualities, he could not have maintained his clerical relation to the Hollis-Street Church and Society, for three and forty years, from 1733 to 1776; and have separated from them, at last, for political considerations alone.

Had his talents and his influence been greater than they were, the peculiarities, to which I have alluded, would have been a

theme, for deeper deprecation. The eccentricities of eminent men are mischievous, in the ratio of their eminence; for thousands, who cannot rival their excellencies, are often the successful imitators of their peculiarities and follies.

I never sympathized with that worthy, old lady, who became satisfied, that Dr. Beecher was a terrible hypocrite, and without a spark of vital religion, because she saw him, from her window, on the Lord's day, in his back yard, gymnasticising, on a pole, in the intermission season; and thereby invigorating his powers, for the due performance of the evening services. Yet, as character is power, and as the children of this generation have a devilish pleasure in detecting inconsistencies, between the practice and the profession of the children of light—it is ever to be deplored, that clergymen should hazard one iota of their clerical respectability, for the love of fun; and it speaks marvels, for the moral and religious worth of Mather Byles, and for the forbearance, intelligence, and discrimination of his parishioners, that, for three-and-forty years, he maintained his ministerial position, in their midst, cutting such wild, unpriestly capers, and giving utterance to such amusing fooleries, from morning to night.

No. XCV.

I HAVE already referred to the subject of being buried alive. There is something very terrible in the idea; and I am compelled, by some recent information, to believe, that occurrences of this distressing nature are more common, than I have hitherto supposed them to be.

Not long ago, I fell into the society of a veteran, maiden lady, who, in the course of her evening revelations of the gossip she had gathered in the morning, informed the company, that an entire family, consisting of a husband, wife, and seven children, were buried alive.

You have heard, or read, I doubt not, of that eminent French surgeon, who, while standing by the bedside of his dying friend and patron, utterly forgot all his professional cares and duties, in his exceeding great joy, at beholding, for the first time in his

life, the genuine Sardonic grin, exhibited upon the distorted features of his dying benefactor. For a moment, my sincere sorrow, for the terrible fate of this interesting family, was utterly forgotten, in the delight I experienced, at the prospect of receiving such an interesting item, for my dealings with the dead.

My tablets were out, in an instant—and, drawing my chair near that of this communicative lady, I requested a relation of all the particulars. My astonishment was very much increased, when she asserted, that they had actually buried themselves—and my utter disappointment—as an artist—can scarcely be conceived, when she added, that the whole family had gone to reside permanently in the country, giving up plays, concerts, balls, soirees and operas.

Putting up my tablets, with a feeling of displeasure, illy concealed, I ventured to suggest, that opportunities, for intellectual improvement, were not wanting in the country; and that, perhaps, this worthy family preferred the enjoyment of rural quiet, to the miscellaneous cries of fire—oysters—and murder. She replied, that she had rather be murdered outright, than live in the country—listen to the frogs, from morning to night—and watch the progress of cucumbers and squashes.

Seriously, this matter of being buried alive, is very unpleasant. The dead, the half-dead, and the dying, were brutally neglected, in the earlier days of Greece. Diogenes Laertius, lib. 8, *de vita et moribus philosophorum*, relates, that Empedocles, having restored Ponthia, a woman of Agrigentum, to life, who was on the point of being buried, laws began to be enacted, for the protection of the apparent dead. At Athens, no one could be buried, before the third day; and, commonly, throughout all Greece, burial and cremation were deferred, till the sixth or seventh day. Alexander kept Hephestion's body, till the tenth day. I have referred, in a former number, to the remarkable cases of Aviola and the Prætor Lamia, who revived, after being placed on the funeral pile. Another Prætor, Tubero, was saved, at the moment, when the torch was about to be applied. I have also alluded to the act of Asclepiades, who, in disregard of the ridicule of the bystanders, stopped a funeral procession, and re-animated the body, about to be burnt.

A perusal of the *Somnium Scipionis*, and of the accounts of Hildanus, Camerarius, and Horstius—of Plato, in his Republic—

and of Valerius Maximus, will satisfy the reader, that premature burials were, by no means, uncommon, of old.

The idea of reviving in one's coffin—one of Fisk and Raymond's "*Patent Metallic Burial Cases, Air-Tight and Indestructible*"—is really awful! How truly, upon such an awakening as this, the wretch must wish he had been born a savage—a Mandan of the upper Missouri—neither to be burnt nor buried—but placed upon a mat, supported by poles—aloof from the accursed wolves and undertakers—with a reasonable supply of pemmican and corncake, and a calabash of water, by his side!

The dread of such an occurrence has induced some very sensible people, to prefer cremation to earth and tomb burial. Of this we have a remarkable example, in our own country. An infant daughter of Henry Laurens, the first President of Congress, had, to all appearance, died of the small pox. She was, accordingly, laid out, and prepared for the grave. A window, which, during her illness, had been kept carefully closed, having been opened after the body was shrouded, and a stream of air blowing freshly into the apartment, the child revived, and the robes of death were joyfully exchanged, for her ordinary garments. This event naturally produced a strong impression, upon the father's mind. By his will, Mr. Laurens enjoined it upon his children, as a solemn duty, that his body should be burnt; and this injunction was duly fulfilled.

In former numbers, I have referred the reader to various authorities, upon this interesting subject. I will offer a brief quotation from a sensible writer—"According to the present usage, as soon as the semblance of death appears, the chamber is deserted, by friends, relatives, and physicians, and the apparently dead, though frequently living, body is committed to the management of an ignorant or unfeeling nurse, whose care extends no further than laying the limbs straight, and securing her accustomed perquisites. The bed clothes are immediately removed, and the body is exposed to the air. This, *when cold*, must extinguish any spark of life, that may remain, and which, by a different treatment, might have been kindled into a flame; or it may only continue to repress it, and the unhappy person revive amidst the horrors of the tomb."—"Coldness, heaviness of the body, a leaden, livid color, with a yellowness in the visage," says the same author, "are all very uncertain signs. Mr. Zimmerman observed them all, upon the body of a criminal, who

fainted, through the dread of the punishment he had merited. He was shaken, dragged about, and turned, in the same manner dead bodies are, without the least sign of resistance: and yet, at the end of twenty-four hours, he was recalled to life, by means of volatile alkali.

In 1777, Dr. William Hawes, the founder of the Humane Society in London, published an address, on premature interment. This is a curious and valuable performance. I cannot here withhold the statement, that this excellent man, before the formation of the Humane Society, for several years, offered rewards, and paid them from his own purse, for the rescue of persons from drowning, between Westminster and London bridge. Dr. Hawes remarks, that the appearance of death has often been mistaken for the reality, in apoplectic, and fainting fits, and those, arising from any violent agitation of the mind, and from the free use of opium and spirituous liquors. Children, he observes, have often been restored, who have apparently died in convulsions. In case of fevers, in weak habits, or when the cure has been chiefly attempted, by means of depletion, the patient often sinks into a state, resembling death; and the friends, in the opinion of Dr. Hawes, have been fatally deceived. In small pox, he remarks, when the pustules sink, and death apparently ensues, means of restoration should by no means be neglected.

In Lord Bacon's *Historia Vitæ et Mortis*, a passage occurs, commencing—"Complura fuerunt exempla hominum, tanquam mortuorum, aut expositorum e lecto, aut delatorum ad funus, quinetiam nonnullorum in terra conditorum, qui nihilominus revixerunt," etc. But the passage is rather long, and in a dead language; and my professional experience has admonished me to be economical of space, and to occupy, for every dead subject, long or short, as little room, as possible. I therefore give an English version, of whose sufficiency the reader may judge, by glancing at the original, vol. viii. p. 447, Lond. 1824.—There were many examples, says Lord Bacon, of men, supposed to be dead, taken from their beds as corpses, or borne to their graves, some of them actually buried, who, nevertheless, revived. This fact, in regard to such as were buried, has been proved, upon re-opening their graves; by the bruises and wounds upon their heads; and by the manifest evidences of tossing about, and struggling in their coffins. John Scott, a man of genius, and a scholar, furnishes a very recent and remarkable example; who,

shortly after his burial, was disinterred, and found, in that condition, by his servant, who was absent at the time of Mr. Scott's interment, and well acquainted, it seems, with those symptoms of catalepsy, to which he was liable.

A like event happened, in my time, to a play-actor, buried at Cambridge. I remember the account, given me by a clever fellow, who being full of frolic, and desirous of knowing what were the feelings of persons, who were hanging, suspended himself to a beam, and let himself drop, thinking that he could lay hold on the beam, when he chose. This, however, he was unable to do; but, luckily, he was relieved by a companion. Upon being interrogated, he replied, that he had not been sensible of any pain—that, at first, a sort of fire and flashing came about his eyes—then extreme darkness and shadows—and, lastly, a sort of pale blue color, like that of the ocean. I have heard a physician, now living, say, that, by frictions and the warm bath, he had brought a man to life, who had hanged himself, and remained suspended, for half an hour. The same physician used to say, that he believed any one might be recovered, who had been suspended no longer, unless his neck was broken. Such is a version of Lord Bacon's statement.

In the *Gentleman's Magazine*, for 1834, page 475, the following account is given of the feelings, during the process of hanging, by one, who was restored—"The preparations were dreadful, beyond all expression. On being dropped, he found himself midst fields and rivers of blood, which gradually acquired a greenish tinge; and imagined, if he could reach a certain spot in the same, he should be easy. He struggled forcibly to attain this, and felt no more."

No. XCVI.

It were greatly to be desired, that every driver of brute animals, Guinea negroes, and hard bargains, since he will not be a Christian, should be a Pythagorean. The doctrine of the metempsychosis would, doubtless, instil a salutary terror into his mind; and soften the harshness of his character, by creating a dread of being, himself, spavined and wind-galled, through all

eternity ; or destined to suffer from the lash, which he has mercilessly laid upon the slave ; or condemned to endure that hard measure, which he has meted, in this world, to the miserable debtor.

This opinion, which Pythagoras is said to have borrowed from the Egyptians, or, as some assert, from the Brachmans, makes the chief basis of religion, among the Banians and others, in India and China, at the present day ; and is the cause of their great aversion to take the life of brute animals, and even insects. The accidental destruction of any living thing produces, with them, a feeling of sorrow, similar to that, experienced, as Mr. Catlin says, by an Indian, who unfortunately shot his *totem*, which, in that case, chanced to be a bear ; that is, an animal of a certain race, one of which his guardian angel was supposed to inhabit.

Vague and fantastical, as have been the notions of a future state, in different nations, the idea of a condition of being, after death, has been very universal. Such was the conclusion from the reasonings of Plato. Such were the results "*quæ Socrates supremo vitæ die de immortalitate animorum disseruisset.*" Such was the faith of Cicero—"Sic mihi persuasi, sic sentio, quum tanta celeritas animorum sit, tanta memoria præteritorum, futurorumque prudentia, tot artes, tantæ scientiæ, tot inventa, non posse eam naturam, quæ res eas contineat, esse mortalem." De Senec. 21.

Seneca was born a year before the Christian era. There is a remarkable passage, in his sixty-third letter, addressed to Lucilius. He is striving to comfort Lucilius, who had lost his friend Flaccus—"Cogitemus ergo Lucili carissime, cito nos eo perventuros quo illum pervenisse mœremus. Et fortasse (si modo sapientium vera fama est, recipitque nos locus aliquis) quem putamus perisse, præmissus est :"—Let us consider, my dear Lucilius, how soon we, ourselves, shall go whither he has gone, whose fate we deplore. And possibly (if the report of certain wise men be true, and there is indeed a place to receive us hereafter) he whom we consider as gone from us *forever*, has only gone *before*. Here is, indeed, a shadowy conception of a future state. The heathen and the Christian, the savage and the sage concur, in the feeling, or the faith, or the philosophy, whichever it may be, that, though flesh and blood, bone and muscle shall perish, the spirit shall not. An impression, like this, swells into convic-

tion, from the very contemplation of its own instinctive and pervasive character.

The Egyptians believed, in the abiding presence of the spirit with the body, so long as the latter could be preserved; and therefore bestowed great pains, in its preservation. In the travels of Lewis and Clarke, the Echeloot Indians are reported to pay great regard to their dead; and Captain Clarke was of the opinion, that they were believers in a future state. They have common cemeteries; the bodies, carefully wrapped in skins, are laid on mats, in vaults made of pine or cedar, eight feet square; the sides are covered with strange figures, cut and painted, and images are attached. On tall poles, surmounting these structures, are suspended brass kettles, old frying-pans, shells, skins, baskets, pieces of cloth, and hair. Sometimes the body is laid in one canoe, and covered with another. It is not easy to conjecture what occasion these poor Echeloots supposed spirits could have, for frying-pans and brass kettles.

The faith of the inhabitants of Taheite is very peculiar. They believe, that the soul passes through no other purgatory, than the stomach of the *Eatooa* bird. They say of the dead, that they are *harra po*, gone to the night; and they believe, that the soul is instantly swallowed, by the *Eatooa* bird, and is purified by the process of deglutition; then it revives; becomes a superior being; never more to be liable to suffering. This soul is now raised to the rank of the *Eatooa*, and may, itself, swallow souls, whenever an opportunity occurs; which, having passed through this gastric purgation, may, in their turn, do the very same thing. Vancouver was present, at the obsequies of the chief, *Matooara*. The priest gave a funeral sermon—"The trees yet live," said he, "*the plants flourish, yet Matooara dies!*" It was a kind of expostulation with *Eatooa*.

Baron Swedenborg's notions of the soul's condition, after death, are very original, and rather oriental. He believed, "that man eats, and drinks, and even enjoys conjugal delight, as in this world; that the resemblance between the two worlds is so great, that, in the spiritual world, there are cities with palaces and houses, and also writings and books, employments and merchandizes; that there are gold and silver, and precious stones there. There is, in the spiritual world, all and every thing that there is in the natural world; but that in Heaven, such things are in an infinitely more perfect state." Trade, in Heaven, is conducted,

doubtless, on those lofty principles, inculcated, by the late Dr. Chalmers, in his commercial discourses; counterfeiters and bank robbers, marriage squabbles and curtain lectures are unknown; and no angel lendeth upon usury. In this arrangement, there is a remarkable oversight; for, as death is dispensed with, our vocation is no better, than Othello's. The superior advantages of the Baron's Heaven scarcely offer a fair compensation, for the suffering and inconvenience of removing, from our present tabernacles; and, for one, I should decidedly prefer to remain where I am, especially now that we have gotten the Cochituate water.

Such being the fashion of Swedenborg's Heaven, it would be quite interesting, were he now among us, in the flesh, to have, under his own hand, a rough sketch of his Hell. As the former is a state, somewhat better, the latter must be a state somewhat worse, than our present condition. It would not be very difficult to give some little idea of Swedenborg's Orcus, or place of punishment. We should have an eternal subtreasury, of course, with a tariff, more onerous, if possible, than that of 1846: the infernal banks would not discount, and money, on prime paper, would be three per cent. a month. Slavery would cover the earth; and the South would rage against the North and its interference, like the maniac, against his best friend, who strives to prevent him, from cutting his own throat, with his own razor.

Among the fancies, which have prevailed, in relation to the soul and its habits, none, perhaps, have been more remarkable, than the belief, in an actual *exodus*, or going forth, of the soul from the body, during life, on excursions of business or pleasure. This may be placed in the category of sick men's dreams; and probably is nothing else than that mighty conjuration of the mind, especially the mind of an invalid; of whose power no man had greater experience than Emanuel Swedenborg. 'The inhabitants of some of the Polynesian islands believe, that the spirits of their ancestors become divinities,' or *Tees*. They believe the soul walks abroad, in dreams, under the charge of its *Tee*, or tutelary angel.

Mydo, a boy, was brought from Taheite, by an English whaler, and died, kindly cared for, by the Moravians. One morning, he spoke to these friends, as follows:—"You told me my soul could not die, and I have been thinking about it. Last night my body lay on that bed, but I knew nothing of it, for my

soul was very far off. My soul was in Taheite. I am sure I saw my mother and my friends, and I saw the trees and dwellings, as I left them. I spoke to the people, and they spoke to me; and yet my body was lying still in this room, all the while. In the morning, I was come again into my body, and was at Mirfield, and Taheite was a great many miles off. Now I understand what you say about my body being put into the earth, and my soul being somewhere else; and I wish to know where it will be, when it can no more return to my body." Such were the humble conceptions of the dying Taheitean boy—let the reader decide for himself what more there may be, under the grandiloquence of Addison—

——Plato, thou reasonest well.
 Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
 This longing after immortality?
 Or whence this secret dread and inward horror
 Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
 Back on herself, and startles at destruction?
 'Tis the divinity, that stirs within us;
 'Tis Heaven itself, that points out an hereafter,
 And intimates eternity to man.

No. XCVII.

THE ashes of the dead are ransacked, not only for hidden treasure, and for interesting relics, but there is a figurative species of raking and scratching, among them, in quest of one's ancestors. This is, too frequently, a perilous experiment; for the searcher sometimes finds his progress—the pleasure of his employment, at least—rudely interrupted, by an offensive stump, which proves to be the relic of the whipping-post, or the gallows.

Neither the party himself, nor the world, trouble their heads, about a man's ancestors, until he has distinguished himself, in some degree, or fancies that he has; for, while he is nobody, they are clearly nobody's ancestors. In Note A, upon the article *Touchet*, vol. ix., fol. ed., Lond., 1739, Bayle remarks—"It is very common to fall into two extremes, with regard to those, whom Providence raises greatly above their former condition: some, by fabulous genealogies, procure them ancestors of the

first quality; others reduce them to a rank, much below the true one." This remark was amply illustrated, in the case of Napoleon Bonaparte: while some there were, who thought they could make out a clear descent from the prince of darkness, others were ready to accommodate him with the most illustrious ancestry. The Emperor of Austria had a fancy, for tracing Napoleon's descent, from one of the petty sovereigns of Treviso; and a genealogist made a merit of proving him to be a descendant, from an ancient line of Gothic princes; to all this Napoleon sensibly replied, that he dated his patent of nobility, from the battle of Monte Notte. Cicero was of the same way of thinking, and prided himself, on being *novus homo*. Among the *fragmenta*, ascribed to him, there is a declamation against Sallust, published by Lemaire, in his edition of the Classics, though he believes it not to be Cicero's; in which, sec. ii., are these words—*Ego meis majoribus virtute mea præluxi; ut, si prius noti non fuerint, a me accipiant initium memoriæ suæ*—*By my virtue, I have shown forth before my ancestors; so, that if they were unknown before, they will receive the commencement of their notoriety from me.* "I am no herald," said Sydney, "to inquire of men's pedigrees: it sufficeth for me if I know their virtues."

This setting up for ancestors, among those, who, from the very nature of our institutions, are, and ever must be, a middling interest people, is as harmless, as it is sometimes ridiculous, and no more need be said of its inoffensiveness.

From the very nature of the case, there can be no lack of ancestors. The simplest arithmetic will show, that the humblest citizen has more than *one million of grand parents*, within the twentieth degree; and it is calculated, in works on consanguinity, that, within the fifteenth degree, every man has nearly *two hundred and seventy millions of kindred*. There is no lack, therefore, of the raw material, for this light work; unless, in a case, like that of the little vagrant, who replied to the magistrate's inquiry, as to his parents, that he never had any, but *was washed ashore*. The process is very simple. Take the name of Smith, for example: set down all of that name, who have graduated at the English, American, and German colleges, for Schmidt is the same thing—then enrol all of that name, upon the habitable earth, who have, in any way, distinguished themselves; carefully avoiding the records of criminal

courts, and such publications as Caulfield's Memoirs, the State Trials, and the Newgate Calendar. Such may be called the genealogy of the Smiths; and every man of that name, while contemplating the list of worthies, will find himself declaring a dividend, *per capita*, of all that was good, and great, and honorable, in the collection; and he will arise, from the perusal, a more complacent, if not a better man.

This species of literature is certainly coming into vogue. I have lately seen, in this city, a large duodecimo volume, recently printed, in which the genealogy of a worthy family, among us, is traced, through Oliver Cromwell, to Æneas, not Æneas Silvius, who flourished in the early part of the fifteenth century, and became Pope Pius II., but to Æneas, the King of the Latins. This royal descent is not through the second marriage with Lavinia; nor through the accidental relation, between Æneas and Dido—

Speluncam Dido dux et Trojanus eandem
Deveniunt —————;

but through the first marriage with the unfortunate Creusa, who was burnt to death, in the great Troy fire, which took place, according to the Parian Marbles, on the 23d of the month, Thargelion, i. e., 11th of June, 1184 years before Christ. Ascanius was certainly therefore the ancestor of this worthy family, the son of Æneas and Creusa; and the grandson of Anchises and Venus. Such a pedigree may satisfy a Welchman.

I am forcibly reminded, by all this, of a very pleasant story, recounted by Horace Walpole, in a letter to Horace Mann: I refer to Letter CCV. in Lord Dover's edition. In 1749, when Mirepoix was ambassador in England, there was a Monsieur de Levi, in his suite. This man was proud of his Jewish name, and really appeared to set no bounds to his genealogical gout. They considered the Virgin Mary a cousin of their house, and had a painting, in which she is represented, as saying to Monsieur Levi's ancestor, who takes off his hat in her presence—"*Couvrez vous, mon cousin:*" to which he replies—"*Non pas, ma très sainte cousine, je sçai trop bien le respect que je vous dois.*" The editor, Lord Dover, says, in a note, that there is said to have been another ridiculous picture, in that family, in which Noah is represented, going into the ark, carrying a

small trunk under his arm, on which is written—“*Papiers de la maison de Levis.*”

Very few persons are calculated for the task of tracing genealogies; patience and discrimination should be united with a certain slowness of belief, and wariness of imposition. Two of a feather do not more readily consociate, than two of a name, and of the genealogical fancy, contrive to strike up a relationship. There are also greater obstacles in the way, than a want of the requisite talents, temper, and attainments:—“Alterations of surnames,” says Camden, “which, in former ages, have been very common, have so obscured the truth of our pedigrees, that it will be no little labor to deduce many of them.” For myself, a plain, old-fashioned sexton, as I am, I am much better satisfied, with the simple and intelligible assurance of my Bible, that I am a child of Adam, than I could possibly be, with any genealogical proofs, that Anchises and Venus were my ancestors. However, there is no such thing as accounting for taste; and it is not unpleasant, I admit, to those of us, who still cherish some of our early, classical attachments, to know, that the blood of that ancient family is still preserved among us.

No man is more inclined than I am, to perpetuate a sentiment of profound respect for the memory of worthy ancestors. Let us extract, from the contemplation of their virtues, a profitable stimulus, to prevent us from being weary in well-doing. By the laws of Confucius, a part of the duty, which children owed to their parents, consisted in worshipping them, when dead. I am inclined to believe, that this filial worship or reverence may be well bestowed, in the ascending line, on all, who have deserved it, and who are, *bona fide*, our grandfathers and grandmothers. It seems to me quite proper and convenient, to have a well-authenticated catalogue or list of one's ancestors, as far back as possible; but let us exercise a sound discretion in this matter; and not run into absurdity. I am ready and willing to obey the laws of Confucius, as implicitly, as though I were a Chinaman, and reverence my ancestors; but I must, first, be well satisfied, as to their identity. I will never consent, because some professional genealogist has worked himself into a particular belief, to worship the man in the moon, for my great Proavus, nor Dido for my great, great grandmother.

Domestic arboriculture is certainly getting into fashion, and a family tree is becoming quite essential to the self-complacency, at least, of many well-regulated families. The roots are found to push freely, in the superficial soil of family pride. Generally, these trees, to render them sightly, require to be pruned with a free hand; and the proprietor, when the crooked branches are skilfully removed, and all the small and imperfect fruit put entirely out of sight, may behold it, with heartfelt pleasure, and rejoice in the happy consciousness, that he is a SMINK. If, however, these family matters, instead of being preserved, for private amusement, are to be multiplied, by the press, there will, indeed, in the words of the wise man, be no end of making books.

Ancestors are relics, and nothing else. Whenever the demand for ancestors becomes brisk, and genealogy becomes a *profession*—it becomes a *craft*. Laboureur, the historian, in his *Additions de Castelnau*, tom. ii. p. 559, affords a specimen of genealogical trust-worthiness. "In 1560, Renatus of Sanzay built, with John le Feron, king at arms of France, a genealogy of the house of Sanzay, made up of near fifty descents, most of them enumerated, year by year; with the names, surnames, and coats of arms of the women; whilst all those names, families, and arms were mere phantoms; brother Stephen of Lusignan, out of this mighty tub, as from a public fountain, let flow the nobility and blood of Lusignan to all persons, who desired any of it."—Again, on page 320, Laboureur says—"They admitted, as true, all that was vented by certain false antiquaries and downright enthusiasts, such as John le Maire de Belges, Forcatel, a civilian, Stephen of Lusignan, and John le Feron, whom I will charge with nothing but credulity." This, doubtless, is the stumbling block of most men, who engage in this semi-mythical employment.

Nothing is more easy, than to mistake one dead person, for another, when corruption has done its work, upon the form and features. There is something bituminous in time. What masculine mistakes are committed by experts! Those relics, which have been the object of hereditary veneration, for thirty centuries, as the virgin daughter of some great high priest in the days of Cheops and Cephrenes, may, by the assistance of the savans, with the aid of magnifiers of extraordinary power, be demonstrated to be the blackened carcass of Hum-Bug-Phi, the

son of Hassan, the camel-driver; who kept a little khane or caravansera near Joseph's granaries, in old Al Karirah, on the eastern banks of the Nile, famous—very—for the quality of its leeks and onions, three thousand years ago.

No. XCVIII.

THANK Heaven, I am not a young widow, for two plain reasons; I do not wish to be young again—and I would not be a widow, if I could help it. A young widow, widder, or widdy, as the word is variously spelt, has been a byword, of odd import, ever since the days, when Sara, the daughter of Raguel, exclaimed, in the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of the book of Tobit—“*My seven husbands are already dead, and why should I live?*” All this tilting against the widows, with goose quills for spears, arises from the fact, that these weapons of war are mainly in the hands of one sex. Men are the scribblers—the lions are the painters. Nothing, in the chapters of political economy, is more remarkable, than the fact, that, since all creation was divided into parishes, there has never been a parish, in which there was not a Mr. Tompkins, who was the very thing for the widow Button. But the cutting out and fitting of these matters commonly belongs to that amiable sisterhood, who are ever happy, without orders, to make up, at short notice.

The result of my limited reading and observation has satisfied me entirely, that there is, and ever has been, a very great majority of bad husbands, over the bad wives, and of bewizzarded widowers, over the widows bewitched. When a poor, lone, young widow, for no reason under Heaven, but the desire to prove her respect, as Dr. Johnson says, for the state of matrimony, takes the initiative, every unmarried female, over thirty, longs to cut her ears off.

If there be sin or silliness, in the repetition of the matrimonial relation, or in strong indications of uneasiness, in the state of single blessedness, man is the offender in chief.

Quadrigamus, signifying a man who had been four times married, was a word, applicable of old. Henry VIII. had six wives, in succession. Let us summon a witness, from among the dead.

Let us inquire, where is there a widow, maid, or wife, who would not be deemed a candidate for the old summary punishment of Skymmington, should she behave herself, as boldly, and outrageously, as John Milton behaved?

Milton, though he did not commence his matrimonial experiments, until he was thirty-five, married, in succession, Mary Powell, in 1643—Catherine Woodcock, in 1653—and Elizabeth Minshull, in 1662. Mary Powell, who was the daughter of a Cavalier, and accustomed to the gaiety of her father's house, soon became weary of her solitary condition, with John Milton, who was, constitutionally, of a choleric and lordly temper. Contrasted with the loneliness, and slender appliances of her new home, the residence of her father, at Forest Hill, appeared to her, like paradise lost. So she went home, at the end of a month, ostensibly upon a visit; and, probably, gave no very flattering account of the honeymoon. Just about that period, the King's forces had thrashed Fairfax, in the North, and taught Waller the true difference, between prose and poetry, in the West; and "the Powells," says Dr. Symmons, "began to repent of their Republican connection." Milton wrote to his wife to return. She neither came, nor responded. He next sent a messenger, who was treated with contempt. Thereupon Milton immediately proceeded to pay his suit to a very beautiful and accomplished young lady, the daughter of a Dr. Davis; and Dr. Symmons is evidently of opinion, that the lady and her family had no objections to the proceeding, which is fully exhibited, in Milton's Prose Works, vol. vii. p. 205, Lond., 1806.

Talk not of widows after this. Finding, even in those days of disorder, that no divorce, a *vinculo*, could be obtained, under existing laws, he wrote his celebrated works—The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, and the Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce. In these works he sets forth his particular grievance, which the reader may easily comprehend, from one or two brief quotations—he speaks of a "*mute and spiritless mate*," and of "*himself bound to an image of earth and phlegm*."

After the fight of Naseby, the Powells appear to have thought better of it; and Madame Milton returned, made the amende, and was restored in full. What sort of composition Milton made with Miss Davis nobody has ever disclosed. Certain it is, that compassionate damsel and the works upon divorce were all

laid upon the same shelf. We are apt to find something of value, in a thing we have discarded, when we perceive, that it is capable of giving high satisfaction to another. This consideration may have influenced Mrs. Milton; and, very possibly, the desire of returning to the residence of Milton may have been secondary to that of jilting Miss Davis, which she was certainly entitled to do. I knew an old gentleman, who was always so much affected, in this manner, by the sight of his cast-off clothing, upon the persons of his servants, that nothing would content him, short of reclaiming.

Milton was ever Milton still—*nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*. Take a brief extract or two from his work on divorce:—"What therefore God hath joined let no man put asunder. But here the Christian prudence lies, to consider what God hath joined. Shall we say that God hath joined error, fraud, unfitness, wrath, contention, perpetual loneliness, perpetual discord? Whatever lust, or wine, or witchery, threat or enticement, avarice or ambition hath joined together, faithful or unfaithful, Christian with anti-Christian, hate with hate, or hate with love—shall we say this is God's joining?"—"But unfitness and contrariety frustrate and nullify forever, unless it be a rare chance, all the good and peace of wedded conversation; and leave nothing between them enjoyable, but a prone and savage necessity, not worth the name of marriage, unaccompanied with love." Every word of all this was written with an eye to the object of his unlawful passion: but the legislature very justly considered the greatest good of the greatest possible number; and would not turn aside, to pass a bill, for the special relief of John Milton and Miss Davis.

Selden, in his *Uxor Hebraica*, has proved, that polygamy existed, not only among the Hebrews, but among all nations, and in all ages. Mark Anthony is mentioned, as the first, among the Romans, who took the liberty of having two wives. What a gathering there would have been, in the Forum, if the news had been spread, that Mrs. Mark Anthony had taken the liberty of having two husbands! Every body knows, that widows are occasionally burnt, in Hindostan, on the funeral pile with their husbands. Whoever heard of a widower being burnt or even scorched, on a similar occasion?

The Landgrave of Hesse, the most warlike of the Protestant leaders, caused a representation to be made to the theologians, that

he must have two wives, and that he would not be denied. A most rampant and outrageous protocol was prepared, and handed to Bucerus, for the ministers at Wittemberg. The substance of this was equally discreditable to the Landgrave, and insulting to Luther and the holy fathers. The Landgrave was no gentleman, for he told the theologians, that his lady got drunk, and was personally disagreeable to him. He calls God to witness, that, if they do not sanction his polygamy, he will do just what he likes, and the sin will be upon their heads. He particularly wishes information, on one point—why he is not as good as Abraham, Jacob, David, Lamech, and Solomon; and why he has not as good a right to have a spare wife or two, as they had. He asks for two only.

Luther was deeply troubled, and perplexed. The Reformation professed to bring back the world to the Scriptures, in which polygamy was expressly recognized. The Reformers held marriage to be *res politica*, and therefore subject to the law of the State. The matter became worse by delay. The Landgrave was filled with fury, and the theologians with fear. At last, poor Luther and the rest signed a paper, concluding with these memorable words—"If however your highness is utterly determined upon marrying a second wife, we are of opinion, that it ought to be done secretly. Signed and sealed at Wittemberg, after the feast of St. Nicholas, in the year 1539. Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Antony Corvin, Adam John Lening, Justin Wintfert, Dyonisius Melanther."

The detail of all this may be found, in Hazlitt's translation of Michelet's Life of Luther, page 251, Lond. 1846. Bayle, article Luther, observes, that the theologians would have promptly refused to sanction such a thing, had the request come from any private gentleman—or, permit me to add, if it had come from the lady of the Landgrave, for a brace of husbands.

It is my opinion, that great injustice is done to widows. The opinion of St. Jerome, who never was a widow, and knew nothing about it, that they should never marry again, is perfectly absurd; for there are some men, whose constitutional timidity would close the matrimonial highway forever, were it not for that peculiar species of encouragement, which none but widows can ever administer. For my own part, I would have a widow speak out, and spare not; for I am very fearful, that the opposite course is productive of great moral mischief, and tends

to perpetuate a system of terrible hypocrisy. But let a sound discretion be exercised. I disapprove altogether of conditional engagements, made *durante vita mariti*.

No. XCIX.

JONNY MOORHEAD was a man of a kind heart and a pleasant fancy. He came hither from Belfast, in 1727. He became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Long Lane, in 1730.—*Tempora mutantur*—Long Lane, and Jonny Moorhead, and the little, old, visible temple, and Presbyterianism itself, are like Rachel's first born—they are not. But in 1744, the good people built a new church, for Jonny Moorhead; in due time, Long Lane became Federal Street; and, Jonny's church bore the bell, which had rung so many peals, and the gilded tell-tale, which, for so many years, had done obeisance to all the winds of Heaven, upon the *old* Brattle Street Church. These, upon the demolition of that church, in 1774, were the gift of John Hancock. Jonny Moorhead had little comfort from that bell, for he died December 3, 1774, and could he have lived to see that Presbyterian weathercock go round, in after-times, it would have broken the tough, old strings of Jonny Moorhead's Irish heart.

About one hundred years ago, Jonny Moorhead, upon a drowsy summer afternoon, gave out the one hundred and eighty-seventh psalm—the chief minstrel, with infinite embarrassment, suggested, that there were not so many in the *Book*—and tradition tells us, that Jonny replied—“*Weel, then, sing as mony as there be.*”

My recollection of this anecdote of Jonny Moorhead will be painfully revived, when I send forth the one hundredth number of these dealings with the dead. They have been prepared like patch-work, from such fragments, as my common-place book supplied, and at such broken hours of more than ordinary loneliness, as might otherwise have been snoozed, unconsciously away. I had cast all that I had written into a particular drawer; and great was my surprise, to find, that the hundredth was the last, and that, with that number, I shall have sung—“*as mony as there be.*”

One hundred—thought I—is an even number—few individuals care to survive one hundred. When these dealings with the dead had reached the number of four-score, I had serious misgivings, that their *strength*, to my weary reader, might prove nothing better than *labor and sorrow*; notwithstanding the occasional tokens of approbation, from some exceedingly old-fashioned people, who were altogether behind the times.

Having attained this *point d'appui*, which appears well enough adapted for the long home of an old sexton, it occurred to me, that I could not possibly do a better thing, for myself, or a more acceptable thing for the public, than to gather up my tools, as snugly as possible, and quietly give up the ghost. But giving up the ghost, even in the sacristan sense of that awful phrase, is not particularly agreeable, after all. If I look upon each one of these hundred dealings, as a sepulchre of my own digging—I cannot deny, that the employment of my spade has been a particular solace to me. But there are other solaces—I know it—there are an hundred according to the exiled bard of Sulmo—

“—— centum solatia curæ
Et ras, et comites, et via longa dabunt.”

Other suggestions readily occur, and are as readily, discarded. Parents, occasionally, experiment upon the sensibility of their children, by fondly discoursing of the uncertainty of human existence, and mingling deep drawn sighs, with shadowy allusions to wills and codicils.

For three-and-thirty years, our veteran, maiden aunt, Jemima Wycherly, at the close of her annual visit, which seldom fell short of six weeks, in its duration, though it seemed much longer, took each of us by the hand, and, with many tears, commended us fervently to the protecting arm of an overruling Providence, and bade us an eternal farewell!

I have always contemplated the conduct of Charles V. in relation to the rehearsal of his funeral obsequies, as a piece of imperial foolery. “He ordered his tomb to be erected, in the chapel of the monastery. His domestics marched thither in funeral procession, with black tapers in their hands. He himself followed, in his shroud. He was laid in his coffin, with much solemnity. The service for the dead was chanted; and Charles joined in the prayers, which were offered for the rest of his soul, mingling his tears with those, which his attendants shed,

as if they had been celebrating a real funeral. The ceremony closed, with sprinkling holy water on the coffin, in the usual form, and, all the assistants retiring, the doors of the chapel were shut. Then Charles rose out of the coffin, and withdrew to his apartment." Such is the statement of Dr. Robertson.*

Notwithstanding this high authority, it is comforting, even at this late day, to believe, that a story, so discreditable to the memory of Charles, is without any substantial foundation. It has ever appeared remarkable, that Bayle should not have alluded to this curious anecdote. After bestowing the highest praise, on Richard Ford's Hand Book, for Travellers in Spain, the London Quarterly Review† furnishes an extract from the work, in which, after giving a minute and interesting account of the convent of St. Yuste, the final retreat of Charles V., Mr. Ford says—"the story of his having had the funeral service said over himself, while alive, is untrue; no record, or tradition of the kind existed among the monks."

There is something, in these drafts upon *posterity*, to be accepted and paid, by the *present generation*, for the honor of the drawer, resembling the conduct of a man, who encroaches on his principal, or who anticipates his revenues.

There is, undoubtedly, a species of luxury in leave-taking. We have delighted, to contemplate the edifying history of that gray-headed old rat, who, weary of the world, and determined to spend the remnant of his days, in pious meditation, took a final and affectionate leave of all his relatives and friends, and retired to a quiet hole—in the recesses of a Cheshire cheese.

However gratified we may be, to witness the second, or third coming of an able, ardent, and ambitious politician, it is not in the gravest nature to restrain a smile, while we contrast that vehemence, which no time can temper—that *vis vivida vita*—ready for all things, in the forum or the field—that unquenchable fire, brightly burning, beneath the frost of more than seventy winters—with those sad infirmities of age—those silver hairs—that one foot in the grave—the necessity of turning from all sub-lunary things, and making way for Heaven, under the pale rays of life's parting sun—those senatorial adieus—and long, last farewells—those solemn prayers and fervent hopes for the hap-

* Hist. of Charles V., vol. v. page 139, Oxford ed. 1825.

† Lond. Quart. Rev., vol. lxxvi. page 161.

piness of his associates, whom he should meet no more, on this side of the eternal world—those *esto perpetuus* for his country! How touching these things would be, but for their frequency! What more natural, or more excusable, having enjoyed the luxury of leave-taking, than a desire—after a reasonable interval—to repeat the process, which afforded so much pleasure, and inflicted so little pain!

As to my own comparatively humble relation to the public—*parris componere magna*—I am of opinion, that I should gain nothing, by affecting to retire, or by pretending to be dead. As to the former, it may be as truly averred of sextons, as it was, by Mr. Jefferson, of office-holders—“*few die and none resign*,” and, in respect to the latter, I not only despise the idea of such an imposition upon the public, but have some little fear, that the affectation might be too suddenly followed, by the reality, as Dr. Robertson, rightly or wrongly, affirms it to have been, in the case of Charles the Fifth.

I am now fairly committed, for the first number, at least, of another hundred, but for nothing more. I pretend not to look deeper into futurity, than six feet, which is the depth of a well-made grave. When I shall have completed the second hundred, and commenced upon a third, I shall be well nigh ready to exclaim, in the words of Ovid—

“*Vixi*

Annos bis centum: nunc tertia vivitur ætas.”

A relation of liberty and equality is decidedly the best, for my reader and for me—I am not constrained to write, nor he to read—if he cannot lie cozily, in a grave of my digging—I do not propose to detain him there—to bury him alive. Dealing with the dead has not hardened my heart. I am a sexton of very considerable sensibility; and have, occasionally, mingled my tears with the earth, as I shovelled it in.

In less figurative phrase, it is my desire to write, for my amusement, till one of us, the reader or myself, gives in, or gives out, and cries *enough*. I have a perfect respect for the old proverb, *de gustibus*, and by no means anticipate the pleasure of pleasing every body—

*Men' moveat cimex Pantilius? aut cruciet, quod
Vellicet absentem Demetrius? aut quod ineptus
Fannius Hermogenis lædat conviva Tigelli?*

There are some readers, for example, who seem to look upon a classical quotation, as a personal affront. I conceive this objection to be scarcely equitable, from those, whose hybrid English, it is quite as hard to bear.

There are mortals—offenders in some sort—whom it is difficult to please, like the culprit who cried *higher* and *lower*, under the lash, till the Irish drummer's patience was perfectly exhausted, and he exclaimed—" *By Jasus, there's no plasing ye, strike where I will.*"

No. C.

THE sayings of eminent men, in a dying hour, are eminently worthy of being gathered together—they are often illustrative of the characters of the dead, and impressive upon the hearts of the living. Not a few of these parting words are scattered, over the breadth and length of history, and might form a volume—a *Vade Mecum*, for the patriot and the Christian—a casket of imperishable jewels.

As an example of those sayings, to which I refer, nothing can be more apposite, than that of the Chevalier Bayard, while dying upon the field of battle. "He received a wound," says Robertson, "which he immediately perceived to be mortal, and being unable any longer to continue on horseback, he ordered one of his attendants to place him under a tree, with his face toward the enemy; then fixing his eyes on the guard of his sword, which he held up, instead of a cross, he addressed his prayers to God; and, in this posture, which became his character, both as a soldier and as a Christian, he calmly awaited the approach of death." Bourbon, who led the foremost of the enemy's troops, found him in this situation, and expressed regret and pity, at the sight. "*Pity not me,*" cried the high-spirited chevalier, "*I die, as a man of honor ought, in the discharge of my duty; they indeed are objects of pity, who fight against their king, their country, and their oath.*"

How significant of the life of that great military phlebotomist, who, from the overthrow of the council of five hundred, in 1799, to his own in 1815, delighted in blood, and in war, were those wild, wandering words of the dying Napoleon—*tete d'armee!*

We have the last words of consciousness, that were uttered, by the younger Adams, when stricken by the hand of death in the capitol—*the last of earth!* We have also those of his venerable father, who expired, on the anniversary of that day, which he had so essentially contributed to render glorious, so long as the annals of our country shall continue to be preserved. On the morning of that day, the dying patriot, at the age of ninety-one, was awakened, by the customary pealing of bells, and the roar of artillery. Upon being asked, if he recognized the day, he replied—“*it is the glorious Fourth—God bless the day—God bless you all.*”

On the ninth day of July, 1850, another patriot died, at his post, and in the service of his country, whose parting words will long remain, engraven at full length, upon the broad area of the whole American heart,—**I AM PREPARED—I HAVE ENDEAVORED TO DO MY DUTY!** Here, in this comprehensive declaration of General Taylor, are embodied all, and more than all, contained in the long cherished words of the departing patriot—**ESTO PERPETUA!**

“And you brave Cobham, to the latest breath,
Shall feel your ruling passion, strong in death:
Such in those moments, as in all the past;
‘O save my country, Heaven!’ shall be your last.”

The ninth day of July is, with the Swiss, the day of their National Independence. On that memorable day, in 1836, they fought, and won the great battle of Sempach, against Leopold, Duke of Austria, which victory established the liberties of Switzerland.

Upon the anniversary of that very day, just ninety-five years ago, Washington was signally preserved, from the sweeping and indiscriminate carnage of Indian warfare, for those high destinies, which he fulfilled so gloriously. The ninth day of July, 1755, was the day of General Braddock's defeat—the battle, as it is sometimes called, of Fort du Quesne. Hereafter, it will be noted, as a day of gloom, in our national calendar. A great—good man has fallen—in a trying hour—in the very midst of his labors—a wiser, a worthier could not have fallen, at a moment of deeper need. From sea to sea—from the mountain tops to the valleys below—from the city and from the wilderness—from the rich man's castle, and from the hunter's cabin—from the silver-haired and from the light-hearted, what an acclaim—what a

response, as the voice of one man—has already answered to that dying declaration—I AM PREPARED—I HAVE ENDEAVORED TO DO MY DUTY! As an entire people, we know it—we feel it—and may God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, enable us to profit, by a dispensation, so awfully solemn, and so terribly severe.

The spirit of this great, good man is now by the side of that sainted shade, which once animated the form of the immortal Washington. They are looking down upon the destinies of their country. Who is so dull of hearing, as not to catch the context of those dying words? *I am prepared—I have endeavored to do my duty*—AND MAY MY DEATH CEMENT THAT UNION, WHICH I SO CHEERFULLY DEVOTED MY LIFE TO PRESERVE!

It is finished. The career of this good man has closed forever. Ingratitude and calumny to him are nothing now. After days and nights of restless agitation, he has obtained one long, last night of sweet repose, reserved for those, who die *prepared, and who have endeavored to do their duty*. He has gone where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest. No summons to attend the agitating councils of the Cabinet shall disturb his profound repose—no sarcastic commentaries upon his honest policy, from the over-heated leaders of the Senate or the House, shall give him additional pain. Party malignity can no longer reach that ear. Even the hoary-headed, political Zoilus of the age can scarcely find a motive, base enough, among the recesses of an envenomed heart, for posthumous abuse. In view of this solemnizing event, the raving abolitionist and the Utopian non-resistant may be expected to hold their incomparably senseless tongues, at least till these obsequies be past.

If I do not greatly mistake, the death of General Harrison and the death of General Taylor, so very soon after entering upon the performance of their presidential duties, will not fail to present before the whole American people, for their learning, a first and a second lesson, so perfectly legible, that he, who runs, may read.

It perfectly comports with a respect, sincere and profound, for the memories of these excellent men, solemnly to inquire, if, upon certain well known and universally acknowledged principles, it would not be as wise, and even more wise, to select a statesman, whose conduct in the cabinet had made him preëmi-

nently popular, and to place him, with a sword, in his unpractised hand, at the head of the armies of the Republic—than to place, in the Presidential chair, a great soldier, universally and deservedly popular, for his success in war—however strong his common sense—however inflexible his integrity—however pure and devoted his patriotism—unless he also possesses that skill, and knowledge of affairs, which never came to man, by intuition; and which cannot be acquired, but by the laborious training and experience of years? This is a solemn question, for the people; and it may well be put, irrespectively of the public weal, and with a reference, directly, to the happiness, and even to the continued existence, of those, who may be so unfortunate as to become the objects of the popular favor. Is there any doubt, that all the battles, in which General Taylor has ever been engaged, have occasioned less wear and tear of body and mind, than have been produced, by the numberless trials and anxieties of the Presidential relation? It is a popular saying, and, perhaps, not altogether unworthy of general acception, that both General Harrison and General Taylor were *killed, not by kindness, but by care.*

It may readily be supposed, that a gallant soldier would rather encounter the brunt of a battle, than such torrents of filth, as have been poured, professionally, upon the chief magistrate of the nation, from week to week, by the great scavenger, and his auxiliaries, at Washington. All this would have been borne, with comparative indifference, by a practised statesman, whose training had been among the contests of the forum, and whose moral *cutis* had been thickened, by time and exposure.

To appear, and to be, all that a chief magistrate ought to appear, and to be, in the centre of his cabinet, what a mass of information, on a great variety of subjects—what tact, amid the details of the cabinet—must be required, which very few gentlemen, who have devoted themselves to the military profession, can be supposed to possess! If knowledge is power, ignorance is weakness; and the consciousness of that weakness produces a condition of suffering and anxiety. Instead of coming to the great work of government, with the necessary stock of knowledge, training, and experience—how incompetent is he, who comes to that work, like an actor, who is learning his part, during the progress of the play.

The crude, iron ore is quite as well adapted to the purposes

of the smith, or the cutler, without any subjection to the preparatory processes of metallurgy, as talent and virtue, however consummate, without preparatory training, and appropriate study, for the great and complicated work of government.

Too much confidence is apt to be reposed, upon the idea, that the President will be sustained, by his cabinet; and that any deficiencies, in him, will be compensated, by their wisdom and experience. The President is an important, component part of the acting government. He is not, like the august Personage, at the head of the government of England, who can do no wrong; and whose chief employment is the breeding of royal babies, and the occasional reading of a little speech. He can do a great deal of wrong, and must do a great deal of work; and, when he differs from his cabinet, the more need he feels of practical and applicable wisdom and knowledge; and, the more upright and conscientious he is, the more miserable he becomes, under an oppressive sense of his incapacity.

General Taylor will long be remembered, by the people of the United States, with profound and affectionate respect. His amiable and excellent qualities are embalmed in their hearts. He fought the battles of his country, with consummate skill and bravery. He led their armies, in many battles—and never, but to victory!

A grateful people, in the fulness of their hearts, and amid the blindness of popular enthusiasm, and with the purest purposes, and with sentiments of patriotic devotion, rewarded their gallant soldier, by placing upon his brows, A GILDED CROWN OF THORNS!

No. CI.

THE form of a Chinese tomb, says Mr. Davis, in his "Description of the Empire of China," whether large or small, is exactly that of the Greek *omega* Ω . Their mourning color is white. Their cemeteries are upon the hills. No interments are permitted in cities. No corpse is suffered to be carried, through any walled town, which may lie in its way to the place of interment.

The tombs of the rich, says M. Grosier, are shaped like a

horse shoe, which, when well made, might pass for a very respectable Ω . Almost immediately after death, says the latter writer, the corpse is arrayed in its best attire. A son will sell himself, as a slave, to purchase a coffin, for his father. The coffin, upon which no cost is spared, remains, frequently, for years, the most showy article of the expectant's furniture. The body lies in state, and is visited by all comers, for seven days. The hall of ceremony is hung with white, interspersed with black or violet colored silk. Flowers, perfumes, and wax lights abound. Those, who enter, salute the dead, as if he were alive, and knock their heads, three times, upon the ground. Upon this, the sons of the defunct creep forth, on their hands and knees, from behind a curtain, and, having returned the salutation, retire in the same manner.

A Chinese hearse is a very elegant affair; it is covered with a dome-shaped canopy of violet-colored silk, with tufts of white, neatly embroidered, and surmounted with net work. In this the coffin reposes; and the whole is borne, by sixty-four men.

Mourning continues for three years, during which the aggrieved abstain from flesh, wine, and all ordinary amusements.

As we have had recently, among us, some half a dozen visitors, male and female, from the Celestial Empire, I am strongly tempted to turn from the dead, to the living.

I have repeatedly attended the morning levees of Miss PWAN YEKOO, who was exhibited with her serving-maid, LUM AKUM, Mr. MOO CHUNE, the musical professor, his son and daughter, MUN CHUNG and AMOON, and Mr. ALEET MONG, the interpreter. This was certainly a very interesting group; such as never before has been presented in this city, and will not be again, I presume, for many years.

Miss Yekoo is said to be seventeen, which appears to be her age. With the costume of the Chinese, which, in our eyes, is superlatively graceless, we have become sufficiently familiar, by the exhibition of the living males and the stuffed females, in our Chinese Museums. Of their music, we had an interesting specimen, a few years since. Being fortunately deaf, I can say nothing of the performances of Miss Yekoo and Professor Chune. Their features and complexions are Chinese, of course, and cannot be better described than in the words of Sir John Barrow, as applicable to the race: "The narrow, elongated, half-closed eye; the linear and highly-arched eye-

brow; the broad root of the nose; the projection of the upper jaw a little beyond the lower; the thin, straggling beard, and the body generally free from hair; a high, conical head, and triangular face: and these are the peculiar characteristics which obtained for them, in the *Systema Naturæ* of Linnæus, a place among the varieties of the species, distinguished by the name of *homines monstrosi*."

Apart from these and other considerations, it was well for all, who had it in their power, to avail themselves of an opportunity, which is not likely to be presented again, for years, and examine, with their own eyes, those "*golden lilies*," for the production of which this little Chinese spinster, Miss Pwan Yekoo has been severely tortured, from her cradle. She is neither very large, nor very small, for a girl of seventeen, and her feet are precisely *two inches and a half* in length. A small female foot, as it came from the hand of the great Creator, has ever been accounted a great beauty, since Eve was born. But, to the eyes of all beholders, on this side of the Yellow Sea, no more disgusting objects were ever presented, than the horribly contracted and crippled deformities, upon the ends of Miss Yekoo's little trotters.

The bare feet are not exhibited; but a model of the foot, two inches and a half in length, on which is a shoe, which is taken off, by the exhibitor, and put upon the real foot of Miss Yekoo, over a shoe, already there. This model is affirmed to be exact. As it is presented in front, the great toe nail alone is visible, forming a central apex, for the foot. On being turned up, the four smaller toes are seen, closely compacted, and inverted upon the sole. It is not possible to walk, with the weight of the body upon the inverted toes, without pain. Miss Yekoo, like all other Chinese girls, with these crippled feet, walks, with manifest uneasiness and awkwardness, upon her heels. The *os calcis* receives the whole weight of the body.

To sustain the statement, that Miss Yekoo is a "*Chinese lady*," it is said, that these crippled feet are signs of aristocracy. Not infallible, I conceive:—not more so, than crippled ribs, occasioned by tight lacing, which may originate in the upper circles, but find hosts of imitators, among the lower orders. "We may add," says Mr. Davis, writing of this practice, "that this odious custom extends lower down, in the scale of society, than might have been expected, from its disabling

effect, upon those, who have to labor for their subsistence. If the custom were first imposed, by the tyranny of the men, the women are fully revenged, in the diminution of their charms and domestic usefulness."

Mr. Davis evidently supposes, that the custom had its rise in jealousy, and a desire to prevent the ambulatory sex, from gadding about. Various causes have been assigned, for this disgusting practice. Sir John Barrow, after expressing his surprise, at the silence of Marco Polo, on the subject of crippled feet, which were, doubtless, common in his time, observes—"Of the origin of this unnatural custom, the Chinese relate twenty different accounts, all absurd. Europeans suppose it to have originated in the jealousy of the men, determined, says M. de Pauw, to keep them '*si étroit qu'on ne peut comparer l'attitude avec laquelle on les gouverne.*'"

A practice, which, at its very birth, and during its infancy, required the assignment of some plausible reason, for its existence and support—when it grows up to be a custom, lives on and thrives, irrespectively of its origin, and, frequently, in spite of its absurdity. The blackened teeth of the Japanese—the goitres of the Swiss, in the valley of Chamouni—the flattened heads of certain Indian races—the crippled feet of the Chinese are illustrations of this truth, in the admiration which they still continue to receive. "Whatever," says Sir John Barrow, "may have been the cause, the continuance may more easily be explained: as long as the men will marry none but such as have crippled feet, crippled feet must forever remain in fashion among Chinese ladies."

M. De Pauw, in his Philosophical Dissertations, alludes to this practice, in connection with that, formerly employed by the Egyptians, and which he calls—the *method of confining the women anciently, in Egypt, by depriving them, in some measure, of the use of their feet.*"

Plutarch, in his *Precepta Connub.* says, that shoes were entirely forbidden to women, by the Egyptians. "Afterwards," says De Pauw, "they imagined it to be inconsistent with decency, that they should appear in public, with the feet naked, and, of course, they remained at home."

The Kalif, Hakin, who founded the religion of the Druses, re-enacted this law. De Pauw remarks, that the assertion of Plutarch might seem doubtful, if a decree, prohibiting the manufac-

ture of shoes for women, under the pain of death, were not found, as it is, in the *Kitab-al-Machaid*, or bible of the Druses.

Upon my first visit to Pwan Yekoo and her *suite*, in connection with other visitors, I was not admitted for nearly two hours, after the appointed time. Ample sleeping arrangements had not been made, for these Celestials; and, for one night, at least, they had been packed, like a crate of China ware, in a closet, or small apartment, contiguous to the hall of exhibition. Yekoo was indignant, and refused to show her "golden lilies." By dint of long importunity, she appeared, but in no gentle humor. Indeed, when Yekoo came forth, followed by Lum Akum, I was reminded, at a glance, of Cruikshank's illustration of Mrs. Varden, followed by Meigs, with the Protestant manual. They soon recovered their better nature; and some little attention, paid by the visitors, to the Celestial papposes, put them into tolerably good humor.

At the close of the exhibition, we were invited near the platform. It would be superfluous to describe the Chinese costume, so commonly presented, in various works. I was especially attracted by the hair of Yekoo, and Lum Akum, who passes for her waiting woman. I examined it with my glasses. It was jet black, coarse, abundant, and besmeared with a stiffening paste or gluten, which mightily resembled grease. Upon the top of the head a slender, round stick, about the size of a crow's quill, is attached, projecting *ast*, in marine parlance, several inches, like a small ring tail boom. The design of this is to support the hair, which is thrown over it, and hangs, or is plastered, down with the shining paste, assuming the appearance, seen *a tergo*, of a rudder.

The Chinese, in relation to the rest of mankind, are, certainly, a contrarious people. In 1833, Mr. Charles Majoribanks addressed a letter to the Right Hon. Charles Grant, in which he says:

"China may, in many respects, be said to stand alone, among the nations; not only differing, but, in many instances, diametrically opposed, in the nature of its laws, customs, and institutions. A Chinese, when he goes into mourning, puts on white; the left hand they consider the place of honor; they think it an act of unbecoming familiarity to uncover the head; their mariner's compass, they assert, points to the South; the stomach they de-

clare to be the seat of the understanding; and the chief God of their idolatry is the Devil."

Suicide is no crime, with the Chinese. To receive a present, with one hand, is deemed an act of rudeness. They never say of the departed, that he is *dead*, but that he has *gone to his ancestors*. Among the good traits of the Chinese are to be numbered filial respect, and general sobriety. In one particular, their legislation may be considered superior to our own—among the grounds of divorce, says Mr. Davis, they include "*excessive talkativeness*."

I have been reared, in the faith, that the Chinese are not only a *peculiar*, but an exceedingly *nasty* generation. According to Barrow, and to Du Halde, in his *Hist. Gén. de la Chine*, they are so liable to a species of leprosy, that, for the purpose of arresting its progress, it is numbered among the causes of divorce. The itch and other cutaneous diseases are extremely common. "They seem," says De Pauw, "to have neither horror nor repugnance for any kind of food; they eat rats, bats, owls, storks, badgers, dogs," &c. Brand, in his *Reise nach China*, observes—"Dogs are chiefly employed, as food, by the Chinese, during the great heat in summer, because they fancy their flesh to have a cooling quality."

Barrow was private secretary to the Earl of Macartnay, and, in 1804, published his travels in China, a work of great merit, and which has been highly lauded, for its candor, and fidelity. In proof of my remark, I offer the following quotation, from that work, on pages 76 and 77. After alluding to the custom of crippling the feet, Mr. Barrow proceeds—"The interior wrappers of the ladies' feet are said to be seldom changed, remaining sometimes, until they can no longer hold together; a custom that conveys no very favorable idea of Chinese cleanliness. This indeed forms no part of their character; on the contrary, they are what Swift would call a *frowzy* people. The comfort of clean linen, or frequent change of under-garments, is equally unknown to the sovereign and the peasant. A sort of thin coarse silk supplies the place of cotton or linen next the skin, among the upper ranks; but the common people wear a coarse kind of open cotton cloth. These vestments are more rarely removed for the purpose of washing, than for that of being replaced with new ones; and the consequence of such neglect is, as might naturally be supposed, an abundant increase of those vermin, to

whose growth filthiness is found to be most favorable. The highest officers of state made no hesitation of calling their attendants, in public, to seek in their necks, for those troublesome animals, which, when caught, they very composedly put between their teeth. They carry no pocket handkerchief, but generally blow their noses into small square pieces of paper, which some of their attendants have ready prepared for the purpose. Many are not so cleanly, but spit about the rooms, or against the walls, like the French, and they wipe their dirty hands, in the sleeves of their gowns. They sleep at night in the same clothes they wear by day. Their bodies are as seldom washed, as their articles of dress. They never make use of the bath, warm or cold. Notwithstanding the vast number of rivers and canals, with which every part of the country is intersected, I do not remember to have seen a single group of boys bathing. The men, in the hottest day of summer, make use of warm water, for washing the hands and face. They are unacquainted with the use of soap."

I do not disbelieve, that we, occasionally, meet men, who are very dirty, and remarkably orthodox, and, now and then, a well-washed and well-dressed villain—but sin and filth are too frequently found to form the very bond of iniquity. "Great crimes," says Sir John Barrow, "are not common, but little vices pervade all ranks of society. A Chinese is cold, cunning, and distrustful; always ready to take advantage of those he has to deal with; extremely covetous and deceitful; quarrelsome, vindictive, but timid and dastardly. A Chinese in office is a strange compound of insolence and meanness. All ranks and conditions have a total disregard for truth. From the Emperor downwards, the most palpable falsehoods are proclaimed, with unblushing effrontery, to answer a political, an interested, or exculpatory purpose."

I beg leave respectfully to suggest to Miss Yekoo, to pay a little more attention to her teeth, and somewhat improve her personal appearance. The collections, upon their upper portions, are, by no means, necessary to prove her Tartar origin.

No. CII.

DEATH is rarely more unwelcome to any, than to those, who reasonably suppose the perils of the deep to be fairly passed, and who are permitted, after a long sojourn in other lands, to look once again upon their own—so near withal, that their eyes are gladdened, by the recognition of familiar landmarks; and who, in the silent chancel of their miscalculating hearts, thank God, that they are *at home at last*—and yet, in the very midst of life and joy, they are in death!

There has ever seemed to me to be something exceedingly impressive, in the death of that eminent patriot, Josiah Quincy. He died when the bark, which bore him homeward was in sight of land—the headlands of Gloucester, April 26, 1775—

———*Dulces moriens reminiscitur Argos.*

Few men, of our own country, have accomplished more, or acquired a more honorable celebrity, at the early age of thirty-one.

His was a death in the common course of nature. I more especially allude, at this moment, to death as it occurs, from shipwreck, on one's own shores, when the voyage is apparently at an end, and the voyagers are anticipating an almost immediate reunion with their friends.

The frequency of these occurrences revives, at the present moment, the sentiment of Horace, delivered some eighteen centuries ago—

*Illi robur et æs triplex
Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci
Commisit pelago ratem
Primus. ———*

We are oblivious of perils past. The tax on commerce, levied by the whirlwind, and by recklessness, and ignorance, far exceeds the common calculation of those, who know little, experimentally, of the perils of the deep; and who go not down upon the sea in ships. Precisely fifty years ago, it was estimated, at Lloyd's, that one ship per diem, three hundred and sixty-five ships, annually, were lost, in the open sea, and on lee shores. And, in Lloyd's Lists, for 1830, it was stated, that six hundred and seventy-seven British vessels were lost, during that year.

Whether or not it be attributable to that natural eagerness, which increases, as the object of our heart's desire draws near, and is apt to abate somewhat of our ordinary vigilance—certain it is, that calamities of this nature are of no unfrequent occurrence, near the termination of a voyage, and when we have almost arrived at the haven, where we would be.

About ten years ago, while enjoying the hospitality of some Southern friends, I became acquainted with a lady, the varying expression of whose features arrested my attention, and excited my surprise. Whenever her countenance was lighted up, by a smile, it was for an instant only; and an expression of solemnity, and even of sadness, immediately succeeded; as the darkness of an autumnal sky follows the feeble flashes of electric light.

I sought an explanation of this peculiarity, from an old friend, who knew this lady well, Mr. Doddridge Crocker, formerly a merchant of this city, and then a resident of Charleston.

He informed me, that, many years before, he had been a passenger, in company with this lady and her father, together with other citizens of Charleston, for New York, on board the *Rose in Bloom*. They had a prosperous voyage, until they came in sight of the Highlands. The passengers proceeded to make their toilets; and arrangements were in progress, for going speedily on shore. The ship was under a press of canvas, with a strong breeze. The wind shifted its direction suddenly, and soon became a gale. The *Rose in Bloom* was capsized, and lost. The lady, said Mr. Crocker, to whom you refer, and her father, amid the terrible confusion, which ensued, clung to some floating article, whose buoyancy, it soon became apparent, was not sufficient to support them both. The filial and paternal contest may be easily conceived, each entreating the other, to retain the only means of preservation. At length, the father abandoned his hold, and struck out for a floating spar, at some little distance. His struggles were ineffectual—he sunk, before his daughter's eyes! We were, ere long, rescued from our imminent peril. The impression, left upon her mind, was left there forever.

The reader may possibly surmise, that my leading remarks have a particular reference to the recent shipwreck of the *Elizabeth*, upon the coast of New York. This catastrophe, which is imputed to ignorance and miscalculation, involves the loss of an

interesting and intelligent young gentleman, Mr. Horace Sumner, of this city, and of the Marquis and Marchioness Ossoli, and their child. One of these sufferers I have known, in earlier days. Under the quiet, unpresuming roof of her worthy father, Mr. Timothy Fuller, I have met his daughter Margaret. Few then would have anticipated her melancholy fate, and fewer still, that she would become an Italian marchioness!

Let me devote the remaining space, in the present article, to those unmitigated wretches, with hearts of flint, who rioted and revelled, amid the sufferings of their fellow-beings. An opportunity will now be afforded, to stamp this hellish practice, with all the force of the law, and whatever there may be of indignant severity, in public sentiment.

Luring vessels on shore, by arranging false lights, and robbing wrecks are crimes of great antiquity. But I had no suspicion, that even the latter practice was carried on, so systematically, and so boldly, as it appears to have been, at the present day, in the State of New York. The names of the places, where these atrocities were committed, Fire Island, Patchogue, Islip, Babylon have something of a Cornish sound, undoubtedly.

Of old, in all the northern regions of Europe, and especially, along the coasts of the Baltic Sea, a wreck was deemed "*a Providence*;" and laws were in force, authorizing the inhabitants to fall on, and plunder at discretion, or, in the language, then employed—" *in naufragorum miseria et calamitate, tanquam vultures, ad prædam currere.*" Of the earlier periods of our own history, tales have been told, which, though almost beyond belief, would not have been related, if they had not been somewhere, upon the outskirts or frontiers of probability. Thus many—many—very many years ago, tradition intimates, that a worthy clergyman of Truro was interrupted, in the middle of his discourse, by one of his deacons, who caused the whole congregation to rise *en masse*, by seizing his hat and crying aloud—" *a wreck!*" whereupon the good man is reported, while putting up his notes, and opening the pulpit door, to have exclaimed—" *Stay—stay, my Christian friends, let us all have a fair start.*"

More than five hundred years ago, in the 13th of Edward III., laws were passed, in England, for the punishment of such offenders. These laws were amended and confirmed, in the 12th of Anne, and 4th of George I., 26th of George II., and 8th of

Elizabeth. By the statute of 26 George II., ch. 19, plundering a vessel, in distress, or wrecked, and putting out false lights, to deceive, were made capital felonies. By the civil law, stealing even a plank from a vessel, in distress, or wrecked, made the offender liable, for the entire ship and cargo. The early Neapolitan constitutions and the laws of the Wisigoths inflicted the severest punishment, not only upon such as plundered a wreck, but upon all, who were convicted of neglecting to aid a vessel in distress, when in their power to render comfort and assistance.

By the laws of the United States—I refer to the act of March 3, 1825—persons who plunder vessels in distress; and all, who obstruct the escape of the sufferers; the exhibitors of false lights and extinguishers of true ones, with intent to produce shipwreck, are punishable, by fine, not exceeding five thousand dollars, and imprisonment and hard labor, not exceeding ten years. The extreme mildness of this law has always struck me with amazement; for, among the offenders, described in the statute, are those, "*who shall wilfully obstruct the escape of any person, endeavoring to save his or her life,*" &c.

Since men went down upon the sea in ships, there has rarely occurred, in our own country, a case of deeper atrocity, than the present; and, it is to be hoped, that the tribunals of New York will exhibit a forcible example of mercy to the whole community, by a prompt and condign punishment of these heartless wretches.

The fiendish spirit, which, of old, animated the Buccaneers of the Tortugas, will probably never entirely die out from the heart of man, till the period of millennial purgation. It is impossible to conceive of anything, in a population of hyænas, more selfish, cold, and cruel, than the conduct of that abandoned class, of whose existence we have abundant evidence; to whom no music is so sweet, as that of the midnight hurricane; and who have, immemorially, obtained the appellation of *moon-cursers*, because they delight in that darkness, which is suited to their infernal profession.

The laws of England have been unable to accomplish the extinction of these miscreants. The Cornish coast, exposed, as it is, to marine disaster, has ever been famous, for this species of crime and cruelty. It is chiefly confined to a few parishes, on the craggy shore, between Mount's Bay and the Lizard. "When a wreck takes place," says Mr. Haydn, page 559, fol-

lowing the words of Phillips, " thousands assemble with hatchets, axes, crowbars, &c., and many women and children fight, by habit, for the plunder, utterly regardless of the sufferers."

For the honor of human nature I trust, that many, very many years have gone by, since any such atrocities were practised, upon the sea-coast of New England. The late Dr. Holbrook, of Milton, related an incident, which occurred, during the last war with Great Britain, extending not beyond mere pilfering; and which, in the case of one individual, at least, had rather an amusing termination.

A vessel was wrecked, on Nantasket beach; and, her cargo was broken up, and scattered along the shore. On the following day, Dr. Holbrook was hastily summoned, to visit a patient, who was thought to be dying. He was thoroughly exhausted, and had vomited, through the whole day, a substance, in no degree offensive, but, on the contrary, exceedingly aromatic and agreeable. Nevertheless, he was sinking from exhaustion. Dr. Holbrook could not prevail upon the patient to admit, that he had partaken of any other, than his customary diet. His wife stated, that he had been absent the preceding night, and had not told her, in what manner he had been engaged.

At last, the doctor gravely informed him, that it was folly to practise such deception; that, unless a physician knew the nature of the poison, he could not easily prescribe an antidote; and, that, if he persisted in his folly, death might be the consequence.

At this, the fellow, who, with others, had been pilfering from the wreck, became thoroughly frightened; and, with an expression of great terror, confessed, that he feared he had *eaten rather too heartily of nutmegs.*

No. CIII.

In the Transcript of August 14, I notice an editorial criticism, upon the recent employment of the word *catafalque*. In primitive strictness, I believe that criticism to be perfectly correct; and that, in its original signification, *catafalque* cannot be understood to mean a *funeral car*.

In the *grand Dictionnaire*, by Fleming & Tibbins, *catafalque*

is thus defined—" *decoration funebre qu'on eleve au milieu d'une eglise pour y placer le cercueil ou le representation d'un mort a qui l'on veut rendre les plus grands honneurs.*"

Herse is defined, by the same lexicographers, "*un cercueil, une biere, voiture pour porter un mort au tombeau, un char funebre, corbillard, pierre tumulaire provisoire.*"

Thus, while *catafalque* seems to signify an ornamental structure, erected in the middle of a church, to support the coffin or the effigy of the dead, whom it is intended to honor—*herse*, at the present day, is understood to mean a coffin, a bier, a carriage to bear the dead to the tomb, a funeral car, a van, a temporary mausoleum or gravestone.

Herse, whose etymology, according to Johnson, is unknown, imported, three hundred years ago, a temporary structure, in honor of the dead; such also is the meaning of the word *catafalque*; of this, there cannot be the slightest doubt. In this sense, *herse* was employed by Shakspeare, in his Henry IV. :

"To add to your laments

Wherewith you now bodew King Henry's herse," &c.

Johnson furnishes two definitions of the word, *herse*—1. A carriage, in which the dead are conveyed to the grave. 2. A temporary monument, set over a grave. It is quite certain, however, that the *herse*, whether justly styled *a monument*, or not, was *not* usually "*set over the grave*," but more frequently, like the *catafalque*, agreeably to the definition given above—*au milieu d'une eglise*.

No writer, probably, refers to the *herse*, so frequently, as old John Strype, in his Memorials; and, in no instance, I believe, in the sense of a *car* or *vehicle*, or as a structure, "*set over the grave.*"

Strype's Memorials are the records of a Roman Catholic age, or of a period, during which, the usages of the Romish Church, in England, had not entirely worn out their welcome with the people—the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Bloody Mary, and Elizabeth. For, even during the reigns of Edward VI., and of Elizabeth, not a few of those pompous practices, which grew up, in the times of their respective predecessors, still clung upon the imaginations of the populace, and were reluctantly surrendered.

The church is the theatre of the Romish ecclesiastic. The service is an attractive spectacle. If the world were struck

blind, who does not perceive, that the principal supports of Romanism would be instantly taken away! It has been the practice of all churches, that deal somewhat extensively, in forms and ceremonies, to demand of their members, with a greater or less degree of peremptoriness, that certain acts shall be publicly performed—*au milieu d'une eglise*. Thus the ceremony of marriage—the baptism of infants—the churching of women—and the burial of the dead furnish occasion, for throwing open the temple, and exhibiting its showy furniture to the multitude; and of verifying a pleasing saying of the late eminent, and excellent Archbishop of Bordeaux, while Bishop of Boston—"If we cannot catch them, in one way, we catch them in another."

Nothing has ever been a more prolific source of capital to the Romish church, in former ages, than funereal parade, *au milieu d'une eglise*. Strype, with very few exceptions, speaks of the *herse* as a "*herse of wax*." To this I have alluded in an earlier number. It may require a brief explanation here. Wax candles, of divers colors and forms, were attached to the *herse*, and the wax chandler of those days was in great request, and often rose to wealth and distinction.

The reader will readily perceive, that the *herse*, of those early times, was identical with the *catfalque*, if he will give his attention to the following statements—"1554, on the 5th of October were the obsequies of the said Duke of Norfolk celebrated at St. Mary Overy's: an *herse* being made with timber, and hanged with black, with his arms, and four goodly candlesticks gilded, and as many great tapers standing about it, all the choir hung in black," &c. Mem. vol. iii., part 1, ch. 25. Here is no *car*, but a temporary structure, *au milieu d'une eglise*—not "*set over the grave*"—*the choir hung in black*, &c.

To show how Strype distinguished between the *herse* and a *car* for conveyance, the reader may turn to the Memorials, vol. iii., part 1, page 471, where, after describing the ceremonies, in the church, at the funeral of the Bishop of Winchester, Strype adds—"at the gate, the corpse was put into a *wagon* with four horses, all covered with black," &c. This is our modern *herse*, but was not so called by Strype.

"1557.—On the 5th of May was the Lady Chamberlin buried, with a fair *hearse* of wax." The following is sufficiently explicit—"1557, the same day (July 29) began the *hearse*, at

Westminster, for the Lady Anne of Cleves, consisting of carpenters' work of seven principals; being as goodly a hearse, as had been seen." Vol iii. p. 11.

"1557.—On the 3d of August, the body of the Lady Anne of Cleves was brought from Chelsy, where her house was, unto Westminster, to be buried; with all the children of Westminster, and many priests and clerks." Father Strype did not probably intend to say they were all to be buried together.

"Then the gray Amis of Paul's, and three crosses, and the monks of Westminster, and my Lord Bishop of London, and Lord Abbot of Westminster, rode together next the monks. Then the two secretaries, Sir Edmund Peckham and Sir Robert Freston, cofferer to the Queen of England, my Lord Admiral and Mr. Darcy, of Essex, and many knights and gentlemen. And before her corpse, her servants, her banner of arms. Then her gentlemen and her head officers; and then her chariot, with eight banners of arms, consisting of divers arms, and four banners of images of white taffeta, wrought with gold, and her arms. And so they passed by St. James's, and thence to Charing Cross, with an hundred torches burning, her servants bearing them. And the twelve beadmen of Westminster had new black gowns, bearing twelve torches burning. There were four white branches with arms; then ladies and gentlewomen, all in black with their horses; eight heralds of arms, in black, with their horses, &c., &c. At the church door all did alight; and there the Lord Bishop of London and the Lord Abbot, in their copes, did receive the good lady, censing her. Men bore her under a canopy of black velvet, with four black staves *and so brought her into the hearse*, and there tarried dirge, remaining there all night, with lights burning." Ibid. "On the 22d was the hearse of the Lady Anne of Cleves, lately set up in Westminster Abbey, taken down, which the monks, by night, had spoiled of all the velvet cloth, arms, banners, pensils, majesty, and valance and all,—the which was never seen afore so done." Ibid. page 15.

Hence it is manifest, that the *herse*, in the time of Strype, was identical with the *catafalque* of the present day. Nevertheless, *herse* and *catafalque* are as clearly not convertible terms, since the latter word can never be correctly applied to a funeral car.

Two and twenty pages of original record are devoted, by Strype, to an account of the "ceremonies and funeral solemnities, paid to the corpse of King Henry VIII." These pages are

extremely interesting, and full of curious detail. They also furnish additional evidence, that *the herse* was then understood to mean all, that is now meant by *the catafalque*. The works of Strype are not in the hands of very many; and the reader will not be displeased to know, in what manner they dealt with the dead body of an English King, some three hundred years ago. A few extracts are all, that my limits will allow:—

“After the corps was cold, and seen by the Lords of the Privy Council and others of the nobility of the realm, as appertained, commandment was given to the apothecaries, chirurgions, wax-chandlers, and others, to do their duties in spurging, cleansing, bowelling, cering, embalming, furnishing, and dressing with spices the said corpse; and also for wrapping the same in cerecloth of many folds over the fine cloth of rains and velvet, surely bound and trammel'd with cords of silk: which was done and executed of them accordingly, as to the dignity of such a mighty prince it appertaineth; and a writing in great and small letters annexed against the breast, containing his name and style, the day and year of his death, in like manner. And after this don, then was the plumber and carpenter appointed to case him in lead, and to chest him. Which being don, the said chest was covered about with blew velvet, and a cross set upon the same.”

“And the corps being thus ordained, the entrails and bowels were honorably buried in the chappel,” &c. Mem., vol. 2, p. 289.

“Then was the corps in the chest had into the midds of the privy chamber, and set upon tressels, with a rich pall of cloth of gold, and a cross thereon, with all manner of lights thereto requisite.” Ibid.

“In the said chappel was ordained a goodly, formal herse, with four-score square tapers; every light containing two foot in length, poising in the whole eighteen hundred weight of wax, garnished about with pensils and escutcheons, banners and bannerols of descents. And, at the four corners, four banners of saints, beaten in fine gold upon damask, with a majesty thereover,” &c., &c. Ibid. 290.

“The second day of the month of February, being Wednesday and Candlemas day, betwixt eight and nine of the clock at night, the herse being lighted, and all other things appointed and prepared, the said most royal corps was reverently taken and removed from the chambers, &c., and so brought to the chappel,

&c., and there it was honorably set and placed within the said herse under a pall of rich cloth of tissue, garnished with escutheons, and a rich cloth of gold, set with precious stones." Ibid. 292.

"And the herse, standing in the midst of said choir, was of a wonderful state and proportion; that is to say formed in the compass of eight panes and thirteen principals, double storied, of thirty-five foot high, curiously wrot, painted and gilded, having in it a wonderful sort of lights, amounting, in price, of wax, to the sum of four thousand pound weight, and garnished underneath with a rich majesty, and a doome double vallanced: on the which, on either side, was written the King's word, in beaten gold, upon silk, and his arms of descents. And the whole herse was richly fringed with double fringes of black silk and gold on either side, both within and without very gorgeous and valiant to behold." Ibid. 295.

It does not appear, that, in those days any *single* English word was employed, to express the *vehicle*, which we call a *hearse*, at the present day, unless the word *bier* may suffice: and this, like the Roman *feretrum*, which I take to be much like our common graveyard article with legs, will scarcely answer the description of a four-wheeled car. I infer, that the *feretrum* was a thing, which might be taken up, and set down, from the word *posito* in Ovid's *Fasti*, iv., 851—

Osculaque applicuit posito suprema feretro.

The *feretrum* and the *capulus*, among the Romans, were designed mainly, for the poor. Citizens of any note were borne, as was our own practice, not very many years ago, on the shoulders of their friends.

The *funeral car* of Henry VIII. was a noble affair:—

"There was ordained for the corps a sumptuous and valuable chariot of four wheels, very long and large, with four pillars, overlaid with cloth of gold at the four corners, bearing a pillow of rich cloth of gold and tissue, fringed with a goodly deep fringe of blew silk and gold; and underneath that, turned towards the chariot, was a marvellous excellent cloth of majesty, having in it a doom artificially wrought, in fine gold upon oyl: and at the nether part of the said Chariot was hanged with blew velvet down to the ground, between the wheels, and at other parts of

the chariot, enclosed in like manner with blew velvet." Ibid. 295.

"The next day early, the 14 February, the chariot was brought to the court hall door; and the corps with great reverence brought from the *herse* to the same, by mitred prelates and others, temporal lords." Ibid. 598.

Then, over the area of thirteen remaining pages, the record contains the minute particulars of the monarch's obsequies, which, though full of interest, are no farther to our present purpose.

No. CIV.

BULL—I speak not of Ole, but of John—Bull, when the teazle of opposition has elevated the nap of his temper, is a pestilent fellow; whatever the amount—and there is enough—of the milk of human kindness within him, there is, then, but one way, known among men, of getting it out, and that is, by giving Bull a bloody nose; whereupon he comes to his senses directly, and to a just appreciation of himself and his neighbors. True indeed it is, Bull is remarkably oblivious; and it sometimes becomes necessary to give him another, which is invariably followed, by the same happy result.

Qui hæret in cortice will never come at the milk of a cocoa nut. It is necessary to strip off its rough coat, and punch sundry holes in its *wooden walls*, and give it a regular cracking. It is precisely so with Bull. When the fit is upon him, Bull is terrible. He is the very Bull of Crete—the Bull of Claudian, in his rape of Proserpine—

Dictæus quatiens mugitibus urbes
Taurus —————

Bull is a prodigious fellow;
Nations tremble at his bellow.

There seems to have existed a strange, political hallucination, in regard to Bull and Jonathan. We are clearly, all of us, of one and the same family—a Bull-begotten people; and have a great deal of pleasure, in believing, that old madam Bull was the mother of us all. A goodly number of highly respectable Bulls came over the water, of old, and were well contented with

the green pastures of the New World. They differed, upon some points, from the Bulls they had left behind. They did not believe, that there was a power or right, to bellow louder than the rest, vested in any particular Bull, which power came down from Bull to Bull, in unbroken succession, from the Bull of Bashan. Such a belief, in their opinion, would have been a terrible Bull. Well; all at once, the trans-atlantic Bulls began to call the cis-atlantic Bulls—*Jonathans*. A very good name it was—a great deal better than *Bulls*. There could be no objection to the name, in the abstract.

But, unfortunately, it was bestowed, as a diminutive, and in derision; and the old Bulls, ere long, began to beat their flanks with their tails, and paw up the earth, and look unutterable things, about Jonathan's cowardice; and they came over the water in droves, and began to roar awfully; and tore up the earth, under our very noses: and, after doing all, in our power to spare the world the miserable spectacle of a conflict, among Bulls, that were brothers, of the whole blood, we went to work, *ex necessitate*, with hoofs and horns; and tossed up such a terrible dust, at Lexington, and Concord, and Bunker's Hill, and Long Island, and White Plains, and upon the Lakes, and at Sheensborough, and Albany, and Brandywine, and Saratoga, and Bennington, and Germantown, and Rhode Island, and Briar's Creek, and Camden, and Broad River, and Guilford, and Hobkirk's Hill, and the Eutaw Springs, and York Town, and at fifty places beside, that the old Bulls were perfectly astonished; and so very severely gored withal, that their roaring sunk, at last, into something like Snug's, when he became fearful of frightening the ladies. The old Bulls—those that survived—went *back again*, like Sawney, out of the peach orchard; and the mammoth Bull, in London, publicly acknowledged, that we were as independent a set of Bulls, as ever he saw, or heard of.

No man, in his senses, marvels, that a contemptuous, and supercilious sentiment, towards us, in our days of small things, should have been indulged, by the vulgar and unphilosophical, among the English people. It is matter for surprise, nevertheless, that so much ignorance of the American character should have existed, in the higher ranks of British society—such disparaging estimates of men and *materiel*, on this side the water—such mistaken conceptions—such a general belief of almost universal pusillanimity, among *men*, who were not a whit the less

Englishmen, than their revilers; as though there were something, particularly enervating, in breathing the bracing air of America, and listening to the thorough bass of the wild waters, breaking on our original walls of granite; and in struggling, with our horny hands, along the precipices, for bread—such an awful miscalculation of probabilities, as resulted at last, in the loss to King George of thirteen inestimable jewels, of the fairest water.

The impressions, entertained of the Americans, by the English people, or a great majority of them, about that period, were truly amusing. It is scarcely worth while to comment on the abuse of us, by the early reviewers, and the taunting inquiry, long—long ago, what American had ever produced an epic?—Unluckily, Joel did, at last.—This question, thus early and impudently propounded, was quite as sensible, as it might be, to ask men, who, by dint of industry and thrift, are just getting plain shirts to their backs—who among them ever had lace ruffles? We have improved since that time; and *halmost hevery man in the ole population can hutter imself hin werry decent Henglish.*

Josiah Quincy, then junior, father of the late President of Harvard University, has noted some curious facts, in his journal, as reported by Gordon, i. 438. In a conversation between him and Col. Barré, who, though he opposed the Stamp Act, in 1765, supported the Boston Port Bill, in 1774. Col. Barré said to Mr. Quincy—"About fourteen or fifteen years ago, I was through a considerable part of your country; for, in the expedition against Canada, my business caused me to pass by land, through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Albany; and, when I returned again to this country, I was often speaking of America, and could not help speaking well of its climate, soil, and inhabitants; for you must know, sir, America was always a favorite with me. But, will you believe it, sir, yet I assure you it is true, more than two thirds of this island, at this time, thought the Americans were all negroes." Mr. Quincy replied that he did not in the least doubt it, for, if he was to judge by the late acts of Parliament, he should suppose, that a great majority of the people of Great Britain still thought so, for he found that their representatives still treated them as such.

The ministry had decided, that "*the punishment of a few of*

the worst sort of traitors, such as Hancock and his crew, might be sufficient to teach the rest their duty, in future.”—“Some men of rank in the army,” says Gordon, i. 457, “treated all idea of resistance, by the Americans, with the utmost contempt. They are neither soldiers, nor ever can be made so, being naturally of a pusillanimous disposition, and utterly incapable of any sort of order or discipline; and by their laziness, uncleanness, and radical defect of constitution, they are disabled from going through the service of a campaign. Many ludicrous stories, to that purport, were told, greatly to the entertainment of the house.”

Jonathan turned out, at the end of the Bull baiting, to have been neither a fool nor a coward: and the American Congress received a memorable compliment from Lord Chatham—“*For genuine sagacity, for singular moderation, for manly spirit, for sublime sentiments, and simplicity of language, for everything respectable and honorable, the Congress of Philadelphia shines unrivalled.*”

In the war of 1812, Bull was the very identical Bull, that he had been before: Frenchmen were frogs; Yankees were cowards—there was nobody that could fight, on the land or the sea, but Bull.

“It has always,” says that wittiest, and, I fear, wickedest of wags, William Cobbett, while addressing Lord Liverpool, “been the misfortune of England, that her rulers and her people have spoken and have thought contemptuously of the Americans. Was there a man in the country, who did not despise the American navy? Was there a public writer beside myself, who did not doom that navy to destruction in a month? Did not all parties exceedingly relish the description given, in a very august assembly, of “*half a dozen of fir frigates, with bits of striped bunting tied to their mast heads!*” Did not the Guerriere sail up and down the American coast, with her name, written on her flag, challenging those fir frigates? Did not the whole nation, with one voice exclaim at the affair of the *Little Belt*—Only let Rogers come *within reach* of one of our frigates!” If such was the opinion of the whole nation, with what justice is the Board of Admiralty blamed, for not sending out the means of combatting this extraordinary sort of foe? and for issuing a privilege to our frigates to run away from one of those *fir things with a bit of striped bunting at*

its mast head? The result of the former war, while it enlightened nobody, added to the vindictiveness of hundreds of thousands; so that we have entered into this war with all our old stock of contempt, and a vastly increased stock of rancor. To think that the American republic is to be a great power is unsupportable. Of the effect of this contempt I know nobody, who has so much reason to repent, as the officers of his Majesty's navy. If they had triumphed, it would only have been over half a dozen *fir things, with bits of bunting at their mast heads*. They were sure to gain no reputation in the contest; and, if they failed, what was their lot? The worst of it is, they themselves did, in some measure, contribute to their own ill fate: for, of all men living, none spoke of poor Jonathan with so much contempt. There are some people, who are for taking the American commodores at their word, and ascribing their victories to the immediate intervention of Providence. Both Perry and McDonough begin their despatches by saying—*Almighty God has given us a victory.*"

This is keen political satire; and it is well, that it should come to neighbor Bull's ears, from the mouth of an Englishman. It is more gracefully administered thus. That it was entirely deserved, no one will doubt, who has any recollection of Bull's unmeasured and unmitigated impudence, during the war of 1812, in its earlier stages. May God of his infinite mercy grant, that Peace Societies may have these matters, hereafter, very much their own way; though I have a little misgiving, I confess, as to the expediency of any sudden, or very general conversion of swords into ploughshares, or spears into pruning hooks.

No. CV.

Modus in rebus—an admirable proverb, upon all common occasions—is inapplicable, of course, to musical matters. No doubt of it. The luxury of sweet sounds cannot be too dearly bought; and, for its procurement, mankind may go stark mad, without any diminution of their respectability.

Such I infer to be the popular philosophy of today—*while it is called today*. The moderns have been greatly perplexed, by

the legends, which have come down to us, respecting the melody of swans. The *carmina cynorum* of Ovid, and the *Cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cygni*, of Virgil, are perfectly incomprehensible by us. Cicero also, in his Tusculan Questions, i. 74, says, they die, *cum cantu et voluptate*. Martial, xiii. 77, asserts the matter, very positively—

*Dulcia defecta modulatur carmina lingua
Cantator cygnus funeris ipse sui.*

I no more believe in the power of a living or a dying swan to make melody of any kind, than I believe in the antiquated humbug of immediate emancipation. Pliny had no confidence in the story, and expresses himself to that effect, x. 23, *Olorum morte narratur flebilis cantus (falso, ut arbitror) aliquot experimentis*.

No mortal has done more than Shakspeare, among the moderns, to perpetuate this pleasant fancy—no bard, when weary of Pegasus, and preferring a drive to a ride, has harnessed his cygnets more frequently—or compelled them to sing more sweetly, in a dying hour. A single example may suffice. When prince Henry is told, that his father, King John, sang, during his dying frenzy, he says—

" 'Tis strange, that death should sing—
I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,
Who chants a doleful hymn to his own death :
And, from the organ pipe of frailty, sings
His soul and body to their lasting rest."

One brief example more—Emilia, after the murder of her mistress—

" Hark ! canst thou hear me ? I will play the swan ;
And die in music."

In all this there lurks not one particle of sober prose—one syllable of truth. The most learned refutation of it may be found, in the Pseudodoxia of Sir Thomas Browne, ii. 517, Lond. 1835.

In the "*Memoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*," M. Morin discusses the question very agreeably, why swans, that sang so delightfully, of old, sing so miserably, at the present day. Tame swans, he observes, are mutes : but the wild swan exerts its vocal powers, after a fashion of its own. He introduces the observations of the Abbé Arnaud, upon the performances of a couple of wild swans, which had located, upon the lagoons of Chantilly.

"One can hardly say," says the Abbé, "that the swans of Chantilly sing—they cry; but their cries are truly and constantly modulated. Their voice is not sweet; on the contrary, it is shrill, piercing, and rather disagreeable; I could compare it to nothing better than the sound of a clarionet, winded by a person unacquainted with the instrument." Nothing surely savors less of melody than this. So thought Buffon—"Des sons bruyans de clarion, mais dont les tons aigus et peu diversifiés sont néanmoins tres—éloignés de la tendre mélodie et de la variété douce et brillante du ramage de nos oiseaux chanteurs." Nat. Hist. des Oiseaux, ix. 25.

In his exposition of this error, imposed upon mankind, by the poets, Buffon expresses himself with singular beauty, in the concluding paragraph—"Nulle fiction en Histoire Naturelle, nulle fable chez les Anciens n'a été plus célébrée, plus répétée, plus accréditée; elle s'étoit emparée de l'imagination vive et sensible des Grecs; poètes, orateurs, philosophes même l'ont adoptée, comme une vérité trop agréable pour vouloir en douter. Il faut bien leur pardonner leurs fables; elles étoient aimables et touchantes; elles valaient bien de tristes, d'arides vérités c'étoient de doux emblèmes pour les âmes sensibles. Les cygnes, sans doute, ne chantent point leur mort; mais toujours, en parlant du dernier essor et de derniers élans d'un beau génie prêt à s'éteindre, on rappellera avec sentiment cette expression touchante—*c'est le chant du cygne!*" Ibid. 28.

It is not surprising, that these celebrated naturalists, Buffon and Morin, who discourse, so eloquently, of Grecian and Roman swans, should say nothing of Swedish nightingales, for, between their time and the present, numerous additions have been made to the catalogue of songsters.

The very thing, which the barber, Arkwright did, for all the spinning Jennies, in Lancashire, some seventy years ago, has been done by Jenny Lind, for all the singing Jennies upon earth, beside herself—they are cast into the shade.

She came here with an irresistible prestige. A singing woman has been a proverb, since the world began; and, of course, long before Ulysses dropped in, upon the island of Ogygia, and listened to Calypso; or fell into serious difficulty, among the Sirens. A singing woman, a Siren, has been frequently accounted, and with great propriety, a singing bird of evil omen. How grateful then must it be, to know, that, while lending their ears and their

eyes to this incomparable songstress, our wives, our daughters, and our sisters have before them a pure, and virtuous, and gentle, and generous creature, as free, as poor, human nature can well be free, from life's alloy, and very much as she was, when created—a little lower than the angels.

Among other mythological matters, Pausanias relates, that the three Sirens, instigated by Juno, challenged the Muses to a trial of skill in singing. They were beaten, of course, for the Muses, being nine in number, there were three upon one. The victors, as the story goes, proceeded very deliberately, to pluck the golden feathers, from the wings of the vanquished, and converted them into crowns, for their own brows.

Now, it cannot be denied, that Jenny has vanquished us all, and made the golden feathers fly abundantly. But this is not Jenny's fault; for, whatever the wisdom or the folly, the affair was our own entirely. If, for the sake of distinction, any one has seen fit to pluck every golden feather from his back, and appear, like the featherless biped of Diogenes, and give the golden feathers to Jenny, to make her a crown; we have substantial facts, upon which to predict, that Jenny will make a better use of those golden feathers, than to fool them away, for a song. If Jenny plucks golden feathers, from the backs of the rich, she finds bare spots enough, for a large part of them all, upon the backs of the poor: and, as for the crown, for Jenny's brows, if she goes onward, as she has begun, investing her treasure in *Heaven*, and selecting the Lord for her paymaster, *there* will be her coronation; and her crown a crown of Glory. *And*, when she comes to lie down and die, let the two last lines of Johnson's imperishable epitaph, on Philips, be inscribed upon her tomb—

"Rest undisturb'd, beneath this marble shrine,
Till angels wake thee, with a note like thine."

Orpheus was changed into a swan; Philomela into a nightingale; and Jenny, in due time, will be changed into an angel. Indeed, it is the opinion of some competent judges, that the metamorphosis has already commenced.

Music is such a delightful, soothing thing, that one grieves, to think its professors and amateurs are frequently so excessively irritable.

The disputes, between Handel and Senesino, and their respective partisans, disturbed all London, and finally broke up the

Academy of Music, after it had been established, for nine years. The quarrels of Handel and Buononcini are said to have occasioned duels, among the amateurs; and the nation was filled, by these musical geniuses, with discord and uproar. Good humor was, in some degree, restored, by the following epigram, so often ascribed to Swift, the two last lines of which, however, are alone to be found in the editions of his works, by Nicholls, and Scott:

"Some say, that signor Buononcini,
Compar'd with Handel, is a niddy;
Others aver to him, that Handel
Does not deserve to hold a candle;
Strange, all this difference should be,
'Twixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee."

This epigram cannot be attributed to that contempt for music, which is sometimes occasioned, by a constitutional inability to appreciate its effect, upon the great mass of mankind. It undoubtedly sprang from a desire to put an end, by the power of ridicule, to these unmusical disturbances of the public peace.

Swift's musical pun, upon the accidental destruction of a fine Cremona fiddle, which was thrown down by a lady's mantua, has always been highly and deservedly commended; and recently, upon the very best authority, pronounced the finest specimen extant of this species of wit—"Perhaps," says Sir Walter Scott, in his life of Swift, speaking of his puns, i. 467, "the application of the line of Virgil to the lady, who threw down with her mantua a Cremona fiddle, is the best ever made—

"*Mantua vae miseræ nimium vicina Cremonæ!*"

In every nation, and in every age, the power of music has been acknowledged by mankind. Now and then, the negative idiosyncracies of certain persons place this particular department of pleasure, beyond the sphere of their comprehension, as effectually as utter blindness denies the power of enjoying the finest specimens of the painter's art. Occasionally, some pious divine, absolutely drunk with over-potent draughts of orthodoxy, like the friar, before Boccaccio, shakes his holy finger at this wicked world, and warns them to beware of the singing woman!

The vocal power of music is ascribed to the angels in Heaven; and my own personal knowledge has assured me, that it affords a melancholy solace, to the slave in bonds.

I passed the winter of 1840-41 with an invalid daughter, in the island of St. Croix. With a party of some six or eight, we

devoted one delightful, moonlight evening, to a ride, on horse-back, among the sugar-loaf summits of that beautiful speck amid the main. We were ascending the hills, in the neighborhood of the Annelly plantation—the moon was at full, that night; and the Caribbean Sea, far and wide, shone like a boundless prairie of burnished silver. As we were slowly winding our way, to the summit, one of our party called the attention of the rest to the sounds of music, coming from the slave cabins, at a distance. As we advanced, slowly and silently, towards the spot, the male and female voices were readily distinguished.

We drew near, unperceived, and, checking our horses, listened, for several minutes, to the wild, simple notes of these children of bondage. "There is melody in this"—said one of our party aloud, and all was hushed, in an instant. We rode down to the cabins, and begged them to continue their song—but our solicitations were in vain—even the offer of sundry five stiver pieces, which operate, like a charm, upon many occasions, with the *uncles* and the *aunties*, was ineffectual then. "*No massa—b'lieve no sing any more*"—were the only replies, and we went upon our way.

As we descended the Annelly hills, on the opposite side, after leaving the negroes and their cabins, at some distance, we halted and listened—they had recommenced—the same wild music was floating upon the breeze.

As we rode slowly along, my daughter asked me, if I could account for their reluctance to comply with our request. I told her, I could not. "Perhaps," said she, "they have a reason, somewhat like the reason of those, who sat down, by the waters of Babylon, and wept, and who could not sing one of the songs of Zion, in a strange land."

It might have been thus. "*They that carried us away captive, required of us a song! They, that wasted us, required of us mirth!*"

NO. CVI.

WHILE pursuing his free inquiry into the origin of evil, I doubt, if Soame Jenyns had as much pleasure, as Sir Joseph

Banks enjoyed, in his famous investigation, if fleas were the prototypes of lobsters.

These inquiries are immeasurably pleasant. When a boy, I well remember my cogitations, what became of the old moons; and how joyously I accepted the solution of my nurse, who had quite a turn for judicial astrology, that they were unquestionably cut up, for stars.

It is truly delightful to look into these occult matters—*rerum cognoscere causas*. There are subjects of deep interest, which lie somewhat nearer the surface of the earth—the origin of certain usages and undertakings, and the authorship of certain long-lived works, which appear to be made of a species of literary everlasting, but whose original proprietors have never been discovered. I have great respect, for those antiquarians, whose researches have unlocked so many of these long hidden mysteries; and, however bare-headed I may be, when the venerated names of Speed, or Strype, or Stow, or Rushworth, or Wood, or Holinshed occurs to my memory, I have an involuntary tendency to take off my hat.

It was, doubtless, in allusion to their grotesque and uncouth versification, that the Earl of Rochester prepared his well-known epigram—

"Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms,
When they translated David's Psalms."

This version, which held its ground, for a century and a half, and, as Chalmers says, slowly gave place to the translation, by Tate and Brady, had an origin, of which, I presume, few individuals are apprized.

Thomas Sternhold lived to translate fifty-one only of the Psalms; and the first edition was published in 1549, with this title—"All such Psalms of David as Thomas Sterneholde, late groome of the king's majesty's robes did in his lyfetime drawe into Englyshe metre."

About this period, the larger cities of the kingdom had become inundated with obscene and blasphemous songs, to such a degree, that some powerful expedient seemed to be required, for the removal of this insufferable grievance. Accordingly, the felicitous idea occurred to Mr. Thomas Sternhold, of substituting the Psalms of David, as versified by himself, for the bacchanalian songs, then in use, throughout the realm. He anticipated a practical illustration of the command of St. James—"Is any merry let him sing Psalms."

Ostensibly prepared for the use of the churches, the moving consideration, for this version, with Mr. Sternhold, was such as I have shown it to be. The motive is plainly stated, in the title-page—"Set forth and allowed to be sung in churches of the people together, before and after evening prayer, as also before and after sermon; and moreover, in private houses, for their godly solace and comfort, laying apart all ungodly songs and ballads, which tend only to the nourishment of vice and the corrupting of youth."

Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i. 183, Lond. 1813, says of Sternhold—"Being a most zealous reformer and a very strict liver, he became so scandalized, at the amorous and obscene songs used in the court, that he, forsooth turned into English metre fifty-one of David's Psalms, and caused musical notes to be set to them, thinking thereby, that the courtiers would sing them, instead of their sonnets, but did not, only some few excepted."

How cheerfully would I go, undieted, for a long summer's day, to know who was the author of "Jonny Armstrong's Last Good Night;" and for a much longer term, to ascertain the writer of Chevy Chase, of which Ben Jonson used to say, he had rather have been the author of it, than of all his works. The words of Sir Philip Sidney, in his Discourse on Poetry, are quoted, by Addison, in No. 70 of the Spectator—"I never heard the old song of Percy and Douglas, that I found not my heart more moved than with a trumpet." The ballad of Chevy Chase was founded upon the battle of Otterburn, which was fought in 1388, and of which a brief account will be found in the fourteenth chapter of Sir Walter's first series of the Grandfather's Tales.

The author of those songs for children, which have been lisped, by the tongues of millions, shall never be forgotten, while dogs delight to bark and bite—but who was the author of Hush-a-bye baby—Now we go up, up, up—Cock Robin—or Dickory Dock, no human tongue can tell!

Poor André, we know, was the author of the Cow Chace; but the composer of our national air is utterly unknown. Who would not give more of the *siller*, to know to whose immortal mind we are indebted for Yankee Doodle, than to ascertain the authorship of the Letters of Junius?

Both France and England have been more fortunate, in re-

spect to the origin and authorship of their most popular, national songs. Speaking of Barbaroux and the Marseillois, Sir Walter Scott, in his *Life of Napoleon*, observes—"Besides the advantage of this enthusiastic leader, the Marseillois marched to the air of the finest hymn, to which Liberty or the Revolution had yet given birth."

I am aware that something like doubt or obscurity hangs over the reputed authorship of the Hymn of the Marseillais. But in respect to the national air of Great Britain—*God save the King*—the authorship appears to be more satisfactorily, if not perfectly, indicated.

It is certainly worthy of note, that this celebrated air, in which *John Bull* has taken so much delight, ever since it came into existence, is by some persons supposed to have been the production of JOHN BULL himself, a celebrated composer of his day. An engraving of him may be found, in the *History of Music*, by Hawkins. There is an original painting of him, by J. W. Childe, in the Music School, at Oxford, which was engraved by Illman, with the words below—"John Bull, Mus. Doct. Cantab. Instaur. Oxon. MDXCII." A portrait of Dr. Bull will also be found, in Richard Clarke's *Account of the National Anthem, God save the King*, 8vo. Lond. 1822."

The account of Bull, by Wood, in his *Fasti*, i. 235, Lond. 1815, is somewhat amusing—"1586, July 9.—John Bull, who had practised the fac. of music for 14 years, was then admitted batch. of music. This person, who had a most prodigious hand on the organ, and was famous, throughout the religious world, for his church music, had been trained up under an excellent master, named Blitheman, organist of Qu. Elizabeth's chappel, who died much lamented, in 1591. This Blitheman perceiving that he had a natural geny to the faculty, spared neither time nor labor to advance it to the utmost. So that in short time, he being more than master of it, which he showed by his most admirable compositions, played and sung in many churches beyond the seas, as well as at home, he took occasion to go incognito, into France and Germany. At length, hearing of a famous musician, belonging to a certain cathedral, (at St. Omers, as I have heard,) he applied himself, as a novice, to learn something of his faculty, and to see and admire his works. This musician, after some discourse had passed between them, conducted Bull to a vestry, or music school, joyning to the

cathedral, and shew'd him a lesson, or song of forty parts, and then made a vaunting challenge to any person in the world to add one more part to them, supposing it to be so compleat and full, that it was impossible for any mortal man to correct or add to it. Bull thereupon desiring the use of ink and rul'd paper (such as we call musical paper) prayed the musician to lock him up in the said school for 2 or 3 hours; which being done, not without great disdain by the musician, Bull, in that time or less, added forty more parts to the said lesson or song. The musician thereupon being called in, he viewed it, try'd it and retry'd it. At length he burst out into great ecstasy, and swore by the great God, that he that added those 40 parts must either be the Devil or Dr. Bull, &c. Whereupon Bull making himself known, the musician fell down and adored him."

Of music it may be said, as of most other matters—the *fashion of these things passeth away*. So great was the fame of Bull in his day, and such tempting offers of preferment were made him, by the Emperor, and by the Kings of France and Spain, that Queen Elizabeth commanded him home. It is stated, in the Biographical History of England, ii. 167, that the famous Dr. Pepusch preferred some of the lessons in Bull's Partheniæ, to the productions of most of the composers of that time. Yet Dr. Burney says of these lessons—" *They may be heard, by a lover of music, with as little emotion as the clapper of a sawmill, or the rumbling of a post-chaise.*"

Musicians are a sensitive and jealous generation. "Handel," says Chalmers, "despised the pedantry of Pepusch; and Pepusch, in return, refused to join, in the general chorus of Handel's praise."

Handel, when a stripling at Hamburgh, laid claim to the first harpsichord, against a master, greatly his superior, in point of years, and the matter, upon trial, was decided in Handel's favor, which so incensed the other, that he drew, and made a thrust, at his young rival, whose life, according to Dr. Burney's version, was saved, by a fortunate contact, between the point of the rapier and a metal button.

The principles, which govern, in all mutual admiration societies, are deeply laid in the nature of man. If Handel had borne the pedantry of Dr. Pepusch, with forbearance, or common civility, the Doctor would have, doubtless, afforded Handel the advantage of his highest commendation.

The managers of musical matters act wisely, in tendering, to every conductor of a public journal, the

Melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam—

But I fear they are not always as cautious and discriminating, as the occasion appears to demand. How very different would have been the fate of the poor strolling player, whom Goldsmith so pleasantly describes, had he taken a little more pains—only a little—to propitiate “*the lady, who had been nine months in London!*”

The managers, upon such occasions, should never omit the most careful espionage, into the musical pretensions of every member of the press—I speak of their pretensions, and not of their actual knowledge—that, in the present connection, is of little importance: and, when they discover one of this powerful brotherhood, who, in musical matters, would be thought to know more than his neighbors, however mistaken he may be—let them pay him particular attention—let them procure him an excellent seat—once—twice perhaps—express a hope, that he is well accommodated—and occasionally, during the performance, be sure to catch his eye, as if with a “fearful longing after immortality,” such as tomorrow’s leader may possibly confer on the candidate for fame. How often the omission to observe these simple rules has been followed, by faint praise, and invidious discriminations!

No. CVII.

My great grandmother used to say, that she never desired to be told, that anything was broken, in her household; for, though she had been a housekeeper, for fifty years, nothing was ever broken, in her family, that had not been cracked before. I have the very same feeling in regard to the majority of all inventions and discoveries; for some ingenious fellow invariably presents himself, who, as it turns out, had verified the suggestion already.

I never found my mind in a very feverish condition, while pursuing the inquiry, whether the art of medicine was first invented, by Hermes, Isis, or Osiris; nor while examining the arguments,

ingenious though they are, of Clemens Alexandrinus, to prove, that Moses was a very respectable apothecary.

I have ever supposed, that Necessity, the mother of invention, was the inventress of the blessed art; and that the origin was somewhat on this wise:—before the transgression, all went on well—there were neither aches nor ails—the apple certainly disagreed with Adam—he sought relief, by hunting for an antidote; and finding great comfort, in chewing such carminative herbs, as catmint and pennyroyal, he prescribed them to the sharer of his joys and sorrows. It is quite likely, that, with no family, and a great deal of time upon her hands, while walking in her garden, as poppies were not forbidden, Eve, to satisfy her curiosity, might have sucked their narcotic juice; and thus acquired a knowledge of opiates, so useful, ever since the fall.

Physicking was, at first, a very general affair. Whether benevolence, or the desire of a little reputation lies at the bottom, there has ever existed, among mankind, a pungent, irresistible desire to physick one another. It is to be regretted, that Irenæus, who was just the man for it, had not given a few years of his life to ascertain, if Eve, during the parturition of Cain, or Abel, received any alleviation, from slippery elm. Plato, Theocret. p. 149, says, the midwives of Athens did great, good service, on these occasions, with certain drugs and charms.

In the beginning, so little was to be known, upon this subject, it is not wonderful, that almost every man should have known that little. Thus, according to Homer, Od. iv., 320, every Egyptian was a doctor:—

“From Pæon sprung, their patron god imparts
To all the Pharian race his healing arts.”

Herodotus, who was born, about 484, B. C., in Book II. of his history, sec. 84, speaks distinctly of the fact, that the Egyptian doctors were not physicians, in the general sense, but confined their practice, respectively, to particular diseases. The passage may be thus translated—*Now, in truth, the art of medicine with them was so distributed, that their physicians managed particular disorders, and not diseases generally; thus, though all were referred to the physicians, some were doctors for the eyes, some for the head, some for the teeth, some for the belly, and some for the occult diseases.*

The first mention of physicians, in Holy Writ, is in Genesis, 50, 2—“And Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians,

to embalm his father : and the physicians embalmed Israel." Physicians, to this extent, were mechanical operators ; and the celebrated physicians of Greece, Chiron, Machaon, Podalirius, Pæon, and even Æsculapius, were *surgeons*. Their art, as Pliny says, did not go beyond curing a green wound. The cure of internal, or complicated, disorders was beyond their province. Celsus says, that Podalirius and Machaon, the physicians, who went with Agamemnon, to the wars of Troy, were never employed, to cure the plague, or internal maladies, nor anything but external injuries.

No physician was required to manage external applications, in certain cases of common occurrence. In Kings II. xx. 7, Hezekiah appears to have thought himself extremely sick ; when Isaiah applied a poultice of figs to his boil, and he soon was upon his legs again. This seems to have been accounted a remarkable cure, in those days, for Isaiah thought it worth repeating, xxxviii. 21. Job does not appear to have resorted to fig poultices, nor to any remedies, whatever : and, while Hezekiah behaved like a great baby, and wept bitterly, Job toughed it out, like a man ; and, instead of mourning and murmuring, under the torment, not of one, but of countless boils, he poured forth torrents of incomparable eloquence, all the while, on various topics.

Job's affliction, being viewed in the light of a direct judgment, it was deemed quite outrageous, by many, to stave off the wrath of Heaven, by interposing fig poultices, or remedies of any kind. Thus it appears, that Asa suffered severely with the gout ; and there is a sharp fling against him, Chron. II. xvi. 12, on account of his want of faith—" *Yet in his disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians.*"

This seems to be in accordance, with the opinion of those modern Fathers, who consider the use of ether or chloroform, in obstetric cases, a point blank insult to the majesty of Heaven, because of the primeval fiat—*in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children*.

The race of Cyclops entertained a similar sentiment of submission, in sickness, according to Homer, Od. IX. 485. When *Oudeis* (*Anglice Noman*) which always seemed to me an undignified pun, for an Epic, had put out the eye of Polyphemus, his roaring collected the neighboring giants. They inquired, outside the portal, what was the matter ; and he replied, that *Oudeis—Noman*—was killing him ; upon which they reply—

*

"If *Nomax* hurts thee, but the power divine
 Inflict disease, it fits thee to resign.
 To Jove or to thy father Neptune pray,
 The Cyclops cried, and instant strode away."

The theory was, that God worked upon mortals, by the agency of a great number and variety of evil spirits, or devils; and that the employment of remedial means was therefore neither more nor less, than withstanding the Almighty. Hence arose the custom, being supposed less offensive, in the sight of Heaven, of resorting to charms and incantations; and of employing diviners and magicians; and, as old Sir Robert Walpole is reported to have said, that every man has his price; so it was supposed to be the case, with those devils, who were engaged, in the system of tormenting mankind. Instead therefore of turning directly to the Lord, the sufferers were much in the habit of making their propitiatory suit, directly, to some false god, or influential demon. Of this we have an example, in Kings II. i. 2, et seq. Ahaziah, King of Israel, went up into his garret, probably, in the dark, and fell through the scuttle. He was severely bruised, and sent a messenger, post haste, to Ekron, to consult the false god, Baalzebub. Elisha, who, though a prophet, had no reputation, as a physician, was consulted by Hazael and by Naaman, about their distempers.

Enchantments, talismans, music, phylacteries were in use, among the Hebrews, and formed no small part of their *materia medica*. Charms were used, as preventives against the bites of serpents. "Who," says Ecclesiasticus xii. 13, "*will pity a charmer, that is bitten with a serpent?*" This seems not to have availed, against the deaf adder, "which," Psalm lviii. 5, "*will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely.*" And Jeremiah, viii. 17, declares, that the Lord will send cockatrices and serpents, that will not be charmed, upon any terms whatever.

Some verses are preserved, by Cato, De Re Rustica, art. 160, which were used, in reducing a dislocated member. Dr. Johnson has informed us, though without naming his authority, that *ABRACADABRA* was a superstitious charm, against agues.

It is quite amusing, while reading Sir Thomas Browne's remarks on quackery, in his Pseudodoxia, ch. xi. to see how readily he admits satanic agency, himself. Take the following passage—"When Gracchus was slain, the same day the chickens

refused to come out of the coop; and Claudius Pulcher underwent the like success, when he commanded the tripudiary augurations; they died, not because the pullets would not feed, but because the devil foresaw their death, and contrived that abstinence in them."

Sir Thomas was a wise and safe counsellor, in all cases, in which there was no chance for the devil to operate; but whenever there was a loop hole, according to the belief in those days, for diabolical influence to creep through, no man was more inclined to give the devil his due, than Sir Thomas.

In this chapter, designed to be purely philosophical, he says of satan—"He deludeth us also by philters, ligatures, charms, ungrounded amulets, characters, and many superstitious ways, in the cure of common diseases, seconding herein the expectation of men with events of his own contriving, which, while some, unwilling to fall directly upon magic, impute unto the power of imagination, or the efficacy of hidden causes, he obtains a bloody advantage." This description of the devil and of his manœuvres so precisely fits the empiric, and all his proceedings, that I should suspect Sir Thomas of the unusual sin of perpetrating a pleasantry; and, under the devil's *effigies*, presenting the image of a charlatan; were it not, for the knowledge we have of this great and good man's credulity, and his firm belief in satanic realities; and, that, in part upon his own testimony, two miserable women were condemned and executed, for witchcraft.

No. CVIII.

JOHN JAHN says, in his *Biblical Archæology*, Upham's translation, page 105, that, in Babylon, when first attacked with disease, the patients were placed in the streets, for the purpose of ascertaining, from casual passengers, what practices or medicines *they* had found useful, in similar cases. Imagine a poor fellow, suddenly attacked with a windy colic, and deposited for this purpose, in State Street, in the very place, formerly occupied, by the razor-strop man, or the magnolia merchant! If it be true—I very much doubt it—that, in a multitude of counsel-

lors, there is safety, this must be an excellent arrangement for the patient.

I have often thought, that benevolence was getting to be an epidemic; particularly when I have noticed the attentions of one or two hundred charitably disposed persons, gathered about a conservative horse, that would not budge an inch. They have not the slightest interest in the horse, nor in the driver—it's nothing under heaven, but pure brotherly love. The driver is distracted, by the advice of some twenty persons, pointing with sticks and umbrellas, in every direction, and all vociferating together. In the meanwhile, three or four volunteers are belaboring the shins of the refractory beast, while as many are rapping his nose with their sticks. Four stout fellows, at least, are trying to shove the buggy forward, and as many exerting their energies, to shove the horse backward. Half a dozen sailors, attracted by the noise, tumble up to the rescue; three seize the horse's head, and pull *a starboard*, and three take him, by the tail, and pull *to larboard*, and all yell together, to the driver, to put his helm hard down. At last, urged, by rage, terror, and despair, the poor brute shakes off his persecutors, with a rear, and a plunge, and a leap, and dashes through the bow window of a confectioner's shop, or of some dealer in naked women, done in Parian.

I am very sorry we have been delayed, by this accident. Let us proceed. Never has there been known, among men, a more universal diffusion of such a little modicum of knowledge. The knowledge of the *materia medica* and of pathology, what there was of it, seems to have been held, by the Babylonians, as tenants in common, and upon the Agrarian principle—every man and woman had an equal share of it. Such, according to John Jahn, Professor of Orientals in Vienna, was the state of therapeutics, in Babylon.

The Egyptians carried their sick into the temples of Serapis—the Greeks to those of *Æsculapius*. Written receipts were preserved there, for the cure of different diseases. Professor Jahn certainly seems disposed to make the most of the knowledge of physic and surgery, among the Israelites. He says they had "*some acquaintance with chirurgical operations*." In support of this opinion, he refers to the rite of circumcision, and to—nothing else. He also says, that it is evident "*physicians*

sometimes undertook to exercise their skill, in removing diseases of an internal nature."

If the reader is good at conundrums, will he be so obliging as to *guess*, upon what evidence the worthy professor grounds this assertion? I perceive he gives it up—Well—on Samuel I. xvi. 16. And what sayeth Samuel?—"And Saul's servants said unto him, behold now an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our Lord now command thy servants, which are before thee, to seek out a man, who is a cunning player on a harp: and it shall come to pass, when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well." This, reduced into plain language, is simply this—Saul's servants took the liberty of telling his majesty, that the devil was in him, and he had better have a little music. Accordingly, David was called in—as a *physician*, according to Jahn—and drove the devil out of Saul, by playing on his Jews'-harp. Jahn also informs us, and the Bible did before, that the art of healing was committed to the priests, who were specially bound, by law, "*to take cognizance of leprosy*." There were, as he admits, other *physicians*, probably of little note. *The priests* were the regular, legalized faculty. On this ground, we can explain the severe reproach, cast upon Asa, who, when he had the gout, "*sought not the Lord but to the physician*:" that is, he did not seek the Lord, in prayer, through the intermediation of the regular faculty, the priests.

There are ecclesiastics among us, who consider, that the Levitical law is obligatory upon the priesthood, throughout the United States of America, at the present day; and who believe it to be *their* bounden duty, to take cognizance of leprosy, and all other disorders; and to physick the bodies, not less than the souls, of their respective parishioners. To this I sturdily object—not at all, from any doubt of their ability, to practise the profession, as skillfully, as did the son of Jesse, and to drive out devils with a Jews'-harp; and to cure all manner of diseases, in the same manner, in which the learned Kircherus avers, according to Sir Thomas Browne, vol. ii. page 536, Lond. 1835, the bite of the tarantula is cured, by songs and tunes; and to soothe boils as big as King Hezekiah's, with fig poultices, according to Scripture; for I have the greatest reverence for that intuition, whereby such men are spared those *studia annorum*, so necessary for the acquirement of any tol-

erable knowledge of the art of medicine, by all, who are not in holy orders. My objection is of quite another kind—I object to the union of the cure of souls and the cure of bodies, in the same person; as I object to the union of Church and State, and to the union of the power of the purse and the power of the sword. It is true, withal, that when a sufferer is killed, by ministerial physic, which never can happen, of course, but for the patient's want of faith, nobody dreams of such an irrelevant proceeding, as pursuing the officious priest, for *mala praxis*.

Priests and witches, jugglers, and old women have been the earliest practitioners of medicine, in every age, and every nation: and the principal, preventive, and remedial medicines, in all the primitive, unwritten pharmacopœias, have been consecrated herbs and roots, charms and incantations, amulets and prayers, and the free use of the Jews'-harp. The reader has heard the statement of Professor Jahn. In 1803, Dr. Winterbottom, physician to the colony of Sierra Leone, published, in London, a very interesting account of the state of medicine, in that colony. He says, that the practice of physic, in Africa, is entirely in the hands of old women. These practitioners, like the servants of Saul, believe, that almost all diseases are caused by evil spirits; in other words, that their patients are bedevilled: and they rely, mainly, on charms and incantations. Dr. W. states, that the natives get terribly drunk, at funerals—funerals produce drunkenness—drunkenness produces fevers—fevers produce death—and death produces funerals. All this is imputed to witchcraft, acting in a circle.

In the account of the Voyage of the Ship Duff to Tongataboo, in 1796, the missionaries give a similar statement of the popular notion, as to the origin of diseases—the devil is at the bottom of them all; and exorcism the only remedy.

In Mill's British India, vol. ii. p. 185, Lond. 1826, the reader may find a statement of the paltry amount of knowledge, on the subject, not only of medicine, but of surgery, among the Hindoos: "Even medicine and surgery, to the cultivation of which so obvious and powerful an interest invites, had scarcely attracted the rude understanding of the Hindus."

Sir William Jones, in the Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 354, says, "there is no evidence, that, in any language of Asia, there exists one original treatise on medicine, considered as a sci-

ence." Crawford, in his Sketches, and he has an exalted opinion of the Hindoos, states, that surgery is unknown among them; and, that, in cases of wounds from the sabre or musket, they do no more than wash the wound; bind it up with fresh leaves, and keep the patient on rice gruel. Buchanan, in his journey, through Mysore, vol. i. p. 336, informs us, that medicine was in the hands of ignorant and impudent charlatans. Origen, who was born, about 185 A.D., states that the Egyptians believed thirty-six devils divided the human body, among them; and that diseases were cured, by supplication and sacrifice, to the particular devil, within whose precinct the malady lay. This is a convenient kind of practice. May it not have some relation to the fact, referred to by Herodotus, in his History, book ii. sec. 84, that the doctors, in Egypt, were not practitioners, in a general sense, but for one part of the body only. Possibly, though I affirm nothing of the sort, Origen may have written *devils for doctors*, by mistake: for the doctors, in those days, were, manifestly, very little better.

If it be true—*et quis negat?*—that Hippocrates was the father of physic—the child was neither born nor begotten, before its father, of course, and Hippocrates was born, about 400 B. C., which, according to Calmet, was about 600 years after David practised upon Saul, with his Jews'-harp. His genealogy was quite respectable. He descended from *Æsculapius*, through a long line of doctors; and, by the mother's side, he was the eighteenth from Hercules, who was, of course, the great grandfather of physic, at eighteen removes; and who, it will be remembered, was an eminent practitioner, and doctored the Hydra. Divesting the subject of all, that is magical and fantastical, Hippocrates thought and taught such rational things, as no physician had thought and taught before. It appears amazing to us, the uninitiated, that the healing art should have been successfully practised at all, from the beginning of the world, till 1628, in utter ignorance of the circulation of the blood; yet it was in that year the discovery was made, when Dr. William Harvey dedicated to Charles I. and published his *Exercitatio anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis*.

No. CIX.

QUACKERY may be found, in every vocation, from the humblest, to the holiest.

If the dead rise not at all, says St. Paul, *what shall they do, who are baptized for the dead!* Nine different opinions are set forth, by Bosius, in regard to the true meaning of this passage. Scaliger and Grotius, who were men of common sense, conclude, that St. Paul referred to a practice, existing at the time; and St. Chrysostom tells a frolicsome story of this vicarious baptism; that a living sponsor was concealed under the bed of the defunct, and answered all the questions, put by the sagacious priest, to the corpse, about to be baptized.

The dead have been, occasionally, through inadvertence, summoned to give evidence, in courts of justice. But, fortunately for quacks, in every department, dead men are mute upon the stand.

Saul, if we may believe the singing women, who came out to meet him, after the fall of Goliath, hath slain his thousands; and, could dead men testify, it would, doubtless, appear, that quacks have slain their tens of thousands. When we consider the overbearing influence of that ignorant, impudent, and plausible jabber, which the quack has always at command, it must be admitted, that these, his fatal victories, are achieved, with the very same weapon, employed by Samson, in his destruction of the Philistines.

There is nothing marvellous, in the existence of quackery, if we recognize the maxim of M. Sorbier, in his *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre*, p. 155, *homo est animal credulum et mendax*—man is a credulous and lying animal. David said, that all men were liars; but, as this is found in one of his lyrics, and he admits, that he uttered it in haste, it may be fairly carried to the account of *poetica licentia*. With no more, however, than a moderate allowance, for man's notorious diathesis towards lying, for pleasure or profit, it is truly wonderful, that credulity should preserve its relative level, as it does, and ever has done, since the world began. Many, who will not go an inch with the Almighty, without a sign, will deliver their noses, for safe keeping, into the hands of a charlatan, and be led by him, blindfold, to the charnel-house. Take away credulity, and the world

would speedily prove an exhausted receiver, for all manner of quackery.

At the close of the seventeenth century, there was a famous impostor in France, whom the royal family, on account of his marvellous powers, invited to Paris. His name was James Aymar. I shall speak of him more fully hereafter; and refer to him, at present, in connection with a remark of Leibnitz. Aymar's imposture had no relation to the healing art, but the remark of Leibnitz is not, on that account, the less applicable. That great man wrote a letter, in 1694, which may be found in the Journal of Tenzelius, in which he refers to Aymar's fraud, and to his subsequent confession, before the Prince of Condé. Aymar said, according to Leibnitz, that he was led on, *non tam propria audacia, quam aliena credulitate hominum, falli volentium, et velut obtrudentium sibi*—not so much by his own audacity, as by the credulity of others, who were not only willing to be cheated, but actually thrust themselves upon him. All Paris was occupied, in attempting to explain the mystery of Aymar's performances, with his wonderful wand: and Leibnitz says—

Nuper scripsi Parisios, utilius et examine dignius, mihi videri problema morale vel logicum, quomodo tot viri insignes Lugduni in fraudem ducti fuerint, quam illud pseudo-physicum, quomodo virga coryllacea tot miracula operetur—I wrote lately to the Parisians, that a solution of the moral or logical problem, how it happened, that so many distinguished persons, in Lyons, came to be taken in, seemed to me of much greater utility, and far more worthy of investigation, than how this fellow performed miracles, with his hazel wand.

It is worth noting, perhaps, that Leibnitz himself, according to the statement of the Abbé Conti, in the *Gazette Littéraire*, for 1765, fell a victim to a quack medicine, given him by a Jesuit, for the gout.

Ignorance is the hotbed of credulity. This axiom is not the less respectable, because the greatest philosophers, occasionally, place confidence in the veriest fools, and do their bidding. Wise and learned men, beyond the pale of their professional pursuits, or peculiar studies, are, very frequently, the simplest of simple folk—*non omnia possumus omnes*. Ignorance must be very common; for a vast majority of the human race have not proceeded so far, in the great volume of wisdom and knowledge, as that profitable but humiliating chapter, whose perusal is likely to

stimulate their energies, by convincing them, that they are of yesterday and know nothing. Credulity must therefore be very common.

Credulity has very little scope, for its fantastical operations among the exact sciences. Who does not foresee the fate of a geometrical quack, who should maintain, that the square of the hypotenuse, in a right-angled triangle, is either greater or less than the sum of the squares of the sides; or of the quack arithmetician, who would persuade our housewives, that of two and two pounds of Muscovado sugar, he had actually discovered the art of making five?

The healing art—the science of medicine, cannot be placed, in the exact category.

It is a popular saying, that *there is a glorious uncertainty in the law*. This opinion has been ably considered, by that most amiable and learned man, the late John Pickering, in his lecture, on the alleged uncertainty of the law—before the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, in 1834. The credulity of the client, to which Mr. Pickering does not refer, must, in some cases, be of extraordinary strength and quality. After presenting a case to his counsel, as favorably to himself as he can, and carefully suppressing much, that is material and adverse, he fondly believes, that his advocate will be able to mesmerise the court and jury, and procure a verdict, in opposition to the facts, apparent at the trial. He is disappointed of course; and then he complains of the uncertainty of the law, instead of the uncertainty of the facts.

In a dissertation, before the Medical Society, in June, 1828, Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck, after setting forth a melancholy catalogue of the troubles and perplexities of the medical profession, concludes by saying, that “all these trials, to which the physician is subjected, do not equal that, which proceeds from the *uncertainty* of the healing art.” When we contrast this candid avowal, from an accomplished and experienced physician, with the splendid promises, and infallible assurances of empirics—with their balms of Gilead, panaceas, and elixirs of everlasting life—we cannot marvel, that the larger part of all the invalids, in this uncertain and credulous world, fly from those conservative professors, who promise nothing, to such as will assure them of a perfect relief, from their maladies, no matter how

complicated, or chronic, they may be—with four words of inspiriting import—NO CURE NO PAY.

I am no physician; my opinion therefore is not presented *ex cathedra*: but the averment of Dr. Shattuck is, I presume, to be viewed in no other light, than as the opinion of an honorable man, who would rather claim too little, than too much, for his own profession: who would rather perform more, than he has promised, than promise more, than he can perform. If the regularly bred and educated physician complains of uncertainty, none but a madman would seek for its opposite, in the palace, or the kennel, of a quack; for the charlatan may occasionally be found in either.

The first thing to be done, I suppose, by the regular doctor, is to ascertain what the disease is. This, I believe, is the very last thing, thought of by the charlatan. He is spared the labor of all pathological inquiry, for all his medicines are, fortunately, panaceas. Thus, he administers a medicine, for the gout; the patient does not happen to have the gout, but the gravel; it is the same thing; for the physic, like our almanacs, was calculated, for different meridians.

These gentlemen sometimes limit their practice to particular diseases, cancers, fistulas, fevers, &c. A memorial was presented, some few years since, to the legislature of Alabama, for the establishment of a medical college, to be devoted, exclusively, to vegetable practice. A shrewd, old member of the assembly rose, and spoke, much after this fashion—I shall support this measure, Mr. Speaker, on one condition, that a neighbor of mine shall be appointed president of this college. It is proper, therefore, that you should know how far he is qualified. He was a travelling merchant; dealt chiefly in apple-trade and other notions, and failed. He had once taken an old book, on fevers, in exchange for essences. This he got by heart. Fevers are common with us. He was a man of some tact; and, a week after he failed, he put up his sign, "BELA BODKIN, FEVER DOCTOR—ROOTS AND HERBS—F. R. S.—L. L. D.—M. D. No charge to the poor or the reverend clergy."—When asked, what he meant by adding those capital letters to his name, he said the alphabet was common property; that F. R. S. stood for Feverfew, Ragwort, and Slippery Elm—L. L. D. for Liverwort, Lichens, and Dill—and M. D. for Milk Diet.

The thing took—his garret was crowded, from morning till

night, and the regular doctor was driven out of that town. Those, who got well, proclaimed Dr. Bodkin's praises—those, who died, were a very silent majority. Everybody declared, of the dead, 'twas a pity they had applied too late. Bodkin was once called to a farmer's wife. He entered the house, with his book under his arm, saying FEVER! with a loud voice, as he crossed the threshold. This evidence of his skill was astonishing. Without more than a glance at the patient, he asked the farmer, if he had a sorrel sheep; and, being told, that he had never heard of such a thing, he inquired, if he had a sorrel horse. The farmer replied, that he had, and a very valuable one. Dr. Bodkin assured him the horse must be killed immediately, and a broth made of the *in'ards* for the sick wife. The farmer hesitated; the wife groaned; the doctor opened the book, and showed his authority—there it was—readable enough—“*sheep sorrel, horse sorrel, good in fevers.*” The farmer smiled—the doctor departed in anger, saying, as he went, “you may decide which you will sacrifice, your wife or your nag.” The woman died, and, shortly after, the horse. The neighbors considered the farmer a hard-hearted man—the wife a victim to the husband's selfishness—the sudden death of the horse a particular providence—and Dr. Bodkin the most skilful of physicians.

No. CX.

No class of men, not even the professors of the wrangling art, are, and ever have been, more universally used and abused, than the members of the medical profession. It has always appeared to me, that this abuse has been occasioned, in some degree, by the pompous air and Papal pretensions of certain members of the faculty; for the irritation of disappointment is, in the ratio of encouragement and hope; and the tongue of experience can have little to say of the infallibility of the medical art. The candid admission of its uncertainty, by Dr. Shattuck, in his dissertation, to which I have referred, is the true mode of erecting a barrier, between honorable and intelligent practitioners, and charlatans.

The opinion of Cato and of Pliny, in regard to the art is, of

course, to be construed, with an allowance, for its humble condition, in their day. With the exception of the superstitious, and even magical, employment of roots and herbs, it consisted, essentially, in externals. There was nothing like a systematic nosology. The *iurgoi* of Athens, and the *medici* of Rome were *vulnerarii*, or surgeons. Cato, who died at the age of 85, U. C. 605, is reported, by Pliny, lib. xxix. cap. 7, to have said of the doctors, in a letter to his son Marcus—*Jurarunt inter se, barbaros, necare omnes, medicina*. They have sworn among themselves, barbarians as they are, to kill us all with their physic. In cap. 5 of the same book, he thus expresses his opinion—*mutatur ars quotidie, toties interpolis, et ingeniorum Græciæ flatu impellimur: palamque est, ut quisque inter istos loquendo polleat, imperatorem illico vitæ nostræ necisque fieri: cœu vero non millia gentium sine medicis degant*. The art is varying, from day to day: as often as a change takes place, we are driven along, by some new wind of doctrine from Greece. When it becomes manifest, that one of these doctors gains the ascendancy, by his harangues, he becomes, upon the spot, the arbiter of our life and death; as though there were not thousands of the nations, who got along without doctors. In the same passage he says, the art was not practised, among the Romans, until the sixth hundredth year, from the building of the city.

The healing art seems to have been carried on, in those days, with fire and sword, that is, with the knife and the cautery. In cap. 6, of the same book, Pliny tells us, that, U. C. 535, *Romam venisse—vulnerarium—mireque gratum adventum ejus initio: mox a sævitia secandi urendique transisse nomen in carnificem, et in tædium artem*—there came to Rome a surgeon, who was, at first, cordially received, but, shortly, on account of his cuttings and burnings, they called him a butcher, and his art a nuisance.

A professional wrestler, who was unsuccessful, in his profession, met Diogenes, the cynic, as we are told, by Diog. Laertius, in Vita, lib. vi. p. 60, and told him, that he had given up wrestling, and taken to physic—"Well done," said the philosopher, "*now thou wilt be able to throw those, who have thrown thee.*"

The revolutions, which took place, in the practice of the healing art, previously to the period, when Pliny composed his Natural History, are certainly remarkable. Chrysippus, as far as he was able, overthrew the system of Hippocrates; Erasistratus

overthrew the system of Chrysippus; the Empirics, or experimentalists, overthrew, to the best of their ability, the system of Erasistratus; Herophilus did the very same thing, for the Empirics; Asclepiades turned the tables, upon Herophilus; Vexius Valens next came into vogue, as the leader of a sect; then Thessalus, in Nero's age, opposed all previous systems; the system of Thessalus was overthrown by Crinas of Marseilles; and so on, to the end of the chapter—which chapter, by the way, somewhat resembles the first chapter of Matthew, substituting the word *overthrew* for the word *begat*.

Water doctors certainly existed, in those ancient days. After Crinas, says Pliny, cap. 5, of the same book, there came along one—*damnatis non solum prioribus medicis, verum, et balineis; frigidaque etiam hibernis algoribus lavari persuasit. Mergit agros in lacus. Videbamus senes consulares usque in ostentationem rigentes. Qua de re exstat etiam Annæi Senecæ stipulatio. Nec dubium est omnes istos famam novitate aliqua aucupantes anima statim nostra negotiari*. Condemning not only all former physicians, but the baths, then in use, he persuaded his patients to use cold water, during the rigors of winter. He plunged sick folks in ponds. We have seen certain aged, consular gentlemen, freezing themselves, from sheer ostentation. We have the personal statement of Annæus Seneca, in proof of this practice. Nor can it be doubted, that those quacks, greedily seeking fame, by the production of some novelty, would readily bargain away any man's life, for lucre. The statement of Seneca, to which Pliny refers, may be found in Seneca's letters, 53, and 83, both to Lucilius; in which he tells his friend, that, according to his old usage, he bathed in the Eurypus, upon the Kalends of January.

It would be easy to fill a volume, with the railings of such peevish philosophers, as Michael De Montaigne, against all sorts of physic and physicians. We are very apt to treat doctors and deities, in the same way—to scoff at them, in health, and fly to them, in sickness.

That was a pertinent question of Cicero's, lib. i. de Divinatione, 14. *An Medicina, ars non putanda est, quam tamen multa fallunt? * * * num imperatorum scientia nihil est, quia summus imperator nuper fugit, amisso exercitu? Aut num propterea nulla est reipublicæ gerendæ ratio atque, prudentia, quia multa Cn. Pompeium, quædam Catonem, nonnulla etiam te ipsum fe*

fellerunt? As to medicine shall it be accounted not an art, because of the great uncertainty therein? What, then, is there no such thing as military skill, because a great commander lately fled, and lost his army? Can there be no such thing as a wise and prudent government, because Pompey has been often mistaken, even Cato sometimes, and yourself, now and then?

If much more than all, that has been proclaimed, were true, in regard to the uncertainty of the healing art, still the practice of seeking some kind of counsel and assistance, whenever a screw gets loose, in our tabernacle of the flesh, is not likely to go out of fashion. What shall we do? Follow the tetotum doctor, and swallow a purge, if P. come uppermost? This is good evidence of our faith, in the doctrine of uncertainty. Or shall we go for the doctor, who works the cheapest? There is no reason, why we should not cheapen our physic, if we cheapen our salvation; for pack horses of all sorts, lay and clerical, are accounted the better workers, when they are rather low in flesh. Or shall we follow the example of the mutual admiration society, and get up a mutual physicking association? Most men are pathologists, by intuition. I have been perfectly astonished to find how many persons, especially females and root doctors, know just what ails their neighbors, upon the very first hint of their being out of order, without even seeing them.

It is a curious fact, that, while men of honor, thoroughly educated, and who have devoted their whole lives, to the study and practice of the healing art, candidly admit its uncertainty, the ignorant and unprincipled of the earth alone, who have impudently resorted to the vocation, suddenly, and as an antidote to absolute starvation, boast of their infallibility, and deal in nothing, but panaceas. The fools, in this pleasant world, are such a respectable and wealthy minority, that the charlatan will not cease from among us, until the last of mortals shall have put on immortality: and then, like the fellow, who entered Charon's boat, with his commodities, he will try to smuggle some of his patent medicines, or *leetil doshes*, into the other world.

A curious illustration of the popular notion, that no man is guilty of any presumptuous sin, merely because, after lying down, at night, a notorious *pedler* or *tinker*, he rises, in the morning, a *physician*, may be found, in the fact, that a watch-maker, who would laugh at a tailor, should he offer to repair a

timekeeper, will readily confide in him, as a physician, for himself, his wife, or his child.

The most delicate female will sometimes submit her person, to the rubbings and manipulations of a blacksmith, in preference to following the prescriptions of a regular physician. A respectable citizen, with a pimple on the end of his nose, resembling, upon the testimony of a dozen old ladies, in the neighborhood, the identical cancer, of which every one of them was cured, by the famous Indian doctress, in Puzzlepot Alley, will, now and then, give his confidence to a lying, ignorant, half-drunken squaw, rather than to the most experienced member of the medical profession.

Suffer me to close this imperfect sketch, with the words of Lord Bacon, vol. i. page 120, Lond. 1824. "We see the weakness and credulity of men is such, as they will often prefer a mountebank or witch, before a learned physician. And therefore the poets were clear-sighted, in discerning this extreme folly, when they made *Æsculapius* and *Circe* brother and sister. For, in all times, in the opinion of the multitude, witches, and old women, and impostors have had a competition with physicians. And what followeth? Even this, that physicians say, to themselves, as *Solomon* expresseth it, upon a higher occasion, *If it befall to me, as befall to the fools, why should I labor to be more wise?*"

No. CXI.

VAN BUTCHELL, the fistula-doctor, in London, some forty years ago, had a white horse, and he painted the animal, with many colored spots. He also wore an enormous beard. These tricks were useful, in attracting notice. In the *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. viii. page 135, Lond. 1810, there is a clever article on quackery, published in 1678, from which I will extract a passage or two, for the benefit of the fraternity: "Any sexton will furnish you with a skull, in hope of your custom; over which hang up the skeleton of a monkey, to proclaim your skill in anatomy. Let your table be never without some old musty Greek or Arabic author, and the fourth book of *Cornelius*

Agrippa's Occult Philosophy, wide open, with half a dozen gilt shillings, as so many guineas, received, that morning for fees. Fail not to oblige neighboring ale-houses to recommend you to inquirers; and hold correspondence with all the nurses and midwives near you, to applaud your skill at gossippings. The admiring patient shall cry you up for a scholar, provided always your nonsense be fluent, and mixed with a disparagement of the college, graduated doctors, and book-learned physicians. Pretend to the cure of all diseases, especially those, that are incurable."

There are gentlemen of the medical and surgical professions, whose high reputation, for science and skill, is perfectly established, and who have humanely associated their honorable names with certain benevolent societies. Such is the fact, in regard to Dr. John Collins Warren, who, by his adoption of the broad ground of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, as a beverage, by men in health, and by his consistent practice and example, has become entitled to the grateful respect of every well-wisher of the temperance cause. To the best of my ability, I have long endeavored to do, for the sextons, the very thing, which that distinguished man would accomplish for the doctors, and other classes. Never did mortal more certainly oppose his own interest, than a physician, or a sexton, who advocates the temperance reform.

There are, however, personages, in the medical profession, regulars, as well as volunteers, who cling to certain societies, with the paralyzing grasp of death—holding on to their very skirts, as boys cling behind our vehicles, *to get a cast*. The patronage and advocacy of some of these individuals are absolutely fatal. It may be surely affirmed of more than one of their number, *nihil tetigit quod non dampnavit*.

I have long been satisfied, that, without a great increase of societies, it will be utterly impossible to satisfy the innumerable aspirants, for the offices of President, Vice President, &c., in our ambitious community. A sagacious, medical friend of mine, whose whole heart is devoted to the public service, and I am sorry to say it, to the injury of his wife and children, has handed me a list of several societies, for the want of which, he assures me, the citizens of Boston are actually suffering, at the present moment. For myself, I cannot pretend to judge of such mat-

ters. A publication of the list may interest the benevolent, and, possibly, promote the cause of humanity. I give it entire :—

A society, for soothing the feelings and relieving the apprehensions of criminals, especially midnight assassins.

A mutual relief society, in case of flatulent colic.

A society, for the diffusion of buttermilk, with funds to enable the visiting committee to place a full jug, in the hands of every man, woman and child, in the United States, upon the first Monday of every month.

A friendly cockroach-trap society.

A society, composed exclusively of medical men, without practice, for the destruction of sowbugs and pismires, throughout the Commonwealth.

A society, for the promotion of domestic happiness, with power to send for persons and papers.

A society, for elevating the standard of education, by introducing trigonometry into infant schools.

An association, for the gratuitous administration, to the poorer classes, by steam power, of anodyne clysters.

Let us return to the faculty. I am in favor of some peculiarity, in the dress and equipage of medical men. With the exception of certain stated hours, they cannot be found at home ; and the case may be one of emergency. Van Butchell's spotted horse was readily distinguished, from Charing Cross to Temple Bar. This was very convenient for those, who were in quest of that remarkable leech. A small mast, abaft the vehicle, whether sulky, buggy, chariot, or phaeton, bearing the owner's private signal, would afford great public accommodation. There is nothing more nautical in such an arrangement, than in the use of the *killeck*, or small anchor, which many of the faculty regularly cast, when they are about to board a patient, and as regularly weigh, when they are about to take a new departure.

The bright yellow chariot of Dr. Benjamin Rush was universally known in Philadelphia, and its environs ; and his peculiar features are not likely to escape from the memory of any man, who ever beheld them. These striking points were seized, by that arch villain, Cobbett, when he published his pictured libel, representing that eminent physician, looking out of his chariot window, with a label, proceeding from his mouth—*Bleed and purge all Kensington !* Upon Cobbett's trial for this libel, Dr. Rush swore, that, by making him ridiculous, it had seriously affected his practice.

Dr. James Lloyd was easily discovered, by his large bay horse—take him for all in all—the finest harness gelding of his day, in Boston. With the eyes of a Swedenborgian, I see the good, old doctor now; and I hear the tramp of those highly polished, white topped boots; and I almost feel the lash of his horse-whip, around my boyish legs, rather too harshly administered, for mild practice however—but he was an able physician, and a gentleman—*factus ad unguem*. His remarkable courtliness of manner, arose, doubtless, in some degree, from his relation to the nobility. During the siege, General Howe and Lord Percy were his intimate friends; the latter was his tenant in 1775, occupying the Vassal estate, for which Dr. Lloyd was the agent, and which afterwards became the residence of the late Gardner Greene.

Dr. Danforth, who resided, in 1789, near the residence of Dr. Lloyd, on Pemberton's Hill, nearly opposite Concert Hall, and, subsequently, in Green Street, might be recognized, by the broad top of his chaise, and the unvarying moderation of the pace, at which he drove. He was tall and thin. His features were perfectly Brunonian. There seemed to be nothing antiphlogistic about him. When pleased, he was very gentlemanly, in his manner and carriage. He ever placed himself, with remarkable exactitude, in the very centre of his vehicle, bolt upright; and, with his stern expression, wrinkled features, remarkably aquiline nose, prominent chin, and broad-brimmed hat, appeared, even some fifty years ago, like a remnant of a by-gone age. He had been a royalist. His manners were occasionally rough and overbearing.

I remember to have told my mother, when a boy, that I should not like to take Dr. Danforth's physic. The character of his practice is, doubtless, well remembered, by those, who have taken his *divers*, as they were called, and lived to tell of it. The late Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse being interrogated, by some aged spinsters, as to the difference, between the practice of Dr. Danforth and his opponents, replied, that there were two ways of putting a disordered clock in tolerable condition—the first, by taking it apart, cleaning its various members of their dust and dirt, applying a little oil to the pivots, and attaching no other than its former weight; “and then,” said he, “it will go very well, for a considerable time; and this we call the anti-Brunonian system.”

The second method he described, as follows: "You are to take no pains about examining the parts; let the dust and dirt remain, by all means; apply no oil to the pivots; but hitch on three or four times the original weight, and you will be able to drag it along, after a fashion; and this is the Brunonian system." In this, the reader will recognize one of the pleasantries of Dr. Waterhouse, rather than an impartial illustration.

Dr. Isaac Rand, the son of Dr. Isaac Rand, of Charlestown, lived, in 1789, some sixty years ago, in Middle Street, just below Cross: in after years, he resided, till his death, in 1822, in Atkinson Street. He was a pupil of Dr. Lloyd. His liberalities to the poor became a proverb. The chaise, in which he practised, in his latter days, was a notable object. The width of it, though not equal to that of Solomon's temple, was several cubits. It became the property of the late Sheriff Badlam, who filled it to admiration. The mantle of Elijah was not a closer fit, upon the shoulders of Elisha.

Dr. Rand was an able physician, and a truly good man. He made rather a more liberal use of the learned terms of his profession, than was the practice of other physicians. With him, this arose from habit, and a desire to speak with accuracy, and not from affectation. Charles Austin was shot dead, in State Street, by Thomas O. Selfridge, August 4, 1806, in self-defence. Dr. Rand was a witness, at the trial; and his long and learned, professional terms, so completely confounded the stenographers, that they were obliged to beat the *chamade*, and humbly beg for plainer English.

I have more to say of these interesting matters, but am too near the boundary wall of my paper, to enter upon their consideration, at present.

No. CXII.

In my last number, I referred to three eminent physicians, of the olden time, Drs. Lloyd, Danforth, and Rand. Some sixty years ago, there were three and twenty physicians, in this city, exclusive of quacks. The residences of the three I have already stated. Dr. James Pecker resided, at the corner of

Hanover and Friend Street—Thomas Bulfinch, in Bowdoin Square—Charles Jarvis, in Common Street—Lemuel Hayward, opposite the sign of the White Horse, in Newbury Street—Thomas Kast, in Fish Street, near the North Square—David Townsend, in Southack's Court—John Warren, next door to Cromwell's Head, in South Latin School Street, then kept by Joshua Brackett—Thomas Welsh, in Sudbury Street, near Concert Hall—William Eustis, in Sudbury Street, near the Mill Pond—John Homans, No. 6 Marlborough Street—John Sprague, in Federal Street—Nathaniel W. Appleton, in South Latin School Street, near the Stone Chapel—Joseph Whipple, in Orange Street—Aaron Dexter, in Milk Street, opposite the lower end of the rope walks, that were burnt, in the great fire, July 30, 1794—Abijah Cheever, in Hanover Street—William Spooner, in Cambridge Street—John Fleet, in Milk Street—Amos Winship, in Hanover Street—Robert Rogerson, in Ship Street—Alexander A. Peters, in Marlborough Street—John Jeffries, who, in 1776, went to Halifax, with the British garrison, did not return and resume practice in Boston, till 1790.

Ten years after, in 1799, the number had increased to twenty-nine, of whom nineteen were of the old guard of 1789.

In 1816, the number had risen to forty-three, of whom eight only were of 1789. In 1830, the number was seventy-five, two only surviving of 1789—Drs. William Spooner and Thomas Welsh.

In 1840, we had, in Boston, one hundred and twenty-two physicians, surgeons, and dentists, and a population of 93,383. There are now, in this physicky metropolis, according to the Directory, for 1848-9, physicians, of all sorts, not including those for the soul, but doctors, surgeons, dentists, regulars and quacks, of all colors and both sexes, 362. THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO: an increase of two hundred and forty, in eight years. This is certainly encouraging. If 122 doctors are quite as many, as 93,383 Athenians ought to bear, 362 require about 280,000 patients, and such should be our population. Let us arrange this formidable host. At the very *tete d'armee*, marching left in front, we have seven *Female Physicians*, preceded by an *Indian doctress*—next in order, come the surgeon *Dentists*, seventy in number—then the main body, to whom the publisher of the Directory courteously and indiscriminately applies the title of *Physicians*, two hundred and fifty-seven, rank

and file;—seven and twenty *Botanic Doctors* bring up the rear! How appropriate, in the hand of the very last of this enormous *cortege*, would be a banner, inscribed with those well known words—**GOD SAVE THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS!**

I shall devote this paper to comparative statistics. In 1789, with twenty-three physicians in Boston, four less, than the present number of *botanic doctors* alone, and three hundred and thirty-nine less, than the present number of regulars and pretenders, there were nine only of *our* profession, regularly enrolled, as F. U., funeral undertakers, and placed upon a footing with the Roman *designatores*, or *domini funerum*. There were several others, who bore to our profession the same relation, which bachelors of medicine bear to theirs, and who were entitled to subscribe themselves D. G., diggers of graves. Yet in 1840, the year, which I take, as a *point d'appui* for my calculations, there were only twenty, enrolled as F. U., with 362 medical operatives, busily at work, day and night, upon the insides and outsides of our fellow-citizens! Here is matter for marvel! How was it done? Did the dead bury the dead? I presume the solution lies, in the fact, that there existed an unrecorded number of those, who were D. G. only.

There were few dentists, *eo nomine*, some sixty years ago. Our ancestors appear to have gotten along pretty comfortably, in spite of their teeth. Many of those, who practised the "*dental art*," had so little employment, that it became convenient to unite their dental practice, with some other occupation. Thus John Templeman, was a *broker and dentist*, at the northeast corner of the Old State House. Whitlock was, doubtless, frequently called out, from a rehearsal, at the play house, to pull a refractory grinder. Isaac Greenwood advertises, in the *Columbian Sentinel* of June 1, 1785, not only his desire to wait upon all, who may require his services, at their houses, in the dental line; but a variety of umbrellas, canes, silk caps for bathing, dice, chess men, and cane for hoops and bonnets, by the dozen, or single stick. In the *Boston Mercury* of Jan. 6, 1797, W. P. Greenwood combines, with his dental profession, the sale of piano-fortes and guitars. In 1799, the registered dentists were three only, Messrs. Isaac and Wm. P. Greenwood, and Josiah Flagg. In 1816, there were three only, Wm. P. Greenwood, Thomas Parsons, and Thomas Barnes.

It would appear somewhat extravagant, perhaps, to state, that, including doctors of all sorts, there is a fraction more than two doctors to every one merchant, *eo nomine*, excluding commission merchants, of course, in the city of Boston. Such, nevertheless, appears to be the fact, unless Mr. Adams has made some important error, which I do not suspect, in his valuable Directory, for 1848-9.

It will not be utterly worthless, to contemplate the quarter-master's department of this portentous army; and compare it with the corresponding establishment of other times. In 1789, there were fifteen druggists and apothecaries, in the town of Boston. Examples were exceedingly rare, in those days, of wholesale establishments, exclusively dealing in drugs and medicines. At present, we have, in this city, eighty-nine apothecaries, doing business, in as many different places—drugs and medicines are also sold, at wholesale, in forty-four establishments—there are fourteen special depots, for the sale of patent medicines, Gordak's drugs, Indian purgatives, Holman's restorative, Brandreth's pills, Sherry wine bitters, and pectoral balsam, Graefenberg's medicines, and many other kinds of nastiness—eighteen dealers exclusively in botanic medicines—ninety-seven nurses—twenty-eight undertakers—and eight warehouses for the sale of coffins!

It is amusing, if nothing worse, to compare the relative increase, in the number of persons, who are, in various ways, employed about the sick, the dying, and the dead, in killing, or curing, or comforting, or burying, with the increase in some other crafts and callings. In 1789, there were thirty-one bakers, in Boston: there are now fifty-seven. The number has not doubled in sixty years. The number of doctors then, as I have stated, was twenty-three: now, charlatans included, it falls short, only six, of sixteen times that number.

There were then sixty-seven tailors' shops; there are now one hundred and forty-eight such establishments. There were then thirty-six barbers, hair-dressers, and wig-makers: there are now ninety-one. There were then one hundred and five cabinet-makers and carpenters: there are now three hundred and fifty. This ratio of comparison will, by no means, hold, in some other callings. There were then nine auctioneers: there are now fifty-two. There were then seven brokers, of all sorts: there are now two hundred and ten. The source from

which I draw my information, is the Directory of 1789, "printed and sold by John Norman, at Oliver's Dock," and of which the writer speaks, in his preface, as "*this first attempt*." For want of sufficient designation, it is impossible, in this primitive work, to pick out the members of the legal profession. Compared with the present fraternity, whose name is legion, they were very few. There are more than three hundred and fifty practitioners of the law, in this city. In this, as in the medical profession, there are, and ever will be, *ex necessitate rei*, infernal scoundrels, and highly intelligent and honorable men—blind guides and safe counsellors. Not very long ago, a day of purification was appointed—some plan seemed to be excogitating, for the ventilation of the brotherhood. For once, they were gathered together, brothers, looking upon the features of brothers, and knowing them not. This was an occasion of mutual interest, and the arena was common ground—they came, some of them, doubtless, from strange quarters, lofty attics and lowly places—

"From all their dens the one-eyed race repair,
From rifted rocks, and mountains high in air."

When doctors, lawyers, and brokers are greatly upon the increase, it is very clear, that we are getting into the way of submitting our bodies and estates, to be frequently, and extensively, tinkered.

I cannot doubt, that in 1789, there were quacks, about town, who could not contrive to get their names inserted, in the same page, with the regular physicians. I cannot believe, however, that they bore any proportion to the unprincipled and ignorant impostors, at the present time. In the "*Massachusetts Centinel*," of Sept. 21, 1785, is the following advertisement—"John Pope, who, for eighteen years past, has been noted for curing Cancers, schrophulous Tumours, fetid and phagedenic Ulcers, &c., has removed into a house, the north corner of Orange and Hollis Street, South End, Boston, where he proposes to open a school, for Reading, Writing, Arithmetick, &c."

In 1789 there were twenty-two distillers of rum in Boston: there are nine only, named in the Directory of 1848-9. The increase of doctors and all the appliances of sickness and death have not probably arisen from the falling off, among distillers. In 1789, there were about twenty innholders: there are

now eighty-eight public houses, hotels, or taverns—ninety-two restaurants—thirty-five confectionery establishments—thirty-nine stores, under the caption of “liquors and wines”—sixty-nine places, for the sale of oysters, which are not always the *spiritless* things they appear to be—one hundred and forty-three wholesale dealers, in West India goods and groceries—three hundred and seventy-three retailers of such articles: I speak not of those, who fall below the dignity of history; whose operations are entirely subterraneous; and whose entire stock in trade might be carried, in a wheelbarrow. We have also one hundred and fifty-two provision dealers. We live well in this city. It would be very pleasant, to walk over it, with old Captain Keayne, who died here, March 23, 1656, and who left a sum of money to the town, to erect a granary or storehouse, for the poor, in case of famine!

No. CXIII.

THE Quack is commonly accounted a spurious leech—a false doctor—clinging, like a vicious barnacle, to the very bottom of the medical profession. But impostors exist, in every craft, calling, and profession, under the names of quacks, empirics, charmers, magicians, professors, sciolists, plagiaries, enchanters, charlatans, pretenders, judicial astrologers, quacksalvers, muffs, mountebanks, medicasters, barrators, cheats, puffs, champertors, cuckoos, diviners, jugglers, and verifiers of suggestions.

Butler, in his *Hudibras*, says, of medical quacks, they

Seek out for plants, with signatures,
To quack of universal cures.

In the *Spectator*, Addison has this observation—“At the first appearance, that a French quack made in Paris, a boy walked before him, publishing, with a shrill voice, ‘*my father cures all sorts of distempers*,’ to which the doctor added, in a grave manner, ‘*what the boy says is true.*’”

The imposture of James Aymar, to which I have alluded, was of a different kind. Aymar was an ignorant peasant of Dauphiné. He finally confessed himself to be an impostor, before

the Prince of Condé; and the whole affair is narrated, by the apothecary of the prince, in a *Lettre à M. L'Abbé, D. L., sur les véritables effets de la baguette de Jaques Aymar par P. Buisiere; chez Louis Lucas, à Paris, 1694.*

The power of this fellow's wand was not limited, to the discovery of hidden treasures, or springs of water; nor were his only dupes the lowly and the ignorant. As I have said, he was detected, and made a full confession, before the Prince of Condé. The magistrates published an official account of the imposture; yet such is the energy of the credulous principle, that M. Vallemont, a man of note, published a treatise "*on the occult philosophy of the divining wand*;" in which he tries to show, that Aymar, notwithstanding his mistakes, before the Prince, was really possessed of all the wonderful power he claimed, of divining with his wand. The measure of this popular credulity will be better understood, after perusing the following translation of an extract from the *Mercur Historique*, for April, 1697, page 440.—"The Prior of the Carthusians passed through Villeneuve with Aymar, to discover, by the aid of his wand, some landmarks, that were lost. Just before, a foundling had been left on the steps of the monastery. Aymar was employed, by the Superior, to find out the father. Followed by a great crowd, and guided by the indications of his wand, he went to the village of Comaret, in the County of Venaissin, and thence to a cottage, where he affirmed the child was born.

"Bayle says, on the authority of another letter from M. Buisiere, in 1698, that Aymar's apparent simplicity, and rustic dialect, and the rapid motion of his wand went far, to complete the delusion. He was also exceedingly devout, and never absent from mass, or confession. While he was at Paris, and before his exposure, the Pythoness, herself, would not have been more frequently, and zealously consulted, than was this crafty and ignorant boor, by the Parisians. Fees showered in from all quarters; and he was summoned, in all directions, to detect thieves; recover lost property; settle the question of genuine identity, among the relics of *prima facie* saints, in different churches; and, in truth, no limit was set, by his innumerable dupes, to the power of his miraculous wand. "I myself," says M. Buisiere, "saw a simple, young fellow, a silk weaver, who was engaged to a girl, give Aymar a couple of crowns, to know if she were a virgin."

Joseph Francis Borri flourished, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and a most complicated scoundrel he was—heresiarch, traitor, alchymist, and empiric. He had spiritual revelations, of course. He was an intelligent and audacious liar, and converts came in apace. At his suggestion, his followers took upon themselves an oath of poverty, and placed all they possessed in the hands of Borri, who told them he would take care it should never again interfere with their devotions, but would be spent in prayers and masses, for their ulcerated souls. The bloodhounds of the Inquisition were soon upon his track, at the moment he was about to raise the standard of insurrection in Milan.

He fled to Amsterdam—made capital of his persecution by the Inquisition; and won the reputation of a great chemist, and wonderful physician. He then went to Hamburg, and persuaded Queen Christina, to advance him a large sum of money, to be reimbursed, from the avails of the philosopher's stone, which Borri was to discover. This trick was clearly worth repeating. So thought Borri; and he tried it, with still better success, on his Majesty of Denmark. Still the stone remained undiscovered; and the thought occurred to Signor Borri, that it might not be amiss, to look for it, in Turkey. He accordingly removed; but was arrested at Vienna, by the Pope's agents; and consigned to the prisons of the Inquisition, for life. His fame, however, had become so omnipotent, that, upon the earnest application of the Duke d'Etrée, he was let loose, to prescribe for that nobleman, whom the regular physicians had given over. The Duke got well, and the world gave Borri the credit of the cure. When a poor suffering mortal is given over, in other words, *let alone*, by half a dozen doctors—I am speaking now of the regulars, not less than of the volunteers—he, occasionally, gets well.

A wit replied to a French physician, who was marvelling how a certain Abbé came to die, since he himself and three other physicians were unremitting, in their attentions—"My dear doctor, how could the poor abbé sustain himself, against you all four?" The doctors do much as they did of old. Pliny, lib. xxix. 5, says, of consultations—"Hinc illæ circa ægros misera sententiarum concertationes, nullo idem censente ne videatur accessio alterius. Hinc illa infelicis monumenti inscriptio, TURBA SE MEDICORUM PERIISSE. Hence those contemptible consulta-

tions, round the beds of the sick—no one assenting to the opinion of another, lest he should be deemed his subaltern. Hence the monumental inscription, over the poor fellow, who was destroyed in this way—KILLED BY A MOB OF DOCTORS!

Who has not seen a fire rekindle, *sua sponte*, after the officious bellows have, apparently, extinguished the last spark? So, now and then, the vital spark, stimulated by the *vis medicatrix naturæ* will rekindle into life and action, after having been well nigh smothered, by all sorts of complicated efforts to restore it.

This is the *punctum instans*, the very nick of time, for the charlatan: in he comes, looking insufferably wise, and brim full of sympathetic indignation. All has been done wrong, of course. While he affects to be doing everything, he does exactly nothing—stirs up an invisible, impalpable, infinitesimal, incomprehensible particle, in a little water, which the patient can neither see, feel, taste, nor smell. Down it goes. The patient's faith, as to the size of it, rather resembles a cocoanut than a grain of mustard seed. His confidence in the *new* doctor is as gigantic, and as blind, as Polyphemus, after he had been gouged, by him of Ithaca. He plants his galvanic grasp, upon the wrist of the little doctor, much in the manner of a drowning man, clutching at a full grown straw. He is absolutely better already. The wife and the little ones look upon the mountebank, as their preserver from widowhood and orphanage. "*Dere ish noting*," he says, "*like de leetil doshes*;" and he takes his leave, regretting, as he closes the door, that his sleeve is not large enough, to hold the sum total of his laughter. Yet some of these quacks become *honest men*; and, however surprised at the result, they are finally unable, to resist the force of the popular outcry, in their own favor. They almost forget their days of duplicity, and small things—they arrive, somehow or other, at the conclusion, that, however unexpectedly, they are *great men*, and their wild tactics a system. They use longer words, move into larger houses, and talk of first principles: and all the practice of a neighborhood finally falls into the hands of Dr. Ninkempaup or Dr. Pauketpeeker.

Francis Joseph Borri died, in prison, in 1695. Sorbierc in his *Voyage en Angleterre*, page 158, describes him thus—"He is a cunning blade; a lusty, dark-complexioned, good-looking fellow, well dressed, and lives at considerable expense, though not

at such a rate, as some suppose ; for eight or ten thousand livres will go a great way at Amsterdam. But a house, worth 15,000 crowns, in a fine location, five or six footmen, a French suit of clothes, a treat or two to the ladies, the occasional refusal of fees, five or six rix dollars distributed, at the proper time and place among the poor, a spice of insolence in discourse, and sundry other artifices have made some credulous persons say, that he gave away handfulls of diamonds, that he had discovered the philosopher's stone, and the universal medicine." When he was in Amsterdam, he appeared in a splendid equipage, was accosted, by the title of "*your excellence*," and they talked of marrying him to one of the greatest fortunes.

I have no taste for unsocial pleasures. Will the reader go with me to Franklin Place—let us take our station near No. 2, and turn our eyes to the opposite side—let us put back the hand of the world's timekeeper, some thirty years. A showy chariot, very peculiar, very yellow, and abundantly supplied with glass, with two tall bay horses, gaudily harnessed, is driven to the door of the mansion, by a coachman, in livery ; and there it stands ; till, after the expiration of an hour, perhaps, the house door is flung open, and there appears, upon the steps, a tall, dark visaged, portly personage, in black, who, looking slowly up and down the avenue, proceeds, with great deliberation, to draw on his yellow, buckskin gloves. Rings glitter upon his fingers ; seals, keys, and safety chain, upon his person. His beaver, of an unusual form, is exquisitely glossy, surpassed, by nothing but the polish of his tall suwarrows, surmounted with black, silk tassels.

He descends to the vehicle—the door is opened, with a bow of profound reverence, which is scarcely acknowledged, and in he gets, the very fac simile of a Spanish grandee. The chariot moves off, so very slowly, that we can easily follow it, on foot—on it goes, up Franklin, and down Washington, up Court, into Tremont, down School, into Washington, along Washington, up Winter, and through Park to Beacon Street, where it halts, before the mansion of some respectable citizen. The occupant alights, and, leaving his chariot there, proceeds, through obscure and winding ways, to visit his patients, on foot, in the purlieu of *La Montagne*.

This was no other than the celebrated patentee of the famous bug liquid ; who was forever putting the community on its guard, by admonishing the pill-taking public, that they *could not be too particular*, for none were genuine, unless signed *W. T. Conway*.

No. CXIV.

CHARITY began at home—I speak of Charity Shaw, the famous root and herb doctress, who was a great blessing to all undertakers, in this city, for many years—her practice was, at first, purely domestic—she began at home, in her own household; and, had she ended there, it had fared better, doubtless, with many, who have received the final attentions of our craft. The mischief of quackery is negative, as well as positive. Charity could not be fairly classed with those reckless empirics, who, rather than lose the sale of a nostrum, will send you directly to the devil, for a dollar: Charity was kind, though she vaunted herself a little in the newspapers. She was, now and then, rather severely handled, but she bore all things, and endured all things, and hoped all things; for, to do her justice, she was desirous, that her patients should recover: and, if she believed not all things, her patients did; and therein consisted the negative mischief—in that stupid credulity, which led them to follow this poor, ignorant, old woman, and thus prevented them, from applying for relief, where, if anywhere, in this uncertain world, it may be found—at the fountains of knowledge and experience. In Charity's day, there were several root and herb practitioners; but the greatest of these was Charity.

Herb doctors have, for some two thousand years, attempted to turn back the tables, upon the faculty—they are a species of *garde mobile*, who have an old grudge against the *corps regulier*: for they have not forgotten, that, some two thousand years ago, herb doctors had all things pretty much in their own way. Two entire books, the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh of Pliny's Natural History, are devoted to a consideration of the medicinal properties of herbs—the twentieth treats of the medicinal properties of vegetables—the twenty-third and twenty-fourth of the medicinal properties of roots and barks. Thus, we see, of what importance these simples were accounted, in the healing art, in that early age. Herbs, barks, and roots were, and, for ages, had been, the principal *materia medica*, and were employed, by the different sects—by the Rationalists, of whom Pliny, lib. xxvi. cap. 6, considers Herophilus the head, though this honor is ascribed, by Galen, to Hippocrates—the Empirics, or experimentalists—and the Methodics, who avoided all actions, for *mala*

praxis, by adhering to the rules. Pliny manifestly inclined to herb doctoring. In the chapter, just now referred to, after alluding to the *verba, garrulitatemque* of certain lecturers, he intimates, that they and their pupils had an easy time of it—*sedere namque his in scholis auditioni operatos gratius erat, quam ire in solitudines, et quærere herbas alias aliis diebus anni*—for it was pleasanter to sit, listening in the lecture-rooms, than to run about in the fields and woods, culling certain simples, on certain days in the year.

Herb doctors were destined to be overthrown; and the account, given by Pliny, in chapters 7, 8 and 9, book xxvi. of the sudden and complete revolution, in the practice of the healing art, is curious and interesting.

Asclepiades, of Prusa, in Bythinia, came to Rome, in the time of Pompey the Great, about one hundred years before Christ, to teach rhetoric; and, like an impudent hussy, who came to this city, as a cook, from Vermont, some years ago, and, not succeeding, in that capacity, but hearing, that wet nurses obtained high wages here, prepared herself, for that lucrative occupation—so Asclepiades, not succeeding, as a rhetorician, prepared himself for a doctor. He was ignorant of the whole matter; but a man of genius; and, as he knew nothing of root and herb practice, he determined to cut up the whole system root and branch, and substitute one of his own—*torrenti ac meditata quotidie oratione blandiens omnia abdicavit: totamque medicinam ad causam revocando, conjecturæ fecit*. By the power of his forcible and preconcerted orations, pronounced from day to day, in a smooth and persuasive manner, he overthrew the whole; and, bringing back the science of medicine to cause and effect, he constructed a system of inference or conjecture. Pliny is not disposed to be altogether pleased with Asclepiades, though he recounts his merits fairly. He says of him—*Id solum possumus indignari, unum hominem, e levissima gente, sine ullis opibus orsum, vctigalis sua causa, repente leges salutis humano genere dedisse, quas tamen postea abrogavere multi*—at least, we may feel rather indignant, that one, born among a people, remarkable for their levity, born also in poverty, toiling for his daily support, should thus suddenly lay down, for the human race, the laws of health, which, nevertheless, many rejected afterwards.

Now it seems to me, that Asclepiades was a very clever fellow; and I think, upon Pliny's own showing, there was more reason, for indignation, against a people, who had so long toler-

ated the marvellous absurdities of the herb system, such as it then was, than against a man, who had the good sense to perceive, and the courage and perseverance to explode, them. What there was in the poverty of Asclepiades, or in the character of his countrymen, to rouse Pliny's indignation, I cannot conceive. Pliny says, lib. xxvi. cap. 9, after naming several things, which promoted this great change, in the practice of Physic—*Super omnia adjuvere eum magicæ vanitates, in tantum erectæ, ut abrogare herbis fidem cunctis possent.* He was especially assisted in his efforts, by the excesses, to which the magical absurdities had been carried, in respect to herbs, so that they alone were enough to destroy all confidence, in such things.

Pliny proceeds to narrate some of these magical absurdities—the plant *Æthiops*, thrown into lakes and rivers, would dry them up—the touch of it would open everything, that was shut. The *Achæmenis*, cast among the enemy, would cause immediate flight. The *Latace* would ensure plenty. Josephus also, *De Bell. Ind.* lib. vii. cap. 25—speaks of an excellent root for driving out devils.

Pliny says, Asclepiades laid down five important particulars—*abstinentiam cibi, alias vini, fricationem corporis, ambulationem, gestationes*—abstinence from meat, and, at other times, from wine, friction of the body, walking, and various kinds of gestation, on horseback, and otherwise. There were some things, in the old practice, *nimis anxia et rudia*, too troublesome and coarse, whose rejection favored the new doctor greatly, *obruendi ægros veste sudoresque omni modo ciendi; nunc corpora ad ignes torrendi*, etc.—smothering the sick in blankets, and exciting perspiration, by all possible means—roasting them before fires, &c. Like every other ingenious physician, he had something pleasant, of his own contriving, to propose—*tum primum pensili balnearum usu ad infinitum blandientem*—then first came up the employment of hanging baths, to the infinite delight of the public. These hanging baths, which Pliny says, lib. ix. 79, were really the invention of Sergius Orata, were rather supported than suspended—fires were kindled below—there were different *ahena*, or caldrons, the *caldarium*, and *frigidarium*. The *corrivatio* was simply the running together of the cold and hot water. Annexed was the *laconicum*, or sweating room. The curious reader may compare the Roman baths with those at Constantinople, described by Miss Pardoe.

Alia quoque blandimenta, says Pliny, *excogitabat, jam suspendendo lectulos, quorum jactatus aut morbos extenuaret, aut somnos alliceret*. He excogitated other delights, such as suspended beds, whose motion soothed the patient, or put him to sleep. The principle here seems pretty universal, lying at the bottom of all those simple contrivances, rocking-chairs, cribs, and cradles, swings, hammocks, &c. This is truly Indian practice—

Rock-a-bye baby upon the tree top,
And, when the wind blows, the cradle will rock.

Præterea in quibusdam morbis medendi cruciatus detraxit, ut in anginis quas curabant in fauces organo demisso. Damnavit merito et vomitiones, tunc supra modum frequentes. He also greatly diminished the severity of former practice, in certain diseases, in quinsies for example, which they used to cure, with an instrument, introduced into the fauces. He very properly condemned those vomitings, then frequent, beyond all account. This refers to the Roman usage, which is almost incomprehensible by us. Celsus, *De Med. lib. i. 3*, refers to it, as the practice *eorum, qui quotidie ejiciendo, vorandi facultatem moluntur*—of those, who, by vomiting daily, acquired the faculty of gormandizing. Suetonius says of the imperial brute, Vitellius, *sec. xiii.* that he regularly dined, at three places daily, *facile omnibus sufficiens, vomitandi consuetudine*—easily enabled to do so, by his custom of vomiting.

Pliny's reflection, upon the success of the new doctor, is very natural—*quæ quum unusquisque semetipsum sibi præstare posse intelligeret, faventibus cunctis, ut essent vera quæ facillima erant, universum prope humanum genus circumegit in se, non alio modo quam si cælo emissus advenisset*. When every one saw, that he could apply the rules for himself, all agreeing that things, which were so very simple, must certainly be true, he gathered all mankind around him, precisely as though he had been one, sent from Heaven.

In the following passage, Pliny employs the word, *artificium*, in an oblique sense. *Trahebat præterea mentes artificio mirabili, vinum promittendo ægris*. He attracted men's minds, by the remarkable *artifice* of allowing wine to the sick.

During the temperance movement, some eminent physicians have asserted, that wine was unnecessary, in every case—others have extended their practice, and increased their popularity, by

making their patients as comfortable, as possible—*while they continued in the flesh*. A German, who had been very intemperate, joined a total abstinence society, by the advice of a temperance physician. In a little time the *tormina* of his stomach became unbearable. Instead of calling his temperance physician, who would, probably, have eased the irritation, with a little worm-wood, or opium, he sent for the popular doctor, who told him, at once, that he wanted brandy—"How much may I take?" inquired the German. "An ounce, during the forenoon;" replied the doctor. After he had gone, the German said to his son, "Harman, go, get de-measure pook, and zee how mooch be won ounz." The boy brought the book, and read aloud, eight drachms make one ounce—the patient sprang half out of bed; and, rubbing his hands, exclaimed—"dat ish de toctor vor me; I never took more nor voor trams in a morning, in all my porn days—dat ish de trouble—I zee it now."

No. CXV.

MISS BUNGS is dead. It is well to state this fact, lest I should be suspected of some covert allusion to the living. She firmly believed in the XXXIX. articles, and in a fortieth—namely—that man is a fortune-hunter, from his cradle. She often declared, that, sooner than wed a fortune-hunter, she would die a cruel death—she would die a maid—she did so, in the full possession of her senses, to the last.

Her entire estate, consisting of sundry shares, in fancy stocks, two parrots, a monkey, a silver snuff-box, and her paraphernalia, she directed to be sold; and the avails employed, for the promotion of celibacy, among the heathen.

Yet it was the opinion of those, who knew her intimately, that Miss Bungs was, at heart, sufficiently disposed to enter into the holy state of matrimony, could she have found one pure, disinterested spirit; but, unfortunately, she was fully persuaded, that every man, who smiled upon her, and inquired after her health, was "*after her money*." Miss Bungs was not unwilling to encourage the impression, that she was an object of particular regard, in certain quarters; and, if a gentleman picked up her

glove, or escorted her across a gutter, she was in the habit of instituting particular inquiries, among her acquaintances—in strict confidence of course—in regard to his moral character—ejaculating with a sigh, that men were so mercenary now-a-days, it was difficult to know who could be trusted.

Now, this was very wrong, in Miss Bung's. By the English law, if a man or a woman pretends, falsely, that he or she is married to any person, that person may libel, in the spiritual court, and obtain an injunction of silence; and this offence, in the language of the law, is called *jactitation of marriage*. I can see no reason why an injunction in cases of *jactitation of courtship*, should not be allowed; for serious evils may frequently arise, from such unauthorized pretences.

After grave reflection, I am of opinion, that Miss Bung's carried her opposition to fortune-hunters, beyond the bounds of reason. Let us define our terms. The party, who marries, only for money, intending, from the very commencement, to make use of it, for the selfish gratification of vain, or vicious, propensities—is a fortune-hunter of the very worst kind. But let us not forget, as we go along, that this field is occupied by huntresses, as well as by hunters; and that, upon such voyages of discovery, the cap may be set, as effectually, as the compass.

There is another class, with whom the degree of personal attachment, which really exists, is too feeble, to resist the combined influence of selfishness and pride. Such also, I suppose, may be placed in the category of fortune-hunters. We find an illustration of this, in the case of Mr. Mewins. After a liberal arrangement had been made, for the young lady, by her father; Mr. Mewins, having taken a particular fancy to a little, brown mare, demanded, that it should be thrown into the bargain; and, upon a positive refusal, the match was broken off. After a couple of years, the parties accidentally met, at a country ball—Mr. Mewins was quite willing to renew the engagement—the lady appeared not to have the slightest recollection of him. "Surely you have not forgotten me," said he—"What name, sir?" she inquired—"Mewins," he replied; "I had the honor of paying my addresses to you, about two years ago."—"I remember a person of that name," she rejoined, "who paid his addresses to my father's brown mare."

In matrimony, wealth is, of course, a very comforting accessory. It renders an agreeable partner still more so—and it often

goes, not a little way, to balance an unequal bargain. Time and talent may as wisely be wasted, in pursuit of the philosopher's stone, as of an unmixed good or evil, on this side the grave. Temper may be mistaken, or it may change; beauty may fade; but £60,000, well managed, will enable the *happy man or woman*, to bear up, with tolerable complacency, under the severest trials of domestic life. What a blessed thing it is, to fall back upon, when one is compelled to mourn, over the infirmities of the living, or the absence, of the dead! What a solace!

It was therefore wrong, in Miss Bungs, to designate, as fortune-hunters, those, of either sex, who have come to the rational conclusion, that money is essential to the happiness of married life. No man or woman of common sense, who is poor, will, now-a-days, commit the indiscretion of *falling in love*, unless with some person of ample possessions.

What, then, is to become of the penniless, and the unpretty! We must adopt the custom of the ancient Babylonians, introduced about 1433 B. C., by Atossa, the daughter of Belochus. At a certain season of the year, the most lovely damsels were assembled, and put up, singly, at auction, to be purchased, by the *highest bidder*. The wealthy swains of Babylon poured forth their wealth, like water; and rivals settled the question, not by the length of their rapiers, but of their purses. The money, thus obtained, became the dowry of those, whose personal attractions were not likely to obtain them husbands. They also were put up, and sold to the *lowest bidder*, as the poor were formerly disposed of, in our villages. Every unattractive maiden, young, old, and of no particular age, was put up, at a *maximum*, and bestowed on him, who would take her, with the smallest amount of dowry. It is quite possible, that certain lots may have been withdrawn.

I rather prefer this practice to that of the Spartans, which prevailed, about 884 B. C. At an appointed time, the marriageable damsels were collected, in a hall, perfectly dark; and the young men were sent into the apartment; walking, evidently, neither by faith nor by sight, but, literally, feeling their way, and thus selected their helpmates. This is in perfect keeping with the principle, that love is blind.

The ancient Greeks lived, and multiplied, without marriage. Eusebius, in the preface to his *Chronicon*, states, that marriage

ceremonies were first introduced among them, by Cecrops, about 1554 B. C. The Athenians provided by law, that no unmarried man should be entrusted with public affairs, and the Lacedemonians passed severe laws against those, who unreasonably deferred their marriage. It is not easy to reconcile the general policy of promoting marriages, with the statute, 8 William III., 1695, by which they were taxed; as they were again, in 1784.

The earliest celebration of marriages, in churches, was ordained by Pope Innocent III., A. D. 1199. Marriages were forbidden in Lent, A. D. 364, conforming, perhaps, to the rule of abstinence from flesh.

Fortune-hunting has not always been unaccompanied with violence. Stealing an heiress was made felony, by 3 Henry VII. 1487, and benefit of clergy denied, in such cases, by 39 Eliz. 1596. In the first year of George IV. 1820, this offence was made punishable by transportation. In the reign of William III., Captain Campbell forcibly married Miss Wharton, an heiress. The marriage was annulled, by act of Parliament, and Sir John Johnston was hanged, for abetting. In 1827, two brothers and a sister, Edward, William, and Frances Wakefield, were tried and convicted, for the felonious abduction of Miss Turner, an heiress, whose marriage with Edward Wakefield was annulled, by act of Parliament.

No species of fortune-hunter appears so entirely contemptible, as the wretch, who marries for money, intending to employ it, not for the joint comfort of the parties, but for the payment of his own arrears; and who resorts to the expedient of marriage, not to obtain a wife, but to avoid a jail. And the exultation is pretty universal, when such a vagabond falls, himself, into the snare, which he had so deliberately prepared, for another.

In the fifth volume of the Diary of Samuel Pepys, pages 323, 329 and 330, Lord Braybrooke has recorded three letters to Pepys, from an extraordinary scoundrel of this description. The first letter from this man, Sir Samuel Morland, who seems to have had some employment in the navy, bears date "Saturday, 19 February, 1686-7." After communicating certain information, respecting naval affairs, he proceeds, as follows:—

"I would have wayted on you with this account myself, but I presume you have, ere this time, heard what an unfortunate and

fatall accident has lately befallen me, of which I shall give you an abreviat."

"About three weeks or a month since, being in very great perplexities, and almost distracted for want of moneys, my private creditors tormenting me from morning to night, and some of them threatening me with a prison, and having no positive answer from his Majesty, about the £1300 which the late Lord Treasurer cutt off from my pension so severely, which left a debt upon me, which I was utterly unable to pay, there came a certain person to me, whom I had relieved in a starving condition, and for whom I had done a thousand kindnesses; who pretended, in gratitude to help me to a wife, who was a very vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady, and an heiress, who had £500 per ann. in land and inheritance, and £4000 in ready money, with the interest since nine years, besides a mortgage upon £300 per ann. more, with plate, jewels, &c. The devil himself could not contrive more probable circumstances than were layd before me; and when I had often a mind to enquire into the truth, I had no power, believing for certain reasons, that there were certain charms or witchcraft used upon me; and, withall, believing it utterly impossible that a person so obliged should ever be guilty of so black a deed as to betray me in so barbarous a manner. Besides that, I really believ'd it a blessing from Heaven for my charity to that person: and I was, about a fortnight since, led as a fool to the stocks, and married a coachman's daughter not worth a shilling, and one who, about nine months since, was brought to bed of a bastard; and thus I am both absolutely ruined, in my fortune and reputation, and must become a derision to all the world."

"My case is at present in the Spiritual Court, and I presume, that one word from his Majesty to his Proctor, and Advocate, and Judge, would procure me speedy justice; if either our old acquaintance or Christian pity move you, I beg you to put in a kind word for me, and to deliver the enclosed into the King's own hands, with all convenient speed; for a criminal bound and going to execution is not in greater agonies than has been my poor, active soul since this befell me: and I earnestly beg you to leave in three lines for me with your porter, what answer the King gives you, and my man shall call for it. A flood of tears blind my eyes, and I can write no more, but that I am your most humble and poor distressed servant,

S. MORLAND."

All that befell Sir Samuel and *Lady Morland*, after his application to Pepys and the King, will be found fully set forth, by this prince of fortune-hunters, in the two remaining letters to which I have referred, and which I purpose to lay before the reader in the ensuing number.

No. CXVI.

THE reader will remember, that we left Sir Samuel Morland, in deep distress, his eyes, to use his own words, in the letter to Pepys, *blinded by a flood of tears*. Of all fortune-hunters he was the most unfortunate, who have recorded, with their own hands, the history of their own most wretched adventures. Instead of marrying a "*vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady, with £500 per ann. in land, and £4000 in ready money, with plate, jewels, &c.*," he found himself in silken bonds, with a coachman's daughter, "not worth a shilling," who, nine months before, had been introduced to a new code of sensations, by giving birth to a child, whose father was of that problematical species, which the law terms *putative*.

I have promised to lay before the reader two additional letters, from Sir Samuel Morland, to Pepys, on the subject of his difficulties with Lady Morland. Here they are: the first will be found, in Pepys' Diary, vol. v. page 329.

"17 May, 1688. Sir: Being of late unable to go abroad, by reason of my lame hip"—no wonder he was hipped—"which gives me great pain, besides that it would not be safe for me, at present, because of that strumpet's"—*Lady Morland's*—"debts, I take the boldness to entreat you, that, according to your wonted favors, of the same kind, you will be pleased, at the next opportunity, to give the King this following account."

"A little before Christmas last, being informed, that she was willing, for a sum of money, to confess in open court a pre-contract with Mr. Cheek, and being at the same time assured, both by hir and my own lawyers, that such a confession would be sufficient for a sentence of nullity, I did deposit the money, and accordingly a day of tryall was appoynted; but after the cause had been pleaded, I was privately assured, that the Judge

was not at all satisfyd with such a confession of hers, as to be sufficient ground for him to null the marriage, and so that design came to nothing."

"Then I was advised to treat with her, and give her a present sum and a future maintenance, she giving me sufficient security never to trouble mee more; but her demands were so high, I could not consent to them."

"After this she sent me a very submissive letter, by her own advocate. I was advised, both by several private friends, and some eminent divines, to take her home, and a day of treaty was appoynted for an accommodation."

"In the interim, a certain gentleman came on purpose, to my house, to assure me that I was taking a snake into my bosome, forasmuch as she had for six months last past, to his certain knowledge, been kept by, and cohabited with Sir Gilb. Gerrard, as his wife, &c. Upon which making further enquiry, that gentleman furnishing me with some witnesses, and I having found out others, I am this term endeavoring to prove adultery against her, and so to obteyn a divorce, which is the present condition of your most humble and faithful servant,

SAMUEL MORLAND."

It was fortunate, that Sir Samuel, whose *naïveté* and rascality are most amusingly mingled, did not take the "*snake into his bosome*," notwithstanding the advice of those "*eminent divines*," whose counsel is almost ever too celestial, for the practical occasions of the present world.

The issue of Sir Samuel's fatal plunge into the abyss of matrimony, in pursuit of "£500 per annum in land and £4000 in ready money," and of all that befell the Lady Morland, until she lost her title, is recorded, in the third and last letter to Peypys, in vol. v., page 330.

"19 July, 1688. Sir: I once more begg you to give yourself the trouble of acquainting His Majesty that upon Munday last, after many hott disputes between the Doctors of the Civil Law, the sentence of divorce was solemnly pronounced in open Court against that strumpet"—*Lady Morland*—"for living in adultery with Sir Gilbert Gerrard, for six months last past; so that now, unless shee appeal, for which the law allows her 15 days, I am freed from her for life, and all that I have to do, for the future, will bee to gett clear of her debts, which she has contracted from the day of marriage to the time of sentence, which is like to give me no small trouble, besides the charge, for sev-

erall months in the Chancery. And till I gett cleared of these debts, I shall bee little better than a prisoner in my own house. Sir, believing it my duty to give His/Majesty this account of myselfe and of my proceedings, and having no other friend to do it for mee, I hope you will forgive the trouble thus given you, by, yours, &c.,

S. MORLAND."

This must have interested His Majesty, very deeply. Poor James had then enough of care. If he had possessed the hands of Briareus, they would have been full already. In less than four months, after the date of this letter, William of Orange had landed at Torbay, Nov. 5, 1688, and the last days of the last of the Stuarts were at hand.

If Miss Bungs were living, even that inexorable hater of all fortune-hunters would admit, that the punishment of Sir Samuel Morland was sufficient for his crimes. Few will pretend, that his sufferings were more than he deserved. A more exact retribution cannot well be imagined. It was his intention to apply "*£4000 ready money*," belonging to "*a very vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady*," to the payment of his pre-contracted debts. Instead of effecting this honorable purpose, he becomes the husband of a low-born strumpet, who is not worth a shilling, and for whose debts, contracted before, as well as after marriage, he is liable; for the law decrees, that a man takes his wife and her circumstances together.

There are few individuals, of either sex, however constitutionally grave, who have not a little merriment to spare, for such happy contingencies as these. Retributive justice seldom descends, more gracefully, or more deservedly, or more to universal acceptance, upon the crafty heads of unprincipled projectors. For all, that may befall him, the fortune-hunter has little to expect, from male or female sympathy. The scolding tongue—those bewitching tresses, nocturnally deposited on the bedpost—those teeth of pearly brilliancy, which Keep or Tucker could so readily identify—the perpetual look of distrust—the espionage of jealousy—these and all other *tormina domestica* are the allotments of the fortune-hunter, by immemorial prescription, and without the slightest sympathy, from man or woman.

The case of Sir Samuel Morland is a valuable precedent, on account of his station in society, and the auto-biographical character of the narrative. But there are very few of us, who have not the record of some similar catastrophe, within the

compass of our knowledge, though, probably, of a less aggravated type.

There is a pleasant legend, in the humbler relations of life, to which I have listened, in earlier days, and which illustrates the principle, involved in these remarks. Molly Moodey was an excellent cook, in the family of an avaricious old widower, whose god was mammon, and who had been deterred, by the expensiveness of the proceeding, from taking a second goddess.

The only sentiment, in any way resembling the tender passion, which had ever been awakened, in the bosom of Molly Moodey, was a passion for lotteries.

She gave such of her waking hours, as were not devoted to roasting and boiling, to the calculation of chances, and her sleeping hours to the dreaming of dreams, about £20,000: and by certain combinations, she had come to the conclusion, that No. 26,666 was the fortunate number, in the great scheme, then presented to the public.

Molly avowed her purpose, and demanded her wages, which, after severely berating her, for her folly, were handed over, and the identical ticket was bought. With the hope of being the first to inform her, after the drawing, that her ticket was a blank, her old master noted down the number, in his tablets.

In about seven weeks after this occurrence, the old gentleman, while reading the newspaper, in one of the public offices, came upon the following notice—"HIGHEST PRIZE! £20,000. No. 26,666 the fortunate number, sold at our fortunate office, in one entire ticket, SKINNER, KETCHUM, & CLUTCH, and will be paid to the lucky proprietor, after the 27th current."

The old gentleman took out his tablets; compared the numbers; wiped his spectacles; collated the numbers again; resorted to the lottery office; and, upon inquiry there, became satisfied, that Molly Moodey had actually drawn £20,000.

A new code of sensations came over the spirit of his dreams. He hastened home, oppressed by the heat and his emotions. He bade Molly lay aside her mop, and attend him in the parlor, as he had something of importance to communicate.—"Molly," said he, after closing the doors—"I find a partner absolutely necessary to my happiness. Let me be brief. I am not the man to make a fool of myself, by marrying a young flirt. I have known you, Molly, for many years. You have what I prize above all things in a wife, solid, substantial qualifications. Will you have me?"

Taken thus by surprise, she gave a striking evidence of her self-possession, by requesting leave of absence, for a moment, to remove a kettle of fat, which she was trying out, lest it should boil over. She soon came back, and turned her eye—she had but one—with great respect, upon her old master—said something of the difference of their stations—and consented.

The old gentleman's attachment for Molly appeared to be very extraordinary. Until the wedding-day, which was an unusually early one, he would not suffer her to be out of his sight. The day came—they were married. On their way from church—"Molly," said the bridegroom, "whereabouts is your ticket, with that fortunate number?"—"Oh," she replied, "when I came to think of it, I saw, that you were right. I thought, 'twas quite likely it would draw a blank. Crust, the baker, offered me what I gave for it, and a sheet of bunn, to boot, and I let him have it, three weeks ago."—"Good God," exclaimed the poor old gentleman—"£20,000 for a sheet of bunn!"

The shock was too much for his reason; and, in less than six weeks, Molly was a widow. She attended him, with great fidelity, to the last moment; and his dying words were engraven upon her heart—"Twenty thousand pounds for a sheet of bunn!"

How true to reality are the gay words of Tom Moore—

"In wedlock a species of lottery lies,
Where in blanks and in prizes we deal."

No. CXVII.

THE Archbishop of Cambray, the amiable Fenelon, has remarked, that God shows us the high value he sets upon time, by giving us, in absolute possession, one instant only, leaving us, in utter uncertainty, if we shall ever have another. And yet, so little are we disturbed, by this truly momentous consideration, that, long before the breath is fairly out of the old year's body, we are found busily occupied, in gathering chaplets, for the brows of the new one.

The early Christians were opposed to New Year's Gifts, as fixedly, as some of the latter Christians are opposed to the song

and the dance. But I am inclined to believe the rising generation will take steps, very like their fathers—that light fantastic tongues and toes, will continue to wag, to all eternity—and that the unmusical and rheumatic will deplore over such heterodox and ungodly proceedings, till the world shall be no more.

The New Year's gifts of the Romans were, originally, exceedingly simple. Sprigs of vervain, gathered in a wood, consecrated to Strenia, the goddess of Strength, somehow or other, came into favor, and were accounted of good omen. A custom arose of sending these sprigs about the neighborhood, as tokens of friendship, on New Year's day; and these trifling remembrancers obtained the name of *Strenæ*. These sprigs of vervain, ere long, wore out their welcome; and were followed, in after years, by presents of dates, figs and honey. Clients thus complimented their patrons; and, before many anniversaries, the coin of Rome began to mingle with the donative, whatever it might be; and, very soon, the advantage of the receiver came less to be consulted, than the reputation of him, who gave.

When I contemplate those ample storehouses of all, that is gorgeous and glittering—those receptacles of useless finery, which nobody actually wants—and, at the same time, reflect upon all that I know, and much that I conjecture, of the necessities and distresses of mankind, I am not certain, that it may not be wise to resume the earlier custom of the Romans, and embody, in certain cases, our annual tokens of friendship and good will, in such useful materials, as *figs, dates and honey*.

Are there not individuals, who, upon the reception of some gaudy and expensive bagatelle, are ready to exclaim, with the cock in *Æsop*—“*I had rather have one grain of dear, delicious, barley, than all the jewels under the sun!*”

I am not so utopian, as to anticipate any immediate or very extensive reformation, in this practice, which, excellent as it is, when restrained within reasonable bounds, is, unquestionably, under certain circumstances, productive of evil. It is not to be expected, that expensive *bijoux*, for new year's gifts, will speedily give place to *sugar and molasses*. But there are cases, not a few, when, upon a new year's day, the wealthy giver, without paining the recipient, may convert the annual compliment, into something better than a worthless toy—a fantastical token of ostentatious remembrance.

The Christian world has settled down, at last, upon the first of January, as New Year's day. It was not always thus; and, even now, no little difficulty occurs, in our attempts to refer historical events to particular years. We can do no better, perhaps, than to devote this number to a brief exposition of this difficulty.

Every schoolboy knows, that Romulus divided the year into ten months. The first was March, and, from March to December, they have retained their original names, for some six and twenty centuries, excepting the fifth and sixth month, which, from *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*, have been changed, in honor of *Julius* and *Augustus*.

Numa added two months, *Januarius* and *Februarius*. Numa's year consisted therefore of twelve months, according to the moon's course. But Numa's lunar year did not agree with the course of the sun, and he therefore introduced, every other year, an *intercalary* month, between the 23d and 24th of February. The length of this month was decided by the priests, who lengthened or shortened the year, to suit their convenience. Cicero, in a letter to Atticus, x. 17, writes, in strong disfavor, of Numa's calendar.

Julius Cæsar, with the aid of Sosigenes of Alexandria, adjusted this astronomical account. To bring matters into order, Suetonius, in his life of Julius Cæsar, 40, says, they were constrained to make one final year of fifteen months, to close the confusion.

Hence arose the Julian or Solar year, the year of the Christian world. The "*alteration of the style*" is only an amendment of the Julian calendar, in one particular, by Pope Gregory, in 1582. In 325, A. D., the vernal equinox occurred March 21, and in 1582 it occurred March 10. He called the astronomers to council, and, by their advice, obliterated ten days from the current year, between October 4, and 15.

These ten days make the difference, from 1582 to February 29, 1700. From March 1, 1700, to February 29, 1800, eleven days were required, and from March 1, 1800, to February 29, 1900, twelve days. In all Roman Catholic countries, this alteration of the style was instantly adopted; but not in Great Britain, till 1752. The Greeks and Russians have never adopted the Gregorian alteration of the style.

The commencement of the year has been assigned to very different periods. In some of the Italian states, as recently as 1745, the year has been taken to commence, at the Annuncia-

tion, March 25. Writers of the sixth century have, occasionally, like the Romans, considered March 1 as New Year's day. Charles IX. by a special edict, in 1563, decreed, that the year should be considered to commence, on the first of January. In Germany, about the eleventh century, the year commenced at Christmas. Such was the practice, in modern Rome, and other Italian cities, as late as the fifteenth century.

Gervais of Canterbury, who lived early in the thirteenth century, states, that all writers of his country considered Christmas the true beginning of the year. In Great Britain, from the twelfth century, till the alteration of the style in 1752, the Annunciation, or March 25, was commonly considered the first day of the year. After this, the year was taken to commence, on the first of January.

The Chaldean and Egyptian years commenced with the Autumnal equinox. The Japanese and the Chinese date their year from the new moon, nearest the Winter solstice.

As Diemschid, king of Persia, entered Persepolis, the sun happened to be entering into Aries. In commemoration of this coincidence, he decreed, that the year should change front, and commence, forever more, in the Vernal, instead of the Autumnal equinox. The Swedish year, of old, began, most happily, at the Winter solstice, or at the time of the sun's reëpppearance in the horizon, after the usual *quarantine*, or absence of forty days. The Turks and Arabs date the advent of their year, upon the sixteenth of July.

In our own country, the year, in former times, commenced in March. In the Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. xvii. p. 136, may be found certain votes, passed in Boston, Nov. 30, 1635, among which is the following—"that all such as have allotments for habitations allotted unto them, shall build thereon, before the first of the first month next, called March." In Johnson's Wonder-working Providence, ch. 27, the writer says of the Boston pilgrims, in 1633: "Thus this poor people, having now tasted liberally of the salvation of the Lord, &c. &c., set apart the 16 day of October, which they call the *eighth Moneth*, not out of any peevish humor of singularity, as some are ready to censor them with, but of purpose to prevent the Heathenish and Popish observation of Dayes, Moneths, and Yeares, that they may be forgotten, among the people of the Lord." If October was their *eighth* month, March was necessarily their *first*. Whatever the practice

may have been, in this respect, it was by no means universal, in New England, during a considerable period, before the alteration of the style in 1752.

A reference to the record will show, that, until 1752, the old style was adhered to, by the courts, in this country, and the 25th of March was considered to be New Year's day. But it was not so with the public journals. Thus the Boston News Letter, the Boston Gazette, the New England Courant and other journals, existing here, before the adoption of the new style, in Great Britain, in 1752, considered the year, as commencing on the first of January.

Private individuals very frequently did the same thing. At this moment, a letter from Peter Faneuil is lying at my elbow, addressed to Messrs. Lane and Smethurst of London, bearing date January 1, 1739, at the close of which he wishes his correspondents *a happy new year*, showing, that the first of January, for ordinary purposes, and in common parlance, was accounted New Year's day.

The little people, of both sexes, would, doubtless, have voted for the adoption of the old style and of the new; in other words, for having two new year's days, in every year. They would have been as much delighted with the conceit, as was Rousseau, with the pleasant fancy of St. Pierre, who wrote, from the Isle of France, to a friend in Paris, that he had enjoyed two summers in one year; the perusal of which letter induced Rousseau, to seek the acquaintance of the author of Paul and Virginia.

No. CXVIII.

DION remarks, while speaking of Trajan—*he that lies in a golden urn, eminently above the earth, is not likely to rest in peace.* The same thing may be affirmed of him, who has raised himself, eminently above his peers, wherever he may lie. During the Roman Catholic rage for relics, the graves were ransacked, and numberless sinners, to supply the demand, were dug up for saints. Sooner or later, the finger of curiosity, under some plausible pretext, will lift the coffin lid; or the foot of political sacrilege will trample upon the ashes of him, whom a former

generation had delighted to honor; or the motiveless spirit of mischief will violate the sanctity of the tomb.

When Charles I. was buried, in the same vault with Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, a soldier, as Wood relates, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iv. p. 39, Lond. 1820, attempted to steal a royal bone, which was afterwards found upon his person, and, which he said, upon examination, he had designed, for a handle to his knife.

John Milton died, according to the respective accounts of Mitford, Johnson, and Hayley, on the 8th—about the 10th—or on the 15th of November, 1674. He was buried, in the chancel of St. Giles, Cripplegate. In the *London Monthly Magazine*, for August, 1833, there appeared an extract from the diary of General Murray, giving a particular account of the desecration of Milton's remains. The account was given to General Murray, at a dinner party, Aug. 23, 1790, by Mr. Thornton, who received it, from an eye-witness of the transaction. The church of St. Giles requiring repairs, the occasion was thought a proper one, to place a monument, over the body of Milton. Messieurs Strong, Cole, and others, of that parish, sought for, and discovered, the leaden coffin, the outer coffin of wood having mouldered away. Having settled the question of identity, these persons replaced the coffin, and ordered the workmen to fill up the grave. The execution of this order was postponed, for several days. In the interim, some of the parish, whose names are given, by General Murray, having dined together, and become partially drunk, resolved to examine the body; and proceeded, with lights, to the church. With a mallet and chisel, they cut open the coffin, rolled back the lead, and gazed upon the bones of John Milton! General Murray's diary shall relate the residue of a proceeding, which might call the rouge to the cheeks of a Vandal:—

“The hair was in an astonishingly perfect state; its color a light brown, its length six inches and a half, and, although somewhat clotted, it appeared, after having been well washed, as strong as the hair of a living being. Fountain said he was determined to have two of his teeth; but as they resisted the pressure of his fingers, he struck the jaw, with a paving stone, and several teeth then fell out. There were only five in the upper jaw, and these were taken by Fountain; the four, that were in the lower jaw, were seized upon, by Taylor, Hawkesworth, and the sexton's man. The hair, which had been carefully combed,

and tied together, before the interment, was forcibly pulled off the skull, by Taylor and another; but Ellis, the player, who had now joined the party, told the former, that being a good hair-worker, if he would let him have it, he would pay a guinea-bowl of punch. Ellis, therefore, became possessed of all the hair: he likewise took a part of the shroud, and a bit of the skin of the skull: indeed, he was only prevented from carrying off the head, by the sextons, Hoppy and Grant, who said, that they intended to exhibit the remains, which was afterwards done, each person paying sixpence to view the body. These fellows, I am told, gained near one hundred pounds, by the exhibition. Laming put one of the leg-bones in his pocket."

After reading this short, shameless record, one half inclines to cremation; even if, instead of being enshrined or inurned, our dust be given, in fee simple, to the winds. How forcibly the words of Sir Thomas ring in our ears—"To be gnawed out of our graves, to have our skulls made drinking bowls, and our bones turned into pipes, to delight and sport our enemies, are tragical abominations, escaped in burning burials." The account from General Murray's diary, and at greater length, may be found also, in the appendix to Mitford's life of Milton, in the octavo edition of his poetical works, Cambridge, Mass., 1839.

Great indignation has lately been excited, in England, against a vampyre of a fellow, named Blore, who is said to have destroyed one half of Dryden's monument, and defaced Ben Jonson's, and Cowley's, in Westminster Abbey. Inquiring after motive, in such cases, is much like raking the ashes, after a conflagration, to find the originating spark. There is a motive, doubtless, in some by-corner of the brain; whether a man burns the temple, at Ephesus; or spears the elephant of Judas Maccabæus, with certain death to himself; or destroys the Barberrini vase. The motive was avowed, on the trial, in a similar case, by a young man, who, some years ago, shot a menagerie elephant, while passing through a village, in the State of Maine, to be a wish "*to see how a fellow would feel, who killed an elephant.*"

Dryden's, and Cowley's monuments are on the left of Ben Jonson's, and before you, as you approach the Poet's Corner. Dryden's monument is a lofty affair, with an arch and a bust, and is thus inscribed: "J. Dryden, born 1632, died May 1,

1700.—John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, erected this monument, 1720." It is not commonly known, that the original bust was changed, by the Duchess, for one of very superior workmanship, which, of course, is the one mutilated by Blore. The monument, erected by George, Duke of Buckingham, to Cowley, is a pedestal, bearing an urn, decorated with laurel, and with a pompous and unmeaning epitaph, in Latin hexameters. If Blore understood the language, perhaps he considered these words, upon the tablet, a challenge—

———Quis temerarius ausit—
Sacrilega turbare manu venerabile bustum.

The monument of Ben Jonson is an elegant tablet, with a festoon of masks, and the inscription—*Oh rare Ben Jonson!* It stands before you, when Dryden's and Cowley's are upon your left, and is next to that of Samuel Butler. In the north aisle of the nave, there is a stone, about eighteen inches square, bearing the same inscription. In the "History of Westminster Abbey," 4to ed Lond. 1812, vol. ii. p. 95, note, it is stated, that "Dart says one Young, afterwards a Knight in the time of Charles II., of Great Milton, in Oxfordshire, placed a stone over the grave of Ben Jonson, which cost eighteen pence, with the above inscription:" but it is not stated, that the stone, now there, is the same.

Dr. Johnson, in his Life of Dryden, recites what he terms "*a wild story, relating to some vexatious events, that happened, at his funeral.*" Dryden's widow, and his son, Charles, had accepted the offer of Lord Halifax, to pay the expenses of the funeral, and five hundred pounds, for a monument. The company came—the corpse was placed in a velvet hearse—eighteen coaches were in attendance, filled with mourners.—As they were about to move, the young Lord Jeffries, son of the Chancellor, with a band of rakes, coming by, and learning that the funeral was Dryden's, said the ornament of the nation should not so be buried, and proceeded, accompanied by his associates, in a body, to wait upon the widow, and beg her to permit him to bear the expense of the interment, and to pay one thousand pounds, for a monument, in the Abbey.

The gentlemen in the coaches, being ignorant of the liberal offers of the Dean and Lord Halifax, readily descended from their carriages, and attended Lord Jeffries and his party to the

bedside of the lady, who was sick, where he repeated his offers; and, upon her positive refusal, got upon his knees, as did the whole party; and he there swore that he would not rise, till his entreaty was granted. At length, affecting to understand some word of the lady's, as giving permission, he rushed out, followed by the rest, proclaiming her consent, and ordered the corpse to be left at Russell's, an undertaker's, in Cheapside, till he gave orders for its embalment. During this proceeding, the Abbey having been lighted up, Lord Halifax and the Dean, who was also Bishop of Rochester, to use the tea-table phrase, waited and waited, and waited. The ground was opened, the choir attending, and an anthem set. When Mr. Dryden went, next day, to offer excuses, neither Lord Halifax, nor the Dean, would accept of any apology. After waiting three days for orders, the undertaker called on Lord Jeffries, who said he knew nothing about it, and that it was only a tipsy frolic, and that the undertaker might do what he pleased with the corpse. The undertaker threatened to set the corpse before the widow's door. She begged a day's respite. Mr. Charles Dryden wrote to Lord Jeffries, who replied, that he knew nothing about it. He then addressed the Dean and Lord Halifax, who refused to have anything to do with it. He then challenged Lord Jeffries, who refused to fight. He went himself, and was refused admittance. He then resolved to horsewhip his Lordship; upon notice of which design, the latter left town. In the midst of this misery, Dr. Garth sent for the body, to be brought to the college of physicians; proposed a subscription; and set a noble example. The body was finally buried, about three weeks after the decease, and Dr. Garth pronounced a fine Latin oration. At the close of the narrative, which, as repeated by Dr. Johnson, covers more than three octavo pages of Murphy's edition, the Doctor remarks, that he once intended to omit it entirely, and that he had met with no confirmation, but in a letter of Farquhar's.

The tale is simply alluded to, by Gorton, and told, at some length, by Chalmers. Both, however, consider it a fabrication, by Mrs. Thomas, the authoress, whom Dryden styled *Corinna*, and whom Pope lampooned, in his comatose and vicious performance, the *Dunciad*, probably because she provoked his wrath, by publishing his letters to H. Cromwell.

In the earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the tale is told, as sober matter of fact: in the last, Napier's, of

1842, it is wholly omitted. Malone, in his *Life of Dryden*, page 347, ascribes the whole to Mrs. Thomas.

Dryden died, in 1700. The first four volumes of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, containing Dryden's, went to the press in 1779. Considering the nature of this outrage; the eminence, not only of the dead, but of some of the living, whose names are involved; its alleged publicity; and its occurrence in the very city, where all the parties flourished; it is remarkable, that this "*wild story*," as Johnson fitly calls it, should have obtained any credit, and survived for nine-and-seventy years.

No. CXIX.

DEEPLY to be commiserated are all those, who have not read, from beginning to end, the writings of the immortal Oliver—a repast, *ab ovo usque ad mala*, to be swallowed, and inwardly digested, while our intellectual stomachs are young and vigorous, and to be regurgitated, and chewed over, a thousand times, when the almond tree begins to flourish, and even the grasshopper becomes a burden. Who does not remember his story of the Chinese matron—the widow with the great fan!

The original of this pleasant tale is not generally known. The brief legend, related by Goldsmith, is an imperfect epitome of an interesting story, illustrating the power of magic, among the followers of Laou-keun, the founder of a religious sect, in China, resembling that of Epicurus.

The original tale was translated from the Chinese, by Père Dentrecolles, who was at the head of the French missionaries, in China, and died at Peking, in 1741. The following liberal version, from the French, which may, perhaps, be better called a paraphrase, will not fail, I think, to interest the reader.

Wealth, and all the blessings it can procure, for man, are brief and visionary. Honors, glory, fame are gaudy clouds, that flit by, and are gone. The ties of blood are easily broken; affection is a dream. The most deadly hate may occupy the heart, which held the warmest love. A yoke is not worth wearing, though wrought of gold. Chains are burdensome, though adorned with jewels. Let us purge our minds; calm our pas-

sions; curb our wishes; and set not our hearts upon a vain world. Let our highest aim be liberty—pleasure.

Chuang-tsze took unto himself a wife, whose youth and beauty seduced him from the busy world. He retired, among the delightful scenery of Soong, his native province, and gave himself up, entirely, to the delights of philosophy and love. A sovereign, who had become acquainted with the fame of Chuang-tsze, for superior wisdom, invited him to become his wuzzeer, or prime minister. Chuang-tsze declined, in the language of parable—"A heifer," said he, "pampered for the sacrifice, and decked with ornaments, marched triumphantly along, looking, as she passed, with mingled pride and contempt, upon some humble oxen, that were yoked to the plough. She proudly entered the temple—but when she beheld the knife, and comprehended that she was a victim, how gladly would she have exchanged conditions with the humblest of those, upon whom she had so lately looked down with pity and contempt."

Chuang-tsze walked by the skirts of the mountain, absorbed in thought—he suddenly came among many tombs—the city of the dead. "Here then," he exclaimed, "all are upon a level—* caste is unknown—the philosopher and the fool sleep, side by side. This is eternity! From the sepulchre there is no return!"

He strolled among the tombs; and, ere long, perceived a grave, that had been recently made. The mound of moistened clay was not yet thoroughly dry. By the side of that grave sat a young woman, clad in the deepest mourning. With a white fan, of large proportions, she was engaged, in fanning the earth, which covered this newly made grave. Chuang-tsze was amazed; and, drawing near, respectfully inquired, who was the occupant of that grave, and why this mourning lady was so strangely employed. Tears dropped from her eyes, as she uttered a few inaudible words, without rising, or ceasing to fan the grave. The curiosity of Chuang-tsze was greatly excited—he ascribed her manner, not to fear, but to some inward sense of shame—and earnestly besought her to explain her motives, for an act, so perfectly novel and mysterious.

After a little embarrassment, she replied, as follows: "Sir, you behold a lone woman—death has deprived me of my beloved husband—this grave contains his precious remains. Our love was very great for each other. In the hour of death, his

agony, at the thought of parting from me, was immoderate. These were his dying words—"My beloved, should you ever think of a second marriage, it is my dying request, that you remain a widow, at least till my grave is thoroughly dry; then you have my permission to marry whomsoever you will." And now, as the earth, which is quite damp still, will take a long time to dry, I thought I would fan it a little, to dissipate the moisture."

Chuang-tsze made great efforts, to suppress a strong disposition to laugh outright, in the woman's face. "She is in a feverish haste," thought he. "What a hypocrite, to talk of their mutual affection! If such be love, what a time there would have been, had they hated each other."

"Madam," said the philosopher, "you are desirous, that this grave should dry, as soon as possible; but, with your feeble strength, it will require a long time, to accomplish it; let me assist you." She expressed her deep sense of the obligation, and rising, with a profound courtesy, handed the philosopher a spare fan, which she had brought with her. Chuang-tsze, who possessed the power of magic, struck the ground with the fan repeatedly; and it soon became perfectly dry. The widow appeared greatly surprised, and delighted, and presented the philosopher with the fan, and a silver bodkin, which she drew from her tresses. He accepted the fan only; and the lady retired, highly gratified, with the speedy accomplishment of her object.

Chuang-tsze remained, for a brief space, absorbed in thought; and, at length, returned slowly homeward, meditating, by the way, upon this extraordinary adventure. He sat down in his apartment, and, for some time, gazed, in silence, upon the fan. At length, he exclaimed—"Who, after having witnessed this occurrence, can hesitate to draw the inference, that marriage is one of the modes, by which the doctrine of the metempsychosis is carried out. People, who have hated each other heartily, in some prior condition of being, are made man and wife, for the purpose of mutual vexation—that is it, undoubtedly."

The wife of the philosopher had approached him, unobserved; and, hearing his last words, and noticing the fan, which he was still earnestly gazing upon—"Pray, be so good, as to inform me," said she, "what is the meaning of all this; and where, I should like to know, did you obtain that fine fan, which appears to interest you so much?" Chuang-tsze, very faithfully, nar-

rated to his wife the story of the young widow, and all the circumstances, which had taken place, at the tomb.

As soon as the philosopher had finished the narrative, his wife, her countenance inflamed with the severest indignation, broke forth, with a torrent of contemptuous expressions, and unmeasured abuse, against the abominable, young widow. She considered her a scandal to her sex. "Aye," she exclaimed, "this vile widow must be a perfect monster, devoid of every particle of feeling."

"Alas," said the philosopher, "while the husband is in the flesh, there is no wife, that is not ready to flatter and caress him—but no sooner is the breath out of his body, than she seizes her fan, and forthwith proceeds to dry up his grave."

This greatly excited the ire of his wife—"How dare you talk in this outrageous manner," said she, "of the whole sex? You confound the virtuous with such vile wretches, as this unprincipled widow, who deserves to be annihilated. Are you not ashamed of yourself, to talk in this cruel way? I should think you might be restrained, by the dread of future punishment."

"Why give way," said Chuang-tsze, "to all this passionate outcry? Be candid—you are young, and extremely beautiful—should I die, this day—do you pretend, that, with your attractions, you would suffer much time to be lost, before you accepted the services of another husband?"

"Good God," cried the lady, "how you talk! Who ever heard of a truly faithful wuzzeer, that, after the death of his master, served another prince? A widow *indeed* never accepts a second partner. Did you ever know a case, in which such a wife as I have been—a woman of my qualities and station, after having lost her tenderly beloved, forsook his memory, and gave herself to the embraces of a second husband! Such an act, in my opinion, would be infamous. Should you be taken from me, today, be assured, that I should follow you, with my imperishable love, and die, at last, your disconsolate widow."

"It is easy to promise, but not always so easy to perform," replied the philosopher. At this speech, the lady was exasperated—"I would have you to know," said she, "that women are to be found, without much inquiry, quite as noble-hearted and constant, as *you* have ever been. What a pattern of constancy you have been! Dear me! Only think of it! When your first wife died, you soon repaired your loss: and, becoming

weary of your second, you obtained a divorce from her, and then married me! What a constant creature you have been! No wonder you think so lightly of women!" Saying this, she snatched the fan out of her husband's hand, and tore it into innumerable pieces; by which act she appeared to have obtained very considerable relief; and, in a somewhat gentler tone, she told her husband, that he was in excellent health, and likely to live, for very many years; and that she could not, for the soul of her, see what could induce him to torment her to death, by talking in this manner.

"Compose yourself, my dear," said Chuang-tsze, "I confess that your indignation delights me. I rejoice to see you exhibit so much feeling and fire, upon such a theme." The wife of the philosopher recovered her composure; and their conversation turned upon ordinary affairs.

Before many days, Chuang-tsze became suddenly and severely attacked, by some unaccountable disease. The symptoms

No. CXX.

LET us continue the story of Chuang-tsze, the great master of magic.

Before many days, as I have stated, Chuang-tsze became suddenly and severely attacked, by some unaccountable disease. The symptoms were full of evil. His devoted wife was ever near her sick husband, sobbing bitterly, and bathing him in tears. "It is but too plain," said the philosopher, "that I cannot survive—I am upon the bed of death—this very night, perhaps—at farthest, tomorrow—we shall part forever—what a pity, that you should have destroyed that fan—it would have answered so well, for the purpose of drying the earth upon my tomb!"

"For heaven's sake," exclaimed the weeping wife, "do not, weak and feeble as you are, harass yourself, with these horrible fancies. You do me great wrong. Our books I have carefully perused. I know my duties well. You have received my troth—it shall never be another's. Can you doubt my sincerity! Let me prove it, by dying first. I am ready." "Enough," said the philosopher—"I now die in peace—I am satisfied of

your constancy. But the world is fading away—the cold hand of death is upon me.” The head of Chuang-tsze fell back—the breath had stopped—the pulse had ceased to beat—he was already with the dead.

If the piercing cries of a despairing, shrieking widow could have raised the dead, Chuang-tsze would have arisen, on the spot. She sprang upon the corpse, and held it long, in her fond embrace. She then arrayed her person in the deepest mourning, a robe of seamless white, and made the air resound with her cries of anguish and despair. She abjured food; abstained from slumber; and refused to be comforted.

Chuang-tsze had the wide-spread fame of an eminent sage—crowds gathered to his obsequies. After their performance, and when the vast assemblage had all, well nigh, departed—a youth of comely face, and elegantly arrayed, was observed, lingering near the spot. He proclaimed himself to be of most honorable descent, and that he had, long before, declared to Chuang-tsze his design of becoming the pupil of that great philosopher. “For that end,” said he, “and that alone, I have come to this place—and behold Chuang-tsze is no more. Great is my misfortune!”

This splendid youth cast off his colored garments, and assumed the robes of lamentation—he bowed himself to the earth, before the coffin of the defunct—four times, he touched the ground with his forehead; and, with an utterance choked by sobs, he exclaimed—“Oh Chuang-tsze, learned and wise, your ill-fated disciple cannot receive wisdom and knowledge from your lips; but he will signify his reverence for your memory, by abiding here an hundred days, to mourn, for one he so truly revered.” He then again bent his forehead, four times, to the earth, and moistened it with his tears.

The youthful disciple, after a few days, desired permission to offer his condolence to the widow, which she, at first declined: but, upon his reference to the ancient rites, which allow a widow to receive the visits of her late husband’s friends, and especially of his disciples, she finally consented. She moved with slow and solemn steps to the hall of reception, where the young gentleman acquitted himself, with infinite grace and propriety, and tendered the usual expressions of consolation.

The elegant address and fine person of this young disciple were not lost upon the widow of Chuang-tsze. She was fas-

minated. A sentiment of tenderness began to rise in her bosom, whose presence she had scarcely the courage to recognize. She ventured, in a right melancholy way, to suggest a hope, that it was not his purpose immediately to leave the valley of Soong. "I have endured much in the loss of my great master," he replied. "Precious forever be his memory. It will be grateful to my heart to seek here a brief home, wherein I may pass those hundred days of mourning, which our rites prescribe, and then to take part in the obsequies, which will follow. I may also solace myself the while, by perusing the works of my great master, of whose living instructions I am so unhappily deprived."

"We shall feel ourselves highly honored, by your presence, under our roof," replied the lady; "it seems to me entirely proper, that you should take up your abode here, rather than elsewhere." She immediately directed some refreshments to be brought, and caused the works of Chuang-tsze to be exhibited, on a large table, together with a copy of the learned Taou-te-King, which had been a present to her late husband, from Laou-keun himself.

The coffin of Chuang-tsze was deposited, in a large hall; and, on one side, was a suite of apartments, opening into it, which was assigned to the visitor. This devoted widow came, very frequently, to weep over the remains of her honored husband; and failed not to say a civil word to the youth, who, notified of her presence, by her audible sobs, never omitted to come forth, and mingle his lamentations with hers. Mutual glances were exchanged, upon such occasions. In short, each, already, was effectually smitten with the other.

One day, the pretty, little widow sent privately for the old domestic, who attended upon the young man, in the capacity of body servant, and inquired, all in a seemingly casual way, if his master was married. "Not yet"—he replied.—"He is very fastidious, I suppose"—said the lady, with an inquiring look.—"It is even so, madam," replied the servant—"my master is, indeed, not easily suited, in such a matter. His standard is very high. I have heard him say, that he should, probably, never be married, as he despaired of ever finding a female resembling yourself, in every particular."—"Did he say so?" exclaimed the widow, as the warm blood rushed into her cheeks.—"He certainly did," replied the other, "and much more, which I do not feel at liberty to repeat."—"Dear me," said the widow,

"what a bewitching young man he is! go to him, and if he really loves me, as you say, tell him he may open the subject, without fear, for his passion is amply returned, by one, who is willing, if he so wishes, to become his wife."

The young widow, from day to day, threw herself repeatedly, and as if by accident, into the old servant's way; and began, at last, to feel surprised, and somewhat nettled, that he brought her no message from his master. At length, she became exceedingly impatient, and asked him directly, if he had spoken to his master on the subject. "Yes, madam," the old man replied.—"And pray," asked the widow, eagerly, "what said he?"—"He said, madam, that such an union would place him upon the pinnacle of human happiness; but that there was one fatal objection."—"And do, for pity's sake, tell me," said she, hastily interrupting the old man, "what that objection can be."—"He said," rejoined the old domestic, "that, being a disciple of your late husband, such a marriage, he feared, would be considered scandalous."—"But," said she, briskly, "there is just nothing in that. He was never a disciple of Chuang-tse—he only proposed to become one, which is an entirely different thing. If any other frivolous objections arise, I beg you to remove them; and you may count upon being handsomely rewarded."

Her anxiety caused her to become exceedingly restless. She made frequent visits to the hall, and, when she approached the coffin, her sobs became more audible than ever—but the young disciple came not forth, as usual. Upon one occasion, after dark, as she was standing near the coffin, she was startled, by an unusual noise. "Gracious Heaven!" she exclaimed, "can it be so! Is the old philosopher coming back to life!" The cold sweat came upon her lovely brow, as she started to procure a light. When she returned, the mystery was readily explained. In front of the coffin there was a table, designed as an altar, for the reception of such emblems and presents, as were placed there by visitors. The old servant, had become tipsy, and finding no more convenient place, in which to bestow himself, while waiting his master's bidding, he had thrown himself, at full length, upon this altar; and, in turning over, had occasioned the noise, which had so much alarmed the young widow. Under other circumstances, the act would have been accounted sacrilegious, and the fellow would have been subjected to the bastinado. But, as matters stood, the widow passed it by, and even suffered the *sot* to remain undisturbed.

On the morning of the following day, the widow encountered the old domestic, who was passing her, with as much apparent indifference, as though she had never entrusted him, with any important commission. Surprised by his behavior, she called him to her private apartment.—“Well,” said she, “have you executed the business, which I gave you in charge?”—“Oh,” said he, with an air of provoking indifference, “that is all over, I believe.”—“How so,” inquired the widow—“did you deliver my message correctly?”—“In your own words,” he replied—“my master would make any sacrifice to make you his wife; and is entirely persuaded, by your arguments, to give up the objection he stated, in regard to his being the disciple of Chuang-tsze; but there are three other objections, which it will be impossible to overcome; and which his sense of delicacy forbids him to exhibit before you.”—“Poh, poh,” said the widow, “let me hear what they are, and we shall then see, whether they are insurmountable or not.”—“Well, madam,” said the old man, “since you command me, I will state them, as nearly as I can, in the words of my young master. The first of these three objections is this —”

No. CXXI.

WE were about to exhibit those three objections of the young disciple, to his marriage, with the widow of Chuang-tsze, when we were summoned away, by professional duties. Let us proceed—“The first of my master’s objections,” said the old domestic, is this—“the coffin of Chuang-tsze is still in the hall of ceremony. A sight, so sad and solemnizing, is absolutely inconsistent with the nuptial celebration. The world would cry out upon such inconsistency. In the second place, the fame of your late husband was so great—his love for you so devoted—yours for him so ardent and sincere, and founded, so obviously, upon his learning and wisdom—that my master fears it will be impossible for him, to supply the place of so good, and so great, a man; and that you will, ere long, despise him, for his inferiority; and that your affections will be entirely and unchangeably fixed, on the memory of the great defunct. The third and last

objection, named by my master, whose passion for you knows no bounds, is serious indeed. Though of lofty pedigree, he is very poor. He has neither money nor lands; and has not the means of purchasing those marriage gifts, which custom requires him to offer."

"And are these the only objections?" said she. "There are no others," he replied; "if it were not for these insurmountable objections, the happiness of my master would be complete, and he would openly manifest that passion, by which he is now secretly consumed."

"They are, by no means, insurmountable," said the young widow, with animation. "As for the coffin, what is it? A mere shell, containing the remains of poor Chuang-tsze. It is not absolutely necessary, that it should remain in the hall, during these one hundred days. At the farther end of my garden is an ancient smoke-house. It is quite dilapidated, and no longer in use. Some of my people shall carry the coffin thither, without farther delay. So you may inform your sweet, young master, that his first objection will be instantly removed. And why should he distress himself so needlessly, in regard to the second? Chuang-tsze certainly passed, with the world, for a great philosopher, and a wonderful man. The world sees from a distance. A sort of haze or mist impedes its vision. Minute particulars escape its observation. That, which is smooth and fair, seen from afar, may appear full of inequalities to one, who is near at hand. God forbid, that I should undervalue the dead; but it is well known, that Chuang-tsze repudiated his second wife, because she did not precisely suit his humor, and then married me. His great reputation induced a certain sovereign, to appoint him his chief minister. But the philosopher was not deficient in shrewdness—he knew his incapacity, and resolved to hide himself, in that solitude, where we have vegetated, so long."

"About a month ago, he encountered a young widow, who, with a large fan, was endeavoring to dry up her husband's grave, because she could not marry again, under the condition her husband had imposed upon her, until this was done. Chuang-tsze, if you will believe it, made the acquaintance of this shameless woman; and actually assisted her, in drying up her husband's grave. She gave him a fan, as a keepsake; and he valued it highly. I got possession of it however, and tore it to tatters. You see how great my obligations are to this wonderful philoso-

pher; and you may judge of the real affection, which I must feel, for the memory of such a man."

"The last objection," continued the widow, "is easily disposed of. I will furnish your master with all the means he can desire. Chuang-tsze, to do the man justice, has left me the absolute mistress of an ample fortune—here, present these twenty taels to your master, from me, with such expressions of devotion, as may befit the lips of one, whose heart is all his own; and say to him, unless he himself is desirous of a longer delay, that, as the whole of life is not too long for love, I shall be happy, if he desires it, to become his bride, this very day."

Thus far the course of true love, in despite of the proverb, certainly ran smooth.

"Here," said the young disciple, upon sight of the twenty taels, as he turned them over, "is something substantial—run back immediately to the widow, and tell her my passion will endure the curb no longer. I am entirely at her disposal." The widow was quite beside herself, upon receiving these tidings; and, casting off her garments of heaviness, she began to embellish her fine person. The coffin of Chuang-tsze, by her directions, was immediately transferred to the old smoke-house.

The hall was made ready, for the approaching nuptials. If murmurs occasionally arose, among the old, faithful domestics of Chuang-tsze, the widow's passion was more blind than moonless midnight, and deafen than the time-stricken adder. A gorgeous feast was made ready. The shades of evening drew on apace—the lanterns were lighted up, in all directions—the nuptial torch cast forth its bright beams from an elevated table.

At the appointed signal, the bridegroom entered, most skilfully and splendidly arrayed,—so that his fine, manly figure was exhibited, to the greatest advantage. The young widow soon appeared, her countenance the very tabernacle of pleasure, and her bewitching form, adorned in the most costly silks, and splendid embroidery. They placed themselves, side by side, in front of the hymeneal taper, arrayed in pearls, and diamonds, and tissue of gold. Those salutations, which custom demands, having been duly performed, and the bride and bridegroom having wished each other eternal felicity, in that manner, which the marriage rites prescribe, the bridegroom holding the hand of the bride, they proceeded to the festal hall; and having drunk from the goblet of mutual fidelity, they took their places, at the banquetting board.

The repast went joyously forward—the darkest cloud—how suddenly will it come over the smiling face of the bewitching moon! The festival had not yet passed, when the bridegroom fell to the floor, in horrible convulsions. With eyes turned upward, and mouth frightfully distorted, he became an object of horror. The bride, whose passion for the young disciple was ardent and sincere, screamed aloud. She threw herself, in all her bridal array, upon the floor, by his side; clasped him in her arms; covered him with kisses; and implored him, to say what she could do, to afford him relief. Miserable youth! He was unable to reply, and seemed about to expire.

The old domestic rushed into the apartment, upon hearing the noise, and taking his master from the floor, proceeded to shake him with violence. "My God," cried the lady, "has this ever happened before?" "Yes, Madam," he replied, "he has a return of it about once, in every year." "And, for Heaven's sake, tell me what remedies do you employ?" she eagerly inquired. "There is one sovereign remedy," the old man replied; "his physician considers it a specific." "And what is it? tell me, in the name of Confucius," she passionately exclaimed, for the convulsions were growing more violent. "Nothing will restore him, but the brains of a man, recently dead, taken in warm wine. His father, who was governor of a province, when his son was last attacked, in this way, caused a criminal to be executed, that his brains might be thus employed." "Good God!" exclaimed the agonizing bride, for the convulsions, after a short remission, were returning, with redoubled violence, and the bridegroom was foaming terribly, at the mouth. "Tell me instantly, will the brains of a man who died a natural death answer as well?" "Undoubtedly," the old servant replied. "Well then," said she, in a tone somewhat subdued—"there is Chuang-tsze in the smoke-house." "Ah, Madam," said the old domestic, "I am aware of it—it occurred to me—but I feared to suggest it." "And of what possible use," she exclaimed, "can the brains of old Chuang-tsze be to him now, I should like to know?"

At this moment, the convulsions became absolutely terrific. "These returns," said the old man, "will become more and more violent, till they destroy my poor master. There is no time to be lost." The wretched bride rushed from the apartment, and, seizing a hatchet, which happened to be lying in the

outer passage, she hastily made her way to the old smoke-house. Elevating the hatchet above her head, she struck a violent blow, on the lid of the coffin.

If the whole force of the blow had descended upon a secret spring, the lid could not have risen more suddenly. It seemed like the power of magic. The bride turned her eyes upon the closed lids of the corpse—they gradually opened; and the balls were slowly turned, and steadily fixed, upon her. In an instant Chuang-tsze sat, bolt upright, in his coffin! She sent forth a shriek of terror—the hatchet fell from her paralyzed hand—the cold sweat of confusion gathered thickly upon her brow.

"My beloved wife," said the philosopher, with perfect calmness, "be so obliging as to lend me your hand, that I may get out.—I have had a charming nap," continued he, as he took the lamp from her hand, and advanced towards the hall. She followed, trembling at every step, and dreading the meeting, between the old philosopher and the young disciple.

Though the air of unwonted festivity, under the light of the waning tapers, still hung over the apartment, fortunately the youth and the old servant seemed to have departed. Upon this, her courage, in some measure, revived, and, turning a look of inexpressible tenderness upon Chuang-tsze—"Dearest husband," said she, "how I have cherished your memory! My day thoughts and dreams have been all of you. I have often heard, that the apparent dead were revived, especially if not confined within closed apartments. I therefore caused your precious coffin to be removed, where the cool, refreshing air could blow over it. How I have watched, and listened, for some evidence of returning life! And how my heart leaped into my mouth, when my vigilance was at last rewarded. I flew with a hatchet to open the coffin; and, when I saw your dear eyes turned upon me, I thought I should"—"I can never repay your devotion," said the philosopher, interrupting her, with an expression of ineffable tenderness, "but why are you thus gaily apparelled—why these robes—these jewels—my love?"

"It seemed to me, my dear husband," she readily replied, "that some invisible power assured me of your return to life. How, thought I, can I meet my beloved Chuang-tsze, in the garments of heaviness? No; it will be like a return of our wedding day; and thus, you see, I have resumed my bridal array, and the jewels you gave me, during our honeymoon."—"Ah,"

said the philosopher, "how considerate you are—you always had your thoughts about you." He then drew near the table. The wedding taper, which was then burning low in its socket, cast its equivocal rays upon the gorgeous bowls and dishes, which covered the festal board. Chuang-tsze surveyed them attentively, in silence; and, calling for warm wine, deliberately drained the goblet, while the lady stood near him, trembling with confusion and terror.

At length, setting down the goblet, and pointing his finger—"Look behind you!" he exclaimed. She turned her head, and beheld the young disciple, in his wedding finery, with his attendant—a second glance, and they were gone. Such was the power of this mighty master of magic. The wife slunk to her apartment; and, resolving not to survive her shame and disappointment, unloosened her wedding girdle, and ascending to the garret, hung herself therewith, to one of the cross-beams, until she was dead. Tidings were soon brought to Chuang-tsze, who, deliberately feeling her pulse, and ascertaining that she was certainly dead, cut her down, and placed her precious remains, in the coffin, in the old smoke-house.

He then proceeded to indulge his philosophical humor. He sat down, among the flickering lamps, at the solitary board, and struck up a dirge, accompanying his voice, by knocking with the chopsticks, and whatever else was convenient to his purpose, upon the porcelain bowls and dishes, which he finally broke into a thousand pieces, and setting fire to his mansion, he consumed it to ashes, together with the smoke-house, and all its valuable contents.

He then, abandoning all thoughts of taking another wife, travelled into the recesses of Latinguin, in pursuit of his old master, Laoukeun, whom, at length, he discovered. There he acquired the reputation of a profound philosopher; and lay down, at last, in the peaceful grave, where wicked widows cease from troubling, and weary widowers are at rest.

No. CXXII.

A GRASSHOPPER was not the crest of Peter Faneuil's arms. I formerly supposed it was ; for a gilded grasshopper, as half the world knows, is the vane upon the cupola of Faneuil Hall ; and a gilded grasshopper, as many of us well remember, whirled about, of yore, upon the little spire, that rose above the summer-house, appurtenant to the mansion, where Peter Faneuil lived, and died. That house was built, and occupied, by his uncle, Andrew ; and he had some seven acres, for his garden thereabouts. It was upon the westerly side of old *Treamount* Street, and became the residence of the late William Phillips, whose political relations to the people of Massachusetts, as their Lieutenant Governor, could not preserve him from the sobriquet of *Billy*.

I thought it not unlikely, that Peter's crest was a grasshopper, and that, on that account, he had become partial to this emblem. But I am duly certified, that it was not so. The selection of a grasshopper, for a vane, was made, in imitation of their example, who placed the very same thing, upon the pinnacle of the Royal Exchange, in London. The arms of the Faneuils I have seen, upon the silver castors, which once were Peter's own ; and, upon his decease, became the property of his brother, Benjamin, from whom they descended to his only daughter, Mary Faneuil, who became, October 13, 1754, the wife of George Bethune, now deceased ; and was the mother of George Bethune, Esquire, who will complete his eighty-second year, in April, 1851. From this gentleman, whose grand-uncle Peter Faneuil was, and from other descendants of old Benjamin Faneuil, of Rochelle, I have received some facts and documents—interesting to me—possibly to others.

In conversation with an antiquarian friend, not long ago, we agreed, that very much less was generally known of Peter Faneuil, than of almost any other great, public benefactor. His name, nevertheless, is inseparably associated, with the cradle of American liberty. Drs. Eliot and Allen, in their Biographical Dictionaries, have passed him over, very slightly, the former finishing up this noble-hearted Huguenot, with fifteen lines ; and the latter, with eight ; while not a few of their pages have been

devoted, to the very dullest doctors of the drowsiest theology, and to—

“Names ignoble, born to be forgot.”

Mr. Farmer, in his Genealogical Register, does not seem to be aware, that the name of Faneuil existed, for he has not even found a niche for it there. His Register, I am aware, purports to be a register of the “*First Settlers*.” But he has found room for the Baudouins (Bowdoin) and their descendants. They also were Huguenots; and came hither, with the Faneuils, after 1685. One of that family, as will be more fully shown, Claude Baudoin, presented Peter Faneuil in baptism. Yet, such was the public sense of Peter's favors, *when they were green*, that John Lovell—that same Master Lovell, who retired with the British army, in 1776—delivered, under an appointment of the town, an oration, to commemorate the virtues, and laud the munificence of Peter Faneuil. Such, in truth, was the very first occasion, upon which the citizens were summoned to listen to the voice of an orator, in Faneuil Hall; and then, in honor of him, who perfected the noble work, at his own proper cost, and whose death so speedily followed its completion—for a noble work assuredly it was, relatively to the times, in which it was wrought.

The Faneuils were Huguenots. The original pronunciation of this patronymic must have been somewhat different from the present: there was an excusable *naïveté*, in the inquiry of a rural visitant of the city—if a well known mechanical establishment, with a tall, tubular chimney, were not *Funnel* Hall?

After the revocation of the edict of Nantes, by Louis XIV., in 1685, the Faneuils, in common with many other Huguenots of France,—the Baudouins, the Bernons, the Sigourneys, the Boudinots, the Pringles, the Hugers, the Boutineaus, the Jays, the Laurenses, the Manigaults, the Marions, the Prioleaus, and many others, came to these North American shores—as our pilgrim fathers came—to worship God, in security, and according to their consciences. Many of these persecuted men conferred, upon their adopted home, those blessings, which the exercise of their talents, and the influence of their characters, and of the talents and characters of their descendants have confirmed to our common country, for many generations.

They came, by instalments, and arrived at different points. Thirty families of these expatriated Protestants came hither, and settled upon a tract, eight miles square, in the “Nipmug coun-

try," where now stands the town of Oxford, in the County of Worcester. This settlement commenced, in Gov. Dudley's time, and under his particular auspices; but continued only till 1696, when it was broken up, by the inroads of the savages. In the overthrow of this settlement, rum was a material agent, and occasioned, though upon a very small scale, a second massacre of some of these Huguenots. There is a letter to Gov. Dudley, from M. Bondet, the Huguenot clergyman, dated July 6, 1691, complaining bitterly of the unrestricted sale, among the Indians, of this fatal fire water; and giving a graphic account of the uproar and outrage it produced.

After the failure of this attempt, many of the scattered planters collected, in Boston. For several years, they gathered, for devotional purposes, in one of the larger school-houses. Jan. 4, 1704, they purchased a piece of land, in South School Street, of John Mears, a hatter, for "£110 current silver money of New England;" but, for several years, the selectmen, for some cause, unknown to us, refused their consent, that these worthy French Protestants should build their church thereon. About twelve years after the purchase of the land, the little church—the visible temple—went up. It was of brick, and very small. Monsieur Pierre Daillé was their first pastor, André Le Mercier the second; and, if there be any truth, in tradition, these Huguenot shepherds were pure and holy men. Daillé died testate, May 20, 1715. His will bears date May 15, of that year. He directs his body to be interred, at the discretion of his executor, James Bowdoin, "*with this restriction, that there be no wine at my funeral, and that none of my wife's relations have mourning cloaths.*" He empowers his executor to give them gloves; and scarfs and gloves to all the ministers of Boston. To his wife, Martha, he gives £350, Province bills, and his negro man, Kuffy. His Latin and French books he gives to the French Church, as *the nucleus of a library*. £100 to be put at interest for the use of the minister. £10 to be improved by the elders, for the use of the church, and should a meeting-house be built, then in aid of that object. To John Rawlins the French schoolmaster, £5. He then makes his brother Paul, of Armsfort, in Holland, residuary legatee. His "*books and arms*" were appraised at £2. 10. The whole estate at £274. 10. sterling.

Le Mercier dedicated his book, on Detraction, to his people. Therein he says, "You have not despised my youth, when I first

came among you ; you have since excused my infirmities ; and, as I did the same, in respect to yours, it has pleased our Saviour, the head of his church, to favor us with an uninterrupted peace and union in our church, for the almost eighteen years that I have preached the word of salvation to you." His book was published in 1733. He therefore became their pastor between 1715, when Dailé died, and 1716. He died March 31, 1764, aged 71. He was therefore born in 1693, and ordained about the age of 22.

Le Mercier's will is dated, at Dorchester, Nov. 7, 1761. A codicil was added, at Boston, Feb. 3, 1764. He left his estate to his four children, "*Andrew, Margaret, Jane, and my son Bartholomew, if living.*" He enjoins upon his heirs the payment of Bartholomew's debt to Thomas Hancock, for which he had become responsible, and which he had partly paid. By his will, he appointed Jane and Margaret to execute his will. In the codicil, he refers to the disordered state of Margaret's mind, and appoints Zachariah Johonnot, in her stead, requesting him to be her guardian. The whole estate was appraised at £232. 18. 6. sterling.

Years rolled on : juxtaposition and intermarriage were Americanising these Huguenots, from month to month ; and, ere long, they felt, less and less, the necessity of any separate place of worship. On the 7th of May, 1748, "Stephen Boutineau, the only surviving elder," and others, among whom we recognize the Huguenot names of Johonnot, Packinett, Boudoin, and Sigourney, conveyed their church and land to Thomas Fillebrown, Thomas Handyside Peck, and others, trustees for the "new congregational church, whereof Mr. Andrew Croswell is pastor." After a while, this church became the property of the Roman Catholics ; and mass was first celebrated there, Nov. 2, 1788. The Catholics, in 1803, having removed to Franklin Place, the old Huguenot church was taken down ; and, upon the site of it, a temple was erected, by the Universalists ; showing incontrovertibly, thank God, that the soil was most happily adapted to toleration.

The reader fancies, perhaps, that I have forgotten Peter Fanueil. Not so : but I must linger a little longer with these Huguenots, who attempted a settlement in the Nipmug country. In the southwesterly part of Oxford, there rises a lofty hill, whose summit affords an extensive and delightful prospect. Beneath,

at the distance of a mile, or more, lies the village of Oxford; and the scenery, beyond, is exceedingly picturesque. Upon this eminence, which now bears the name of Mayo's Hill, are the well-defined remains of an ancient fort. Its construction is perfectly regular. The bastions are clearly marked; and the old well, constructed within the barrier, still remains. As recently, as 1819, says the Rev. Dr. Holmes, in his able and interesting account of the Huguenots, "grapevines were growing luxuriantly, along the line of this fort; and these, together with currant bushes, roses, and other shrubbery, nearly formed a hedge around it. There were some remains of an apple orchard. The currant and asparagus were still growing there."

Such were the vestiges of these thirty families, who, in 1696, fled from a foe, not more savage and relentless, though less enlightened, than the murderers of Coligny, in 1572.

The Faneuils formed no part of these thirty families; but, not many years after the little Oxford colony was broken up, and the fugitive survivors had found their way to Boston, the Faneuils, one after another, seem to have been attracted hither, from those points of our country, where they first arrived, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes, in 1685, or from other, intermediate stations, to which they had removed.

There are not elements enough, I fear, for a very interesting memoir of Peter Faneuil. The materials, even for a brief account, are marvellously few, and far between; and the very best result, to be anticipated, is a warp and woof of shreds and patches.

But, if I am not much mistaken, I know more of Peter Faneuil, than Master Lovell ever wot of, though he delivered the funeral oration; and, albeit the sum total is very small, it seems but meet and right, that it should be given to the world. I think it would so be decided, by the citizens, if the vote were taken, this very day—in *Faneuil Hall*.

Our neighbors, all over the United States have heard of *Faneuil Hall*; and, though, of late years, since we have had a race, or breed, of mayors, every one of whom has endeavored to be *worthier* or more *conceding* than his predecessor, Faneuil Hall has been converted into a sort of omnibus without wheels; yet the glory of its earlier, and of some, among its latter days, is made, thank God, of that unchangeable stuff, that will never shrink, and cannot fade.

No man has ever heard of Faneuil Hall, who will not be pleased to hear somewhat of that noble-minded, whole-souled descendant of the primitive Huguenots—and such indeed he was—who came, as a stranger and sojourner here, and built that hall, at his own proper cost and charge, and gave it—the gift of a cheerful giver—to those, among whom he had come to dwell—and all this, in the midst of his days, in the very prime of his life, not waiting for the almond tree to flourish, and for desire to fail, and for the infirmities of age to admonish the rich man, that he must set his house in order, and could carry nothing with him, to those regions beyond.

Faneuil Hall has been called the *Cradle of Liberty*, so long and so often, that it may seem to savor of political heresy, to quarrel with the name—but, for the soul of me, I cannot help it. If it be intended to say, that Faneuil Hall is the *birth place* of Liberty, I am not aware of a single instance, on record, of a baby, *born in a cradle*. The proverbial use of the cradle has ever been to rock the baby to sleep; and Heaven knows our old fathers made no such use of Faneuil Hall, in their early management of the bantling; for it was an ever-wakeful child, from the very moment of its first, sharp, shrill, life cry.

No. CXXIII.

GENERAL Jackson has been reported—how justly I know not—upon some occasion, in a company of ladies, to have given a brief, but spirited, description of all his predecessors, in the Presidential chair, till he came down to the time of President Tyler, when, seizing his hat, he proceeded to bow himself out of the room. The ladies, however, insisted upon his completing the catalogue—“*Well, ladies,*” said he, “*it is matter of history, and may therefore be spoken—President Tyler, ladies, was—pretty much nothing.*”

A very felicitous description; and not of very limited application to men and things. I cannot find a better, for Master John Lovell's funeral oration, upon Peter Faneuil. This affair, which Dr. Snow, in his history of Boston, calls “*a precious relic,*” is certainly a wonderfully flatulent performance. A time-stained

copy of the original edition of 1743 lies under my eye. I hoped, not unreasonably, that it would be a lamp to my path, in searching after the historical assets of Peter Faneuil. But not one ray of light has it afforded me; and, with one or two exceptions, in relation to the *Hall*, and the general beneficence of its founder, it is, in no sense, more of a funeral oration, upon Peter Faneuil, than upon Peter Smink. In their vote of thanks to Master Lovell, passed on the day of its delivery, the committee speak of "*his oration*," very judiciously abstaining from all unwarrantable expletives. From this oration we can discover nothing of Faneuil's birth-place, nor parentage, nor when, nor whence, nor wherefore he came hither; nor of the day of his birth, nor of the day of his death, nor of the disease of which he died; nor of his habits of life, nor of the manner, in which he acquired his large estate; nor of his religious opinions, nor of his ancestors.

We collect, however, from these meagre pages, that Mr. Faneuil meditated other benefactions to the town—that his death was sudden—that votes of thanks had been passed, for his donation of the Hall, "a few months before"—that the meeting, at which the oration was pronounced, March 14, 1742, was the very first annual meeting, in Faneuil Hall—that Peter Faneuil was the owner of "a large and plentiful estate"—that "no man managed his affairs with greater prudence and industry"—that "he fed the hungry and clothed the naked; comforted the fatherless and the widows, in their affliction, and his bounty visited the prisoner."

Master Lovell, not inelegantly, observes of Faneuil's intended benefactions, which were prevented by his death—"His intended charities, though they are lost to us, will not be lost to him. Designs of goodness and mercy, prevented as these were, will meet with the reward of actions." This passage appears to have found favor, in the eyes of the late Dr. Boyle, who has, accordingly, on page 21, of his memoir of the Boston Episcopal Charitable Society, when speaking of Faneuil, made a very free and familiar appropriation of it, with a slight verbal variation.

Master Lovell's fervent aspirations, in regard to Faneuil Hall, one hundred and nine years ago, have not been fulfilled, to the letter. The gods have granted the orator's prayer—"May Liberty always spread its joyful wings over this place"—but not with Master Lovell's conditions annexed; for he adds—"May

LOYALTY to a KING, under whom we enjoy that Liberty, ever remain our character."

In this particular, Master Lovell was not to be indulged. Yet he steadily adhered to his tory principles; and, like many other conscientious and honorable men, whom it is much less the fashion to abuse, at present, than it was, of yore, adhered to his royal master; and relinquished his own sceptre, as monarch of the South Grammar School, with all the honors and emoluments thereof, choosing rather to suffer affliction, with his thwarted and mortified master, than to enjoy the pleasures of rebellion, for a season. He retired to Halifax, with the British army, in 1776, and died there, in 1778.

Original copies of Master Lovell's oration are exceedingly rare; though the "*precious relic*" has been reprinted, by Dr. Snow, in his history of Boston. The title may be worth preserving—"A funeral oration, delivered at the opening of the annual meeting of the town, March 14th, 1742. In Faneuil Hall, in Boston. Occasioned by the death of the founder, Peter Faneuil Esq. By John Lovell, A. M., Master of the South Grammar School, in Boston. *Sui memores alios fecere merendo*. Boston, printed by Green, Bushell & Allen, for S. Kneeland & T. Green, in Queen Street, 1743."

As an eminent historian conceived it to be a matter of indifference, at which end he commenced his history, I shall not adhere to any chronological arrangement, in the presentation of the few facts, which I have collected, relating to Peter Faneuil and his family. On the contrary, I shall begin at the latter end, and, first, endeavor to clear up a little confusion, that has arisen, as to the time of his death. Allen, in his Biog. Dic., says, that Peter Faneuil died, March 3, 1743. I am sorry to say, that, in several instances, President Allen's *dates* resemble Jeremiah's *figs*, in the second basket; though, upon the present occasion, he is right, on a certain hypothesis. In a note to the "Memoir of the French Protestants," also, M. H. C. vol. xxii. p. 55, Peter Faneuil is said to have died, March 3, 1743. Pemberton, in his "Description of Boston," Ibid. v. 3, p. 253, by stating that the funeral oration was delivered, March 14, 1742, makes 1742 the year of Faneuil's death. The title page of the oration itself, quoted above, fixes the death, in 1742. Dr. Eliot, in his Biog. Dic., says 1742. The Probate records of Suffolk show administration granted, on Peter Faneuil's estate, March 18, 1742. His *obit*, on a mourning ring, that I have seen, is 1742.

Now, if all dealers in dates, of the olden time, would discriminate, between the old style and the new, we should be spared a vast deal of vexation; and the good people of Boston, notional as they proverbially are, would not appear, in their creditable zeal to do honor to a public benefactor, to have given him a funeral oration, a twelve month before he was dead. If the year be taken to begin, on the first of January, then Dr. Allen is right; and Peter Faneuil died March 3, 1743. But if it did not begin, till the twenty-fifth of March, and, legally, it certainly did not, before 1752, when the new style was adopted, in Great Britain, and the Provinces, then Eliot, and Pemberton, and the title page of the oration, and the records of the court, and the mourning ring are right, and Peter Faneuil died, in 1742.

An illustration of this principle may be found, on the title page of the oration itself. It is stated to have been delivered, March 14, 1742, and printed in 1743. Having been delivered near the close of the year 1742, it was printed, doubtless, soon after March 25, which was New Year's day for 1743.

The public journals, nevertheless, seem to have adopted, and adhered to the idea, that January 1, was the first day of the historical year, long before the style was altered; and thus, in the *Weekly News Letter*, published in Boston, Faneuil is stated to have died, in 1743. This journal contains an obituary notice. A few imperfect numbers of this paper are all that remain, and its extreme rarity leads me to copy the obituary here:—

“Thursday, March 10, 1743. On Thursday last, dyed at his seat in this Town, PETER FANEUIL, Esq., whose remains, we hear, are to be enterred this afternoon; a gentleman, possessed of a very ample fortune, and a most generous spirit, whose noble benefaction to this town, and constant employment of a great number of tradesmen, artificers and labourers, to whom he was a liberal paymaster; whose hospitality to all, and secret unbounded chirity to the poor—made his life a public blessing, and his death a general loss to, and universally regretted by, the inhabitants; who had been so sensible of their obligations to him, for the sumptuous edifice, which he raised at his private expence, for their Market house and Town Hall, that, at a general town meeting, as a testimony of their gratitude, they voted, that the place of their future consultations should be called by his name forever: in doing which they perpetuated their own honor as much as his memory; for, by this record posterity will know

the most publick spirited man, in all regards, that ever yet appeared on the Northern continent of America, was a member of their community."

In the Boston Evening Post of March 7, 1743, in a brief notice of Peter Faneuil's death, the disease of which he died is said to have been "*dropsey*."

Now that we have established the period of Peter's death, it may be well, to establish the period of his birth; and this we can do, with certainty, even to an hour, from authentic documents. In addition to other means, for ascertaining dates, and various particulars, respecting Peter Faneuil, and the members of his family—through the kindness of the Genealogical Society, I have, before me, a folio volume of his commercial correspondence: mutilated, indeed it is, by some thoughtless hand, but furnishes some curious and interesting matter. Many of his letters are written in French; and those, which are in English, are well composed. I have found but a single instance, in which he writes our language, like a Frenchman. Upon that occasion, he was in a passion with a certain judge of the admiralty, complained of his ill usage, and charged him with "*capporice*."

No. CXXIV.

I AM indebted to Mr. Charles Faneuil Jones, a grandson of Mary Ann Jones, Peter Faneuil's sister, for the use of some ancient papers, and family relics; and to George Bethune, Esquire, of Boston, the grandson of *Benjamin Faneuil*, Peter's brother, for the loan of a venerable document—time worn, torn, and sallow—the record of the birth of Peter Faneuil, and of his brothers and sisters. This document, from its manifest antiquity, the masculine character of the hand writing, and the constant use of the parental expressions—*notre fils*—*notre fille*—I, at first, supposed to be the original autograph of *Benjamin*, the father of Peter. This conjecture was, of course, demolished, by the last entry, on the record, which is of old *Benjamin's* de-
cease, but in the same peculiar hand.

The document is in French; and, after a careful comparison—*literatim*—with the volume of Peter's commercial cor-

respondence, now in my possession—I have very little doubt, that this record was copied, by Peter, from the paternal original, with the additional entry, by himself, of the date of his father's death. At the bottom, and beneath a line of separation, and by another hand, with a fresher ink, is the following entry—" *Le 6 D'Aout 1725, M. Gillam Phillips de Boston a epousee ma Fille Marie Faneuil agée de dix sept et quatre mois.*" The 6th of August, 1725, Mr. Gillam Phillips, of Boston, married my daughter, Marie, aged seventeen and four months. The expression *ma fille*, shows this entry to have been made by Peter's mother, then the widow of *Benjamin*, who appears, by this record, to have died, at New York, March 31, 1718-9, aged 50 years and 8 months.

This unusual prænomen, *Gillam*, I, at first, supposed to be a corruption of *Guillaume*. But there was a merchant, of that day, in Boston, bearing the name of *Gillam Phillips*. In the Registry of Deeds, for Suffolk, lib. 43, fol. 13, there is recorded a deed, from "*Wentworth Paxton, and Faith, his wife, formerly Faith Gillam,*" in which, reference is made to Faith's father, *Benjamin Gillam*. Mr. Gillam Phillips is thus named, in the will of his wife's uncle, Andrew Faneuil, to which I shall have occasion to refer. Jan 22, 1738, Peter, in a letter to Lane & Smethurst, of London, speaks of his brother-in-law, *Mr. Gillam Phillips*.

This gentleman was the elder brother of *Mr. Henry Phillips*, who was indicted, for killing Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, in a duel, fought with swords, and without seconds, on Boston Common, upon the evening of July 3, 1728. This extremely interesting affair cannot be introduced, as an episode here, on account of the space it must necessarily occupy. The original documents, relating to this encounter, which terminated in the immediate death of Mr. Woodbridge, have fallen into my possession; and, as Peter Faneuil personally assisted, in the escape of the survivor, who found a city of refuge, in Rochelle, and a friend and protector, in Peter's uncle, *Jean Faneuil*; it seems, in some degree, related to the history of Peter and his kinsfolk. I may, possibly, refer to it hereafter.

In 1685, the period of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, there were living, in or near Rochelle, in France, three brothers and two sisters of the Faneuil family. One of these, *Benjamin*, became the father of *our* Peter Fan-

euil—the others, his uncles and aunts, when the persecution commenced, so ably and touchingly described, by James Saurin, fled for safety to foreign lands. Andrew, the elder brother, escaped into Holland, and took up his abode in Amsterdam; where he married that preëminently beautiful lady, whose portrait is now in the possession of Col. Benjamin Hunt, whose mother was Jane Bethune, a daughter of Mary Faneuil, the niece of Peter.

Andrew Faneuil, before many years, came to this country—precisely when, I cannot say. That he was here, as early as 1709, is evident, from the proposals of Oliver Noyes and others, to build a wharf from the bottom of King Street, to low-water mark, “of the width of King Street, between Mr. East Apthorp’s and Mr. Andrew Faneuil’s.” These proposals are dated Feb. 20, 1709, and are inserted in Dr. Snow’s History of Boston, p. 209.

In Holland, doubtless, Andrew acquired that passion, for flowers, which he gratified, in his seven-acre Eden, on the westerly side of Treamount Street, where he is said to have erected the first hothouse, that ever existed in New England. His warehouse, the same, by him devised, for the support of the minister of the French Church, was at the lower end of King Street, near Merchant’s Row, from which Butler’s Wharf then extended, as laid down, by John Bonner, in 1722. This warehouse, under the will of Andrew, reverted, to his heirs, upon the extinction of the French Church. It was then, just where we find it, in the New England Weekly Journal, of Jan. 13, 1729. “*Good New York Flower. To be sold, at Mr. Andrew Faneuil’s Warehouse, at the lower end of King Street, at 35s per Hundred, as also good chocolate, just imported.*” He was engaged in commerce; and, for those days of small things, acquired a large estate, which his forecast taught him to distribute, among the public funds of France, England, and Holland. His warehouse was purchased of one of his descendants, by the late John Parker.

Jean Faneuil, another of Peter’s uncles, held fast to the faith of his fathers; and lived, and died, a Roman Catholic. He died in Rochelle, of apoplexy, June 24, 1737, about four months after the decease of his brother Andrew, as appears by Peter’s letter of Sept. 8, 1737. ●

Susannah Faneuil also continued, in the Roman Catholic

faith, and remained in Rochelle; where she became the wife, and the widow, of Abraham de la Croix. She survived her brother Andrew, the date of whose decease is clearly shown to have been Feb. 13, 1737, by Peter's letter to S. & W. Baker, of London, giving them the inscription, "*for the handsomest mourning rings.*"

Jane Faneuil was a Huguenot. She became the wife of Pierre Cossart, and took refuge, with her husband, in Ireland, where she died.

Benjamin Faneuil, the father of our Peter, was closely associated with that little band of Huguenots, who clustered about the town of Narragansett, otherwise called Kingstown, and the region round about, at the very close of the seventeenth century. In that village, in 1699, he married a French lady, whose name was Anne Bureau. The record, in Peter's transcript from his father's original, is now upon my table—"Le 28 de Juillet 1699. *Benjamin Faneuil et Anne Bureau ont été marié a Narragansett, en nouvelle Angleterre, en la maison de Mons. Pierre Ayross, par Mons. Pierre Daillé ministre de L'Eglise francoise de Boston.*" The 28th of July, 1699, Benjamin Faneuil and Ann Bureau were married at Narragansett, in New England, at the house of Mr. Peter Ayross, by Mr. Peter Daillé, minister of the French Church in Boston. Three years before, in 1696, Sept. 4, the name of this Benjamin Faneuil will be found, M. H. C., xxii. 60, attached to a certificate, in favor of Gabriel Bernon, referring to the massacre of John Johnson and his three children, at New Oxford. Johnson had married the sister of old *André Sigournay*.

This *Benjamin Faneuil*, the præpositus, or stirps, became the father of eleven children, by his wife, *Anne Bureau*, who were all born in New Rochelle, in the State of New York, and of whom our Peter was the first born. Their names, in the order of birth, are these—*Peter, Benjamin, Francis, Anne, Anne, Marie, John, Anne, Susannah, Mary Anne, and Catherine*. The two first Annes, John, and Catherine, died in infancy.

The birth of our Peter is thus chronicled, in the family record—"Le 20 de Juin, 1700, *Estant Jeudy a 6 heures du soir est né nostre fils Pierre Faneuil, et a été baptisé le 14 Juillet, par M. Peyret, ministre de l'Eglise francoise de la Nouvelle York, présenté au Bâptême par M. Claude Baudoin et par Sa Mere.*" The 20th of June, 1700, being Thursday, at 6 o'clock

in the evening, was born our son, Peter Faneuil, and he was baptized the 14th of July, by Mr. Peyret, minister of the French Church, in New York; presented in baptism, by Mr. Claude Bowdoin and its mother.

Benjamin, our Peter's brother, was born Dec. 29, 1701. He was a merchant in Boston, about the time of his uncle Andrew's death, in 1737. Shortly after that event, he went to England, and France, and returned, about two years before the death of his brother Peter, in 1742-3, upon whose estate he administered. His nephew, Edward Jones, in a letter to his mother, June 23, 1783, informs her, that "*Uncle Faneuil seems to be growing very low; I think he will not continue long.*" He was then in his eighty-second year. He died in October, 1785.

After Peter's death, Benjamin resided in Brighton, then Cambridge, in the street, which now bears the family name, where he erected an expensive mansion, successively occupied, after his decease, by Messieurs Bethune, English, Parkman, and Bigelow. By his wife, Mary Cutler, he had three children, Benjamin, Mary, and Peter.

This Benjamin, nephew of our Peter, is the "*Benjamin Faneuil, junior*," whose name appears, among the signers of the "*Loyall Address*" to Gov. Gage on his departure Oct. 6, 1775. He left Boston for Halifax, with the British army, in March, 1776. He is the person, referred to, by Ward, in his *Memoirs of Curwen*—"the merchant of Boston, and with Joshua Winslow, consignee of one third of the East India Company's tea, destroyed in 1773, a refugee to Halifax, afterwards in England." He married Jane, daughter of Addington Davenport, by his first wife, Jane, who was the daughter of Grove Hirst, and sister of the Lady Mary Pepperell; and, with his wife, lived many years, abroad, chiefly in Bristol, England, which became the favorite resort of many refugees, and where he died. I have, in my possession, several of his letters, written to his relatives, during his exile. These letters are spiritedly written; and, to the very last, in the most perfect assurance, that the colonies must submit.

Mary, our Peter's niece, became the wife of George Bethune, Oct. 13, 1754, and died in 1797. A portrait, by Blackburn, of this beautiful woman, is in the possession of her son, George Bethune, Esquire, of Boston. After a very careful

inspection of this portrait, not long ago, I went directly to the rooms of the Historical Society, to compare it with the portrait there of her uncle Peter, to which it seems to me to bear a strong family resemblance. This portrait of Peter was presented to the Society, by Miss Jones, the grand niece of *our* Peter, now the wife of Dr. Cutter of Pepperell. It has been erroneously ascribed to Copley. If its manifest inferiority to the works of that eminent master were not sufficiently germane to this question—Copley was born in 1738, and not quite five years old, when Peter Faneuil died.

Peter, the youngest child of Benjamin, and, of course, the nephew of *our* Faneuil Hall Peter, who may be otherwise distinguished, as Peter the Great—was baptized, in Trinity Church, in Boston, in 1738, and entered the Latin School, in 1746. He entered into trade—went to Montreal—failed—resorted to the West Indies—and, after his father's death, returned to Boston.

No. CXXV.

LET us conclude our post mortem examination of the brothers and sisters of Peter Faneuil.

Francis, the third son of *Benjamin*, the old Rocheller, Peter's father, was born Aug. 21, 1703, of whom I know nothing, beyond the fact, that he was baptized, by M. Peyret, minister of the French church in New York, and presented "*par son grand pere, Francois Bureau, et Mad'selle Anne Delancey.*"

Mary, the eldest sister of *our* Peter, that came to maturity, was born April 16, 1708, and is the *Marie*, to whom I have already referred, as having married Mr. Gillam Phillips, Aug. 6, 1725. Their abode, before the revolution, was in the mansion, more recently occupied by Abiel Smith, at the corner of State and Devonshire Streets; or, as they are called, on Bonner's plan of 1722, King Street and Pudding Lane. Her husband was a refugee. After his death, she resided in Cambridge, Mass., where she died, in April, 1778.

Anne, the next, in order of time, was born Oct. 9, 1710, and married Addington Davenport. This fact is stated, by Peter, in a letter, of Sept. 26, 1738. This is the same gentleman, un-

doubtedly, to whom the ancient record of King's Chapel refers :
" Oct. 11, 1733. Voted, that the brass stand for the hourglass be lent to the church at Scituate, as also three Diaper napkins, provided the Rev. Mr. Addington Davenport, their minister, gives his note to return the same," &c. He was, afterwards, promoted, to be assistant minister of King's Chapel, in 1737, and Rector of Trinity Church, in 1740, and was, probably, the son of Addington Davenport, who was the Register of Deeds, for Suffolk, in 1706.

Susannah, the third sister of our Peter, in the order of birth, was born March 14, 1712, and became the wife of James Boutineau, the son of Stephen Boutineau, that "*only surviving elder*," who joined in the conveyance of the French Church, in 1748. James was a royalist; and, according to Ward's Curwen, died in exile. This marriage is also referred to, by Peter, in his letter of Sept. 26, 1738. Mr. James Boutineau was a lawyer, in Boston; and occupied the "*old Dorr house*," so called, in Milk Street.

Mr. Sabine, in his "*American Loyalists*," says *his fate is unknown, but he was in England, in 1777*. An original letter from his widow, "*Susanna Boutineau*," now before me, is dated *Bristol, Eng., Feb. 20, 1784*, and refers to the recent decease of her husband there.

Mary Ann was the last of Peter's sisters, that survived her infancy. She was born April 6, 1715, and died October, 1790. She became the wife of John Jones, who died at Roxbury, in 1767, and whose son, Edward, died in Boston, in 1835, at the age of 83. She was a refugee; and resided, for some time, in Windsor, Nova Scotia. She is omitted by Mr. Sabine, in his list of refugees; but named by Ward, page 444. A letter, from her son, Edward, dated at Boston, June 23, 1783, advises her, if desirous of returning, not to come directly to Boston, as the law was still in force; but first, to some other State, and thence to Boston.

Such were Peter Faneuil's brothers and sisters; with whom, so far as I have been able to ascertain, from his correspondence, and from all other sources, he appears to have maintained an amiable and becoming relation, as the file leader of the flock—the elder brother of the house: and it speaks a folio volume, in favor of Benjamin's equanimity, that he continued to fraternize, as the correspondence abundantly proves, that he did, in the most

cordial and affectionate manner, with his brother Peter, to whom uncle Andrew had, with the exception of a few legacies, willed the whole of his "*large and plentiful estate*," as Master Lovell calls it—while five vindictive shillings were all, that were found, after the death of this unforgiving, old gentleman, in the mouth of poor Benjamin's sack.

Uncle Andrew's testamentary phraseology, though not so anathematical, as that of some other obstinate, old uncles, is sufficiently uncivil, and even bitter, in relation to his "loving sister, Susannah," and his nephew, Benjamin.

But, of the will of Andrew Faneuil, and his motive—an exceedingly preposterous motive, to be sure, for cutting his adopted nephew off, with five shillings—in other words, of the cause, manner, and instrument, whereby Benjamin was put in the ablativè, I shall treat, more fully, hereafter.

There were collaterals of the Boston Faneuils, residing in St. Domingo, in 1738. There was then, in that island, a Benjamin Faneuil, to whom Peter addressed a letter of mere friendship, in the French language, informing him, that Peter's brother Benjamin was then in Europe. It was probably a son of the St. Domingo Benjamin, the "*Monsieur Fanneuil*," of whom Washington writes to the President of Congress, Feb. 20, 1777, Sparks, iv. 327, as having memorialized, for leave to raise and command troops. The application failed, principally, on the ground of his entire ignorance of the English language.

We have seen, that Peter Faneuil died, at the early age of forty-two. His premature decease becomes the more remarkable, when contrasted with the longevity of all his brothers and sisters, who lived beyond the period of infancy. Marie attained the age of seventy—Susannah was living, in Bristol, at seventy-two—Mary Ann died at seventy-five—Benjamin died, in October, 1785, being two months less than eighty-four years old.

This veteran had been a generous liver, all his days. He was not a man, whose devotion was abdominal—whose God was his belly. He was no anchorite, but an advocate for social worship—he was preëminently hospitable. For more than forty years, from the period, when Peter's death afforded him the means, his hospitality had been a proverb—a by-word—but never a reproach. There was a refinement about it—it was precisely such hospitality, as Apicius would have practised, had Apicius been a bishop.

His appetite never forsook him. He died suddenly—ate a cheerful dinner, on the day of his death—and went not to his account, on an empty stomach. A post mortem examination, under the autopsy of that eminently shrewd, and most pleasant, gentleman, Dr. Marshall Spring of Watertown, exhibited the whole gastric apparatus, in admirable working order, for a much longer campaign. A nephritic malady occasioned his decease.

The death of Benjamin Faneuil, *the elder*, in 1718, and the previous adoption of his son Benjamin, Peter's brother, by Andrew, the wealthy Boston uncle, naturally turned the thoughts of the family, in this direction. Their interest in Boston was necessarily increased, by the marriage of sister Marie with Mr. Gillingham Phillips, and her consequent removal hither. The entry of the marriage—"ma fille"—on the family record, shows, that her mother was then living. The time of her death I have not ascertained, but suppose it to have occurred within a year or two after, for all the daughters were wending hither, and I find no mention of the mother. Peter was here, as early, as 1728, in which year, his name is associated, with the duel, in which Woodbridge was killed. Anne had married Mr. Davenport, and Susannah Mr. Boutineau, before uncle Andrew's death, in 1737. His will was dated, in 1734. From that document, it is evident, that Mary Ann was here then.

The elder Benjamin having died, in 1718,—Andrew, his brother, in 1737,—and Peter, in 1742-3, there were living Peter's brother and sisters, Benjamin, Anne, Susannah, Marie, and Marianne. They were living, during the revolution. So were their husbands, excepting Mr. Addington Davenport, who died Sept. 8, 1746. Their children also were living. The object of this particular statement is to invite the reader's attention to the extraordinary fact, that, while a religious persecution, in 1685, drove the Huguenot ancestors of these very individuals hither, for security—in 1776, a political persecution here drove many of their descendants into exile, and confiscated their estates.

That very many of those refugees, during the phrensy of political excitement, were just as truly persecuted, for conscience' sake, as were the Huguenots, in 1685, is a simple truth, which the calm, impartial voice of an after-age has been willing to concede. Among those refugees, the Huguenot and the old Anglo-Saxon patronymics are blended together. The Boutineaus and the Bethunes, the Faneuils and the Johnnots are mingled with

the Sewalls and the Hutchinsons, the Hollowells and the Paxtons.

While perusing the letters of Samuel Curwen—and a most kind-hearted, conscientious, old gentleman was he—the veriest saint in crape cannot restrain a smile, as he contemplates the conflict, in Curwen's mind, between the loyal and the patriotic—*his most gracious majesty, and his poor bleeding country!* Mr. Curwen met frequently with Mr. Benjamin Faneuil, Peter's nephew, at Bristol. Thus, on page 240, of the Journal, under date, April 28, 1780—“*Afternoon and evening at Judge Sewall's; company, Mrs. Long, of Ireland, Mr. and Mrs. Faneuil, Mr. Oxnard, with young Inman and his wife, a son of Ralph's, in the military line, and Miss Inman.*”

The more intelligent of the refugees, who resorted to Bristol, hovered about the former Attorney General of Massachusetts, Jonathan Sewall, as their *Magnus Apollo*. Of all the New England tories he was the most illustrious. He was a man of eminent talents, and easy eloquence. His opinions were the opinions of the rest. As crowed the great tory cock, so crowed the bantams, the Faneuils, the Boutineaus, and the others, around the Attorney General's hospitable board, at Bristol. I mean not to intimate, that this worthy gentleman maintained, at this period, anything, beyond the most frugal hospitality. He and his associates were mainly dependent upon the British government, for their daily bread.

One or two extracts from the letters of “*Benjamin Faneuil junior*,” Peter's nephew, while they establish this fact, may serve to exhibit the confidence, in the entire subjugation of the colonies, entertained—*cherished*, perhaps—by him and his companions.

March 9, 1777, he writes to his aunt, Mary Ann Jones, at Halifax, thus—“I cannot say I am very sorry, for your disappointment, in missing your passage for England, for unless you could bring a barrel of guineas, you are much better anywhere than here.” * * * * “As soon as the Christmas holidays were over, we presented a petition to the Lords of the Treasury, setting forth our suffering, and praying for a support, till the affairs in America are settled. This method was taken, by the council, and indeed by all the refugees. Within these few days, the Lords of the Treasury have agreed to allow, for the present, Chief Justice Oliver £400 a year, Lieut. Governor Oliver and

Mr. Flucker £300. The council (Mr. Boutineau among the rest) £200, the refugees in general £100, some only £50. Our affair is not yet absolutely determined, on account of Lord North's sickness; but we are told we shall be tucked in, between the council and the refugees, and be allowed £150 a year. This is a very poor affair, and we can by no means live upon it: but there are such a confounded parcel of us, to be provided for, that I am told no more will be allowed." * * * * "Should there be any opportunity of writing to Boston, I should take it kind, if cousin Betsey would write to my father and let him know what I now write, and give our loves to Mr. Bethune's family, and my aunt Phillips. I do not mention my poor mother, as, from the accounts I have received, I doubt, whether she be alive at this time." She died in October, 1777.

"When we shall be able to return to Boston I cannot say; but hope and believe it will not exceed one year more; for, sooner or later, America will be conquered, and on that they may depend."

May 14, 1777. He writes from London thus—"We were promised, three months ago, that some provision should be made for us; and, about ten days since, we were assured, at the Treasury, that, in a very few days, something should be done for us. As soon as there is, we propose to set out for Bristol, and fix ourselves there, or, at least, in that part of the country, till the American affairs are settled, which, from the last advice from New York, we flatter ourselves will not be longer than this year; though I am not without my doubts, at least as to the time: but submit they must, sooner or later. Mr. Boutineau and my aunt were very well, at their lodging, at Bristol, a few days ago. Mr. Robinson has bought himself a new post chaise, horses, &c., and sets out for Wales, in five or six days; where, I suppose, they will remain, till the American affairs are brought to a conclusion."

This Mr. Robinson was James Boutineau's son-in-law, the officer of the customs, who inflicted that fatal blow, upon James Otis, which is said to have affected his brain, and compelled him to retire from public life. The issue of that affair is not generally known. Mr. Sabine, in his "American Loyalists," p. 169, says—"the jury assessed £2000 sterling, damages. Boutineau appeared, as attorney, for Robinson, and, in his name, signed a submission, asking the pardon of Otis, who, thereupon, executed

a free release for the £2000." The same statement may be found in Allen, and elsewhere.

Mr. Benjamin Faneuil, junior, continues thus—"Mrs. Faneuil received a letter, a few days since, from Mrs. Erving (at Bristol). She sends her the prices of provisions, which are much the same they were in Boston, before the troubles came on. * * * * Miss Peggy Hutchinson has been at death's door. * * * * All the rest of us Yankees are well, but growl at each other most confoundedly, for want of money." * * * * "We hope to see you in Boston, in the course of another year." * * * * "Mrs. Faneuil is sitting by me, trying to transmogrify an old gown. No money to buy new."

No. CXXVI.

To some persons it has appeared a mystery, how Peter Faneuil, having had but a short lease of life, some two and forty years, should have acquired the "*large and plentiful estate*," that Master Lovell speaks of, in his funeral oration. This mystery is readily explained. He had, for several years, before the death of his uncle, Andrew, been engaged in commerce. As Master Lovell justly observes—"No man managed his affairs with greater prudence and industry." His commercial correspondence proves that his relations were extensive and diversified, though it must be admitted, that *rum, fish, sugar and molasses*, are the chorus, or burden, of the song. It will also appear, that the *large and plentiful estate*, was, probably overrated.

Though he had a high sense of commercial honor, no man had a sharper eye for the main chance, as it is called, by money getting men. Let me illustrate both these positions, by extracts—not from "*Peter's letters to his kinsfolks*," but from Peter's letters to his correspondents. He repeatedly scolds Signor Miguel Pacheco de Silva, and Monsieur Sigal, severely, for inattention to his drafts. To S. & W. Baker, of London, who, by reason of the informality of a power to transfer stock, were unsupplied with funds, to meet his drafts, yet paid them, for the honor of the drawer; he writes a letter of cordial thanks, Sept. 7, 1737, in which he says—"I would not for £500 you had not accepted all

those drafts; for, if you had not, it would have been a slur to my character, which I value more than all the money upon earth."

January 22, 1738, he requests Mr. Peter Baynton to advise him, on several points—"also what good French brandy is worth, and if it be possible to cloak it so, as to ship it for rum." On the 13th of March, in the same year, he writes Mr. Peter Baynton, that he has sent him four hogsheads of brandy, and adds—"Pray be as cautious as possible, in taking them on shore, by reason the man has signed bills of lading, for four hogsheads rum, not knowing the contents, which it is not convenient he should."

What a goodly number will openly pronounce Peter a very bad fellow, who, if they have not done this identical thing, have done things, quite as exceptionable, or more so, and who are willing to—

"Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to."

Merchant princes, if I am rightly instructed, do not place the offence of cheating the Government, in the category of cardinal, or unpardonable, sins. And, notwithstanding all, that we so frequently hear, of commercial integrity, and the chivalry of trade; I rather doubt, upon the whole, if traffic is really the "*ne plus ultra strap*," upon which the very finest possible edge can be given to the moral sense. Exceptions there are, but they only establish, more fully, the general rule: and, in accordance with the spirit of the old, prudential legend, we are rather too much in the habit of postponing prayers, till we have sanded the sugar, and watered the molasses. I have long entertained the opinion, that a cheap *vade mecum* edition of Dr. Chalmers' Commercial Discourses, for New Year's gifts, might be very beneficially distributed.

Exceptions certainly there are. I have one, within my own memory. The collector of a Southern port—a Huguenot withal—of whom my personal recollections are exceedingly agreeable, and whose integrity was a proverb, was surprised one day, upon his return, at the dinner hour, by the display of a costly service of plate, which his lady had procured from London. A few inquiries developed the fact, that, by the agency of a gentleman, a friend of the family, it had been gotten over, with *his* baggage, duty free—in other words, *smuggled*. In an instant,

the old gentleman ordered his wife's whole service of silver to the public stores; and seized it for the government. Such cases, I apprehend, are not of frequent occurrence.

If Peter Faneuil made not broad his phylactery, he made broad that mantle of charity, which covereth a multitude of sins. If such had not been the fact, and notoriously so, Master Lovell would not have ventured to proclaim, in Faneuil Hall, one hundred and eight years ago, and before a scanty population, as cognizant, as the population of a village, of all the shortcomings of their neighbors that—

"Peter's acts of charity were so secret and unbounded, that none but they who were the objects of it could compute the sums, which he annually distributed"—that "his alms flowed, like a fruitful river"—that "he fed the hungry, clothed the naked, comforted the fatherless, and the widows in their affliction, and his bounty visited the prisoner. So that Almighty God, in giving riches to this man, seems to have scattered blessings all abroad among the people"—that the building "erected by him at an immense charge, for the convenience and ornament of the town, is incomparably the greatest benefaction ever yet known to our Western shoar"—that this act of munificence, however great, "is but the first fruits of his generosity, a pledge of what his heart, always devising liberal things, would have done for us, had his life been spared." To all this good Master Lovell adds the assertion—"I am well assured from those, who were acquainted with his purposes, that he had many more blessings in store for us, had Heaven prolonged his days."

These statements, publicly pronounced, one hundred and eight years ago, have never been gainsayed, nor even qualified. They must therefore be viewed, in the light of an ancient deposition, read before the grand inquest of the whole people, before whom Peter Faneuil was tried, shortly after his decease, according to the fashion of the Egyptians, while dealing with their departed kings.

I, by no means, approve of Peter's conduct, in jostling the Government, out of the excise, on a few casks of brandy; but, in full view of all these public and private charities, there seems to be something about it, like the gallantry of Robin Hood, whose agrarian philosophy taught him to rob the rich, and feed the poor. And, when the trial comes on, in the Higher Court, about the

duties upon these four hogsheads of brandy ; and Peter Baynton is summoned to testify ; and, upon his evidence, Peter Faneuil is convicted ; most truly, do I believe, that some good natured angel, will slyly draw, over the record, a corner of that broad mantle of gold and tissue—that mantle of charity—whose warp and woof were formed of private alms and public benefactions, and which good Peter Faneuil spent so many of his hours, in weaving, in this lower world.

If Peter Faneuil was otherwise an offender, I am sorry for it ; having a passion for rarities, I should like to behold the *tabula immaculata*—the unsullied sheet of one human being ! I am not aware of anything, in the life of Peter Faneuil, which that mantle will not abundantly cover.

It may be otherwise. If the schoolmaster is not always abroad, the antiquarian is—the moral virtuoso—who delights, metaphorically speaking, to find spots on snow, and specks in amber. This species of antiquarian, male or female, may be found in every city and village. It is a curious creature, and, in the cabinet of a malicious memory, has stowed carefully away the weak points, and the peccadilloes of the living and the dead. In its contracted receptacle, there is no room for public or private charities, nor for merits of any kind : it is capable of holding nothing but delinquencies.

Nothing is more refreshing to this species of antiquarian, than any fair pretence, for opening his cabinet, and showing his precious collection. Nollkens, among his *terra cottas*, was not more adroit, in fitting the heads and members of Priapi to the trunks of fauns and satyrs, than is the ingenious character, of whom I speak, in adapting the legendary gossip, which has been told, till it is stale, of one individual, to the person of another. Such personages are, characteristically, selfish and ungenerous. It would not be a very notable miracle, if some person, of this description, pained and offended, by the trying contrast, between the munificent and charitable career of Peter Faneuil, and the extremely dry and unprofitable character of his own existence, should ransack the charnel-house of his memory, for some offensive offset, against Master Lovell's laudation of Peter.

For this I can truly vouch, excepting that affair of the brandy, the commercial correspondence of Peter Faneuil—and I have read the whole volume, that remains, French and English—is highly honorable to the head and the heart of the writer.

The charity of Peter Faneuil was not that clap-trap munificence, examples of which are frequently heralded, among us, in demi-stipendiary journals—it did not so truly *spring*—it *oozed* from Peter's warm heart, continually, and constitutionally. He required no impressive hints, to be charitable—he *felt* for the poor and needy, habitually. His letter of Sept. 19, 1738, is before me, to one of his commercial correspondents, to whom he has just then made a shipment, Mons. Thomas Baycaux—"Inclosed you have Madame Guinneau's account, by which you are indebted to that poor widow £16, which you will do well to pay her, it being for money she advanced, for the board of you and your family. One would have thought you should have paid that, before you left the country, and not to have served the poor widow as you did."

However direct, and even severe, while addressing delinquents, his French politeness never forsakes him. Such letters always conclude—"Sir, I salute you," or "*I kiss your hand.*"

April 24, 1740, he writes thus to Peter Baynton—"This accompanies Capt. Burgess Hall, who carries with him to your parts two unfortunate Palatine women, that were some time ago shipwrecked, in their voyage from Europe to your place, who, being objects of charity, which the providence of God has thrown in our way, I take leave to recommend to you, as such, not doubting you will so far commiserate their condition, as to direct them the nearest way, to get among their friends, with such other relief as you may think necessary."

Though Peter Faneuil had acquired property, before the death of his uncle Andrew; yet, as we shall presently see, by far the larger part of his "*large and plentiful estate*" came to him, by that uncle's will.

No. CXXVII.

PETER FANEUIL was thirty and seven years old, when he began to reign—that is, when his uncle, Andrew, died, Feb. 13, 1737, according to Peter, in his letter to the Bakers, of London, or 1738, agreeably to the historical style, adopted by the public journals. In the News Letter of February "16, to 23," we

have the following account of the funeral.—“Last Monday the Corpse of *Andrew Faneuil Esquire*, whose death we mentioned in our last, was honorably interr'd here; above 1100 Persons, of all Ranks, besides the Mourners, following the Corpse, also a vast number of Spectators were gathered together on the Occasion, at which time the half-minute guns, from on board several vessels, were discharged. And 'tis suppos'd that as this Gentleman's Fortune was the greatest of any among us, so his funeral was as generous and expensive as any that has been known here.”

Peter was appointed executor sole of Andrew's will, and residuary legatee. He appears to have proceeded with great propriety. He immediately announced his uncle's death to foreign correspondents; and furnished those, who had been custodiers of his property, with duly authenticated copies of the will; and took prompt measures, for the procurement of “*the handsomest mourning rings*.”

John, Archbishop of Canterbury, as was usual then, sent his commission to Judge Willard, from the Prerogative Court, to swear Peter, to render a true inventory, &c.; and Peter responded to John, that, although he was not bound so to do, by the laws of the Province, yet, for his “*own satisfaction*,” he should. Peter probably changed his mind, for no inventory of Andrew's estate appears, amogg the ancient records of the Probate Court, in Suffolk. It is not, therefore, possible, to estimate the value of that “*large and plentiful estate*,” which came to Peter, from his uncle. That it was very considerable, for the times, there cannot be a doubt; but the times—one hundred and fourteen years ago—were the days of small things.

It has been observed, by an eminent man, that prayer and almsgiving are the pathways to Paradise. Andrew Faneuil commences his will, with a supplication, for the *perfecting of his charities*—“*I commit my soul to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, humbly begging the pardon of my sins, the perfecting of my charities, and everlasting life above*.” This will was made, Sept. 12, 1734, and witnessed, by John Read, William Price and Charles Morris; and a codicil was added, Jan. 23, 1737; and both were proved, Feb. 15, 1737, two days after the testator's death.

Wills have ever been accounted an interesting department of *belles lettres*; and I shall therefore furnish the reader with an abstract of Uncle Andrew's.

First. He gives his warehouse in Boston, in trust, to the minister of the French Church, in Boston, and his successors; two thirds of the income for the minister's support, and one third to the elders, to create a fund for repairing the warehouse; and after the creation of such fund, the whole income to the minister; and, should the French church cease to be, then said warehouse to revert to his heirs—"excluding Benjamin Faneuil, of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever."

Secondly. To said French Church, three pieces of plate, of the value of £36 sterling, "*a flaggon for the communion table, a plate for the bread, and a bason to christen the children, with the coat of arms and name of the donor, engraven upon each of them.*" On the 27th of February, fourteen days after his uncle's death, Peter sent a copy of the will to Claude Fonnereau, in France, requesting him to purchase the plate, and added—"of the best fashion, and get engraven, agreeably to his orders, for which end you have his coat of arms in wax herewith, and if it should cost some small matter more, be pleased to charge the same."

Thirdly. £100, in Province Bills, to be paid to the elders, for the poor of the French Church.

Fourthly. £50, in Province bills, and "*a suit of mourning throughout,*" to the French minister.

Fifthly. £100, in Province bills, to the overseers, for the poor of Boston.

Sixthly. To the Rev. Benjamin Colman, "*a suit of mourning throughout.*"

Seventhly. "To my loving brother, John Faneuil, of Rochelle, £100, sterling."

Eighthly. "To my loving brother-in-law, Peter Cossart, of Cork, in Ireland, and his sister Susannah Cossart, of Amsterdam, £50 each to buy mourning."

Ninthly. "To Benjamin Faneuil of Boston, son of my brother, Benjamin Faneuil, deceased, *five shillings and no more.*"

Tenthly. To his executor, in trust, 8000 ounces of silver, or pieces of eight, to purchase an estate of inheritance, at his discretion, within one year after the testator's death, for his loving niece, Mary, wife of Gillam Phillips, and the heirs of her body, remainder to her right heirs. Peter, in correspondence with S. & W. Baker, refers to this purchase, and directs them to sell stocks of his late uncles, to meet the drafts.

Eleventhly. To her son, Andrew, 500 ounces of silver, or pieces of eight, to be put at interest, till majority—to his mother, in case of his death before—and, in case of *her* death and *his* before—to her other children.

Twelfthly, thirteenthly, and fourteenthly. To his nieces, Anne, Susannah, and Marian, £2000 sterling, each; the two first to be paid six months, after his death, and the last, at majority, or marriage; four per cent. to be allowed her, per annum, ad interim, and she to be maintained by the executor, till she attained full age, or married. These legacies were paid from the funds of Uncle Andrew, in the hands of S. & W. Baker, of London.

Fifteenthly. To his loving sister, Susannah F., widow of Abraham de la Croix, of Rochelle, £1000 sterling.

Sixteenthly. To his servant maid, *Hendrine Boyltins*, who probably came, with the family, from Holland, "*a suit of mourning throughout*," and 500 ounces of silver, in pieces of eight, or the value, in Province bills, at her election.

Seventeenthly. To Henry Johnson, her son, who became the confidential clerk of Peter Faneuil, 150 ounces, in pieces of eight, to be paid, at majority.

Eighteenthly. "I give, bequeath, and devise all the rest of my estate, both real and personal, whatsoever and wheresoever 'tis, in New England, Great Britain, France, Holland, or any other part of the world, to my loving nephew, PETER FANEUIL, eldest son of my late brother, Benjamin Faneuil, to hold to him and his heirs forever."

He then appoints Peter, sole executor.

The codicil revokes the legacy to his *loving* sister, the widow Susannah de la Croix, of Rochelle—"my mind and my will is, that my said sister, Susannah F., shall not have the said thousand pounds, *nor any part of it.*"

The severity of these five last words—and the phrase, in relation to his nephew—"excluding Benjamin Faneuil of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever;" and those final words of the ninth clause, by which the testator cuts off poor Benjamin, with "*five shillings and no more*," are sufficiently piquant. Well may such an *avunculus Hector* commence his last will, with a fervent supplication to "God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," for the perfecting of his charities.

How the widow, Susannah, came to lose her thousand pounds

I do not know. Something, that she said or did, or did not say or do, was wafted, all the way over the water, from Rochelle, no doubt, and came to the old gentleman's irritable ears, and roused his ire.

But I well comprehend the occasion, upon which he came to disinherit his nephew, Benjamin Faneuil. My female readers have already arrived at the conclusion, doubtless, that Benjamin so far forgot himself, and his duty to his opulent, old uncle, as to fall in love without asking his permission. Well : they are perfectly right—such was the fact. Benjamin fell in love. He was determined not to be found, like tinkling brass, even at the hazard of losing the good will, and the gold of his uncle Andrew—so he fell in love. And, if the girl of his heart resembled her daughter, *Mary Faneuil*, as she is represented by Blackburn, how the poor fellow could have helped it, God only knows.

There is nothing, in all Amboyna, more spicy, than this little incident, in the history of the Faneuils ; and, having spoilt it, perhaps, by this *avant courier*, I will now venture to tell the story ; premising, that it was far better told, by the lady, who related it to me, and who is a lineal descendant of Benjamin, himself.

To give proper effect to this little episode, I must take the reader to a pretty village, as it was just then beginning to be, one hundred and fifty years ago, on the banks of the Hudson, some twenty miles, only, from the city of New York. There, the persecuted Huguenots gathered together, and planted their new home, their *New Rochelle*. Almost immediately after his marriage with Anne Bureau, in 1699, at Narragansett, Benjamin Faneuil rejoined his Huguenot friends, and fellow-townsmen, in *New Rochelle* ; and there his children were born. *New Rochelle*, as I have stated, was the birth-place of PETER FANEUIL.

Andrew, having arrived in Boston from Holland, very soon after the beginning of the eighteenth century ; having buried his wife ; and being childless, selected Benjamin, the second son of his brother, Benjamin Faneuil, as an object of particular regard. The boy, was, accordingly, transferred from New Rochelle to Boston. He was educated, and brought up, under his patron's eye ; and was considered, by the world, as the heir apparent of his opulent uncle. As he grew up, towards man's estate, it would have been an unheard of circumstance, if the

dowagers of Shawmut, with their marriageable daughters, had not fixed their hopeful eyes, upon young Benjamin, if it were only for the sake of whatever might be found, sooner or later, in the mouth of his sack. It would have been a miracle, if their exhibitions of regard, for the young man, had not visibly increased; and their fears had not been frequently and feelingly expressed, lest that excellent, old gentleman, Andrew Faneuil Esquire, had taken cold.

A patron is rather too prone to look upon a *protégé*, as a puppet. The idea, that Benjamin could be led astray, however tempting the provocation, to commit the crime of matrimony, however lawful and right, however accomplished, and virtuous, and lovely the object, without leave, first had and obtained, from him, at whose board he ate his daily bread, never occurred to Uncle Andrew, for an instant. He supposed, of course, that he had the key to Benjamin's soul. It never occurred to the old gentleman, whose courtship was carried on, in Holland, that falling in love was precisely as much of an accident, as falling into the fire, or into the water.

Well: Benjamin was an intelligent young man; and he was admirably posted up, upon the subject of his uncle's opinions, and prejudices. Nevertheless, he fell in love, very emphatically; and with a girl, as pretty, doubtless, as she was poor. He knew, that his uncle would never consent to such a marriage. But he knew, that he had plighted his troth; and he clearly saw, since he must run the hazard of breaking *one* heart, or *two*, that it would be rather more equitable to risk the old gentleman's, instead of the girl's and his own.

Accordingly, Benjamin secretly took unto himself a lawful wife; and, for a while, though Benjamin was, doubtless, much the happier, Uncle Andrew was nothing the wiser. However strange it may appear, though there were no giants, there were mischievous women, in those days. One of this category, in an evil hour, like a toad, as she was, whispered the secret, into the ear of Uncle Andrew.

The old Huguenot was not of the melting mood. The conduct of his nephew produced not grief, but anger. It reached no tender spot, in the recesses of his heart, but chafed the old man's pericardium, till it drew a blister there. He bottled up his wrath, and corked it well; that the offender might have the full benefit of the fermentation, when the old gentleman came

to pour the contents of the vial, on the devoted head of his unsuspecting nephew.

The following morning, they met, at the breakfast table. The meal passed, as usual. But with what feelings must that old man have contemplated the poor fellow, the boy of his adoption, whom he was about to prostrate, as he finished the last mouthful he was ever to partake at that board! The repast was finished.—A brief colloquy ensued—“*I hear you are married*”—“*Yes, uncle, I am*”—“*Then you will leave my house.*” The young man instantly took his departure. They never met again, until years had passed away,—and then, in that place, where there is no work nor device. There they lie, in the Faneuil tomb, in the Granary Ground; the unforgiving uncle and the disinherited nephew, side by side. Benjamin Faneuil died, at his residence in Brighton, in October, 1785, and was buried, in the family vault.

No. CXXVIII.

NOTWITHSTANDING the “*large and plentiful estate,*” which Peter Faneuil derived from his uncle’s will, it is my opinion, that his munificence, his unbounded charities, his hospitalities, his social, genial temperament were such, that, had he lived a much longer life, he would have died a much poorer man. Almost immediately, upon the death of his uncle, it is manifest, from his letters, that certain magnificent fancies came over the spirit of his waking dreams. And it is equally certain, that, subsequently, he had occasional misgivings, as to the just relation between his means and his prospective arrangements, which, for the times, and upon our little peninsula, were sufficiently expanded.

Feb. 27, 1737, fourteen days after his uncle’s death, he announced that event to his commercial friends, Messrs. S. & W. Baker of London; prescribed the arrangement of funds, for the payment of legacies; and instructed them to honor his draft, in favor of James Pope & Company, of Madeira, in payment for five pipes of wine.

Four days after, on the first of March, he writes Pope & Company thus—“Send me, by the very first opportunity, for this

place, five pipes of your very best Madeira wine, of an amber color, of the same sort, which you sent to our good friend, De Lancey, of New York."

He directs them to draw on the Bakers of London, and adds—"As this wine is for the use of my house, I hope you will be careful, that I have the best. I am not over fond of the strongest. I am to inform you, that my uncle, Mr. Andrew Fan-euil, departed this life, the 13 current, and was interred the 20, for which God prepare all his friends. I shall expect to hear from you, by the first opportunity."

Feb. 27, 1737, the same day, on which he writes the Bakers, he addresses Lane & Smethurst, of London, as follows—"Be so good as to send me a handsome chariot with two sets of harness, with the arms, as enclosed, on the same, in the handsomest manner, that you shall judge proper, but at the same time nothing gaudy: and send me also, well recommended, two sober men, the one, for a coachman the other a gardener; and agree with the same, to be paid either in London, quarterly, or here, allowing for the exchange of the money, which they shall choose. And, as most servants from Europe, when here, are too apt to be debauched with strong drink, rum, &c., being very plenty, I pray your particular care in this article."

On the 6th of March, he writes Gulian Verplanck, of New York—"Send me the pipe of wine, having none good to drink." Again, March 20—"By the first good opportunity the best pipe of wine you can purchase." On the 25th of April, he acknowledges the receipt of the wine from Verplanck—"The wine I hope will prove good—comes in very good time, there being none good in town."

On the 22d of May, he writes the Bakers, for a bountiful supply of glass and China, and for "enough of the best scarlet cloth to trim a cloak:" and, in September of that year, for silver spoons and "silver forks with three prongs, with my arms cut upon them: let them be made very neat and handsome." Shortly after, he writes for several pairs of silver candlesticks, "with my arms engraved thereon," and sends out a piece of wax candle, as a pattern of the size.

On the 1st of January, 1738, he writes Lane & Smethurst, to send him a pair of spectacles, "for a person of 50 years, as also, for the use of my kitchen, the latest, best book of the several sorts of cookery, which pray let be of the largest char-

acter, for the benefit of the maid's reading." As Peter then was not quite thirty-eight years of age, the spectacles were probably for "the maid," to enable her to master "the *best book* of the several sorts of cookery."

Dec. 20, 1738, he writes for "four stone horses." On the 18th of September of that year, he writes Thomas Kilby—"Pray dont forget the larding pins, wine, and sweetmeats, which I have wrote you about before." He frequently writes to his friend Verplanck, for "Albany horses."

In a brief sketch of Brighton, published in 1850, it is stated that Peter's "*large and heavy silver punch bowl*" is in the possession of George Bethune, Esquire, of this city. This is an error. Peter's punch bowl came into the possession of James Lovell, who married a grand-daughter of Benjamin Faneuil, a sister of Mr. Bethune; and it is now in the possession of Mr. Lovell's descendants.

Oh, if that "*large and heavy silver punch bowl*" could speak out, in good French or English, what glorious tales it would tell of Peter, in all his glory, enjoying, as Master Lovell says, "*that divine satisfaction, which results from communicating happiness to others*"—around that preëminently hospitable board, where, in the language of the writer of the obituary, in the News Letter of March 10, 1743—

"Divites ac parvi gustarunt dulcia mensæ."

Peter's punch bowl was not at all like Oliver's "*broken tea-cups, wisely kept for show*." June 22, 1741, some twenty months before his death, he writes Lane & Smethurst, to send him "*six gross of the very best London King Henry's Cards, and six half chests of lemons, for my house winter supply*."

Let not the reader surmise, for all this, that Peter had denied his Lord, or was exclusively absorbed in his care for creature comforts. March 5, 1738, he writes the Bakers, to send him "four handsome, large, octavo, Common Prayer Books, of a good letter and well bound, with one of the same, in French, for my own use."

March 13, 1738, he writes John Depuister, to send him "six of the largest bearskins, and two large, fine, well painted beaver coats, to use in a slay."

It is, in no sense, discreditable to Peter Faneuil, that his correspondence shows him to have been exceedingly partial to

sweetmeats and citron water. Nor does it lower him, in my humble esteem, that his letters clearly indicate his temperament to have been somewhat irritable and fiery. I have found such to be the case, almost ever, when generosity, frankheartedness, and a noble spirit are blended together, as closely as they were, in the character of Peter Faneuil. The converse of this position, to be sure, it is not easy to maintain.

It is quite amusing, to contemplate, now and then, in men, whose brains are brim full of magnificent purposes, and whose habitual dealings are with tens and hundreds of thousands—a remarkable concentration of thought and care, upon some one insignificant item of property, which is in jeopardy of falling into naught. It is, doubtless, the spirit of the woman, who lighted her candle and swept the house, and called her neighbors together, to rejoice with her, over the recovery of that one piece of silver.

A brief episode will exhibit this trait, in Peter's character, and show, at the same time, that his spirit was perfectly placable. Some time before his death, Uncle Andrew, being aware, that pulmonic affections were benefited, by the air of the tropics, consigned a broken-winded horse to Mr. Joseph Ward, of Barbadoes, for sale. No account having been rendered, the fate of the old horse appears to have become a subject of exciting interest, with the residuary legatee. Before he writes to Ward, he addresses three letters of inquiry, in other directions. He then opens upon Mr. Joseph Ward, Jan. 12, 1738. I give the entire letter, as illustrative of Peter's character—"I have been very much surprised, that, ever since the death of Captain Allen, you have not advised me of the sale of a horse, belonging to my deceased uncle, left in your hands by him, which I am informed you sold for a very good price, and I am now to request the favor you would send me the net proceeds, with a fair and just account for the same, in sweetmeats and citron water; your compliance with which will stop me from giving some of my friends the trouble of calling you to an account there. I shall be glad to know, if Captain Allen did not leave a silver watch and some fish, belonging to a servant of mine, with some person of your island, and with who. I expect your speedy answer."

Mr. Ward appears to have responded, more calmly, than tropical gentlemen commonly do, when accosted in this piquant style. He sent his account, and Peter was manifestly mollified, by a box

of sweetmeats. Mr. Ward, however, complained of Peter's want of grace. March 24, 1738, Peter wrote to Mr. Ward—"Yours of 7 February, with the account sales of a horse, left by Captain Allen, accompanying a box sweetmeats I received, in which I observe you refer to my former, which you are pleased to look upon as in too unhandsome a stile. I must own it was not in so soft terms, as I sometimes make use of; but, at that time, I really thought the state of the case required it, not having heard anything to be depended upon, concerning the horse in dispute, either if he was dead, sold, or run away; upon either of which, I presumed the common complaisance, if not honor, among merchants, might have entitled either my uncle, in his lifetime, or myself, after his decease, to some advice at least. I had indeed transiently heard here you had kept him, for your own use, but had undervalued him, which, in some measure prest my writing you on that head, &c. I thank you for your speedy answer, and am, with return of your own compliment, as much as you are mine," &c.

March 6, 1737.—Peter informs M. Isaac Beauchamp, that, he, Peter, has been empowered, by his Excellency, M. Brouillon, Governor of Cape Breton, to call him to account and says—"I am now to let you know, that out of honor and of the regards I have ever had to that gentleman, I am obliged to see some honorable issue made to that affair, for which reason I shall be glad you will advise me, after what manner you propose to satisfy the gentleman or me, without forcing violente means." This affair was occasioned, by a dispute, about tobacco, and ended in smoke.

One brief illustration more. April 6, 1738, he complains to Captain Greenou of certain ill usage and says—"You may see what handsome parcell of protested bills I must pay. If this be the honor of you Ragon men, God deliver me from them, for the future. I would not take their word for a groat &c. These pretended gentlemen think I will tamely sit down by their unhand-some usage, but they will find themselves very much mistaken," &c.

Many years ago, while standing by the artist, as he was working up, from the old portrait, belonging to the Historical Society, the lineaments of Peter, as he is represented, in Faneuil Hall, we agreed, that his temperament must have been choleric. He had that conformation of body, which hints of apoplexy. John,

his uncle, the Rocheller, died of that disease; and Peter, as Master Lovell inform us, died *suddenly*. He belonged not to any total abstinence society. And though there is no evidence, nor the slightest suspicion, that he fell below that standard of gentlemanly temperance, which was in vogue, among those, who were given to hospitality, in our peninsula, one hundred years ago—yet I have not any reasonable doubt, that Peter would have lived longer, had it been the pleasure of his uncle Andrew to have disinherited *him*, instead of *his brother Benjamin*.

No. CXXIX.

PETER FANEUIL was an affectionate brother. I have it from the lips of Benjamin's lineal descendants, who have preserved the tradition, that, after he had sacrificed his hopes of the inheritance, not for a mess of pottage, but for a lovely wife; and Peter had been called from New Rochelle, to supply his place, as the heir apparent; uncle Andrew, probably, without exacting an absolute promise, enjoined it upon Peter, to abstain from assisting Benjamin; to which injunction Peter paid no practical regard whatever; but, like a Christian brother, remembered, that old Benjamin Faneuil and Anne Bureau had been the father and the mother of them both. The commercial correspondence shows, that Peter gave Benjamin his confidence and affection. The relation between them plainly demonstrates, that there was no deficiency of kind and generous offices.

The ease and intimacy of their friendship will be perceived, by the following note, which I copy literally from the original, in my possession. There was a difference of eighteen months only, in their ages. In this note, which was written, after Benjamin's return from Europe, Peter addresses him, by a cant name. "Boston the 18 August, 1741. Dear Cockey: The Occasion of my not Sending my Chase for you was on Account of Mr. Shirley's receiving of his Majties Commission Last Thursday appointing him Govr of this Province wh. was read the Next day, upon which Occasion he ask't me to Loane of my Charrot wh. I granted him till Last Night, so that I presume will plede my xcuse. I now Send you up the Chase, to bring you home,

and have deliver'd ye Coachman Some Boild Beef, a dozen of brown biskett 6 bottles of Madera and 2 of Frontinan with adozen of Lemmons. Your relations and friends are all well, and desire their Love and service may be made acceptable to you. pray my Compliments to the Gentn and Ladys with you—and give me Leave to assure you that I am, Dear Cockey, Your Affectionate Brother, Peter Faneuil."

The superscription of this note is torn off, but to Benjamin alone can it apply. Mr. Jones was not married, till after Peter's death. His relation to Phillips was rather formal; and still more so with Boutineau; and he never would have thought of calling his brother Addington Davenport, the Rector of Trinity, his *dear cockey*. His letters also record the evidences of his kindness to his sisters, and his attention to their most trifling wishes. Nov. 24, 1736, he writes Lynch and Blake—"My youngest sister desires, that you wont forget to send her the Canary birds, which you promised her, when you was here." May 16, 1736, he writes Lane and Smethurst of London—"My sisters have received their things, in good order and to their liking, except the stockings: for the Hosier put up white worsted, instead of thread, although the patern was sent. I have sent them back to you to be changed, in the ship Union, John Homans, master. Be pleased to send them, by the first opportunity: viz, for Mrs. Anne Faneuil, 3 pairs thread hose, with worsted clogs, and a pair of Galoushoses. Mrs. Susannah Faneuil, 2 pairs thread ditto. Mrs. Mary Anne Faneuil, 4 pairs thread stockings, and 3 pairs clogs." It is of small moment, at this late day, whether these ladies wore thread or worsted stockings, one hundred and fourteen years ago; but this ancient example of brotherly regard may not be altogether lost, upon the race of brothers, that has sprung up, during the present century. It is remarkable, that Peter, though he applies the title, *Mrs.* to each of his sisters, gives them the maiden name. The two, first named, were then the wives of Addington Davenport and James Boutineau; the last, Mary Ann, afterwards the wife of John Jones, was then single.

At that early day, the moral sense of the people of the North appears to have been thoroughly asleep, on the subject of slavery. The reverend clergy were no exception from the general rule. After the decease of Parson Moorhead, in 1774, a slave was sold, among his effects, "at his late residence, near

Liberty Tree." Jonny Moorhead was a cotemporary of Peter Faneuil, having assumed the charge of the Presbyterian Church, as it then was, in 1730. The reader will not be startled, therefore, when he comes to be informed, as, in good time he will be, at how many pounds, old tenor, each of Peter Faneuil's five slaves were appraised, after his decease. Slavery was not uncommon then, in the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Douglass, in his Summary, vol. i. page 351, states, that in 1735, about seven years before Peter's death, the whole number of whites, of 16 years and upwards, in the Province, was 35,427; and of negroes, 2600.

Feb. 3, 1738. Peter Faneuil writes thus, to Peter Buckley—"Herewith you have invoice of six hogsheds fish and eight barrells of alewives, amounting to £75.9.2, which, when you arrive at Antigua, be pleased to sell, for my best advantage, and, with the nett produce of the same, purchase, for me, for the use of my house, as likely a strait negro lad as possibly you can, about the age of from 12 to 15 years; and, if to be done, one that has had the small-pox, who being for my own service, I must request the favor, you would let him be one of as tractable a disposition as you can find, which I leave to your prudent care and management, desiring, after you have purchased him, you would send him to me, by the first good opportunity, recommending him to a particular care, from the captain." I have no doubt, that Peter was a kind, considerate master; and, though I have an unconquerable aversion to being the slave of anybody, I had rather have been Peter's *born thrall* than his *uncle Andrew*. What a glorious kitchen Peter's must have been!

My female readers will scarcely find it in their eyelids to be weary, or in their hearts to blame me, for giving them one or two passages more, from Peter Faneuil's letters; when they are told, that those passages relate to a love affair, in which Peter, though not a principal, performed an important part.

The Faneuils and the Jekylls were intimate—so much so, at least, as to bring the Jekylls within the circle of those, who, upon Uncle Andrew's death, were accounted the legitimate recipients of mourning rings. In a letter to Mr. Joseph Jekyll, of Jan. 22, 1738, Peter alludes to Miss Jekyll's extraordinary conduct; and, most happily and truthfully, remarks, that "*there is no accounting for the sex, in affairs of love.*" On the same day, he writes Mr. Richard Blacket Jekyll—"Doubtless, you'll be

surprised to find, that, by this opportunity, only your sister, Mrs. Hannah, of the family, who I hope will arrive safe to you, has the pleasure of seeing you, and her other brothers, in England. I am sorry Mrs. Mary does not consult her own interest, so much, as I could wish, whose conduct I should say nothing of, were it not out of regard to the family in general. It is now only one month past, since she suffered herself to be published to one Mr. Linnington, of St. Christophers, formerly known here, by the name of My Lord Linnington, or My Lord, whose character, if you remember the man, I need not trouble you with a description of it; but, if you do not, I can only say, that he is a worthless pretender to a great deal of money and wit, without, according to the best account I can learn, any of either: with whom she would, inevitably have been married, had not some other friends joined forces with me, and interposed."

"Inclosed I send you my letter to her, on that head, and her answer, for your more private satisfaction. That affair being tolerably well over, and Captain Homan's state-room hired for the two young ladies, and their maid, I had supplied them, according to your desire, with what money they might have occasion for, to fit them out for the voyage, and paid the captain, for their laying in, and tomorrow being the appointed time to go aboard, I was, in the morning, advised Mrs. Mary had changed her mind, on account of some new proposals of matrimony, made her, by Col. Saltonstall of Haverhill, which sudden alteration I find to be, on examination, from a visit or two, within these two or three days last past, at farthest, but, however, concluded upon and determined, so that she does not come to you," &c., &c.

Peter proceeds to comment, with great discretion, upon the absence of any reasonable interval, for the heart of Miss Mary Jekyll to recover its due tone and tension, after its first expansion towards *My Lord Linnington*, and before the second spasm. But, truly, in the language of the anatomist, the heart is a "wonderful muscle."

I had surmised a relation of consanguinity between Peter Faneuil and the late Peter Chardon Brooks, from the fact, that, on the 29th of March, 1737, Peter Faneuil writes to the executors of Isaac Chardon, in South Carolina, whom he calls his cousin; and, in that letter, speaks of his cousin, *Peter Chardon*. But, from the best authority, I have learned, that the name of Pe-

ter Chardon was bestowed, by the Rev. Edward Brooks, formerly of North Yarmouth, and more recently of Medford, upon his son, *causa amicitia*; the Rev. Mr. Brooks and Peter Chardon, having been classmates, of the year 1757. It was, probably, the father of this Peter Chardon, whom Peter Faneuil calls his cousin, in 1737, and the same Peter Chardon, who is named, on the record, as one of the appraisers of Peter Faneuil's estate, in 1742-3. The name is rare; it occurs once only, on the Cambridge Catalogue; and, from its rarity, it may not be unreasonable, to look for the *stirps*, on the pages of Charlevoix, iii. 392, who speaks of *Peter Chardon*, the Jesuit, a missionary, among the Indians, bordering upon Lake Michigan, at the very close of the seventeenth century. Our Peter Chardon, the cousin of Faneuil, resided in Bowdoin Square, near the street, that bears his name.

After the death of his uncle Andrew, Peter Faneuil, by the power of wealth, in addition to his other qualities, intelligence, industry, and courtesy, necessarily became an influential character; and the use, which he immediately began to make of his wealth, his public spirit, his private benevolence, all conspired to make him an object of very general interest. His hospitalities were unbounded. He associated himself with the Episcopal Church. He subscribed £2000 old tenor, £200 sterling for the rebuilding of King's Chapel, in 1740, and was chosen treasurer of the building fund. His death, in 1742-3, put a stop to the project. No money had ever been collected, for that object. In 1747, the project was revived. New subscriptions were solicited, and the old ones demanded, "*at the end of this year 1748.*" Peter Faneuil died March 3, 1742-3, and had therefore been dead, between five and six years. "For the subscription of Peter Faneuil," says Mr. Greenwood, in his history of the Chapel, "they were unfortunately obliged to sue his brother, and executor, Benjamin Faneuil, from whom, after a disagreeable lawsuit, they at last recovered it." Mr. Greenwood erred, in the supposition, that Peter left a will. He died intestate, and administration was granted to Benjamin, March 18, 1742, old style. The estate, of course, had been settled, doubtless, some years before the demand on the administrator, "*at the end of 1748.*" Having other heirs to consult, he very properly resisted this tardy and unexpected claim; and cast the responsibility upon the court.

For several years, Peter Faneuil worshipped in Trinity Church,

of which his brother-in-law, Addington Davenport, became rector, in 1740. Peter's pew, in Old Trinity, was No. 40. He was an active and liberal member of the Episcopal Charitable Society. "Mr. Faneuil," says the late Dr. Boyle, "was one of the earliest members of the society. He was a liberal subscriber to its funds, and acted, as a trustee of the institution."

Peter Faneuil's heart was proverbially warm, and sensitive to the necessities and distresses of his *neighbor*; and he seems to have cherished the true scriptural construction of that *ubiquitary* word. The accession of wealth, upon his uncle's death, hardened not his heart, but gave it a deeper, fuller, and stronger pulse, upon every call of charity. To him, as to other men, who admit their motives to be human, upon common occasions, the applause of the *wise* and *good* was exceedingly agreeable. Whatever the prominence of higher and holier considerations, he turned a willing and a grateful ear to the approbation of the judicious and upright. Not contented with the opportunities of doing good, on a small scale, which were, doubtless, frequently presented, before a man, whose wealth and warmheartedness were equally notorious; he coveted some fair occasion, for pouring forth of his abundance, in a more magnificent manner—pleased—naturally and justifiably pleased—with the thought, that his name and his memory would be associated with the deed, in after times.

No. CXXX.

ONE may, as successfully, search for that identical peck of pickled peppers, that Peter Piper picked, as for the original Hall, that Peter Faneuil built. Like Rachel's first born, *it is not*. After all the reparations, and changes, and hard hammerings she has undergone, we may as well search, within the walls of Old Ironsides, for those very ribs of live oak, which, some fifty years ago, were launched, in the body of the frigate Constitution.

In the olden time, the market men, like the mourners, went "about the streets." The inhabitants were served, at their doors. As early as 1634, Gov. Winthrop, in his journal, speaks

of a market, which was kept in Boston, "on Thursday, the fifth day of the week." This weekly market on the fifth day is mentioned, by Douglass, as of 1639, vol. i. p. 434. This, I think, refers only to a gathering of sellers and buyers, at one spot, and not to any "visible temple," for storage and shelter. Citizens differed, as to the best method of getting their *provant*; some preferred the old mode, as it was supposed to save time; others were in favor of having a common point, with a covered building. Parties were formed; the citizens waxed wroth; and quarrelled about their meat, like angry dogs. Those, who were in favor of market-houses, prevailed. Three were erected; one, at the Old North Square—one, where Faneuil Hall now stands—and one, near Liberty Tree. People were no longer supplied, at their houses.

It seems very strange, that this sensible arrangement should have led to violent outrage. The malcontents assembled together, in the night, "disguised like clergymen"—the devil, sometimes assumes this exterior—and "totally demolished the centre market-house." This occurred, about the year 1736-7, or about the time of Andrew Faneuil's death. Such is the account of good old Thomas Pemberton. M. H. C. iii. 255.

The popular sentiment prevented the reconstruction of the centre market-house, till, in 1740, July 14, a town meeting was held to consider a petition, for this object, from Thomas Palmer and 340 others. At this meeting, it was stated, that Peter Faneuil had offered, at his own cost, to build a market-house, on the town's land, in Dock Square, for the use of the town, if the citizens, would legally empower him so to do; place the same under proper regulations; and maintain it, for that use.

An impression has, somewhat extensively, prevailed, that Mr. Faneuil's proposal was not courteously received, by his fellow-citizens, and that a majority of seven only were in favor of it.

On the contrary, Mr. Faneuil's proposal was received, with the most ample demonstrations of grateful respect. There were two questions before the meeting—first: shall a vote of thanks be passed to Peter Faneuil, for his liberal offer? Secondly: shall we give up the itinerant system, and have a market-house, on any conditions? Upon the first question, there was but *one* mind—on the second, there were *two*. A vote of thanks to Mr. Faneuil was instantly passed, without a dissentient. But the

second question was the vexed question, revived, and excited the passions of the people. Of 727 persons present, 367 only voted in favor of granting the petition of Palmer and others, giving a majority of seven only.

Accordingly, the work was commenced; and it was completed, Sept. 10, 1742, "on which day," says Dr. Snow, "Mr. Samuel Ruggles, who was employed, in building the market house, waited on the selectmen, by order of P. Faneuil, Esq., and delivered them the key of said house."

Peter was a magnificent fellow. An antiquarian friend, to whom the fancy has lineally descended, through a line of highly respectable, antiquarian ancestors, informs me, that his father handed down to him a tradition, which is certainly plausible. It runs thus: while the market-house was in progress—probably on paper—it was suggested to Peter, that, with very little additional expense, a splendid town hall might be constructed over it. Peter's heart was quite as *roomy* as the market-house, and town hall together, and he cheerfully embraced the suggestion. The tradition goes a little farther—when the cost was summed up, Peter scolded—a little. Very likely. Mr. Peter Faneuil was not an exception, I presume, to the common rule.

The keys, as I have stated, were presented to the town, Sept. 10, 1742, with all that courtesy, doubtless, for which he was remarkable. Peter's relatives and connections are somewhat numerous. The descendants of Benjamin his brother are scattered over the country. It will be equally grateful to them, and honorable to our forefathers, to exhibit a portion of the record.

Sept. 13, 1742, at a meeting, in the new hall, a vote of thanks was moved, by the Hon. John Jeffries, uncle of the late Dr. John Jeffries. In this vote, it is stated, that, whereas Peter Faneuil has, "at a very great expense, erected a noble structure, far exceeding his first proposal, inasmuch, as it contains, not only a large and sufficient accommodation for a market place, but a spacious and most beautiful town hall over it, and several other convenient rooms, which may prove very beneficial to the town, for offices or otherwise. And the said building being now finished, he has delivered possession thereof to the selectmen for the use of the town; it is therefore voted, that the town do, with the utmost gratitude, receive and accept this most generous and noble benefaction, for the use and intentions it is designed for; and do appoint the Hon. Thomas Cushing Esquire, the modera-

tor of this meeting, the Hon. Adam Winthrop, Edward Hutchinson, Ezekiel Lewis, and Samuel Waldo, Esquires, Thomas Hutchinson, Esq. the selectmen and representatives of the town of Boston, the Hon. Jacob Wendell, James Bowdoin, Esq., Andrew Oliver, Esq., Captain Nathaniel Cunningham, Peter Chardon, Esq., and Mr. Charles Apthorp, to wait upon Peter Faneuil, Esq., and in the name of the town, to render him their most hearty thanks, for so bountiful a gift, with their prayers, that this and other expressions of his bounty and charity may be abundantly recompensed with the divine blessing."

In addition to this vote, the citizens passed another, that the hall should be called Faneuil Hall, forever; and that the portrait of Faneuil should be painted, at full length, and placed therein. On the 14th of March, 1744, a vote was passed "to purchase the Faneuil arms, carved and gilt, by Moses Deshon, to be fixed in the hall."

Pemberton says—"Previous to the Revolution, the portraits of Mr. Faneuil, General Conway, and Colonel Barré were procured by the town, and hung up in the hall. It is supposed they were carried off by the British." The portrait of Faneuil at present, in the hall, was painted by Henry Sargent, from the portrait, presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society, by Miss Jones, a grandchild of Peter's sister, Mary Ann.

The original building was but half the width of the present, and but two stories high. The hall could contain but 1000 persons. In the memorable fire of Tuesday, Jan. 13, 1761, Faneuil Hall was destroyed, and nothing left standing but the walls. On the 23d of the following March, the town voted to rebuild, and the State authorized a lottery, to meet the expense. There were several classes. A ticket, of the seventh class, lies before me, bearing date March, 1767, with the spacious autograph of John Hancock, at the bottom.

The building retained its primitive proportions, till 1806, when, the occasions of the public requiring its enlargement, its width was increased, from 40 to 80 feet, and a third story added. A very simple rule may be furnished, for those, who would compare the size of the present building, with that of the genuine Peter Faneuil Hall. Take a northeast view of the Hall—there are seven windows before you, in each story—run a perpendicular line, from the ground, through the centre of the middle window to the top of the belt, at the bottom of the third story—carry

a straight line from that point nearly to the top of the second window, on the right, in the third story. That point is the apex of the old pediment. From that point, draw the corresponding roof line down to the belt, at the corner; and you have a profile of the ancient structure; all which is well exhibited by Dr. Snow, on the plan, in his History of Boston.

Small as the original structure may appear, when compared with the present, it was a magnificent donation, for the times. It may well be considered a munificent gift, from a single individual, in 1742, when we consider, that its repairs, in 1761, were accomplished, by the aid of the Commonwealth, and the creation of a lottery, which continued to curse the community, for several years.

Peter Faneuil was then in all his glory. How readily, by the power of Imagination, I raise him from the dead, bolt upright; with his over portly form, and features full of *bon homie*; speaking volumes, about those five pipes of amber-colored Madeira, such as his friend Delancey had; and that best book of all sorts of cookery, of a large character, for the maid's reading! There he is, at the door of his English chariot, "handsome, but nothing gaudy," with his arms thereon, and his English coachman, and his English horses, and that "strait negro lad" perched behind. I see him now, helping in Miss Mary Anne, his youngest maiden sister; and, as he ascends the steps, wrapping his cloak around him, trimmed with that identical "*scarlet cloth of the very best quality*."

The vanity of man's anticipations, the occasional suddenness of his summons away—seldom find a more graphic illustration, than in the case of this noble hearted, and most hospitable gentleman. When he received the grateful salutations of the magnates of the town, who came to thank him, for his munificence, what could have been so little in his thoughts, or in theirs, as the idea, that he was so soon to die!

In about five years—five, short, luxurious years—after the death of Andrew Faneuil, Peter, his favorite nephew, was committed to the ground, March 10, 1742, old style. The event, from its suddenness, and from the amiable and benevolent character of the individual, produced a deep sensation, in the *village*, for Boston was nothing but a seashore village then. In 1728, some fourteen years before, we learn from Douglass, i. 531, that there were but 3000 rateable polls, on the peninsula. This

event was unexpected, by the living, and had been equally unexpected, by the dead. Death came to Peter, like a thief in the still night. He had not looked for this unwelcome visitor. He had made no will. By this event, Benjamin came into possession; and old Andrew is supposed to have turned over, indignantly, in his coffin.

No. CXXXI.

To such of my readers, as the Lord has abundantly blessed, in their basket and their store, and who have loaned him very little, on his simple promise, to be repaid, in Paradise; and who are, peradventure, at this very moment, excogitating revengeful wills; the issue of uncle Andrew's vindictive, posthumous arrangements may prove a profitable lesson, for their learning. Verily, God's ways are not as our ways, nor God's will as Uncle Andrew's.

It may be remembered, that, in the devise of his warehouse, in trust, for the benefit of the French Church, Andrew Faneuil provided, that, in the event of the extinction of that church, the estate should revert to his *right heirs—excluding Benjamin Faneuil, of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever*, whom he cuts off, as the popular phrase runs, with "*five shillings, and no more.*" In passing along, it may not be amiss to notice this popular error. The law has, at no time, required the bequest of a farthing, to one, near of kin, whom the testator intends to cut off. It is enough, if it be manifest, that the testator has *not forgotten him*; and, to leave no possible doubt upon the subject, a churlish curmudgeon, as in the present case, will transmit, in this offensive manner, the record of his vindictiveness and folly, to future generations.

When Andrew Faneuil makes Peter his residuary legatee, there is no provision, for the exclusion of Benjamin, in the event of Peter's death, without heirs of his body. Prepared, as this amiable, old gentleman was, to believe, in the possible extinction of the French Church, he seems to have looked upon Peter, an inveterate old bachelor, as immortal. Yet, in regard to Peter, the issue hung, by a single hair. There was no child, with

the cup in his hand, to catch the ball, and prevent it from lapsing directly into Benjamin's sack, who, with his sisters, stood close at hand, the next of kin to Peter, and heirs at law.

Well: as I have said, God's will was not as Uncle Andrew's. After a few flying years, during which Peter executed the intentions of the testator, with remarkable fidelity; and lived, as magnificently, as a nobleman, and as hospitably, as a bishop, and, as charitably, as an apostle—suddenly, the silver cord was loosed, and the golden bowl was broken, and Peter dropped into the grave. The title of Benjamin and his sisters to all Peter's estate, and to all Andrew's estate, that remained, as the heirs at law of Peter, passed into them, through the atmosphere, at once; and Andrew's will, by the act of God, was set aside, in the *upper Court*.

Administration was granted to Benjamin, March 18, 1742, O. S., who returned an inventory, April 21, 1744. The appraisers of the estate were William Price, Joseph Dowse, and Peter Chardon; and the sum total of their valuation was £44,451. 15. 7. This, certainly, will incline the reader to Master Lovell's idea, of "*a large and plentiful estate*," until I add those words of withering import—*Old Tenor*. Sterling decimates old tenor with a vengeance—*ten pounds, old tenor, were but one pound, sterling*. The valuation, therefore, amounted to about £4,445 sterling, or, in dollars, at five to the pound, to \$22,225. It may seem rather surprising, that the balance, which fell to Peter, from his uncle, under the will, and his own accumulations, should amount to no more. But a few reflections may tend to moderate our surprise.

The estate of his uncle had been seriously diminished, by the payment of legacies, £2,000 stg. to each of his three nieces, \$30,000—more than \$8,000 to his niece, Marie Phillips; and about \$2,000, in smaller legacies, raising the amount of legacies to \$40,000. He had also given his warehouse, in King Street, to the French Church. These legacies Peter had paid. He had also built and presented the Market-house and the Hall to the town. But there is another important consideration. Funds still remained, in other countries, part and parcel of Andrew's property. This is evident, from an original document before me, the marriage settlement of Peter's sister, Mary Anne with John Jones, bearing date March 15, 1742, the very month of Peter's death. This document recites, that one part of her estate, as one of the heirs of Peter Faneuil, "*is in Public Funds, such as*

the Bank of England." As this does not figure in Benjamin's inventory here, it is impossible to say what was the amount of foreign funds, which Peter owned, at the time of his death. For some five years, while he had been living, in a style of unbounded hospitality, he had also enjoyed the luxury of doing good, and paid, most liberally, for that enjoyment. From his commercial correspondence, I infer, that his enterprise suffered no material abatement, after his uncle's decease.

I cannot doubt, that his free expenditure of money, for his personal enjoyment, the gratification of his pride, and the pleasure of ministering to the wants of the poor and needy, had lessened, and was lessening, from month to month, the amount of his estate. There is yet another consideration, which belongs to this account, the great disparity, between the value of money, then, and at the present day.

The items, or particular heads, of the inventory, are one hundred and fifty-eight; and cover near four folio pages of the record. Some of them may not be wholly uninteresting to the reader. The mansion-house, the same, as I have stated, in which Lieutenant Governor Billy Phillips lived and died, and Isaiah Doane before him, the extensive garden, outhouses and yard were appraised, one hundred and eight years ago, at £12,375, or £1,237 stg., about \$6,185, at five dollars to the pound. Fourteen hundred ounces of plate, at £2,122 10. This plate was divided into five parts, for the brother, and four sisters of the deceased. A memorandum lies upon my table, labelled, in the original hand of Gillam Phillips—"An account of my proportion of plate, belonging to the estate of Peter Fancuil, Esq., deceased." This document contains a list of "*Gillam Phillips' Lot,*" and side by side—"a coffee pot—a large, handsome chamber pot." They made a free use of the precious metals, in those days.

A parcel of jewels are appraised, at £1,490—1 white horse, £15—2 Albany horses, £100—2 English horses, £250—2 other English horses, £300—4 old and 4 new harnesses, £120—2 pairs runners, £15—1 four-wheel chaise, £150—1 two-wheel chaise, £50—a coach, £100—1 chariot, £400—5 negroes, £150—130—120—120—100. Then follows a variety of articles—fowling pieces—fishing tackle—silver-hilted sword—pistols—china, glass, hangings, carpets, and culinary articles, in profusion—lignum vitæ coffee cups, lined with silver—silver snuff-

boxes—gold sleeve-buttons and rings—195 dozen of wine—arrack—beer—Cheshire and Gloucester cheeses. Indeed, Peter's establishment appears to have been a variorum edition of all manner of elegancies, luxuries, and creature comforts. The inventory comprehends eight tenements, in Cornhill, and King Street; a number of vessels, and parts of vessels; and various other items of property.

The remains of this noble-spirited descendant of the Huguenots of Rochelle were deposited, in the Faneuil tomb, in the westerly corner of the Granary Ground. This tomb is of dark freestone, with a freestone slab. Upon the easterly end of the tomb, there is a tablet of slate, upon which are sculptured, with manifest care and skill, the family arms; while, upon the freestone slab, are inscribed, at the top, *M. M.—memento mori*, of course,—and, at the bottom of the slab—a cruel apology for the old Huguenot patronymic—“PETER FUNEL. 1742,” and nothing more.

The explanation, which arises, in my mind, of this striking inconsistency, is this: I believe this tomb, whose aspect is simple, solid, and antique, to have been built by Andrew Faneuil, who was a wealthy merchant here as early as 1709: and I think it is quite certain, that the lady, whom he married, in Holland, and whose beauty is traditional, among her descendants, made the great exchange—beauty for ashes—in this very sepulchre. In this tomb, Andrew was buried, by Peter, Feb. 20, 1737, and Peter, by his brother, Benjamin, March 10, 1742, old style, and here Benjamin himself, was laid, after an interval of two-and-forty years, where there is neither work, nor device, nor will, nor codicil.

The arms of Peter Faneuil—I have them before me, at this moment, on his massive, silver pepper-pot—he found a place for them, on many of his possessions, though I cannot say, if on all the articles which came into the possession of Gillam Phillips,—were a field argent—no chevron—a large heart, truly a suitable emblem, in the centre, gules—seven stars equidistant from each other, and from the margin of the escutcheon, extending from the sinister chief to the dexter base—in the sinister base a cross molin, within an annulet—no scroll—no supporters; crest, a martlet.

The arms upon the tomb, though generally like these, and like the arms, on other articles, once Peter's, and still extant,

differ in some important particulars; and seem to have been quartered with those of another family, as the arms of Andrew, being a collateral, might have been. A helmet, beneath the martlet, especially, is wholly different from Peter's crest. Such precisely are the arms, on the seal of wax, upon Andrew's will, in the Registry. Hence I infer, that Uncle Andrew built this ancient sepulchre. Arms, in days of old, and still, where a titled nobility exists, are deemed, for the popular eye, sufficient evidence of ownership, without a name. So thought Uncle Andrew; and he left the freestone tablet, without any inscription.

Some five years after the testator's burial, the tomb was again opened, to let in the residuary legatee. Peter's was a grand funeral. The Evening Post, of March 3, 1742-3, foretold, that it would be such; but the papers, which, doubtless, gave an account of it, are lost—the files are imperfect, of all those primitive journals. At first, and for years, the resting place of Peter's remains was well enough known. But the rust of time began to gather upon men's memories. The Faneuil arms, ere long, became unintelligible, to such, as strolled among the tombs. That "*handsome chariot, but nothing gaudy*," with Peter's armorial bearings upon its panels, no longer rolled along Treamount, and Queen Streets, and Cornhill, and drew up, of a Sabbath morning, before Trinity Church, that brother Peter and the ladies might sit upon their cushions, in No. 40, while brother Addington Davenport gave them a sermon, upon the Apostolical succession. The good people had therefore forgotten all about the Faneuil arms; and, before a great many years had rolled away, the inquiry naturally arose, in popular phraseology—"Whereabouts was it, that Peter Faneuil was buried?"

Some worthy old citizen—God bless him—who knew rather more of this matter than his neighbors, and was well aware, that the arms would be but a dead letter to posterity, resolved to serve the public, and remedy the defect. Up he goes into the Granary Ground, in the very spirit of Old Mortality, and, with all his orthography in his ear, inscribes P. FUNEL upon the tablet!

No. CXXXII.

"*But Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever.*" Mark i. 30. From this text, a clergyman—*of the old school*—had preached just as many, consecutive sermons, as I have already published articles, concerning Peter Faneuil and his family. A day or two after the last discourse, the bell of the village church was tolled, for a funeral; and a long-suffering parishioner, being asked, whose funeral it was, replied, that he had no doubt it was Simon's wife's mother's; for she had been sick of a fever, for nine weeks, to his certain knowledge. Let the reader possess himself in patience—our dealings with the Faneuils cannot last forever.

We have stated, that Peter's death was sudden, the very death, from which, as a churchman, he had prayed to be delivered. But let us not forget, that no death is sudden, in the sense of the good man's prayers, however instantaneously the golden bowl may be broken, to him, whose life has been well spent, and who is prepared to die.

In this connection, two interesting questions arise—how Peter Faneuil came to be a churchman—and if his life was a well-spent life, affording him reasonable assurance of admission into Paradise.

The old Huguenots styled themselves "**THE REFORMERS,**" and embraced the doctrines of Calvin, in full. Oppression commonly teaches even intolerant men the value of toleration. Our Puritan fathers, it is true, who fled from Episcopal, as the Huguenots from Roman Catholic tyranny, profited very little, by the lesson they had learned; and turned upon the Catholics and Quakers, in the spirit of preposterous cruelty. The government of Massachusetts, according to Hazard, received a profitable lesson of moderation, from that of Rhode Island.

The Huguenots soon began to abate somewhat of that exorbitant severity and punctiliousness, in their religion, which, in no slight degree, had brought upon them that persecution, which was gathering, and impending over them, in 1684, a twelvemonth before the revocation of the edict of Nantes; compelling many of them, thus early, to fly from their homes, into other lands. The teachings of James Saurin, the great Huguenot preacher of the refugees, at the Hague, in 1705, and in subsequent years,

were of a milder type. He was "*a moderate Calvinist*." Such, also, were Daillé and Le Mercier, the ministers of the French Church, in Boston.

Peter Faneuil, undoubtedly, worshipped in this church, during a certain period. We have seen the liberal arrangement of his uncle, in 1734, for the support of its minister, and the testator's provision for its poor. Even then, he evidently anticipated, that it might cease to be; and shaped his testamentary provisions accordingly. Natural causes were in operation; I have referred to them—intermarriage, with our English people—merging the language of the few, in that of the many—juxtaposition—all tending to diminish the necessity for maintaining a separate church.

There was no dissolution of the society, at first, by any formal vote. The attendance became irregular and scanty—the members went elsewhere—Le Mercier, "*a worthy character*," says the Rev. Dr. Holmes, ceased to officiate, and the church broke up. For years, there were no services, within the little temple; and, in 1748, it was sold, as I have stated, to the members of another denomination.

It became a question with these Huguenots, the Faneuils, the Boutineaus, the Johonnots, the Oliviers, the Sigourneys, and their associates, where they should worship God. In 1740–41, the preachers, in Boston, were Charles Chauncey, at the Old Brick—at the Old North, Increase Mather, supplying the place of his brother Samuel, who, though ordained, in 1732, preached but one winter, and parted—at the Old South, Joseph Sewall, and Thomas Prince—at the Baptist, in Back Street, Jeremy Condry—at King's Chapel, Stephen Roe—at Brattle Street, William Cooper—at the Quaker meeting-house, in Leverett's Lane, whoever was moved by the Spirit—at the New North, John Webb—at the New South, Samuel Checkley—at the New Brick, Ellis Gray—at Christ Church, Timothy Cutler—at Long Lane, Jonny Moorhead—at Hollis Street, Mather Byles—at Trinity, Addington Davenport—at Lynde Street, William Hooper.

Several of the descendants of the Huguenots, not at all deterred, by the resemblance, whatever that might be, between the forms of Episcopalian worship, and those of their religious persecutors, the Roman Catholics, mingled with the Episcopalians. Thus they clung to the common element, the doctrine of the Trinity; and escaped, like Saurin, from the super-sulphuretted vapors of primitive Calvinism.

It is not very surprising, that the Faneuils should have settled down, upon the new and fashionable temple—Trinity had been erected but a few years before ; and the new rector was Peter's brother-in-law, Mr. Addington Davenport.

Peter therefore became, *pro tanto*, an Episcopalian—a liberal subscriber to the Charitable, Episcopal fund, and to the fund for the rebuilding of King's Chapel ; and identified himself with the Episcopal interest.

The religious character of Peter Faneuil, and the present whereabouts of this public benefactor, will be determined, by different individuals, according to the respective indications of their spiritual thermometers.

I have already ventured an opinion, that the mantle of charity, which covereth a multitude of sins, should be extended, for Peter's behoof, over that little affair with Peter Baynton, touching the duties, on those four hogsheads of brandy. But there is another matter, over which, I am aware, that some very worthy people will doubt, if the mantle of charity, can be stretched, without serious danger of lesion—I refer to the importation, about the same time with the prayer books, of that enormous quantity—six gross—of “the very best King Henry's cards.” I have often marvelled, how the name of the Defender of the Faith ever came to be connected, with such pestilent things.

I am well aware, how closely, in the opinions of some learned divines, cards are associated with the idea of eternal damnation. If it be so ; and a single pack is enough to send the proprietor to the bottomless pit, it is truly grievous to reflect how much deeper Peter, our great public benefactor, has gone, with the oppressive weight of six gross of the very best, upon his soul. Now-a-days, there seem to be very few, the Romanists excepted, who believe in purgatory ; and it is pretty generally agreed, that all, who attempt the bridge of *Al Sirat*, will surely arrive, either at Paradise, or Pandemonium.

How delightful it would be, to have the opinion of good old André Le Mercier, in a case like this. Though Peter no longer waited upon Le Mercier's ministrations ; but, for several years, before the dissolution of the French Church, had settled down, under brother Addington Davenport, first, as the assistant at King's Chapel, and, afterwards, as the Rector of Trinity ; yet Le Mercier could not forget the nephew of his benefactor, Andrew Faneuil. He was, doubtless, at Peter's funeral, who died one

and twenty years, before the holy man was summoned to his account, in 1764. Yes, he was there.

I have heard of a man, who accounted, for the dryness of his eyes, when all around him wept, at a pathetic discourse, on the ground, that he belonged to another parish. I have known Christian ministers—*very*—not many, thank heaven—who were influenced, to such a degree, by that spirit, which may be supposed to govern the proprietors of opposition omnibuses, as to consider the chord of human sympathy cut, through and through, and forever, between themselves, and a parishioner, who, for any cause, elected to receive his spiritual treasures out of some other earthen vessel, albeit of the very same denomination of crockery ware.

Poverty, and disease, and death, and misery, in every type, might stalk in, and upon, and over that homestead, and hearth, where these Christian ministers had been warmed, and refreshed, and fostered—but it was no longer a concern of theirs. No visit of condolence—no kind inquiry—not one, cheap word of consolation had they, for such, as had ceased to receive their ideas of damnation from them—enough—these individuals had sold their pews—“*crimen difficile expiandum*”—they belonged to another parish!

André Le Mercier, was not a man of this description. He was not a holy huckster of spiritual things, having not one crumb of comfort, for any, but his regular customers. André was a man, whose neighbor's ubiquity was a proverb.

But what he would say, about these six gross of King Henry's cards, I am by no means, certain. He was a man of a tolerant spirit; but on certain points, the most tolerant are, occasionally, found to be imbued, with unalterable prejudices. On page 85, of his Church History of Geneva, which I have read with pleasure, he quotes approvingly, the maxim of “a doctor of the church.” “*In necessariis rebus sit unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.*” This breathes the spirit of toleration:—what are *dubia*, what *necessaria* are not quite so readily settled, however.

On page 100, I find a passage, not quite so favorable for Peter, in this matter of the six gross. Referring to Calvin's return to Geneva, in 1536, after his banishment, Le Mercier says—“And then *Balls and Dances* and profane songs were forbidden, by the magistrates. And that form of Discipline remains entire, to the present Time, notwithstanding the repeated Attempts, that have

been made by wicked People to overset it. King Henry's cards, I fear, even of the very best quality, would, undoubtedly, fall into this category, of things Calvinized on earth, in the opinion of André Le Mercier.

The meaning of the words, "*profane songs*," may not be universally intelligible. It undoubtedly meant, as used by the Council, *all songs not sacred*. Calvin, undoubtedly, adopted the commendation of Scripture, to such, as were merry, to sing psalms. It appears, however, that certain persons entertained conservative notions, in those early days; even beyond the dictum of holy writ; for, on page 101, Le Mercier states, that Sebastian Castalio, a preacher, and professor, in the College of Geneva, "*condemned Solomon's Songs, as being profane and immodest*;" the very charge, as the reader is aware, which has been so often urged, against the songs of Tom Moore. Moore, at last, betook himself to sacred melodies. Solomon, had his life been spared, would, probably, have done the same thing, to the entire satisfaction of Sebastian Castalio.

I see wisdom, and mercy, and truth, in a part of the maxim, quoted by André Le Mercier—*in dubiis libertas*. I have long suspected there were some angels in Heaven, who were damned by Calvin, on earth. I verily believe, that Peter Faneuil is in Paradise.

No. CXXXIII.

SOME of my readers, I doubt not, have involuntarily clenched their fists, and set their teeth hard, while conning over the details of that merciless and bloody duel, so long, and so deliberately projected, and furiously fought, at last, near Bergen op Zoom, by the Lord Bruce, and Sir Edward Sackville, with rapiers, and in their shirts. Gentle reader, if you have never met with this morceau, literally dripping with blood, and are born with a relish for such rare provant—for I fear the appetite is congenital—you will find an ample account of the affair, in numbers 129 and 133 of the Guardian.

This wrathful fight is of an early date, having taken place, in 1613. Who could measure the popular excitement, if tomorrow's dawn should bring the tidings of a duel, fought the

night before, on Boston Common, by two young gentlemen, with rapiers, not, perhaps, quite so brutal, in its minute details, but quite as deliberately planned, and quite as fatal, in its result! What then must have been the effect of such an announcement, on the morning of the fourth of July, 1728, one hundred and twenty-three years ago, when Boston was a seaport village, just six years, after the "*perlustration*" of Mr. Salter had rated the population, at 10,670 souls.

It is matter of sober history, that such a duel was actually fought, then and there, on the evening of the third of July, 1728, near the powder-house, which is indicated, on Bonner's plan of 1722. This was a very different affair from the powder-house, erected at West Boston, in 1774, with walls of seven feet in thickness.

The parties, engaged, in this fatal affair were two young gentlemen, whose connections were highly respectable, whose lives had been amiable, whose characters were of good report, and whose friends were numerous and powerful. The names of Peter Faneuil and of his uncle, Jean Faneuil, of Rochelle, are associated with this transaction.

The parties were very young; the survivor twenty-two, and the victim but little more. The survivor, Henry Phillips, was the brother of Gillam Phillips, who, the reader of the preceding articles will remember, married Marie, the sister of Peter Faneuil. Peter was then just twenty-eight; and, doubtless, if there were dandies in those days, one of the foremost, on the peninsula. The natural interest he felt, in the brother of his sister's husband, engaged his efforts, to spirit the wretched survivor away. He was consigned to the uncle of Peter, beyond the sea—to whom Marie, his niece, very probably, wrote a few lines, bespeaking kind offices, for the unfortunate brother of her husband. It is not impossible, that old André added a prudential word or two, by way of postscript, confirming brother Jean, as to the safety of the operation. Be this as it may, Henry Phillips escaped from his pursuers, who were speedily put upon the scent, by Governor Dummer. Henry Phillips arrived safely in Rochelle. What befel him, in the strange land, is not the least interesting portion of the narrative.

Benjamin Woodbridge—such was the name of the individual, who was the victim, in this fatal encounter—was a young merchant, in partnership with Mr. Jonathan Sewall. Of his particu-

lar origin I am not entirely satisfied. The name, among us, is of the olden time. Benjamin Woodbridge was the very earliest alumnus of Harvard College: born in England in 1622, and graduated here in 1642.

The originating cause of this duel, like that, which produced the terrible conflict, between the Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, is unknown.

That the reader may walk along with me, confidently, upon this occasion, it may be well to indicate the sources, from which I derive my knowledge of a transaction, so exciting at the time, so fatal in its results, and so almost universally unknown, to those, who daily pass over the very spot, on our Common, upon which these young gentlemen met, and where young Woodbridge fell.

I have alluded to the subsequent relation of Peter Faneuil, and of his uncle, Jean, of Rochelle, to this affair. In my investigation into the history of Peter and his relatives, I have been aided by Mr. Charles Faneuil Jones, the grandson of Peter's sister, Mary Ann. Among the documents, loaned me, by that gentleman, are sundry papers, which belonged to Gillam Phillips, the brother of Henry, the survivor in the duel.

Among these papers, are original documents, in Jean Faneuil's handwriting, relative to the fate of the miserable wanderer, after his arrival in Rochelle—accounts of disbursements—regularly authenticated copies of the testimony, relative to the duel, and to the finding of the dead body of Woodbridge, and to the coöperation of Peter Faneuil and others, in concealing the survivor, on board the *Sheerness*, British man of war, and of his indictment, the "*Billa Vera*," in August, 1728, by the grand jury of Suffolk, for murder. In addition to these documents, I have found a certified copy of a statement, highly favorable to the character of Henry Phillips, the survivor, and manifestly intended to have an influence upon the public mind. This statement is subscribed, by eighty-eight prominent citizens, several of them holding high official stations, and among the number, are four ministers of the Gospel, with the Rev. Timothy Cutler, of Christ Church, at their head. Appended is the certificate of Governor Burnett, who, in that very month, succeeded Governor Dummer, stating the official, professional and social position of the signers of this document, with which it was clearly intended to fortify an application to George II. for a pardon of the offender.

The discovery of these papers, affording, as they do, some account of a transaction, so very remarkable, for the time and place of its occurrence, and of which I had never heard nor read before, excited my curiosity, and led me to search for additional information.

If my reader is of the fancy, he will readily comprehend my chagrin, when, upon turning over the leaves of Green's "*Boston Weekly News Letter*"—the imperfect files—all that time has left us—preserved in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society—the very paper, that next ensued, after July 3, 1728, the date of the duel, and which, doubtless, referred to an occurrence, so very extraordinary, was among the "*things lost upon earth*." I was not less unfortunate with the files of the old "*Boston Gazette*," of that early day. I then took up Kneeland's "*New England Weekly Journal*," but with very little confidence of success. The file, however, was there—No. 68—July 8, 1728, and my eyes soon fell, as the reader's fall at this moment, upon Governor Dummer's proclamation:—

"Whereas a barbarous murder was last night committed, on the body of Benjamin Woodbridge, a young gentleman, resident in the town of Boston; and Henry Phillips, of said town, is suspected to be the author of said murder, and is now fled from justice; I have therefore thought proper to issue this proclamation, hereby commanding all justices, sheriffs, constables, and all other officers, within this Province, and requiring all others, in his Majesty's name, to use their utmost endeavors, that the said Henry Phillips may be apprehended and brought to justice; and all persons, whosoever, are commanded, at their utmost peril, not to harbor nor conceal him. The said Henry Phillips is a fair young man, about the age of twenty-two years, well set, and well dressed; and has a wound in one of his hands. Given at Boston, the 4th of July, 1728, in the second year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord and King, George II." This proclamation bears the signature of his Excellency, William Dummer.

The editor of the journal, which contains the proclamation, expresses himself as follows—"On Thursday last, the 4th current, about 3 in the morning, after some hour's search, was found dead, near the Powder House, the body of Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, a young gentleman, merchant of this place. He had a small stab, under the right arm; but what proved fatal to him was a thrust he received, under his right breast, which came

out, at the small of his back. The fore-finger of his left hand was almost cut off, at the uppermost joint, supposed to be done, by grasping a naked sword. The coroner's inquest immediately set upon the body; and, after the best information and evidence they could obtain, upon their oaths say, that 'the said Benjamin Woodbridge was killed, with a sword, run through his body, by the hands of Henry Phillips, of Boston, merchant, on the Common, in said Boston, on the third of this instant, as appears to us, by sundry evidences.' The body was carried to the house of Mr. Jonathan Sewall, (his partner,) and, on Saturday last, was decently and handsomely interred, his funeral being attended, by the Commander-in-Chief, several of the Council, and most of the merchants and gentlemen of the town. There are many and various reports respecting this tragic scene, which makes us cautious of relating any of them. But the above, being plain matters of fact, we thought it not improper to give the public an account thereof. The unhappy gentleman, who is supposed to have committed the act, is not as yet found. This new and almost unknown case has put almost the whole town into great surprise."

* A sermon, upon this occasion, of uncommon length, was delivered July 18, 1728, by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Sewall, of the Old South, at the Public Lecture, and published, with a preface, by the "United Ministers" of Boston. To give dignity to this discourse, it is adorned with a Latin prefix—" *Duellum est damnandum, tam in acceptante quam in provocante; quamvis major sit culpa provocantis.*" This discourse is singularly barren of all allusion to the cause and circumstances of this event; and appears, like our almanacs, adapted to any meridian.

At his Majesty's Court of Assize and General Gaol Delivery, on the second Tuesday of August, 1728, the grand jurors, under the Attorney General Hiller's instructions, found a "*Vera Billa*" against Henry Phillips, for the murder of Benjamin Woodbridge. Phillips was then far beyond the influence and effect of the *vera billa*—on the high sea—upon his voyage of expatriation. For some cause, which I am entirely unable to comprehend, and can barely conjecture, a sympathy existed, for this young man, extending far beyond the circle of his personal friends and relatives, and engaging, on his behalf, the disinterested efforts, not only of several persons in high official stations, but in holy orders, who cannot be supposed to have undervalued the crime, of

which he was unquestionably guilty, before God and man. The reader, as we proceed, may possibly be more successful than I have been, in discovering the occasion of this extraordinary sympathy.

No. CXXXIV.

THAT strong sympathy, exhibited for Henry Phillips, by whose sword a fellow creature had so recently fallen, in a duel, must have sprung, if I am not greatly mistaken, from a knowledge of facts, connected with the origin of that duel, and of which the present generation is entirely ignorant.

Truth lies not, more proverbially, at the bottom of a well, than, in a great majority of instances, a woman lurks at the bottom of a duel. If Phillips, unless sorely provoked, had been the challenger, I cannot think the gentlemen, who signed the certificate, in his behalf, would have spoken of him thus :—

“These may certify to all whom it may concern, that we, the subscribers, well knew and esteemed Mr. Henry Phillips of Boston, in New England, to be a youth of a very affable, courteous, and peaceable behavior and disposition, and never heard he was addicted to quarrelling, he being soberly brought up, in the prosecution of his studies, and living chiefly an academical life; and verily believe him slow to anger, and with difficulty moved to resentment.”

Among the eighty-eight signers of this certificate, the names of Peter and Benjamin Faneuil, and of their uncle, Andrew, occur, almost as a matter of course. They were family connections. Who the others were, appears, by the Governor's certificate, under the seal of the Province :—

“By his Excellency, William Burnet, &c. &c. These may certify whom it may concern, that John Wentworth Esquire is Lieut. Governor of the Province of New Hampshire; that William Tailor Esquire was formerly Lieut. Governor of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, and is now a member of his Majesty's Council for said Province; that James Stevens is Surveyor General of the Customs, for the Northern district, in America; that Thomas Lechmere Esquire was late Surveyor

General of the same ; that John Jekyll Esquire is Collector of the Customs, for the port of Boston ; that Thomas Steele is Justice of the Peace ; that William Lambert Esquire is Controller of the Customs, at Boston ; that J. Minzies Esquire was Judge of the Vice Admiralty ; that Messieurs Timothy Cutler, Henry Harris, George Pigot, and Ebenezer Miller are ministers of the Gospel ; and that the other subscribers to the certificate on the other side, are, some of them merchants and others gentlemen of the town of Boston." This certificate, bearing the signature of Gov. Burnet, is dated Oct. 21, 1728.

Of the origin of this affair, I have discovered nothing. Immediately after its consummation, Phillips manifested deep distress, at the result. About midnight, of July 3, 1728, with the assistance of his brother, Gillam, Peter Faneuil, and several other persons, Henry Phillips was removed to a place of safety. He was first conducted, by Peter Faneuil, to the house of Col. Estis Hatch, and there concealed. His brother, Gillam, in the meanwhile, applied to Captain John Winslow, of "*the Pink, Molly*," for a boat, to carry Henry, on board the British man of war, then lying between the Castle and Spectacle Island. Gillam and the Captain repaired to Hatch's, and had an interview with Peter and Henry, in the yard. It was then concluded, that Henry should go to Gibbs' Wharf, probably as the most retired wharf, for embarkation. The reader, who loves to localize—this word will do—will find this little wharf, on Bonner's plan, of 1722, at the southeastern margin of Fort Hill, about half way between Whitehorn's Wharf and South Battery. It lay directly north-east, and not far distant from the lower end of Gibbs' Lane, now Belmont Street.

Henry Phillips, with Peter Faneuil, accordingly proceeded, as quietly as possible, to Gibbs' Wharf. I see them now, stealing through Hatch's back gate, and looking stealthily behind them, as they take the darker side of Belcher's Lane. I trust there was no moon, that night. It was very foggy. The reader will soon be sure, that I am right, in that particular.

Gillam and Captain Winslow had gone to the Long Wharf, where the Molly's boat lay ; and, as the distance was very considerable to the man-of-war, they went first to the Pink, Molly—named, doubtless, for the Captain's lady. There they took on board, four of the Pink's crew.

How heavily the moments passed that night ! That "*fair*

young man," as Governor Dummer calls him, in the *lettres de cachet*—too young, it may seem, at twenty-two, to commence a pilgrimage, like Cain's—how sublimated his misery must have been! What sacrifice would he not have made, to break the dead man's slumber! There he lay; as yet unfound, stark, and stiff, and with eyes unclosed—

"Cut off, ev'n in the blossoms of my sin,
Unhousel'd, unanointed, unanneal'd."

Bootless sorrow! He had made his bloody bed—and therein must he lie o' nights, and in no other. There were no hops in that pillow, for his burning brain. The undying memory of a murdered victim—what an everlasting agrypnic it must be!

Time, to this wretched boy, seemed very like eternity, that night—but the sound of the splashing oar was audible at last—the boat touched the wharf—for the last time he shook the hand of his friend, Peter Faneuil, and left the land of his birth, which he was destined never to revisit.

The boat was turned from the shore, and the rowers gave way. But so intense was the fog, that night, that they got on shore, at Dorchester Neck; and, not until long after midnight, reached the Sheerness, man of war. They were received on board. Captain Conrad and Lieutenant Pritchard were very naturally disposed to sympathize with "*a fair young man*," in a predicament, like this—it was all in their line. Gillam, the elder brother, related the occurrence; and, before day, parted from Henry, whom he was destined to meet no more. Early, on the following morning, the events of the preceding night had been whispered, from man to man; for the pleasure of being among the earliest, to communicate the intelligence of a bloody murder, was precisely the same, in 1728, as it is, at the present day. Mrs. Winslow, the lady of the Captain of the Molly, had learned all the details, doubtless, before the morning watch. The surgeons, who dressed the wounds of Henry Phillips, for he also was wounded, felt themselves under no obligation to be silent. The sailors of the Molly, who had overheard the conversation of several of the party, were under no injunction of secrecy. Indeed, long before the dawn of the fourth of July—not then the glorious Fourth—the intelligence had spread, far and wide; and parties were scouring the Common, in quest of the murdered man. At an early hour, Governor Dummer's proclamation was

in the hands of some trusty compositor, in the office of Samuel Kneeland, in Queen Street; and soon the handbills were upon all the town pumps, and chief corners, according to the usage of those days.

There is a pleasure, somewhat difficult of analysis, undoubtedly, in gazing for hours upon the stuffed skin of a beast, that, when in the flesh, has devoured a respectable citizen. When good Mr. Bowen—not the professor—kept his museum in the mansion, occupied, before the Revolution, by the Rev. Dr. Caner, and upon whose site the Savings Bank, and Historical Society have their apartments, at present, nothing in all his collection—not even the Salem Beauty—nor Marat and Charlotte Cordé—interested me so much, as a broken sword, with a label annexed, certifying, that, during the horrors of St. Domingo, seven and twenty of the white inhabitants had fallen, beneath that sword, in the hands of a gigantic negro! How long, one of the fancy will linger—“*patiens pulveris atque solis*” for the luxury of looking upon nothing more picturesque than the iron bars of a murderer’s cell!

It had, most naturally, spread abroad, that young Philips was concealed, on board the man of war. Hundreds may be supposed to have gathered, in groups, straining their eyes, to get a glimpse of the Sheerness; and the officer, who, in obedience to the warrant, proceeded, on that foggy morning, to arrest the offender, found more difficulty, in discovering the man of war, than was encountered, on the preceding evening, by those, who had sought for the body of Woodbridge, upon the Common. At length, the fog fled before the sun—the vista was opened between the Castle and Spectacle Island—but the Sheerness was no longer there—literally, the places that had known her, knew her no more.

Some of our worthy fathers, more curious than the rest, betook themselves, I dare say, to the cupola of the *old* townhouse—how few of us are aware, that the present is the third, that has occupied that spot. There, with their glasses, they swept the eastern horizon, to find the truant ship—and enjoyed the same measure of satisfaction, that Mr. Irving represents the lodger to have enjoyed, who was so solicitous to get a glimpse of the “Stout Gentleman.”

Over the waters she went, heavily laden, with as much misery, as could be pent up, in the bosom of a single individual.

He was stricken with that malady, which knows no remedy from man—a mind diseased. In one brief hour, he had disfranchised himself for ever, and become a miserable exile.

Among the officers of the Sheerness, he must have been accounted a young lion. His *gallantry*, in the estimation of the gentlemen of the wardroom, must have furnished a ready passport to their hearts—he *had killed his man!*—with the *civilized*, not less than with the *savage*, this is the proudest mark of excellence! How little must he have relished the approbation of the thoughtless, for an act, which had made him the wretched young man, that he was! How paltry the compensation for the anguish he had inflicted upon others—the mourning relatives of him, whom he had, that night, destroyed—his own connections—*his mother*—he was too young, at twenty-two, to be insensible to the sufferings of that mother! God knows, she had not forgotten her poor, misguided boy; as we shall presently see she crossed the ocean, to hold the aching head, and bind up the broken heart of her expatriated son—and arrived, only in season, to weep upon his grave, while it was yet green.

No. CXXXV.

It is known, that *old* Chief Justice Sewall, who died Jan. 1, 1730, kept a diary, which is in the possession of the Rev. Samuel Sewall, of Burlington, Mass., the son of the *late* Chief Justice Sewall. As the death of the *old* Chief Justice occurred, about eighteen months after the time, when the duel was fought, between Phillips and Woodbridge, it occurred to me, that some allusion to it, might be found, in the diary.

The Rev. Samuel Sewall has, very kindly, informed me, that the diary of the Chief Justice does not refer to the duel; but that the event was noticed by him, in his interleaved almanac, and by the Rev. Joseph Sewall, who preached the occasional sermon, to which I have referred—in *his* diary: and the Rev. Mr. Sewall, of Burlington, has obligingly furnished me with such extracts, as seem to have a bearing on the subject, and with some suggestions, in relation to the parties.

On the 4th of July, 1728, Judge Sewall, in his interleaved

almanac, writes thus—"Poor Mr. Benjam. Woodbridge is found dead in the Comon this morning, below the Powder-house, with a Sword-thrust through him, and his own Sicord undrawn. Henry Phillips is suspected. The town is amazed!" This wears the aspect of what is commonly called foul play; and the impression might exist, that Phillips had run his antagonist through, before he had drawn his sword.

It is quite likely, that Judge Sewall himself had that impression, when he made his entry, on the fourth of July: the reader will observe, he does not say *sheathed* but *undrawn*. If there existed no evidence to rebut this presumption, it would seem, not that there had been murder, in a duel, but a case of the *most atrocious* murder; for nothing would be more unlikely to happen, than that a man, after having received his death wound, in this manner, should have sheathed his own sword. The wound was under the right pap; he was run through; the sword had come out, at the small of his back. How strongly, in this case, the presumptive evidence would bear against Phillips, not that he killed Woodbridge, for of this there is no doubt; but that he killed him, before he had drawn his own sword.

When the reader shall have read the authenticated testimony, which now lies before me, he will see, not only that the swords of both were drawn—but that both were wounded—that, after Woodbridge was wounded, he either dropped his sword, or was disarmed—and, that, when he had become helpless, and had walked some little distance from the spot, Phillips picked up the sword of his antagonist, and returned it to the scabbard. The proof of this, by an eye-witness, is clear, direct, and conclusive.

The next extract, in order of time, is from the diary of the Rev. Joseph Sewall, under date July, 1728—"N. B. On ye 4th (wch was kept, as a Day of Prayr upon ye account of ye Drought) we were surpris'd wth ye sad Tidings yt Mr. Henry Phillips and Mr Woodbridge fought a duel in wch ye latter was slain. O Ld Preserve ye Tow. and Land from the guilt of Blood."—"In ye Eveng. I visited Mrs. Ph. O Ld Sanctify thine awful judgt to her. Give her Son a thorow Repentce."

These extracts are of interest, not simply because they are historical, but as illustrative of the times.

"1728, July 18. I preached ye Lecture from yese words, Ps. 119, 115, Depart from me ye evil Doers, &c. Endeavd

to shew ye evill and danger of wicked Company.—Condemned Duelling as a bloody crime, &c. O Lord, Bless my poor labours.”

“1728-9, January 22. Mr. Thacher, Mr. Prince, and I met at Mrs. Phillip’s, and Pray’d for her son. I hope G. graciously assisted. Ld Pardon the hainous Sins of yt young man, convert and Heal his soul.”

Writing to a London correspondent, June 2, 1729, Chief Justice Sewall says—“Richard put the Letter on board Capt. Thomas Lithered, who saild this day; in who went Madam Hannah Phillips.” In his interleaved almanac is the following entry—“1729, Sept. 27, Saturday Madam Phillips arrives; mane.” The explanation of these two last entries is at hand. Jean Faneuil of Rochelle had, doubtless, written, either to his brother André, in Boston, or to his nephew, by marriage, Gillam Phillips, giving an account of the wanderer, Gillam’s brother. At length, the tidings came hither, that he was sick; and, probably, in May, 1729, intelligence arrived, that he was *dangerously ill*. The mother’s heart was stirred within her. By the first vessel she embarked for London, on her way to Rochelle. The eyes of that unhappy young man were not destined to behold again the face of her, whose daylight he had turned into darkness, and whose heart he had broken.

He died about the twentieth of May, 1729, as I infer from the documents before me. The first of these is the account, rendered by Jean Faneuil, to Gillam Phillips, in Jean’s own hand—“*Deboursement fait par Jean faneuil pour feu Monsieur heny Philipe de Boston,*” &c. He charges in this account, for amount paid the physician, “*pendant sa maladie.*” The doctor’s bill is sent as a voucher, and is also before me. Dr. “*Girard De Vilars, Aggrégé au College Royal des Mediciens de la Rochelle*” acknowledges to have received payment in full *pour l’honoraire des consultations de mes confreres et moy a Monsieur Henry Phillipe Anglois*, from the fourth of April, to the twentieth of May.

The apothecary’s bill of Monsieur Guinot, covering three folio pages, is an interesting document, for something of the nature of the malady may be inferred, from the *materia medica* employed—*potion anodine*—*baume tranquille sant*—*cordial somnifere*. How effectually the visions, the graphic recollections of this miserable young man must have *murdered sleep*!

The Rev. Mr. Sewall of Burlington suggests, that Mr. Benja-

min Woodbridge, who fell in this duel, was, very probably, the grandson of the Rev. John Woodbridge of Andover, and he adds, that his partner, Jonathan Sewall, to whose house the body was conveyed, was a nephew of the *old* Chief Justice, and, in 1717, was in business with an elder brother, Major Samuel Sewall, with whom he resided. In 1726, Major Sewall "lived in a house, once occupied by Madam Usher, near the Common;" whither the body of Woodbridge might have been conveyed, without much trouble.

The General Court, which assembled, on the 28th of that month, in which this encounter took place, enacted a more stringent law, than had existed before, on the subject of duelling.

I shall now present the testimony, as it lies before me, certified by Elisha Cook, J. P., before whom the examination was had, on the morning after the duel:—

"Suffolk, ss. Memorandum. Boston, July 4, 1728. Messrs. Robert Handy, George Stewart and others being convened on examination, concerning the murder of Benja. Woodbridge last night, Mr. Handy examined saith—that sometime before night Mr. Benja. Woodbridge come to me at the * White horse and desired me to lett him (have) his own sword. I asked ye reason: he replied he had business called him into the Country. I was jealous he made an excuse. I urged him to tell me plainly what occasion he had for a sword, fearing it was to meet with Mr. Henry Phillips, who had lately fell out. He still persisted in his first story, upon which I gave him his sword and belt,† and then he left the Compy, Mr. Thomas Barton being in Company, I immediately followed, and went into the Common, found said Woodbridge walking the Common by the Powder house, his sword by his side. I saw no person save him. I againe urged the occasion of his being there. He denied informing. In some short time, I saw Mr. Henry Phillips walking towards us, with his Sword by his side and Cloke on. Before he came nere us I told them I feared there was a Quarrel and what would be the events. They both denied it.

"Mr. Phillips replied again Mr. Woodbridge and he had some particular business that concerned them two onley and desired I

* Nearly opposite the residence of Dr. Lemuel Hayward, deceased, where Hayward Place now is.

† Woodbridge, I suppose, belonged to some military company, whose arms and accoutrements were probably kept at the White Horse tavern, under the charge of Robert Handy.

would go about my business. I still persuaded them to let me know their design, and if any quarrel they would make it up. Mr. Phillips used me in such a manner with slites (slights) that I went of and left them by the powder house, this was about eight in the evening. I went up the Common. They walked down. After some short space I returned, being justly fearful of their designe, in order to prevent their fiteing with Swords. I mett with them about the Powder House. I first saw Mr. Woodbridge making up to me, holding his left hand below his right breast. I discovered blood upon his coat, asked the meaning of it. He told me Mr. Phillips had wounded him. Having no Sword I enquired where it was. He said Mr. Phillips had it. Mr. Phillips immediately came up, with Woodbridge's sword in his hand naked, his own by his side. I told them I was surprized they should quarrel to this degree. I told Mr. Phillips he had wounded Mr. Woodbridge. He replied yes so he had and Mr. Woodbridge had also wounded me, but in the fleshy part onley, shewing me his cut fingers. Mr. Phillips took Mr. Woodbridge's scabbard, sheathed the Sword, and either laid it down by him, or gave it to him.

"Mr. Woodbridge beginning to faint satt down, and begged that surgeons might be sent for. I immediately went away, leaving these two together. Phillips presently followed, told me for God's sake to go back to Woodbridge, and take care of him, till he returned with a surgeon. I prayed him to hasten, but did not care to returne. Mr. Phillips went away as fast as he could and went down the lane by the Pound.* I returned to the White Horse. I found Mr. Barton and Geoe Reason together. I told Mr. Barton Phillips and Woodbridge having quarreled, Woodbridge was much wounded. I asked Barton to go and see how it was it with Woodbridge. We went a little way from the house, with a designe to go, but Barton, hearing Phillips was gone for a Chirurgion, concluded Phillips would procure a Chirurgion, and so declined going, and went to Mr. Blin's house where we were invited to supper. I have not seen Mr. Hy Phillips or (heard) any from him, since I left him going for a Chirurgion."

Such is the testimony of Robert Handy; and the reader will agree with me, that, if he and Barton had been choked with their supper at Mr. Blin's, it would have been a "Providence."

* *Hog Alley.* See Bonner's plan, of 1722.

It would be difficult to find the record of more cruel neglect, towards a dying man. When urged to go back and sustain Woodbridge, till a surgeon could be procured, he "*did not care to return.*" And Barton preferred going to his supper. The principle, which governed these fellows, was a grossly selfish and cowardly fear of personal implication. Upon an occasion of minor importance, a similar principle actuated a couple of Yorkshire lads, who refused to assist, in righting the carriage of a member of parliament, which had been overturned, because their father had cautioned them never to meddle with state affairs.

I shall present the remaining testimony, in the following number.

No. CXXXVI.

LET us proceed with the examination, before Justice Elisha Cook, on the fourth of July, 1728.

"John Cutler, of Boston, Chirurgeon, examined upon oath, saith, that, last evening, about seven, Dr. George Pemberton came to me, at Mrs. Mears's, and informed, than an unhappy quarrel hapned betwene Mr. Henry Phillips and Benja. Woodbridge, and it was to be feared Mr. Woodbridge was desperately wounded. We went out. We soon mett Mr. Henry Phillips, who told us he feared he had killed Mr. Woodbridge, or mortally wounded him; that he left him at the bottom of the Common, and begged us to repaire there and see if any relief might be given him. Doct. Pemberton and I went, in compy with Mr. Henry Phillips, in search of said Woodbridge, but could not find him, nor make any discovery of the affair. Mr. Phillips left us. I bid him walk in Bromfield's lane. We went to Mr. Woodbridge's lodgings, and severall other houses, but heard nothing of him. Upon our return Mr. H. Phillips was at my house. I dresed his wound, which was across his belly and his fingers. Mr. Phillips shew a great concern and fear of having killed Mr. Woodbridge. I endeavored to appease him, and hope better things; but he said, could he think he was alive, he should think himself a happy man."

"Doct. George Pemberton, sworn, saith that last evening about seven or eight o'clock Mr. Henry Phillips came to the Sun Tavern and informed me, first desiring me to go out wch I did and went to my house, where said Phillips shew me some wounds, and that he had wounded Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, and feared they would prove mortal—begged of me to repair to the Comon. Accompanied with Dr. Cutler and said Phillips, in quest of said Woodbridge, we went to the Powder house, and searched the ground there, but could make no discovery. Mr. Phillips then left us, and walked towards Mr. Bromfield's lane. Dr. Cutler and I went to Mr. Woodbridge's lodging, and several other places, but could hear nothing of him. We returned and found Henry Phillips, at Dr. Cutler's, who was very greatly concerned; fearing he had killed Mr. Woodbridge. We dressed Mr. Phillips' wounds which were small."

"Capt. John Winslow examined saith that last night being at Mr. Doring's house, Mr. Gillam Phillips, about eleven in the evening, came to me and told me he wanted my boat to carry off his brother Henry, who had wounded or killed a man. I went, by appointment, to Mr. Vardy's where I soon mett Gillam Phillips. I asked him where his brother was—who he had been fiteing with. He made answer I should see him presently. Went down to Colo. Estis Hache's where Mr. Gillam Phillips was to meet me. I gott there first, knocked at Mr. Hache's door. No answer. From Mr. Hache's house Mr. Peter Faneuil and Henry Phillips came into Mr. Hache's yard—Mr. Gillam Phillips immediately after with Mr. Adam Tuck. I heard no discourse about the man who was wounded. They concluded, and sent Mr. Henry Phillips to Gibb's wharf. Then Gillam Phillips with me to the long wharf. I took boat there, and went on board my ship, lying in the harbor. Mr. Phillips (Gillam) being in the bote, I took four of the Ship's crew, and rowed to Gibb's Wharf, where we mett with Mr. Henry Phillips, Peter Faneuil, and Adam Tuck. I came on shore. Henry Phillips and Tuck entred the boat. I understood by discourse with Gillam Phillips, they designed on board his Majestys Ship-Sheerness, Captain James Conrad Comdr. This was about twelve and one of the Clock."

"Adam Tuck of Boston farier, examined upon oath saith, that, about eleven of the clock, last evening, being at Luke Vardy's I understood there had bin a quarril betwene Henry Phillips

and Benja. Woodbridge, and that Phillips had killed or mortally wounded Woodbridge. Gillam Phillips Esq. being there, I walked with him towards Colo. Hatches, where we came up with Capt. Jno. Winslow, and Henry Phillips, and Peter Faneuil. We all went to Gibb's wharf, when we, that is Mr. Gillam and Henry Phillips, with the examinant went on board Capt. John Winslow's boat. We designed, as I understood, to go on board his Majesie's ship Sheerness, in order to leave Mr. Henry Phillips on board the man of War, who, as he told me, had, he feared, wounded a man, that evening on the Comon, near the water side. The person's name I understood was Woodbridge. Soon after our being on board Lt. Pritchard caried us into his apartment, where Gillam Phillips related to the Leut. the ran-counter that hapned betwene his brother Henry and Benja. Woodbridge. I took the intent of their going on board the man of War was to conceale Mr. Henry Phillips. We stayed on board about an hour and a half. We left Mr. Henry Phillips on board the Man of War and came up to Boston."

"John Underwood, at present residing in Boston, mariner, belonging to the Pink Molle, John Winslow Comdr. now lying in the harbour of Boston, being examined upon oath, concerning the death or murther of Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, saith, that about twelve o'clock last night, his Captn John Winslow, with another person, unknown to him came on board. The Captn ordered the boat with four of our hands, I being one, to go to a Wharf at the South end of the Town, where we went, and there the Capt. went on Shore, and two other persons came into the Boat without the Captn. We put of and by the discourse we were designed to go on board the Man of Whar, but by reason of the fogg or thick weather we gott on shore at Dorchester neck, went up to a house and stayed there about an hour and half, then returned to our boat, took in the three persons affore-named, as I suppose, with our crew, and went on board the Man of War, now lying betwene the Castle & Specta Island. We all went on board with the men we took in at the Wharf, stayed there for the space of an hour, and then came up to Boston, leaving one of the three onley on board, and landed by Oliver's Dock."

"Wm. Pavice of Boston, one of the Pink Molly's crew, examined upon oath, saith as above declared by John Underwood."

"James Wood and John Brown, mariners, belonging to the Pink Molly, being examined upon oath, declare as above. John Brown cannot say, or knows not how many persons they took from the shore, at Gibb's wharf, but is positive but two returned to Boston. They both say they cant be sure whether the Capt. went in the boat from the ship to the shoar."

"Mr. Peter Faneuil examined saith, that, last evening, about twelve, he was with Gillam Phillips, Henry Phillips and Adam Tuck at Gibb's wharf, and understood by Gillam Phillips, that his brother Henry had killed or mortally wounded Mr. Benja. Woodbridge this evening, that Henry Phillips went into Capt'n Winslow's boat, with his brother and Adam Tuck with the Boat's crew, where they went he knows not."

Such was the evidence, presented before the examining justice, on the fourth of July, 1728, in relation to this painful, and extraordinary occurrence.

I believe I have well nigh completed my operation, upon Peter Faneuil: but before I throw aside my professional apron, let me cast about, and see, if there are no small arteries which I have not taken up. I perceive there are.

The late Rev. Dr. Gray, of Jamaica Plains, on page 8 of his half century sermon, published in 1842, has the following passage—"The third or Jamaica Plain Parish, in Roxbury, had its origin in the piety of an amiable female. I refer to Mrs. Susanna, wife of Benjamin Pemberton. She was the daughter of Peter Faneuil, who, in 1740 erected and gave to the Town of Boston the far-famed Hall, which still bears his name; and who built also the dwelling house, now standing here, recently known, as late Dr. John Warren's Country seat."

Nothing could have been farther from the meaning of the amiable Mr. Gray, than a design to cast a reproach, upon the unimpeachable pedigree of this excellent lady. But Peter Faneuil was, unfortunately, never married. He was a bachelor; and is styled "*Bachelour*," in the commission, from John, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Judge Willard, to administer the oath to Benjamin Faneuil, as administrator, on Peter's estate. Peter's estate was divided, among his brother, Benjamin, and his four sisters, Anne Davenport, Susanna Boutineau, Mary Phillips, and Mary Ann Jones. This fact is established, by the original indenture of marriage settlement, now before me, between John Jones and Mary Ann Faneuil, dated the very month of Peter's decease.

He had no daughter to inherit. Mrs. Susanna Pemberton had not a drop of the Faneuil blood, in her veins. Her nearest approximation consisted in the fact, that George Bethune, her own brother, married, as I have already stated, Mary Faneuil, Peter's niece, and the daughter of Benjamin. Benjamin occupied that cottage, before he removed to Brighton. He had also a town residence, in rear of the Old Brick Meeting-house, which stood where Joy's buildings now stand.

Thomas Kilby was the commercial agent of Peter Faneuil, at Canso, Nova Scotia, in 1737, 8 and 9. He was a gentleman of education; graduated at Harvard, in 1723, and died in 1740, and according to Pemberton, published essays, in prose and verse. Not long ago, a gentleman inquired of me, if I had ever heard, that Peter Faneuil had a wooden leg; and related the following amusing story, which he received from his collateral ancestor, John Page, who graduated at Harvard, in 1765, and died in 1825, aged 81.

Thomas Kilby was an unthrifty, and rather whimsical, gentleman. Being without property and employment, he retired, either into Maine, or Nova Scotia. There he made a will, for his amusement, having, in reality, nothing to bequeath. He left liberal sums to a number of religious, philanthropic, and literary institutions—his eyes, which were very good, to a blind relative—his body to a surgeon of his acquaintance, “excepting as hereinafter excepted”—his sins he bequeathed to a worthy clergyman, as he appeared not to have any—and the choice of his legs to Peter Faneuil.

Upon inquiry of the oldest surviving relative of Peter, I found, that nothing was known of the wooden leg.

A day or two after, a highly respectable and aged citizen, attracted by the articles, in the Transcript, informed me, that his father, born in 1727, told him, that he had seen Peter Faneuil, in his garden, and that, on one foot, he wore a very high-heeled shoe. This, probably, gave occasion to the considerate bequest of Thomas Kilby.

The will, as my informant states, upon the authority of Mr. John Page, coming to the knowledge of Peter, he was so much pleased with the humor of it, that, probably, having a knowledge of the *testator* before, he sent for him, and made him his agent, at Canso.

Peter was a kind-hearted man. The gentleman who gave me

the fact, concerning the high-heeled shoe, informed me, upon his father's authority, that old Andrew Faneuil—the same, who, in his will, prays God, for “*the perfecting of his charities*”—put a poor, old, schoolmaster, named Walker, into jail, for debt. Imprisonment then, for debt, was a serious and lingering affair. Peter, in the flesh—not his angel—privately paid the poor man's debt, and set the prisoner free.

No. CXXXVII.

THOSE words of Horace were the words of soberness and truth—*Oh imitatores, vulgum pecus!*—I loathe imitators and imitations of all sorts. How cheap must that man feel, who awakens *hesterno vitio*, from yesterday's debauch, on *imitation* gin or brandy! Let no reader of the Transcript suppose, that I am so far behind the times, as to question the respectability of being drunk, on the real, original Scheidam or Cogniac, whether at funerals, weddings, or ordinations. But I consider *imitation* gin or brandy, at a funeral, a point blank insult to the corpse.

Everybody knows, that old oaks, old friendships, and old mocha must grow—they cannot be made. My horse is frightened, nearly out of his harness, almost every day of his life, by the hissing and jetting of the steam, and the clatter of the machinery, as I pass a manufactory, or grindery, of *imitation* coffee. *Imitation* coffee! What would my old friend, Melli Melli, the Tunisian ambassador, with whom—long, long ago—I have taken a cup of his own particular, once and again, at Chapotin's Hotel, in Summer Street, say to such a thing as this!

This grindery is located, in an Irish neighborhood, and there used to be a great number of Irish children thereabouts. The number has greatly diminished of late. I know not why, but, as I passed, the other day, the story that Dickens tells of the poor sausage-maker, whose broken buttons, among the sausage meat, revealed his unlucky destiny, came forcibly to mind. By the smell, I presume, there is a roastery, connected with the establishment; and, now I think of it, the atmosphere, round about, is filled with the odor of roast pig—a little overdone.

Good things, of all sorts, have stimulated the imitative powers of man, from the diamond to the nutmeg. Even death—and death is a good thing to him, whose armor of righteousness is on, *cap-a-pie*—death has been occasionally imitated; and really, now and then, the thing has been very cleverly done. I refer not to cases of catalepsy or trance, nor to cases of total suspension of sensibility and voluntary motion, for a time, under the agency of sulphuric ether, or chloroform.

In 1843, at the request of her Majesty's principal Secretary of State, for the Home Department, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Barrister at Law, made "*a report on the results of a special inquiry into the practice of interment in towns.*" This report is very severe upon our fraternity; but, I must confess, it is a most able and interesting performance, and full of curious detail. The demands of the English undertaker, it appears, are so oppressive upon the poor, that burial societies have been formed, upon the mutual principle. It is asserted by Mr. Chadwick, that parents, under the gripings of poverty, have actually poisoned their children, to obtain the burial money. At the Chester assizes, several trials, for infanticide, have occurred, on these grounds. "*That child will not live, it is in the burial club,*" is a cant and common phrase, among the Manchester paupers.

Some very clever impositions, have been practised, to obtain the burial allowance. A man, living in Manchester, resolved to play corpse, for this laudable object. His wife was privy to the plot, of course,—and gave notice, in proper form, of her bereavement. The agent of the society made the customary domiciliary visit. There the body lay—stiff and stark—and a very straight and proper corpse it was—the jaw decently tied up. The visitor, well convinced, and quite touched by the widow's anguish, was turning on his heel to depart, when a slight motion of the dead man's eyelid arrested his attention: he began to smell—not of the body, like the bear in *Æsop*—but a rat. Upon feeling the pulse, he begged the chief mourner to be comforted; there was strong ground for hope! More obstinate than Rachel, she not only would not be comforted, but abused the visitor, in good Gaelic, for questioning her veracity. Had she not laid out the daar man, her own daar Tooly Mashee, with her own hands! and didn't she know better than to be after laying him out, while the brith was in his daarn buddy! and would she be guilty of so cruel a thing to her own good man! The doctor was called;

and, after feeling the pulse, threw a bucket of water, in the face of the defunct, which resulted in immediate resurrection.

The most extraordinary case of imitation death on record, and which, under the acknowledged rules of evidence, it is quite impossible to disbelieve, is that of the East India Fakeer, who was buried alive at Lahore, in 1837, and at the end of forty days, disinterred, and resuscitated. This tale is, *prima facie*, highly improbable: let us examine the evidence. It is introduced, in the last English edition of Sharon Turner's Sacred History of the World, vol. iii., in a note upon Letter 25. The witness is Sir Claude M. Wade, who, at the time of the Fakeer's burial, and disinterment, was political resident, at Loodianah, and principal agent of the English government, at the court of Runjeet Singh. The character of this witness is entirely above suspicion; and the reader will observe, in his testimony, anything but the marks and numbers of a credulous witness, or a dealer in the marvellous. Mr. Wade addressed a letter to the editor of Turner's History, from which the following extracts are made:—

"I was present, at the court of Runjeet Singh, at Lahore, in 1837, when the Fakeer, mentioned by the Hon. Capt. Osborne, was buried alive, for six weeks; and, though I arrived, a few hours after his interment, I had the testimony of Runjeet Singh, himself, and others, the most credible witnesses of his court, to the truth of the Fakeer having been so buried before them; and from having been present myself, when he was disinterred, and restored to a state of perfect vitality, in a position so close to him, as to render any deception impossible, it is my firm belief that there was no collusion, in producing the extraordinary fact, that I have related."

Mr. Wade proceeds to give an account of the disinterment. "On the approach of the appointed time, according to invitation, I accompanied Runjeet Singh to the spot, where the Fakeer had been buried. It was a square building, called, in the language of the country, *Barra Durree*, in the midst of one of the gardens, adjoining the palace at Lahore, with an open verandah all around, having an enclosed room in the centre. On arriving there, Runjeet Singh, who was attended on the occasion, by the whole of his court, dismounting from his elephant, asked me to join him, in examining the building, to satisfy himself that it was closed, as he had left it. We did so. There had been an open door, on each of the four sides of the room, three of which

were perfectly closed with brick and mortar. The fourth had a strong door, also closed with mud, up to the padlock, which was sealed with the private seal of Runjeet Singh, in his own presence, when the Fakeer was interred. In fact, the exterior of the building presented no aperture whatever, by which air could be admitted, nor any communication held, by which food could possibly be conveyed to the Fakeer; and I may also add, that the walls, closing the doorways, bore no marks of having been recently disturbed or removed."

"Runjeet Singh recognized the impression of the seal, as the one, which he had affixed: and, as he was as skeptical, as any European could be, of the successful result of such an enterprise, to guard, as far as possible, against any collusion, he had placed two companies, from his own personal escort, near the building, from which four sentries were furnished, and relieved, every two hours, night and day, to guard the building from intrusion. At the same time, he ordered one of the principal officers of his court to visit the place occasionally, and report the result of his inspection to him; while he himself, or his minister, kept the seal which closed the hole of the padlock, and the latter received the reports of the officers on guard, morning and evening."

"After our examination, and we had seated ourselves in the verandah, opposite the door, some of Runjeet's people dug away the mud wall, and one of his officers broke the seal, and opened the padlock."

"On the door being thrown open, nothing but a dark room was to be seen. Runjeet Singh and myself then entered it, in company with the servant of the Fakeer. A light was brought, and we descended about three feet below the floor of the room, into a sort of cell, in which a wooden box, about four feet long, by three broad, with a square sloping roof, containing the Fakeer, was placed upright, the door of which had also a padlock and seal, similar to that on the outside. On opening it, we saw"—

But I am reminded, by observing the point I have reached, upon my sheet of paper, that it is time to pause. There are others, who have something to say to the public, of more importance, about rum, sugar and molasses, turtle soup and patent medicine, children, that are lost, and puppies, that are found.

No. CXXXVIII.

SIR CLAUDE M. WADE, the reader may remember, was proceeding thus—"On opening it," (the box containing the Fakeer) "we saw a figure, enclosed in a bag of white linen, drawn together, and fastened by a string over the head; on the exposure of which a grand salute was fired, and the surrounding multitude came crowding to the door to see the spectacle. After they had gratified their curiosity, the Fakeer's servant, putting his arms into the box, took the figure of his master out; and, closing the door, placed it, with his back against the door, exactly as he had been squatted, like a Hindoo idol, in the box itself. Runjeet Singh and I then descended into the cell, which was so small, that we were only able to sit on the ground in front, and so close to the body, as to touch it with our hands and knees. The servant then began pouring warm water over the figure, but, as my object was to watch if any fraudulent practice could be detected, I proposed to Runjeet Singh, to tear open the bag, and have a perfect view of the body, before any means of resuscitation were attempted. I accordingly did so; and may here remark, that the bag, when first seen by us, looked mildewed, as if it had been buried for some time. The legs and arms of the body were shrivelled and stiff, the face full, as in life, and the head reclining on the shoulder, like that of a corpse."

"I then called to the medical gentleman, who was attending me, to come down and inspect the body, which he did, but could discover no pulsation, in the heart, temples or the arms. There was however, a heat, about the region of the brain, which no other part of the body exhibited. The servant then commenced bathing him with hot water, and gradually relaxing his arms and legs from the rigid state, in which they were contracted; Runjeet Singh taking his right and left leg, to aid by friction in restoring them to their proper action, during which time the servant placed a hot wheaten cake, about an inch thick, on the top of the head—a process, which he twice or thrice repeated. He then took out of his nostrils and ears the wax and cotton plugs, with which they were stopped, and after great exertion, opened his mouth, by inserting the point of a knife between the teeth, and while holding his jaws

open, with his left hand, drew the tongue forward, with the forefinger of the right, in the course of which the tongue flew back, several times, to its curved position upwards, that in which it had originally been placed, so as to close the gullet. He then rubbed his eyelids with ghee (clarified butter) for some time, till he succeeded in opening them, when the eye appeared quite motionless and glazed. After the cake had been applied for the third time, to the top of the head, the body was convulsively heaved, the nostrils became violently inflated, respiration ensued, and the limbs began to assume a natural fulness. The servant then put some ghee on his tongue, and made him swallow it. A few minutes afterwards, the eyeballs became slowly dilated, recovered their natural color, and the Fakeer, recognizing Runjeet Singh, sitting close by him, articulated, in a low sepulchral tone, scarcely audible—"Do you believe me now?"

"Runjeet Singh replied in the affirmative; and then began investing the Fakeer with a pearl necklace, a superb pair of gold bracelets, shawls, and pieces of silk and muslin, forming what is called a *khilet*, such as is usually conferred, by the princes of India, on persons of distinction. From the time of the box being opened to the recovery of the voice, not more than half an hour could have elapsed; and, in another half an hour, the Fakeer talked with himself and those about him freely, though feebly, like a sick person, and we then left him, convinced that there had been no fraud or collusion, in the exhibition, which we had witnessed."

The Hon. Captain Osborne, who was attached to the mission of Sir William Macnaughten, in the following year, 1838, sought to persuade the Fakeer to repeat the experiment, and to suffer the keys of the vault to remain in Captain Osborne's custody. At this the Fakeer became alarmed, though he afterwards consented, and, at the request of Runjeet Singh, he came to Lahore for the purpose; but, as he expressed a strong apprehension, that Captain Osborne intended to destroy him, and as Sir William Macnaughten and his suite were about to depart, the matter was given up. This is related by Captain Osborne, in his "Court and Camp of Runjeet Singh."

After avowing his entire belief in all the facts, set forth in the previous narrative, Sir Claude M. Waddell remarks—"I took some pains to inquire into the mode, by which such a result

was effected ; and was informed, that it rested on a doctrine of the Hindoo physiologists, that heat constitutes the self-existent principle of life ; and, that, if the functions are so far destroyed, as to leave that one, in perfect purity, life could be sustained for considerable lengths of time, independently of air, food, or any other means of sustenance. To produce such a state, the patients are obliged to go through a severe preparation. How far such means are calculated to produce such effects physiologists will be better able to judge than I can pretend to do. I only state what I saw, and heard, and think."

This narrative certainly belongs to the very first part of the very first book of very wonderful things. But this marvellous book is no longer a closed volume. Millions of ingenious fingers have, for fifty years, been busily employed, in breaking its mysterious seals, one after another. Demonstration has trampled upon doubt, and the world is rapidly coming to my shrewd old grandmother's conclusion, that nothing is so truly wonderful, as that we wonder at all. There is nothing more difficult, than to exonerate the mind from the weight of its present consciousness, and to wonder by rule. We readily lose the recollection of our doubt and derision, upon former occasions, when matters, apparently quite as absurd and impossible, are presented for contemplation, *de novo*.

If putrefaction can be kept off, mere animal life, the vital principle, may be preserved, for a prodigious length of time, in the lower ranks of animal creation, while in a state of torpidity. Dr. Gillies relates, that he bottled up some *cerastes*, a species of small snakes, and kept them corked tight, with nothing in the bottle, but a little sand, for several years ; and, when the bottle was uncorked, they came forth, revived by the air, and immediately acquired their original activity.

More than fifty years ago, having read Dr. Franklin's account of the flies, which he discovered, drowned, in a bottle of old wine, and which he restored to life, by exposure to the sun's rays ; I bottled up a dozen flies, in a small phial of Madeira—took them out, at the expiration of a month—and placed them under a glass tumbler, in a sunny window. Within half an hour, nine revived ; got up ; walked about, wiped their faces with their fore legs ; trimmed their wings, with their hinder ones ; and began to knock their heads, against the tumbler, to escape. After waiting a couple of hours, to give the remaining

three a fair chance, but to no purpose, and expecting nothing from the humane society, for what I had already accomplished, I returned the nine to their wine bath, in the phial. After rather more than three months, I repeated the experiment of resuscitation. After several hours, two gave evidence of revival, got upon their legs, reeled against each other, and showed some symptoms of *mania a potu*. At length they were fairly on their trotters. I lifted the tumbler; they took the hint, and flew to the window glass. It was fly time. I watched one of those, who had profited by the revival—he got four or five flies about him, who really seemed to be listening to the account of his experience.

“Ants, bees, and wasps,” says Sharon Turner, in his *Sacred History*, vol. i. ch. 17, “especially the smallest of these, the ants, do things, and exercise sensibilities, and combine for purposes, and achieve ends, that bring them nearer to mankind, than any other class of animated nature.” Aye, I know, myself, some of our fellow-citizens, who make quite a stir, in their little circles, petty politicians, who extort responses from great men, and show them, *in confidence*, to all they meet—overgrown boys, in bands and cassocks, who, for mere exercise, edit religious newspapers, and scribble *treason*, under the name of *ethics*—who, in respect to all the qualities, enumerated by Sharon Turner, are decidedly inferior to pismires.

The hybernation of various animals furnishes analogous examples of the matter, under consideration. A suspension of faculties and functions, for a considerable time, followed by a periodical restoration of their use, forms a part of the natural history of certain animals.

Those forty days—that wonderful quarantine of the Fakeer, in the tomb, and his subsequent restoration, are marvels. I have presented the facts, upon the evidence of Sir Claude M. Wade. Every reader will philosophize, upon this interesting matter, for himself. If such experiments can be made, for forty days, it is not easy to comprehend the necessity of such a limit. If trustees were appointed, and gave bonds to keep the tomb comfortable, and free from rats, and to knock up a corpse, at the time appointed, forty years, or an hundred, might answer quite as well. What visions are thus opened to the mind. An author might go to sleep, and wake up in the midst of posterity, and find himself an entire stranger. Weary partners might

find a temporary respite, in the grave, and leave directions, to be called, in season to attend the funeral. The heir expectant of some tenacious ancestor might thus dispose of the drowsy and unprofitable interval. The gentleman of *petite fortune* might suffer it to accumulate, in the hands of trustees, and wake up, after twenty or thirty years, a man of affluence. Instead of making up a party for the pyramids, half a dozen merry fellows might be buried together, with the pleasant prospect of rising again in 1949. No use whatever being made of the time thus relinquished, and the powers of life being husbanded in the interim, years would pass uncounted, of course ; and he, who was buried, at twenty-one, would be just of age when he awoke. I should like, extremely, to have the opinion of the Fakeer, upon these interesting points.

No. CXXXIX.

"And much more honest to be hir'd, and stand
With auctionary hammer in thy hand,
Provoking to give more, and knocking thrice,
For the old household stuff or picture's price."

DRYDEN.

OLD customs, dead and buried, long ago, do certainly come round again, like old comets ; but, whether in their appointed seasons, or not, I cannot tell. Whether old usages, and old chairs, and old teapots revolve in their orbits, or not, I leave to the astronomers. It would be very pleasant to be able to calculate the return of hoops, cocked hats, and cork rumpers, buffets, pillions, links, pillories, and sedans.

I noticed the following paragraph, in the Evening Transcript, not long ago, and it led me to turn over some heaps of old relics, in my possession—

"A substitute for the everlasting 'going, going, gone,' was introduced at a recent auction in New York. The auctioneer held up a sand-glass, through which the sand occupied fourteen seconds in passing. If a person made a bid, the glass was held up in view of all, and if no person advanced on the bid before the sand passed through, the sale was made. This idea is a novel one, though we believe it has long been practised in Europe."

It was formerly the custom in England, to sell goods, at auc-

tion, "by inch of candle." An inch of candle was lighted, and the company proceeded to bid, the last crier or bidder, before the candle went out, was declared the purchaser. Samuel Pepys, who was Secretary of the Admiralty, in the reigns of the two last Stuarts, repeatedly refers to the practice, in his Diary. Thus, in Braybrook's edition, of 1848, he says, vol. i. page 151. under date Nov. 6, 1660—"To our office, where we met all, for the sale of two ships, by an inch of candle, (the first time that I saw any of this kind,) where I observed how they do invite one another, and at last how they all do cry; and we have much to do to tell who did cry last."

Again, Ibid., vol. ii. page 29, Sept. 3, 1662—"After dinner, we met and sold the Weymouth, Successe, and Fellowship hulkes, where pleasant to see how backward men are at first to bid; and yet, when the candle is going out, how they bawl, and dispute afterwards who bid the most first. And here I observed one man cunninger than the rest, that was sure to bid the last man, and carry it; and, inquiring the reason, he told me, that, just as the flame goes out, the smoke descends, which is a thing I never observed before, and, by that he do know the instant when to bid last." Again, Ibid., vol. iv. page 4, Ap. 3, 1667, he refers to certain prize goods, "bought lately at the candle."

Haydn says this species of auction, by inch of candle is derived from a practice, in the Roman Catholic Church. Where there is an excommunication, by inch of candle, and the sinner is allowed to come to repentance, while yet the candle burns. The sinner is supposed, of course, to be *going—going—gone*—unless he avails of the opportunity to bid, as it were, for his salvation. This naturally reminds the reader of the spiritual distich—

"For while the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

Where the bids are, from a maximum, downward, the term—*auction*—is still commonly, though improperly employed, and in the very teeth of all etymology. When I was a boy, the poor, in many of our country towns, were disposed of, in this manner. The question was, who would take Daddy Osgood, one of the town's poor, for the smallest weekly sum, to be paid by the town. The old man was started, at four shillings, and bid down to a minimum. There was yet a little work in his old bones; and I well remember one of these auctions, in 1798, in the town

of Billerica, at which Dr. William Bowers bid off Daddy Osgood, for two and sixpence.

The Dutch have a method of selling fresh fish, which is somewhat analogous to this, and very simple and ingenious. An account of it may be found, in Dodsley's Annual Register, for 1760, vol. iii. page 170. The salesman is called the Affslager. The fish are brought in, in the morning, and placed on the ground, near the fish stalls of the retailers. At ten, precisely, the Affslager rings his bell, which may be heard, for half a mile. Retailers, and individual consumers collect, and the Affslager—the auctioneer—puts up a lot, at a maximum price. No one offers a less sum, but the mynheers stand round, sucking at their pipes, and puffing away, and saying nothing. When the Affslager becomes satisfied, that nobody will buy the lot, at the price named, he gradually lowers it, until one of the mynheers takes his pipe from his mouth and cries "*mine!*" in High Dutch. He is, of course, the purchaser; and the Affslager proceeds to the sale of another lot.

It will be seen, from one of the citations from Pepys, that some of the auctions of his time were called the *candles*; precisely as the auctions, at Rome, were called *hasta*; a spear or *hasta*, instead of a flag, being the customary signal for the sale. The proper word, however, was *auctio*, and the auctioneer was called *auctor*. Notice of the sale was given, by the crier, a *præcone prædicari*, Plaut. Men., v. 9, 94, or, by writing on tables. Such is the import of *tabulum proscriptit*, in Cicero's letter to his brother Quintus, ii. 6.

In the year 1824, passing through the streets of Natchez, I saw a slave, walking along, and ringing a bell, as he went; the bell very much resembled our cowbells, in size and form. Upon a signal from a citizen, the slave stopped ringing, and walked over to him, and stood before him, till he had read the advertisement of a sale at auction, placarded on the breast of the slave, who then went forward, ringing his bell, as before. The Romans made their bids, by lifting the finger; and the auctioneer added as many *sesterces*, as he thought amounted to a reasonable bid.

Cicero uses this expression in his fine oration against Verres, i. 54—*digitum tollit Junius patruus—Junius, his paternal uncle, raised his finger*, that is, he made a bid.

The employment of a spear, as the signal of an auction sale,

is supposed to have arisen from the fact, that the only articles, originally sold, in this manner, were the spoils of war. Subsequently, the spear—*hasta*—came to be universally used, to signify a *sale at auction*. The auction of Pompey's goods, by Cæsar, is repeatedly alluded to, by Cicero, with great severity, as the *hasta Cæsaris*. A passage may be found, in his treatise, *De Officiis*, ii. 8, and another, in his eighth Philippic, sec. 3—“Invitus dico, sed dicendum est. Hasta Cæsaris, Patres Conscripti, multis improbis spem affert, et audaciam. Videntur enim, ex mendicis fieri repente divites: itaque hastam semper videre cupiunt ii, qui nostris bonis imminet; quibus omnia pollicetur Antonius.” I say it reluctantly, but it must be said—Cæsar's auction, Conscript Fathers, inflames the hopes and the insolence of many bad men. For they see how immediately, the merest beggars are converted into men of wealth. Therefore it is, that those, who are hankering after our goods and chattels, and to whom Antony has promised all things, are ever longing to behold such another auction, as that.

The auctioneer's bell, in use, at the Hague, in 1760, was introduced into Boston, seventy-seven years ago, by Mr. Bicker, whose auction-room was near the Market. Having given some offence to the public, he inserted the following notice, in the Boston Gazette and Country Journal, Monday, April 18, 1774—“As the method, lately practised by the Subscriber, in having a Person at his Door, to invite Gentlemen and others to his public Sales—has given Dissatisfaction to some (Gentlemen Shopkeepers in particular) to avoid giving Offence for the future, he shall desist from that Practice, and pursue one (as follows) which he flatters himself cannot fail giving universal Satisfaction, as he sincerely wishes so to do. The Public are most earnestly requested to remember (*for their own advantage*) that, for the future, Notice will be given, by sounding a Bell, which he has purchased for that Purpose, which is erected over the Auction Room Door, near the Market, Boston, where constant Attendance is given both early and late, to receive the favors of all such who are pleased to confer on their *Much obliged, Most Obedient, and very humble Servant*, M. Bicker.”

Albeit there is no less bickering or dickering here now, than of yore, yet Bicker and his bell have gone, long ago, to the “receptacle of things lost upon earth.” The very name is no more.

Haydn says, the first auction in Britain was about 1700, by

Elisha Yale, a Governor of Fort George, in the East Indies, of the goods he had brought home with him. That Mr. Haydn must be mistaken is manifest, from the citation from Pepys, who speaks of auctions, by inch of candle, as early as 1660; and not then as a novelty, but the first of the kind that he had witnessed.

Fosbroke says, in his *Antiquities*, page 412—"In the middle age, the goods were cried and sold to the highest bidder, and the sound of a trumpet added with a very loud noise. The use of the spear was retained, the auctions being called *Subhastationes*; and the *Subhastator*, or auctioneer, was sworn to sell the goods faithfully. In Narcs, we have, *sold at a pike or spear*, i. e. by public auction or outcry; and auctions called *port sales*, because originally, perhaps, sales made in ports—the crier stood under the spear, as in the Roman æra, and was, in the thirteenth century, called *cursor*."

Of late, *mock auctions*, as they are termed, have become a very serious evil, especially in the city of New York. In 1813 petitions, in regard to these public impositions, were sent to the Lords of the Treasury, from many of the principal cities of Great Britain. In 1818 a select committee reported, very fully, upon this subject, to the British Parliament. This committee, after long and critical investigation, reported, that great frauds were constantly committed on the public, by *mock* or fraudulent *auctions*. The committee set forth several examples of this species of knavery. Goods are sold, as the furniture of gentlemen, going abroad. For this purpose, empty houses are hired for a few days, and filled with comparatively worthless furniture. Articles of the most inferior manufacture are made for the express purpose of being put into such sales, as the property of individuals of known character and respectability. To impose, more effectually, on the public, the names of the most respectable auctioneers have been used, with the variation of a letter. This bears some analogy to the legislative change of name, in this city, for the purpose of facilitating the sale of inferior pianos. Respectable auctioneers have been compelled, in self-defence, to appear at such mock auctions, and disclaim all connection therewith. Great masses of cutlery and plated ware of base manufacture, with London makers' names, and advertised, as made in London, are constantly sold, at these auctions; forcing the London makers to appear at the sales rooms, and expose the fraud.

The committee say that no imposition is more common than the sale of ordinary wine, in bottles, as the *bonne bouche* of some respectable Amphitryon deceased.

They farther state, that daring men are known to combine, attend real sales, and by various means, drive respectable purchasers away, purchase at their own price, and afterwards privately sell, under a form of public sale, among themselves, at *Knock Out* auctions, as they are called.

The committee recommended an entire revision of the auction laws—an increase of the license—heavier penalties for violation—no sale, without previous exposure of the goods for twenty-four hours, or printed catalogue—name and address of the auctioneer to be published—severe penalty, for using a fictitious name, &c.

The whole advertising system of mock auctions, like that, connected with the kindred impostures of quackery and patent medicines, furnishes a vast amount of curious and entertaining reading; and affords abundant scope, for the exercise of a vicious ingenuity. I have heard of a horse, that could not be compelled, by whip or spur, to cross a bridge, which lay in the way to his owner's country residence—the horse was advertised to be sold at auction for no fault but that his owner was *desirous of going out of the city*.

No. CXL.

Few things are more difficult, than shaving a cold corpse, and making, what the *artistes* call a *good job of it*. I heard Robert New say so, forty years ago, who kept his shop, at the north-easterly corner of Scollay's buildings. He said the barber ought to be called, as soon, as the breath was out of the body, and a little before, if it was a clear case, and you wished the corpse "*to look wholesome*." I think he was right. Pope's Narcissa said—

"One need not sure be ugly, though one's dead."

There is considerable mystery, in shaving a living corpse. I find it so; and yet I have always shaved myself; for I have never been able to overcome a strong, hereditary prejudice, against being taken by the nose.

My razor is very capricious; so, I suppose, is everybody's razor. There is a deep and mystical philosophy, about the edge of a razor, which seems to have baffled the most scientific; and is next of kin to witchcraft. A tract, by Cotton Mather, upon this subject, would be invaluable. The scholar will smile, at any comparison, between Pliny the elder and Cotton Mather. So far, as respects the scope of knowledge, and power of intellect, and inexhaustible treasures, displayed in Pliny's thirty-seven books of Natural History, one might as well compare Hyperion to a mummy. I allude to nothing but the *Magnalia* or *Improbabilia*; and, upon this point of comparison, Mather, witchcraft and all fairly fade out of sight, before the marvels and fantastical stories of Pliny. In lib. xxviii. 23, Pliny assigns a very strange cause, why *aciem in cultris tonsorum hebetescere*—why the edge of a barber's razor is sometimes blunted. The reader may look it up, if he will—it is better in a work, *sub sigillo latinitatis*, than in an English journal.

I have often put my razor down, regretting, that my beard did not spread over a larger area; so keenly and agreeably has the instrument performed its work. It really seemed, that I might have shaved a sleeping mouse, without disturbing his repose. After twelve hours, that very razor, untouched the while, has come forth, no better than a pot-sherd. The very reverse of all this has also befallen me. I once heard Revailon, our old French barber, say, that a razor could not be strapped with too light a hand; and the English proverb was always in his mouth—"a good lather is half the shave."

Some persons suppose the razor to be an instrument, of comparatively modern invention, and barbers to have sprung up, at farthest, within the Christian era. It is written, in Isaiah vii. 20, "In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor, that is hired," &c. Ezekiel began to prophecy, according to Calmet, 590 years before Christ: in the first verse of ch. v. he says—"take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber's razor, and cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard." To cause a razor to *pass upon the beard* seems to mean something very different from *shaving*, in the common sense of that word. Doubtless, it does: the *culter* or *novacula*, that is, the *razor*, of the ancients, was employed, for *shearing* or *shortening*, as well as for *shaving* the beard. Barbers were first known, among the Romans A. U. C. 454, i. e. 298 years before Christ. Pliny says,

vii. 59—*Sequens gentium consensus in tonsoribus fuit, sed Romanis tardior. In Italiam ex Sicilia venire post Romam conditam anno quadringentessimo quinquagessimo quarto, adducente P. Ticinio Mena, ut auctor est Varro: antea intonsi fuere. Primus omnium radi quotidie instituit Africanus sequens: Divus Augustus cultris semper usus est.* Then barbers came into use, among the nations, but more slowly among the Romans. In the year of the city 454, according to Varro, P. Ticinius Mena introduced barbers into Italy from Sicily: until that time, men wore their beards. The latter Africanus first set the example of being shaven daily. Augustus constantly used razors. The passage of Varro, referred to by Pliny, showing, that, before A. U. C. 454, men wore their beards, states the fact to be established, by the long beards, on all the old male statues. That *passing of the sharp knife or razor, upon the beard*, spoken of, by Ezekiel, I take to be the latter of the two modes, employed by the Romans—"vel strictim, hoc est, ad cutem usque; vel paulo longius a cute, interposito pectine"—either close to the skin, or with a comb interposed. That both modes were in use is clear from the lines of Plautus in his play of the Captives, Act ii. sc. 2, v. 16—

Nunc senex est in tonstrina; nunc jam cultros adinet;
Sed utrum strictimne adtonsurum dicam esse, an per pectinem,
Nescio.

Now the old man is in the barber's shop and under the razor; but whether to be close shaved, or clipped with the comb, I know not.

Pliny, as we have seen, states, that the practice came from Sicily. There it had been long in use. There is a curious reference to the custom in Cicero's Tusculan Questions, v. 20. Speaking of the tyrant, Dionysius he says—*Quin etiam, ne tonsori collum committeret, tondere suas filias docuit. Ita sordido ancillarique artificio regie virgines, ut tonstriculæ tondebant barbam et capillum patris.* For, not liking to trust his throat to a barber, he taught his daughters to shave him, and thus these royal virgins, descending to this coarse, servile vocation, became little, she barbers, and clipped their father's beard and hair.

There is a curious passage in Pliny which not only proves, that barbers' shops were common in his time, but shows the very ancient employment of cobweb, as a styptic. In lib. xxix. 36, he says—*Fracto capiti aranei tela ex oleo et aceto imposita, non*

nisi vulnere sanato, abscedit. Hæc et vulneribus tonstrinarum sanguinem sistit. Spiders' web, with oil and vinegar, applied to a broken head, adheres, till the wound heals. This also stops the bleeding from cuts, in barbers' shops.

Razors were sharpened, some two thousand years ago, very much as they are at present. Pliny devotes sec. 47, lib. xxxvi. to hones and whetstones, oil stones and water stones—quarta ratio—he says—est saliva hominis proficientium in tonstrinarum officinis—the fourth kind is such as are used in the barbers' shops, and which the man softens with his saliva.

Most common, proverbial sayings are, doubtless, of great antiquity. Chopping-blocks with a razor is a common illustration of the employment of a subtle ingenuity, upon coarse and uninteresting topics. Thus Goldsmith, in his *Retaliation*, says of Burke—

In short, 'twas his fate, unemploy'd, or in place, sir,
To eat mutton cold, and chop blocks with a razor.

The latter illustration is as old as Livy—*novacula cotem discinderet*.

The Romans made a prodigious fuss, about their beards. The first crop, called *prima barba*, and sometimes *lanugo*, was, according to Petronius, consecrated to some god. Suetonius says, in his *Life of Nero*, 12—*Gymnico quod in septis edebat, inter buthysiæ apparatus, barbam primam posuit, conditamque in auream pyxidem, et pretiosissimis margaritis adornatam, capitolio consecravit*.—During the games, which he had given in the enclosures, and in the very midst of the splendor of the sacrifice, for the first time, he laid down his beard, and having placed it in a golden box, adorned with precious stones, he made a sacred deposit thereof, in the capitol.

After the custom of shaving had been introduced, by Mena, A. U. C. 454, it went out, for a short time, in Rome, during the time of Adrian, who as Spartianus relates, in his *Life of that Emperor*, having some ugly excrescences on his chin, suffered his beard to grow to conceal them—of course the courtiers followed the example of the emperor—the people, that of the courtiers. The grave concealed those excrescences, more effectually, A. D. 139, and the *navacula* again came into use, among the Romans: Marcus Antoninus, his successor, had no excrescences on his chin.

The day, upon which a young Roman was said *ponere barbam*,

that is, to shave for the first time, was accounted a holiday; and Juvenal says, iii. 187, he received presents from his friends.

Ovid, *Trist.* iv. 10, 67, dates his earliest literary exhibitions, before the people, by his first or second shave, or clip—

*Carmina quum primum populo juvenilia legi,
Barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit.*

Which may be thus translated—

When first in public I began
To read my boyish rhymes,
I scarcely could be call'd a man,
And had not shav'd three times.

Cæsar says of the Britons, *B. G. V.* 14—*omni parte corporis rasa, præter caput et labrum superius*—they shave entirely, excepting the head and upper lip.

Half-shaving was accounted, in the days of Samuel, I suppose, as reducing the party to a state of semi-*barbarism*: thus, in *Samuel II.* x. 4—“Wherefore Hanan took David's servants, and shaved off the one half of their beards.”

To be denied the privilege of shaving was accounted dishonorable, among the Catti, a German nation, in the days of Tacitus; for he says, *De Moribus Germanæ*, 31—*Apud Cattos in consensum vertit, ut primum adoleverint, crinem barbamque submittere, nec, nisi hoste cæso*—It was settled among the Catti, that no young man should cut his hair, or shave his beard, till he had killed his man.

Seneca, *Cons. Polyb.* xxxvi. 5, blames Caius, for refusing to shave, because he had lost his sister—*Idem ille Caius furiosa in constantia, modo barbam capillumque submittens*—There is that Caius, clinging so absurdly to his sorrow, and suffering his hair and beard to grow on account of it.

There is an admirable letter, from Seneca to Lucillus, *Ep.* 114, which shows, that the dandies, in old Rome, were much like our own. He is speaking of those—*qui vellunt barbam, aut intervellunt; qui labra pressius tondent et abradunt, servata et submissa cætera parte*—who pull out the beard, by the roots, or particular parts of it—who clip and shave the hair, either more closely, or leave it growing, on some parts of their lips.

Juvenal, ii. 99, and Martial, vi. 64, 4, laugh at such, as use a mirror while shaving. Knives and razors of *brass*, are of great antiquity, according to the *Archæological Æliana*, p. 39.—Fos-

broke, p. 351, says, that razors are mentioned by Homer. But I am going to a funeral, this afternoon, as an amateur, and it is time for me to shave—not with a razor of brass, however—Pradier is too light for me—I use the Chinese. Hutchinson, i. 153, says, that Leverett was the first Governor of Massachusetts, who is painted without a beard, and that he laid it aside, in Cromwell's court.

China is the paradise of barbers. There, according to Mr. Davis, they abound. No man shaves himself, the part, to be shorn, being out of his reach. There would be no difficulty in removing the scanty hair upon their chins; but the exact tonsure of the crown, without removing one hair from the Chinaman's long tail, that reaches to his heels, is a delicate affair. Their razors are very heavy, but superlatively keen.

No. CXLI.

BARBERS were chiefly peripatetics, when I was a boy. They ran about town, and shaved at their customers' houses. There were fewer shops. This was the genteel mode in Rome. The wealthy had their domestic barbers, as the planters have now, among their slaves. I am really surprised, that we hear of so few throats cut at the South. Some evidence of this custom—not of cutting throats—may be found, in one of the neatest epitaphs, that ever was written; the subject of which, a very young and accomplished slave-barber, has already taken a nap of eighteen hundred years. I refer to Martial's *epitaphium*, on Pantagathus, a word, which, by the way, signifies one, who is good at everything, or, as we say—a man of all works. It is the fifty-second, of Book VI. Its title is *Epitaphium Pantagathi, Tonsoris*:

Hoc jacet in tumulo raptus puerilibus annis
Pantagathus, domini cura, dolorque sui,
Vix tangente vagos ferro resecare capillos
Doctus, et hirsutas excoluisse genas.
Sic, licet, ut debes, Tellus placata, levisque;
Artificis levior non potes esse manu.

In attempting a version of this, I feel, as if I were about to disfigure a pretty spinster, with a mob-cap.

Here lies Pantagathus, the slave,
 Petted he liv'd, and died lamented ;
 No youth, like him could clip and shave,
 Since shears and razors were invented.

So light his touch, you could not feel
 The razor, while your cheeks were smoothing ;
 And sat, unconscious of the steel,
 The operation was so soothing.

Oh, mother Earth, appeas'd, since thou
 Back to thy grasping arms hast won him,
 Soft be thy hand, like his, and now
 Lie thou, in mercy, lightly on him.

Rochester was right ; few things were ever benefited, by translation, but a bishop.

The *Tonstrinæ*, or barbers' shops, in Rome, were seldom visited by any, but the humbler classes. They were sometimes called the *Shades*. Horace, Ep. i. 7, 50, describes Philippus, an eminent lawyer, as struck with sudden envy, upon seeing Vultius Mena, the beadle, sitting very much at ease, in one of these shades, after having been shaved, and leisurely cleaning his own nails, an office commonly performed by the barbers :—

Adrasum quendam vacua tonsoris in umbra,
 Cultello proprios purgantem leniter unguës.

There were she-barbers, in Rome, residing in the *Saburra* and *Argiletum*, very much such localities, as "*the Hill*," formerly in Boston, or *Anthony Street*, in New York. Martial describes one of these *tonstrices*, ii. 17—

Tonstrix Saburræ fancibus sedet primis, etc.

Some there were, of a better order. Plautus, Terence, and Theophrastus have many allusions to the barbers' shops. They have ever been the same "*otiosorum conciliabula*," that they were, when Terence wrote—resorts of the idle and garrulous. In old times—very—not now, of course—not now, a dressmaker, who was mistress of her business, knew that she was expected to turn out so much work, and so much *slander*. That day has fortunately gone by. But the "*barber's tale*" is the very thing that it was, in the days of Oliver Goldsmith, and it was then the very thing, that it was, as I verily believe, in the days of Ezekiel. There are many, who think, that a good story, not less than a good lather, is half the shave.

It is quite *in rerum natura*, that much time should be con-

sumed, in waiting, at the *tonstrinæ*—the barbers' shops; and to make it pass agreeably, the craft have always been remarkable, for the employment of sundry appliances—amusing pictures around the walls—images and mechanical contrivances—the daily journals—poodles, monkeys, squirrels, canaries, and parrots. In the older countries, a barber's boy was greatly in request, who could play upon the *citterne*, or some other musical instrument.

If there had not been a curious assemblage of *materiel*, in an old Roman *tonstrina*, it would not have been selected as an object for the pencil. That it was so selected, however, appears from a passage in Pliny, xxxv. 37. He is writing of *Pureicus*—*arte paucis postferendus: proposito, nescio an destruxerit se: quoniam humilia quidem sequutus, humilitatis tamen summam adeptus est gloriam*. *Tonstrinas, sutrinæque pinxit, et asellos, et obsonia, ac similia*—He had few superiors in his art: I know not if the plan he adopted was fatal to his fame; for, though his subjects were humble, yet, in their representation, he attained the highest excellence. He painted barbers' and shoemakers' shops, asses, eatables, and the like.

A rude sketch of Heemskerck's picture of a barber's shop lies now upon my table. Here is the poodle, with a cape and fool's cap, walking on his hind legs—the suspended bleeding basin, and other *et cætera* of the profession.

Little is generally known, as to the origin and import of the barber's pole. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, surgery was in such low repute, that farriers, barbers, sow-spayers, and surgeons were much upon a level. The truth of this, in respect to surgeons and barbers, has been established by law: and, for about two hundred years, both in London and Paris, they were incorporated, as one company. I remember a case, reported by *Espinasse*—not having the book at hand, I cannot indicate the volume and page—which shows the judicial estimate of surgery then, compared with the practice of physic. A physician's fees, in England, were accounted *quiddam honorarium*, and not *matter of lucre*, and therefore could not be recovered, in an action at law. Upon an action brought for surgical services, the fees were recoverable, because surgeons, upon the testimony of Dr. Mead, were of a lower grade, having nothing to do with the pathology of diseases, and never prescribing; but simply performing certain mechanical acts; and being, like all other artificers and operatives, worthy of their hire.

Nothing can more clearly exhibit the low state of this noble science, at the time, and the humble estimation of it, by the public. Chirurgery seemed destined to grovel, in etymological bondage, *χειρ ἐργον*, a mere *handicraft*. Barbers and surgeons were incorporated, as one company, in the fifteenth century, in the reign of Edward IV., and were called barber-surgeons. At the close of the sixteenth century, Ambrose Paré, the greatest surgeon of his time in France, did not reject the appellation of *barber-surgeon*. Henry VIII. dissolved this union, and gave a new charter in 1540, when it was enacted, that "*no person, using any shaving or barbery in London, shall occupy any surgery, letting of blood, or other matter, excepting only the drawing of teeth.*" The *barber-surgeon* was thus reduced to the *barber-dentist*, which seems not so agreeable to the practitioner, at present, as the loftier appellation of *surgeon-dentist*. Sterne was right: there is something in a name. The British surgeons obtained a new charter, in 1745, and another, in 1800, and various acts have been subsequently passed, on their behalf. July 17, 1797, Lord Thurlow, in the House of Peers, opposed a new bill, which the surgeons desired to have passed. Thurlow was a man of morose temperament, and uncertain humor.

He averred, that so much of the old law was in force, that, to use his own words, "the barbers and surgeons were each to use a pole, the barbers were to have theirs blue and white, striped, with no other appendage; but the surgeons', which was the same, in other respects, was likewise to have a gallipot and a red rag, to denote the particular nature of their vocation."

Brand, in his *Popular Antiquities*, says, that the barber's pole, used in bleeding, is represented, in an illuminated missal, of the time of Edward I., Longshanks, whose reign began in 1272. Fosbroke, in his *Encyc. of Antiquities*, page 414, says—"A staff, bound by a riband, was held, by persons being bled, and the pole was intended to denote the practice of phlebotomy." According to Lord Thurlow's statement, in the House of Peers, the pole was required, by the statute, to be used, as a sign. The first statute, incorporating the barber-surgeons, was that of Edward IV., as I have stated. The missal of Edward I., referred to by Brand, shows, that the usage was older than the law, and, doubtless, that the popular emblem was adopted, in the statute, to which Lord Thurlow refers, as still in force, in 1797.

In Brand's *Newcastle*, I find, that "it is ordered, Dec. 11,

1711, that periwig-making be considered part and branch of the Company of Barber-*Chirurgeons*."

The history of the pole is this: A staff about three feet high, with a ball on the top, and inserted, at the bottom, in a small cross-piece, was very convenient for the person to hold, who extended his arm, as he sat down, to be bled; and a fillet, or tape, was equally convenient for the ligature. These things the barber-surgeons kept, in a corner of their shops; and, when not in use, the tape or fillet was wound or twirled round the staff. When the lawgivers called for a sign, no apter sign could be given unto them, than this identical staff and fillet; much larger of course, and to be seen of men much farther.

No. CXLII.

ANCIENT plays abound with allusions to the barber's *citterne*, or lute, upon which not only he himself, and his apprentices were accustomed to play, but all the loiterers in the *tonstrina*. Much of all this may be found, in the Glossary of Archdeacon Nares, under the article CITTERNE, and in Fosbroke's Antiquities.

The commonness of its use gave rise to a proverb. In the Silent Woman, Act II., scene 2, Ben Jonson avails of it. Morose had married a woman, recommended by his barber, and whose fidelity he suspected, and the following passage occurs, between Morose and Truewit. Lond., 1816, iii. 411.

Morose. That cursed barber!

Truewit. Yes, faith, a cursed wretch indeed, sir.

Morose. I have married his *cittern*, that's common to all men.

Upon this passage is the following note—"It appears from innumerable passages, in our old writers, that barbers' shops were furnished with some musical instrument, commonly a cittern or guitar, for the amusement of such customers as chose to strum upon it, while waiting for their turn to be shaved, &c. It should be recollected, that the patience of customers, if the shop was at all popular, must, in those tedious days of love-locks, and beards of most fantastical cuts, have been frequently put to very severe trials. Some kind of amusement therefore was necessary, to beguile the time."

In old times, in old England, barbers were in the habit of making a variety of noises, with their fingers and their shears, which noises were supposed to be agreeable to their customers. Fosbroke, p. 414, refers to Lily's old play of *Mydas*, iii. 2, as showing the existence of the custom, in his time. Lily was born about 1553. There were some, who preferred to be shaved and dressed quietly. Nares, in his Glossary, refers to Plutarch, *De Garrulitate*, for an anecdote of King Archelaus, who stipulated with his barber to shave him in silence. This barbers' trick was called the "*knack with the fingers*;" and was extremely disagreeable to Morose, in Ben Jonson's play, to which I have referred. Thus, in i. 2, Clerimont, speaking of the partiality of Morose for Cutbeard, the barber, says—"The fellow trims him silently, and has not the knack with his shears or his fingers: and that continence in a barber he thinks so eminent a virtue, as it has made him chief of his counsel."

As barbers were brought first into Rome, from Sicily, so the best razors, according to Nares and Fosbroke, before the English began to excel in cutlery, were obtained in Palermo. Their form was unlike those now in use, and seems more perfectly to correspond with one of the Roman names, signifying a razor, i. e. *culter*. The blade, like that of a pruning knife, or sickle, curved slightly inward, the reverse of which is the modern form.

Smith, in his *Ancient Topography of London*, says—"The flying barber is a character now no more to be seen in London, though he still remains in some of our country villages: he was provided with a napkin, soap, and pewter basin, the form of which may be seen, in many of the illustrative prints of *Don Quixote*. His chafer was a deep leaden vessel, something like a chocolate pot, with a large ring or handle, at the top; this pot held about a quart of water, boiling hot; and, thus equipped, he flew about to his customers."

Old Randle Holme says, "*perawickes*" were very common in his time, about 1668, though unused before "contrary to our forefathers, who wore their own hair." A barber, in Paris, to recommend his bag wigs, hung over his door the sign of Absalom. Hone, i. 1262, states that a periwig-maker, to recommend his wares, turned the reason into rhyme:

"Oh, Absalom, oh Absalom,
Oh Absalom, my son,
If thou hadst worn a perwig,
Thou hadst not been undone."

Hutchinson, i. 152, says periwigs were an eyesore in New England, for thirty years after the Restoration of Charles II.

Among the Romans, after Mena introduced the practice of shaving, those, who professed philosophy, still maintained their dignity, and their beards, as an *ecce signum*. Hence the expression of Horace, Sat. ii. 3, 35, *sapientem pascere barbam*: and of Persius, iv. 1, when speaking of Socrates:

barbatum hæc crede magistrum
Dicere, sorbitio tollit quem dira cicuta.

Of those, who wear beards, at the present day, it has been computed, that, for one philosopher, there are five hundred fools, at the very lowest estimate. Manage them as you will, they are troublesome appendages; of very questionable cleanliness; and mightily in the way of such, as are much addicted to gravy and spoon victual. Like the burden of our sins, the post-prandial odor of them must be sometimes intolerable.

What an infinite variety of colors we have now-a-days! Bottom, in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, i. 2, is in doubt, what beard he shall play Pyramus in, and, at last, he says—"I will discharge it in either your straw-colored beard, your orange tawny beard, your purple ingrain beard, or your French crown-colour beard, your perfect yellow." Now I can honestly aver, that every fifth dandy I meet, looks precisely like Bottom, performing Pyramus. Now and then, I meet a fine, full, black beard; but, even then, it seems to me, that the proud satisfaction the fortunate proprietor must feel, in going about town with it, must be, in some degree, counterbalanced, by the necessity of sleeping in it, during the summer solstice.

The fancy colors, proposed by Bottom, refer to the dyes, in use, at the period, when Bottom flourished. Indeed, dyeing the beard is of the highest antiquity. I have no authority that Aaron dyed his. In 1653, John Bulwer published his "*Anthropo-Metamorphosis*," or Artificial Changeling, a very able and curious production. For the antiquity of the silly practice of dyeing the beard, he refers to Strabo. Old John Bulwer, ch. ix., comments, with just severity, upon the conduct of those ancient fools, who adopt the practice—"In every haire of these old coxcombs, you shall meet with three divers and sundry colors; white at the roots, yellow in the middle, and black at the point, like unto one of your parrat's feathers." What a graphic de-

scription of this nasty appendage! It has ever been to me a matter of infinite surprise, how any mortal can presume to say his prayers, with one of these piod abominations on his chin; giving the lie direct to the volume of inspiration, which avers that he cannot make one hair black nor white.

Another mystery—how can any man's better half become reconciled to a husband, dyed thus, in the wool! The colors are not all fast colors, I believe; and are liable to be rubbed off, by attrition.

Beards were cultivated, to such an excess, in Elizabeth's time, as to require and receive a check from the legislature. "The growth of beards," says Nares, in his Glossary, "was regulated by statute, at Lincoln's Inn, in the time of Eliz.—Primo Eliz. it was ordered, that no fellow of that house should wear a beard above a fortnight's growth. Transgression was punished with fine, loss of commons, and finally expulsion. But fashion prevailed, and in November, the following year, all previous orders, touching beards, were repealed."

It was formerly calculated, by Lord Stanhope, that the sum, expended upon snuff, and the value of the time, consumed in taking it, and the cost of snuff-boxes, handkerchiefs, &c., if duly invested, would pay off the national debt. I have a proposal to offer, and I offer it, timidly and respectfully, for the consideration of those amiable females, who go about, so incessantly, doing good. Perhaps I may not be able to awaken their interest, more effectually, than by suggesting the idea, that here is a very fair opportunity, for the formation of another female auxiliary society. I take it for granted, that there are some of these bearded gentlemen, from whom contributions in money, could not easily be obtained, for any benevolent object. There are some, whose whole estate, real, personal, and mixed, comprehends very little, beyond a costly malacca joint, a set of valuable shirtstuds, and a safety chain. Still if we cudgel the doctrine of political economy, we may get some small contributions, even from them.

Cortez found, in the treasury of Montezuma, a multitude of little bags, which were, at last, discovered to be filled with dead lice. The Emperor, to keep the Mexican beggars out of mischief, had levied this species of tax. I am well aware, that the power of levying taxes is not vested in young ladies. They have certain, natural, inherent rights, however, and, among

them, the right and the power of persuasion. Let them organize, throughout the Union, and establish committees of correspondence. Let them address a circular to every individual, who wears a beard; and, if their applications succeed, they will enjoy the luxury of supplying a comfortable hair mattress, to every poor widow, and aged single woman in the United States.

No. CXLIII.

THE barber's brush is a luxury of more modern times. Stubbe, in his "Anatomy of Abuses," says—"When they come to washing, oh, how gingerly they behave themselves therein. For then shall your mouths be bossed with the lather or some that rinseth of the balles, (for they have their sweete balles, wherewith all they use to washe) your eyes closed must be anointed therewith also. Then snap go the fingers, ful bravely, God wot. Thus, this tragedy ended; comes the warme clothes to wipe and dry him with all." Stubbe wrote, about 1550.

Not very long ago, a writer in the Gentleman's Magazine, observed—"I am old enough to remember when the operation of shaving in this kingdom, was almost exclusively performed by the *barbers*: what I speak of is some threescore years ago, at which time gentlemen shavers were unknown. Expedition was then a prime quality in a barber, who smeared the lather over his customer's face with his hand; for the delicate refinement of the brush had not been introduced. The lathering of the beard being finished, the operator threw off the lather, adhering to his hand, by a peculiar jerk of his arm, which caused the joints of his fingers to crack, this being a more expeditious mode of clearing the hand, than using a towel for that purpose; and, the more audible the crack, the higher the shaver stood, in his own opinion, and in that of the fraternity. This I presume is the custom alluded to by Stubbe."

The Romans, when bald, wore wigs. Some of the emperors wore miserable periwigs. Curly locks, however becoming in a male child, are somewhat ridiculous, trained with manifest care, and descending upon the shoulders of a full grown boy of forty. In addition to the pole, a peruke was frequently employed, as the

barber's sign. There was the short bob, and the full bottom ; the "hie perrawycke" and the scratch ; the top piece, and the perwig with the pole lock ; the curled wig with a dildo, and the travelling wig, with curled foretop and bobs ; the campaign wig, with a dildo on each side, and the toupet, a la mode.

It may seem a paradox to some, that the most *barbarous* nations should suffer the hair and beard to grow longest. The management of the hair has furnished an abundant subject matter for grave attention, in every age and nation. Cleansing, combing, crimping, and curling, clipping, and consecrating their locks gave ample occupation to the ladies and gentlemen of Greece and Rome. At the time of adolescence, and after shipwreck, the hair was cut off and sacrificed to the divinities. It was sometimes cut off, at funerals, and cast upon the pile. Curling irons were in use, at Rome. Girls wore the hair fastened upon the top of the head ; matrons falling on the neck. Shaving the crown was a part of the punishment of conspirators and thieves. We know nothing, at present, in regard to the hair, which was unknown at Rome—our *frizzing* was their *capillorum tortura*. They had an instrument, called *tressorium*, for plaiting the hair. In the time of Edward the Confessor, the hair was worn, universally, long, the laws of England not compelling all, but the nobility, as in France, to cut the hair short, in that age.

The Romans are said, occasionally to have worn wigs of an enormous size, which gave occasion to the term, in Martial's epigram, *caput calceatum*. We have no exact record of the size of those Roman wigs—but I sincerely wish, that Augustus Cæsar or—

"Mæcenæ, whose high lineage springs,
From fair Etruria's ancient kings,"

could have seen the Rev. Dr. Lathrop's ! In Mr. Ward's journal of Samuel Curwen, that venerable and truly respectable, and amiable, old tory is represented, with precisely such a wig, but of much smaller diameter. Dr. John Lathrop died, Jan. 4, 1816, at the age of 75. He published a considerable number of sermons on various occasions, no one of which is remarkable for extraordinary talent, or learning. It was, by some intelligent persons, supposed, that the wig was a great help to him. In his latter days, he found himself unable, any longer, to bear up, under such a portentous superstructure, which really appeared to "overhang," contrary to the statute, and he laid it aside. His

influence certainly appeared to diminish, in some measure, probably, from the increasing infirmities of age; but, doubtless, in some degree, from the deposition of the wig. I honestly confess, that I never felt for Dr. Lathrop the same awful reverence, after he had laid aside this emblem of wisdom. A "wig full of learning" is an ancient saying, and Cowper makes use of it, in one of his lighter poems.

I have always looked upon barbers, as an honorable race of men, quite as much so, as brokers; the barbers seldom fail to shave more gently, and commonly dismiss an old customer, without drawing blood, or taking off the skin. We owe them a debt of gratitude withal, on other scores. How very easily they might cut our throats!

In this goodly city, at the present time, there are more than one hundred and ten gentlemen, who practice the art of barbery, beside their respective servants and apprentices. When I was a small boy—very—some sixty years ago, there were but twenty-nine, and many of them were most respectable and careful operators—an honor to their profession, and a blessing to the community.

There was Charles Gavett, in Devonshire Street, the Pudding Lane of our ancestors. Gavett was a brisk, little fellow; his *tonstrina* was small, and rather dark, but always full.

In Brattle Square, just behind the church, John Green kept a shop, for several years. But John became unsteady, and cut General Winslow, and some other of his customers, and scalded several others, and lost his business.

In Fish Street, which had then, but recently, ceased to be the court end of the town, there were several clever barbers—there was Thomas Grubb, and Zebulon Silvester, and James Adams, and Abraham Florence. I never heard a syllable against them, or their lather.

At No. 33, Marlborough Street, William Whipple kept a first rate establishment, and had a high name, among the dandies, as an accomplished haircutter.

Jonathan Edes kept a small shop, in Ann Street, and had a fair run of transient custom. He had always a keen edge and a delicate hand. He was greatly urged to take a larger establishment, in a more fashionable part of the town, near Cow Lane, but Mr. Edes was not ambitious, and turned a wiry edge to all such suggestions.

William Mock kept a shop, in Newbury Street, an excellent shaver, but slow; his shop was not far from the White Horse. He was a peripatetic. I suspect, but am not certain, that he shaved Dr. Lemuel Hayward.

At the corner of Essex Street, old Auchmuty's Lane, George Gideon kept a fine stand, clean towels, keen edge, and hot lather; but he had a rough, coarse hand. He had been one of the sons of liberty, and his shop being near the old site of Liberty tree, he was rather apt to take liberties with his customers' noses, especially the noses of the disaffected.

There were two professed wig-makers, in Boston, at that time, who performed the ordinary functions of barbers beside, William Haslet, in Adams Street, and John Bosson, in Orange Street. Mr. Bosson was very famous, in his line, and in great request, among the ladies.

In Marshall's Lane, Edward Hill was an admirable shaver; but, in the department of hair cutting, inferior to Anthony Howe, whose exceedingly neat and comfortable establishment was in South Latin School Street. An excellent hotel was then kept, by Joshua Bracket, at the sign of Cromwell's Head, on the very spot, where Palmer keeps his fruit shop, and the very next door below the residence of Dr. John Warren. Bracket patronized Howe's shop, and sent him many customers. Captain John Boyle, whose house and bookstore were at No. 18 Marlborough Street, patronized Anthony Howe.

Samuel Jepson kept his *barbery*, as the shop was sometimes called, in Temple Street, between the two bakeries of William Breed and Matthew Bayley.

James Tate was established in Purchase Street. He would have been a good barber, had he not been a poor poet. He was proud of his descent from Nahum Tate, the psalmodist, the copartner of Brady. Richard Fox kept also in Purchase Street, and had a large custom.

A much frequented barber's shop was kept, by William Pierce, near the Boston Stone. Jonathan Farnham was an excellent barber, in Back Street. He unluckily had an ominous squint, which was inconvenient, as it impressed new comers, now and then, with a fear lest he might cut their throats. Joseph Alexander shaved in Orange Street, and Theodore Dehon, on the north side of the Old State House.

Joseph Eckley was one of the best shavers and hair cutters in

town, some sixty years ago. His shop was in Wing's Lane. Daniel Crosby, who was also a wig maker, in Newbury Street, was clerk of Trinity Church.

Augustine Raillion, whose name was often written Revailion kept his stand, at No. 48 Newbury Street. He was much given to dogs, ponies, and other divertisements.

State Street was famous, for four accomplished barbers, sixty years ago—Stephen Francis, John Gould, John M. Lane, and Robert Smallpiece. The last was the father of Robert Smallpiece, who flourished here, some thirty years ago or more, and kept his shop, in Milk Street, opposite the Old South Church.

It is well known, that the late Robert Treat Paine wrote an ode, upon the occasion of the Spanish successes, to which he gave the title of "*Spain, Commerce and Freedom, a National Ode.*" It bore unquestionable marks of genius; but some of the ideas and much of the phrascology were altogether extravagant. It commenced finely—

"Sound the trumpet of fame! Strike that pæan again!
Religion a war against tyranny wages;
From her seat springs, in armor, regenerate Spain,
Like a giant, refresh'd by the slumber of ages.
From the place, where she lay,
She leaps in array,
Like Ajax, to die in the face of the day."

The ode contained some strange expressions—"redintegrant war"—"though the dismember'd earth effervesce and regender," and so many more, that the ode, though evidently the work of a man of genius, was accounted bombastic. A wag of that day, published a parody, of which this Robert Smallpiece was the hero. It was called, if I mistake not—"Soap, Razors, and Hot Water, a Tonsorial Ode." The first stanza ran thus—

"Strap that razor so keen! Strap that razor again!
And Smallpiece will shave 'em, if he can come at 'em;
From his stool, clad in aprons, he springs up amain,
Like a barber, refresh'd by the smell of pomatum.
From the place, where he lay,
He leaps in array,
To lather and shave, in the face of the day.
He has sworn from pollution our faces to clean,
Our cheeks, necks, and upper lips, whiskers and chin."

"*Paullo majora canamus.*"

No. CXLIV.

IN 1784, Mr. Thomas Percival, an eminent physician, of Manchester, in England, published a work, against duelling, and sent a copy to Dr. Franklin. Dr. Franklin replied to Mr. Percival, from Passy, July 17, 1784, and his reply contains the following observations—"Formerly, when duels were used to determine lawsuits, from an opinion, that Providence would in every instance, favor truth and right, with victory, they were excusable. At present, they decide nothing. A man says something, which another tells him is a lie. They fight; but whichever is killed, the point in dispute remains unsettled. To this purpose, they have a pleasant little story here. A gentleman, in a coffee-house, desired another to sit further from him. 'Why so?'—'Because, sir, you stink.'—'That is an affront, and you must fight me.'—'I will fight you, if you insist upon it; but I do not see how that will mend the matter. For if you kill me, I shall stink too; and, if I kill you, you will stink, if possible, worse than you do at present.'"

This is certainly german to the matter. So far from perceiving any moral courage, in those, who fight duels, nothing seems more apparent, than the triumph of one fear, over four other fears—the fear of shame, over the fear of bringing misery upon parents, wives and children—the fear of the law—the fear of God—and the fear of death. Many a man will *brave* death, who fears it.

Death is the king of terrors, and all men stand in awe of him, saving the Christian, with his armor of righteousness about him, *cap-a-pie*; and even he, perhaps, is slightly pricked, by that fear, now and then, in articulo, between the joints of the harness. I must honestly confess, that I once knew a man, who had a terrible vixen of a wife, and, when about to die, he replied to his clergyman's inquiry, if he was not afraid to meet the king of terrors, that he was not, for he had lived with the queen, for thirty years.

I do not suppose there is a more hypocritical fellow, upon earth, than a duellist. Mandeville, in his Fable of the Bees, in the second dialogue, part ii., puts these words into the mouth of Cleomenes, when speaking to Horatio, on the subject of his duel: "I saw you, that very morning, and you seemed to be sedate

and void of passion: you could have no concern." Horatio replies—"It is silly to show any, at such times; but I know best what I felt; the struggle I had within was unspeakable: it is a terrible thing. I would then have given a considerable part of my estate, that the thing which forced me into it, had not happened; and yet, upon less provocation, I would act the same part again, tomorrow." Such is human nature, and many, who sit down quietly, to write in opposition to this silly, senseless, selfish practice, would be quite apt enough, upon the emergency, to throw aside the pacific steel, wherewith they indite, and take up the cruel rapier. When I was a young man, a Mr. Ogilvie gave lectures, in Boston, on various subjects. He was the son of Mr. Ogilvie, to whose praises of the prospects in Scotland, Dr. Johnson replied, by telling him, that "the noblest prospect, which a Scotchman ever sees, is the high road, that leads him to England."

The son of this gentleman gave, his lectures, in the old Exchange Coffee House, where I heard him, several times. Under the influence of opium, which he used very freely, he was, occasionally, quite eloquent. He lectured, one evening, with considerable power, against duelling. On his way to his lodgings, some person repeated to him, several piquant and cutting things, which a gentleman had said of his lecture. Ogilvie was exceedingly incensed, and swore he would call him out, the very next day.

This law of honor is written nowhere, unless, in letters of blood, in the volume of pride, envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. "What," says Cleomenes, in the work I have just now referred to—"What makes so just and prudent a man, that has the good of society so much at heart, act knowingly against the laws of his country?"—"The strict obedience," says Horatio, "he pays to the laws of honor, which are superior to all others."—"If men of honor," says Cleomenes, "would act consistently, they ought all to be Roman Catholics."—"Why so?"—"Because," he rejoins, "they prefer oral tradition, to all written laws; for nobody can tell, when, in what king's or emperor's reign, in what country, or by what authority, these laws of honor were first enacted: it is very strange they should be of such force."

It is certainly very strange, that their authority should have been acknowledged, in some cases, not only by professing Chris-

tians, but even by the ministers of religion. Four individuals, of this holy calling, stand enrolled, as duellists, on the blood-guilty register of England. In 1764, the Rev. Mr. Hill was killed in a duel, by Cornet Gardner. On the 18th of June, 1782, the Rev. Mr. Allen killed Mr. Lloyd Dulany, in a duel. In August, 1827, Mr. Grady was wounded in a duel, by the Rev. Mr. Hodson. The Rev. Mr. Bate fought two duels—was subsequently made Baronet—fought a third duel, and was made Dean. If such atrocities were not preëminently horrible, how ridiculous they would be!

It would not be agreeable to be placed in that category, in which a worthy bishop placed those, who, after Dr. Johnson's death, began to assail his reputation. "*The old lion is dead,*" said the bishop, "*and now every ass will be kicking at his hide.*" Better and safer, however, to be there, than to bide with those, who receive all the coarse, crude, mental eructations of this truly good and great man, for *dicta perennia*. A volume of outrageously false teachings might readily be selected, from the recorded outpourings of this great literary whale, whenever Boswell, by a little tickling, caused his Leviathan to spout. Too much tea, or none at all, too much dinner, or too little certainly affected his qualifications, as a great moral instructor; and, under the teazle of contradiction, the nap of his great spirit fairly stood on end; and, at such times, he sought victory too often, rather than the truth. It has always seemed to me, that dinner-table philosophy, especially *après*, is often of very questionable value.

Dr. Johnson has frequently been quoted, on the subject of duelling. Some of his opinions were delivered, on this subject, suddenly, and seem entirely unworthy of his majestic powers. At a dinner party, at Gen. Oglethorpe's—I refer to Boswell's Johnson, in ten volumes, Lond. 1835, vol. iii. page 216—Boswell brought up the subject of duelling. Gen. Oglethorpe, *the host*, "fired at this, and said, with a lofty air, 'undoubtedly a man has a right to defend his honor.'"

Dr. Johnson, the *principal guest*, did the civil thing, and took the same side, and is reported, by Boswell, to have said substantially—"Sir, as men become in a high degree refined, various causes of offence arise; which are considered to be of such importance, that life must be staked at atone for them; though, in reality, they are not so. A body, that has received a very

fine polish, may be easily hurt. Before men arrive at this artificial refinement, if one tells his neighbor he lies—his neighbor tells him he lies—if one gives his neighbor a blow, his neighbor gives him a blow: but, in a state of highly polished society, an affront is held to be a serious injury. It must therefore be resisted, or rather a duel must be fought upon it; as men have agreed to banish, from society, one, who puts up with an affront, without fighting a duel. Now, sir, it is never unlawful to fight, in self-defence. He, then, who fights a duel, does not fight from passion against his antagonist, but out of self-defence, to avert the stigma of the world, and to prevent himself from being driven out of society. I could wish there was not that superfluity of refinement; but, while such notions prevail, no doubt a man may lawfully fight a duel." I must have another witness, besides Mr. Boswell, before I believe, that Dr. Johnson uttered these words. Dr. Johnson could never have maintained, that the *lawfulness* of an act depended upon the existence of certain popular *notions*. Nor is it true, nor was it then true, that *men have agreed to banish, from society, one, who puts up with an affront, without fighting a duel*.

Dr. Johnson seems to have made no distinction, between military men and the rest of the world. It is impossible to doubt, that the Doctor was graciously disposed to favor Gen. Oglethorpe's *notions*, and that he would have taken the opposite side, had he been the guest of the Archbishop of Canterbury. "*It is not unlawful to fight, in self-defence:*" the law, by punishing all killing, in a duel, as murder, in the very first degree, shows clearly enough, that duelling is never looked upon, as fighting, in self-defence. It is remarkable, that Mr. Boswell, himself a lawyer, should have thought this paragraph worthy of preservation.

On page 268, of the same volume, Mr. Boswell has the following record—"April 19, 1773, he again defended duelling, and put his argument upon what I have ever thought the most solid basis; that, if public war be allowed to be consistent with morality, private war must be equally so." And this, in Mr. Boswell's opinion, was *the most solid basis*! It is difficult to perceive what is stubble, if this is not. Whither does this argument carry us all, but back to the state of nature—of uncovenanted man—of man, who has surrendered none of his natural rights, as a consideration for the blessings of government and

law? A state of nature and a state of society are very different things. Who will doubt, that, if Dr. Johnson really uttered these things, he would have talked more warily, could he have imagined, that Boszzy would have transmitted them to distant ages?

It is, nevertheless, perfectly clear, that Dr. Johnson, upon both these occasions, had talked, only for the pride and pleasure of talking; for Mr. Boswell records a very different opinion, vol. iv. page 249. Sept. 19, 1773.—Dr. Johnson then had thoroughly digested General Oglethorpe's dinner; and Mr. Boswell's record runs thus—“*He fairly owned he could not explain the rationality of duelling.*”

Poor Mr. Boswell! It is not unreasonable, to suppose, that he had inculcated his notions, upon the subject of duelling, in his own family, and repeated, for the edification of his sons, the valuable sentiments of Dr. Johnson. Mr. Boswell died, May 19, 1795. Seven and twenty years after his death, his son, Sir Alexander Boswell, was killed, in a duel, at Auchterpool, by Mr. James Stuart, March 26, 1822. Upon the trial of Stuart, for murder, Mr. Jeffrey, who defended him, quoted the very passage, in which Dr. Johnson had justified, to the father, that fatal sin and folly, which had brought the son to an untimely grave!

No. CXLV.

DR. FRANKLIN, in his letter to Mr. Percival, referred to, in my last number, observes, that, “formerly, when duels were used, to determine lawsuits, from an opinion, that Providence would, in every instance, favor truth and right with victory, they were excusable.” Dr. Johnson did not think this species of duel so absurd, as it is commonly supposed to be: “it was only allowed,” said he, “when the question was in equilibrio, and they had a notion that Providence would interfere in favor of him, who was in the right.” Bos., vol. iv. page 14. The lawfulness of a thing may excuse it: but there are some laws, so very absurd, that one stares at them, in the statute book, as he looks at flies in amber, and marvels “*how the devil they*

got there." There was, I am gravely assured, in the city of New Orleans, not very long ago, a practitioner of the healing art, who was called *the Tetotum doctor*—he felt no pulse—he examined no tongue—he asked no questions for conscience' sake, nor for any other—his tetotum was marked with various letters, on its sides—he sat down, in front of the patient, and spun his tetotum—if B. came uppermost, he bled immediately—if P., he gave a purge—if E., an emetic—if C., a clyster, and so on. If there be less wisdom, in this new mode of practice, than in the old wager of Battel, I perceive it not.

Both Drs. Franklin and Johnson refer to it, as an *ancient* practice. It was supposed, doubtless, to have become obsolete, and a dead letter, extinguished by the mere progress of civilization. Much surprise, therefore, was excited, when, at a period, as late as 1818, an attempt was made to revive it, in the case of *Ashford vs. Thornton*, tried before the King's Bench, in April of that year. This was a case of appeal of murder, under the law of England. Thornton had violated, and murdered the sister of Ashford; and, as a last resort, claimed his right to *wager of battel*. The court, after full consideration, felt themselves obliged to admit the claim, under the unrepealed statute of 9, William II., passed A. D. 1096. Ashford, the appellant, and brother of the unfortunate victim, declined to accept the challenge, and the murderer was accordingly discharged. This occurred, in the 58th year of George III., and a statute was passed, in 1819, putting an end to this terrible absurdity. Had the appellant, the brother, accepted this legalized challenge, what a barbarous exhibition would have been presented to the world, at this late day, through the inadvertence of Parliament, in omitting to repeal this preposterous law!

In a former number, I quoted a sentiment, attributed, by Boswell, to Dr. Johnson, and which, I suppose, was no deliberate conviction of his, but uttered, in the course of his dinner-table talk, for the gratification of Gen. Oglethorpe, "*Men have agreed to banish from society, a man, who puts up with an affront without fighting a duel.*" This is not asserted, as an independent averment, but assumed or taken for granted, as the basis of the argument, such as it was. Is this a fact? Cannot cases innumerable be stated, to prove, that it is not? The words, ascribed to Dr. Johnson, are not confined to any class or profession, but

are of universal application. Have men agreed to banish from society every man, who refuses to fight a duel, when summoned to that refreshing amusement? Let us examine a few cases. General Jackson did not lose caste, because he omitted to challenge Randolph, for pulling his nose. Josiah Quincy was not banished from society, for refusing the challenge of a Southern Hotspur. I believe, that Judge Thacher, of Maine, would have been much less respected, had he gone out to be shot, when invited, than he ever has been, for the very sensible answer to his antagonist, that he would talk to Mrs. Thacher about it, and be guided by her opinion. Nobody ever supposed, that Judge Breckenridge suffered, in character or standing, because he told his challenger, that he *wouldn't come*; but, that he might sketch his, the Judge's, figure, on a board, and fire at that, till he was weary, at any distance he pleased; and if he hit it, upon a certificate of the fact, the Judge would agree to it.

Had Hamilton refused the challenge of Burr, his *deliberate murderer*, his fame would have remained untarnished—his countrymen would never have forgotten the 14th of October, 1781—the charge of that advanced corps—the fall of Yorktown! On his death-bed, Hamilton expressed his abhorrence of the practice; and solemnly declared, should he survive, never to be engaged in another duel. "*Pendleton knows*," said he, in a dying hour, referring to Burr, and addressing Dr. Hossack, "*that I did not intend to fire at him*." How different from the blood-thirsty purposes of his assassin! In vol. x. of Jeremy Bentham's works, pages 432-3, the reader will find a letter from Dumont to Bentham, in which the Frenchman says, referring to a conversation with Burr, in 1808, four years after the duel—"His duel with Hamilton was a savage affair:" and Bentham adds—"He gave me an account of his duel with Hamilton; he was sure of being able to kill him, so I thought it little better than murder."

In England, *politics* seem to have given occasion to very many affairs of this nature—the duels of the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Mohun, in 1712, fatal to both—Mr. Martin and Mr. Wilkes, in 1763—the Lords Townshend and Bellamont, in 1773—C. J. Fox and Mr. Adam, in 1779—Capt. Fullerton and Lord Shelburne, in 1780—Lord Macartney and Major General Stuart, in 1786—the Duke of York and Colonel Lenox, in 1789—Mr. Curran and Major Hobart, in 1790—Earl of Lons-

dale and Capt. Cuthbert, in 1792—Lord Valentia and Mr. Gawler, in 1796—William Pitt and George Tierney, in 1798—Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Paull, in 1807—Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, in 1809—Mr. O'Connell and Mr. D'Esterre, in 1815—Mr. Grattan and the Earl of Clare, in 1820—Sir A. Boswell and James Stuart, in 1822—Mr. Long Wellesly and Mr. Crespigny, in 1828—the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Winchelsea, in 1829—Lord Alvanley and Morgan O'Connell, in 1835—Sir Colquhoun Grant and Lord Seymour, in 1835—Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Black, in 1835—Mr. Ruthven and Mr. Scott, in 1836—the Earl of Cardigan and Mr. Tuckett, in 1840.

Sir J. Barrington says, that, during his grand climacteric, two hundred and twenty-seven duels were fought. In different ages and nations, various preventives have been employed. Killing in a duel, here and in England, is murder, in the surviving principal, and seconds. To add effect to the law, it was proclaimed, by 30, Charles II., 1679, to be *an unpardonable offence*.

Disqualification from holding office, and dismissal from the army and navy have, at different times, been held up, in *terrorem*. In England, eighteen survivors have suffered the penalty, provided against duelling. Major Campbell was hung, in 1808, for having killed Capt. Boyd, in a duel.

In 1813, Lieutenant Blundell was killed in a duel at Carisbroke Castle: the survivor and both seconds were tried, and convicted of murder; and, though subsequently pardoned, dismissed the service. "Duels," says Sir George Mackenzie, "are but illustrious murders." Mr. Addison recommends the pillory. The councils of Valentia and Trent excommunicated such combatants; but a man, who has made up his mind to fight a duel, cares little for the church.

During the first eighteen years of the reign of Henry IV., four thousand persons were slain, in duels, in France. He published his famous edict of Blois, against duels, in 1602: and, in 1609, added, to the existing penalties, punishment by death, confiscations, fines, and imprisonment, respectively, for all, concerned in fighting or abetting, even as spectators, or as casual passers, who did not interpose. All this, however, was the work of Sully: for this consistent king, at this very time, gave Cregui leave to fight the Duke of Savoy, and even told him, that he would be his second, were he not a king.

Duels were so frequent, in the reign of his successor, Louis

XIII., that Lord Herbert, who was then ambassador, at the court of France, used to say, there was not a Frenchman, worth looking at, who had not killed his man. "*Who fought yesterday?*" was the mode of inquiring after the news of the morning. The most famous duellist of the age was Montmorenci, Count de Boutville. He and the Marquis de Beuoron, setting their faces against all authority, and, persisting in this amusement, it was found necessary to take their stubborn heads off. They were tried, convicted, and beheaded. A check was, at length, put to these excesses, by Louis XIV. A particular account of all this will be found in Larrey, *Histoire de France, sous le Règne de Louis XIV.*, tom. ii. p. 208. Matters, during the minority of Louis XIV., had come to a terrible pass. The Dukes de Beaufort and Nemours had fought a duel, with four seconds each, and converted it into a *Welch main*, as the cock-fighters term a *melée*. They fought, five to five, with swords and pistols. Beaufort killed Nemours—the Marquis de Villars killed D'Henricourt, and D'Uzerches killed De Ris. In 1663, another affair took place, four to four. The king finally published his famous edict of 1679. The marshals of France and the nobility entered into a solemn league and covenant, never to fight a duel, on any pretence whatever; and Louis le Grand adhered to his oath, and resolutely refused pardon to every offender. This greatly checked the evil, for a time.

Kings will die, and their worthy purposes are not always inherited by their successors; soon after the death of the great monarch, the practice of duelling revived in France.

The only radical and permanent preventive, of this equally barbarous, and foolish custom, lies, in the moral and religious education of the people. The infrequency of the practice, in New England, arises entirely from the fact, that the moral and religious training of the community has taught them to look upon a duellist, as an exceedingly unfashionable personage.

New Englanders are a calculating race. They *calculate*, that it is infinitely better to mind their business, and die quietly in their beds, than to go out and be shot, by the very fellow, who has not the decency to say he is sorry, for treading on their toes, when he was drunk—and they are a fearful race, for they fear the reprehension of the wise and good, and the commands of God, more than they fear the decisions of a lawless tribunal, where fools sit in judgment, and whose absurd decrees are written on the sand.

No. CXLVI.

SOME nine and thirty years ago, I was in the habit, occasionally, when I had no call, in my line, of strolling over to the Navy Yard, at Charlestown, and spending an evening, in the cabin of a long, dismantled, old hulk, that was lying there. Once in a while, we had a very pleasant dinner party, on board that old craft. That cabin was the head-quarters of my host. It was the cabin of that ill-fated frigate, the Chesapeake. My friend had been one of her deeply mortified officers, when she was surrendered, by James Barron, to the British frigate Leopard, without firing a gun, June 23, 1807.

A sore subject this, for my brave, old friend. I well remember to have dined, in that cabin, one fourth of July, with some very pleasant associates—there were ten of us—we were very noisy then—all, but myself, are still enough now—they are all in their graves. I recollect, that, towards the close of the entertainment, some allusion to the old frigate, in which we were assembled, revived the recollection of the day, when those stars and stripes came down. We sat in silence, listening to the narrative of our host, whose feelings were feverishly and painfully excited—"It would have been a thousand times better," said he, "if the old hulk had gone to bottom and every man on board. The country might then, possibly, have been spared the war; for our honor would have been saved, and there would have been less to fight for. Unprepared as we were, for such an attack, at a time of profound peace, we ought to have gone down, like little Mudge, who, while his frigate was sinking, thanked God the *Blanche* was not destined to wear French colors!"

When he paused, and, with the back of his hand, brushed away the tears from his eyes, we were all of his mind, and wished he had been in command, that day, instead of James Barron; for this old friend of mine was a very, very clever fellow—a warmer heart never beat in a braver bosom. There was one thing, however, that I could never break him of, and yet I had some little influence with him, in those days—I mean the *habit* of fighting duels. He would not harm a fly, but he would shoot a man, in an honorable way, at the shortest notice, and the shortest distance. He fought a duel, on one oc-

casian, when, being challengee, and having the choice of distance, he insisted on three paces, saying he was so near-sighted, he could not hit a barn door, at ten. He was apt to be, not affectedly, but naturally, jocular, on such occasions.

Another old friend of mine, in by-gone days, the elder son of the late Governor Brooks, was second, in one of these duels, to the friend, of whom I am speaking. Major Brooks had, occasionally, indulged himself, in the publication of poetical effusions. When the parties and their seconds came upon the ground, he found, that he had brought no leather, to envelop the ball, as usual, in loading; and, drawing a newspaper from his pocket, tore off the corner, on which some verses were printed: at this moment, his principal drawing near, said, in an under tone, "*I hope that isn't one of your fugitive pieces, Alek.*"

Though our lines were, of late years, cast far apart, I always rejoiced in his good fortune. After having occupied a very elevated position, for some time, in the naval department, he fell—poor fellow—not in a duel—but in a moment, doubtless, of temporary, mental derangement, by his own hand. The news of my old friend's death reached me, just before dinner—I postponed it till the next day—went home—sat alone—and had that old dinner, in the cabin of the Chesapeake, warmed over, upon the coals of the imagination, and seated around me every guest, who was there that day, just as fresh, as if he had never been buried.

James Barron was an unlucky dog, to say the least of it. Striking the stars and stripes, without firing a gun, was enough for one life. For this he was tried, found guilty, and suspended from duty, for five years, from Feb. 8, 1808, and deprived of his pay. He went abroad; and, during his absence, war was declared, which continued about two years, after the termination of his suspension. He returned, at last, and sought employment; Decatur officially opposed his claims; and thereupon he challenged, and killed Decatur, the pride of the American navy; and, after this, he received employment from the government. The services of James Barron are not likely to be undervalued. Decatur's offence consisted, in his declaration of opinion, that Barron did not return to the service of his country, as in duty bound. The duel took place March 22, 1820. After this, Barron demanded a Court of Inquiry, to settle this point. The Court consisted of Commodores Stewart and Morris and Captain

Evans, and convened May 10, 1821, and the conclusion of the sentence is this—"It is therefore the opinion of the court, that his (Barron's) absence from the United States, without the permission of the government, was contrary to his duty, as an officer, in the navy of the United States."

Here then was another silly and senseless duel. Mr. Allen, in his Biographical Dictionary remarks—"The correspondence issued in a challenge from Barron, though he considered duelling '*a barbarous practice, which ought to be exploded from civilized society.*' And the challenge was accepted by Decatur, though he '*had long since discovered, that fighting duels is not even an unerring criterion of personal courage.*'"

They fired at the same instant; Barron fell immediately, wounded in the hip, where Decatur had mercifully declared his intention to wound him; Decatur stood erect, for a moment—put his hand to his right side—and fell, mortally wounded. He was raised, and supported, a few steps, and sunk down, exhausted, near Barron. Captain Mackenzie, in his Life of Decatur, page 322, gives his opinion, that this duel could have been gracefully prevented, on the ground; and such will be the judgment, doubtless, of posterity. Capt. Jesse D. Elliot was the second of Barron—Com. Bainbridge of Decatur. After they had taken their stands, Barron said to Decatur, that "he hoped, *on meeting, in another world, they would be better friends, than they had been in this.*"

To this Decatur replied, "*I have never been your enemy, sir.*" "Why," says Captain Mackenzie, "could not this aspiration for peace, between them, in the next world, on one part, and this comprehensive disclaimer of all enmity, on the other, have been seized by the friends, for the purposes of reconciliation?" A pertinent question truly—but of very ready solution. These seconds, like most others, acted, like military undertakers; their office consists, as they seem to suppose, in seeing the bodies duly cared for; and all consideration for the chief mourners, and such the very principals often are, is out of the question. With all his excellent qualities, Commodore Bainbridge, as every one, who knew him well, will readily admit, was not possessed of that happy mixture of qualities, to avail of this pacific *prestige*. It was an overture—such Barron afterwards avowed it to have been. On the 10th of October, 1818, Decatur had been the second of Com. Perry, in his duel with Captain Heath, which

was terminated, after the first fire, by Decatur's declaration, that Com. Perry had avowed his purpose, not to fire at Capt Heath. Had Perry lived, and been at hand, it is highly probable, that Decatur would not have fallen, for Perry would, doubtless, have been his second, and readily availed of the expressions of the parties, on the ground.

Had Charles Morris, whose gallantry and discretion have mingled into a proverb—had he been the second of his old commander, by whose side, he stood, on the Philadelphia's deck, in that night of peril, February, 1804, who can doubt, the pacific issue of this most miserable adventure! Seconds, too frequently, are themselves the instigators and supporters of these combats. True or false, the tale is a fair one, of two friends, who had disputed over their cups; and, by the exciting expressions of some common acquaintances, were urged into a duel. They met early the next morning—the influence of the liquor had departed—the seconds loaded the pistols, and placed their principals—but, before the word was given, one of them, rubbing his eyes, and looking about him, exclaims—"there is some mistake, there can be no enmity between us two, my old friend; these fellows, who have brought us here, upon this foolish errand, are our enemies, let us fire at them." The proposition was highly relished, by the other party, and the seconds took to their heels.

Well: we left Decatur and Barron, lying side by side, and weltering in their blood. The strife was past, and they came to a sort of friendly understanding. Barron, supposing his wound to be fatal, said all things had been conducted honorably, and that he forgave Decatur, from the bottom of his heart. Mackenzie, in a note, on page 325, refers to a conversation between them, as they lay upon the ground, until the means of transportation arrived. He does not give the details, but says they would be "creditable to the parties, and soothing to the feelings of the humane." I understood, at the time, from a naval officer of high rank, and have heard it often, repeated, that Decatur said, "Barron, why didn't you come home and fight your country's battles?" that Barron replied, "I was too poor to pay my debts, and couldn't get away,"—and that Decatur rejoined, "If I had known that, we should not be lying here." Strip this matter of its honorable epidermis, and there is something quite ridiculous in the idea of doing such an unpleasant thing, and all for nothing!

These changes, from hostility to amity, are often extremely sudden. I have read, that Rapin, the historian, when young, fought a duel, late in the evening, with small swords. His sword broke near the hilt—he did not perceive it, and continued to fence with the hilt alone. His antagonist paused and gave him notice; and, like the two girls, in the Antijacobin, they flew into each other's arms, and "swore perpetual amity."

No. CXLVII.

M. DE VASSOR wrote with a faulty pen, when he asserted, in his history, that the only good thing Louis XIV. did, in his long reign of fifty-six years, consisted in his vigorous attempts, to suppress the practice of duelling. Cardinal Richelieu admits, however, in his *Political Testament*, that his own previous efforts had been ineffectual, although he caused Messieurs de Chappelle and Bouteville to be executed, for the crime, in disregard of the earnest importunities of their numerous and powerful friends. No public man ever did more, for the suppression of the practice, than Lord Bacon, while he was attorney general. His celebrated charge, upon an information in the star chamber, against Priest & Wright, vol. iv. page 399, Lond. 1824, was ordered to be printed, by the Lords of Council; and was vastly learned and powerful, in its way. It is rather amusing, upon looking at the decree, which followed, dated Jan. 26, 2 James I., to see how such matters were then managed; the information, against Priest, was, "*for writing and sending a letter of challenge together with a stick, which should be the length of the weapon.*"

Such measures are surely well enough, as far as they go; but can be of no lasting influence, unless certain processes are simultaneously carried on, to meliorate the moral tone, in society. Without the continual employment of moral and religious alternatives—laws, homilies, charges, decrees, ridicule, menaces of disinherison here, and damnation hereafter will be of very little use. They are outward applications—temporary repellants, which serve no other purpose, than to drive back the distemper, for a brief space, but reach not the seat of the disorder. As was stated, in a former number, nothing will put an end to this

practice, but indoctrination—the mild, antiphlogistic system of the Gospel. Wherever its gentle spirit prevails, combined with intellectual and moral culture, there will be no duels. Temperance forms, necessarily, an important part of that antiphlogistic system—for a careful examination will show, that, in a very great number of cases, duels have originated over the table—we import them, corked up in bottles, which turn out, now and then, to be vials of wrath.

One of the most ferocious duels, upon record, is that, between Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, of which the survivor, Sir Edward, wrote an account from Louvain, Sept. 8, 1613. These fellows appear to have been royal tigers, untameable even by Herr Driesbach. This brutal and bloody fight took place, at Bergen op Zoom, near Antwerp. The *cause* of this terrible duel has never been fully ascertained, but the *manner and instrument*, by which these blood-thirsty gentlemen were put in the ablative, are indicated in the letter—they fought with *rapiers and in their shirts*. I have neither room nor taste for the details: by the curious in such matters, some account may be gathered, in Collins's Peerage, which refers to the correspondence, preserved in manuscript, in Queen's College library, Oxford. These, with Sir Edward's letter, may be found in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* also, vol. iii. page 314, Lond. 1817. Wood says—"he (*Sackville*) entered into a fatal quarrel, upon a subject very unwarrantable, with a young Scottish nobleman, the Lord Bruce." Sackville was afterward Earl of Dorset. A more accessible authority, for the reader, probably, is the *Guardian*, vol. iii. No. 133, though the former is more full, and taken from the original manuscript, in the Ashmole Museum, with the ancient spelling.

The duel, with swords, between the Lords Mohun and Hamilton, in Hyde Park, Nov. 15, 1712, was nearly as brutal. Both were killed. Richard Brinsley Sheridan's duel with Matthews—the second I mean, for they had two duels—was a very doglike thing indeed. They fought, first, with pistols, and, not killing each other, as speedily as they wished, resorted to their swords. They cut and pricked each other, at a terrible rate; and, losing all patience and temper, closed, rough and tumble, went heels over head, rolled, and puffed, and tussled, in the dust and dirt, till, at last, they were literally pulled apart, like two dogs, by their tails, and a part of Matthews' sword was found sticking in Sheridan's ear. Gentlemanly satisfaction this! It has some-

times occurred, that advantages, unduly taken, on the ground, such as firing out of order, for example, have converted the killing into murder, in the eyes even of the seconds, which it ever is, at all such meetings, in the eye of the law. Such was the case in the duels, between M'Keon and Reynolds, Jan. 31, 1788, and between Campbell and Boyd, June 23, 1808.

Doubtless, there are men of wonderfully well balanced minds, who go about their business, with great apparent composure, after they have killed their antagonists in duels. Now and then, there is one, who takes things more gravely—*nervously*, perhaps. Poor fellow, he feels rather unpleasantly, when he chances to go by the husbandless mansion—or passes that woman, whom he has made a widow—or sees, hand in hand, those little children, in their sober garments, whom the accursed cunning of his red, right hand has rendered orphans! Such feeble spirits there are—the heart of a duellist should be made of sterner stuff.

June 8, 1807, Mr. Colclough was killed in a duel, by Mr. Alcock, who immediately lost his reason, and was carried from the ground to the madhouse. Some years ago, I visited the Lunatic Hospital in Philadelphia; and there saw, among its inmates, a well known gentleman, who had killed *his friend*, in a duel. He had referred, while conversing, to his hair, which had grown very gray, since I last saw him. A bystander said, in a mild way—gray hairs are honorable—"Aye," he replied, "*honor made my hairs gray.*"

I know, very well, that the common, lawless duel is supposed, by many persons, to have sprung from the old *wager of battel*, defined, by Fleta, in his law Latin, *singularis pugnus inter duos ad probandum litem, et qui vicit probasse intelligitur*. The first time we hear of the *wager of Battel*, as a written judicial rule, is A. D. 501, in the reign of Gundibald, king of Burgundy; and it was in use, among the Germans, Danes, and Franks. The practice or usage was common, however, to all the Celtic nations. It came into England, with William the Conqueror. It happens, however, that men have ever been disposed to settle their disputes, by fighting about them, since the world began.

If the classical reader will open his Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii., and read the first sentence of section 118, he will see, that, when Quintilius Varus endeavored to persuade the rude Germans, to adopt the laws and usages of Rome, in the adjustment of their disputes, between man and man, they laughed at his

simplicity, and told him they had a summary mode of settling these matters, among themselves, by the arm of flesh. This occurred, shortly after the birth of Christ, or about 500 years before the time of Gundibald. Instead of attempting to trace the origin of modern duelling to the legalized *wager of battel*, we may as well look for its moving cause, in the heart of man.

Duels are of very ancient origin. Abel was a noncombatant. Had it been otherwise, the affair, between him and Cain, would have been the first affair of honor; and his death would not have been *murder*, but *killing in a duel*! One thousand and fifty-eight years, according to the chronology of Calmet, before the birth of Christ, the very first duel was fought, near a place called *Shochoh*, which certainly sounds as roughly, on the ear, as *Hoboken*. There seems not to have been, upon that occasion, any of the ceremony, practised, now-a-days—there were no regular seconds—no surgeons—no marking off the ground—and each party had the right, to use whatever weapons he pleased.

Two armies were drawn up, in the face of each other. A man, of unusually large proportions, stepped between them, and proposed an adjustment of their national differences, by single combat, and challenged any man of his opponents, to fight a duel with him. He was certainly a fine looking fellow, and armed to the teeth. He came, without any second or friend, to adjust the preliminaries; and no one was with him, but an armor bearer, who carried his shield. The audacity of this unexpected challenge, and the tremendous limbs of the challenger, for a time, produced a sort of panic, in the opposite army—no man seemed inclined to break a spear with the tall champion. At last, after he had strutted up and down, for some time, there came along a smart little fellow, a sort of cowboy or sheep-herd, who was sent to the army by his father, with some provisions, for his three brothers, who had enlisted, and a few fine cheeses, for the colonel of their regiment, the father thinking, very naturally, doubtless, that a present of this kind might pave the way for their promotion. The old gentleman's name was Jesse—an ancestor, doubtless, of John Henenage Jesse, whose memoirs of George Selwyn we have all read, with so much pleasure. The young fellow arrived with his cheeses, at the very time, when this huge braggart was going about, strutting and defying. Hearing, that the King had offered his daughter in marriage, with a handsome dowry, to any one, who would kill this great bugbear out of the way, this stripling offered to do it.

When he was brought into the royal presence, the King, struck by his youth and slender figure, told him, without ceremony, that the proposition was perfect nonsense, and that he would certainly get his brains knocked out, by such a terrible fellow. But the young man seemed nothing daunted, and respectfully informed his majesty, that, upon one occasion, he had had an affair with a lion, and, upon another, with a bear, and that he had taken the lion by the beard, and slain him.

The King finally consented, and proceeded to put armor on the boy, who told his majesty, that he was very much obliged to him, but had much rather go without it. The challenge was duly accepted. But, when they came together, on the ground, all the modern notions of etiquette appear to have been set entirely at defiance. Contrary to all the rules of propriety, the principals commenced an angry conversation. When the challenger first saw the little fellow, coming towards him, with a stick and a sling, he really supposed they were hoaxing him. He felt somewhat, perhaps, like Mr. Crofts, when he was challenged, in 1664, by Humphrey Judson, the dwarf; who, nevertheless, killed him, at the first fire.

When the youngster marched up to him, the challenger was very indignant, and asked if he took him for a dog, that he came out to him, with a stick; and, in a very ungentlemanly way, hinted something about making mince meat of his little antagonist, for the crows. The little fellow was not to be outdone, in this preparatory skirmish of words; for he threatened to take off the giant's head in a jiffy, and told him the ravens should have an alderman's meal, upon his carcass.

Such bandying of rough words is entirely out of order, on such occasions. At it they went; and, at the very first fire, down came the bully upon his face, struck, upon the frontal sinus, with a smooth stone from a sling. The youngster, I am sorry to say, contrary to all the rules of duelling, ran up to him, after he was down, and chopped off his head, with his own sword; for, as I have already stated, there were no seconds, and there was no surgeon at hand, to attend to the mutilated gentleman, after he was satisfied.

The survivor, who seems to have been the founder of his own fortune—*novus homo*—became eminently distinguished for his fine poetical talents, and composed a volume of lyrics, which have passed through innumerable editions. The one hundred

and forty-fourth of the series is supposed, by the critics, to have been commemorative of this very affair of honor—*Blessed be the Lord, my strength, who teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight.*

No. CXLVIII.

THE duel, between David and Goliath, bears a striking resemblance to that, between Titus Manlius and the Gaul, so finely described, by Livy, lib. vii. cap. 10. In both cases, the circumstances, at the commencement, were precisely alike. The armies of the Hernici and of the Romans were drawn up, on the opposite banks of the Anio—those of the Israelites and of the Philistines, on two mountains, on the opposite sides of the valley of Elah. “Tum eximia corporis magnitudine in vacuum pontem Gallus processit, et quantum maxima voce potuit, *quem nunc inquit Roma virum fortissimum habet, procedat, agedum, ad pugnam, ut noster duorum eventus ostendat, utra gens bello sit melior.*” Then, a Gaul of enormous size, came down upon the unoccupied bridge, and cried out, as loud as he could, let the bravest of the Romans come forth—let him come on—and let the issue of our single combat decide, which nation is superior in war.—And there went out a champion out of the camp of the Philistines, named Goliath of Gath, whose height was six cubits and a span. * * * * And he stood, and cried unto the armies of Israel, and said unto them, why are ye come out to set your battle in array? Am not I a Philistine, and ye servants of Saul? Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me and to kill me, then will we be your servants; but if I prevail against him and kill him, then shall ye be our servants, and serve us.

The next point, is the effect upon the two armies: “Diu inter primores juvenum Romanorum silentium fuit, quum et abnuere certamen vererentur, et præcipuam sortem periculi petere nolent.” There was a long silence, upon this, among the chiefs of the young Romans; for, while they were afraid to refuse the challenge, they were reluctant to encounter this peculiar kind of

peril.—When Saul and all Israel heard those words of the Philistine, they were dismayed and greatly afraid.

After Titus Manlius had accepted the challenge, he seems desirous of giving his commander a proof of his confidence in himself, and the reasons, or grounds, of that confidence: “*Si tu permittis, volo ego illi belluæ ostendere, quando adeo ferox præsulat hostium signis, me ex ea familia ortum, quæ Gallorum agmen ex rupe Tarpeia dejecit.*” If you will permit me, I will show this brute, after he has vaunted a little longer, in this brag-gart style, before the banners of the enemy, that I am sprung from the family, that hurled the whole host of Gauls from the Tarpeian rock.—And David said to Saul, let no man’s heart fail because of him, thy servant will go and fight with this Philistine. * * * * Thy servant kept his father’s sheep, and there came a lion and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock. And I went out after him, and delivered it out of his mouth; and when he arose against me, I caught him, by his beard, and smote him and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear, and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them.

The difference in their port and appearance may also be considered. “*Nequaquam visu ac specie æstimantibus pares. Corpus alteri magnitudine eximium, versicolori veste, pictisque et auro cælatis refulgens armis; media in altero militaris statura, modicaque in armis habilibus magis quam decoris species.*” In size and appearance, there was no resemblance. The frame of the Gaul was enormous. He wore a vest whose color was changeable, and his refulgent arms were highly ornamented and studded with gold. The Roman was of middle military stature, and his simple weapons were calculated for service and not for show. Of Goliath we read—He had a helmet of brass upon his head, and he was armed with a coat of mail. * * * And he had greaves of brass upon his legs, and a target of brass between his shoulders, and the staff of his spear was like a weaver’s beam; and David took his staff in his hand, and chose him five smooth stones out of the brook, and put them in a shepherd’s bag which he had, even in a scrip, and his sling was in his hand. The General’s consent is given to Titus Manlius, in these words—“*Perge et nomen Romanum invictum, juvantibus diis, præsta.*” Go, and have a care, the gods assisting thee, that the Roman name remains unconquered. And Saul said unto David, Go,

and the Lord be with thee. The Philistine and the Gaul were both speedily killed, and here the parallel ends; for David hewed off the Philistine's head. The Roman was more generous than the child of Israel—"Jacentis inde corpus, ab omni alia vexatione intactum, uno torque spoliavit; quem, respersum cruore, collo circumdedit suo." He despoiled the body of his fallen foe, in no otherwise insulted, of a chain, which, bloody, as it was, he placed around his own neck. I cannot turn from this gallant story, without remarking, that this Titus Manlius must have been a terrible wag: Livy says, that his young companions having prepared him for the duel—"armatum adornatumque adversus Gallum stolidè lætum, et (quoniam id quoque memoria dignum antiquis visum est) linguam, etiam ab irrisu exserentem, producunt"—they brought him forward, armed and prepared for his conflict with the Gaul, childishly delighted, and (since the ancients have thought it worth repeating) waggishly thrusting his tongue out of his mouth, in derision of his antagonist.

Doubtless, the challenge of Charles V. by Francis I., in which affair, Charles, in the opinion of some folks, showed a little, if the cant phrase be allowable, of the white feather, gave an impetus to the practice of duelling. Doubtless, the *wager of battel* supplied something of the form and ceremony, the use of seconds, and measuring the lists, the signal of onset, &c. of modern duels: but the principle was in the bosom of Adam, and the practice is of the highest antiquity.

Woman, in some way or other, has been, very often, at the bottom of these duels. Helen, as the chief occasion of the Trojan war, was, of course, the cause of Hector's duel with Ajax, which duel, as the reader will see, by turning to his *Iliad*, lib. viii. v. 279, was stopped, by the police, at the very moment, when both gentlemen, having thrown their lances aside, were drawing their long knives. Lavinia set Turnus and Æneas by the ears. Turnus challenged him twice. Upon the first occasion, Æneas was unwell; but, upon the second, they had a meeting, and he killed his man. David would not have accepted Goliath's challenge, had not his heart been set upon Saul's daughter, and the *shekels*. I find nothing of this, in the commentators; but the reader may find it, in the Book of Nature, *passim*. For one so young, David practised, with all the wariness of an old bachelor. When he first arrived in camp, some one asked him, if he had seen Goliath, and added, *and it shall*

be that the man who killeth him the King will enrich him with great riches, and will give him his daughter. David had no idea of going upon a fool's errand; and, to make matters sure, he turned to those about him, and inquired, clearly for confirmation, *what shall be done to the man that killeth this Philistine?* And they repeated what he had heard before. David was a discreet youth, for one of his time, the titman, as he was, of Jesse's eight children—and, to avoid all chance of mistake, he walks off to another person, near at hand, and repeats his inquiry, and receives a similar answer. Sam. I. xvii. 30. A wide difference there is, between the motives of Titus Manlius, in accepting the challenge of the Gaul, and those of David, in accepting that of the Philistine—the love of country and of glory in the first—in the last, the desire of possessing Saul's daughter and the shekels.

Duels have been occasioned, by other Helens than her of Troy. A pleasant tale is told, by Valvasor, in his work, *La Gloire de Duche de Carniöle*, Liv. ii. p. 634—of Andrew Eberhard Rauber, a German Knight, and Lord of the fortress of Petronel. Maximilian II., Emperor of Germany, had a natural daughter, Helen Scharseginn, of exquisite beauty, who had a brace of gallant admirers, of whom Rauber was one—the other was a Spanish gentleman, of high rank. Both were at the court of Maximilian, and in such high favor, that the Emperor was extremely unwilling to disoblige either. Upon the lifting of a finger, these gallants were ready to fight a score of duels, for the lady's favor, in the most approved fashion of the day. To this the Emperor was decidedly opposed; and, had they resorted to such extremities, neither would have taken anything, by his motion. The Emperor secretly preferred the German alliance, but was unwilling to offend the Spaniard. He was young and of larger proportions, than his German rival; but Rauber's prodigious strength had become a proverb, through the land. He had the power of breaking horse-shoes with his thumbs and fingers; and, upon one occasion, at Gratz, in the presence of the Archduke Charles, according to Valvasor's account, he seized an insolent Jew, by his long beard, and actually pulled his jaw off. He was a terrible antagonist, of course.

Maximilian, heartily wearied with their incessant strife and importunity, finally consented, that the question should be settled, by a duel, in presence of the whole court. The hour was

appointed, and the parties duly notified. The terms of the conflict were to be announced, by the Emperor. The day arrived. The Lords and Ladies of the Court were assembled, to witness the combat; and the rivals presented themselves, with their weapons, prepared to struggle manfully, for life and love.

The Emperor commanded the combatants to lay their rapiers aside, and each was presented with a large bag or sack; and they were told, that whichever should succeed, in putting the other into the sack, should be entitled to the hand of the fair Helen Scharseginn.

Though, doubtless, greatly surprised, by this extraordinary announcement, there appeared to be no alternative, and at it they went. After a protracted struggle, amid shouts of laughter from the spectators, Rauber, Lord of the fortress of Petronel, obtained the victory, bagged his bird, and encased the haughty Spaniard in the sack, who, shortly after, departed from the court of Maximilian.

Would to God, that all duels were as harmless, in their consequences. It is not precisely so. When the gentleman, that does the murder, and the two or more gentlemen, who aid and abet, have finished their handiwork, the end is not yet—mother, wife, sisters, brothers, children are involuntary parties—the iron, or the lead, which pierced that selfish heart, must enter their very souls.

Where these encounters have proved fatal, the survivors, as I have stated, have, occasionally, gone mad. It is not very common, to be sure, for duels to produce such melancholy consequences, as those, which occurred, after that, between Cameron and McLean, in 1722. McLean was killed. Upon receiving the intelligence, his aged mother lost her reason, and closed her days in a mad-house. The lady, to whom he was betrothed, expired in convulsions, upon the third day, after the event—*n'importe!*

No. CXLIX.

It is quite unpleasant, after having diligently read a volume of memoirs, or voyages, or travels, and carefully transferred a goodly number of interesting items to one's common-place book

—to discover, that the work, *ab ovo usque ad mala*, is an ingenious tissue of deliberate lies. It is no slight aggravation of this species of affliction, to reflect, that one has highly commended the work, to some of his acquaintances, who are no way remarkable, for their bowels of compassion, and whose intelligible smile he is certain to encounter, when they first meet again, after the *éclaircissement*.

There is very little of the *hæc olim meminisse juvabit*, in store, for those, who have been thus misled. If there had been, absolutely, no foundation for the story, in the credulity of certain members of the Royal Society, Butler would not, probably, have produced his pleasant account of "*the elephant in the moon*." There were some very grave gentlemen, of lawful age, who were inclined to receive, for sober truth, that incomparable hoax, of which Sir John Herschell was represented, as the hero.

Damberger's travels, in Africa, and his personal adventures there gave me great pleasure, when I was a boy; and I remember to have felt excessively indignant, when I discovered, that the work was written, in a garret, in the city of Amsterdam, by a fellow who had never quitted Europe.

I never derived much pleasure or instruction, from Wraxall's memoirs of the Kings of France of the race of Valois, nor from his tour through the Southern Provinces, published in 1777. But his Historical memoirs of his own time, prepared, somewhat after the manner of De Thou, and Bishop Burnet, and extending from 1772 to 1784, I well remember to have read, with very considerable pleasure, in 1816; and was pained to find them cut up, however unmercifully, with so much irresistible justice, in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, and the British Critic. Mr. Wraxall made matters immeasurably worse, by his defence. There could be no adequate defence, for a man, who had asserted, that Lord Dorset told him an anecdote, touching an event, *which event did not happen, till Lord Dorset was dead*. A single instance of this kind, in a writer of common accuracy, might be carried, in charity, to the debit of chance, or forgetfulness; but the catalogue, presented by the reviewers, is truly overpowering. To close the account, Sir N. W. Wraxall was, in May, 1816, convicted of a libel, in these very memoirs, upon Count Woronzow, the Russian minister; and Mr. Wraxall was imprisoned in Newgate, for that offence.

After this disqualification of my witness, I am, nevertheless,

about to vouch in Mr. Wraxall, by reciting one of his stories, in illustration of a principle. I quote from memory—I have not the work—the reviewers prevented me from buying it. June 16, 1743, the battle of Dettingen was fought, and won, by George II. in person, and the Earl of Stair, against the Marechal de Noailles and the Duke de Grammont. Mr. Wraxall relates—*me memoria mea non fallente*—the following incident. After the battle, the Earl gave a dinner, at his quarters; and, among the guests, were several of the French prisoners of war. Of course, the Earl of Stair presided, at one end of the table—at the other sat a gentleman, of very common-place appearance, of small stature, thin and pale, evidently an invalid, and who, unless addressed, scarcely opened his lips, during the entertainment. This unobtrusive, and rather unprepossessing, young man was the Lord Mark Kerr, the nephew, and the aid-de-camp of the Earl. After the removal of the cloth, the gentlemen discussed the subject of the battle, and the manœuvres, by which the victory had been achieved. A difference of opinion arose, between the Earl and one of the French Colonels, as to the time of a particular movement. The latter became highly excited, and very confident he was right. The Earl referred to Lord Mark Kerr, whose position, at the time of that movement, rendered his decision conclusive. Lord Mark politely assured the French Colonel, that he was mistaken; upon which the Frenchman instantly insulted him, without saying a word, but in that felicitous manner, which enables a Frenchman to convey an insult, even by his mode of taking snuff. Soon after, the party broke up, and the Earl of Stair was left alone. In about half an hour, Lord Mark Kerr returned, and found his uncle very much disturbed.

“Nephew,” said he, “you know my strong dislike of duelling. In our situation we are sometimes, perhaps, unable to avoid it. The French Colonel insulted you, at table; others noticed it, besides myself. I fear, my dear nephew, you will have to ask him to apologize.”

“I noticed it myself, my Lord,” replied the Lord Mark; “you need have no trouble, on that account—we have already met—I ran him through the body; and they are now burying him, in the outer court.”

Duels are often produced, by a foolish, and fatal misestimate, which one man makes of another's temperament. The diminu-

tive frame, the pale cheek, and small voice, modest carriage, youth, and inexperience, afford no certain indicia: *nimum ne crede colori*. Men of small stature, are sometimes the more *brusque*, and more on the *qui vive*, from this very circumstance.

Ingentes animos angusto in pectore volvunt.

'That a man will not fight, like a dragon, simply because he has neither the stature of Falstaff, nor the lungs of Bottom, is a well authenticated *non sequitur*.

A well told, and well substantiated illustration of all this, may be found, in Mackenzie's Life of Decatur, page 55. I refer to the case of Joseph Bainbridge, who, in 1803, when a midshipman, and an inexperienced boy, was purposely and wantonly insulted, at Malta, by a professed duellist, the Secretary of Sir Alexander Ball, the Governor. No one can read Mackenzie's Narrative, without a conviction, that Bainbridge owed the preservation of his life, to the address of Decatur. They met—fired twice, at four paces; and, at the second fire, the English duellist fell, mortally wounded in the head: Bainbridge was untouched.

When I was a school boy, more than fifty years ago, I remember to have read, in an English journal, whose name I have now forgotten, a story, which may have been a fiction; but which was very naturally told, and made a deep impression upon me then. I will endeavor to draw it forth from the locker of my memory; and engage, beforehand, to be very much indebted to any one, who will indicate its original source.

Three young gentlemen, who had finished the most substantial part of their repast, were lingering over their fruit and wine, at an eating-house, in London; when a man, of middle age, and middle stature, entered the public room, where they were sitting; seated himself, at one end of a small, unoccupied table; and, calling the waiter, ordered a simple mutton chop, and a glass of ale. His appearance, at first view, was not likely to arrest the attention of any one. His hair was getting to be thin and gray; the expression of his countenance was sedate, with a slight touch, perhaps, of melancholy; and he wore a gray sur-tout, with a standing collar, which, manifestly, had seen service, if the wearer had not—just such a thing, as an officer would bestow upon his serving man. He might be taken for a country magistrate, or an attorney, of limited practice, or a schoolmaster.

He continued to masticate his chop, and sip his ale, in silence, without lifting his eyes from the table, until a melon seed, sportively snapped, from between the thumb and finger of one of the gentlemen, at the opposite table, struck him upon the right ear. His eye was instantly upon the aggressor; and his ready intelligence gathered, from the illy suppressed merriment of the party, that this petty impertinence was intentional.

The stranger stooped, and picked up the melon seed, and a scarcely perceptible smile passed over his features, as he carefully wrapped up the seed, in a piece of paper, and placed it in his pocket. This singular procedure, with their preconceived impressions of their customer, somewhat elevated, as they were, by the wine they had partaken, capsize their gravity entirely, and a burst of irresistible laughter proceeded from the group.

Unmoved by this rudeness, the stranger continued to finish his frugal repast, in quiet, until another melon seed, from the same hand, struck him, upon the right elbow. This also, to the infinite amusement of the other party, he picked from the floor, and carefully deposited with the first.

Amidst shouts of laughter, a third melon seed was, soon after, discharged, which hit him, upon the left breast. This also he, very deliberately took from the floor, and deposited with the other two.

As he rose, and was engaged in paying for his repast, the gayety of these sporting gentlemen became slightly subdued. It was not easy to account for this. Lavater would not have been able to detect the slightest evidence of irritation or resentment, upon the features of the stranger. He seemed a little taller, to be sure, and the carriage of his head might have appeared to them rather more erect. He walked to the table, at which they were sitting, and with that air of dignified calmness, which is a thousand times more terrible than wrath, drew a card from his pocket, and presented it, with perfect civility, to the offender, who could do no less than offer his own, in return. While the stranger unclosed his surtout, to take the card from his pocket, they had a glance at the undress coat of a military man. The card disclosed his rank, and a brief inquiry at the bag was sufficient for the rest. He was a captain, whom ill health and long service had entitled to half pay. In earlier life he had been engaged in several affairs of honor, and, in the dialect of the fancy, was a dead shot.

The next morning a note arrived at the aggressor's residence, containing a challenge, in form, and one only of the melon seeds. The truth then flashed before the challenged party—it was the challenger's intention to make three bites at this cherry, three separate affairs out of this unwarrantable frolic! The challenge was accepted, and the challenged party, in deference to the challenger's reputed skill with the pistol, had half decided upon the small sword; but his friends, who were on the alert, soon discovered, that the captain, who had risen by his merit, had, in the earlier days of his necessity, gained his bread, as an accomplished instructor, in the use of that very weapon. They met and fired, alternately, by lot; the young man had elected this mode, thinking he might win the first fire—he did—fired, and missed his opponent. The captain levelled his pistol and fired—the ball passed through the flap of the right ear, and grazed the bone; and, as the wounded man involuntarily put his hand to the place, he remembered that it was on the right ear of his antagonist, that the first melon seed had fallen. Here ended the first lesson. A month had passed. His friends cherished the hope, that he would hear nothing more from the captain, when another note—a challenge of course—and another of those accursed melon seeds arrived, with the captain's apology, on the score of ill-health, for not sending it before.

Again they met—fired simultaneously, and the captain, who was unhurt, shattered the right elbow of his antagonist—the very point upon which he had been struck by the second melon seed: and here ended the second lesson. There was something awfully impressive, in the *modus operandi*, and exquisite skill of this antagonist. The third melon seed was still in his possession, and the aggressor had not forgotten, that it had struck the unoffending gentleman, upon the left breast! A month had past—another—and another, of terrible suspense; but nothing was heard from the captain. Intelligence had been received, that he was confined to his lodgings, by illness. At length, the gentleman who had been his second, in the former duels, once more presented himself, and tendered another note, which, as the recipient perceived, on taking it, contained the last of the melon seeds. The note was superscribed in the captain's well known hand, but it was the writing evidently of one, who wrote *deficiente manu*. There was an unusual solemnity also, in the manner of him, who delivered it. The seal was broken, and there was the

melon seed, in a blank envelope—"And what, sir, am I to understand by this?"—"You will understand, sir, that my friend forgives you—he is dead."

No. CL.

A CURIOUS story of vicarious hanging is referred to, by several of the earlier historians, of New England. The readers of *Hudibras* will remember the following passage, Part ii. 407—

"Justice gives sentence, many times,
On one man for another's crimes.
Our brethren of New England use
Choice malefactors to excuse,
And hang the guiltless in their stead,
Of whom the churches have less need :
As lately 't happen'd :—in a town
There liv'd a cobbler, and but one,
That out of doctrines could cut use,
And mend men's lives, as well as shoes.
This precious brother having slain,
In times of peace, an Indian,
Not out of malice, but mere zeal,
Because he was an infidel ;
The mighty Tottipotymoy
Sent to our elders an envoy ;
Complaining sorely of the breach
Of league, held forth by brother Patch,
Against the articles in force
Between both churches, his and ours,
For which he crav'd the saints to render
Into his hands, or hang th' offender :
But they, maturely having weigh'd
They had no more but him o' the trade,
A man that serv'd them, in a double
Capacity, to teach and cobble,
Resolv'd to spare him ; yet to do
The Indian Hoghan Moghan too
Impartial Justice, in his stead did
Hang an old weaver, that was bedrid."

This is not altogether the sheer *poetica licentia*, that common readers may suppose it to be. Hubbard, Mass. Hist. Coll. xv. 77, gives the following version, after having spoken of the theft—"the company, as some report pretended, in way of satisfaction, to punish him, that did the theft, but in his stead, hanged a poor, decrepit, old man, that was unser-

viceable to the company, and burthensome to keep alive, which was the ground of the story, with which the merry gentleman, that wrote the poem, called Hudibras, did, in his poetical fancy, make so much sport. Yet the inhabitants of Plymouth tell the story much otherwise, as if the person hanged was really guilty of stealing, as may be were many of the rest, and if they were driven by necessity to content the Indians, at that time to do justice, there were some of Mr. Weston's company living, it is possible it might be executed not on him that most deserved, but on him that could be best spared, or was not likely to live long, if let alone."

Morton published his English Canaan, in 1637, and relates the story Part iii. ch. iv. p. 108, but he states, that it was a proposal only, which was very well received, but being opposed by one person, "they hanged up the real offender."

As the condemned draw nigh unto death—the scaffold—the gibbet—it would be natural to suppose, that every avenue to the heart would be effectually closed, against the entrance of all impressions, but those of terrible solemnity; yet no common truth is more clearly established, than that ill-timed levity, vanity, pride, and an almost inexplicable pleasure, arising from a consciousness of being the observed of all observers, have been exhibited, by men, on their way to the scaffold, and even with the halter about their necks.

The story is well worn out, of the wretched man, who, observing the crowd eagerly rushing before him, on his way to the gallows, exclaimed, "gentlemen, why so fast—there can be no sport, till I come!"

In Jesse's memoirs of George Selwyn, i. 345, it is stated, that John Wisket, who committed a most atrocious burglary, in 1763, the evidence of which was perfectly clear and conclusive, insisted upon wearing a large white cockade, on the scaffold, as a token of his innocence, and was swung off, bearing that significant appendage.

In the same volume, page 117, it is said of the famous Lord Lovat, that, in Scotland, a story is current, that, when upon his way to the Tower, after his condemnation, an old woman thrust her head into the window of the coach, which conveyed him, and exclaimed—"You old rascal, I begin to think you will be hung at last." To which he instantly replied—"You old b—h, I begin to think I shall."

In Walpole's letters to Mann, 163, a very interesting and curious account may be found, of the execution of the Lords Kilmarnock, and Balmarino. These Lords, with the Lord Cromartie, who was pardoned, were engaged, on the side of the Pretender, in the rebellion of 1745. "Just before they came out of the Tower, Lord Balmarino drank a bumper to King James's health. As the clock struck ten, they came forth, on foot, Lord Kilmarnock all in black, his hair unpowdered, in a bag, supported by Forster, the great Presbyterian, and by Mr. Home, a young clergyman, his friend. Lord Balmarino followed, alone, in a blue coat, turned up with red, *his rebellious regimentals*, a flannel waistcoat, and his shroud beneath, the hearses following. They were conducted to a house near the scaffold; the room forwards had benches for the spectators; in the second was Lord Kilmarnock; and in the third backwards Lord Balmarino—all three chambers hung with black. Here they parted! Balmarino embraced the other, and said—'My lord, I wish I could suffer for both.'"

When Kilmarnock came to the scaffold, continues Walpole,—“He then took off his bag, coat, and waistcoat, with great composure, and, after some trouble, put on a napkin cap, and then several times tried the block, the executioner, who was in white, with a white apron, out of tenderness concealing the axe behind himself. At last the Earl knelt down, with a visible unwillingness to depart, and, after five minutes, dropped his handkerchief, the signal, and his head was cut off at once, only hanging by a bit of skin, and was received in a scarlet cloth, by four undertakers' men kneeling, who wrapped it up, and put it into the coffin with the body; orders having been given not to expose the heads, as used to be the custom. The scaffold was immediately new strewed with sawdust, the block new covered, the executioner new dressed, and a new axe brought. Then came old Balmarino, treading with the air of a general. As soon as he mounted the scaffold, he read the inscription on his coffin, as he did again afterwards: he then surveyed the spectators, who were in amazing numbers, even upon masts of ships in the river; and, pulling out his spectacles, read a treasonable speech, which he delivered to the sheriff, and said the young Pretender was so sweet a prince, that flesh and blood could not resist following him; and, lying down to try the block, he said—'if I had a thousand lives I would lay them all down here in the same cause.' He

said, if he had not taken the sacrament the day before, he would have knocked down Williamson, the Lieutenant of the Tower, for his ill usage of him. He took the axe and felt of it, and asked the headsman how many blows he had given Lord Kilmar-nock, and gave him two guineas. Then he went to the corner of the scaffold, and called very loud to the Warder, to give him his periwig, which he took off, and put on a night cap of Scotch plaid, and then pulled off his coat and waistcoat and lay down; but being told he was on the wrong side, vaulted round, and immediately gave the sign, by tossing up his arm, as if he were giving the signal for battle. He received three blows, but the first certainly took away sensation. As he was on his way to the place of execution, seeing every window open, and the roofs covered with spectators—"Look, look," he cried, "see how they are piled up like rotten oranges!"

Following the English custom, the clergymen of Boston were in the habit, formerly, of preaching to those, who were under sentence of death. I have before me, while I write, the following manuscript memoranda of Dr. Andrew Eliot—"1746, July 24. Thursday lecture preached by Dr. Sewall to three poor malefactors, who were executed P. M." "1747, Oct. 8. Went to Cambridge to attend Eliza Wakefield, this day executed. Mr. Grady began with prayer. Mr. Appleton preached and prayed." There is a printed sermon, preached by Dr. Andrew Eliot, on the Lords' day before the execution of Levi Ames, who was hung for burglary Oct. 21, 1773. Ames was present, and the sermon was preached, by his particular request. The desire of distinction dies hard, even in the hearts of malefactors.

Dr. Andrew Eliot was a man of excellent sense, and disapproved of the practice, then in vogue, of lionizing burglars and murderers, of which, few, at the present day, I believe, have any just conception. For their edification I subjoin a portion of a manuscript note, in the hand writing of the late Dr. Ephraim Eliot, appended to the last page of the sermon, delivered by his father. "Levi Ames was a noted offender—though a young man, he had gone through all the routine of punishment; and there was now another indictment against him, where there was positive proof, in addition to his own confession. He was tried and condemned, for breaking into the house of Martin Bicker, in Dock Square. His condemnation excited extraordinary sympathy. *He was every Sabbath carried through the streets with*

chains about his ankles and handcuffed, in custody of the Sheriff's officers and constables, to some public meeting, attended by an innumerable company of boys, women and men. Nothing was talked of but Levi Ames. The ministers were successively employed in delivering occasional discourses. Stillman improved the opportunity several times, and absolutely persuaded the fellow, that he was to step from the cart into Heaven."

It is quite surprising, that our fathers should have suffered this interesting burglar—"misguided" of course—to be hung by the neck, till he was dead. When an individual, as sanguine, as Dr. Stillman appears to have been, in regard to Levi Ames, remarked of a notorious burglar, a few days after his execution, that he had certainly been *born again*, an incredulous bystander observed, that he was sorry to hear it, for some dwelling-house or store would surely be broken open before morning.

No. CLI.

WE are sufficiently acquainted with the Catholic practice of roasting heretics—that of boiling thieves and other offenders is less generally known. *Caldariis decoquere*, to boil them in cauldrons, was a punishment, inflicted in the middle ages, on thieves, false coiners, and others. In 1532, seventeen persons, in the family of the Bishop of Rochester, were poisoned by Rouse, a cook; the offence was, in consequence, made treason, by 23 Henry VIII., punishable, by boiling to death. Margaret Davie was boiled to death, for the like crime, in 1541. Quite a number of Roman ladies, in the year 331 B. C., formed a poisoning society, or club; and adopted this quiet mode of divorcing themselves from their husbands: seventy of the sisterhood were denounced, by a slave, to the consul, Fabius Maximus, who ordered them to be executed. None of these ladies were boiled.

Boiling the dead has been very customary, after beheading or hanging, and drawing, and quartering, whenever the criminal was sentenced to be hung afterwards, in chains. Thus father Strype—"1554.—Sir Thomas Wyatt's fatal day was come, being the 11th of April, when, between nine and ten of the clock, aforenoon, on Tower Hill, he was beheaded; and, by eleven of

the clock, he was quartered on the scaffold, and his bowels and members burnt beside the scaffold; and, a car and basket being at hand, the four quarters and the head were put into the basket, and conveyed to Newgate, to be parboiled." One more quotation from Strype—"1557.—May 28th, was Thomas Stafford beheaded on Tower Hill, by nine of the clock, Mr. Wode being his ghostly father; and, after, three more, viz., Stowel, Proctor, and Bradford were drawn from the Tower, through London, unto Tyburn, and there hanged and quartered: and, the morrow after, was Stafford quartered, and his quarters hanged on a car, and carried to Newgate to boil."

How very ingenious we have been, since the days of Cain, in torturing one another! Boiling and roasting are not to be thought of. The Turkish bowstring will never be adopted here, nor the Chinese drop, nor their mode of capital punishment, in which the criminal, having been stripped naked, is so confined, that he can scarcely move a muscle, and, being smeared with honey, is exposed to myriads of insects, and thus left to perish. Crucifixion will never be popular in Massachusetts, though quite common among the Syrians, Egyptians, Persians, Africans, Greeks, Romans, and Jews. Starving to death, sawing in twain, and rending asunder, by strong horses, have all been tried, but are not much approved of, by the moderns. The rack may answer well enough, in Catholic countries, but, in this quarter, there is a strong prejudice against it. Exposure to wild beasts is objectionable, for two reasons; one of these reasons resembles the first of twenty-four, offered to the Queen of Hungary, for not ringing the bells upon her arrival,—there were no bells in the village—we have no wild beasts. The second reason is quite germane—man is savage enough, without any foreign assistance. Burying alive, though it has been employed, as a punishment, in other countries, is, literally, too much for flesh and blood; and, I am happy to say, there is not a sexton in this city, who would, knowingly, be a party to such a barbarous proceeding.

Death has been produced, by preventing sleep, as a mode of punishment. Impaling, and flaying alive, tearing to pieces with red hot pincers, casting headlong from high rocks, eviscerating the bowels, firing the criminals from the mouths of canons, and pressing them slowly to death, by weights, gradually increased, upon the breast, the *peine forte et dure*, are very much out of fashion; though one and all have been frequently employed, in

other times. There is a wheel of fashion, as well as a wheel of fortune, in the course of whose revolutions, some of these obsolete modes of capital punishment may come round again, like polygon porcelain, and antiquated chair-backs. Should our legislature think proper to revive the practice, in capital cases, of heading up the criminal in a barrel, filled with nails, driven inward, a sort of inverted *cheval de frize*, and rolling him down hill, I have often thought the more elevated corner of our Common would be an admirable spot for the commencement of the execution, were it not for interrupting the practice of coasting, during the winter; by which several innocent persons, in no way parties to the process, have been very nearly executed already.

Shooting is apt to be performed, in a bungling manner. Hanging by the heels, till the criminal is dead, is very objectionable, and requires too much time. The mode adopted here and in England, and also in some other countries, of hanging by the neck, is, in no respect agreeable, even if the operator be a skilful man; and, if not, it is highly offensive. The rope is sometimes too long, and the victim touches the ground—it is too frail, and breaks, and the odious act must be performed again—or the noose is unskilfully adjusted, the neck is not broken, and the struggles are terrible.

The sword, in a Turkish hand, performs the work well. It was used in France. Charles Henry Sanson, the hereditary executioner, on the third of March, 1792, presented a memorial to the Constituent Assembly, in which he objected to decollation, and stated that he had but two swords; that they became dull immediately; and were wholly insufficient, when there were many to be executed, at one time. Monsieur Sanson knew nothing then of that delightful instrument, which, not long afterward, became a mere plaything, in his hands.

Stoning to death and flaying alive have been employed, occasionally, since the days of Stephen and Bartholomew. The axe, so much in vogue, formerly, in England, was a ruffianly instrument, often mangling the victim, in a horrible manner.

After all, there is nothing like the guillotine; and, should it ever be thought expedient to erect one here, I should recommend, for a location, the knoll, near the fountain, on our Common, which would enable a very large concourse of men, women, and children, to witness the performances of both, at the same moment.

The very best account of the guillotine, that I have ever met with, is contained in the *London Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxiii. page 235. It is commonly supposed, that this instrument was invented by Dr. Guillotin, whose name it bears. It has been frequently asserted, that Dr. Guillotin was one of the earliest, who fell victims to its terrible agency. It has been still more generally believed, that this awfully efficient machine was conceived in sin and begotten in iniquity, or in other words, that its original contrivers were moved, by the spirit of cruelty. All these conjectures are unfounded.

The guillotine, before its employment, in France, was well known in England, under the name of the Halifax gibbet. A copy of a print, by John Doyle, bearing date 1650, and representing the instrument, may be found, in the work, to which I have, just now, referred. Pennant, in his *Tour*, vol. iii. page 365, affirms, that he saw one of the same kind, "in a room, under the Parliament house, at Edinburgh, where it was introduced by the Regent, Morton, who took a model of it, as he passed through Halifax, and, at length, suffered by it, himself."

The writer in the *London Quarterly*, puts the question of invention at rest, by exhibiting, on page 258, a copy of an engraving, by Henry Aldgrave, bearing date 1553, representing the death of Titus Manlius, under the operation of "an instrument, identical with the guillotine."

During the revolution, Dr. Guillotin was committed to prison, from which he was released, after a tedious confinement. He died in his bed, at Paris, an obscure and inoffensive, old man; deeply deploring, to the day of his decease, the association of his name, with this terrible instrument—an instrument, which he attempted to introduce, in good faith, and with a merciful design, but which had been employed by the devils incarnate of the revolution, for the purposes of reckless and indiscriminating carnage.

Dr. Guillotin was a weak, consequential, well-meaning man, willing to mount any hobby, that would lift him from the ground. He is described, in the *Portraits des Personnes célèbres*, 1796, as a simple busybody, meddling with everything, *à tort et à travers*, and being both mischievous and ridiculous.

He had sundry benevolent visions, in regard to capital punishment, and the suppression, *by legal enactment*, of the *senti-*
ment of prejudice, against the families of persons, executed for

crime! Among the members of the faculty, in every large city, there are commonly two or three, at least, exhibiting striking points of resemblance to Dr. Guillotin. In urging the merits of this machine, upon merciful considerations, his integrity was unimpeachable. He considered hanging a barbarous and cruel punishment; and, by the zeal and simplicity of his arguments, produced, even upon so grave a topic, universal laughter, in the constituent assembly—having represented hanging, as a tedious and painful process, he exclaimed, “Now, with my machine, *Je vous sauter le tête*, I strike off your head, in the twinkling of an eye, and you never feel it.”

No. CLII.

THE Sansons, hereditary executioners, in Paris, were gentlemen. In 1684, Carlier, executioner of Paris, was dismissed. His successor was Charles Sanson a lieutenant in the army, born in Abbeville, in Picardy, and a relative of Nicholas Sanson, the celebrated geographer. Charles Sanson married the daughter of the executioner of Normandy, and hence a long line of illustrious executioners. Charles died in 1695; and was succeeded by his son Charles.

Charles Sanson, the second, was succeeded by his son, Charles John Baptiste, who died Aug. 4, 1778, when his son Charles Henry was appointed in his place; and, in 1795, retired on a pension. By his hand, with the assistance of two of his brothers, the King, Louis XVI. was guillotined. This Charles Henry had two sons. His eldest, the heir-apparent to the guillotine, was killed, by a fall from the scaffold, while holding forth the head of a man, executed for the forgery of assignats. Henry, the younger son of Charles Henry, therefore became his successor, at the time of his retirement, in 1795. To fill this office, he gave up his military rank, as captain of artillery. He died Aug. 18, 1840. He was an elector, and had a taste for music and literature. He was succeeded by his son, Henry Clement, Dec. 1, 1840. These particulars will be found on page 27 of *Recherches Historiques et Physiologiques, sur la Guillotine, &c.*, par M. Louis du Bois. Paris, 1843. Monsieur du Bois informs

us, that all these Sansons were very worthy men, and that the present official possesses a fine figure, features stamped with nobility, and an expression sweet and attractive. How very little all this quadrates with our popular impressions of the common hangman !

The objection to the guillotine, which was called, for a time, *Louison*, after M. Louis, Secretary of the College of Surgeons, that it would make men familiar with the sight of blood, was urged by the Abbé Maury, and afterwards, by A. M. La Cheze. The Duke de Liancourt, inclined to *mercy*, that is, to the employment of the guillotine. He contended, that it was necessary to efface all recollections of hanging, which, he gravely remarked, had recently been so *irregularly applied*, referring to the summary process of lynching, as we term it—*à la lanterne*.

It is curious to note the doubt and apprehension, which existed, as to the result of the first experiment of decollation. March 3, 1792, the minister, Duport du Tertre, writes thus to the Legislative Assembly—"It appears, by the communications, made to me, by the executioners themselves, that, without some precautions, the act of decollation will be horrible to the spectators. It will either prove them to be monsters, if they are able to bear such a spectacle ; or the executioner, himself, alarmed, will fall before the wrath of the people.

The matter being referred to Louis, then Secretary of the Academy of Surgeons, he made his report, March 7, 1792. The new law required, that the criminal should be decapitated—*aura la tête tranchée* ; and that the punishment should be inflicted *without torture*. Louis shows how difficult the execution of such a law must be—"We should recollect," says he, "the occurrences at M. de Lally's execution. He was upon his knees, with his eyes covered—the executioner struck him, on the back of his neck—the blow was insufficient. He fell upon his face, and three or four cuts of the sabre severed the head. Such *hacherie* excited a feeling of horror." To such a polite and gentle nation, this must have been highly offensive.

April 25, 1798. Rœderer, Procureur Général, wrote a letter to Lafayette, telling him, that a public trial of the new instrument would take place, that day, in the *Place de Grève*, and would, doubtless, draw a great crowd, and begging him not to withdraw the gens d'armes, till the apparatus had been removed. In the *Courrier Extraordinaire*, of April 27, 1792, is the following notice—"They made yesterday (meaning the 25th) the first

trial of the *little Louison*, and cut off a head, one Pelletier. I never in my life could bear to see a man hanged; but I own I feel a greater aversion to this species of execution. The preparations make me shudder, and increase the moral suffering. The people seemed to wish, that M. Sanson had his old gallows."

After the *Louison*, or guillotine, had been in operation rather more than a year, the following interesting letter was sent, by the Procureur Général, Rœderer, to citizen Guideu. "13 May, 1793. I enclose, citizen, the copy of a letter from citizen Chaumette, solicitor to the commune of Paris, by which you will perceive, that complaints are made, that, after these public executions, the blood of the criminals remains in pools, upon the *Place de Grève*, that dogs came to drink it, and that crowds of men feed their eyes with this spectacle, which naturally instigates their hearts to ferocity and blood. I request you therefore to take the earliest and most convenient opportunity, to remove from the eyes of men a sight so afflicting to humanity."

Voltaire, who thought very gravely, before he delivered the sentiment to the world, has stated of his countrymen, that they were a mixture of the monkey and the tiger. Undoubtedly he knew. In the revolution of 1793, and in every other, that has occurred in France—those excepted which may have taken place, since the arrival of the last steamer—the tiger has had the upper hand. Prudhomme, the prince of pamphleteers, having published fifteen hundred, on political subjects, and author of the General History of the crimes, committed, during the revolution, writing of the execution of Louis XVI. remarks—"Some individuals steeped their handkerchiefs in his blood. A number of armed volunteers crowded also to dip in the blood of the despot their pikes, their bayonets, and their sabres. Several officers of the Marseillais battalion, and others, dipped the covers of letters in this impure blood, and carried them, on the points of their swords, at the head of their companies, exclaiming 'this is the blood of a tyrant.' One citizen got up to the guillotine itself, and plunging his whole arm into the blood of Capet, of which a great quantity remained; he took up handfuls of the clotted gore, and sprinkled it over the crowd below, which pressed round the scaffold, each anxious to receive a drop on his forehead. 'Friends,' said this citizen in sprinkling them, 'we were threatened, that the blood of Louis should be on our heads, and so you see it is.'" Rev. de Paris, No. 185, p. 205.

Upon the earnest request of the inhabitants of several streets, through which the gangs of criminals were carried, the guillotine was removed, June 8, 1794, from the *Place de la Revolution* to the *Place St. Antoine*, in front of the ruins of the Bastile; where it remained five days only, during which time, it took off ninety-six heads. The proximity of this terrible revolutionary plaything annoyed the shopkeepers. The purchasers of ~~funery~~ were too forcibly reminded of the uncertainty of life, and the brief occasion they might have, for all such things, especially for neckerchiefs and collars. Once again then, the guillotine, after five days' labor, was removed; and took its station still farther off, at the *Barrière du Trône*. There it stood, from June 9 till the overthrow of Robespierre, July 27, 1794: and, during those forty-nine days, twelve hundred and seventy heads dropped into its voracious basket. July 28, it was returned to the *Place de la Revolution*.

Sanson, Charles Henry, the executioner of Louis XVI. had not a little *bonhomie* in his composition—his infernal profession seems not to have completely ossified his heart. He reminds me, not a little, of Sir Thomas Erpingham, who, George Colman, the younger, says, carried on his wars, in France, in a benevolent spirit, and went about, I suppose, like dear, old General Taylor, in Mexico, "pitying and killing." On the day, when Robespierre fell, forty-nine victims were ascending the carts, to proceed to the guillotine, about three in the afternoon. Sanson, at the moment, met that incomparable bloodhound, the *Accusateur Public*, Fouquier de Tinville, going to dinner. Sanson suggested the propriety of delaying the execution, as a new order of things might cause the lives of the condemned to be spared. Fouquier briefly replied, "the law must take its course;" and went to dine—the forty-nine to die; and, shortly after, their fate was his.

The guillotine, viewed as an instrument of justice, in cases of execution, for capital offences, is certainly a most merciful contrivance, liable, undoubtedly, during a period of intense excitement, to be converted into a terrible toy.

During the reign of terror, matters of extreme insignificance, brought men, women, and children to the guillotine. The record is, occasionally, awfully ridiculous. A few examples may suffice—Jean Julian, wagoner, sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment, took it into his head, on the way—*s'avis*a—to cry—

Vive le Roi; executed September, 1792.—Jean Baptiste Henry sawed a tree of liberty; executed Sept. 6, 1793.—M. Baulny, ex-noble, assisted his son to emigrate; executed Jan. 31, 1794.—La veuve Marbeuf *hoped* the Austrians would come; executed Feb. 5, 1794.—Francis Bertrand, publican, sold sour wine; executed May 15, 1793.—Marie Angelique Plaisant, sempstress, exclaimed—"a fig for the nation;" executed July 19, 1794.

No. CLIII.

AN interesting, physiological question arose, in 1796, whether death, by decollation, under the guillotine, were instantaneous or not. Men of science and talent, and among them Dr. Sue, and a number of German physicians, maintained, that, in the brain, after decapitation, there was a certain degree—*un reste*—of thought, and, in the nerves, a measure of sensibility. An opposite opinion seems to have prevailed. The controversy, which was extremely interesting, acquired additional interest and activity, from an incident, which occurred, on the scaffold, immediately after the execution of Marie Anne Charlotte de Corday d'Armont—commonly known, under the imperishable name of *Charlotte Corday*. A brute, François Le Gros, one of the assistant executioners, held up the beautiful and bleeding head, and slapped the cheek with his hand. A blush was instantly visible to the spectators. In connection with the physiological question, to which I have referred, a careful inquiry was instituted, and it was proved, very satisfactorily, that the color—the blush—appeared on *both* cheeks, after the blow was given. Dr. Sue's account of this matter runs thus—"The countenance of Charlotte Corday expressed the most unequivocal marks of indignation. Let us look back to the facts—the executioner held the head, suspended in one hand; the face was then pale, but had no sooner received the slap, which the sanguinary wretch inflicted, than both cheeks visibly reddened. Every spectator was struck, by the change of color, and with loud murmurs cried out for vengeance, on this cowardly and atrocious barbarity. It cannot be said, that the redness was caused by the blow—for we all know, that no blows will recall anything like color to the cheeks

of a corpse; besides this blow was given on one cheek, and the other equally reddened." *Sue; Opinion sur le supplice de la guillotine*, p. 9.

Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Religio Medici*, remarked, that he had never known a religion, in which there were impossibilities enough to give full exercise to an active faith. This remark greatly delighted Sir Kenelm Digby, who was an ultra Catholic. The faith of Browne, in regard to things spiritual, was not an overmatch for his credulity, in regard to things temporal, which is the more remarkable, as he gave so much time to his Pseudodoxia, or exposition of vulgar errors? He was a believer in the existence of invisible beings, holding rank between men and angels—in apparitions; and affirmed, *from his own knowledge*, the certainty of witchcraft. Hutchinson, in his essay on witchcraft, repeats the testimony of Dr. Browne, in the case of Amy Duny and Rose Cullender, who were tried, before Sir Matthew Hale, in 1664; and executed, at St. Edmunds Bury, as witches. Sir Thomas stated in court, "*that the fits were natural, but heightened, by the devil's cooperating with the malice of the witches, at whose instance he did the villanies.*" He added that "a great discovery had lately been made, in Denmark, of witches, who used the very same way of afflicting persons, by conveying pins into them." Now it would be curious to know what Sir Thomas thought of the famous and apposite story of Sir Everard Digby, the father of Sir Kenelm, and if the faith of Sir Thomas were strong enough, to credit that extraordinary tale.

Charlotte Corday was *beheaded*, and Sir Everard Digby was *hanged*. The difference must be borne in mind, while considering this interesting subject. Sir Everard, who was an amiable young man, was led astray, and executed Jan. 30, 1606, for the part he bore, in the gunpowder plot. Wood, in his "*Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iii. p. 693, Lond. 1817, has the following passage—"Sir Everard Digby, father to Sir Kenelm, was a goodly gentleman, and the handsomest man of his time, but much pitied, for that it was his ill fate to suffer for the powder plot, in 1605, aged 24, at which time, when the executioner pluck'd out the heart, when the body was to be quartered, and, according to the manner, held it up, saying, *here is the heart of a traitor*, Sir Everard made answer, *thou liest*. This a most famous author mentions, but tells us not his name, in his *Historia Vitæ et*

Mortis." This most famous author is Lord Bacon—Hist. Vit. et Mort., vol. viii. p. 446, Lond. 1624. The passage is so curious, that I give it entire—"Anguillæ, serpentes et insecta diu moventur singulis partibus, post concisionem. Etiam aves, capitibus avulsis, ad tempus subsultant: quin et corda animalium avulsa diu palpitant. Equidem meminimus ipsi vidisse hominis cor, qui evisceratus erat (supplicii genere apud nos versus proditores recepto) quod in ignem, de more, injectum, saltabat in altum, primo ad sesquipedem, et deinde gradatim ad minus; durante spatio (ut meminimus) septem aut octo minutarum. Etiam vetus et fide digna traditio est, de bove sub evisceratione mugiente. At magis certa de homine, qui eo supplicii genere (quod diximus) evisceratus, postquam cor avulsum penitus esset, et in carnificis manu, tria aut quatuor verba precum auditus est proferre"—which may be Englished thus—Snakes, serpents, and insects move, a long time, after they have been cut into parts. Birds also hop about, for a time, after their heads have been wrung off. Even the hearts of animals, after they have been torn out, continue long to palpitate. Indeed, we ourselves remember to have seen the heart of a man, who had been drawn, or eviscerated, in that kind of punishment, which we employ against traitors, and which, when cast upon the fire, according to custom, leapt on high, at first, a foot and a half, and gradually less and less, during the space, if we justly remember, of seven or eight minutes. There is also an ancient tradition, well entitled to credit, of a cow, that bellowed, under the process of evisceration. And more certain is the story of the man, who was eviscerated, according to the mode of punishment we have referred to, who, when his heart was actually torn out, and in the hands of the executioner, was heard to utter three or four words of imprecation. Sir Everard was executed, as I have stated, in 1603. Lord Bacon was born Jan. 22, 1561, and died April 9, 1626, twenty-one years only after Digby's execution, and at the age of 65. Lord Bacon was therefore 44 years old, when Digby's execution took place, which fact has some bearing upon the authenticity of this extraordinary story. Lord Bacon speaks confidently of the fact; and his suppression of the name was very natural, as the family of Sir Everard were then upon the stage.

A writer in the London Quarterly Review remarks, in a note on page 274, vol. 73, comparing the case of Charlotte Corday

with that of Sir Everard Digby—"This" (Sir Everard's) "was a case of *evisceration*, and not of *decapitation*, which makes the whole difference, as to the credibility of the story."

Chalmers relates the anecdote, and refers to Wood's *Athenæ*, and Lord Bacon's *Historia Vitæ et Mortis*, but speaks of the tale, as "*a story, which will scarcely now obtain belief*." In the *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. iii. page 5, Lond. 1809, there is an account of the discovery of the gunpowder plot, imprinted at London, by Robert Barker, 1605. On page 47, a very brief cotemporaneous account is given of Digby's execution, in St. Paul's churchyard, which contains no allusion whatever to the circumstance, stated by Wood, and so very confidently, by Lord Bacon.

I suppose few will really believe, that any man's conversational abilities can be worth much, after his head is off, or his heart is out. From the expression of the Quarterly reviewer, it may be inferred, that he did not consider the story of Sir Everard Digby utterly impossible and incredible. For my own part, I am very much inclined to hand over this extraordinary legend to Judæus Appella. Every man, who has not, by long experience, like George Selwyn, acquired great self-possession, while enjoying an execution, inclines to the marvellous. Sir Everard, before the work of *evisceration* began, it must be remembered, had been hanged, the usual length of time; and the words—"thou liest"—are stated to have been uttered, at the moment, when the heart, having been plucked out, was held up by the executioner. It is more easy of belief, that some guttural noise, like that, spasmodically uttered by certain birds, after their heads have been chopped off, may have sounded to the gaping bystanders, who looked and listened, *auribus arrectis*, not very unlike the words in question. The belief, that Digby spoke these words, seems to be analogous to the belief, that, in *hydrophobia*, the sufferers bark like dogs, simply because, oppressed with phlegm, and nearly strangled, their terrific efforts, to clear the breathing passages, are accompanied with a variety of unintelligible, and horrible sounds.

There are some curious cases, on record, which may have something to do with our reasoning, upon this subject. A similar species of death, attended by spasms or convulsions, is said to have been produced, by the bite of other animals. Dr. Fothergill relates cases of death, from the bite of a cat. Thiermayer

recites two cases, both terminating fatally, from the bite of a goose, and a hen. *Le Cat*, *Receuil Periodique*, ii. page 90, presents a similar case, from the bite of a duck. But we are not informed, that, the patient, in either of these cases, during the spasms, mewed, quacked, cackled, or hissed; and yet there seems to be no rational apology for a patient's *barking*, simply because he has been bitten, by a cat, or a duck, a goose, or a hen.

Spasmodic or convulsive motion, in a human body, which has been hung, or shot, or eviscerated, is a very different thing, from an intelligent exercise of the will, over the organs of speech, producing the utterance even of a word or syllable.

In the cases of persons, who have been shot through the heart, violent spasmodic action is no unusual phenomenon. When I was a boy, the duel took place, between Rand and Millar, at Dorchester Point, then a locality as solitary, as Hoboken, or the Hebrides. The movements of the parties were observed, and their purposes readily surmised, by the officers, on Castle William; and a barge was immediately despatched, from the fort. Shots were exchanged, between the combatants, while the barge was passing over. Rand fell, wounded through the heart; and, after lying motionless, for a very brief space, was seen to leap into the air. several feet, and fall again, upon the earth.

No. CLIV.

WE are living and learning, forever. Life is a court of cassation, where truth sits, as chancellor, daily reversing the most incomparably beautiful decrees of theoretical philosophy.

It is not unlikely, that a very interesting volume of 600 pages, folio, might be prepared, to be called the *Mistakes of Science*. The elephant in the moon, and the weighing of the fish have furnished amusement, in their day. Even in our own times, philosophers, of considerable note, have seriously *doubted* the truth of that incomparable hoax, concerning Sir John Herschell's lunar discoveries.

Savans were completely deceived, for a considerable period, by the electrical beatifications of Mr. Bose. One of the most

amusing occurrences, upon record, on which occasion, the philosopher, unlike Mr. Bose, was a perfectly honest man, befell the famous mathematical instrument-maker, Mr. Troughton. He became fully possessed, by the idea, that certain persons, a select few, were capable of exerting a magnetic influence, over the needle, by advancing their faces towards it. So far from being common, this power was limited to a very small number. The statements of Mr. Troughton, and his well-established reputation, for integrity, caused the subject to be gravely discussed, by members of the Royal Society.

Every individual of the very small number, who possessed this remarkable power—every *medium*—was carefully examined. Collusion seemed utterly impossible. A new theory appeared to be established. Amazement ran through the learned assembly. A careful inquiry was instituted, in relation to the manner of life of these *mediums*, from their youth upwards, their occupations, diet, &c., and some very learned papers would, ere long, have been read, before the Royal Society, if Mr. Troughton himself had not previously made a most fortunate discovery—he discovered, that he wore a wig, constructed with *steel* springs—such, also, was the case with every other *medium*!

The tendency to predicate certainty, of things, manifestly doubtful, is exceedingly common. I fell, recently, into the society of some very intelligent gentlemen, who were *certain*, that Sir John Franklin was lost, irrecoverably lost.

There are some—perhaps their name is not Legion—whose faith is of superior dimensions to the mustard seed, and who believe, that Sir John Franklin is not destroyed; that he yet lives; and, that, sooner or later, he will come back to his friends and the world, with a world of wonders to relate, of all that he has seen and suffered. God, all merciful, grant it may be so. To all human observation, after a careful balancing of probabilities, there is certainly nothing particularly flattering in the prospect. Yet, on the other hand, absolute, unqualified despair is irrational, and unjustifiable.

The present existence of Sir John Franklin is certainly *possible*. No one, I presume, will say it is *probable*. Some half a dozen good, substantial words are greatly needed, to mark shades between these two, and to designate what is more than *possible*, and less than *probable*.

A careful consideration of the narrative of Sir John Ross, the

narrative, I mean, of his second voyage, in quest of a northwest passage, and of his abode in the Arctic regions, and of the opinion, very generally entertained, for a great length of time, that he was lost, will strengthen the impression, that Sir John Franklin also may be yet alive, *somewhere* ! Even then, a question may arise, in connection with the force of certain currents, referred to, by those, who have lately returned, from an unsuccessful search for Sir John Franklin, whether it may be possible to return, against those currents, with such means and appliances, as he possessed ; and whether, even on this side the grave, there may not be a bourne, from which no presumptuous voyager ever shall return.

The residence of Sir John Ross, in the Arctic regions, continued, through five consecutive years, 1829, 30, '31, '32, '33. To such, as imagine there is any effective summer, in those regions, and who have been accustomed to associate spring and summer, with flowers and fruits, it may not be amiss, by way of corrective, to administer a brief passage, from the journal of Sir John Ross, in August, 1832—"But to see, to have seen, ice and snow, to have felt snow and ice forever, and nothing forever but snow and ice, during all the months of a year ; to have seen and felt but uninterrupted and unceasing ice and snow, during all the months of four years, this it is, that has made the sight of those most chilling and wearisome objects an evil, which is still one in recollection, as if the remembrance would never cease."

At this period, August, 1832, very little hope was entertained, that Sir John Ross and his companions were living. Even a year before, they were generally supposed to be lost.

The abandonment of their ship, which had been locked fast in the ice, for years, and their almost inconceivable toil, while crossing, with their boats, on sledges, to the confluence of Regent's Inlet, and Barrow's Strait, are fully presented in the narrative. Their hour of deliverance came at last, and the event cannot be better described, than in the words of Sir John Ross himself. As they were standing along the southern shore of Barrow's Strait, in their boats, on the 26th of August, a sail, to their inexpressible joy, hove in sight. After a period of great anxiety, lest she should not observe their signals of distress, their deep delight may be imagined, even by an unpractised landsman, when they first became assured, that they had attracted the notice of the crew, in one of the ship's boats. The reader

will be better satisfied with an account from the lips of the *πολυτροπος* ὁς *μᾶλλον* *πολλὰ*, himself.

"She was soon along side, when the mate in command addressed us, by presuming, that we had met with some misfortune and lost our ship. This being answered in the affirmative, I requested to know the name of his vessel, and expressed our wish to be taken on board. I was answered, that it was the 'Isabella, of Hull, once commanded by Captain Ross;' on which I stated, that I was the identical man in question, and my people the crew of the Victory. That the mate, who commanded this boat, was as much astonished, as he appeared to be, I do not doubt; while, with the usual blunderheadedness of men, on such occasions, he assured me, that I had been dead two years. I easily convinced him, however, that what ought to have been true, according to his estimate, was a somewhat premature conclusion; as the bear-like form of the whole set of us, might have shown him, had he taken time to consider, that we were certainly not whaling gentlemen, and that we carried tolerable evidence of our being 'true men and no imposters,' on our backs, and in our starved and unshaven countenances."

However close the resemblance, between Sir John Ross and his comrades to *bears*, they soon become *lions* on board the *Isabella*. Sir John continues thus—

"A hearty congratulation followed, of course, in the true seaman style, and, after a few natural inquiries, he added, that the *Isabella* was commanded by Captain Humphreys; when he immediately went off in his boat to communicate his information on board; repeating, that we had long been given up as lost, not by them alone, but by all England."

In this precedent, there is kindling stuff for hope, if not substantial fuel. After reading this account, the hearts of the strong-hearted cannot fail to be strengthened the more. A scientific and elaborate comparison of all the facts and circumstances, in the respective cases of Ross and Franklin, may lead to dissipate our hope. But hope is a vivacious principle, like the polypus, from the minutest particle remaining, growing up to be the integral thing, that it was. Science, philosophy, perched upon theoretical stilts, occasionally walk confidently into the mire. Sir John Franklin may yet be among the living, notwithstanding those negative demonstrations, in which many so very plausibly indulge themselves.

Let us follow Sir John Ross and his companions on board the *Isabella*.—"As we approached slowly after him (the mate of the *Isabella*) he jumped up the side, and, in a minute, the rigging was manned; while we were saluted with three cheers, as we came within cable's length, and were not long in getting on board my old vessel, where we were all received, by Captain Humphreys, with a hearty seaman's welcome. Though we had not been supported by our names and characters, we should not the less have claimed, from charity, the attentions we received; for never was seen a more miserable looking set of wretches. If to be poor, wretchedly poor, as far as all our present property was concerned, were to have a claim on charity, none could well deserve it more; but, if to look so, be to frighten away the so called charitable, no beggar, that wanders in Ireland, could have outdone us, in exciting the repugnance of those, who know not what poverty can be. Unshaven, since I know not when, dirty, dressed in the rags of wild beasts, instead of the tatters of civilization, and starved to the very bones, our gaunt and grim looks, when contrasted with those of the well dressed and well fed men around us, made us all feel, I believe, for the first time, what we really were, as well as what we seemed to others."

Very considerable training must, doubtless, be required, to reconcile a Mohawk Indian to a feather bed. A short passage from the Journal of Sir John Ross forcibly illustrates the truth, that we are the creatures of habit. "Long accustomed, however, to a cold bed, on the hard snow or the bare rock, few could sleep, amid the comforts of our new accommodations. I was myself compelled to leave the bed, which had been kindly assigned me, and take my abode in a chair for the night, nor did it fare much better with the rest. It was for time to reconcile us to this sudden and violent change, to break through what had become habit, and to inure us, once more, to the usages of our former days."

No. CLV.

Good, old Sir William Dugdale was certainly the prince of antiquaries. His labors and their products were greater, than

could have been anticipated, even from his long and ever busy life. He was born, Sept. 12, 1605, and died, in his eighty-first year, while sitting quietly, in his antiquarian chair, Feb. 6, 1686.

It seemed not to have occurred, so impressively, to other men, how very important was the diligent study of ancient wills, not only to the antiquarian, but to the historian, of any age or nation. Dugdale's annotations, upon the royal and noble wills of England, are eminently useful and curious. A collection of "royal wills" was published, by Mr. John Nicholls, the historian of Leicestershire, and the "*Testamenta Vetusta*," by Mr. Nicolas. These works are in very few hands, and some of them almost as rarely to be met with, as those of Du Cange, Charpentiere, Spelman, or Lacombe.

There is no small amount of information and amusement, to be gathered from these ancient declarations of the purposes of men, contemplating death, at a distance, or about to die; though it cannot be denied, that the wills of our immediate ancestors, especially, if they have amassed great wealth, and, after a few unimportant legacies to others, have made us their residuary legatees, furnish a far more interesting species of reading, to the rising generation.

There are worthy persons, who entertain a superstitious horror, upon the subject of making a will: they seem to have an actual fear, that the execution of a will is very much in the nature of a dying speech; that it is an expression of their willingness to go; and that the King of Terrors may possibly take them, at their word.

There are others, who are so far from being oppressed, by any apprehension, of this nature, that one of their most common amusements consists in the making, and mending of their wills.

"Who," says the compiler of the *Testamenta Vetusta*, "would have the hardihood to stain with those evil passions, which actuate mankind, in this world, that deed, which cannot take effect, until he is before the Supreme Judge, and consequently immediately responsible for his conduct?" To this grave inquiry I, unhesitatingly answer—*thousands!* The secret motives of men, upon such occasions, if fairly brought to light, would present a very curious record. That record would, by no means, sustain the sentiment, implied, in the preceding interrogatory. Malice

and caprice, notoriously, have governed the testator's pen, upon numberless occasions. The old phrase—*cutting off with a shilling*—has been reduced to practice, in a multitude of instances, for considerations of mere hatred and revenge, or of pique and displeasure. The malevolent testator, who would be heartily ashamed, to avow what he had done, on this side the grave, is regardless of his reputation, on the other.

Goldsmith places in the mouth of one of his characters, a declaration, that he was disinherited, for liking gravy. This, however it may have been intended as a pleasantry, by the author, is, by no means, beyond the region of probability. Considerations, equally absurd and frivolous, have, occasionally, operated upon the minds of passionate and capricious people, especially in the decline of life; and, though they are sensible of the Bible truth, that they can carry nothing with them, they may, yet a little while, enjoy the prospective disappointment of another.

The Testamenta Vetusta contain abstracts of numerous wills of the English kings, and of the nobility, and gentry, for several centuries, from the time of Henry second, who began to reign, in 1154. The work, as I have stated, is rare; and I am mistaken, if the general reader, any more than he, who has an antiquarian diathesis, will complain of the exhumation I propose to make of some, among the “reliques of thae antient dayes.”

It is almost impossible, to glance over one of these venerable testaments of the old English nobility, without perceiving, that the testator's thoughts were pretty equally divided, between beds, masses, and wax tapers. Beds, with the gorgeous trappings, appurtenant thereto, form a common subject of bequest, and of entailment, as heir-looms.

- Edward, the Black Prince, son of Edward III., died June 8, 1376. In his will, dated the day before his death, he bequeaths “To our son Richard,* the bed, which the King our father gave us. To Sir Roger de Clarendon,† a silk bed. To Sir Robert de Walsham, our confessor, a large bed of red camora, with our arms embroidered at each corner; also embroidered with the arms of Hereford. To Monsr. Allayne Cheyne our bed of camora, powdered with blue eagles. And we bequeath all our goods and chattels, jewels, &c., for the payment of our funeral and debts; after which we will, that our executors pay certain

* Afterwards Richard II.

† His natural son.

legacies to our poor servants. All annuities, which we have given to our Knights, Esquires, and other, our followers, we desire to be fully paid. And we charge our son Richard, on our blessing, that he fulfil our bequests to them. And we appoint our very dear and beloved brother of Spain, Duke of Lancaster,* &c., &c., executors," &c.

Joan, Princess of Wales, was daughter of Edmund Plantagenet. From her extreme beauty, she was styled the "*Fair Maid of Kent*." I find the following record in regard to Joan—"She entered into a contract of marriage with Thomas Montacute, Earl of Salisbury; but Sir Thomas Holland, H. G., on a petition to Pope Clement VI. alleged a precontract, *consensus et concubitus*, but that, he being abroad, the Earl of Salisbury unjustly kept her from him; and his Holiness gave her to Sir Thomas."

Joan seems to have been a wilful body, and the reader may like to know what sort of a will she made, four hundred and sixty-six years ago. She finally became the wife of Edward, the Black Prince, and, by him, the mother of Richard II. An abstract of her will runs thus—"In the year of our Lord, 1385, and of the reign of my dear son, Richard, King of England and France, the 9th at my castle of Walyngford, in the Diocese of Salisbury, the 7th of August, I, Joan, Princess of Wales, Duchess of Cornwall, Countess of Chester, and Lady Wake. My body to be buried, in my chapel, at Stanford, near the monument of our late lord and father, the Earl of Kent. To my dear son, the King, my new bed of red velvet, embroidered with ostrich feathers of silver, and heads of leopards of gold, with boughs and leaves issuing out of their mouths. To my dear son, Thomas, Earl of Kent, my bed of red camak, paied with red and rays of gold. To my dear son, John Holland, a bed of red camak."

Katheriné of Arragon wills, *inter alia*—"I supplicate, that my body be buried in a convent of Observant Friars. Item, that for my soul be said C. masses. Item, that some personage go to our Lady of Walsingham, in pilgrimage, and in going by the way, dole XX nobles. Item, I ordain that the collar of gold, that I brought out of Spain be to my daughter. * * * Item, if it may please the King, my good Lord, that the house ornaments of the church be made of my gowns, which he holdeth, for to serve the

* John of Gaunt.

convent thereat I shall be buried. And the furs of the same I give for my daughter."

William de Longspee, Earl of Salisbury, was a natural son of Henry II., by Fair Rosamond, daughter of Walter de Clifford, and distinguished himself in the Holy Land. He bequeaths to the Monastery of the Carthusians—"A cup of gold, set with emeralds and rubies; also a pix of gold with XLII. s. and two goblets of silver, one of which is gilt; likewise a chesible and cope of red silk; a tunicle and dalmatick of yellow cendal; an alba, amice, and stole; also a favon and towel, and all my reliques; likewise a thousand sheep, three hundred muttons, forty-eight oxen, and fifteen bulls."

It was not unusual, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, to dedicate children, at the hour of their baptism, to the *military* service of *God*, in Palestine. An example of this may be found, in the will of William de Beauchamp, who was the father of the first Earl of Warwick, and died before 1269—"My body to be buried in the Church of Friars Minors at Worcester. I will, that a horse, completely harnessed with all military caparisons, precede my corpse: to a priest to sing mass daily, in my chapel without the city of Worcester, near unto that house of Friars, which I gave for the health of my soul, and for the soul of Isabel my wife, Isabel de Mortimer, and all the faithful deceased, all my rent of the fee of Richard Bruli, in Wiche and Winchester, with supply of what should be short, out of my own proper goods. * * * To William, my oldest son, the cup and horns of St. Hugh. * * * To Isabel, my wife, ten marks*: to the Church and nuns of Westwood one mark: to the Church and nuns without Worcester one mark: to every Anchorite in Worcester and the parts adjacent four shillings: to the Church of Salewarp, a house and garden, near the parsonage, to find a lamp to burn continually therein to the honor of God, the blessed Virgins St. Katherine, and St. Margaret."

The will of his son, the Earl of Warwick, is full of the spirit of the age. He died in 1298—"My heart to be buried where-soever the Countess, my dear consort, may, herself, resolve to be interred: to the place, where I may be buried two great horses, viz., those which shall carry my armor at my funeral, for the solemnizing of which, I bequeath two hundred pounds: to the maintenance of two soldiers in the Holy Land one hundred

* An English mark was two-thirds of a pound sterling, or 13s. 4d.

pounds: to Maud, my wife, all my silver vessels, with the cross, wherein is contained part of the wood of the very cross, on which our Saviour died. * * * To my said wife a cup, which the Bishop of Worcester gave me, and all my other cups, with my lesser sort of jewels and rings, to distribute for the health of my soul, where she may think best: to my two daughters, nuns at Shouldham, fifty marks."

Elizabeth De Burgh, Lady of Clare, was the daughter of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, by Joan D'Acres, daughter of Edward I. She was thrice married. Her will is a curious affair, and bears date Sept. 25, 1355. She leaves legacies to her "servants" numbering, about one hundred and forty, and among whom are several knights and "peres."—"My body to be buried in the Sisters Minories, beyond Aldgate. I devise c. c. lb. of wax, to burn round my corpse. I will that my body be not buried for fifteen days after my decease. * * * For masses to be sung for the souls of Monsr. John de Bourg, Monsr. Theobaud de Verdon, and Monsr. Roger Dammory, my lords, my soul, and for the souls of all my good and loyal servants, who have died or may die in my service CXL., li.: To find five men for the Holy Land C. marks, to be spent, in the service of God and destruction of his enemies, if any general voyage be made within seven years after my decease: To my daughter Bardoff my bed of green velvet."

Elizabeth, Countess of Northampton, wife of William de Bohun, made her will, in 1356. To the Church of the Friars Preachers, in London, she bequeaths: "C. marks sterling, and also the cross, made of the very wood of our Saviour's cross which I was wont to carry about me, and wherein is contained one of the thorns of his crown; and I bequeath to the said Church two fair altar cloths of one suit, two of cloth of gold, one chalice, one missal, one graille,* and one silver bell; likewise thirty-one ells of linen cloth for making of albes, one pulpitry, one portfory,† and a holy water pot of silver." She also wills, that "one hundred and fifty marks be distributed to several other convents of Friars Preachers, in such manner as Friar David de Sturington shall think best, for my soul's health: To the Grey Friars, in London five marks: To the Carmelites five marks: and to the Augustines five marks * * * to Elizabeth my daughter a bed of red worsted embroidered:

* A church book.

† Breviary.

To my sister, the Countess of Oxford a black horse and a nonche.* "

Believers in the doctrine of transubstantiation must extend their faith to the very cross; for, to comprehend all the wood, in possession of the faithful, it must have consisted of many cords of substantial timber.

No. CLVI.

THE testamentary recognition of bastards, *eo nomine*, was very common, in the olden time. There were some, to whom funereal extravagance and pomp were offensive. Sir Ottro De Grandison says, in his will, dated Sept. 18, 1358—"I entreat, that no armed horse or armed man be allowed to go before my body, on my burial day, nor that my body be covered with any cloth, painted, or gilt, or signed with my arms; but that it be only of white cloth, marked with a red cross; and I give for the charges thereof xx*l.* and x. quarters of wheat: to a priest to celebrate divine service, in the church at Chellesfield for three years after my decease, xv*l.*: to Thomas, my son, all my armor, four horses, twelve oxen, and two hundred ewe sheep. * * * * To my bastard son," &c.

Henry, Duke of Lancaster, 1360, wills, "that our body be not buried for three weeks after the departure of our soul."

Humphrey De Bohun, Earl of Hereford, 1361, bequeaths to his nephew Humphrey—"a nonchet of gold, surrounded with large pearls, with a ruby between four pearls, three diamonds, and a pair of gold paternosters of fifty pieces, with ornaments, together with a cross of gold, in which is a piece of the true cross of our Lord: to Elizabeth, our niece of Northampton, a bed with the arms of England. * * * * We will also that a chaplain of good condition be sent to Jerusalem, principally for my Lady my mother, my Lord my father, and for us; and that the chaplain be charged to say masses by the way, at all times that he can conveniently, for the souls."

Agnes, Countess of Pembroke, daughter of Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, wills, in 1367, that her body be buried, "within

* A button of gold.

† A button.

two days after my death, without any other cost than a blue cloth and two tapers of ten pound weight."

Robert, Earl of Suffolk, 1368—"I will, that five square tapers and four mortars,* besides torches, shall burn about my corpse, at my funeral: To William my oldest son my sword, which the King gave me, in name of the Earldom, also my bed with the eagle, and my summer vestment, powdered with leopards."

Roger, Lord de Warre, personally took John, King of France, prisoner, at the battle of Poitiers, and obtained the crampet or chape of his sword, as a memorial of his chivalry. His will bears date 1368—"My body to be buried without pomp, and I will that, on my funeral day, twenty-four torches be placed about my corpse, and two tapers, one at my head and one at my feet, and also that my best horse shall be my principal, without any armour or man armed, according to the custom of mean people." He orders his estate to be divided into three parts—"one to be disposed of for the health of my soul."

Joan, Lady Cobham, 1369—"I will that vii. thousand masses be said for my soul by the canons of Tunbrugge and Tanfugge and the four orders of Friars in London, viz. the Friars Preachers, Minors, Augustines, and Carmelites, who, for so doing shall have xxixl. iiii. iyd. Also I will that, on my funeral day, twelve poor persons, clothed in black gowns and hoods, shall carry twelve torches."

Sir Walter Manney, 1371—"My body to be buried at God's pleasure * * * but without any great pomp * * * twenty masses to be said for my soul, and that every poor person coming to my funeral shall have a penny to pray for me, and for the remission of my sins. * * * To my two bastard daughters, nuns, viz., Mailosel and Malplesant, the one cc. franks, the other c. franks. * * * To Margaret Mareschall, my dear wife, my plate, which I bought of Robert Francis; also a girdle of gold, and a hook for a mantle, and likewise a garter of gold, with all my girdles and knives, and all my beds and clossers in my wardrobe, excepting my folding bed, paly of blue and red, which I bequeath to my daughter of Pembroke."

Thomas, Earl of Oxford, 1371—"For my funeral expenses cxxxiii. To Maud my wife all my reliques now in my own keeping, and a cross made of the very wood of Christ's cross. To Sir Alberic de Vere, my brother, a coat of mail, which Sir

* Round funeral tapers.

William de Wingfield gave me, also a new helmet and a pair of gauntlets."

Anne, Lady Maltravers, 1374—"No cloth of gold to be put upon my corpse, nor any more than five tapers, each weighing five pounds, be put about it."

Edward, Lord Despencer, 1375—"To the Abbot and Convent of Tewksbury one whole suit of my best vestments, also two gilt chalices, one gilt hanap, likewise a ewer, wherein to put the body of Christ, on Corpus Christi day, which was given to me by the King of France. To Elizabeth, my wife, my great bed of blue camaka with griffins; also another bed of camaka, striped with white and black, with all the furniture, thereto belonging."

Mary, Countess of Pembroke, 1376—"To the Abbey of Westminster a cross with a foot of gold and emeralds, which Sir William de Valence, Kt., brought from the Holy Land."

Philipa, Countess of March, 1378—"To Edmond, my son, a bed, &c. Also a gold ring, with a piece of the true cross, with this writing, *In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen.* Which I charge him, on my blessing to keep."

Sir John Northwood, Knight, 1378—"I will that two Pilgrims be sent to visit the shadow of St. Peter, Paul, and James, in Gallacia."

Sir Roger Beauchamp, Kt., 1379—"My body to be buried in the church of the Friars Preachers, near to the grave, where Sybil, my wife resteth. And I desire, that, at my funeral, there be a *placebo* and *dirige* with note, and, on the morrow after, two masses, one of our Lady, and another of Requiem. And whereas I am bound to do a service on the Infidels, by devise of my grandsire, Sir Walter Beauchamp, to the expense of two hundred marks, I will, that, Roger, son to Roger, my son, shall perform the same, when he comes of age. To my Chauntrey of Bletneshe one hundred pounds, for the maintenance of one priest, to sing there perpetually, for my soul, and also for the soul of Sybil, late my wife, and for all Christian souls."

William, Lord Latimer, 1380—"I will that my house in the parish of St. Mary's be sold, to found prayers for King Edward's soul."

Guichard, Earl of Huntington, 1380—"I will that my heart be taken out of my body and preserved with spices, and deposited in the said church of Engle. I will that the expenses of

my funeral, if celebrated with pomp, be bestowed in masses for my soul."

Edmond, Earl of March, was a man of great note. His will is dated May 1, 1380—"To the Abbey of Wigmore a large cross of gold, set with stones with a relique of the cross of our Lord, a bone of St. Richard the Confessor, Bishop of Chichester, and a finger of St. Thomas de Cantelowe, Bishop of Hereford, and the reliques of St. Thomas, Bishop of Canterbury. To Roger, our son and heir, the cup of gold with a cover called *Benesonne*, and our sword, garnished with gold, which belonged to the good King Edward, with God's blessing and ours. * * * Also our large bed of black satin, embroidered with white lions and gold roses."

William, Earl of Suffolk, 1381—"I will that, on the eve and day of my funeral, there shall be five square tapers of the height, which my nearest of kin shall think fit, and four morters; also forty-eight torches borne by forty-eight poor men, clothed in white. * * * I will that a picture of a horse and man, armed with my arms, be made in silver, and offered to the altar of our Lady of Walsingham; and another the like be made and offered at Bromeholme."

One of the most interesting, among the olden wills, is that of John, Duke of Lancaster—the famous John of Gaunt. He died in February, 1399. His will bears date Feb. 3, 1397—"My body to be buried, in the Cathedral church of St. Paul of London, near the principal altar, beside my most dear wife, Blanch, who is there interred. If I die out of London, I desire that the night my body arrives there, it be carried direct to the Friars Carmelites, in Fleet Street, and the next day taken strait to St. Paul's, and that it be not buried for forty days, during which I charge my executors, that there be no cering or embalming my corpse. * * * I desire that chauntries and obits be founded for the souls of my late dear wives Blanch and Constance, whom God pardon; to the altar of St. Paul's my vestment of satin embroidered, which I bought of Courtney, embroider of London. * * * To my most dear wife, Katherine, my two best nonches, which I have, excepting that, which I have allowed to my Lord and nephew, the King, and my large cup of gold, which the Earl of Wilts gave to the King, my Lord, upon my going into Guienne, together with all the buckles, rings, diamonds, rubies and other things, that will be found, in a little box of

cypress wood, of which I carry the key myself, and all the robes, which I bought of my dear cousin, the Duchess of Norfolk;* also my large bed of black velvet, embroidered with a circle of fetter lockst and garters, all the beds, made for my body, called trussing beds, my best stay with a good ruby, my best collar, all which my said wife had before her marriage with me, also all the goods and jewels, which I have given her, since my marriage. To my Lord and nephew, the king,† the best nonche, which I have, on the day of my death, my best cup of gold, which my dear wife Katherine gave me, on New Year's day last, my gold salt-cellar with a garter, and the piece of arras, which the Duke of Burgoyne gave me, when I was in Calais." This is a mere extract. The will bequeaths numerous legacies of nonches, beds, and cups of gold; and abundantly provides for chauntries, masses, and obits.

Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, 1399—"To the Abbess and Convent of the Sisters Minoresses, near London, without Aldgate, vii. xiiis. iiid. and a tonel of good wine. * * * To my Lady and mother, the Countess of Hereford, a pair of paternosters of coral."

Thomas Mussenden, 1402—"I will, that all my arms, swords, bastard,§ and dagger be sold, and disposed of, for my soul."

William Heron, Lord Say, 1404—"Whereas I have been a soldier, and taken wages from King Richard and the Realm, as well by land as by water, and peradventure received more than my desert, I will that my Executor pay six score marks to the most needful men, unto whom King Richard was debtor, in discharge of his soul."

Sir Lewis Clifford, Kt.—"I, Lewis Clifford, false and traitor to my Lord God, and to all the blessed company of Heaven, and unworthy to be called a Christian man, make and ordaine my testament and my last will the 17th of September, 1404. At the beginning, I, most unworthy and God's traitor, recommend my wretched and sinful soul to the grace and to the mercy of the blissful Trinity, and my wretched carrion to be buried in the furthest corner of the churchyard, in which parish my wretched soul departeth from my body. And I pray and charge my executors, as they will answer before God, that on my stinking carrion be neither laid cloth of gold nor of silk, but a black cloth,

* Margaret Plantagenet, grand-daughter of King Edward I.

† The badge of the house of Lancaster.

‡ Richard II.

§ A culveria.

and a taper at my head and another at my feet ; no stone nor other thing, whereby any man may know where my stinking carrion lieth." In the original, this word is written *careyne*.

The reader will be amused to know the cause of all this humility. Sir Lewis had joined the Lollards, who rejected the doctrines of the mass, penance for sins, extreme unction, &c. ; but was brought back to the church of Rome ; and thus records his penitence.

No. CLVII.

"Tell thou the Earl his divination lies." SHAKESPEARE.

AN impertinent desire to pry into the future, by unnatural means—to penetrate the hidden purposes of God—is coeval with the earliest development of man's finite powers. It is Titanic insolence—and resembles the audacity of the giants, who piled Pelion upon Ossa, to be upon a level with the gods.

Divination, however old it may be, seems not to wear out its welcome with a credulous world, nor to grow bald with time. It has been longer upon the earth, than from the time, when Joseph's silver cup, "whereby he divineth," was deposited, in Benjamin's sack, to the days of Moll Pitcher of Lynn, whose divining cup was of crockery ware.

"*Mediums*" are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles—*"And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel, possessed with a spirit of divination, met us, which brought her masters much gain, by soothsaying."* Paul cast out the evil spirit ; an example worthy of consideration, by those, to whom the power is given, in the statute, to commit "*all persons, who use any juggling,*" to the house of correction, unless their exhibitions are licensed, according to law.

All manner of rogues and roguery has immemorially delighted in *aliases*. So has it been with that species of imposture, which assumes, that man's *finite* powers are sufficient, for *infinite* purposes. The black art, magic, fortune telling, sorcery, divination, soothsaying, augury, oracular responses, witchcraft, judicial astrology, palmistry, which is the same thing as chiromancy, or divination, by the lines of the hand or palm, horoscopy, which

is a part of judicial astrology, haruspicy, or divination, from an inspection of entrails, aeromancy, the art of divining by the air, pyromancy, by flame or fire, hydromancy, by water, geomancy, by cracks or clefts in the earth, hepatoscopy, by the liver, starmancy, by the elements, theomancy, by the spirit, demonomancy, by the revelation of genii or devils, idolomancy, by images, psychomancy, by the will or inward movement of the soul, anti-nopomancy, by the viscera of animals, theriomancy, by beasts, ornithomancy, by birds, ichthyomancy, by fishes, botanomancy, by herbs, lithomancy, by stones, cleromancy, by lots, oneiromancy, by dreams, onomancy, by names, arithmancy, by numbers, logarithmancy, by logarithms, sternomancy, by the chest, gastromancy, by abdominal sounds, omphelomancy, by the signs of the navel, pedomancy, by the feet, onychomancy, by the nails, cephalonomancy, by the marks of the head, tuphramancy, by ashes, capnomancy, by smoke, livanomancy, by the burning of frankincense, carromancy, by the burning of wax, lecanomancy, by basins of water, catoptromancy, by mirrors, chartomancy, by certain writings on paper, machanomancy, by knives, chrystallomancy, by glasses, dactylomancy, by rings, coseinomancy, by seives, axinomancy, by saws, cattobomancy, by brazen chalices, roadomancy, by stars, spatulamancy, by bones and skins, sciomancy, by shadows, astragalomancy, by dice, oinomancy, by wine, sycomancy, by figs, typomancy, by the coagulation of cheese, alphetomancy, by flour or bran, crithomancy, by grain or corn, alectromancy, by cocks and hens, gyromancy, by rounds and circles, lampadomancy, by candles and lamps, nagomancy, or necromancy, by consulting, or divining with, by, or from the dead.

The reader must bear in mind, that this list of absurdities is brief and imperfect. All these *mancies*, and many more may be found in Gaule's *Mag-Astro-Mancer*, page 165, and many of them are described in the *Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria*.

These mischievous follies have prevailed, in a greater or less degree, in every age, and among every people. During the very days of auguries, nevertheless, individuals have appeared, whose rough, common sense tore itself forcibly away, from the prevailing delusions of the age. A pleasant tale related, by Claude Millot, of an old Roman Admiral. He was in pursuit of the Carthaginian fleet; and, as he gained upon the enemy, and a battle seemed to be unavoidable, the

haruspex, or priest, who, as usual, accompanied the expedition, with the birds of omen, and who had probably become alarmed, for his personal safety, came suddenly on deck, exclaiming, that the sacred pullets *would not eat*, and that, under such circumstances, it would be unsafe to engage. The old Roman tar ordered the sacred pullets, then in their cage, to be brought before him, and, kicking them overboard, exclaimed, "*let them drink then.*"

The etymology of the word necromancy, νεκρός μάντις, shows its direct application to the scandalous orgies, which are matters of weekly exhibition, in many of our villages and cities, under the name of *spiritual knockings*. Though Sir Thomas Browne could mark, learn, and inwardly digest a witch, a *necromancer* was beyond his powers; and in Book I., Chap. X. of his *Pseudodoxia*, he speaks, with deep contempt, of such as "can believe in the real resurrection of Samuel, or that there is anything but delusion, in the practice of *necromancy*, and popular raising of ghosts."

Necromancers are those, who pretend to a power of communing with the dead, that is, conjuring up spifits, and of consulting them, in regard to the affairs of this or the other world. In the strictest sense, the Fishes and the Foxes and their numerous imitators are *necromancers*, of course.

This impious and eminently pernicious practice has been condemned, in every age, and by every civilized nation. It was condemned, by the law of Moses—"There shall not be found among you any one, that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." Deut. xviii. 10, 11, 12.

Conjurers may justly be accounted disturbers of the public peace; and such undoubtedly they are, most effectually, by unsettling the minds of credulous people, murdering sleep, and, occasionally, as in repeated instances, during the progress of the present delusion, by driving their infatuated victims to despair, insanity, and suicide. Severe laws have often been enacted, against these pestilent impostors. Conjuraton was made felony by statute 1, James I., 1603. This was repealed by 9 Geo. II., 1763. This repeal was in keeping with the ascendancy of com-

mon sense, which decreed, that all conjuration was an absurdity : but, at the same time, all *pretensions* to exercise this or any similar art was made punishable, as a misdemeanor. All laws, against witchcraft and sorcery, founded on the presumption of their possibility, are now justly accounted cruel and absurd. Laws, for the punishment of such, as disturb the public repose, by pretending to exercise these unnatural agencies, are no less judicious ; though they have not always been effectual, against the prejudices of the people. The *Genethliaci*, who erected their horoscopes in Rome, for the purpose of foretelling future events, by judicial astrology, were expelled, by a formal decree of the senate ; yet they long retained their hold, upon the affections of a credulous people.

This species of divination, by the heavenly bodies, commenced with the Chaldeans, and, from them, passed to the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. Henault informs us, that it was much in vogue, in France, during the days of Catherine de Medicis. Roger Bacon was greatly devoted to the practice of Judicial Astrology. Cecil, Lord Burleigh, is known, gravely and elaborately to have calculated the nativity of Queen Elizabeth, who was feverishly addicted to magic. The judicial astrologers of the middle ages were a formidable body, and their conjuring cups and glasses were in high esteem. In Swêden, judicial astrology was in the greatest favor, with kings and commoners. A particular influence was ascribed to the conjuring cup of Erricus, king of Sweden. The Swedes firmly believed, that Herlicius, their famous astrologer, had truly predicted the death of the monarch, Gustavus Adolphus, in 1632, at the battle of Lutzengen, or Lippstadt.

In the reigns of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France, this absurd delusion was in such repute, that judicial astrologers were consulted, upon the most trivial occasions ; and their daily predictions were the theme of grave and constant conversation, with every class of society. It was no uncommon thing, even in England, for those, who were desirous of communicating with the dead, to make a previous arrangement with some favorite astrologer, and *bespeak a spirit*, as we bespeak a coach, for some particular hour.

In the Autobiography of William Lilly, the famous astrologer, in the time of the Stuarts, a curious account is given of Alexander Hart, an astrologer, living in Houndsditch, about the year

1632. It seems, that Hart had entered into a contract with a countryman, who had paid him twenty or thirty pounds, to arrange a meeting between this countryman and a particular spirit, at an appointed time. But, either Hart's powers of raising the dead were unequal to the task, or the spirit had no inclination to keep up the countryman's acquaintance; certain it is, the spirit was unpunctual; and, the patience of the countryman becoming exhausted, he caused the astrologer to be indicted, for a cheat. He was convicted, and about to be set in the pillory, when John Taylor, the water poet, persuaded Chief Justice Richardson to bail him, and Hart was fairly spirited away. He then fled into Holland, where, a few years after, he gave up the spirit, in reality.

Its unintelligible quality is the very essence of delusion. Nothing can be more unreasonable, therefore, than to mistake our inability to explain a mystery, for conclusive evidence of its reality and truth. That it is unintelligible or inexplicable surely affords less evidence of its reality, and truth, than is furnished of its falsehood, by its manifest inconsistency with all known natural laws. Bruce informs us, that the inhabitants of the western coasts of Africa pretend to hold a direct communication with the devil; and the evidence of the thing they assert is so very curious and imposing, that he and other travellers are entirely at fault, in their attempts to explain the mystery. Yet no one, for a moment, supposes, that Bruce had the slightest confidence in these absurdities.

And yet, so great, so profound, was the belief of Friar Bacon, in this preposterous delusion, that, in his *Opus Majus*, page 65, he exclaims—"Oh, how happy had it been for the church of God, and how many mischiefs would it have prevented, if the aspects and qualities of the Heavenly bodies had been predicted, by learned men, and known to the princes and prelates of those times! There would not then have been so great a slaughter of Christians, nor would so many miserable souls have been sent to hell."

This eminently learned man, Roger Bacon, refers, in this remarkable passage, to the various calamities, which existed, in England, Spain, and Italy, during the year 1264.

The word, mathematician, seems to have been applied, in that age, exclusively to astrologers. Peter de Blois, one of the most learned writers of his time, who died A. D. 1200, says, in the

folio edition of his works, by Gussanville, page 596—" Mathematicians are those, who, from the position of the stars, the aspect of the firmament, and the motion of the planets, discover things, that are to come."

" These prognosticators," says Henry, in his History of Great Britain, vol. vi. page 109, " were so much admired and credited, that there was hardly a prince, or even an earl, or great baron, in Europe, who did not keep one or more of them, in his family, to cast the horoscopes of his children, discover the success of his designs, and the public events, that were to happen."

No. CLVIII.

THERE are sundry precepts, delivered by Heathen poets, some eighteen hundred years ago, which modern philosophy may not disregard with impunity. If it be true, and doubtless it is true, that a certain blindness to the future is given, in mercy, to man, how utterly unwise are all our efforts to rend the veil, and how preposterous withal !

The wiser, even among those, who were not confirmed in the belief, that there was absolutely nothing, in the doctrines of auguries, and omens, and judicial astrology, have discountenanced all attempts to pry into the future, by a resort to such mystical agencies. The counsel of Horace to Leuconoe is fresh in the memory of every classical reader :—

*" Tu ne quesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi
Finem Di dederint, Leuconoe, neu Babylonios
Tentâris numeros. Ut melius, quidquid erit pati !
Seu plures hyemes, seu tribuit Jupiter ultimam,
Quæ nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrhenum "*——

The version of Francis, however imperfect, may not be unwelcome to the English reader :—

*" Strive not, Leuconoe, to pry
Into the secret will of fate ;
Nor impious magic vainly try
To know our life's uncertain date.

Whether th' indulgent Power divine
Hath many seasons yet in store,
Or this the latest winter thine,
Which breaks its waves against the shore."*

This passage from Horace is not required, to establish the fact, that magical arts were practised, among the Babylonians. A certain measure of superstition seems to belong to the nature of man; and to grow greater or less, in proportion to the exercise, or neglect, of his reasoning faculties. From this general rule history has furnished us with eminent exceptions. Cunning, and cupidity, and credulity are destined to be ever present: it is therefore to be expected, that, from age to age, the most egregious absurdities will pass, upon a portion of the community, for sober truths.

The fact, that popular absurdities have won the patient, if not the respectful, consideration of certain distinguished individuals, who have spoken, and written, doubtingly, if not precisely, in their favor, goes but a very little way, in their behalf. There was a time, when all the world believed, that the sun revolved around the earth, and that the blood was a stagnant pool, in the human body. There are none, I presume, of all, who give their confidence to any marvel of modern times, who are more learned or more wise, than Sir Matthew Hale, or Sir Thomas Browne. Yet both these wise and learned men were firm believers, in witchcraft; and two miserable people, Cullender and Duny, were given over to be hung, by Sir Matthew, partly upon the testimony of Sir Thomas.

Though nobody, whose sense is of the common kind, believes in witchcraft, at the present day, there was formerly no lack of believers, in any rank, or profession, in society. The matter was taken for a fixed and incontrovertible fact. The evidence was clear and conclusive, in the opinion of some, among the most eminent judges. If to doubt was not exactly to be damned, it often brought the audacious unbeliever, in danger of being hanged. Competent witnesses gravely swore, that pins and needles were run into their bodies, by persons, at the distance of a mile or more. For this offence, the witches were sentenced to be hanged; and, upon the gallows, confessed, with tears in their eyes, that they did really stick those identical pins, into the bodies of their accusers, being at the time, at the distance of a mile or more; and were swung off; having thus made their peace with God. Witnesses actually swore, that their houses were rocked, by old women, apparently too feeble to rock an infant's cradle, and that tables and chairs were turned topsy turvy; and the old ladies confessed, that they had actually

rocked two-story houses and upset those tables, and seemed to be pleased with the distinction of being hanged, for the achievement.

Whoever doubted these miracles was called upon to *explain*, or *believe*; and, if he could not indicate clearly the mode, in which this jugglery was effected, he was required to believe in a thing, which was manifestly not *in rerum natura*. In this dilemma, he might suggest an example of legerdemain, familiar to us all—a juggler puts an egg into an ordinary hat, and, apparently, in an instant, the egg is converted into a pancake. If the beholder cannot demonstrate how this is done, he, of course, must believe in the actual conversion, that is in transubstantiation. I have seen this little miracle performed, and confess I do not understand it; and yet I exceedingly doubt, if an egg can be so instantly converted into a pancake.

The witch of Endor pretended to conjure up the dead. The effigy was supposed to be made manifest to the eye. Our modern witches and wizards conjure, up or down, whichever it may be, invisible spirits. These spirits have no power of audible speech; thus far, at least, they seem not to have recovered the use of their tongues. To be sure, spirit without matter cannot be supposed to emit sounds; but such is not the case here, for they convey their responses, audibly, by knockings. This is rather a circuitous mode of conveying intelligence, with their fingers and toes, which might be more easily conveyed by the voice.

The difference, between our Blitzes and Samees, and the Fishes and the Foxes, consists in this—the former never, for a moment, pretend, that eggs are in reality pancakes, or that they actually perform the pretty miracles, which they seem to perform—the latter gravely contend, as it was contended, in the days of witchcraft, those days, that tried old women's souls, that their achievements are realities.

So long as these matters are merely harmless, even though they consume much valuable time, that might be more worthily employed, and transfer the illy-spared coin of the credulous poor, from their own pockets, to the pockets of unprincipled jugglers and imposters, perhaps it may be well to suffer the evil to correct itself, and die even a lingering death. But, when it is manifestly spreading, broadcast, over the land, and even receiving a dash of something like grave importance from the pen,

occasionally, of some professional gentleman, whose very doubt may dignify delusion; the matter seems really to demand some little consideration, at least: not that the doubts, even of a respectable physician, elaborately uttered, in a journal of fair repute, can do more to establish the power of mother Fish or mother Fox, to raise the dead, than was achieved, by the opinion of Lord Chief Justice Hale, in favor of witchcraft. That has fallen, as, in due time, this will fall, into merited contempt. But the expression of doubts, from a respectable quarter, upon an occasion like the present, tends, obviously, to strengthen those hands, which probably deserve to be paralyzed.

So long, as a matter, like this, is confined to speculation, it may be suffered to flit by, like the folly of a day. But the pestilent thing, of which I am speaking, has, long ago, assumed an entirely different, and a severer, type. At this very time, individuals, who are strictly entitled to the name of vagabonds, male and female, are getting their bread, by cheating the curious and the credulous, in a great number of our towns and villages, by the performance of these frightful antics. This term is altogether too feeble, to express the meaning, which I would gladly fix, in the public mind. By these infernal agencies, children are imbued with a superstitious fear, which tends to enfeeble their intellects, and has a mischievous influence, upon life and conduct, to the end of their days—upon children of a larger growth, especially upon those of nervous temperament, and feeble health, the pernicious effect is incalculable. The fact is perfectly well known, and thoroughly established, that these diabolical orgies, and mystical teachings have not only inflicted the deepest misery on many minds, but have induced several infatuated persons, to commit self murder; and driven others to despair; deprived them of their reason; and caused them to be placed, in asylums for the insane.

It is no longer therefore the part of wisdom to treat this evil, with sheer contempt. The conflagration has advanced too far, for us to hope it will go out, ere long, of its own accord. What is then the part of wisdom?

There are individuals, whose opinions are certainly entitled to respect, and who conceive, that these mysteries deserve a full and formal examination, by a committee of wise and learned men, that the world may be guided by their decision. I am fearful, that such a course would result in nothing better than disappointment, if in nothing worse.

These mysteries are Protean, in their character—

"Verum, ubi correptum manibus vinclisque tenebis,
Tum variae eludent species atque ora ferarum."

If the members of the learned inquisition should furnish an explanation of one, or more, of these *mirabilia*, a new series of perplexing novelties would speedily arise, and demand their attention;—so that the *savans* would, necessarily, become a standing committee, on modern miracles. The incomparable Blitz, if the process were discovered, by which he appears, instantaneously, to convert an egg into a pancake, would challenge you to explain another, by which he rapidly deduces some thirty yards of ribbon from the nose of a bystander. And, if we cannot explain this mystery, he may as reasonably demand of us to believe it a reality, as goody Fox or goody Fish may require her customers—for raising the dead is a trade—to believe in her power, to conjure up spirits, because we may not be able to discover the process, by which the rappings are produced.

But, even if an investigation were made, by the most competent physiologists, and the decree should go forth, *ex cathedra*; it would, probably, produce a very slight impression upon the whole community. That same self-conceit, which often fills an old woman to the brim, with the belief, that she is a more skilful leech, than *Æsculapius* ever was, will continue to stand the credulous instead; and the rappings will go on, in spite of the decree of the *savans*; the spirits of the dead will continue to be raised, as they are, at present, at fifty cents apiece; men, women, and children will insist upon their inalienable right to believe, that eggs are pancakes, and that, in violation of all the established laws of nature, ghosts may be conjured up, at the shortest notice; and examples will continue to occur, of distressing nervous excitement, domestic misery, self-murder, and madness.

The question recurs—what shall be done, for the correction of this increasing evil? Some suggestions have been made, sufficiently germain to several of the extraordinary pretensions of the present day. Thus, in respect to *clairvoyance*, a standing offer of several thousand francs has been made, by certain persons, in Paris, to any individual, who will prove his ability to see through a pine plank. In regard also to the assumption of knowledge, obtained, through a pretended communication with spirits, a purse of gold has been offered to any person, who, with

the aid of all the spirits he can conjure up to his assistance, will truly declare the amount it contains, with a moderate forfeit, in case of failure.

This whole matter of conjuration, and spiritual rapping has become an insufferable evil. It is a crying nuisance, and should be dealt with accordingly. It is, by no means, necessary, before we proceed to abate a nuisance, to inquire, in what manner it is produced. It is not possible to distinguish, between the *chevaliers d'industrie*, who swindle the credulous out of their money, by the exhibition of these highly pernicious orgies, from conjurers and jugglers. If this construction be correct, and I perceive nothing to the contrary, then these mischief-makers come within the fifth section of chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes of Massachusetts. Any police court or justice of the peace, has power to send to the house of correction, "*all persons who use any juggling.*" It would be a public service to apply this wholesome law to goody Fox, or goody Fish, or any other goody, of either sex, holding these conjurations within our precinct. Upon a complaint, the question would necessarily arise if the offence charged were "*juggling*" or not; and the rule of evidence, *cuique in sua arte*, would bring out the opinions of men, learned in their profession. I am aware of no other mode, by which those persons are likely to be gratified, who believe these proceedings entitled to serious examination. Let us not drop this interesting subject here.

No. CLIX.

In the olden time, almanacs were exclusively the work of judicial astrologers. The calendar, in addition to the registration of remarkable events, and times, and tides, and predictions, in relation to the weather, presumed to foretell the affairs of mankind, and the prospective changes, in the condition of the world; not by any processes of reasoning, but by a careful contemplation of the heavenly bodies.

On most occasions, these predictions were sufficiently vague, for the soothsayer's security; quite as much so, as our more modern foreshadowings, in relation to the weather, whose admo-

nitions, to *expect a change, about these times*, are frequently extended from the beginning to the end of the calendar month. An example of this wariness appears, in a letter of John of Salisbury, written in 1170. "The astrologers," says he, "call this year the wonderful year, from the singular situation of the planets and constellations; and say, that, in the course of it, the councils of kings will be changed, wars will be frequent, and the world will be troubled with seditions; that learned men will be discouraged; but, towards the end of the year, they will be exalted."

Emboldened, by the almost universal deference, paid to their predictions, the astrologers soon began to venture, on a measure of precision, which was somewhat hazardous.

In the commencement of the year 1186, the most distinguished judicial astrologers, not only in England, but upon the continent, proclaimed, that there existed an unprecedented conjunction of the planets, in the sign Libra. Hence they predicted, that, on Tuesday, the sixteenth day of September, at three o'clock in the morning, a storm would arise, such as the world had never known before. They asserted, with an amazing confidence, that, not only individual structures would be destroyed, by this terrible storm, but that great cities would be swept away, before its fury. This tempest, according to their predictions, would be followed, by a far spreading pestilence, and by wars of unexampled severity. A particular account of these remarkable predictions may be found, on page 356 of the annals of Roger de Hoveden.

No more conclusive evidence is necessary of the implicit, and universal confidence, which then prevailed, in the teachings of judicial astrology, than the wide spread dismay and consternation, produced by these bold and positive predictions. It is not possible to calculate the sum of human misery, inflicted upon society, by the terrible anticipations of these coming events. As the fatal day drew near, extraordinary preparations were everywhere made, to secure property, from the devastating effects of the approaching tempest. Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, commanded a solemn fast of three days' continuance, throughout his precinct. On the night of the fifteenth of September, very many persons sat up, in solemn expectation of the coming tempest.

It has been cruelly observed of medical men, that, to some of

their number, the death of a patient would, on the whole, be rather more agreeable, than that he should falsify their prediction, by the recovery of his health. How powerfully a sentiment, similar to this, must have exercised the spirits of these astrologers, as the appointed hour drew nigh ! It came at last—bright and cloudless—followed by a day of unusual serenity. The season was one of extraordinary mildness ; the harvest and vintage were abundant ; and the general health of the people was a subject of universal observation. Old Gervase, of Tilbury, in his Chronicles, alluding to the Archbishop's fears and fastings, remarks, that there were no storms, during the whole year, other than such, as the Archbishop himself raised in the church, by his own absurdity and violence.

The astrologers hung their heads, for very shame, and lost caste, for a time, with the people.

Divination was, of old, emphatically, a royal folly ; and kings have been its dupes and votaries, from the earliest ages of the world. The secret manner, in which Saul betook himself to the witch of Endor, arose, partly, from his knowledge, that such orgies were a violation of divine and human laws. The evils, resulting from such absurdities, had become so apparent, that Saul, himself, had already banished all the soothsayers and magicians from his kingdom. It is manifest, from the experience of Saul, that it is unwise to consult a witch, upon an empty stomach—“ *Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel : and there was no strength in him ; for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night.*”

Lucan, lib. vi. v. 570, et seq., represents young Pompey, just before the battle of Pharsalia, as paying a nocturnal visit, to a sorceress of Thessaly, of whom he inquires, in relation to the issue of the combat. With the ordinary preliminaries, charms, and incantations, the necromancer conjures up the ghost of a soldier, who had recently fallen in battle. At length, she pronounces a denunciation, between which and the prediction of the witch of Endor, delivered to Saul, the resemblance is certainly remarkable.

The laws of France, in the time of Louis XIV., were extremely rigorous, against sorcery and divination, inflicting the severest penalties, upon all, who pretended to exercise their skill, in these worse than unprofitable mysteries. Nevertheless, an

extraordinary story is related, in the autobiography of Madame Du Barri, as communicated to her, by Louis XV., of several visits stealthily paid, by Louis XIV., and Madame de Maintenon, to a celebrated judicial astrologer, in Paris. This narrative may be found recorded, at length, in the first volume of Madame Du Barri's Memoirs, commencing on page 286.

The age of Louis XIV. was an age of superstition. An Italian priest, a secret professor of the art of necromancy, was induced, upon the King's promise of protection, against the parliament, in the event of a discovery, to satisfy the royal curiosity, and open the book of fate. At the hour appointed, being midnight, Madame de Maintenon and the *Duc de Noailles* were conveyed to a house in Sevrès, where they met the sorcerer, who had celebrated the mass alone, and consecrated several wafers. After performing a variety of ceremonies, he drew the horoscope of the King, and Madame de Maintenon. He promised the King, that he should succeed, in all his undertakings. He then gave his Majesty a parcel, wrapped in new parchment, and carefully sealed, saying to the King—"the day, in which you form the fatal resolution of acquainting yourself with the contents of this package, will be the last of your prosperity; but, if you desire to carry your good fortune to the highest pitch, be careful, upon every great festival, Easter, Whitsunday, the Assumption, and Christmas, to pierce this talisman with a pin; do this, and be happy."

Certain events confirmed the sorcerer's predictions—others gave them the lie direct. The royal confidence was shaken.

Upon one occasion, the Bishop of Meaux, the great Bossuet, chanced to be at the apartments of Madame de Maintenon; and the subject of magic and sorcery being introduced, the good Bishop expressed himself, with such abhorrence of the profanation, as effectually to stir up a sentiment of compunction, in the bosom of the King and Madame. At length, they disclosed the secret to their confessors, to whom the most effectual means of breaking the charm appeared to be, to break open the talismanic package; and this was accordingly imposed, as a penance, on the King.

His sacred Majesty was thus painfully placed, *inter cornua*, or, as we trivially say, between hawk and buzzard—between the priest and the sorcerer. His good sense, if not his devotion, prevailed. The package was torn open, in the presence of

Madame de Maintenon, and father la Chaise. It contained a consecrated wafer, pierced with as many holes, as there had been saints' days in the calendar, since it had been in the King's possession. That consternation fell upon the King, which becomes a good Catholic, when he believes, that he has committed sacrilege. He was long disordered, by the recollection, and all, that masses and starvation could avail, to purge the offence, was cheerfully submitted to, by the King. Louis XV. closes this farcical account, with a grave averment, that his ancestor, after this, lost as many male descendants, in the right line, as he had stuck pins, in the holy wafer. There may, possibly, be some little consolation, in the reflection, that, if the private history of Louis le Grand be entitled to any credit, like Charles the Second of England, he could well afford the sacrifice—of whom Butler pleasantly remarks—

*"Go on, brave Charles, and if thy back,
As well as purse, but hold thee tack,
Most of thy realm, in time, the rather
Than call thee king, shall call thee father."*

The Millennarians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—and these enthusiasts are, by no means, of modern origin—may be said to have hunted, in company with the judicial astrologers. Herlicius and the Millennarians solemnly predicted the destruction of the Turkish Empire, in 1665, the one relying upon the aspect of the stars, and the other upon their fantastical interpretation of the Scriptures; and both, in all likelihood, chiefly, upon the good sword and stubborn will of the Emperor; who, to their infinite disappointment and mortification, finally made peace with the Ottomans. Yet David Herlicius was no impostor, or if so, there was no greater dupe to his astrological doctrines than himself. He was a learned, pious, and honest man.

There is, probably, no more extensively popular error, than that a deceiver must possess, on all occasions, a greater measure of knowledge than the deceived. Herlicius was an eminent physician; and Bayle says of him, vol. vi. page 137—"One can hardly imagine why a man, who had so much business, in the practice of physic, and who never had any children, should fear to want bread in his old age, unless he drew horoscopes."

This eminent man had doubtless some little misgivings, as to the infallibility of the art, after the failure of his prediction, in relation to the Ottomans. Bayle recites an extract of a letter, from Herlicius to a friend, in which the writer says: "Oh that fortune would look kindly upon me! that, without meddling with those astrological trifles, I might make provision for old age, which threatens me with blindness; and I would never draw any horoscope. In the mean time, when a great many persons inquire for, and desire to know more things, than are within the compass of our art, or more than it can explain, I choose rather to act with conscience, than to disgrace, and, as it were, to defile, our sacred Astrology, and to cast a blemish upon it. For our art abounds with a great number of Chaldean superstitions, which several of our countrymen are still obstinately fond of. A great many ask me what color of clothes and horses will be lucky for them? Sometimes I laugh heartily, at these and other such absurd questions, but I do also often abhor them. For I am enamored with the virgin state of our art, nor can I suffer that it should be so abominably defiled, as to give the enemies of astrology an opportunity to object to us those abuses, to the contempt of the art itself."

At the period, when Herlicius unfortunately predicted the destruction of the Ottoman power, Judicial Astrology was in the highest favor in England. The date of the prediction, 1665, was the sixth year of Charles the Second. Whatever space remained, unoccupied by other follies, during the reign of the Stuarts, and even during the interregnum, was filled by the preposterous doctrines of Judicial Astrology. It is perfectly well established, that Charles the First, when meditating his escape from Carisbrook castle, in 1647, consulted the famous astrologer, Sir William Lilly.

No. CLX.

ISABEL, Countess of Warwick, 1439—"My body is to be buried, in the Abbey of Tewksbury; and I desire, that my great

Templys* with the Baleyst be sold to the utmost, and delivered to the monks of that house, so that they grutcheth not my burial there. Also I will that my statue be made, all naked, with my hair cast backwards, according to the design and model, which Thomas Porchalion† has, for that purpose, with Mary Magdalen laying her hand across, and St. John the Evangelist on the right side, and St. Anthony on the left." The singularity of this provision would lead one to believe that the testatrix made her will, under the influence of St. Anthony's fire.

John, Lord Fanhope, 1443—"To John, my bastard son, now at Ampthill, ccc. marks; and, in case he should die, before he attain the age of twenty-one, I will that Thomas, my other bastard son, shall have the said ccc. marks."

Henry Beaufort was the second son of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, by Katherine Swinford, a bastard born, but with his brothers and sister, legitimated by act of Parliament, 20 Rich. II., became Bishop of Lincoln 1397—translated to Winchester, 1404, and made a Cardinal. He was remarkable, for his immense wealth, prudence, and frugality. He was four times Chancellor of England. He is reported to have clung to life with a remarkable tenacity. Rapin says, he died for grief, that wealth could not save him from death. The death bed of this Cardinal is admirably described by Shakspeare, in the second part of King Henry VI., Act III., Scene III. :

K. Henry. How fares my lord? Speak Beaufort to thy Sovereign.

Cardinal. If thou be'st Death, I'll give thee England's treasure,
Enough to purchase such another island,
So thou wilt let me live, and feel no pain.

Warwick. See how the pangs of death do make him grin.

Salisbury. Disturb him not, let him pass peaceably.

K. Henry. Peace to his soul, if God's good pleasure be!
Lord Cardinal, if think'st on Heaven's bliss,
Hold up thy hand, make signal of thy hope.
He dies, and makes no sign; Oh God forgive him!

Warwick. So bad a death argues a monstrous life.

K. Henry. Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all.—
Close up his eyes, and draw the curtains close.

The Cardinal's will, though without date, was made about 1443.—"I will that ten thousand masses be said for my soul,

* Dugdale says these were jewels, hanging over the forehead, on bodkins, thrust through the hair.

† Pale or peach-colored rubies.

‡ This effigy is referred to by Walpole, in his *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. i. p. 37.

as soon as possible after my decease, three thousand of requiem, three thousand of *de rorate cali desuper*, three thousand of the Holy Ghost, and one thousand of the Trinity. * * * * Item, I bequeath to my Lord, King Henry, a tablet with reliques, which is called the tablet of Bourbon, and a cup of gold with a ewer, which belonged to the illustrious prince, his father, and offered by him on Easter Eve, and out of which cup he usually drunk, and for the last time drank. * * * * Item, I bequeath to my Lord the King, my dish or plate of gold for spices, and my cup of gold, enamelled with images."

In two codicils to this will, Cardinal Beaufort refers to certain crown jewels, and vessels of silver and gold, pledged to him by the King and Parliament, for certain sums lent. When the King went into France and Normandy, and upon other subsequent occasions, the Cardinal had loaned the King £22,306 18s. 8d. It appears in Rymer, vol. x. page 502, that the King redeemed the sword of Spain and sundry jewels, pledged to the Cardinal, for £493 6s. 8d.

John, Duke of Exeter, 1447—"I will that four honest and cunning priests be provided, to pray perpetually every year, for my soul." He then conveys certain manors to his son Henry, "provided always, that an annuity of xli. be reserved for my two bastard sons, William and Thomas."

William Burges, garter King of Arms, 1449, bequeaths to the church of St. George at Staunford—"to the seyde church for ther solempne feste dayes to stand upon the high awter 11 grete basque of silver, and 11 high candlesticks of sylver, 1 coupe of sylver, in the whych is one litel box of yvory, to put in the blessid sacrament." He also gives to said church "two greter candelstykkes, and for eiche of these candelstykkes to be ordayned a taper of waxe of 1 pound wight, and so served, to be lighted atte dyvyno servyce at pryncipal fest dayes, and al other solempne festes, as, at matyns, pryme, masse, and the yeven songs."

John, Lord Scrope, 1451—"To the altar, in the chapel of St. Mary, at York, a jewel, with a bone of St. Margaret, and xli. for ringing their bells, at my funeral."

Ann, Duchess of Exeter, 1457—"I forbid my executors to make any great feast, or to have a solemn hearse, or any costly lights, or largess of liveries according to the glory or vain pomp of the world, at my funeral, but only to the worship of God, after the discrecion of Mr. John Pynchebeke, Doctor of Divinity."

Edmund Brudenell, 1457—"To Agmondesham Church; "to the Provosts of the Church for the maintenance of the great light before the cross *xxs.* To the maintenance of the light before St. Katherine's Cross, *iiis. 1vd.*"

John Younge, 1458—"To the fabrick of the Church of Herne, viz., to make seats, called puyinge, *x. marks.*"

John Sprot, Clerk, 1461—"To each of my parishioners *xld.*"

The passion for books, merely because of their antique rarity, and not for their intrinsic value, is not less dangerous, for the pursuer, than that, for collecting rare animals, and forming a private menagerie, at vast expense. Even the entomologist has been known to diminish the comforts of his family, by investing his ready money in rare and valuable bugs. It has been pleasantly said of him,

"He leaves his children, when he dies,
The richest cabinet of flies."

There is no doubt, that, in those superstitious days, the traffic in relics must have been a source of very great profit to the priests; equal, at least, to the traffic in *ancient terra cottas*, in the days of Nollokens. The sleeves of those crafty friars could not have been large enough, to hold their laughter, at the expense of the faithful. The heir apparent, whose grief, for the death of his ancestor, was sufficiently subdued, by his refreshing anticipations of some thousands of marks in ready money, must have been somewhat startled, upon the reading of the will, to find himself residuary legatee, *for life*, of the testator's "reliques, remainder over to the Carthusian Friars!"

Such, and similar, things were of actual occurrence. William Haute, Esquire, made his will, May 9, 1462, of course, in the reign of Edward the Fourth. This worthy gentleman ordains—"My body to be buried, in the Church of the Augustine Friars, before the image of St. Catherine, between my wives. * * * * I bequeath one piece of that stone, on which the Archangel Gabriel descended, when he saluted the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the image of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Church of Bourne, the same to stand under the foot of the said image. I bequeath one piece of the bone of St. Bartholomew to the Church of Waltham. One piece of the hair cloth of St. Catherine, the Virgin, and a piece of the bone of St. Nicholas, to the Church of the Augustine Friars aforesaid. I bequeath all the remainder of

my relicks to my son William, *for life*, with remainder to the Augustine Friars forever."

Humphrey, Earl of Devon, 1463—"I will, that Mr. Nicholas Goss and Mr. Watts, Warden of the Grey Friars, at Exeter, shall, for the salvation of my soul, go to every Parish Church, in the Counties of Dorset, Somerset, Wilts, Devon, and Cornwall, and say a sermon, in every Church, town, or other; and as I cannot recompense such as I have offended, I desire them to forgive my poor soul, that it be not endangered."

William, Earl of Pembroke, 1469—"In nomine Jesu, &c. And wyfe, that ye remember your promise to me, that ye take the ordre of widowhood, as ye may the better mayster your owne * * * * Wyfe pray for me, and take the said ordre, that ye promised me, as ye had, in my lyfe, my hert and love." This lady, who was the daughter of Sir Walter Devereux, observed her vow, and died the widow of the Earl; which is the more remarkable, as these injunctions have often produced an opposite effect, and abbreviated the term of continency.

Sir Harry Stafford, Kt., 1471—"To my son-in-law, the Earl of Richmond, a trappur, four new horse harness of velvet; to my brother, John, Earl of Wiltshire, my bay courser; to Reynold Bray, my Receiver General, my grizzled horse."

Cecilia Lady Kirriel, 1472—"In my pure widowhood, &c. To John Kirriel, bastard, &c."

It is not unusual for the consciences of men, in a dying hour, to clutch, for security, at the veriest straws. It is instructive to consider the evidences, exhibited in these ancient testaments, of superfluous compunction. Sir Walter Moyle, Knt., 1479, directs his feoffees "to make an estate, in two acres of land, more or less, lying in the parish of Estwell, in a field called Calinglond, and deliver the same, in fee simple, to three or four honest men, to the use and behoof of the Church of Estwell aforesaid, in recompense of a certain annual rent of £2 of wax, by me wrested and detained from the said Church, against my conscience."

It was not unusual, to appoint overseers, to have an eye upon executors; a provision, which may not be without its advantages, occasionally, even in these days of more perfect morality, and higher law. Sir Ralph Verney, Knt., 1478, appoints four executors, and "my trowe lover, John Browne, Alderman of London, to be one of the *overseers* of this my present testament, and

to have a remembrance upon my soul, one of my cups, covered with silver gilt."

Monks and Friars were pleasant fellows in the olden time, and Nuns are not supposed to have been without their holy comforts. Landseer's fine picture of Bolton Abbey is a faithful illustration. The fat of the land, when offered to idols, has commonly been eaten up by deputy. However shadowy and attenuated the souls of their humble and confiding tributaries, the carcasses of abbots are commonly represented as superlatively fat and rubicund.

Bequests and devises to Lights and Altars were very common. Eustace Greville, Esquire, 1479, bequeaths "to the Light of the Blessed Mary, in the said Church of Wolton, three pounds of wax in candles and two torches; to the Altar of the Blessed Mary in the said church, one bushel of wheat and as much of barley; and to the Lights of the Holy Cross there one bushel of barley and as much of beans; and the same to the Light of St. Katherine there."

FINIS.

DUST TO DUST.

IN utter disregard of all precedent, I have placed this dedication at the end of the volume, deeming it meet and right, that the corpse should go before.

How very often the publication of a ponderous tome has been found to resemble the interment of a portly corpse! How truly, ere long, it may be equally affirmed, of both—the places, that knew them, shall know them no more!

Mæcenas was the friend and privy counsellor of Augustus Cæsar; and, accordingly, became, in some measure, the dispenser of executive patronage. The name of Mæcenas has been employed, ever since, to signify a patron of letters and the arts. Dedications are said to have been coeval with the days of his power.

In almost every case, a dedication is neither more nor less, than an application for convoy, from the literary mariner, who is scarcely willing to venture, with his fragile bark, "*in mare Creticum*" or *criticum*, unaided and alone. He solicits permission to dedicate his work to some distinguished individual—in other words, to place his influential name, upon the very front of the volume, as an amulet—a sort of passover—to keep evil spirits and critics, at a

distance. If the permission be granted, of which the public is sure to be informed, the presumption, that the patron has read and approved the work, amounts to a sanction, of course, to the extent of his credit and authority. In some cases, however, I have reason to believe, that the only part of the work, which the patron ever reads, is the dedication itself. That most amiable and excellent man, and high-minded bibliopolist, the late Mr. JAMES BROWN, informed me, that an author once requested permission, to dedicate his work, to a certain professor, in the State of New York, tendering the manuscript, for his perusal; and that the professor declined reading the work, as superfluous; but readily accepted the dedication, observing, that he usually received five dollars, on such occasions.

There was one, to whom it would afford me real pleasure to dedicate this volume, were he here, in the flesh; but he has gone to his account. GROSSMAN is numbered with the dead!

READER—if you can lay your hand upon your heart, and honestly say, that you have read these pages, or any considerable portion of them, with pleasure—that they have afforded you instruction, or amusement—I dedicate this volume—with your permission, of course—most respectfully, to you; having conceived the most exalted opinion of your taste and judgment.

L. M. SARGENT,

ROCK HILL, DECEMBER, 1855.

GENERAL INDEX.

The figures refer to the numbers—not to the pages.

A.

- ABNER**, cautioned by his father, as to his behavior to aged people, 1.
ADAMS, John, anecdote of, 45:—lines written under his name, in a lady's album, 46.
ARMS, national, authorship of, 106.
ALMSGIVING, 56.
AMBASSADORS, from U. S. A. to G. B. 73.
ANCESTRY, pride of, 97.
ANTIQUARIES, sometimes malicious, 126.
APOTHECARIES, in Boston—some notice of, 112.
ARISTOCRACY, of Boston—examples of, 90:—among the dead, 1.
ARMS, reversed, at military funerals, of great antiquity, 30.
ARNOLD, Benedict, what made him a traitor, 87.
ARUNDINES CAMI, 92.
ASCLEPIADES, of Prussia, his medical practice, 114.
ASTROLOGERS, Judicial, formerly part of a nobleman's household, 157.—False prediction of, in 1186. Ibid.—Consulted by Louis XIV. and Madame de Maintenon, 159.
ASTROLOGY, Judicial, Q. Elizabeth addicted to.—Much practised, in the middle ages, 157, 159.
AVARICE, 31.
AVERT, steals three negroes:—attempts to sell them:—their rescue, 47.
AYMAR, James, a famous impostor, 113.
AUCTIONS, various modes of:—by inch of candle:—by sand glass:—of fight among the Dutch:—various modes of notifying, and bidding at, 139.
AUCTIONER'S BELL, used at the Hague:—formerly in Boston, 139.

B.

- BABYLONIANS**, their mode of obtaining husbands, for homely women, 115.
BACHELORS punished by the Lacedæmonians for their celibacy:—not trusted with affairs of state at Athens, 115.
BARBERS, 140, 141, 142, 143:—their antiquity, 140:—formerly peripatetics, 141:—their shops and poles, 141:—female, 141:—their citternes and "knack with the fingers," 142.
BAPTISM, vicarious, 109.
BATHS, ancient, 114.
BATTEL, wager of, 145.
BEARDS, habits of the ancients, respecting, 140:—modern, 142:—dyeing them an ancient practice, 142.
BELKNAP, Jeremy, Rev. 47:—his desire for a sudden death, 75:—regard for historical truth, 75:—error, as to Gosnold, 75.
BELLS, and bell ringing:—weight of several—a terror to "evil spirytes," 37.
BENEVOLENCE, remarkable example of, 55.
BENTHAM, Jeremy, dissected by his own request, 8.
"BLEED AND PURGE all Kensington," 111.
BODIES, posthumous preservation of, 20.
BODKIN, the famous root and herb doctor, 109.
BOILING TO DEATH, a mode of punishment, 151.
BOODLE, William, his self-conceit, 49.
BOORN, Stephen and Jesse, remarkable case of erroneous conviction, on circumstantial evidence, 79 to 85, both inclusive.
BORRI, Joseph Francis, a famous impostor, 113.
BRADFORD, Sheriff, anecdote of, 5.
BROCKLEBANK, Parson, anecdote of, 49.
BURIAL, joint stock companies, 58:—their profits enormous, 58:—of weapons, by the slaves, at Charleston, 34.
"BRING OUT YOUR DEAD," 27.
BUCHANAN, James, his errors, in relation to Major André, corrected, 19.
BURKE AND BISHOP, executed, for murder, with intent to sell the bodies, 7.
BURYING THE DEAD, manner of, commended, 21:—in cities and under churches, objections to, 10, 11, 60, 61:—manner of, and practices, connected therewith, in different ages and nations, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 21, 30, 38, 96, 101:—premature, 15, 91, 95:—means for preventing, 91, 95.

- BULL JOHN**, and brother Jonathan, 104 :
—John, the musician, author of "God save the King," 106.
- BYLES**, Mather, anecdotes of, 93, 94.
- C.
- CADES**, sexton, how he lost his office, 44.
- CALIFORNIA** fever, 31.
- CAMPBELL**, hung for killing Boyd in a duel, 145.
- CAMPBELL**, Captain, steals an heiress, 115.
- CANDLES**, burnt in the day, at a church, in Nantucket, 24 :—of wax, at Popish funerals, in old times, 2. by inch of, ancient mode of selling at auction, 139.
- CANER**, Rev. Dr., some notice of, 78.
- CAPITAL PUNISHMENT**, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 89.
- CAPITAL OFFENCES**, in Massachusetts, in 1648, 62.
- CARTER**, sexton, insulted by a surgeon, 43.
- CATACOMBS**, 10 :—of Paris, 12, 13.
- CATAFALQUE**, its import, 103.
- CHADWICK**, Edwin, his report on interments, to the British Parliament, 68.
- CHAPEL**, King's, some account of, 78.
- CHARLES I.** funeral of, 39 :—his body discovered, in 1813, 40 :—V. legend of his mock funeral, denied, 99.
- CHILDREN**, female, destruction of, in China, and elsewhere, 29.
- CHINESE**, habits of the, 101.
- CHUANG-TSZE**, story of, 119, 120.
- CLARENDON**, in error, as to the burial place of King Charles I. 40.
- CLARKE**, Barnabas, anecdote of, 90.
- CLARK**, Alvan, his versatility of talent, 46.
- CLAY**, Henry, his frequent leavetaking, 99.
- COBBETT**, William, his letter to Lord Liverpool, on the American triumphs, 104.
- CONGRESS**, American, Lord Chatham's opinion of, 104.
- COURAGE**, personal, externals no sure criterion of—two remarkable examples, 149.
- CONSCIENCE PARTIES**, 29.
- CORDAY**, CHARLOTTE de, an interesting question, connected with her decapitation, 153.
- CREMATION**, cost of—least expensive mode, excepting the urns, 74 :—of Henry Laurens, 95 :—of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley :—their diet in prison, 74.
- CRIMINALS**, how to dispose of, 89 :—bodies of, delivered for dissection, 7 :—number waiting to be hung, 51.
- CROMWELL**, Oliver, various estimates of his character :—views and handles the dead body of Charles I. :—his funeral :—his body dug up, and hung, at Tyburn, 39.
- CRUCIFIXION**, 151.
- D.
- DADDY OSGOOD**, sold at auction, 139.
- DANFORTH**, Dr. Samuel, notice of, 111.
- DEACONS**, their dispute about a tomb, 11.
- DEAD SEA**, some account of, 35, 36.
- DEATH**, certain evidence of, 91 :—condition of the soul, after, 96 :—imitation of, 137 :—by shipwreck, 102.
- DENTISTS**, in Boston, some notice of, 112.
- DESECRATION**, of the dead, 14, 21, 23.
- DICKSON**, provost of Dundee, his epitaph, 9.
- DIEDRICK VAN PRONK**'s widow, anecdote of, 7.
- DIGBY**, Everard, account of his having spoken, after the removal of his heart, 153.
- DINAH FORBUSH**, her corpse insulted, 77.
- DIOPHANTUS**, anecdote of, 4.
- DISTILLERS**, in Boston, number of, 112.
- DIVINATION**, some account of, 157, 158.
- DIVINING ROD**, of James Aymar, 115.
- "DON'T GO TOO NEAR THAT BEDGE,"** 91.
- DREAMS**, of Martin Smith and King's Chapel, by the Old Sexton, 76, 77, 78.
- DRUNKENNESS**, at ordinations, 37.
- DRYDEN**, John, disturbance at his funeral, 118.
- DUELS**, between Benjamin Woodbridge and Henry Phillips, on Boston Common, 133 to 136, both inclusive :—various, 144 to 149, both inclusive :—punishment of, 145 :—number killed in, 145 :—Decatur and Barron, 146 :—Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, 147 :—Lords Mohun and Hamilton, 147 :—Sheridan and Matthews, 147 :—M'Keon and Reynolds, 147 :—Campbell and Boyd, 147 :—Colclough and Alcock, 147 :—David and Goliath, 147 :—Titus Manlius and the Gaul, 148 :—Hector and Ajax, 148 :—Turnus and Aeneas, 148 :—Rauben and a Spanish gentleman, 148 :—Cameron, and McLean, 148 :—Lord Mark Kerr and a French Colonel, 149 :—Joseph Bainbridge and the Secretary of Sir Alexander Ball, 149 :—Rand and Millar, 153.
- DUGDALE**, Sir William, the antiquary, 155.
- DYONISIVS**, to save his throat, taught his daughters to shave, 140.
- E.
- EFFIGIES** of the dead, made of cinnamon, and carried in the procession, 30.
- EGYPTIANS**, trials of their kings, after death, 5 :—every Egyptian a doctor, 107.

- ELI, the sexton, his hallucinations, 55.
 ELIOT, Rev. Andrew, gloves and rings, given him at funerals, and the sale of, 28.
 EMBALMING, process of, 4.
 EMPIRICS, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114.
 EPITAPHS, 5, 9.
 ESTIMATE OF AMERICANS by the English people, in 1775 and 1812, 104.
 EVIDENCE, circumstantial, remarkable examples of, 79 to 85, both inclusive: Webster's case, 86.
 EXECUTION, in Ballyconnel, 54.
 F.
 FAKER, East India, account of his apparent death, and resurrection, 137, 138.
 FAMINE, Keayne's granary in case of, 112.
 FANEUIL HALL, origin of:—burnt:—rebuilt and enlarged, 130, 131.
 FANEUIL PETER, and his relatives, some account of, 122 to 132, both inclusive:—aids Henry Phillips, to escape, after his fatal duel, with Woodbridge, 134.
 FOOD for ghosts, 25.
 FORTUNE-HUNTERS, remarkable disappointment of one, 115, 116.
 FRANKLIN, Benjamin, his account of the resurrection of flies, drowned in wine, 138:—his letter to Thomas Percival, on duelling, 144:—Sir John, probably lost, 154.
 FREEMAN, Dr., manner of his ordination, 78.
 FRIENDSHIPS rarely lifelong:—examples of, 59:—Cicero's first law of, 59.
 FRIZZELL'S BELL, 37.
 FUNERALS, invitations to, 8:—baked meats at:—games, and festivals at, 25.
 G.
 GIFTS, New Year's, 117.
 GLOVES and rings, at funerals, 28.
 GOSNOLD, Bartholomew, his abode, at Cuttyhunk, 75.
 GOVERNOR of Mass., anecdote of a, 52.
 GRANNY, anecdote of skinning, 58.
 GROSSMAN threatened to be shot, 13.
 GUILLOTIN, Dr. 151:—the instrument that bears his name, 151, 152.
 H.
 HAIR, management of the, 143.
 HALLEY, Thomas, great pomp, and much guzzling, at his funeral, 25.
 HALIFAX GIBBET and the guillotine identical, 151.
 HANDEL, rivalry, between him, and Senesino, and Buononcini, 105:—Swift's epigram, on their squabbles, 105.
 HANGING, sensations produced by, 95:—vicarious, 150:—persons differently moved, in prospect of, 150.
 HANWAY, Sir Jonas, his account of the practice of giving vales, 28.
 HAPPINESS, 48.
 HASTÆ, why auctions were so called, at Rome, 139.
 HAWES, Dr. William, his work on premature interment, 95.
 HEIRESS, stealing an, made felony:—remarkable examples of, 115.
 HENRY VIII. bone stolen from his corpse, 39:—some account of his funeral, 103.
 HERSE, ancient import of the word, 103.
 HOOK, Theodore, anecdote of, 24.
 "How could the poor Abbé sustain himself against you all four?" 113.
 HOWLERS, at funerals, ancient and modern, 32, 38.
 HUGUENOTS, in Boston:—their early settlement, in Oxford, Mass. 122:—their church in Boston, 122, 123.
 I.
 IDLENESS, effects of, 22.
 INFANTICIDE, 29.
 INNOLDERS, in Boston, number of, 112.
 INTOLERANCE, in Massachusetts, 62.
 J.
 JAMES II., his gallantry, when Duke of York, in a sea-fight, 66.
 JEWS usurious, 15,000 banished, 52.
 JE vous sauter le tête, 151.
 L.
 LACERATION, of the cheeks and hair at funerals, in Greece, Rome, and elsewhere, 30, 32, 38.
 LARGESSES at funerals, 25.
 LAURENS, Henry, his body burnt, after death, by his request, 95.
 LAWYERS, in Boston, their number at different periods, 112.
 LE MERCIER, André, minister of the Huguenots, in Boston, 132.
 LEVI, M. de, his pride of ancestry, 97.
 LIBERTY TREE, 41, 42. Philip Billes devises his estate, on condition of being buried under that tree, 42.
 LICINIUS, P., games, &c., at his funeral, 25.
 LILLY, Sir William, the astrologer, notice of, 157.
 LIND, Jenny, some account of, 105.
 LLOYD, Dr. James, his appearance, 111.
 LOCALITIES, certain interesting, 7.
 LONGEVITY, some examples of, 45.
 LOT'S WIFE, pillar of salt, &c., 35, 36:—seen by Irenæus and others, after she was salted, 36.
 LOUIS XVI., brutal behaviour of the French people, at his execution, 152.
 LOVAT, Lord, his repartee, on his way to be hung, 150.
 LUDII, HISTRIONES, SCURRÆ, 30.
 LUXURY, ever injurious, and often fatal, to Republics, 87, 88.
 LYMAN, Theodore, notice of him, and his public and private charities, 56.

- M.**
MARCUS FLAVIUS, anecdote of, 25.
MARRIAGES, taxed:—first celebration of, in churches:—forbidden during Lent, 115.
MARINER bound for Africa, reaches Norway, 48.
MARSHALL, Tommy, anecdote of, 90.
MARTYRS, cremation of:—cost of burning Cranmer, Laimier, and Ridley, 24.
MASHEE, Tooley, plays corpse, 137.
MCPHEE, widow Nelly, anecdote of, 7.
MEDICINE, origin of the practice of, 107:—practice of, among the Babylonians, Greeks, Egyptians, Israelites, and Hindoos, 108.
MEDIUMS, some notice of, 157.
MEXICAN BEGGARS, how employed by Montezuma, 142.
MILTON, John, his marriages, 98:—writes in favor of polygamy, 98:—desecration of his remains, 118.
MINGLING the ashes of dear friends, in the same urn, practice of, 21.
MINISTERS of the Gospel, in Boston, in 1740, 132.
MIRTHFULNESS, its advantages, 92.
MONK, George Herbert's address to, 31.
MONTGOMERY, Gen. Richard, his exhaustion, and reinterment, 18.
MOSUMENTS, Dryden's, Ben Jonson's, and Cowley's, mutilation of, 118.
MOONCURSERS, laws for their punishment:—anecdote of, 102.
MOORHEAD, Rev. John, some notice of, 99.
MOSKS, an apothecary, 107.
MOURNERS, their peculiar consolations, 32:—for the year 1843, 33.
MOURNING, time allowed for:—color of the vesture, in different countries, 32. Irish, consists in the number of coaches and the quantity of whiskey, 74.
MULE, a bad one, 30.
N.
NAPOLEON's last words, 31.
NEW YEAR'S DAY, when, 117, 123.
NEW NORTH CHURCH, uproar there, 37.
NORTH CHURCH, peal of bells there, 37.
NUISANCE, affecting the air, not necessary to prove it noxious, 60.
O.
OBSEQUIES, provisions for, by persons, while living, 7.
OTIS, James, anecdote of, 90.
P.
PARKMAN, Dr. George, his murder:—his peculiarities, 72.
PENN, William, reply to Macaulay's abuse of:—memoir of, 62 to 71, both inclusive:—death bed of his son, 71.
PERCIVAL, Thomas, his work, on duelling, 144.
PERE LA CHAISE, 11.
PESTILENCE, numbers destroyed by, 27.
PHILADELPHIANS, saved from being Welchmen, 68.
PHYSICIANS, various schools of, named by Pliny, 110, 114:—number of the old Boston doctors, and their residences, 112.
PIPERS, at funerals, 8.
PIRATES, hung on Boston Common, 50.
PITCAIRN, Major, the honor of killing him, claimed by many:—the remains, under Westminster Abbey, said to have been erroneously selected, from under the North Church, 17.
PLAGUE, some account of the, 27.
PLINY, in favor of herb doctoring, 114.
PLANTER, funeral of an old, in St. Croix, 30.
POLHAMUS, the good Samaritan, 83.
POMPADOUR, Madame de, her remains transferred to the Catacombs, 13.
PONTRACI, the prince of undertakers, 12.
PORTLAND VASE, history of the, 20.
PRIDE AND POVERTY, excess of dangerous, 87.
PUNISHMENT, various kinds of, 151.
PUNSTERS habitual, nuisances, 94.
PWAF YAKOO, and other Chinese, their visit to Boston:—description of her golden lilies, 102.
Q.
QUACKS of great use to sextons, 27.
QUAKERS, persecution of, in Massachusetts, 62, 63.
R.
RAND, Dr. Isaac, brief notice of, 111.
RAZORS, their antiquity:—mentioned by Homer, Samuel, Ezekiel:—how sharpened:—of brass, 140:—the best formerly from Palermo, 142.
RECHERCHES, *Historiques et Physiologiques sur la Guillotine*, 152.
RELICS, traffic and joggery in, by the priests, 17.
REPUBLICS, extravagance fatal to, 87, 88.
REVENGE Church of Christ, 37.
REVIVAL, amusing example of, on the way to the grave, 91:—of a child of Henry Laurens, which caused him to order his own corpse to be burnt, 95.
ROCHEFOUCAULT, maxim erroneously ascribed to, 59.
ROMAN CATHOLICS, persecution of, in Massachusetts, 29.
ROSS, Sir John, his residence, in the Arctic regions:—discovery of him and his company, 164.
ROTHSCHILD, Nathan Meyer, his funeral solemnities, 3.
RUM, mainspring of the slave trade in Massachusetts, 47.
RUSH, Dr. Benjamin, alluded to:—anecdote of, 111.

- S.**
"SACRED TO THE MEMORY"! 77.
SANTA CRUZ, gross extortion there, from surviving friends, 16.
SANSONS, the hereditary executioners of Paris, 151, 152.
SAVINGS, of eminent men, in articulo, or just before death, 100.
SCOTCH WEAVER'S VANITY, 39.
SELWYN, George, seldom absent from an execution, 50.
SENECA, quotation from, 48.
SERITONS, their office, its origin, and duties, of old—their extortion, occasionally, in the hour of affliction, 16—their business much benefited by steam, 2.
SCIENCE, some curious mistakes of, 154.
SHAYS, his insurrection, 29.
SHAVING, suggestions concerning, 140.
SHELLEY, the poet, cremation of, 20.
SHIPWRECKS, their number, 102.
SLAVERY, 34—in Boston, 43, 47—early attempts to abolish, in Massachusetts, 44—how and when abolished there, 47—Slave trade, in Boston, 47.
SLAVES, example of their ingenuity, 34.
SMITH, Martin, sexton of King's Chapel, his apparition to the sexton of the old school, 76, 77, 78.
SOLDIERS, their sufferings, as statesmen, 100.
SONS OF LIBERTY, some account of the, 41.
SOUTHERN STATES, liberality to Boston, in 1774, 44.
SPARTANS, their mode of selecting wives, 115.
SPIDER and chambermaid, 29.
SPIRITUAL KNOCKINGS, sometimes resulting in madness, and self-murder, 157, 158—remedy for, 158.
STAMP ACT, resolutions in Faneuil Hall, 58.
STEAM, of great benefit to sextons, 27.
STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS, their version of the Psalms gave place to that of Tate and Brady—motive of Sternhold little suspected, 100.
STONECUTTER, anecdote of a, 6.
STYLE, old and new, some account of, 117.
SUCCESSION, Apostolic, 78.
SUNKER, Governor, funeral of, 39.
SUMPTUARY LAWS, some account of, 88.
SURGEONS, the earliest—limited nature of their functions, 107—among the Israelites, 108.
SUTTEKS, description of, 74.
SWANS, their musical power fabulous, 105.
SWAGING SICKNESS, some account of, 27.
SWEDENBORG, his notions of Heaven—of the soul, 96.
- T.**
TALLOW CHANDLER, retired from business, anecdote of, 22.
TASMAN'S BOWL, used for conjuration, in Tongataboo, 38.
TEA, thrown overboard, 44.
TEARS, power of shedding at will, 32.
TEMPERANCE "has done for funerals," 2.
TETOTUM DOCTOR, 111.
THACHER, Rev. Peter, installation of, 37.
THREE CHECKS for the elephant, 39.
TUMBS, reasons for preferring graves—outrage upon live, in Salem, Massachusetts, 13, 14.
"TOO HEARTILY of nutmegs," 103.
TORIES, their faith in the royal cause, 125.
TREASURES, buried with the dead, 21.
TURENNE, singular fate of his remains, 23.
- U.**
URNS, funeral, forms, and materials of, 20—occasionally large enough to contain the mingled ashes of whole families, 21.
USURY, some remarks on, 48, 52.
- V.**
VALES, practice of giving, 27.
VANITY, illustration of, 49.
VIANDS, deposited near the dead, 25.
VISCERATION among the ancients, 25.
VOLTAIRE, his description of a Frenchman, 152.
- W.**
WADZ, Sir Claude M. his account of the East India Fakeer, who was restored, after a suspension of consciousness, for six weeks, 137, 138.
WAGER OF BATTLE, the law of England, so late, as 1819, 145.
WAKES, their origin—some account of, 91.
WARREN, Gen. Joseph, manner of discovering his remains—the bullet, by which he was killed, in possession of the Montague family, 17.
WASHINGTON, George, illustration of the reverence for his memory, in New England—opinion of, by Lords Erskine and Brougham—national neglect of his monument—sale of some of his effects, 26.
WATERHOUSE, Dr. Benjamin, anecdote of, 111.
"WEEL THEN sing as mony as there be," 99.
WEBSTER, Dr. John White, his trial for the murder of Dr. Parkman, 72—his case stated, at the close of, 89.
WEEVER'S funeral monuments, 24.
"WHAT that boy says is true," 113.
WIDOWS, Numa severe upon—marrying within ten months accounted infamous, 32—unjustly censured, 98—"with the great fan," 119.

- Wigs, scratches, bobs, and full bottomed :—their antiquity, 142, 143 :—periwigs in N. England, 142 :—Roman, 143.
- WILLS, ANCIENT, 155, 156, 160 :—superstitious dread of making, 155 :—Andrew Faneuil's, 127.
- WITCHES, their right to travel through the air, decided by Lord Mansfield, 29.
- WOODBRIDGE, Benjamin, killed in a duel on Boston Common, 153 to 157: both inclusive.
- WRATALL'S MEMOIRS, inaccurate, 149.
- Z.
- ZISCA, John, anecdote of, 7.

INDEX TO PROPER NAMES.

The figures refer to the pages—not to the numbers.

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| A. | Amoon, 398. | Attleborough, 31. |
| Abbeville, 635. | Amory, 94. | Auchterpool, 603. |
| Abbott, 112, 204. | Amsterdam, 456, 622. | Augustines, 652, 654, 677. |
| Abel, 429. | Anderson, 309. | Augustus, 99, 583. |
| Aberdeen, 364. | Andover, 561. | Auld Reekie, 334. |
| Abner, 9, 13, 108, 172, 173, | André, 57 to 62, <i>passim</i> . | Aulus Gellius, 218. |
| 197, 289. | Andrews, 24, 159. | Austin, 449. |
| Abzalom, 691. | Andros, 298. | Austria, 321. |
| Achilles, 12, 17, 67, 107. | Anecy, 56. | Austrians, 539. |
| Adam, 70, 429, 606. | Angoulême, 124. | Auxerre, 220. |
| Adams, 596. | Anio, 617. | Avery, 166, 167. |
| Adams, John, 142, 156, 157, | Annan, 286. | Aviola, 49, 373. |
| 160, 275, 276, 394. | Anne Boleyn, 477. | Avis, 92. |
| Adams, John Q., 155, 394. | Annelly, 423. | Aymar, 438, 454, 455. |
| Adams, Samuel, 142. | Anne of Cleves, 78, 81, 410. | Azotus, 33. |
| Addison, 35, 38, 454, 606. | Anne, Queen, 186, 348, 262, | B. |
| Admetus, 12. | 365, 406. | Bacon, Roger, 360, 361, 362. |
| Adrian, 584. | Antijacobin, 612. | Bacon, Lord, 185, 188, 375, |
| Aeneas, 382. | Antoninus, 67. | 376, 445, 641, 642. |
| Æsculapius, 433, 436, 445, | Antony, 579. | Babylon, 406, 422, 432, 433. |
| 667. | Antwerp, 618. | Babylonians, 664. |
| Affslager, 587. | Appleton, 450, 506, 533, 630. | Baie, 320. |
| Africa, 33, 168, 435, 622, | Apthorp, 297. | Babar Loth, 123. |
| 662. | Arabian Nights, 269. | Bailey, 246. |
| Africans, 632. | Arabs, 119, 123. | Bainbridge, 610, 624. |
| Africanus, 583. | Aratus, 12. | Balch, 269, 353. |
| Agamemnon, 17, 430. | Archelaus, 102, 591. | Baldwin, 57, 181, 303, 311. |
| Agathias, 16. | Archimides, 98. | Ball, 624. |
| Agriental, 373. | Arceuil, 39, 42. | Ballyconnel, 194. |
| Agmondesham, 676. | Argiletum, 587. | Ballymahon, 195. |
| Agrippa, 251. | Aristotle, 186, 217, 218. | Ballyshannon, 356. |
| Agrippa, Cornelius, 445. | Arkwright, 420. | Balmarino, 629. |
| Abaziah, 431. | Arnaud, 419. | Bancroft, 277. |
| Alaricus, 65. | Arnold, 62, 228, 338, 339, | Banians, 377. |
| Albany, 38, 415. | 340. | Banks, 298, 424. |
| Alcock, 614. | Arundel, 157. | Barataria, 123, 265. |
| Aldgate, 652. | Asa, 430, 434. | Barbaroux, 426. |
| Aldgrave, 634. | Asclepiades, 358, 373, 443, | Barbary, 88. |
| Aleet Mong, 398. | 460, 461. | Barbut, 29. |
| Alexander, 373. | Ashford, 604. | Barcephas, 120. |
| Allen, 353, 495, 502, 503, | Ashmole Museum, 613. | Barclay, 752. |
| 601, 610. | Asiatic Researches, 435. | Barker, 642. |
| Allwick, 69. | Athenæ Oxonienses, 133 | Barlow, 288, 361. |
| Almotanah, 123. | 135, 136, 232, 248, 250, | Barnes, 451. |
| Almshouse, 24. | 425, 640, 642. | Barnard, 24. |
| Alvanley, 606. | Athens, 11, 88, 343, 373, | Barra Durree, 570. |
| America, 265, 416. | 429, 442. | Barre, 140, 145, 416. |
| Ames, 91, 630, 631. | Atherton, 30, 167. | Barrington, 606. |
| Ammianus, 64. | Atossa, 465. | Barrow, 608, 609. |
| Amphytrion, 217, 581. | Atticus, 51, 474. | Barrow, 398, 400, 402, 403. |

- Barrow's Strait, 645.
 Barton, 561, 562, 563.
 Bartholomew, 633.
 Bartholomew's Eve, 93.
 Bassorah, 89.
 Bastile, 84.
 Bate, 601.
 Battenkill, 303.
 Baulny, 639.
 Baulston, 223.
 Baxter, 252.
 Bayard, 393.
 Bayeaux, 519.
 Bayle, 56, 353, 390, 393,
 391, 455, 672, 673.
 Bayley, 597.
 Bayuton, 516, 519.
 Bay State, 163.
 Bentie, 350.
 Beauchamp, 529, 651, 655.
 Beaumont, 607, 674, 675.
 Beccaria, 207.
 Beckford, 145.
 Bedonin, 119.
 Beecher, 372.
 Becher, 298.
 Belfast, 389.
 Belknap, 163 to 167, and
 233 to 236, *passim*: 363.
 Bellamont, 605.
 Bellingham, 228, 229, 230.
 Belochus, 465.
 Belzoni, 33.
 Bengal, 251.
 Benia, 33.
 Bennington, 415.
 Benthams, 27, 52, 176, 605.
 Benton, 159.
 Bergen-op-Zoom, 549, 613.
 Berlia, 89.
 Bernou, 496, 508.
 Berthier, 109.
 Bertrand, 639.
 Bothune, 495, 505, 508
 514, 567.
 Bouillon, 607.
 Bias, 217, 218.
 Bichat, 357.
 Biddad, 217.
 Biles, 147.
 Biographia Britannica, 363.
 Bishop, 27, 227.
 Blackburn, 508, 523.
 Black Prince, 649.
 Blackstone, 301.
 Blackwood's Mag., 243.
 Blackwell, 182, 183.
 Blanche, 608.
 Blin, 562.
 Blitheman, 426.
 Blitz, 665.
 Blandell, 606.
 Boecacio, 218, 422. [441
 Bodkin, 189, 190, 192, 440,
 Bogle, 195.
 Boles, 159.
 Bolton Abbey, 678.
 Bondet, 497.
 Bonet, 49.
 Bonner, 506, 550, 562.
 Bonrepaux, 239, 240, 242.
 Boodle, 171, 172, 173.
 Boorn, 301 to 331, *passim*.
 Borri, 456.
 Borromeo, 220.
 Rose, 643, 644.
 Bosius, 437.
 Bosphorus, 22.
 Bosson, 597.
 Bossuet, 671.
 Boston, 66, 125, 151, 153,
 165, 167, 179, 184, 191,
 194, 210, 221, 223, 270,
 351, 452, 497, 514, 536.
 Boston Athen'm, 269, 324.
 Boston Common, 549.
 Boswell, 601, 602, 603, 606.
 Bottom, 592, 624.
 Boudinot, 496.
 Bourbon, 393, 675.
 Bourbon, Jeanne of, 74.
 Bourdeaux, 210.
 Boutineau, 496, 499, 510,
 512, 514, 531, 566.
 Boutville, 607.
 Bowdoin, 294, 496, 499,
 508, 539.
 Bowen, 557.
 Bowers, 82.
 Boyd, 606, 614.
 Boyle, 243, 535, 597.
 Brachmans, 377.
 Brackets, 592.
 Braddock, 394.
 Bradford, 19, 301, 632.
 Brady, 31, 55, 597.
 Brague, 220.
 Brand, 402, 539.
 Brandreth, 86.
 Brandywine, 415.
 Brandenburgh, 65.
 Bray, 81, 677.
 Braybrooke, 577.
 Breck, 270, 271.
 Breckenridge, 605.
 Breed, 597.
 Briareus, 56, 91.
 Briar's Creek, 415.
 Briggs, 175.
 Brighton, 508, 525, 527.
 Bristol, 508.
 British Critic, 622.
 Britons, 535.
 Brockebank, 174.
 Brockwell, 297.
 Bromholme, 656.
 Bromfield, 269, 564. [609
 Brooks, 352, 353, 553, 554,
 Brougham, 84, 347.
 Broollan, 529.
 Brown, 530.
 Browne, 42, 65, 67, 118,
 122, 131, 180, 215, 227,
 232, 419, 431, 478, 640,
 660, 664, 677.
 Bruce, 549, 551, 662.
 Bruli, 651.
 Buchanan, 59, 59, 61, 436.
 Buckingham, 479.
 Buckley, 532.
 Buddikin, 108.
 Buffon, 420.
 Buissiere, 455.
 Bulfinch, 450.
 Bull, 414, 415, 426, 427.
 Bullivant, 298.
 Bulwer, 592.
 Bungs, 463.
 Banker's Hill, 54, 55, 415.
 Buononcini, 422.
 Bordett, 606.
 Bureau, 507, 530.
 Burgoyne, 353, 617.
 Burgundy, 614.
 Burke, 27, 268, 613.
 Burleigh, 76, 661.
 Burnett, 33, 76, 233, 262,
 551.
 Barney, 427.
 Burr, 332, 605.
 Burrit, 177.
 Burton, 26, 66.
 Busching, 119.
 Bute, 140, 146.
 Butler, 56, 208, 351, 454,
 622.
 Byles, 143, also 363 to 372,
passim: also 546.
 C.
 Cades, 152.
 Caesar, Augustus, 29, 36,
 99, 595, 679.
 Caesar, Julius, 29, 474, 579,
 585.
 Caesars, the twelve, 67.
 Cesar, the slave, 31.
 Caffraria, 103.
 Cain, 377, 429, 556, 615.
 Cairo, 241.
 Cairns, 88, 585.
 Calabria, 87.
 Calais, 657.
 Calhoun, 114.
 Calcraft, 346.
 California, 101.
 Calinglond, 677.
 Callender, 163.
 Calmet, 119, 120, 187, 436,
 582, 615.
 Callowhill, 267.
 Calvin, 543, 549.
 Calypso, 420.

- Cambridge, 630.
Camden, 145, 146, 383, 415.
Camerarius, 373.
Cameron, 681.
Camillus Papers, 277.
Campbell, 614.
Cancer, 289 to 300, *passim*.
Canning, 606.
Canoso, 567.
Canterbury, 520, 656, 669.
Cape Anne, 16.
Capet, 73, 81, 637.
Capulets, 351.
Cardigan, 606.
Caribs, 130.
Carisbroke Castle, 606, 673.
Carmelites, 652, 654.
Carne, 117, 119.
Carroll, 181.
Carter, 148.
Carthago, 152.
Carthusians, 651.
Cartwright, 240.
Casa, 85, 110.
Cassieres, 59.
Castalio, 549.
Castellan, 358.
Castellano, 384.
Castlereagh, 606.
Catanes, 33.
Catholics, 535.
Cattin, 23.
Cato, 71, 431, 442, 443, 444.
Cattii, 585.
Caulfield, 382.
Cavan, 193.
Cecil, 661.
Cecrops, 64.
Celsus, 429, 462.
Cemetery des Innocens, 39, 43, 65.
Cephrenes, 384.
Chace, 310 to 330, *passim*.
Charles, 80.
Chadwick, 212, 278, 320, 321, 322, 333, 569.
Chaise, Pêre la, 672.
Chaldeans, 661.
Chalmers, 49, 238, 248, 249, 258, 363, 427, 480, 516, 642.
Chamberlain, 77, 80.
Chamouni, 400.
Chantilly, 419, 420.
Chapel Yard, 225.
Chapotin, 568.
Chappelle, 612.
Chardon, 533, 534, 538, 541.
Charles, Archduke, 620.
Charles I., 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 157, 177, 248, 436, 477, 673.
Charles II., 99, 136, 159, 170, 177, 248, 249, 259, 309, 426, 479, 592, 606, 672, 673.
Charles V., 25, 74, 390, 392, 619.
Charles IX., 475.
Charles XII., 217.
Charleston, 112, 405.
Charlestown, 608.
Charlemagne, 37, 73.
Charlotte, Queen, 145.
Charlton, 125.
Charon, 68.
Charpentiere, 648.
Chartreuse, 162.
Chateaubriand, 117, 118, 119, 122.
Chatham, 146, 417.
Chaumette, 637.
Chauncey, 148, 546.
Chazlett, 244.
Checkley, 546.
Cheever, 450.
Cheselsfield, 653.
Chenoo, 129.
Cheops, 384.
Chesapeake, 608, 609.
Chester, 239, 240, 660.
Chesterfield, 108.
Chevy Chace, 425.
Cheverus, 210, 410.
Cheyne, 649.
Chicago, 357.
Chigwell, 248.
Childe, 426.
Chilperic, 56, 67.
China, 93, 94, 106, 397, 401, 481, 586.
Chinese, 67, 632.
Chiron, 429.
Chitty, 192.
Christ Church, 143.
Christian Observer, 281.
Christianstadt, 97.
Christina, 456.
Christmas, 124, 671.
Christopherson, 228.
Chronicles, 122, 430.
Chrysippus, 442, 443.
Chrysostom, 437.
Chuang-tze, 482 to 494, *passim*.
Cicero, 51, 64, 79, 97, 176, 214, 217, 218, 279, 282, 377, 381, 419, 443, 578, 579, 583.
Cimon, 11.
Circé, 445.
Claudin, 124. [649.
Clarendon, 135, 136, 137.
Clarissa, 320.
Clare, 606, 652.
Clarke, 121, 122, 129, 132, 159, 378.
Clarkson, 237 to 269, *passim*.
Claudius, 67, 99.
Claudius Pulcher, 432.
Clemens Alexandrinus, 429.
Clement, 121, 650.
Cleomenes, 590, 600.
Clerimont, 591.
Clifford, 271, 651, 657.
Clinton, 60, 62.
Clytemnestra, 11.
Cobbett, 417, 447.
Cobham, 20, 654.
Coke, 181.
Colclough, 614.
Colebrooke, 22.
Colman, 214, 638.
Columbus, 362.
Colvin, 301 to 331, *passim*.
Commodus, 67.
Concord, 415.
Condé, 455.
Condy, 546.
Coneyball, 299.
Confucius, 383.
Congo, 129.
Conrad, 556, 564.
Constantinople, 22, 55, 87, 88.
Constantius, 55.
Conway, 145, 458, 538.
Cook, 129, 561.
Cooley, 316.
Coolidge, 180.
Cooper, 181, 546.
Copeland, 227.
Copley, 371, 508.
Corday, 639, 640, 641.
Cornish, 237, 332.
Cornwall, 650, 676.
"Corpse Hill," 92.
Corry, 232.
Cortez, 593.
Cossart, 507.
Cotton, 229, 230.
Courland, 227.
Courrier Extraordinaire, 639.
Courtney, 656.
Coventry, 180.
Cow Lane, 596.
Cowley, 478.
Cowler, 222, 596.
Cox, 252.
Cranmer, 279.
Crawford, 436.
Creech, 244.
Crequi, 606.
Crespigney, 606.
Creusa, 382.
Crinas, 443.
Cripplegate, 477.
Crocker, 405.
Crockett, 209.
Croese, 239, 240, 242, 262.

- Crofts, 616.
 Cromartie, 629.
 Cromwell, 134, 135, 170, 177.
 • Cromwell's Head, 557.
 Crosby, 598.
 Croyland Abbey, 124.
 Cruikshanks, 401.
 Cullender, 33, 664.
 Cunningham, 538.
 Curran, 605.
 Curwen, 513, 595.
 Cushing, 537.
 Cutheard, 591.
 Cuthbert, 37, 606.
 Cader, 508, 546, 551, 553, 554, 563.
 Cutter, 509.
 Cyclops, 430.
 Cyrus, 382.
 D.
 Daddy Osgood, 578.
 Dagobert, 74.
 Daille, 497, 498, 507, 546.
 Dainberger, 622.
 Dammory, 652.
 Dana, 142, 190, 191, 276, 337.
 Danes, 614.
 Danforth, 449.
 Dardon, 184.
 Davenport, 293, 509, 510, 512, 531, 535, 546, 547, 566.
 David, 16, 221, 617, 618, 619, 620.
 Davis, 397, 399, 400, 402, 586.
 Dead Sea, 116, 118, 119, 121, 123.
 D'Acres, 652.
 D'Arblay, 105.
 De Blois, 24, 662.
 De Burgh, 652.
 Decatur, 609, 610, 611, 624.
 Dedication, 679.
 Defoe, 87.
 De Grandison, 653.
 De Henricourt, 607.
 Dehon, 597.
 De Hoveden, 669.
 De la Croix, 507.
 Delanrey, 609.
 Delaware, 552.
 Delia, 100.
 Demades, 52.
 Demarat, 58, 59.
 De Medicis, 661.
 Demetrius, 97.
 Deming, 302, 312, 322.
 Democritus, 360.
 Demosthenes, 97.
 Dentrecolles, 481.
 Denmark, 22, 53, 82, 640.
 De Pauw, 400, 402.
 Deptford, 267.
 De Ris, 607.
 Desdemona, 82.
 Deshon, 538.
 Despencer, 655.
 De Thon, 622.
 Dettingen, 623.
 De Uzerehes, 607.
 De Valence, 655.
 De Vassor, 612.
 De Verdon, 652.
 Devergie, 557.
 Devereux, 677.
 Devon, 677.
 De Warre, 654.
 De Worde, 125.
 Dexter, 25, 450.
 Didian Law, 342.
 Dido, 382.
 Dickens, 563.
 Dickson, 31.
 Diemerbroeck, 49.
 Diemtschid, 475.
 Digby, 640, 641, 642.
 Diodorus, 18, 342.
 Diogenes, 16, 17, 18, 217.
 Diogenes Laertius, 373.
 Dionysius, 12, 98, 383.
 Dirk Hatteraick, 238.
 Dodsley's Annual Register, 578.
 Domitian, 67, 106, 120.
 Don Quixote, 591.
 Doolittle, 330.
 Dorchester Neck, 575.
 Dorchester Point, 643.
 Doring, 564.
 Dorsett, 66, 613, 622, 677.
 Douglas, 425, 536.
 Dover, 519.
 Doyle, 634.
 Dowse, 541.
 Draco, 256, 207, 209, 226.
 Draper, 91.
 Drury, 361.
 Druses, 400, 401.
 Dryden, 478, 480, 481, 576.
 Du Barri, 671.
 Dufala, 89, 249.
 Dubois, 635.
 Ducange, 643.
 Dudley, 181, 298, 497.
 Duff, 129, 435.
 Dugdale, 647, 648, 674.
 Du Halde, 402.
 Dulsany, 601.
 Dummer, 550, 551, 552, 556.
 Dumont, 605.
 Dundee, 31.
 Dunciad, 460.
 Dunmow, 124.
 Dunny, 331, 640, 664.
 Duport, 636.
 Durandus, 124.
 Dutch, 578.
 Dyer, 232.
 E.
 Earle, 94.
 Easter Eve, 675.
 Eastman, 182, 183.
 Easton, 158.
 Eatona, 378.
 Ecclesiastes, 111, 267.
 Ecclesiasticus, 431.
 Echeloot Indians, 378.
 Eckley, 597.
 Eden, 70.
 Edes, 596.
 Edessa, 57.
 Edgeworth, 103.
 Edinburgh, 89, 241.
 Edinburgh Review, 178, 209, 346.
 Edmund I., 124.
 Edmund Plantagenet, 650.
 Edom, 116.
 Edward I., 26, 187, 589, 652.
 Edward III., 342, 406, 649.
 Edward IV., 342, 589, 676.
 Edward, the Confessor, 695.
 Egypt, 33, 88, 106, 129, 400, 436.
 Egyptians, 19, 102, 110, 111, 129, 131, 206, 377, 378, 400, 517, 632, 661.
 Ekron, 431.
 Elah, 617.
 Eldon, 192, 193, 230.
 El Dorado, 71, 103.
 Eli, 197, 198.
 Eliot, 91, 495, 502, 630.
 Elliot, 610.
 Eliphaz, 217.
 Elizabeth, 103, 170, 407, 409, 593, 661.
 Elizabeth Island, 285.
 Embomma, 129, 130.
 Empedocles, 373.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, 268.
 Eador, 363, 480, 665, 670, 673.
 England, 183, 206, 210, 229, 233, 268, 346, 407, 409, 576, 583, 591, 595, 599, 600, 601, 604, 605, 606, 614, 632, 633, 634.
 English Canon, 623.
 English Mark, 651.
 Enoch, 57.
 Epicurus, 481.
 Erasistratus, 442, 443.
 Erasmus, 152.
 Erfurth, 125.
 Erpingham, 638.
 Erricus, 661.

- Erskine, 84.
 Erving, 515.
 Estwell, 677.
 Espinasse, 538.
 Ethiopia, 106.
 Europe, 106, 131, 576, 622, 665.
 Eurypus, 443.
 Euschius, 465.
 Eustis, 450.
 Eutaw Springs, 415.
 Evans, 610.
 Eve, 429.
 Evelyn, 134.
 Everett, 55, 204, 277.
 Ewins, 159.
 Exeter, 20, 204, 214, 675, 677.
 Ezekiel, 582, 583, 587.
 F.
 Fabius Maximus, 631.
 Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria, 659.
 Fagan, 193.
 Fairbanks, 190, 191, 377.
 Fakeer, 570, 571, 573, 576.
 Fales, 190, 337.
 Falmouth, 243.
 Falstaff, 624.
 Faneuil, 476 :—495 to 568, passim.
 Faneuil Hall, 211, 429, 500, 601, 535.
 Fanhope, 674.
 Farmer, 496.
 Farnham, 597.
 Farnsworth, 314, 327, 328.
 Farquhar, 480.
 Faraday, 103.
 Farrar, 159.
 Farrago, 189, 347.
 Fasti, 426.
 Faulconbridge, 321.
 Favor, 98.
 Feild, 228.
 Feinelon, 472.
 Fenner, 229.
 Ferrari, 27.
 Fielding, 272.
 Fillebrown, 498.
 Fire Island, 406.
 Fish, 665, 666, 667.
 Flacrus, 106, 337.
 Flanders, 63.
 Florence, 123, 506.
 Fleet, 147.
 Fleet Prison, 268.
 Fleet Street, 656.
 Flota, 614.
 Flagg, 431.
 Flaherty, 196.
 Flechier, 215.
 Flucker, 514.
 Folsom, 189.
 Fontenelle, 337.
 Fomereau, 521.
 Foote, 367, 371.
 Ford, 25, 268, 391.
 Fordyce, 27.
 Forrester, 286.
 Forest Hills, 68, 225.
 Forster, 629.
 Fosbrooke, 591.
 Fothergill, 642.
 Fox, 597, 665, 666, 667.
 Foxcroft, 298.
 France, 68, 88, 188, 426, 436, 593, 606, 607, 633, 634, 637, 638, 661, 670, 675.
 Francis I., 73, 97, 619, 654.
 Francis, 598, 663.
 Frankfort, 15.
 Franklin, 20, 142, 574, 599, 603, 604, 644, 645, 646.
 Franks, 614.
 Freand, 56.
 Frederick I., 28.
 Freedly, 181.
 Freeman, 165.
 French Church, 521.
 Frescati, 64.
 Frizzell, 126.
 Frizzles, 189.
 Fuller, 66, 265, 466.
 Fullerton, 605.
 G.
 Gabriel, 57, 119.
 Galen, 459.
 Galilee, 57.
 Gannett, 92, 286.
 Gardner, 299, 601.
 Garib, 480.
 Gates, 77, 81.
 Gath, 617.
 Gato, 33.
 Gaul, 617, 618, 619.
 Gaule, 659.
 Gauls, 618.
 Gaunt, 217, 656, 674.
 Gavett, 596.
 Gawler, 606.
 Gellia, 107.
 Genesis, 122, 429.
 Genethiaci, 661.
 Genevieve, 73, 75.
 Genoa, 89.
 Gentleman's Magazine, 376, 594.
 George I., 28, 218, 406.
 George II., 406, 407, 551, 623, 660.
 George III., 59, 90, 103, 144, 145, 147, 275, 604.
 George IV., 207, 209.
 Gerard, 429.
 Germanicus, 29.
 Germania, 614.
 Germantown, 415.
 Germany, 88, 426, 620.
 Gervais, 475, 670.
 Ghizeh, 33.
 Gibraltar, 88.
 Gideon, 597.
 Gill, 61.
 Gillies, 514.
 Gilpin, 74.
 Girondists, 68, 74.
 Glossin, 388.
 Gloucester, 349, 404, 652, 657.
 Goethe, 287.
 Golgotha, 35.
 Goliath, 437, 617, 618, 619.
 Gold, 227.
 Goldsmith, 21, 123, 362, 481, 584, 587, 649.
 Gomorrah, 117, 119, 221.
 Good, 49.
 Goode, 181, 184, 338.
 Gooseberry, 70.
 Gordon, 62, 147, 153, 416, 417.
 Gore, 277.
 Gorton, 480.
 Gosnold, 283.
 Goss, 677.
 Gould, 698.
 Græchus, 431.
 Grady, 601.
 Grammont, 623.
 Granger, 260.
 Granary, 24, 46, 48, 148, 197, 428, 525, 543.
 Grant, 401, 666.
 Grattan, 606.
 Gratz, 620.
 Graunt, 103.
 Gray, 161, 162, 269, 546, 550.
 Great Britain, 186, 207, 277, 347, 416, 474, 580, 663.
 Great Tom, 125.
 Greece, 103, 128, 204, 355, 373, 430, 533.
 Greeks, 68, 106, 131, 632, 661.
 Green, 596.
 Greene, 62, 159, 474.
 Greenlanders, 35.
 Greenleaf, 192, 329, 330.
 Green Mount, 38.
 Greenwood, 300, 451, 534.
 Gregory, Pope, 474.
 Grey, 347.
 Grey Friars, 632.
 Greville, 678.
 Gridley, 142.
 Griswold, 160, 360.
 Grossman, 7, 8, 18, 24, 25, 41, 50, 115, 132, 288, 680.
 Grotius, 437.

- Grouchy, 132.
 Grozier, 397.
 Grubb, 396.
 Guardian, 613.
 Guerriere, 417.
 Guiana, 130.
 Guideu, 637.
 Guicene, 656.
 Guilford, 415.
 Guillotin, 634, 635.
 Guillotine, 634, 635, 638.
 Guineau, 519.
 Gundebald, 614, 615.
 Gussanville, 663.
 Gustavus Adolphus, 661.
 H.
 Hades, 345.
 Hague, 445.
 Hakin, 400.
 Hale, 62, 124, 177, 188, 189,
 190, 209, 220, 301, 310,
 315, 324, 331, 332, 334,
 640, 664, 666.
 Halford, 134, 135, 136, 139.
 Halifax, 223, 479, 480, 634.
 Hall, 130.
 Hallam, 361.
 Haller, 157.
 Halley, 81.
 Hamilton, 277, 298, 605,
 615.
 Hammond, 180.
 Hancock, 142, 143, 166,
 299, 417, 498, 589.
 Handel, 297, 422, 427.
 Handy, 561.
 Hanan, 585.
 Hannibal, 45.
 Hanover Square, 140.
 Hanway, 90.
 Harleian Miscellany, 217,
 445, 642.
 Harper, 227.
 Harris, 555.
 Harrison, 265, 395, 396.
 Hart, 661, 662.
 Hartop, 158.
 Harvey, 157, 436.
 Haslett, 577.
 Hatch, 555, 564, 565.
 Haute, 676.
 Hawes, 375.
 Hawkins, 426.
 Hawles, 332.
 Hawtrey, 361.
 Haydn, 346, 407, 577, 579,
 590.
 Hayes, 301.
 Hayley, 477.
 Haynes, 302, 307, 310, 316,
 317, 321, 322.
 Hayward, 450, 561, 597.
 Hazael, 431.
 Hazzard, 226, 545.
 Heath, 172, 610, 611.
 Heber, 360.
 Hebrews, 33, 431.
 Hebrides, 643.
 Hector, 619.
 Heemskerck, 588.
 Helen, 619.
 Henault, 661.
 Henderson, 304.
 Henry II., 649, 651.
 Henry III., 187, 241, 661.
 Henry IV., 73, 74, 342, 352,
 409, 606, 661.
 Henry VI., 349, 674.
 Henry VII., 87, 88, 134,
 185.
 Henry VIII., 78, 133, 136,
 138, 139, 170, 185, 188,
 342, 346, 385, 409, 411,
 413, 477, 589, 631.
 Henry, 639, 663.
 Hephæstion, 373.
 Herbert, 104, 133, 138, 607.
 Hercules, 436.
 Hereford, 649, 656, 657.
 Heracles, 661, 672, 673.
 Hermes, 428.
 Heræ, 676.
 Herod, 93.
 Herodotus, 18, 21, 436.
 Heron, 657.
 Herophylus, 443, 459.
 Herr Driesbach, 613.
 Herschell, 622, 643.
 Hertford, 133, 135.
 Highgate, 37.
 Hildanus, 49, 373.
 Hill, 298, 307, 308, 310, 368,
 369, 697.
 Hiller, 553.
 Hindoos, 22, 436.
 Hindostan, 93, 100.
 Hippocrates, 436, 442, 459.
 Hirst, 508.
 Hobart, 134, 605.
 Hobkirk's Hill, 415.
 Hoboken, 615, 643.
 Hodgson, 361.
 Hodson, 601.
 Hog Alley, 562.
 Hogarth, 271.
 Holborn, 134.
 Holbrook, 408.
 Holden, 124, 227.
 Holinshed, 87, 424.
 Holland, 88, 506, 650, 662.
 Holme, 591.
 Holmes, 365, 499, 546.
 Holy Land, 651, 652.
 Romans, 450.
 Homer, 15, 17, 145, 429,
 430, 685, 686.
 Hone, 591.
 Hook, 76, 367.
 Hooper, 369, 546.
 Hopkins, 221, 422, 424.
 Horace, 36, 51, 97, 168,
 360, 367, 404, 568, 587,
 592, 663, 664.
 Horatio, 599, 600.
 Horne, 178.
 Horstius, 373.
 Hossack, 605.
 Hottentots, 34.
 Hough, 245, 246.
 Houndsditch, 661.
 Howe, 65, 697.
 Hubbard, 627.
 Hudibras, 260, 454, 627,
 628.
 Huger, 496.
 Huguenots, 496 to 500, pas-
 sim : also, 506, 507, 523,
 545, 546.
 Hull, 66, 274, 646.
 Hume, 186, 241.
 Humphreys, 646, 647.
 Hungary, 632.
 Hungerford, 233.
 Hunt, 506.
 Huntington, 655.
 Hutchinson, 226, 228, 229,
 230, 515, 538, 586, 592,
 640.
 Hydriothaphia, 42, 65, 131,
 281.
 Hydrophobia, 193.
 Hyperion, 582.
 1.
 Idumea, 116.
 Inman, 513.
 Innocent III., 468.
 Ireland, 87, 93.
 Irenæus, 171.
 Ireton, 134.
 Irish, 193.
 Irving, 657.
 Isabella, 646.
 Israel, 431.
 Israelites, 102.
 Isis, 428.
 Islip, 406.
 Istambul, 186.
 J.
 Jabbok, 118.
 Jackson, 55, 600, 605.
 Jacobs, 312.
 Jahn, 33, 432, 433, 434,
 435.
 Jamaica Pond, 69.
 James I., 170, 612, 660.
 James II., 232, 243, 248,
 253, 259.
 Jardin des Plantes, 75.
 Jasper, 256.
 Jay, 276.
 Jefferson, 85, 163, 344, 322.
 Jeffrey, 603.

- Jeffreys, 235.
 Jeffries, 450, 479, 480, 537.
 Jekyll, 532, 555.
 Jenkins, 157.
 Jenks, 117, 118.
 Jenyns, 42.
 Jepson, 597.
 Jeremiah, 105.
 Jerusalem, 119.
 Jesse, 615, 620, 623.
 Jew, 620.
 Jews, 106, 131, 170, 186, 188, 632.
 Job, 217, 225, 430.
 Jonathan, 116, 167, 414, 417.
 Jones, 159, 181, 435, 510, 513, 531, 541, 551, 566.
 Johnson Samuel, 31, 90, 107, 108, 183, 277, 409, 421, 477, 480, 481, 601, 602, 603, 604.
 Johnson, 55, 305, 306, 475.
 Johnnot, 493.
 Joany Armstrong, 425.
 Jonson Ben, 59, 479, 521.
 Jordan, 117, 118.
 Joseph, 57, 429.
 Josephus, 118, 120.
 Josselyn, 283.
 Judah, 116.
 Judeus Apella, 612.
 Judd, 77.
 Judea, 105, 116, 128, 355.
 Judicial Astrology, 661, 673.
 Judson, 616.
 Julia, 67.
 Junius, 525, 578.
 Juno, 421.
 Juvenal, 79, 585.
 K.
 Kaines, 367.
 Kamshatka, 35.
 Kast, 450.
 Katherine of Arragon, 650.
 Keatinge, 123.
 Keayne, 454.
 Keith, 239.
 Kensall Green, 37.
 Kent, 650.
 Kerr, 623.
 Kidd, 235.
 Kidder, 86.
 Kilby, 567.
 Kilmarnock, 629, 630.
 King, 276.
 Kings, 431.
 King's Chapel, 43, 55, 288, 297, 510, 534.
 Kingsmill, 227.
 Kingstreet, 509.
 Kingstown, 507.
 Kirchnerus, 434.
 Kirchmann, 106.
 Kirriel, 677.
 Kishun, 118.
 Kitchen, 231, 232.
 Kittal-al-Machaid, 401.
 Knox, 369.
 Koran, 21.
 L.
 Lacedemonians, 12, 13, 17.
 La Cheze, 636.
 Lacombe, 648.
 Lafayette, 62, 84, 636.
 Lahore, 570.
 Lally, 636.
 Lamartine, 68.
 Lambert, 555.
 Lamia, 49, 373.
 Lancashire, 420.
 Lancaster, 650.
 Landgrave of Hesse, 587.
 Landseer, 678.
 Lane, 598.
 Langdon, 92, 127.
 Langstaff, 92.
 Lansdowne, 365.
 Laou-Kem, 481.
 Larassy, 179.
 Lares, 64.
 Larkin, 101.
 Larrey, 607.
 Larve, 64.
 Lathrop, 595.
 Latimer, 75, 279, 655.
 Laurel Hill, 38.
 Laurens, 374, 496.
 Lavater, 625.
 Lavinia, 619.
 Lazarus, 56.
 Leadenhall Market, 213, 220.
 Le Cat, 643.
 Lechemere, 554.
 Lectouse, 37.
 Ledeia, 229.
 Lee, 126, 276.
 L'Etoile, 166.
 Le Gros, 639.
 Leibnitz, 439.
 Leicestershire, 63, 648.
 Le Mercier, 497, 498, 516, 547, 548, 549.
 Lemures, 64.
 Lenoir, 40.
 Lenox, 605.
 Leopard, 608.
 Lepidas, 52.
 Leuconoe, 663.
 Levi, 382.
 Leviticus, 230.
 Lewis, 378.
 Lewyn, 81.
 Lexington, 415.
 Liancourt, 636.
 Libo, 99.
 Licinius, 80.
 Lilly, 691, 661, 673.
 Lincoln, 91, 312, 674.
 Lincoln's Inn, 593.
 Lind, 420.
 Lindsey, 133, 135.
 Linnaeus, 399.
 Linnington, 553.
 Lippstadt, 661.
 Lithered, 560.
 Little Belt, 417.
 Liverpool, 417.
 Livingston, 276.
 Livy, 52, 80, 617, 619.
 Lizard, 407.
 Lloyd, 35, 265, 367, 448, 419.
 Lloyd's Lists, 404.
 Locke, 266.
 Locrian Law, 342.
 Loe, 248, 249.
 Lollards, 658.
 Lombards, 186.
 London, 37, 56, 67, 76, 87, 88, 89, 94, 118, 211, 213, 220, 237, 346, 421, 588, 589, 591, 624, 632, 632, 676.
 London Quarterly Review, 212, 356, 397, 391, 622, 634, 641.
 London Times, 358.
 Long, 513.
 Long Branch, 320.
 Long Island, 62.
 Longshanks, 187, 583.
 Longspee, 651.
 Lot's Wife, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122.
 Loudon, 213, 214.
 Louis, 636.
 Louis XI., 74.
 Louis XII., 73.
 Louis XIII., 74, 352, 607.
 Louis XIV., 38, 74, 75, 351, 607, 612, 670, 671.
 Louis XV., 671, 672.
 Louis XVI., 635, 637, 638.
 Louison, 636, 637.
 Lovat, 628.
 Lovell, 139—496 to 530, passim.
 Lowell, 83.
 Luean, 670.
 Lucilius, 106, 107, 168, 377, 443.
 Ludlow, 226.
 Lum Akum, 598.
 Luther, 388.
 Lutton, 123, 132.
 Lutzingen, 661.
 Lyeurgus, 17.
 Lyman, 202, 203.
 Lynn, 658.
 Lyon, 324.
 Lyons, 438.

- M.**
 Mabillon, 124.
 Macabe, 195.
 McAndrew, 181.
 Macartney, 402, 605.
 Macaulay, 231 to 269, *passim*—also 361.
 McDonough, 418.
 McGammon, 196.
 McGill, 332.
 Machaon, 430.
 Machiavelli, 95, 115, 220, 234.
 Machyl, 82.
 McKeon, 614.
 Mackenzie, 606, 610, 611, 624.
 Mackintosh, 207, 346.
 McLean, 621.
 McNamara, 197.
 McNaughten, 573.
 Machpelah, 299.
 Mæneas, 36, 679.
 Mag-Astro-Mancer, 659.
 Magdalen College, 243, 244, 246.
 Magdalen, 56.
 Magee, 195.
 Magnalia, 582.
 Mahomet, 171.
 Mahoney, 193.
 Maillard, 73.
 Mailosel, 654.
 Maintenon, 671, 672.
 Majoribanks, 401.
 Malmsbury, 87.
 Malone, 481.
 Malpessant, 654.
 Malia, 33, 624.
 Maltravers, 655.
 Mammon, 170.
 Mamre, 299.
 Manchester, 303 to 325, *passim*.
 Mandans, 23, 51.
 Mandeville, 118, 344, 345, 599.
 Manlius, 617, 618, 619, 634.
 Mauers, 64.
 Manigault, 496.
 Meun, 382, 629.
 Mauering, 360.
 Maaney, 654.
 Mansfield, 95, 115, 220, 234.
 Mantua, 422.
 Marsi, 217.
 Marbeuf, 639.
 Marc Antony, 387.
 Marcellinus, 64.
 March, 653, 655, 666.
 Marco Polo, 400.
 Marcus Antoninus, 584.
 Mareschall, 654.
 Maret, 37.
 Mariner, 129.
 Marion, 496.
 Mariti, 88.
 Marius, 63.
 Marseillais, 426, 637.
 Marseilles, 88.
 Marshall, 55, 83, 355.
 Martel, 73.
 Martial, 107, 419, 586, 587, 595.
 Martin, 189.
 Martinico, 166.
 Martinique, 29.
 Mary, Bloody, 75, 82, 93, 405.
 Maryland, 153, 154.
 Masbee, 696.
 Mason, 101, 102.
 Massachusetts, 84, 94, 114, 153, 156, 164, 165, 166, 176, 187, 231, 276, 632.
 Mather, 94, 280, 327, 364, 367, 546, 582, 668.
 Matthews, 180, 367, 613.
 Matocara, 378.
 Maury, 636.
 Maverick, 163.
 Maximilian II., 620, 621.
 Maynard, 81.
 Mazarin, 135.
 Mazzei, 163.
 Mead, 588.
 Mears, 497, 663.
 Meaux, 671.
 Mediterranean, 118.
 Megret, 217.
 Melancthon, 388.
 Melli Melli, 568.
 Mena, 130, 583, 687, 692.
 Menalcas, 90.
 Menander, 217.
 Menu, 130.
 Merrick, 221.
 Merrill, 313 to 325, *passim*.
 Mewins, 464.
 Mexico, 101, 638.
 Michaelis, 119.
 Midsummer Night's Dream, 592.
 Milan, 220, 456.
 Mildmay, 133.
 Milton, 342.
 Milford Haven, 88.
 Miller, 643.
 Millenarius, 672.
 Millengen, 36, 49.
 Millens, 92.
 Miller, 555.
 Millot, 659.
 Mills, 455.
 Miltiades, 11.
 Milton, 159, 386, 387, 477.
 Minzies, 553.
 Minoresses, 657.
 Minors, 654.
 Minshull, 386.
 Mirepoix, 382.
 Mirfield, 380.
 Mission, 56.
 Missouri, 23.
 Mitford, 477.
 Moab, 116.
 Mock, 597.
 Mohawk Indian, 647.
 Mohun, 605, 613.
 Momus, 368.
 Monmouth, 235.
 Montacute, 650.
 Montaigne, 27, 104, 343, 443.
 Montague, 55.
 Montebore, 15.
 Monte Notte, 381.
 Montesquieu, 342.
 Montezuma, 63, 593.
 Montmorenci, 607.
 Moody, 30, 189, 471.
 Moore, 472.
 Moorhead, 150, 286, 389, 631, 632, 546.
 Moors, 138.
 Moravians, 379.
 More, 359, 361.
 Morin, 419, 420.
 Morland, 466 to 470, *passim*.
 Morose, 591.
 Morris, 420, 609, 611.
 Mortimer, 651, 653.
 Morton, 628, 634.
 Moses, 429, 660.
 Mount Auburn, 38, 46, 68, 225.
 Mounts Bay, 407.
 Mount Hope, 33.
 Moyle, 677.
 Mudge, 608.
 Mullowny, 194.
 Mun Chung, 398.
 Murphy, 101, 102, 107, 193.
 Murray, 477.
 Murulus, 106.
 Muses, 421.
 Muskerry, 243.
 Musenden, 657.
 Mydas, 591.
 Mysore, 436.
 Mytelene, 12.
N
 Nsaman, 431.
 Nain, 320.
 Nantasket, 400.
 Nantes, 37.
 Nantucket, 77.
 Naples, 33, 88.
 Napoleon, 106, 381, 393.
 Narcissa, 22.
 Nares, 580, 591, 593.

- Narragansett Bay, 283, 284.
 Naseby, 131, 386.
 Natchez, 587.
 Nau, 122.
 Negoose, 189, 190, 191
 347.
 Nemours, 607.
 New, 581.
 Newcastle, 90.
 New England, 177, 221
 283, 408, 476, 607, 627.
 Newgate, 179, 183, 259,
 622, 632.
 New London, 363.
 New North Church, 125,
 126.
 New Orleans, 604.
 New Rochelle, 523, 530.
 Newton, 66.
 New York, 576.
 New York Evening Post,
 330, 331.
 New Zealand, 23, 94.
 Nicholls, 193, 122, 648.
 Nicolas, 648.
 Ninkemau, 466.
 Niobe, 121.
 Nipmug, 496.
 Noah, 176.
 Noailles, 623, 671.
 Noble, 262.
 Noddle's Island, 163.
 Nollekens, 676.
 Norfolk, 677.
 Norman, 453.
 Normandy, 635, 675.
 Norris, 232.
 North American Review,
 330.
 Norway, 88, 168.
 Norwich, 346.
 Notre Dame, 124.
 Nova Scotia, 568.
 Noyes, 506.
 Numa, 69, 105, 106.
 Numbers, 122.
 Nunhead, 37.
 O.
 Oak Hall, 133.
 O'Brien, 355.
 O'Connell, 606.
 Odyssey, 11.
 Ogilvie, 606.
 Oglethorpe, 601, 603, 604.
 Ogygia, 420.
 Olam Fodia, 93.
 Old Brick, 123, 132, 128,
 567.
 Oldmixon, 268.
 Oliver, 140, 141, 142, 513
 638.
 Omnibus, 191, 347.
 Oporto, 55.
 Orde, 188.
 Orfila, 219.
 Origen, 436.
 Orinoco, 130.
 Orleans, 135.
 Orreery, 250.
 Osborne, 573.
 Osiris, 428.
 O'Shane, 194.
 Ossa, 658.
 Ossoli, 406.
 Otis, Harrison Gray, 159.
 Otis, James, 211, 354.
 Ottomans, 672, 673.
 Outhier, 51.
 Ovid, 64, 98, 105, 106, 223,
 248, 392, 413, 558.
 Oxford, 87, 125, 244, 245,
 243, 249, 360, 497, 498,
 499, 653, 654.
 Oxnard, 513.
 P.
 Packinett, 498.
 Page, 566.
 Paine, 598.
 Palestine, 34, 121, 204, 651.
 Palermo, 591.
 Paliaurus, 168.
 Pallas, 99.
 Palmer, 536, 537, 597.
 Pantagathus, 586.
 Parant Duchatelet, 219.
 Paré, 589.
 Pareicus, 588.
 Parian Marbles, 382.
 Paris, 37, 39, 73, 89, 249,
 438, 634, 636, 637, 667,
 671.
 Parker, 246, 506.
 Parkman, 270 to 273, pas-
 sim —also 278, 335, 336.
 Parr, 157.
 Parsoes, 130.
 Parsons, 276, 451.
 Passy, 599.
 Patchogue, 406.
 Patroclus, 15, 67, 107.
 Pauketpecker, 457.
 Paulding, 62.
 Paul, 658.
 Paull, 606.
 Pausanias, 421.
 Pavice, 565.
 Paxton, 513.
 Paybody, 175.
 Peake, 192.
 Pearson, 175, 189.
 Peck, 498.
 Pecker, 449.
 Peel, 207, 346.
 Pekin, 481.
 Pelion, 658.
 Pelletier, 637.
 Pemberton, 536, 563, 566.
 Pembroke, 553, 554, 555, 677.
 Penn, 231 to 269 passim —
 also 339.
 Pennant, 634.
 Pennsylvania, 94.
 Pendleton, 605.
 Pepin, 73.
 Pepperell, 508.
 Pepusch, 427.
 Pepys, 466, 468, 577.
 Percival, 599, 603.
 Percy, 425.
 Perry, 418, 610, 611.
 Persepolis, 475.
 Persia, 475.
 Persians, 632.
 Persius, 592.
 Peters, 450.
 Petre, 281.
 Petronel, 620, 621.
 Pew, 49.
 Peyret, 508.
 Pharamond, 72.
 Pharsalia, 670.
 Phelps, 227.
 Philadelphia, 36, 38, 268,
 339, 614.
 Philip Augustus, 39.
 Philip the Bold, 73.
 Philippos, 588.
 Phillips, 408, 421, 495, 505,
 531, 541, 542 —also 560
 to 566 passim —also 568.
 Philistines, 617, 618, 619.
 Philomela, 42.
 Picardy, 635.
 Pickering, 165, 221, 439.
 Pickett, 189.
 Pickworth, 283.
 Pierce, 597.
 Pierre de Nemours, 39.
 Pierson, 226.
 Pigot, 555.
 Pinchbeke, 675.
 Pinckney, 277.
 Pindar, 96.
 Pineau, 49.
 Pinohe, 81.
 Pitcairn, 54, 223.
 Pitcher, 363, 658.
 Pitt, 145, 146, 606.
 Pitaeus, 12.
 Place de Grève, 73, 636, 637.
 Place de la Revolution, 638.
 Place St. Antoine, 638.
 Plaine de Mont Louis, 40.
 Plaisant, 639.
 Plaistowe, 230.
 Plato, 20, 49, 373, 577, 429
 Plautus, 577, 587.
 Pleydell, 360.
 Plimouth, 283, 628.
 Pliny, 79, 99, 117, 121, 419,
 430, 442, 443, 450, 459,
 461, 462, 582, 583, 588.

- Plutarch, 105, 106, 217, 400, 591.
 Pococke, 111, 118.
 Podalirius, 430.
 Pecon, 430.
 Poitiers, 654.
 Poitou, 358.
 Polack, 23.
 Pole, 75.
 Polhamus, 319, 320, 323.
 Pollard, 29.
 Pompadour, 41, 43.
 Pompey, 443, 444, 670.
 Pontina, 373.
 Pontraci, 39, 40, 54, 59.
 Popayan, 130.
 Pope, 111, 331, 361, 453, 480.
 Popple, 263.
 Porchalion, 674.
 Portland, 64, 65.
 Port Mahon, 42.
 Potter, 12.
 Powell, 386.
 Pratt, 314, 327.
 Pretender, 629.
 Prevot, 49.
 Priam, 322.
 Price, 520, 511.
 Priest, 612.
 Primrose, 111.
 Prince of Orange, 233.
 Pringle, 496.
 Prioleau, 496.
 Prior, 54, 233.
 Pritchard, 550.
 Proctor, 632.
 Prudhomme, 637.
 Psamatheus, 33.
 Pseudodoxia, 431, 660.
 Puddifant, 131, 133.
 Pudding Lane, 596.
 Purchase Street, 397.
 Puzzlepot, 189.
 Pwan Yekoo, 393.
 Pyramus, 592.
 Pythagoras, 377.
 Q.
 Quakers, 445.
 Quincy, 43, 156, 401, 416, 605.
 Quintilius Varus, 614.
 Quintus, 578.
 R.
 Rachel, 569.
 Radzivil, 121.
 Rand, 419, 643.
 Randall, 228.
 Randolph, 85, 603.
 Raulegh, 266.
 Rapin, 177, 183, 186, 241, 349, 612, 671.
 Rauber, 620, 621.
 Ravalliac, 73.
 Ravenscroft, 298.
 Raymond, 309, 315, 326, 327.
 Read, 520.
 Reason, 562.
 Recueil Periodique, 643.
 Reese, 357.
 Regent's Inlet, 645.
 Religio Medici, 610.
 Remus, 64.
 Reuben, 116.
 Revallion, 582.
 Richard II., 649, 650, 657.
 Richardson, 662.
 Riehelieu, 612.
 Richmond, 133, 135, 677.
 Ridley, 279, 571.
 Riley, 181.
 Rivet, 20.
 Robertson, 241, 290, 391, 392, 393.
 Robespierre, 638.
 Robinson, 232, 260, 261, 514.
 Robin Hood, 517.
 Rochelle, 495, 506, 507, 551.
 Rochester, 216, 266, 424, 480, 587, 631.
 Rochefoucault, 217, 218, 338.
 Rockingham, 145.
 Rockport, 16.
 Roebuck, 606.
 Roederer, 636, 637.
 Rogers, 279, 417.
 Rogerson, 450.
 Roma, 617.
 Roman, 618, 619.
 Romans, 68, 106, 131, 475, 592, 594, 595, 617, 632, 661.
 Roman Catholics, 600.
 Rome, 87, 89, 263, 343, 442, 460, 475, 614, 638, 661.
 Romilly, 207, 316.
 Romulus, 105, 474, 591, 595.
 Rosamond, 651.
 Roscius, 215.
 Rose Cullender, 640.
 Rose in Bloom, 405.
 Ross, 641, 645, 646, 647.
 Rothschild, 15, 54.
 Rous, 227.
 Rouse, 631.
 Rousseau, 476.
 Rowlett, 82.
 Roxbury, 220, 221, 227, 566.
 Royal Society, 622, 644.
 Rue d'Enfer, 39, 42.
 Rufus, 320.
 Runjeet Singh, 570, 571, 572, 573.
 Russell, 29.
 Rush, 447.
 Rushworth, 424.
 Russia, 276.
 Russians, 129, 474.
 Ruthven, 606.
 Rutland Herald, 318, 331.
 Rymer's Fœdera, 349, 675, S.
 St. Andrew, 55.
 St. Anne, 56.
 St. Augustine, 51.
 St. Clara, 52.
 St. Christophers, 533.
 St. Croix, 11, 52, 98, 422.
 St. Denis, 73, 75.
 St. Edmunds Bury, 640.
 St. James, 424.
 St. Katherine, 651.
 St. Luke, 55.
 St. Margaret, 651, 675.
 St. Martins, 124.
 St. Mary, 655, 675.
 St. Mathew, 217.
 St. Michael, 57, 124.
 St. Omers, 263, 426.
 St. Paul, 437.
 St. Paul's, 225, 642, 656.
 St. Peter, 56.
 St. Pierre, 476.
 St. Richard, 656.
 St. Saba, 122.
 St. Saturnin, 37.
 St. Thomas, 56, 321, 656.
 Sabine, 510.
 Sabarra, 587.
 Sackville, 145, 549, 551, 613.
 Salem, 54.
 Salewarp, 651.
 Salisbury, 307, 650, 651, 669, 674.
 Sallust, 381.
 Salmon, 87.
 Salter, 550.
 Saltonstall, 533.
 Sancee, 665.
 Samson, 437.
 Samuel, 111, 363, 434, 585, 620, 660, 670.
 Samuels, 15.
 Sancho Panza, 192, 265.
 Sanders, 131.
 Sanson, 633, 635, 636, 637, 638.
 Sardinia, 88.
 Sargent, 180, 533.
 Sarsaparilla, 133.
 Sarum, 363.
 Saul, 16, 67, 434, 617, 618, 670.
 Saulien, 37.
 Saunders, 176.
 Sauvages, 101.

- Savage, 55.
Savo, 606.
Scaliger, 437.
Scharsegin, 620, 621.
Schmidt, 381.
Schrieder, 356.
Scipio Africanus, 22, 216.
Scott, 49, 227, 269, 360,
375, 376, 422, 426, 606.
Scope, 675.
Scutari, 22.
Segor, 117.
Seignelay, 239.
Selridge, 449.
Selkirk, 171.
Selwyn, 179, 237, 615, 628,
642.
Seneca, 106, 107, 168, 169,
377, 443, 585.
Senisino, 421.
Serampore, 281.
Sergius Orator, 461.
Servius, 97, 279.
Sèvres, 671.
Sewall, 142, 165, 513, 546,
553, 558, 561, 630.
Seymour, 133, 136, 608.
Shades, 587.
Shakespeare, 83, 409, 419,
658.
Shandois, 77, 82.
Sharp, 93.
Shattuck, 222, 439, 440.
Shaw, 112, 221, 459.
Shays, 941.
Shea, 54.
Sheerness, 538, 564.
Shelburne, 605.
Shelden, 261.
Sheldon, 314, 327.
Shelson, 299.
Sheridan, 613.
Shirley, 291, 297, 530.
Shochoh, 615.
Shouldham, 652.
Shrewsbury, 320.
Shute, 298.
Shylock, 171.
Siberia, 35.
Sicily, 33, 591.
Sicilies, the Two, 89.
Siddim, 117.
Sidney, 425.
Sigal, 515.
Sigourney, 496, 498.
Simmons, 130.
Skinner, 309, 331.
Smallpiece, 598.
Smith, Sidney, 367.
Smith, 24, 27, 71, 152, 164,
227, 289, 509, 591.
Smuk, 101.
Smollett, 241, 243.
Snow, 537.
Socrates, 592.
Sodom, 117, 119, 120, 123,
213, 221.
Sodoma, 122.
Solomon, 192.
Solon, 209.
Somerset, 677.
Sonnium Scipionis, 373.
Sao Chune, 395.
Soong, 432.
Sophia Charlotte, 28.
Sorbiere, 437, 457.
Sosigenes, 474.
Southampton, 135.
Southwick, 227.
Spain, 650, 662, 675.
Spaniards, 130.
Sparks, 62, 561.
Speed, 76, 424, 677.
Spelman, 643.
Spitalfields, 67, 256.
Spoonier, 450.
Spring, 512.
Springett, 252.
Sprout, 676.
Stafford, 632.
Stair, 623.
Stanford, 650.
Stanhope, 593.
Starkie, 192.
Staunford, 675.
Steele, 555.
Stephanus, 105.
Stephens, 117, 118, 121,
122, 123.
Sterne, 37.
Sterndale, 231, 424, 425.
Steuben, 62.
Stevens, 554.
Stevenson, 232.
Stewart, 609.
Sullivan, 631.
Surling Castle, 95.
Sturington, 632.
Stockholm, 52.
Stone Chapel, 296.
Story, 268.
Stow, 20, 67, 346, 349, 424.
Stowell, 632.
Strabo, 592.
Streathfield, 105.
Styrie, 77, 81, 82, 89, 139,
279, 280, 281, 409, 410,
424, 631, 632.
Stuart, 603, 605, 606.
Stuarts, 661.
Stubbe, 594.
Sue, 639, 640.
Suetonius, 29, 67, 79, 96,
99, 107, 463.
Suffolk, 654.
Sully, 532, 606.
Sulma, 350.
Summer, 19, 132.
Sunderland, 89, 243.
Suriann, 351.
Sweden, 661.
Swedenborg, 378, 379.
Swedes, 661.
Swift, 32, 193, 367, 422.
Swingford, 674.
Switzerland, 394.
Sykes, 344.
Sylla, 63, 97.
Sylvester, 596.
Syracuse, 33.
Syrrens, 421.
Syria, 34, 83.
Syrians, 632.
T.
Tacitus, 29, 99, 107.
Tahiti, 378, 380.
Tailor, 531.
Tappan, 53, 60.
Tarpeian Rock, 618.
Tasman, 129.
Tate, 31, 596.
Taylor, 34, 110, 157, 215,
394, 395, 396, 397, 638,
662.
Tamilton, 235.
Tees, 379.
Templeman, 451.
Tereace, 267.
Tertullian, 122.
Testaments Vetusta, 648,
649.
Tewksbury, 655, 673.
Thacher, 31, 59, 61, 126,
127, 658, 668.
Thebes, 16, 32.
Theodolphus, 57.
Theodosius, 36.
Theophrastus, 587.
Thessalus, 443.
Thessaly, 670.
Thivet, 113.
Thiermeyer, 642.
Thomas, 346, 480.
Thomas of Canterbury, 281.
Thompson, 86.
Thornton, 477, 604.
Thurlow, 569.
Tiberius, 98.
Tibullus, 100, 160.
Tierney, 606.
Tibury, 670.
Tillotson, 178, 233, 240,
262, 264.
Timoleon, 12.
Tiville, 638.
Tonga Islands, 129.
Toogataboo, 129.
Tonstrina, 588.
Tortugas, 407.
Touchet, 380.
Tournay, 67.
Tower Hill, 631, 632.

- Townshend, 146.
 Trajan, 476.
 Trenchard, 265.
 Trent, 606.
 Trisham, 77.
 Treviso, 381.
 Troughton, 644.
 Troutbeck, 297.
 Troy, 322, 430.
 Trunnon, 221.
 Truro, 406.
 Tanfugge, 654.
 Tubero, 373.
 Tuck, 564, 566.
 Tuckett, 606.
 Tuckey, 129, 130.
 Tudor, 76.
 Tunbrugge, 654.
 Turkey, 106.
 Turkish Empire, 672.
 Turks, 123.
 Turenne, 73, 75.
 Turner, 155, 157, 231, 570, 575.
 Twiss, 230.
 Tyburn, 340, 632.
 Tyler, 600.
 U.
 Ucalegon, 143.
 Ula-Deguisi, 123.
 Ulysses, 106, 109, 420.
 United States, 347, 407, 434, 610.
 Usher, 561.
 Uxbridge, 16.
 V.
 Val de Graca, 68.
 Valentia, 606.
 Valerius Maximus, 374.
 Vallemont, 455.
 Valois, 622.
 Valvasor, 620.
 Van Buren, 85, 95, 96.
 Van Butchell, 445, 447.
 Vandyke, 137.
 Van Gelder, 69.
 Van Pronk, 25.
 Vans, 184.
 Van Wart, 63.
 Varden, 401.
 Vardy, 564.
 Varro, 583.
 Vassal, 296.
 Vaughan, 361.
 Velleius Paterculus, 614.
 Vere, 654.
 Verney, 677.
 Vermont, 114.
 Veronica, 57.
 Verulam, 258.
 Vespasian, 29, 67, 98.
 Vesuvius, 121.
 Vexius Valens, 443.
 Victoria, 208.
 Victory, 646.
 Vicq d'Azyr, 37.
 Vienna, 433.
 Villars, 607.
 Vincent, 256, 257, 258.
 Virgil, 76, 79, 97, 99, 419, 422.
 Virginia, 153, 154.
 Volney, 117, 119, 121.
 Voltaire, 217, 637.
 W.
 Wade, 570, 572, 573, 575.
 Wakefield, 359, 466.
 Waldo, 90, 302.
 Walpole, 382, 431, 629, 674.
 Waltham, 676.
 Walsingham, 65, 83, 84, 650, 656.
 Ward, 281, 282, 528, 529, 595.
 Ward's Curwen, 510.
 Warre, 235, 236.
 Warren, 55, 66, 222, 446, 450, 597.
 Warwick, 651.
 Washington, 62, 277, 394, 511.
 Waterhouse, 448.
 Waterloo, 132.
 Watts, 366, 677.
 Webb, 91, 126, 546.
 Webster, 159, 160, 271, 280, 335, 336, 337.
 Wedgewood, 64.
 Weever, 76, 124.
 Wellesley, 606.
 Wellington, 606.
 Wells, 273.
 Welsh, 450.
 Wendell, 538.
 Wentworth, 554.
 Westminster, 37, 134.
 Westminster Abbey, 34, 78, 136, 290, 478.
 Weston, 622.
 Westwood, 651.
 Wharton, 227.
 Whelpley, 322.
 Whipple, 450, 596.
 Whiston, 120.
 White, 82.
 Whitehall, 134.
 Whitehead, 256, 257, 258.
 Whitehurst, 158.
 White Plains, 351, 415.
 Wicbe, 651.
 Wigmore, 656.
 Wilkes, 145, 605.
 Willard, 520, 566.
 William, the Conqueror, 614.
 William and Mary, 248.
 William III., 232, 233, 248, 253.
 William IV., 37, 207, 208.
 Williams, 27, 29, 63, 164, 204.
 Williamson, 630.
 Willis, 88, 181.
 Wils, 656.
 Wiltshire, 677.
 Winchelsea, 606.
 Winchester, 280, 400, 651.
 Windsor, 153, 155, 136.
 Winkle, 231.
 Winslow, 555, 564, 565, 595.
 Winterbottom, 435.
 Winthrop, 535, 538.
 Wisigoths, 407.
 Wiskel, 623.
 Wode, 632.
 Wolton, 678.
 Wood, 133, 181, 232, 248, 249, 424, 425, 426, 613, 642.
 Woodbridge, 550 to 564, passim.
 Woodcock, 386.
 Woods, 127.
 Worcester, 124, 651, 652.
 Woronzow, 622.
 Wraxall, 622, 623.
 Wyatt, 631.
 Y.
 Yale, 580.
 York, 675.
 York, Duke of, 252, 256.
 Yorktown, 415.
 Younge, 676.
 Z.
 Zaire, 129.
 Zeleucus, 342.
 Zeno, 49.
 Zeres, 56.
 Zimmermann, 347.
 Zion, 423.
 Zisca, 26.
 Zoar, 121.
 Zophar, 217.

DEALINGS

WITH

T H E D E A D .

BY

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

Lucius Hanson.

VOLUME II.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
83 AND 85 CONGRESS STREET:
AND
TICKNOR AND FIELDS,
CORNER OF WASHINGTON AND SCHOOL STREETS.
MDCCCLVI.

From the Library of
Rev. H. W. FOOTHILL

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855, by
DUTTON AND WENTWORTH,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Dealings with the Dead.

BY

A SEXTON OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

No. XC.

My earliest recollections of some, among the dead and buried aristocracy of Boston, find a ready embodiment, in cocked hats of enormous proportions, queues reaching to their middles, cloaks of scarlet broadcloth, lined with silk, and faced with velvet, and just so short, as to exhibit the swell of the leg, silk stockings, and breeches, highly polished shoes, and large, square, silver buckles, embroidered vests, with deep lappet pockets, similar to those, which were worn, in the age of *Louis Quatorze*, shirts ruffled, at the bosoms and sleeves, doeskin or beaver gloves, and glossy, black, Surinam walking canes, six feet in length, and commonly carried by the middle.

Of the last of the Capulets we know nearly all, that it is desirable to know. Of the last of the cocked hats we are not so clearly certified.

The dimensions of the military cocked hat were terrible ; and, like those enormous, bear skin caps, which are in use, at present, eminently calculated to put the enemy to flight. I have seen one of those enormous cocked hats, which had long been preserved, as a memorial of the wearer's gallantry. In one corner, and near the extremity, was a round hole, said to have been made by a musket ball, at the battle of White Plains, Nov. 30, 1776. As I contemplated this relic, it was impossible to avoid

the comforting reflection, that the head of the gallant proprietor was at a very safe distance from the bullet.

After the assassination of Henry IV., and greatly to the amusement of the gay and giddy courtiers of his successor, Louis XIII.—old Sully obstinately adhered to the costume of the former reign. Colonel Barnabas Clarke was very much of Sully's way of thinking. "And who," asks the reader, "was Colonel Barnabas Clarke?" He was a pensioner of the United States, and died a poor, though highly respected old man, in the town of Randolph, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts. For several years, he commanded the third Regiment of the first Brigade, and first Division of infantry; and he wore the largest cocked hat and the longest queue in the known world. He was a broad-shouldered, strong-hearted Revolutioner. Let me take the reader aside, for a brief space; and recite to him a pleasant anecdote of old Colonel Barnabas Clarke, which occurred, under my own observation, when John Brooks—whose patent of military nobility bears date at Saratoga, but who was one of nature's noblemen from his cradle—was governor of Massachusetts.

There was a militia muster of the Norfolk troops, and they were reviewed by Governor Brooks. They were drawn up in line. The Governor, bare headed, with his suite, had moved slowly down, in front of the array, each regiment, as he passed, paying the customary salute.

The petty *chapeau militaire* had then become almost universal, and, with, or without, its feather and gold edgings, was all over the field. Splendid epaulettes and eaglets glittered, on the shoulders of such, as were entitled to wear them. Prancing horses were caracoling and curvetting, in gaudy trappings. In the midst of this showy array, in front of his regiment, bolt upright, upon the back of his tall, chestnut horse, that, upon the strength of an extra allowance of oats, pawed the ground, and seemed to forget, that he was in the plough, the day before, sat an old man, of rugged features, and large proportions. Upon his head was that enormous cocked hat, of other days—upon his shoulders, scarcely distinguishable, was a small pair of tarnished epaulettes—the gray hairs at the extremity of his prodigious queue lay upon the crupper of his saddle—his ancient boots shaped to the leg, his long shanked spurs, his straight silver-hilted sword, and lion-headed pistols were of 1776. Such was the outer man of old Colonel Barnabas Clarke.

As the Governor advanced, upon the line of the third Regiment of the first Brigade, the fifes of that regiment commenced their shrill whistle, and the drums began to roll; and, at the appropriate moment, the veteran saluted his excellency, in that rather angular style, which was common, in the days of our military fathers.

At that moment, Governor Brooks checked his horse, and, replacing his hat upon his head, dismounted, and walked towards the Colonel, who, comprehending the intention, returned his sword to its scabbard, and came to the ground, with the alertness of a much younger man. They met midway, between the line and the reviewing cortege—in an instant, each grasped the other's hand, with the ardor of men, who are mutually endeared, by the recollection of partnership, in days of danger and daring—they had been fellow lodgers, within the intrenchments of Burgoyne, on the memorable night of October 7, 1777. After a few words of mutual respect and affection, they parted—the review went forward—the fifers and drummers outdid themselves—the beholders sent forth an irrepressible shout—and when old Colonel Barnabas got up once again, upon his chestnut horse, I thought he looked considerably more like old Frederick, hat, queue, and all, than he did, before he got down. He looked as proud as Tamerlane, after he had caged the Sultan, Bajazet—yet I saw him dash a tear from his eye, with the sleeve of his coat—I found one in my own. How frail we are!—there is one there now!

While contemplating the remarkable resurrection that has occurred, within a few years, of old chairs and tables, porcelain and candlesticks, I confidently look forward to the resurrection of cocked hats. They were really very becoming. I speak not of those vasty beavers, manufactured, of yore, by that most accomplished, gentlemanly, and facetious of all hatters, Mr. Nathaniel Balch, No. 72 old Cornhill; but such as he made, for his excellent friend, and boon companion, Jeremiah Allen, Esquire, high Sheriff of Suffolk. When trimmed with gold lace, and adorned with the official cockade, it was a very becoming affair.

No man carried the fashion, as I have described it, in the commencement of this article, to a greater extent, than Mr. Thomas Marshall, more commonly known as *Tommy Marshall*. He was a tailor, and his shop and house were in State Street,

near the present site of the Boston Bank. In London, his leisurely gait, finished toilette, admirable personal equipments, and exceedingly composed and courtly carriage and deportment would have passed him off, for a gentleman, living at his ease, or for one of the nobility. Mr. Marshall was remarkable, for the exquisite polish, and classical cut of his cocked hat. He was much on 'change, in those primitive days, and highly respected, for his true sense of honor. Though the most accomplished tailor of his day, no one ever suspected him of cabbage.

When I began the present article, it was my design to have written upon a very different subject—but since all my cogitations have been "*knocked into a cocked hat*," I may as well close this article, with a short anecdote of Tommy Marshall.

There was a period—there often is, in similar cases—during which it was doubtful, if the celebrated James Otis was a sane or an insane man. During that period, he was engaged for the plaintiff, in a cause, in which Mr. Marshall was a witness, for the defendant. After a tedious cross examination, Mr. Otis perceived the impossibility of perplexing the witness, or driving him into any discrepancy; and, in a moment of despair, his mind, probably, not being perfectly balanced, he lifted his finger, and shaking it, knowingly, at the witness, exclaimed—"Ah, Tommy Marshall, Tommy Marshall, I know you!" "And what do you know of me, sir?" cried the witness, doubling his fist in the very face of Mr. Otis, and stamping on the floor—"I know you're a tailor, Tommy!"

No. XCI.

WAKE—Vigil—Wæcan—import one and the same thing. So we are informed, by that learned antiquary, John Whitaker, in his History of Manchester, published in 1771. Originally, this was a festival, kept by watching, through the night, preceding the day, on which a church was dedicated. We are told, by Shakspeare—

He that outlives this day, and sees old age,
Will yearly, on the *vigil*, feast his neighbors,
And say *tomorrow* is Saint Crispian.

These vigils, like the *agapæ*, or love-feasts, fell, erelong, into

disrepute, and furnished occasion, for disgraceful revelry and riot.

The *Irish Wake*, as it is popularly called, however it may have sprung from the same original stock, is, at present, a very different affair. Howling, at a wake, is akin to the ululation of the mourning women of Greece, Rome, and Judea, to which I have alluded, in a former number. The object of the *Irish Wake* is to rouse the spirit, which, otherwise, it is apprehended, might remain inactive, unwilling, or unable, to quit its mortal frame—to *wake* the soul, not precisely, “by tender strokes of art,” but by long-continued, nocturnal wailings and howlings. In practice, it has ever been accounted extremely difficult, to get the Irish soul fairly off, either upward or downward, without an abundance of intoxicating liquor.

The philosophy of this is too high for me—I cannot attain unto it. I know not, whether the soul goes off, in a fit of disgust, at the senseless and insufferable uproar, or is fairly frightened out of its tabernacle. This I know, that boon companions, and plenty of liquor are the very last means I should think of employing, to induce a true-born Irishman, to give up the ghost. I have read with pleasure, in the *Pilot*, a Roman Catholic paper of this city, an editorial discommendation of this preposterous custom.

However these barbarous proceedings may serve to outrage the dignity, and even the decency, of death, they have not always been absolutely useless. If the ravings, and rantings, the drunkenness, and the bloody brawls, that have sometimes occurred, during the celebration of an *Irish wake*, have proved unavailing, in raising the dead, or in exciting the lethargic soul—they have, certainly, sometimes sufficed, to restore consciousness to the cataleptic, who were supposed to be dead, and about to be committed to the grave.

In April, 1804, Barney O'Brien, to all appearance, died suddenly, in the town of Ballyshannon. He had been a terrible bruiser, and so much of a profligate, that it was thought all the priests, in the county of Donegal, would have as much as they could do, of a long summer's day, to confess him. It was concluded, on all hands, that more than ordinary efforts would be required, for the *waking* of Barney O'Brien's soul. A great crowd was accordingly gathered to the shanty of death. The mountain dew was supplied, without stint. The howling was

terrific. Confusion began. The altercation of tongues was speedily followed, by the collision of fists, and the cracking of shelalahs. The yet uncovered coffin was overturned. The shock, in an instant, terminated the trance. Barney O'Brien stood erect, before the terrified and flying group, six feet and four inches in his winding sheet, screaming, at the very top of his lungs, as he rose—"For the love o' the blissed Jasus, jist a dhrap o' the crathur, and a shelalah!"

In a former number, I have alluded to the subject of premature interment. A writer, in the London Quarterly, vol. lxiii. p. 458, observes, that "there exists, among the poor of the metropolitan districts, an inordinate dread of premature burial." After referring to a contrivance, in the receiving houses of Frankfort and Munich,—a ring, attached to the finger of the corpse, and connected with a lightly hung bell, in the watcher's room—he significantly asks—"Has the corpse bell at Frankfort and Munich ever yet been rung?"—For my own part, I have no correspondence with the sextons there, and cannot tell. It may possibly have been rung, while the watcher slept! After admitting the possibility of premature burial, this writer says, he should be content with Shakspeare's test—"This feather stirs; she lives." This may be a very good affirmative test. But, as a negative test, it would be good for little—*this feather stirs not; she is dead.* In cases of catalepsy, it often happens, that a feather will not stir; and even the more trustworthy test—the mirror—will furnish no evidence of life.

To doubt the fact of premature interment is quite as absurd, as to credit all the tales, in this connection, fabricated by French and German wonder-mongers. During the existence of that terrible epidemic, which has so recently passed away, the necessity, real or imagined, of removing the corpses, as speedily as possible, has, very probably, occasioned some instances of premature interment.

On the 28th of June, 1849, a Mr. Schridieder was supposed to be dead of cholera, at St. Louis, and was carried to the grave; where a noise in the coffin was heard, and, upon opening it, he was found to be alive.

In the month of July, 1849, a Chicago paper contained the following statement:—

"We know a gentleman now residing in this city, who was attacked by the cholera, in 1832, and after a short time, was

supposed to have died. He was in the collapsed state, gave not the least sign of life, and when a glass was held over his mouth, there was no evidence that he still breathed. But, after his coffin was obtained, he revived, and is now living in Chicago, one of our most estimable citizens."

"Another case, of a like character, occurred near this city, yesterday. A man who was in the collapsed state, and to all appearances dead, became reanimated after his coffin was procured. He revived slightly—again apparently died—again revived slightly—and finally died and was buried."

I find the following, in the Boston Atlas of August 23, 1849 :—
 "A painful occurrence has come to light in Baltimore, which creates intense excitement. The remains of the venerable D. Evans Reese, who died suddenly on Friday evening, were conveyed to the Light Street burying-ground, and while they were placed in the vault, the hand of a human being was discovered protruding from one of the coffins deposited there. On a closer examination, those present were startled to find the hand was firmly clenched, the coffin burst open, and the body turned entirely over, leaving not a doubt that the unfortunate being had been buried alive. The corpse was that of a very respectable man, who died, apparently, very suddenly, and whose body was placed in the vault on Friday last."

The *Recherches Medico-legales sur l'incertitude des risques de la mort, les dangers des inhumations précipitées, les moyens de constater les décès et de rappeler à la vie ceux qui sont en état de mort apparente*, by I. de Fontenelle, is a very curious production. In a review of this work, and of the *Recherches Physiologiques, sur la vie et la mort*, by Bichat, in the London Quarterly, vol. lxxxv. page 369, the writer remarks—"A gas is developed in the decaying body, which mimics, by its mechanical force, many of the movements of life. So powerful is this gas, in corpses, which have laid long in the water, that M. Devergie, the physician at the Morgue, at Paris, says that, unless secured to the table, they are often heaved up and thrown to the ground."

Upon this theory, the writer proposes, to account for those posthumous changes of position, which are known, sometimes to have taken place. It may serve to explain some of these occurrences. But the formation of this gas, in a greater or less degree, must be universal, while a change in the position is comparatively rare. The curiosity of friends often leads to an in-

spection of the dead, in every stage of decomposition. However valuable the theory, in the writer's estimation, the generation of the most powerful gas would scarcely be able to throw the body entirely out of the coffin, with its arms outstretched towards the portal of the tomb; of which, and of similar changes, there exist well authenticated records.

It is quite probable, that the *Irish wake* may have originated, in this very dread of premature interment, strangely blended with certain spiritual fancies, respecting the soul's reluctance to quit its tenement of clay.

After relating the remarkable story of Asclepiades of Prusa in Bithynia, who restored to life an individual, then on his way to the funeral pile—Bayle, vol. ii. p. 379, Lond. 1735, relates the following interesting tale. A peasant of Poitou was married to a woman, who, after a long fit of sickness, fell into a profound lethargy, which so closely resembled death, that the poor people gathered round, and laid out the peasant's helpmate, for burial. The peasant assumed a becoming expression of sorrow, which utterly belied that exceeding great joy, that is natural to every man, when he becomes perfectly assured, that the tongue of a scolding wife is hushed forever.

The people of that neighborhood were very poor; and, either from economy or taste, coffins were not used among them. The corpses were borne to the grave, simply enveloped in their shrouds, as we are told, by Castellan, is the custom, among the Turks. Those who bore the body, moved, inadvertently, rather too near a hedge, at the roadside, and, a sharp thorn pricking the leg of the corpse, the trance was broken—the supposed defunct sprang up on end—and began to scold, as vigorously as ever.

The disappointed peasant had fourteen years more of it. At the expiration of that term, the good woman pined away, and appeared to die, once more. She was again borne toward the grave. When the bearers drew near to the spot, where the remarkable revival had occurred, upon a former occasion, the widower became very much excited; and, at length, unable to restrain his emotions, audibly exclaimed—“*don't go too near that hedge!*”

In a number of the London Times, for 1821, there is an account of the directions, given by an old Irish expert in such matters, who was about to die, respecting his own *wake*—“Recol-

lect to put three candles at the head of the bed, after ye lay me out, two at the foot, and one at each side. Mind now and put a plate with the salt on it, just atop of my breast. And d'ye hear—have plinty o' tobacky and pipes enough; and remimber to have the punch strong. And—blundenoons, what the devil's the use o' pratin t'ye—sure it's mysilf knows ye'll be after botching it, as I'll not be there mysel."

No. XCII.

THAT man must be an incorrigible *fool*, who does not, occasionally, like the Vicar of Wakefield, find himself growing weary of being always *wise*. In this sense, there are few men of sixty winters, who have not been guilty of being over-wise—of assuming, at some period of their lives, the port and majesty of the bird of Minerva—of exercising that talent, for silence and solemnity, ascribed by the French nobleman, as More relates, in his travels, to the English nation. A man, thus protected—dipped, as it were, in the waters of Lethe, *usque ad calcem*—is truly a pleasant fellow. There is no such thing as getting hold of him—there he is, conservative as a tortoise, *unguibus retractis*. He seems to think the exchange of intellectual commodities, entirely out of the question; he will have none of your folly, and he holds up his own superlative wisdom, as a cow, of consummate resolution, holds up her milk. If society were thus composed, what a concert of voices there would be, in unison with Job's—*we would not live alway*. Life would be no other, than a long funeral procession—the dead burying the dead. I am decidedly in favor of a cheerful philosophy. Jeremy Taylor says, that, "*the slightest going off from a man's natural temper is a species of drunkenness*." There are some men, certainly, who seem to think, that total abstinence, from every species of merriment, is a wholesome preparative, for a residence in Paradise. The Preacher saith of laughter, *it is mad, and of mirth, what doeth it?* But in the very next chapter, he declares, *there is a time to dance and a time to sing*. We are told in the book of Proverbs, that *a merry heart doeth good, like a medicine*.

There has probably seldom been a wiser man than Democritus of Abdera, who was called the laughing philosopher; and of whom Seneca says, in his work *De Ira*, ii. c. 10, *Democritum aiunt nunquam sine risu in publico fuisse; adeo nihil illi videbatur serius eorum, quæ serio gerebantur*: Democritus never appeared in public, without laughter in his countenance; so that nothing seemed to affect him seriously, however much so it might affect the rest of mankind.—The Abderites, with some exceptions, thought him mad; or, in Beattie's words, when describing his minstrel boy—

"Some deem'd him wondrous wise, and some believ'd him mad."

These Abderites, who were, notoriously, the most stupid of the Thracians, looked upon Democritus precisely as the miserable monks, about Oxford, looked upon Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century—they believed him a magician, or a madman.

To laugh and grow fat is a proverb. Whether Democritus grew fat or not, I am unable to say; but he died at a great age, having passed one hundred years; and he died cheerfully, as he had lived temperately. Lucretius says of him, lib. iii. v. 1052—

"Sponte sua letho caput obvius obtulit ipse."

The tendency of his philosophy was to ensure longevity. The grand aim and end of it all were comprehended, in one word, *εὐφροσύνη*, or the enjoyment of a tranquil state of mind.

There is much good-natured wisdom, in the command, and in the axiom of Horace—

*"Misce stultitiam consiliis brevem
Dulce est desipere in loco"*—

which means, if an off-hand version will suffice—

Mix with your cares a little folly,
'Tis pleasant sometimes to be jolly.

One of the most acceptable images, presented by Sir Walter Scott, is that of Counsellor Pleydell, perched upon the table, playing at high jinks, who compliments Colonel Mannering, by continuing the frolic, and telling him, that, if a fool had entered, instead of a man of sense, he should have come down immediately.

My New England readers would be very much surprised, if they had any personal knowledge of the late excellent and venerable Bishop Griswold, to be told, that, among his works, there

was an edition of Mother Goose's Melodies, with *prolegomina, notæ, et variæ lectiones*; well—there is no such thing there. But every one knows, that the comic romance of Bluebeard, as it is performed on the stage, was written by Bishop Heber, and is published in his works. Every one knows that Hannah More wrote tolerable plays, and was prevented, by nothing but her sex, from being a bishop. Every one knows that bishops and archbishops have done very funny things—in *loco*. And every one knows, that all this is quite as respectable, as being very reverently dull, and wearing the phylactery for life—*stand off, for I am stupider than thou*.

I have now before me a small octavo volume—a very *bijou* of a book, with the following title—*Arundines Cami, sive Musarum Cantabrigiensium Lusus Canori*, and bearing, for its motto—*Equitare in arundine longa*. This book is printed at Cambridge, England; and I have never seen a more beautiful specimen of typography. The work is edited by Henry Drury, Vicar of Wilton: and it contains a collection of Greek and Latin versions; by Mr. Drury himself, and by several good, holy, and learned men—Butler, late Bishop of Litchfield—Richard Porson—Hodgson, S. J. B. of Eton College—Vaughan, Principal of Harrow—Macaulay—Hallam—Law—and many others.

The third edition of this delightful book was published in 1846. And now the reader would know something of the originals, which these grave and learned men have thought it worthy of their talents and time, to turn into Greek and Latin. I scarcely know where to select a specimen, among articles, every one of which is prepared, with such exquisite taste, and such perfect knowledge of the capabilities of the language employed. Among the readers of the Transcript, I happen to know some fair scholars, who would relish a Greek epigram, on any subject, as highly, as others enjoy a pointed paragraph in English, on the subject of rum and molasses. Here is a Greek version of the ditty—"What care I how black I be," by Mr. Hawtrey, Principal of Eton, which I would transcribe, were it not that a Greek word, now and then, presented in the common type, suggests to me, that you may not have a Greek font. It may be found by those, who are of the fancy, on page 49 of the work.

Here is a version by Mr. Hodgson—how the shrill, thready voice of my dear old nurse rings in my ears, while reading the original! God reward her kind, untiring spirit—she has gone

where little Pickles cease from troubling, and where weary nurses are at rest:—

Pat a cake, pat a cake, baker's man,
So I do, master, as fast as I can.
Pat it, and prick it, and mark it with C,
Then it will answer for Charley and me.

Tunde mihi dulcem pistor, mihi tunde farinam.
Tunditur, O rapida tunditur illa manu.
Punge decenter acu, tituloque inscribe magistri;
Sic mihi, Carolulo, sic erit esca meo.

The contributions of Mr. H. Drury, the editor, are inferior to none—

There was an old man in Tobago,
Who liv'd on rice gruel and sago;
Till, much to his bliss,
His physician said this:
'To a leg, sir, of mutton you may go.'

Senex æger in Tarento
De oryza et pulmento
Vili vixerat invento;
Donec medicus
Seni inquit valde læto,
'Senex æger, o grandæto,
Crus ovinum, jam non veto
Tibi benedicus.'

Decidedly the most felicitous, though by no means the most elaborate in the volume, is the following, which is also by the editor, Mr. Drury—

Hey diddle diddle! The cat and the fiddle!
The cow jumped over the moon;
The little dog laughed to see such sport;
And the dish ran away with the spoon.

Hei didulum—atque iterum didulum! Felisque fidesque!
Vacca super lune cornua prosiluit.
Nescio qua catulus risit dulcedine ludi;
Abstulit et turpi lanx cochleare fuga.

A Latin version of Goldsmith's mad dog, by H. J. Hodgson, is very clever, and there are some on solemn subjects, and of a higher order.

How sturdily these little ditties, the works of authors dead, buried, and unknown, have breasted the current of time! I had rather be the author of *Hush-a-bye baby, upon the tree top*, than of Joel Barlow's *Vision of Columbus*—for, though I have always perceived the propriety of putting babies to sleep, at proper times,

I have never entirely appreciated the wisdom of doing the very same thing to adults, at all hours of the day.

What powerful resurrectionists these nursery melodies are! Moll Pitcher of Endor had not a greater power over the dry bones of Samuel, than has the ring of some one of these little chimes, to bring before us, with all the freshness of years ago, that good old soul, who sat with her knitting beside us, and rocked our cradle, and watched our progress from petticoats to breeches; and gave notice of the first tooth; and the earliest words; and faithfully reported, from day to day, all our marvellous achievements, to one, who, had she been a queen, would have given us her sceptre for a hoop stick.

No. XCIII.

BYLES is a patronymic of extraordinary rarity. It will be sought for, without success, in the voluminous record of Alexander Chalmers. It is not in the Biographia Britannica; though, even there, we may, occasionally, discover names, which, according to Cowper, were not born for immortality—

*"Oh fond attempt to give a deathless lot
To names ignoble, born to be forgot!"*

Even in that conservative record of choice spirits, the Boston Directory for 1849, this patronymic is nowhere to be found.

Henry Byles came from Sarum in England; and settled at Salisbury in this Commonwealth, as early as 1640. I am not aware, that any individual, particularly eminent, and bearing this uncommon name, has ever existed among us, excepting that eccentric clergyman, who, within the bounds of our little peninsula, at least, is still occasionally mentioned, as "*the celebrated Mather Byles*." I am aware, that he had a son, who bore the father's prænomen, and graduated at Harvard, in 1751; became a doctor of divinity, in 1770; was a minister, in New London, and dismissed from his charge, in 1769; officiated, as an Episcopal clergyman, in Boston, for several years; went to St. Johns, N. B., at the time of the revolution; officiated there; and died, March 12, 1814.

But my dealings, this evening, are with "*the celebrated Mather*

Byles," who was born of worthy parents, in the town of Boston, March 26, 1706. His father was an Englishman. Through the maternal line, he had John Cotton and Richard Mather, for his ancestors. He graduated, at Harvard, in 1725; was settled at the Hollis Street Church, Dec. 20, 1733; created D. D. at Aberdeen, in 1765; was, on account of his toryism, separated from his people, in 1776; and died of paralysis, July 5, 1788, at the age of 82. He was twice married; a niece of Governor Belcher was his first, and the daughter of Lieut. Governor Tailer, his second wife.

I should be faithless, indeed, were I to go forward, without one passing word, for precious memory, in regard to those two perennial damsels, the daughters of Dr. Byles. How many visitations, at that ancient manse in Nassau Street! To how many of the sex—young—aye, and of no particular age—it has occurred, at the nick of time, when there was nothing under Heaven else to be done, to exclaim—"What an excellent occasion, for a visit to Katy and Polly!" And the visit was paid; and the descendants of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*" were so glad to see the visitors—and it was so long since their last visit—and it must not be so long again—and then the old stories, over and over, for the thousandth time—and the concerted merriment of these amiable visitors, as if the tales were quite as new, as the year itself, upon the first January morn—and the filial delights, that beamed upon the features of these vestals, at the effect, produced, by the recitation of stories, which really seemed to be made of that very *everlasting* of which the breeches of our ancestors were made—and then the exhibition of those relics, and *heir looms*, or what remained of them, after some thirty years' presentation to all comers, which, in one way and another, were associated with the memory of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*,"—and then the oh don't gos—and oh fly not yetes—and when will you come agains!

The question naturally arises, and, rather distrustingly, demands an answer—what was "*the celebrated Mather Byles*"—celebrated for? In the first place, he was *Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor*. But his degree was from Aberdeen; and the Scotch colleges, at that period, were not particularly coy. With a cousin at court, and a little gold in hand, it was somewhat less difficult, for a clergyman, without very great learning, or talent, to obtain a doctorate, at Aberdeen, in 1765, than for a

camel, of unusual proportions, to go through the eye of a very small needle. Even in our cis-atlantic colleges, these bestowments do not always serve to mark degrees of merit, with infallible accuracy—for God's sun does not more certainly shine, upon the just and upon the unjust, than doctorates have, in some cases, fallen upon wise men, and upon fools. That, which, charily and conservatively bestowed, may well be accounted an honor, necessarily loses its value, by diffusion and prostitution. Not many years ago, the worthy president of one of our colleges, being asked, how it happened, that a doctorate of divinity had been given to a certain person of ordinary talents, and very little learning; replied, with infinite *naïveté*—“*Why ——— had it; and ——— had it; and ——— had it; and we didn't like to hurt his feelings.*”

Let us not consider the claims of Mather Byles as definitely settled, by the faculty at Aberdeen.—He corresponded with Pope, and with Lansdowne, and with Watts. The works of the latter were sent to him, by the author, from time to time; and, among the treasures, highly prized by the family, was a presentation copy, in quarto, from Pope, of his translation of the *Odyssey*. This correspondence, however, so far as I was ever able to gather information from the daughters, many years ago, did not amount to much; the letters were very few, and very far between; on the one side complimentary, and bearing congratulations upon the occasion of some recent literary success; and, on the other, fraught with grateful civility; and accompanied, as is often the case, with copies of some of the author's productions.

Let me here present a somewhat disconnected anecdote: At the sale of the library of Dr. Byles, a large folio Bible, in French, was purchased, by a private individual. This Bible had been presented to the French Protestant Church, in Boston, by Queen Anne; and, at the time, when it came to the hands of Dr. Byles, was the last relic of that church, whose visible temple had been erected in School Street, about 1716. Whoever desires to know more of these French Protestants, may turn to the “*Memoir*,” by Dr. Holmes, or to vol. xxii. p. 62, of the *Massachusetts Historical Collections*.

Dr. Byles wrote, in prose and verse, and quite *respectably* in both. There is not more of the spirit of poetry, however, in his metrical compositions, than in his performances in prose. His versification was easy, and the style of his prose works was un-

affected; his sentences were usually short, and never rendered unintelligible, by the multiplication of adjuncts, or by any affectation of sententious brevity. Yet nothing, that I have ever met with, from the pen of Dr. Byles, is particularly remarkable for its elegance; and it is in vain to look, among such of his writings, as have been preserved, for the evidences of extraordinary powers of thought. Some dozen of his published sermons are still extant. We have also several of his essays, in the *New England Weekly Journal*; a poem on the death of George I., and the accession of George II., in 1727; a sort of monodial address to Governor Belcher, on the death of his lady; a poem called the *Conflagration*; and a volume of metrical matters, published in 1744.

If his celebrity had depended upon these and other literary labors, he would scarcely have won the appellation of "*the celebrated Mather Byles*."

The correspondent of Byles, Isaac Watts, never imagined, that the time would arrive, when his own voluminous lyrics and his address to "*Great Gouge*," would be classed, in the *Materia Poetica*, as soporifics, and scarcely find one, so poor, as to do them reverence; while millions of lisping tongues still continued to repeat, from age to age, till the English language should be forgotten,

" Let dogs delight
To bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let bears and lions
Growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature to."

Dr. Byles himself could not have imagined, while putting the finishing hand to "*The Conflagration*," that, if he had embarked his hopes of reaching posterity, in that heavy bottom, they must surely have foundered, in the gulf of oblivion—and that, after all, he would be wafted down the stream of time, to distant ages, astride, as it were, upon a feather—and that what he could never have accomplished, by his grave discourses, and elaborate, poetical labors, would be so certainly and signally achieved, by the never-to-be-forgotten quips, and cranks, and bon mots, and puns, and funny sayings, and comical doings of the reverend pastor of the Hollis Street Church.

The reader must not do so great injustice to Dr. Byles, as to suppose, that he mingled together *sacra profanis*, or was in the

habit of exhibiting, in the pulpit, that frolicsome vein, which was, in him, as congenital, as is the tendency, in a fish, to swim in water.

The sentiment of Horace applies not here—

ridentem dicere verum
Quid vetat ?

The serious writings of Dr. Byles are singularly free from everything, suggestive of frivolous association. In his pulpit, there was none of it; not a jot; while, out of it, unless on solemn occasions, there was very little else. I have heard from those, who knew him well, that he ransacked the whole vocabulary, in search of the materials for punning. Yet of his attempts, in this species of humor, few examples are remembered. The specimens of the wit and humor of this eccentric divine, which have been preserved, are often of a different character; and not a few of them of that description, which are called practical jokes. Some of these pleasantries were exceedingly clever, and others supremely ridiculous. It is now more than half a century, since I listened to the first, amusing anecdote of Mather Byles. Many have reached me since—some of them quite as clever, as any we have ever had—I will not say from Foote, or Hook, or Matthews; for such unclerical comparisons would be particularly odious—but quite as clever as anything from Jonathan Swift, or Sydney Smith. Suppose I convert my next number into a penny box, for the collection and safe keeping of these petty records—I know they are below the dignity of history—so is a very large proportion of all the thoughts, words, and actions of Kings and Emperors—I'll think of it.

No. XCIV.

THERE were political sympathies, during the American Revolution, between that eminent physician and excellent man, Dr. James Lloyd, and Mather Byles; yet, some forty-three years ago, I heard Dr. Lloyd remark, that, in company, the Reverend Mather Byles was a most troublesome puppy; and that there was no peace for his punning. Dr. Lloyd was, doubtless, of opinion, with Lord Kaimes, who remarked, in relation to this inveterate habit, that few might object to a little salt upon their

plates, but the man must have an extraordinary appetite, who could make a meal of it.

The daily employment of our mental powers, for the discovery of words, which agree in sound, but differ in sense, is a species of intellectual huckstering, well enough adapted to the capacities of those, who are unfit for business, on a larger scale. If this occupation could be made *to pay*, many an oysterman would be found, forsaking his calling, and successfully competing with those, who will not suffer ten words to be uttered, in their company, without converting five of them, at least, to this preposterous purpose.

No conversation can be so grave, or so solemn, as to secure it from the rude and impertinent interruption of some one of these pleasant fellows; who seem to employ their little gift upon the community, as a species of laughing gas. A little of this may be well enough; but, like musk, in the gross, it is absolutely suffocating.

The first story, that I ever heard, of Mather Byles, was related, at my father's table, by the Rev. Dr. Belknap, in 1797, the year before he died. It was upon a Saturday; and Dr. John Clarke and some other gentlemen, among whom I well remember Major General Lincoln, ate their salt fish there, that day. I was a boy; and I remember their mirth, when, after Dr. Belknap had told the story, I said to our minister, Dr. Clarke, near whom I was eating my apple, that I wished he was half as funny a minister, as Dr. Byles.

Upon a Fast day, Dr. Byles had negotiated an exchange, with a country clergyman. Upon the appointed morning, each of them—for vehicles were not common then—proceeded, on horseback, to his respective place of appointment. Dr. Byles no sooner observed his brother clergyman approaching, at a distance, than he applied the whip; put his horse into a gallop; and, with his canonicals flying all abroad, passed his friend, at full run. "*What is the matter?*" he exclaimed, raising his hand in astonishment—"Why so fast, brother Byles?"—to which the Dr., without slackening his speed, replied, over his shoulder—"It is Fast day!"

This is, unquestionably, very funny—but it is surely undesirable, for a consecrated servant of the Lord, thus lavishly to sacrifice, upon the altars of Momus.

The distillery of Thomas Hill was at the corner of Essex and

South Streets, not far from Dr. Belknap's residence in Lincoln Street. Dr. Byles called on Mr. Hill, and inquired—"Do you still?"—"That is my business," Mr. Hill replied—"Then," said Dr. Byles—"will you go with me, and still my wife?"

As he was once occupied, in nailing some list upon his doors, to exclude the cold, a parishioner said to him—"the wind bloweth wheresoever it listeth, Dr. Byles."—"Yes sir," replied the Dr. "and man listeth, wheresoever the wind bloweth."

He was intimate with General Knox, who was a bookseller, before the war. When the American troops took possession of the town, after the evacuation, Knox, who had become quite corpulent, marched in, at the head of his artillery. As he passed on, Byles, who thought himself privileged, on old scores, exclaimed, loud enough to be heard—"I never saw an ox fatter in my life." But Knox was not in the vein. He felt offended by this freedom, especially from Byles, who was then well known to be a tory; and replied, in uncourtly terms, that he was a "— fool."

In May, 1777, Dr. Byles was arrested, as a tory, and subsequently tried, convicted, and sentenced to confinement, on board a guard ship, and to be sent to England with his family, in forty days. This sentence was changed, by the board of war, to confinement in his own house. A guard was placed over him. After a time, the sentinel was removed—afterwards replaced—and again removed—when the Dr. exclaimed, that *he had been guarded—regarded—and disregarded*. He called his sentry his *observ-a-tory*.

Perceiving, one morning, that the sentinel, a simple fellow, was absent, and seeing Dr. Byles himself, pacing before his own door, with a musket on his shoulder, the neighbors stepped over, to inquire the cause—"You see," said the Dr., "*I begged the sentinel to let me go for some milk for my family, but he would not suffer me to stir. I reasoned the matter with him; and he has gone, himself, to get it for me, on condition that I keep guard in his absence.*"

When he was very poor, and had no money to waste on fol-lies, he caused the little room, in which he read and wrote, to be painted brown, that he might say to every visitor—"You see I am in a brown study."

His family, having gone to rest, were roused one night, by the reiterated cry of *thieves!—thieves!* in the doctor's loudest

voice—the wife and daughters sprang instantly from their beds, and rushed into the room—there sat the Dr. alone, in his study chair—“*Where, father?*” cried the astonished family—“*there!*” he exclaimed, pointing to the candles.

One bitter December night, he called his daughters from their bed, simply to inquire if they lay warm.

He had a small collection of curiosities. Some visitors called, one morning; and Mrs. Byles, unwilling to be found at her ironing board, and desiring to hide herself, as she would not be so caught, by these ladies, for the world, the doctor put her in a closet, and buttoned her in. After a few remarks, the ladies expressed a wish to see the Dr’s curiosities, which he proceeded to exhibit; and, after entertaining them very agreeably, for several hours, he told them he had kept the greatest curiosity to the last; and, proceeding to the closet, unbuttoned the door, and exhibited Mrs. Byles.

He had complained, long, often, and fruitlessly, to the selectmen, of a quagmire, in front of his dwelling. One morning, two of the fathers of the town, after a violent rain, passing with their chaise, became stuck in this bog. As they were striving to extricate themselves, and pulling to the right and to the left, the doctor came forth, and bowing, with great politeness, exclaimed—“*I am delighted, gentlemen, to see you stirring in this matter, at last.*”

A candidate for fame proposed to fly, from the North Church steeple, and had already mounted, and was clapping his wings, to the great delight of the mob. Dr. Byles, mingling with the crowd, inquired what was the object of the gathering—“*We have come, sir,*” said some one, “*to see a man fly.*”—“*Poh, poh,*” replied the doctor, “*I have seen a horse-fly.*”

A gentleman sent Dr. Byles a barrel of very fine oysters. Meeting the gentleman’s wife, an hour or two after, in the street, the doctor assumed an air of great severity, and told her, that he had, that morning, been treated, by her husband, in a most *Bil-lingsgate* manner, and then abruptly left her. The lady, who was of a nervous temperament, went home in tears, and was quite miserable, till her husband returned, at noon, and explained the occurrence; but was so much offended with the doctor’s folly, that he cut his acquaintance.

A poor fellow, in agony with the toothache, meeting the doctor, asked him where he should go, to have it drawn. The doctor

gave him a direction to a particular street and number. The man went, as directed; and, when the occupant came to the door, told him that Dr. Byles had sent him there, to have his tooth drawn. "*This is a poor joke, for Dr. Byles,*" said the gentleman; "*I am not a dentist, but a portrait painter—it will give you little comfort, my friend, to have me draw your tooth.*" Dr. Byles had sent the poor fellow to Copley.

Upon the 19th of May, 1780, the memorable dark day, a lady wrote to the doctor as follows—"Dear doctor, how do you account for this darkness?" and received his immediate reply—"Dear Madam, I am as much in the dark, as you are." This, for sententious brevity, has never been surpassed, unless by the correspondence, between the comedian, Sam Foote, and his mother—"Dear Sam, I'm in jail"—"Dear Mother; So am I."

He had, at one time, a remarkably stupid, and literal, Irish girl, as a domestic. With a look and voice of terror, he said to her, in haste—"Go and say to your mistress, Dr. Byles has put an end to himself." The girl flew up stairs, and, with a face of horror, exclaimed, at the top of her lungs—"Dr. Byles has put an end to himself!" The astonished wife and daughters rushed into the parlor—and there was the doctor, calmly walking about, with a part of a cow's tail, that he had picked up, in the street, tied to his coat, or cassock, behind.

From the time of the stamp act, in 1765, to the period of the revolution, the cry had been repeated, in every form of phraseology, that our *grievances* should be *redressed*. One fine morning, when the multitude had gathered on the Common, to see a regiment of red coats, paraded there, who had recently arrived—"Well," said the doctor, gazing at the spectacle, "*I think we can no longer complain, that our grievances are not red dressed.*" "True," said one of the laughers, who were standing near, "*but you have two ds, Dr. Byles.*" "To be sure, sir, I have," the doctor instantly replied, "I had them from *Aberdeen*, in 1765."

These pleasantries will, probably, survive "THE CONFLAGRATION." Had not this eccentric man possessed some very excellent and amiable qualities, he could not have maintained his clerical relation to the Hollis-Street Church and Society, for three and forty years, from 1733 to 1776; and have separated from them, at last, for political considerations alone.

Had his talents and his influence been greater than they were, the peculiarities, to which I have alluded, would have been a

theme, for deeper deprecation. The eccentricities of eminent men are mischievous, in the ratio of their eminence; for thousands, who cannot rival their excellencies, are often the successful imitators of their peculiarities and follies.

I never sympathized with that worthy, old lady, who became satisfied, that Dr. Beecher was a terrible hypocrite, and without a spark of vital religion, because she saw him, from her window, on the Lord's day, in his back yard, gymnasticising, on a pole, in the intermission season; and thereby invigorating his powers, for the due performance of the evening services. Yet, as character is power, and as the children of this generation have a devilish pleasure in detecting inconsistencies, between the practice and the profession of the children of light—it is ever to be deplored, that clergymen should hazard one iota of their clerical respectability, for the love of fun; and it speaks marvels, for the moral and religious worth of Mather Byles, and for the forbearance, intelligence, and discrimination of his parishioners, that, for three-and-forty years, he maintained his ministerial position, in their midst, cutting such wild, unpriestly capers, and giving utterance to such amusing fooleries, from morning to night.

No. XCV.

I HAVE already referred to the subject of being buried alive. There is something very terrible in the idea; and I am compelled, by some recent information, to believe, that occurrences of this distressing nature are more common, than I have hitherto supposed them to be.

Not long ago, I fell into the society of a veteran, maiden lady, who, in the course of her evening revelations of the gossip she had gathered in the morning, informed the company, that an entire family, consisting of a husband, wife, and seven children, were buried alive.

You have heard, or read, I doubt not, of that eminent French surgeon, who, while standing by the bedside of his dying friend and patron, utterly forgot all his professional cares and duties, in his exceeding great joy, at beholding, for the first time in his

life, the genuine Sardonic grin, exhibited upon the distorted features of his dying benefactor. For a moment, my sincere sorrow, for the terrible fate of this interesting family, was utterly forgotten, in the delight I experienced, at the prospect of receiving such an interesting item, for my dealings with the dead.

My tablets were out, in an instant—and, drawing my chair near that of this communicative lady, I requested a relation of all the particulars. My astonishment was very much increased, when she asserted, that they had actually buried themselves—and my utter disappointment—as an artist—can scarcely be conceived, when she added, that the whole family had gone to reside permanently in the country, giving up plays, concerts, balls, soirees and operas.

Putting up my tablets, with a feeling of displeasure, illy concealed, I ventured to suggest, that opportunities, for intellectual improvement, were not wanting in the country; and that, perhaps, this worthy family preferred the enjoyment of rural quiet, to the miscellaneous cries of fire—oysters—and murder. She replied, that she had rather be murdered outright, than live in the country—listen to the frogs, from morning to night—and watch the progress of cucumbers and squashes.

Seriously, this matter of being buried alive, is very unpleasant. The dead, the half-dead, and the dying, were brutally neglected, in the earlier days of Greece. Diogenes Laertius, lib. 8, *de vita et moribus philosophorum*, relates, that Empedocles, having restored Ponthia, a woman of Agrigentum, to life, who was on the point of being buried, laws began to be enacted, for the protection of the apparent dead. At Athens, no one could be buried, before the third day; and, commonly, throughout all Greece, burial and cremation were deferred, till the sixth or seventh day. Alexander kept Hephestion's body, till the tenth day. I have referred, in a former number, to the remarkable cases of Aviola and the Prætor Lamia, who revived, after being placed on the funeral pile. Another Prætor, Tubero, was saved, at the moment, when the torch was about to be applied. I have also alluded to the act of Asclepiades, who, in disregard of the ridicule of the bystanders, stopped a funeral procession, and re-animated the body, about to be burnt.

A perusal of the *Somnium Scipionis*, and of the accounts of Hildanus, Camerarius, and Horstius—of Plato, in his Republic—

and of Valerius Maximus, will satisfy the reader, that premature burials were, by no means, uncommon, of old.

The idea of reviving in one's coffin—one of Fisk and Raymond's "*Patent Metallic Burial Cases, Air-Tight and Indestructible*"—is really awful! How truly, upon such an awakening as this, the wretch must wish he had been born a savage—a Mandan of the upper Missouri—neither to be burnt nor buried—but placed upon a mat, supported by poles—aloof from the accursed wolves and undertakers—with a reasonable supply of pemmican and corncake, and a calabash of water, by his side!

The dread of such an occurrence has induced some very sensible people, to prefer cremation to earth and tomb burial. Of this we have a remarkable example, in our own country. An infant daughter of Henry Laurens, the first President of Congress, had, to all appearance, died of the small pox. She was, accordingly, laid out, and prepared for the grave. A window, which, during her illness, had been kept carefully closed, having been opened after the body was shrouded, and a stream of air blowing freshly into the apartment, the child revived, and the robes of death were joyfully exchanged, for her ordinary garments. This event naturally produced a strong impression, upon the father's mind. By his will, Mr. Laurens enjoined it upon his children, as a solemn duty, that his body should be burnt; and this injunction was duly fulfilled.

In former numbers, I have referred the reader to various authorities, upon this interesting subject. I will offer a brief quotation from a sensible writer—"According to the present usage, as soon as the semblance of death appears, the chamber is deserted, by friends, relatives, and physicians, and the apparently dead, though frequently living, body is committed to the management of an ignorant or unfeeling nurse, whose care extends no further than laying the limbs straight, and securing her accustomed perquisites. The bed clothes are immediately removed, and the body is exposed to the air. This, *when cold*, must extinguish any spark of life, that may remain, and which, by a different treatment, might have been kindled into a flame; or it may only continue to repress it, and the unhappy person revive amidst the horrors of the tomb."—"Coldness, heaviness of the body, a leaden, livid color, with a yellowness in the visage," says the same author, "are all very uncertain signs. Mr. Zimmerman observed them all, upon the body of a criminal, who

fainted, through the dread of the punishment he had merited. He was shaken, dragged about, and turned, in the same manner dead bodies are, without the least sign of resistance: and yet, at the end of twenty-four hours, he was recalled to life, by means of volatile alkali.

In 1777, Dr. William Hawes, the founder of the Humane Society in London, published an address, on premature interment. This is a curious and valuable performance. I cannot here withhold the statement, that this excellent man, before the formation of the Humane Society, for several years, offered rewards, and paid them from his own purse, for the rescue of persons from drowning, between Westminster and London bridge. Dr. Hawes remarks, that the appearance of death has often been mistaken for the reality, in apoplectic, and fainting fits, and those, arising from any violent agitation of the mind, and from the free use of opium and spirituous liquors. Children, he observes, have often been restored, who have apparently died in convulsions. In case of fevers, in weak habits, or when the cure has been chiefly attempted, by means of depletion, the patient often sinks into a state, resembling death; and the friends, in the opinion of Dr. Hawes, have been fatally deceived. In small pox, he remarks, when the pustules sink, and death apparently ensues, means of restoration should by no means be neglected.

In Lord Bacon's *Historia Vitæ et Mortis*, a passage occurs, commencing—"Complura fuerunt exempla hominum, tanquam mortuorum, aut expositorum e lecto, aut delatorum ad funus, quinetiam nonnullorum in terra conditorum, qui nihilominus revixerunt," etc. But the passage is rather long, and in a dead language; and my professional experience has admonished me to be economical of space, and to occupy, for every dead subject, long or short, as little room, as possible. I therefore give an English version, of whose sufficiency the reader may judge, by glancing at the original, vol. viii. p. 447, Lond. 1824.—There were many examples, says Lord Bacon, of men, supposed to be dead, taken from their beds as corpses, or borne to their graves, some of them actually buried, who, nevertheless, revived. This fact, in regard to such as were buried, has been proved, upon re-opening their graves; by the bruises and wounds upon their heads; and by the manifest evidences of tossing about, and struggling in their coffins. John Scott, a man of genius, and a scholar, furnishes a very recent and remarkable example; who,

shortly after his burial, was disinterred, and found, in that condition, by his servant, who was absent at the time of Mr. Scott's interment, and well acquainted, it seems, with those symptoms of catalepsy, to which he was liable.

A like event happened, in my time, to a play-actor, buried at Cambridge. I remember the account, given me by a clever fellow, who being full of frolic, and desirous of knowing what were the feelings of persons, who were hanging, suspended himself to a beam, and let himself drop, thinking that he could lay hold on the beam, when he chose. This, however, he was unable to do; but, luckily, he was relieved by a companion. Upon being interrogated, he replied, that he had not been sensible of any pain—that, at first, a sort of fire and flashing came about his eyes—then extreme darkness and shadows—and, lastly, a sort of pale blue color, like that of the ocean. I have heard a physician, now living, say, that, by frictions and the warm bath, he had brought a man to life, who had hanged himself, and remained suspended, for half an hour. The same physician used to say, that he believed any one might be recovered, who had been suspended no longer, unless his neck was broken. Such is a version of Lord Bacon's statement.

In the Gentleman's Magazine, for 1834, page 475, the following account is given of the feelings, during the process of hanging, by one, who was restored—"The preparations were dreadful, beyond all expression. On being dropped, he found himself midst fields and rivers of blood, which gradually acquired a greenish tinge; and imagined, if he could reach a certain spot in the same, he should be easy. He struggled forcibly to attain this, and felt no more."

No. XCVI.

It were greatly to be desired, that every driver of brute animals, Guinea negroes, and hard bargains, since he will not be a Christian, should be a Pythagorean. The doctrine of the metempsychosis would, doubtless, instil a salutary terror into his mind; and soften the harshness of his character, by creating a dread of being, himself, spavined and wind-galled, through all

eternity ; or destined to suffer from the lash, which he has mercilessly laid upon the slave ; or condemned to endure that hard measure, which he has meted, in this world, to the miserable debtor.

This opinion, which Pythagoras is said to have borrowed from the Egyptians, or, as some assert, from the Brachmans, makes the chief basis of religion, among the Banians and others, in India and China, at the present day ; and is the cause of their great aversion to take the life of brute animals, and even insects. The accidental destruction of any living thing produces, with them, a feeling of sorrow, similar to that, experienced, as Mr. Catlin says, by an Indian, who unfortunately shot his *totem*, which, in that case, chanced to be a bear ; that is, an animal of a certain race, one of which his guardian angel was supposed to inhabit.

Vague and fantastical, as have been the notions of a future state, in different nations, the idea of a condition of being, after death, has been very universal. Such was the conclusion from the reasonings of Plato. Such were the results "*quæ Socrates supremo vitæ die de immortalitate animorum disseruisset.*" Such was the faith of Cicero—"Sic mihi persuasi, sic sentio, quum tanta celeritas animorum sit, tanta memoria præteritorum, futurorumque prudentia, tot artes, tantæ scientiæ, tot inventa, non posse eam naturam, quæ res eas contineat, esse mortalem." De Senec. 21.

Seneca was born a year before the Christian era. There is a remarkable passage, in his sixty-third letter, addressed to Lucilius. He is striving to comfort Lucilius, who had lost his friend Flaccus—"Cogitemus ergo Lucili carissime, cito nos eo perventuros quo illum pervenisse mœremus. Et fortasse (si modo sapientium vera fama est, recipitque nos locus aliquis) quem putamus perisse, præmissus est :"—Let us consider, my dear Lucilius, how soon we, ourselves, shall go whither he has gone, whose fate we deplore. And possibly (if the report of certain wise men be true, and there is indeed a place to receive us hereafter) he whom we consider as gone from us *forever*, has only gone *before*. Here is, indeed, a shadowy conception of a future state. The heathen and the Christian, the savage and the sage concur, in the feeling, or the faith, or the philosophy, whichever it may be, that, though flesh and blood, bone and muscle shall perish, the spirit shall not. An impression, like this, swells into convic-

tion, from the very contemplation of its own instinctive and pervasive character.

The Egyptians believed, in the abiding presence of the spirit with the body, so long as the latter could be preserved; and therefore bestowed great pains, in its preservation. In the travels of Lewis and Clarke, the Echeloot Indians are reported to pay great regard to their dead; and Captain Clarke was of the opinion, that they were believers in a future state. They have common cemeteries; the bodies, carefully wrapped in skins, are laid on mats, in vaults made of pine or cedar, eight feet square; the sides are covered with strange figures, cut and painted, and images are attached. On tall poles, surmounting these structures, are suspended brass kettles, old frying-pans, shells, skins, baskets, pieces of cloth, and hair. Sometimes the body is laid in one canoe, and covered with another. It is not easy to conjecture what occasion these poor Echeloots supposed spirits could have, for frying-pans and brass kettles.

The faith of the inhabitants of Taheite is very peculiar. They believe, that the soul passes through no other purgatory, than the stomach of the *Eatooa* bird. They say of the dead, that they are *harra po*, gone to the night; and they believe, that the soul is instantly swallowed, by the *Eatooa* bird, and is purified by the process of deglutition; then it revives; becomes a superior being; never more to be liable to suffering. This soul is now raised to the rank of the *Eatooa*, and may, itself, swallow souls, whenever an opportunity occurs; which, having passed through this gastric purgation, may, in their turn, do the very same thing. Vancouver was present, at the obsequies of the chief, *Matooara*. The priest gave a funeral sermon—"The trees yet live," said he, "*the plants flourish, yet Matooara dies!*" It was a kind of expostulation with *Eatooa*.

Baron Swedenborg's notions of the soul's condition, after death, are very original, and rather oriental. He believed, "that man eats, and drinks, and even enjoys conjugal delight, as in this world; that the resemblance between the two worlds is so great, that, in the spiritual world, there are cities with palaces and houses, and also writings and books, employments and merchandizes; that there are gold and silver, and precious stones there. There is, in the spiritual world, all and every thing that there is in the natural world; but that in Heaven, such things are in an infinitely more perfect state." Trade, in Heaven, is conducted,

doubtless, on those lofty principles, inculcated, by the late Dr. Chalmers, in his commercial discourses; counterfeiters and bank robbers, marriage squabbles and curtain lectures are unknown; and no angel lendeth upon usury. In this arrangement, there is a remarkable oversight; for, as death is dispensed with, our vocation is no better, than Othello's. The superior advantages of the Baron's Heaven scarcely offer a fair compensation, for the suffering and inconvenience of removing, from our present tabernacles; and, for one, I should decidedly prefer to remain where I am, especially now that we have gotten the Cochituate water.

Such being the fashion of Swedenborg's Heaven, it would be quite interesting, were he now among us, in the flesh, to have, under his own hand, a rough sketch of his Hell. As the former is a state, somewhat better, the latter must be a state somewhat worse, than our present condition. It would not be very difficult to give some little idea of Swedenborg's Orcus, or place of punishment. We should have an eternal subtreasury, of course, with a tariff, more onerous, if possible, than that of 1846: the infernal banks would not discount, and money, on prime paper, would be three per cent. a month. Slavery would cover the earth; and the South would rage against the North and its interference, like the maniac, against his best friend, who strives to prevent him, from cutting his own throat, with his own razor.

Among the fancies, which have prevailed, in relation to the soul and its habits, none, perhaps, have been more remarkable, than the belief, in an actual *exodus*, or going forth, of the soul from the body, during life, on excursions of business or pleasure. This may be placed in the category of sick men's dreams; and probably is nothing else than that mighty conjuration of the mind, especially the mind of an invalid; of whose power no man had greater experience than Emanuel Swedenborg. The inhabitants of some of the Polynesian islands believe, that the spirits of their ancestors become divinities, or *Tees*. They believe the soul walks abroad, in dreams, under the charge of its *Tee*, or tutelary angel.

Mydo, a boy, was brought from Taheite, by an English whaler, and died, kindly cared for, by the Moravians. One morning, he spoke to these friends, as follows:—"You told me my soul could not die, and I have been thinking about it. Last night my body lay on that bed, but I knew nothing of it, for my

soul was very far off. My soul was in Taheite. I am sure I saw my mother and my friends, and I saw the trees and dwellings, as I left them. I spoke to the people, and they spoke to me; and yet my body was lying still in this room, all the while. In the morning, I was come again into my body, and was at Mirfield, and Taheite was a great many miles off. Now I understand what you say about my body being put into the earth, and my soul being somewhere else; and I wish to know where it will be, when it can no more return to my body." Such were the humble conceptions of the dying Taheitean boy—let the reader decide for himself what more there may be, under the grandiloquence of Addison—

———Plato, thou reasonest well.
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?
Or whence this secret dread and inward horror
Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction!
'Tis the divinity, that stirs within us;
'Tis Heaven itself, that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.

No. XCVII.

THE ashes of the dead are ransacked, not only for hidden treasure, and for interesting relics, but there is a figurative species of raking and scratching, among them, in quest of one's ancestors. This is, too frequently, a periculous experiment; for the searcher sometimes finds his progress—the pleasure of his employment, at least—rudely interrupted, by an offensive stump, which proves to be the relic of the whipping-post, or the gallows.

Neither the party himself, nor the world, trouble their heads, about a man's ancestors, until he has distinguished himself, in some degree, or fancies that he has; for, while he is nobody, they are clearly nobody's ancestors. In Note A, upon the article *Touchet*, vol. ix., fol. ed., Lond., 1739, Bayle remarks—"It is very common to fall into two extremes, with regard to those, whom Providence raises greatly above their former condition: some, by fabulous genealogies, procure them ancestors of the

first quality; others reduce them to a rank, much below the true one." This remark was amply illustrated, in the case of Napoleon Bonaparte: while some there were, who thought they could make out a clear descent from the prince of darkness, others were ready to accommodate him with the most illustrious ancestry. The Emperor of Austria had a fancy, for tracing Napoleon's descent, from one of the petty sovereigns of Treviso; and a genealogist made a merit of proving him to be a descendant, from an ancient line of Gothic princes; to all this Napoleon sensibly replied, that he dated his patent of nobility, from the battle of Monte Notte. Cicero was of the same way of thinking, and prided himself, on being *novus homo*. Among the *fragmenta*, ascribed to him, there is a declamation against Sallust, published by Lemaire, in his edition of the Classics, though he believes it not to be Cicero's; in which, sec. ii., are these words—*Ego meis majoribus virtute mea praeluxi; ut, si prius noti non fuerint, a me accipiant initium memoriae suæ*—By my virtue, I have shown forth before my ancestors; so, that if they were unknown before, they will receive the commencement of their notoriety from me. "I am no herald," said Sydney, "to inquire of men's pedigrees: it sufficeth for me if I know their virtues."

This setting up for ancestors, among those, who, from the very nature of our institutions, are, and ever must be, a middling interest people, is as harmless, as it is sometimes ridiculous, and no more need be said of its inoffensiveness.

From the very nature of the case, there can be no lack of ancestors. The simplest arithmetic will show, that the humblest citizen has more than *one million of grand parents*, within the twentieth degree; and it is calculated, in works on consanguinity, that, within the fifteenth degree, every man has nearly *two hundred and seventy millions of kindred*. There is no lack, therefore, of the raw material, for this light work; unless, in a case, like that of the little vagrant, who replied to the magistrate's inquiry, as to his parents, that he never had any, but *was washed ashore*. The process is very simple. Take the name of Smith, for example: set down all of that name, who have graduated at the English, American, and German colleges, for Schmidt is the same thing—then enrol all of that name, upon the habitable earth, who have, in any way, distinguished themselves; carefully avoiding the records of criminal

courts, and such publications as Caulfield's Memoirs, the State Trials, and the Newgate Calendar. Such may be called the genealogy of the Smiths; and every man of that name, while contemplating the list of worthies, will find himself declaring a dividend, *per capita*, of all that was good, and great, and honorable, in the collection; and he will arise, from the perusal, a more complacent, if not a better man.

This species of literature is certainly coming into vogue. I have lately seen, in this city, a large duodecimo volume, recently printed, in which the genealogy of a worthy family, among us, is traced, through Oliver Cromwell, to Æneas, not Æneas Silvius, who flourished in the early part of the fifteenth century, and became Pope Pius II., but to Æneas, the King of the Latins. This royal descent is not through the second marriage with Lavinia; nor through the accidental relation, between Æneas and Dido—

Speluncam Dido dux et Trojanus eandem
Deveniunt —————;

but through the first marriage with the unfortunate Creusa, who was burnt to death, in the great Troy fire, which took place, according to the Parian Marbles, on the 23d of the month, Thargelion, i. e., 11th of June, 1184 years before Christ. Ascanius was certainly therefore the ancestor of this worthy family, the son of Æneas and Creusa; and the grandson of Anchises and Venus. Such a pedigree may satisfy a Welchman.

I am forcibly reminded, by all this, of a very pleasant story, recounted by Horace Walpole, in a letter to Horace Mann: I refer to Letter CCV. in Lord Dover's edition. In 1749, when Mirepoix was ambassador in England, there was a Monsieur de Levi, in his suite. This man was proud of his Jewish name, and really appeared to set no bounds to his genealogical *gout*. They considered the Virgin Mary a cousin of their house, and had a painting, in which she is represented, as saying to Monsieur Levi's ancestor, who takes off his hat in her presence—"*Couvrez vous, mon cousin:*" to which he replies—"*Non pas, ma très sainte cousine, je sçai trop bien le respect que je vous dois.*" The editor, Lord Dover, says, in a note, that there is said to have been another ridiculous picture, in that family, in which Noah is represented, going into the ark, carrying a

small trunk under his arm, on which is written—“*Papiers de la maison de Levis.*”

Very few persons are calculated for the task of tracing genealogies; patience and discrimination should be united with a certain slowness of belief, and wariness of imposition. Two of a feather do not more readily consociate, than two of a name, and of the genealogical fancy, contrive to strike up a relationship. There are also greater obstacles in the way, than a want of the requisite talents, temper, and attainments:—“Alterations of surnames,” says Camden, “which, in former ages, have been very common, have so obscured the truth of our pedigrees, that it will be no little labor to deduce many of them.” For myself, a plain, old-fashioned sexton, as I am, I am much better satisfied, with the simple and intelligible assurance of my Bible, that I am a child of Adam, than I could possibly be, with any genealogical proofs, that Anchises and Venus were my ancestors. However, there is no such thing as accounting for taste; and it is not unpleasant, I admit, to those of us, who still cherish some of our early, classical attachments, to know, that the blood of that ancient family is still preserved among us.

No man is more inclined than I am, to perpetuate a sentiment of profound respect for the memory of worthy ancestors. Let us extract, from the contemplation of their virtues, a profitable stimulus, to prevent us from being weary in well-doing. By the laws of Confucius, a part of the duty, which children owed to their parents, consisted in worshipping them, when dead. I am inclined to believe, that this filial worship or reverence may be well bestowed, in the ascending line, on all, who have deserved it, and who are, *bona fide*, our grandfathers and grandmothers. It seems to me quite proper and convenient, to have a well-authenticated catalogue or list of one's ancestors, as far back as possible; but let us exercise a sound discretion in this matter; and not run into absurdity. I am ready and willing to obey the laws of Confucius, as implicitly, as though I were a Chinaman, and reverence my ancestors; but I must, first, be well satisfied, as to their identity. I will never consent, because some professional genealogist has worked himself into a particular belief, to worship the man in the moon, for my great Proavus, nor Dido for my great, great grandmother.

Domestic arboriculture is certainly getting into fashion, and a family tree is becoming quite essential to the self-complacency, at least, of many well-regulated families. The roots are found to push freely, in the superficial soil of family pride. Generally, these trees, to render them sightly, require to be pruned with a free hand; and the proprietor, when the crooked branches are skilfully removed, and all the small and imperfect fruit put entirely out of sight, may behold it, with heartfelt pleasure, and rejoice in the happy consciousness, that he is a SMINK. If, however, these family matters, instead of being preserved, for private amusement, are to be multiplied, by the press, there will, indeed, in the words of the wise man, be no end of making books.

Ancestors are relics, and nothing else. Whenever the demand for ancestors becomes brisk, and genealogy becomes a *profession*—it becomes a *craft*. Laboureur, the historian, in his *Additions de Castelnau*, tom. ii. p. 559, affords a specimen of genealogical trust-worthiness. “In 1560, Renatus of Sanzay built, with John le Feron, king at arms of France, a genealogy of the house of Sanzay, made up of near fifty descents, most of them enumerated, year by year; with the names, surnames, and coats of arms of the women; whilst all those names, families, and arms were mere phantoms; brother Stephen of Lusignan, out of this mighty tub, as from a public fountain, let flow the nobility and blood of Lusignan to all persons, who desired any of it.”—Again, on page 320, Laboureur says—“They admitted, as true, all that was vented by certain false antiquaries and downright enthusiasts, such as John le Maire de Belges, Forcatel, a civilian, Stephen of Lusignan, and John le Feron, whom I will charge with nothing but credulity.” This, doubtless, is the stumbling block of most men, who engage in this semi-mythical employment.

Nothing is more easy, than to mistake one dead person, for another, when corruption has done its work, upon the form and features. There is something bituminous in time. What masculine mistakes are committed by experts! Those relics, which have been the object of hereditary veneration, for thirty centuries, as the virgin daughter of some great high priest in the days of Cheops and Cephrenes, may, by the assistance of the savans, with the aid of magnifiers of extraordinary power, be demonstrated to be the blackened carcass of Hum-Bug-Phi, the

son of Hassan, the camel-driver ; who kept a little khane or caravansera near Joseph's granaries, in old Al Karirah, on the eastern banks of the Nile, famous—very—for the quality of its leeks and onions, three thousand years ago.

No. XCVIII.

THANK Heaven, I am not a young widow, for two plain reasons ; I do not wish to be young again—and I would not be a widow, if I could help it. A young widow, widder, or widdy, as the word is variously spelt, has been a byword, of odd import, ever since the days, when Sara, the daughter of Raguel, exclaimed, in the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of the book of Tobit—“ *My seven husbands are already dead, and why should I live ?*” All this tilting against the widows, with goose quills for spears, arises from the fact, that these weapons of war are mainly in the hands of one sex. Men are the scribblers—the lions are the painters. Nothing, in the chapters of political economy, is more remarkable, than the fact, that, since all creation was divided into parishes, there has never been a parish, in which there was not a Mr. Tompkins, who was the very thing for the widow Button. But the cutting out and fitting of these matters commonly belongs to that amiable sisterhood, who are ever happy, without orders, to make up, at short notice.

The result of my limited reading and observation has satisfied me entirely, that there is, and ever has been, a very great majority of bad husbands, over the bad wives, and of bewizzarded widowers, over the widows bewitched. When a poor, lone, young widow, for no reason under Heaven, but the desire to prove her respect, as Dr. Johnson says, for the state of matrimony, takes the initiative, every unmarried female, over thirty, longs to cut her ears off.

If there be sin or silliness, in the repetition of the matrimonial relation, or in strong indications of uneasiness, in the state of single blessedness, man is the offender in chief.

Quadrigamus, signifying a man who had been four times married, was a word, applicable of old. Henry VIII. had six wives, in succession. Let us summon a witness, from among the dead.

Let us inquire, where is there a widow, maid, or wife, who would not be deemed a candidate for the old summary punishment of Skymmington, should she behave herself, as boldly, and outrageously, as John Milton behaved?

Milton, though he did not commence his matrimonial experiments, until he was thirty-five, married, in succession, Mary Powell, in 1643—Catherine Woodcock, in 1653—and Elizabeth Minshull, in 1662. Mary Powell, who was the daughter of a Cavalier, and accustomed to the gaiety of her father's house, soon became weary of her solitary condition, with John Milton, who was, constitutionally, of a choleric and lordly temper. Contrasted with the loneliness, and slender appliances of her new home, the residence of her father, at Forest Hill, appeared to her, like paradise lost. So she went home, at the end of a month, ostensibly upon a visit; and, probably, gave no very flattering account of the honeymoon. Just about that period, the King's forces had thrashed Fairfax, in the North, and taught Waller the true difference, between prose and poetry, in the West; and "the Powells," says Dr. Symmons, "began to repent of their Republican connection." Milton wrote to his wife to return. She neither came, nor responded. He next sent a messenger, who was treated with contempt. Thereupon Milton immediately proceeded to pay his suit to a very beautiful and accomplished young lady, the daughter of a Dr. Davis; and Dr. Symmons is evidently of opinion, that the lady and her family had no objections to the proceeding, which is fully exhibited, in Milton's Prose Works, vol. vii. p. 205, Lond., 1806.

Talk not of widows after this. Finding, even in those days of disorder, that no divorce, *a vinculo*, could be obtained, under existing laws, he wrote his celebrated works—The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, and the Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce. In these works he sets forth his particular grievance, which the reader may easily comprehend, from one or two brief quotations—he speaks of a "*mute and spiritless mate*," and of "*himself bound to an image of earth and phlegm*."

After the fight of Naseby, the Powells appear to have thought better of it; and Madame Milton returned, made the amende, and was restored in full. What sort of composition Milton made with Miss Davis nobody has ever disclosed. Certain it is, that compassionate damsel and the works upon divorce were all

laid upon the same shelf. We are apt to find something of value, in a thing we have discarded, when we perceive, that it is capable of giving high satisfaction to another. This consideration may have influenced Mrs. Milton; and, very possibly, the desire of returning to the residence of Milton may have been secondary to that of jilting Miss Davis, which she was certainly entitled to do. I knew an old gentleman, who was always so much affected, in this manner, by the sight of his cast-off clothing, upon the persons of his servants, that nothing would content him, short of reclamer.

Milton was ever Milton still—*nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*. Take a brief extract or two from his work on divorce:—"What therefore God hath joined let no man put asunder. But here the Christian prudence lies, to consider what God hath joined. Shall we say that God hath joined error, fraud, unfitness, wrath, contention, perpetual loneliness, perpetual discord? Whatever lust, or wine, or witchery, threat or enticement, avarice or ambition hath joined together, faithful or unfaithful, Christian with anti-Christian, hate with hate, or hate with love—shall we say this is God's joining?"—"But unfitness and contrariety frustrate and nullify forever, unless it be a rare chance, all the good and peace of wedded conversation; and leave nothing between them enjoyable, but a prone and savage necessity, not worth the name of marriage, unaccompanied with love." Every word of all this was written with an eye to the object of his unlawful passion: but the legislature very justly considered the greatest good of the greatest possible number; and would not turn aside, to pass a bill, for the special relief of John Milton and Miss Davis.

Selden, in his *Uxor Hebraica*, has proved, that polygamy existed, not only among the Hebrews, but among all nations, and in all ages. Mark Anthony is mentioned, as the first, among the Romans, who took the liberty of having two wives. What a gathering there would have been, in the Forum, if the news had been spread, that Mrs. Mark Anthony had taken the liberty of having two husbands! Every body knows, that widows are occasionally burnt, in Hindostan, on the funeral pile with their husbands. Whoever heard of a widower being burnt or even scorched, on a similar occasion?

The Landgrave of Hesse, the most warlike of the Protestant leaders, caused a representation to be made to the theologians, that

he must have two wives, and that he would not be denied. A most rampant and outrageous protocol was prepared, and handed to Bucerus, for the ministers at Wittemberg. The substance of this was equally discreditable to the Landgrave, and insulting to Luther and the holy fathers. The Landgrave was no gentleman, for he told the theologians, that his lady got drunk, and was personally disagreeable to him. He calls God to witness, that, if they do not sanction his polygamy, he will do just what he likes, and the sin will be upon their heads. He particularly wishes information, on one point—why he is not as good as Abraham, Jacob, David, Lamech, and Solomon; and why he has not as good a right to have a spare wife or two, as they had. He asks for two only.

Luther was deeply troubled, and perplexed. The Reformation professed to bring back the world to the Scriptures, in which polygamy was expressly recognized. The Reformers held marriage to be *res politica*, and therefore subject to the law of the State. The matter became worse by delay. The Landgrave was filled with fury, and the theologians with fear. At last, poor Luther and the rest signed a paper, concluding with these memorable words—"If however your highness is utterly determined upon marrying a second wife, we are of opinion, that it ought to be done secretly. Signed and sealed at Wittemberg, after the feast of St. Nicholas, in the year 1539. Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Antony Corvin, Adam John Lening, Justin Wintfert, Dyonisius Melanther."

The detail of all this may be found, in Hazlitt's translation of Michelet's *Life of Luther*, page 251, Lond. 1846. Bayle, article Luther, observes, that the theologians would have promptly refused to sanction such a thing, had the request come from any private gentleman—or, permit me to add, if it had come from the lady of the Landgrave, for a brace of husbands.

It is my opinion, that great injustice is done to widows. The opinion of St. Jerome, who never was a widow, and knew nothing about it, that they should never marry again, is perfectly absurd; for there are some men, whose constitutional timidity would close the matrimonial highway forever, were it not for that peculiar species of encouragement, which none but widows can ever administer. For my own part, I would have a widow speak out, and spare not; for I am very fearful, that the opposite course is productive of great moral mischief, and tends

to perpetuate a system of terrible hypocrisy. But let a sound discretion be exercised. I disapprove altogether of conditional engagements, made *durante vita mariti*.

No. XCIX.

JONNY MOORHEAD was a man of a kind heart and a pleasant fancy. He came hither from Belfast, in 1727. He became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Long Lane, in 1730.—*Tempora mutantur*—Long Lane, and Jonny Moorhead, and the little, old, visible temple, and Presbyterianism itself, are like Rachel's first born—they are not. But in 1744, the good people built a new church, for Jonny Moorhead; in due time, Long Lane became Federal Street; and, Jonny's church bore the bell, which had rung so many peals, and the gilded tell-tale, which, for so many years, had done obeisance to all the winds of Heaven, upon the *old* Brattle Street Church. These, upon the demolition of that church, in 1774, were the gift of John Hancock. Jonny Moorhead had little comfort from that bell, for he died December 3, 1774, and could he have lived to see that Presbyterian weathercock go round, in after-times, it would have broken the tough, old strings of Jonny Moorhead's Irish heart.

About one hundred years ago, Jonny Moorhead, upon a drowsy summer afternoon, gave out the one hundred and eighty-seventh psalm—the chief minstrel, with infinite embarrassment, suggested, that there were not so many in the *Book*—and tradition tells us, that Jonny replied—“*Weel, then, sing as mony as there be.*”

My recollection of this anecdote of Jonny Moorhead will be painfully revived, when I send forth the one hundredth number of these dealings with the dead. They have been prepared like patch-work, from such fragments, as my common-place book supplied, and at such broken hours of more than ordinary loneliness, as might otherwise have been snoozed, unconsciously away. I had cast all that I had written into a particular drawer; and great was my surprise, to find, that the hundredth was the last, and that, with that number, I shall have sung—“*as mony as there be.*”

One hundred—thought I—is an even number—few individuals care to survive one hundred. When these dealings with the dead had reached the number of four-score, I had serious misgivings, that their *strength*, to my weary reader, might prove nothing better than *labor and sorrow*; notwithstanding the occasional tokens of approbation, from some exceedingly old-fashioned people, who were altogether behind the times.

Having attained this *point d'appui*, which appears well enough adapted for the long home of an old sexton, it occurred to me, that I could not possibly do a better thing, for myself, or a more acceptable thing for the public, than to gather up my tools, as snugly as possible, and quietly give up the ghost. But giving up the ghost, even in the sacristan sense of that awful phrase, is not particularly agreeable, after all. If I look upon each one of these hundred dealings, as a sepulchre of my own digging—I cannot deny, that the employment of my spade has been a particular solace to me. But there are other solaces—I know it—there are an hundred according to the exiled bard of Sulmo—

“ ——— centum solatia curæ
Et ras, et comites, et via longa dabunt.”

Other suggestions readily occur, and are as readily, discarded. Parents, occasionally, experiment upon the sensibility of their children, by fondly discoursing of the uncertainty of human existence, and mingling deep drawn sighs, with shadowy allusions to wills and codicils.

For three-and-thirty years, our veteran, maiden aunt, Jemima Wycherly, at the close of her annual visit, which seldom fell short of six weeks, in its duration, though it seemed much longer, took each of us by the hand, and, with many tears, commended us fervently to the protecting arm of an overruling Providence, and bade us an eternal farewell!

I have always contemplated the conduct of Charles V. in relation to the rehearsal of his funeral obsequies, as a piece of imperial foolery. “He ordered his tomb to be erected, in the chapel of the monastery. His domestics marched thither in funeral procession, with black tapers in their hands. He himself followed, in his shroud. He was laid in his coffin, with much solemnity. The service for the dead was chanted; and Charles joined in the prayers, which were offered for the rest of his soul, mingling his tears with those, which his attendants shed,

as if they had been celebrating a real funeral. The ceremony closed, with sprinkling holy water on the coffin, in the usual form, and, all the assistants retiring, the doors of the chapel were shut. Then Charles rose out of the coffin, and withdrew to his apartment." Such is the statement of Dr. Robertson.*

Notwithstanding this high authority, it is comforting, even at this late day, to believe, that a story, so discreditable to the memory of Charles, is without any substantial foundation. It has ever appeared remarkable, that Bayle should not have alluded to this curious anecdote. After bestowing the highest praise, on Richard Ford's *Hand Book, for Travellers in Spain*, the *London Quarterly Review*† furnishes an extract from the work, in which, after giving a minute and interesting account of the convent of St. Yuste, the final retreat of Charles V., Mr. Ford says—"the story of his having had the funeral service said over himself, while alive, is untrue; no record, or tradition of the kind existed among the monks."

There is something, in these drafts upon *posterity*, to be accepted and paid, by the *present generation*, for the honor of the drawer, resembling the conduct of a man, who encroaches on his principal, or who anticipates his revenues.

There is, undoubtedly, a species of luxury in leave-taking. We have delighted, to contemplate the edifying history of that gray-headed old rat, who, weary of the world, and determined to spend the remnant of his days, in pious meditation, took a final and affectionate leave of all his relatives and friends, and retired to a quiet hole—in the recesses of a *Cheshire cheese*.

However gratified we may be, to witness the second, or third coming of an able, ardent, and ambitious politician, it is not in the gravest nature to restrain a smile, while we contrast that vehemence, which no time can temper—that *vis vivida vitæ*—ready for all things, in the forum or the field—that unquenchable fire, brightly burning, beneath the frost of more than seventy winters—with those sad infirmities of age—those silver hairs—that one foot in the grave—the necessity of turning from all sub-lunary things, and making way for Heaven, under the pale rays of life's parting sun—those senatorial adieus—and long, last farewells—those solemn prayers and fervent hopes for the hap-

* Hist. of Charles V., vol. v. page 139, Oxford ed. 1825.

† Loud. Quart. Rev., vol. lxxvi. page 161.

piness of his associates, whom he should meet no more, on this side of the eternal world—those *esto perpetuas* for his country! How touching these things would be, but for their frequency! What more natural, or more excusable, having enjoyed the luxury of leave-taking, than a desire—after a reasonable interval—to repeat the process, which afforded so much pleasure, and inflicted so little pain!

As to my own comparatively humble relation to the public—*parvis componere magna*—I am of opinion, that I should gain nothing, by affecting to retire, or by pretending to be dead. As to the former, it may be as truly averred of sextons, as it was, by Mr. Jefferson, of office-holders—“*few die and none resign;*” and, in respect to the latter, I not only despise the idea of such an imposition upon the public, but have some little fear, that the affectation might be too suddenly followed, by the reality, as Dr. Robertson, rightly or wrongly, affirms it to have been, in the case of Charles the Fifth.

I am now fairly committed, for the first number, at least, of another hundred, but for nothing more. I pretend not to look deeper into futurity, than six feet, which is the depth of a well-made grave. When I shall have completed the second hundred, and commenced upon a third, I shall be well nigh ready to exclaim, in the words of Ovid—

“Vixi

Annos his centum: nunc tertia vivitur ætas.”

A relation of liberty and equality is decidedly the best, for my reader and for me—I am not constrained to write, nor he to read—if he cannot lie cozily, in a grave of my digging—I do not propose to detain him there—to bury him alive. Dealing with the dead has not hardened my heart. I am a sexton of very considerable sensibility; and have, occasionally, mingled my tears with the earth, as I shovelled it in.

In less figurative phrase, it is my desire to write, for my amusement, till one of us, the reader or myself, gives in, or gives out, and cries *enough*. I have a perfect respect for the old proverb, *de gustibus*, and by no means anticipate the pleasure of pleasing every body—

*Men' moveat cimex Pantilius? aut cruciet, quod
Vellicet absentem Demetrius? aut quod ineptus
Fannius Hermogenis lædat conviva Tigelli?*

There are some readers, for example, who seem to look upon a classical quotation, as a personal affront. I conceive this objection to be scarcely equitable, from those, whose hybrid English, it is quite as hard to bear.

There are mortals—offenders in some sort—whom it is difficult to please, like the culprit who cried *higher* and *lower*, under the lash, till the Irish drummer's patience was perfectly exhausted, and he exclaimed—“*By Jasus, there's no plasing ye, strike where I will.*”

No. C.

THE sayings of eminent men, in a dying hour, are eminently worthy of being gathered together—they are often illustrative of the characters of the dead, and impressive upon the hearts of the living. Not a few of these parting words are scattered, over the breadth and length of history, and might form a volume—a *Vade Mecum*, for the patriot and the Christian—a casket of imperishable jewels.

As an example of those sayings, to which I refer, nothing can be more apposite, than that of the Chevalier Bayard, while dying upon the field of battle. “He received a wound,” says Robertson, “which he immediately perceived to be mortal, and being unable any longer to continue on horseback, he ordered one of his attendants to place him under a tree, with his face toward the enemy; then fixing his eyes on the guard of his sword, which he held up, instead of a cross, he addressed his prayers to God; and, in this posture, which became his character, both as a soldier and as a Christian, he calmly awaited the approach of death.” Bourbon, who led the foremost of the enemy's troops, found him in this situation, and expressed regret and pity, at the sight. “*Pity not me,*” cried the high-spirited chevalier, “*I die, as a man of honor ought, in the discharge of my duty; they indeed are objects of pity, who fight against their king, their country, and their oath.*”

How significant of the life of that great military phlebotomist, who, from the overthrow of the council of five hundred, in 1799, to his own in 1815, delighted in blood, and in war, were those wild, wandering words of the dying Napoleon—*tete d'armee!*

We have the last words of consciousness, that were uttered, by the younger Adams, when stricken by the hand of death in the capitol—the *last of earth*! We have also those of his venerable father, who expired, on the anniversary of that day, which he had so essentially contributed to render glorious, so long as the annals of our country shall continue to be preserved. On the morning of that day, the dying patriot, at the age of ninety-one, was awakened, by the customary pealing of bells, and the roar of artillery. Upon being asked, if he recognized the day, he replied—“*it is the glorious Fourth—God bless the day—God bless you all.*”

On the ninth day of July, 1850, another patriot died, at his post, and in the service of his country, whose parting words will long remain, engraven at full length, upon the broad area of the whole American heart,—**I AM PREPARED—I HAVE ENDEAVORED TO DO MY DUTY!** Here, in this comprehensive declaration of General Taylor, are embodied all, and more than all, contained in the long cherished words of the departing patriot—**ESTO PERPETUA!**

“And you brave Cobham, to the latest breath,
Shall feel your ruling passion, strong in death:
Such in those moments, as in all the past;
‘O save my country, Heaven!’ shall be your last.”

The ninth day of July is, with the Swiss, the day of their National Independence. On that memorable day, in 1836, they fought, and won the great battle of Sempach, against Leopold, Duke of Austria, which victory established the liberties of Switzerland.

Upon the anniversary of that very day, just ninety-five years ago, Washington was signally preserved, from the sweeping and indiscriminate carnage of Indian warfare, for those high destinies, which he fulfilled so gloriously. The ninth day of July, 1755, was the day of General Braddock’s defeat—the battle, as it is sometimes called, of Fort du Quesne. Hereafter, it will be noted, as a day of gloom, in our national calendar. A great—good man has fallen—in a trying hour—in the very midst of his labors—a wiser, a worthier could not have fallen, at a moment of deeper need. From sea to sea—from the mountain tops to the valleys below—from the city and from the wilderness—from the rich man’s castle, and from the hunter’s cabin—from the silver-haired and from the light-hearted, what an acclaim—what a

response, as the voice of one man—has already answered to that dying declaration—I AM PREPARED—I HAVE ENDEAVORED TO DO MY DUTY! As an entire people, we know it—we feel it—and may God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, enable us to profit, by a dispensation, so awfully solemn, and so terribly severe.

The spirit of this great, good man is now by the side of that sainted shade, which once animated the form of the immortal Washington. They are looking down upon the destinies of their country. Who is so dull of hearing, as not to catch the context of those dying words? *I am prepared—I have endeavored to do my duty*—AND MAY MY DEATH CEMENT THAT UNION, WHICH I SO CHEERFULLY DEVOTED MY LIFE TO PRESERVE!

It is finished. The career of this good man has closed forever. Ingratitude and calumny to him are nothing now. After days and nights of restless agitation, he has obtained one long, last night of sweet repose, reserved for those, who die *prepared*, and who have endeavored to do their duty. He has gone where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest. No summons to attend the agitating councils of the Cabinet shall disturb his profound repose—no sarcastic commentaries upon his honest policy, from the over-heated leaders of the Senate or the House, shall give him additional pain. Party malignity can no longer reach that ear. Even the hoary-headed, political Zoilus of the age can scarcely find a motive, base enough, among the recesses of an envenomed heart, for post-humous abuse. In view of this solemnizing event, the raving abolitionist and the Utopian non-resistant may be expected to hold their incomparably senseless tongues, at least till these obsequies be past.

If I do not greatly mistake, the death of General Harrison and the death of General Taylor, so very soon after entering upon the performance of their presidential duties, will not fail to present before the whole American people, for their learning, a first and a second lesson, so perfectly legible, that he, who runs, may read.

It perfectly comports with a respect, sincere and profound, for the memories of these excellent men, solemnly to inquire, if, upon certain well known and universally acknowledged principles, it would not be as wise, and even more wise, to select a statesman, whose conduct in the cabinet had made him preëmi-

nently popular, and to place him, with a sword, in his unpractised hand, at the head of the armies of the Republic—than to place, in the Presidential chair, a great soldier, universally and deservedly popular, for his success in war—however strong his common sense—however inflexible his integrity—however pure and devoted his patriotism—unless he also possesses that skill, and knowledge of affairs, which never came to man, by intuition; and which cannot be acquired, but by the laborious training and experience of years? This is a solemn question, for the people; and it may well be put, irrespectively of the public weal, and with a reference, directly, to the happiness, and even to the continued existence, of those, who may be so unfortunate as to become the objects of the popular favor. Is there any doubt, that all the battles, in which General Taylor has ever been engaged, have occasioned less wear and tear of body and mind, than have been produced, by the numberless trials and anxieties of the Presidential relation? It is a popular saying, and, perhaps, not altogether unworthy of general acception, that both General Harrison and General Taylor were *killed, not by kindness, but by care.*

It may readily be supposed, that a gallant soldier would rather encounter the brunt of a battle, than such torrents of filth, as have been poured, professionally, upon the chief magistrate of the nation, from week to week, by the great scavenger, and his auxiliaries, at Washington. All this would have been borne, with comparative indifference, by a practised statesman, whose training had been among the contests of the forum, and whose moral *cutis* had been thickened, by time and exposure.

To appear, and to be, all that a chief magistrate ought to appear, and to be, in the centre of his cabinet, what a mass of information, on a great variety of subjects—what tact, amid the details of the cabinet—must be required, which very few gentlemen, who have devoted themselves to the military profession, can be supposed to possess! If knowledge is power, ignorance is weakness; and the consciousness of that weakness produces a condition of suffering and anxiety. Instead of coming to the great work of government, with the necessary stock of knowledge, training, and experience—how incompetent is he, who comes to that work, like an actor, who is learning his part, during the progress of the play.

The crude, iron ore is quite as well adapted to the purposes

of the smith, or the cutler, without any subjection to the preparatory processes of metallurgy, as talent and virtue, however consummate, without preparatory training, and appropriate study, for the great and complicated work of government.

Too much confidence is apt to be reposed, upon the idea, that the President will be sustained, by his cabinet; and that any deficiencies, in him, will be compensated, by their wisdom and experience. The President is an important, component part of the acting government. He is not, like the august Personage, at the head of the government of England, who can do no wrong; and whose chief employment is the breeding of royal babies, and the occasional reading of a little speech. He can do a great deal of wrong, and must do a great deal of work; and, when he differs from his cabinet, the more need he feels of practical and applicable wisdom and knowledge; and, the more upright and conscientious he is, the more miserable he becomes, under an oppressive sense of his incapacity.

General Taylor will long be remembered, by the people of the United States, with profound and affectionate respect. His amiable and excellent qualities are embalmed in their hearts. He fought the battles of his country, with consummate skill and bravery. He led their armies, in many battles—and never, but to victory!

A grateful people, in the fulness of their hearts, and amid the blindness of popular enthusiasm, and with the purest purposes, and with sentiments of patriotic devotion, rewarded their gallant soldier, by placing upon his brows, A GILDED CROWN OF THORNS!

No. CI.

THE form of a Chinese tomb, says Mr. Davis, in his "Description of the Empire of China," whether large or small, is exactly that of the Greek *omega* Ω . Their mourning color is white. Their cemeteries are upon the hills. No interments are permitted in cities. No corpse is suffered to be carried, through any walled town, which may lie in its way to the place of interment.

The tombs of the rich, says M. Grosier, are shaped like a

horse shoe, which, when well made, might pass for a very respectable Ω . Almost immediately after death, says the latter writer, the corpse is arrayed in its best attire. A son will sell himself, as a slave, to purchase a coffin, for his father. The coffin, upon which no cost is spared, remains, frequently, for years, the most showy article of the expectant's furniture. The body lies in state, and is visited by all comers, for seven days. The hall of ceremony is hung with white, interspersed with black or violet colored silk. Flowers, perfumes, and wax lights abound. Those, who enter, salute the dead, as if he were alive, and knock their heads, three times, upon the ground. Upon this, the sons of the defunct creep forth, on their hands and knees, from behind a curtain, and, having returned the salutation, retire in the same manner.

A Chinese hearse is a very elegant affair; it is covered with a dome-shaped canopy of violet-colored silk, with tufts of white, neatly embroidered, and surmounted with net work. In this the coffin reposes; and the whole is borne, by sixty-four men.

Mourning continues for three years, during which the aggrieved abstain from flesh, wine, and all ordinary amusements.

As we have had recently, among us, some half a dozen visitors, male and female, from the Celestial Empire, I am strongly tempted to turn from the dead, to the living.

I have repeatedly attended the morning levees of Miss PWAN YEKOO, who was exhibited with her serving-maid, LUM AKUM, Mr. SOO CHUNE, the musical professor, his son and daughter, MUN CHUNG and AMOON, and Mr. ALEET MONG, the interpreter. This was certainly a very interesting group; such as never before has been presented in this city, and will not be again, I presume, for many years.

Miss Yekoo is said to be seventeen, which appears to be her age. With the costume of the Chinese, which, in our eyes, is superlatively graceless, we have become sufficiently familiar, by the exhibition of the living males and the stuffed females, in our Chinese Museums. Of their music, we had an interesting specimen, a few years since. Being fortunately deaf, I can say nothing of the performances of Miss Yekoo and Professor Chune. Their features and complexions are Chinese, of course, and cannot be better described than in the words of Sir John Barrow, as applicable to the race: "The narrow, elongated, half-closed eye; the linear and highly-arched eye-

brow ; the broad root of the nose ; the projection of the upper jaw a little beyond the lower ; the thin, straggling beard, and the body generally free from hair ; a high, conical head, and triangular face : and these are the peculiar characteristics which obtained for them, in the *Systema Naturæ* of Linnaeus, a place among the varieties of the species, distinguished by the name of *homines monstrosi*."

Apart from these and other considerations, it was well for all, who had it in their power, to avail themselves of an opportunity, which is not likely to be presented again, for years, and examine, with their own eyes, those "*golden lilies*," for the production of which this little Chinese spinster, Miss Pwan Yekoo has been severely tortured, from her cradle. She is neither very large, nor very small, for a girl of seventeen, and her feet are precisely *two inches and a half* in length. A small female foot, as it came from the hand of the great Creator, has ever been accounted a great beauty, since Eve was born. But, to the eyes of all beholders, on this side of the Yellow Sea, no more disgusting objects were ever presented, than the horribly contracted and crippled deformities, upon the ends of Miss Yekoo's little trotters.

The bare feet are not exhibited ; but a model of the foot, two inches and a half in length, on which is a shoe, which is taken off, by the exhibitor, and put upon the real foot of Miss Yekoo, over a shoe, already there. This model is affirmed to be exact. As it is presented in front, the great toe nail alone is visible, forming a central apex, for the foot. On being turned up, the four smaller toes are seen, closely compacted, and inverted upon the sole. It is not possible to walk, with the weight of the body upon the inverted toes, without pain. Miss Yekoo, like all other Chinese girls, with these crippled feet, walks, with manifest uneasiness and awkwardness, upon her heels. The *os calcis* receives the whole weight of the body.

To sustain the statement, that Miss Yekoo is a "*Chinese lady*," it is said, that these crippled feet are signs of aristocracy. Not infallible, I conceive :—not more so, than crippled ribs, occasioned by tight lacing, which may originate in the upper circles, but find hosts of imitators, among the lower orders. "We may add," says Mr. Davis, writing of this practice, "that this odious custom extends lower down, in the scale of society, than might have been expected, from its disabling

effect, upon those, who have to labor for their subsistence. If the custom were first imposed, by the tyranny of the men, the women are fully revenged, in the diminution of their charms and domestic usefulness."

Mr. Davis evidently supposes, that the custom had its rise in jealousy, and a desire to prevent the ambulatory sex, from gadding about. Various causes have been assigned, for this disgusting practice. Sir John Barrow, after expressing his surprise, at the silence of Marco Polo, on the subject of crippled feet, which were, doubtless, common in his time, observes—"Of the origin of this unnatural custom, the Chinese relate twenty different accounts, all absurd. Europeans suppose it to have originated in the jealousy of the men, determined, says M. de Pauw, to keep them '*si étroit qu'on ne peut comparer l'exactitude avec laquelle on les gouverne.*'"

A practice, which, at its very birth, and during its infancy, required the assignment of some plausible reason, for its existence and support—when it grows up to be a custom, lives on and thrives, irrespectively of its origin, and, frequently, in spite of its absurdity. The blackened teeth of the Japanese—the goitres of the Swiss, in the valley of Chamouni—the flattened heads of certain Indian races—the crippled feet of the Chinese are illustrations of this truth, in the admiration which they still continue to receive. "Whatever," says Sir John Barrow, "may have been the cause, the continuance may more easily be explained: as long as the men will marry none but such as have crippled feet, crippled feet must forever remain in fashion among Chinese ladies."

M. De Pauw, in his Philosophical Dissertations, alludes to this practice, in connection with that, formerly employed by the Egyptians, and which he calls—the *method of confining the women anciently, in Egypt, by depriving them, in some measure, of the use of their feet.*"

Plutarch, in his *Precepta Connub.* says, that shoes were entirely forbidden to women, by the Egyptians. "Afterwards," says De Pauw, "they imagined it to be inconsistent with decency, that they should appear in public, with the feet naked, and, of course, they remained at home."

The Kalif, Hakin, who founded the religion of the Druses, re-enacted this law. De Pauw remarks, that the assertion of Plutarch might seem doubtful, if a decree, prohibiting the manufac-

ture of shoes for women, under the pain of death, were not found, as it is, in the *Kitab-al-Machaid*, or bible of the Druses.

Upon my first visit to Pwan Yekoo and her *suite*, in connection with other visitors, I was not admitted for nearly two hours, after the appointed time. Ample sleeping arrangements had not been made, for these Celestials; and, for one night, at least, they had been packed, like a crate of China ware, in a closet, or small apartment, contiguous to the hall of exhibition. Yekoo was indignant, and refused to show her "golden lilies." By dint of long importunity, she appeared, but in no gentle humor. Indeed, when Yekoo came forth, followed by Lum Akum, I was reminded, at a glance, of Cruikshank's illustration of Mrs. Varden, followed by Meigs, with the Protestant manual. They soon recovered their better nature; and some little attention, paid by the visitors, to the Celestial papposes, put them into tolerably good humor.

At the close of the exhibition, we were invited near the platform. It would be superfluous to describe the Chinese costume, so commonly presented, in various works. I was especially attracted by the hair of Yekoo, and Lum Akum, who passes for her waiting woman. I examined it with my glasses. It was jet black, coarse, abundant, and besmeared with a stiffening paste or gluten, which mightily resembled grease. Upon the top of the head a slender, round stick, about the size of a crow's quill, is attached, projecting *aft*, in marine parlance, several inches, like a small ring tail boom. The design of this is to support the hair, which is thrown over it, and hangs, or is plastered, down with the shining paste, assuming the appearance, seen *a tergo*, of a rudder.

The Chinese, in relation to the rest of mankind, are, certainly, a contrarious people. In 1833, Mr. Charles Majoribanks addressed a letter to the Right Hon. Charles Grant, in which he says:

"China may, in many respects, be said to stand alone, among the nations; not only differing, but, in many instances, diametrically opposed, in the nature of its laws, customs, and institutions. A Chinese, when he goes into mourning, puts on white; the left hand they consider the place of honor; they think it an act of unbecoming familiarity to uncover the head; their mariner's compass, they assert, points to the South; the stomach they de-

clare to be the seat of the understanding; and the chief God of their idolatry is the Devil."

Suicide is no crime, with the Chinese. To receive a present, with one hand, is deemed an act of rudeness. They never say of the departed, that he is *dead*, but that he has *gone to his ancestors*. Among the good traits of the Chinese are to be numbered filial respect, and general sobriety. In one particular, their legislation may be considered superior to our own—among the grounds of divorce, says Mr. Davis, they include "*excessive talkativeness*."

I have been reared, in the faith, that the Chinese are not only a *peculiar*, but an exceedingly *nasty* generation. According to Barrow, and to Du Halde, in his *Hist. Gén. de la Chine*, they are so liable to a species of leprosy, that, for the purpose of arresting its progress, it is numbered among the causes of divorce. The itch and other cutaneous diseases are extremely common. "They seem," says De Pauw, "to have neither horror nor repugnance for any kind of food; they eat rats, bats, owls, storks, badgers, dogs," &c. Brand, in his *Reise nach China*, observes—"Dogs are chiefly employed, as food, by the Chinese, during the great heat in summer, because they fancy their flesh to have a cooling quality."

Barrow was private secretary to the Earl of Macartnay, and, in 1804, published his travels in China, a work of great merit, and which has been highly lauded, for its candor and fidelity. In proof of my remark, I offer the following quotation, from that work, on pages 76 and 77. After alluding to the custom of crippling the feet, Mr. Barrow proceeds—"The interior wrappers of the ladies' feet are said to be seldom changed, remaining sometimes, until they can no longer hold together; a custom that conveys no very favorable idea of Chinese cleanliness. This indeed forms no part of their character; on the contrary, they are what Swift would call a *frowzy* people. The comfort of clean linen, or frequent change of under-garments, is equally unknown to the sovereign and the peasant. A sort of thin coarse silk supplies the place of cotton or linen next the skin, among the upper ranks; but the common people wear a coarse kind of open cotton cloth. These vestments are more rarely removed for the purpose of washing, than for that of being replaced with new ones; and the consequence of such neglect is, as might naturally be supposed, an abundant increase of those vermin, to

whose growth filthiness is found to be most favorable. The highest officers of state made no hesitation of calling their attendants, in public, to seek in their necks, for those troublesome animals, which, when caught, they very composedly put between their teeth. They carry no pocket handkerchief, but generally blow their noses into small square pieces of paper, which some of their attendants have ready prepared for the purpose. Many are not so cleanly, but spit about the rooms, or against the walls, like the French, and they wipe their dirty hands, in the sleeves of their gowns. They sleep at night in the same clothes they wear by day. Their bodies are as seldom washed, as their articles of dress. They never make use of the bath, warm or cold. Notwithstanding the vast number of rivers and canals, with which every part of the country is intersected, I do not remember to have seen a single group of boys bathing. The men, in the hottest day of summer, make use of warm water, for washing the hands and face. They are unacquainted with the use of soap."

I do not disbelieve, that we, occasionally, meet men, who are very dirty, and remarkably orthodox, and, now and then, a well-washed and well-dressed villain—but sin and filth are too frequently found to form the very bond of iniquity. "Great crimes," says Sir John Barrow, "are not common, but little vices pervade all ranks of society. A Chinese is cold, cunning, and distrustful; always ready to take advantage of those he has to deal with; extremely covetous and deceitful; quarrelsome, vindictive, but timid and dastardly. A Chinese in office is a strange compound of insolence and meanness. All ranks and conditions have a total disregard for truth. From the Emperor downwards, the most palpable falsehoods are proclaimed, with unblushing effrontery, to answer a political, an interested, or exculpatory purpose."

I beg leave respectfully to suggest to Miss Yekoo, to pay a little more attention to her teeth, and somewhat improve her personal appearance. The collections, upon their upper portions, are, by no means, necessary to prove her Tartar origin.

No. CII.

DEATH is rarely more unwelcome to any, than to those, who reasonably suppose the perils of the deep to be fairly passed, and who are permitted, after a long sojourn in other lands, to look once again upon their own—so near withal, that their eyes are gladdened, by the recognition of familiar landmarks; and who, in the silent chancel of their miscalculating hearts, thank God, that they are *at home at last*—and yet, in the very midst of life and joy, they are in death!

There has ever seemed to me to be something exceedingly impressive, in the death of that eminent patriot, Josiah Quincy. He died when the bark, which bore him homeward was in sight of land—the headlands of Gloucester, April 26, 1775—

———*Dulces moriens reminiscitur Argos.*

Few men, of our own country, have accomplished more, or acquired a more honorable celebrity, at the early age of thirty-one.

His was a death in the common course of nature. I more especially allude, at this moment, to death as it occurs, from shipwreck, on one's own shores, when the voyage is apparently at an end, and the voyagers are anticipating an almost immediate reunion with their friends.

The frequency of these occurrences revives, at the present moment, the sentiment of Horace, delivered some eighteen centuries ago—

*Illi robur et æs triplex
Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci
Commisit pelago ratem
Primus. ———*

We are oblivious of perils past. The tax on commerce, levied by the whirlwind, and by recklessness, and ignorance, far exceeds the common calculation of those, who know little, experimentally, of the perils of the deep; and who go not down upon the sea in ships. Precisely fifty years ago, it was estimated, at Lloyd's, that one ship per diem, three hundred and sixty-five ships, annually, were lost, in the open sea, and on lee shores. And, in Lloyd's Lists, for 1830, it was stated, that six hundred and seventy-seven British vessels were lost, during that year.

Whether or not it be attributable to that natural eagerness, which increases, as the object of our heart's desire draws near, and is apt to abate somewhat of our ordinary vigilance—certain it is, that calamities of this nature are of no unfrequent occurrence, near the termination of a voyage, and when we have almost arrived at the haven, where we would be.

About ten years ago, while enjoying the hospitality of some Southern friends, I became acquainted with a lady, the varying expression of whose features arrested my attention, and excited my surprise. Whenever her countenance was lighted up, by a smile, it was for an instant only; and an expression of solemnity, and even of sadness, immediately succeeded; as the darkness of an autumnal sky follows the feeble flashes of electric light.

I sought an explanation of this peculiarity, from an old friend, who knew this lady well, Mr. Doddridge Crocker, formerly a merchant of this city, and then a resident of Charleston.

He informed me, that, many years before, he had been a passenger, in company with this lady and her father, together with other citizens of Charleston, for New York, on board the *Rose in Bloom*. They had a prosperous voyage, until they came in sight of the Highlands. The passengers proceeded to make their toilets; and arrangements were in progress, for going speedily on shore. The ship was under a press of canvas, with a strong breeze. The wind shifted its direction suddenly, and soon became a gale. The *Rose in Bloom* was capsized, and lost. The lady, said Mr. Crocker, to whom you refer, and her father, amid the terrible confusion, which ensued, clung to some floating article, whose buoyancy, it soon became apparent, was not sufficient to support them both. The filial and paternal contest may be easily conceived, each entreating the other, to retain the only means of preservation. At length, the father abandoned his hold, and struck out for a floating spar, at some little distance. His struggles were ineffectual—he sunk, before his daughter's eyes! We were, ere long, rescued from our imminent peril. The impression, left upon her mind, was left there forever.

The reader may possibly surmise, that my leading remarks have a particular reference to the recent shipwreck of the *Elizabeth*, upon the coast of New York. This catastrophe, which is imputed to ignorance and miscalculation, involves the loss of an

interesting and intelligent young gentleman, Mr. Horace Sumner, of this city, and of the Marquis and Marchioness Ossoli, and their child. One of these sufferers I have known, in earlier days. Under the quiet, unassuming roof of her worthy father, Mr. Timothy Fuller, I have met his daughter Margaret. Few then would have anticipated her melancholy fate, and fewer still, that she would become an Italian marchioness!

Let me devote the remaining space, in the present article, to those unmitigated wretches, with hearts of flint, who rioted and revelled, amid the sufferings of their fellow-beings. An opportunity will now be afforded, to stamp this hellish practice, with all the force of the law, and whatever there may be of indignant severity, in public sentiment.

Luring vessels on shore, by arranging false lights, and robbing wrecks are crimes of great antiquity. But I had no suspicion, that even the latter practice was carried on, so systematically, and so boldly, as it appears to have been, at the present day, in the State of New York. The names of the places, where these atrocities were committed, Fire Island, Patchogue, Islip, Babylon have something of a Cornish sound, undoubtedly.

Of old, in all the northern regions of Europe, and especially, along the coasts of the Baltic Sea, a wreck was deemed "*a Providence*;" and laws were in force, authorizing the inhabitants to fall on, and plunder at discretion, or, in the language, then employed—"in naufragorum miseria et calamitate, tanquam vultures, ad prædam currere." Of the earlier periods of our own history, tales have been told, which, though almost beyond belief, would not have been related, if they had not been somewhere, upon the outskirts or frontiers of probability. Thus many—many—very many years ago, tradition intimates, that a worthy clergyman of Truro was interrupted, in the middle of his discourse, by one of his deacons, who caused the whole congregation to rise *en masse*, by seizing his hat and crying aloud—"a wreck!" whereupon the good man is reported, while putting up his notes, and opening the pulpit door, to have exclaimed—"Stay—stay, my Christian friends, let us all have a fair start."

More than five hundred years ago, in the 13th of Edward III., laws were passed, in England, for the punishment of such offenders. These laws were amended and confirmed, in the 12th of Anne, and 4th of George I., 26th of George II., and 8th of

Elizabeth. By the statute of 26 George II., ch. 19, plundering a vessel, in distress, or wrecked, and putting out false lights, to deceive, were made capital felonies. By the civil law, stealing even a plank from a vessel, in distress, or wrecked, made the offender liable, for the entire ship and cargo. The early Neapolitan constitutions and the laws of the Wisigoths inflicted the severest punishment, not only upon such as plundered a wreck, but upon all, who were convicted of neglecting to aid a vessel in distress, when in their power to render comfort and assistance.

By the laws of the United States—I refer to the act of March 3, 1825—persons who plunder vessels in distress; and all, who obstruct the escape of the sufferers; the exhibitors of false lights and extinguishers of true ones, with intent to produce shipwreck, are punishable, by fine, not exceeding five thousand dollars, and imprisonment and hard labor, not exceeding ten years. The extreme mildness of this law has always struck me with amazement; for, among the offenders, described in the statute, are those, "*who shall wilfully obstruct the escape of any person, endeavoring to save his or her life,*" &c.

Since men went down upon the sea in ships, there has rarely occurred, in our own country, a case of deeper atrocity, than the present; and, it is to be hoped, that the tribunals of New York will exhibit a forcible example of mercy to the whole community, by a prompt and condign punishment of these heartless wretches.

The fiendish spirit, which, of old, animated the Buccaneers of the Tortugas, will probably never entirely die out from the heart of man, till the period of millennial purgation. It is impossible to conceive of anything, in a population of hyænas, more selfish, cold, and cruel, than the conduct of that abandoned class, of whose existence we have abundant evidence; to whom no music is so sweet, as that of the midnight hurricane; and who have, immemorially, obtained the appellation of *moon-cursers*, because they delight in that darkness, which is suited to their infernal profession.

The laws of England have been unable to accomplish the extinction of these miscreants. The Cornish coast, exposed, as it is, to marine disaster, has ever been famous, for this species of crime and cruelty. It is chiefly confined to a few parishes, on the craggy shore, between Mount's Bay and the Lizard. "When a wreck takes place," says Mr. Haydn, page 559, fol-

lowing the words of Phillips, "thousands assemble with hatchets, axes, crowbars, &c., and many women and children fight, by habit, for the plunder, utterly regardless of the sufferers."

For the honor of human nature I trust, that many, very many years have gone by, since any such atrocities were practised, upon the sea-coast of New England. The late Dr. Holbrook, of Milton, related an incident, which occurred, during the last war with Great Britain, extending not beyond mere pilfering; and which, in the case of one individual, at least, had rather an amusing termination.

A vessel was wrecked, on Nantasket beach; and, her cargo was broken up, and scattered along the shore. On the following day, Dr. Holbrook was hastily summoned, to visit a patient, who was thought to be dying. He was thoroughly exhausted, and had vomited, through the whole day, a substance, in no degree offensive, but, on the contrary, exceedingly aromatic and agreeable. Nevertheless, he was sinking from exhaustion. Dr. Holbrook could not prevail upon the patient to admit, that he had partaken of any other, than his customary diet. His wife stated, that he had been absent the preceding night, and had not told her, in what manner he had been engaged.

At last, the doctor gravely informed him, that it was folly to practise such deception; that, unless a physician knew the nature of the poison, he could not easily prescribe an antidote; and, that, if he persisted in his folly, death might be the consequence.

At this, the fellow, who, with others, had been pilfering from the wreck, became thoroughly frightened; and, with an expression of great terror, confessed, that he feared he had *eaten rather too heartily of nutmegs*.

No. CIII.

IN the Transcript of August 14, I notice an editorial criticism, upon the recent employment of the word *catafalque*. In primitive strictness, I believe that criticism to be perfectly correct; and that, in its original signification, *catafalque* cannot be understood to mean a *funeral car*.

In the *grand Dictionnaire*, by Fleming & Tibbins, *catafalque*

is thus defined—" *decoration funebre qu'on eleve au milieu d'une église pour y placer le cercueil ou le representation d'un mort a qui l'on veut rendre les plus grands honneurs.*"

Herse is defined, by the same lexicographers, "*un cercueil, une biere, voiture pour porter un mort au tombeau, un char funebre, corbillard, pierre tumulaire provisoire.*"

Thus, while *catafalque* seems to signify an ornamental structure, erected in the middle of a church, to support the coffin or the effigy of the dead, whom it is intended to honor—*herse*, at the present day, is understood to mean a coffin, a bier, a carriage to bear the dead to the tomb, a funeral car, a van, a temporary mausoleum or gravestone.

Herse, whose etymology, according to Johnson, is unknown, imported, three hundred years ago, a temporary structure, in honor of the dead; such also is the meaning of the word *catafalque*; of this, there cannot be the slightest doubt. In this sense, *herse* was employed by Shakspeare, in his *Henry IV.* :

"To add to your laments
Wherewith you now bedew King Henry's *herse*," &c.

Johnson furnishes two definitions of the word, *herse*—1. A carriage, in which the dead are conveyed to the grave. 2. A temporary monument, set over a grave. It is quite certain, however, that the *herse*, whether justly styled a monument, or not, was *not* usually "*set over the grave*," but more frequently, like the *catafalque*, agreeably to the definition given above—*au milieu d'une église*.

No writer, probably, refers to the *herse*, so frequently, as old John Strype, in his *Memorials*; and, in no instance, I believe, in the sense of a *car* or *vehicle*, or as a structure, "*set over the grave*."

Strype's *Memorials* are the records of a Roman Catholic age, or of a period, during which, the usages of the Romish Church, in England, had not entirely worn out their welcome with the people—the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Bloody Mary, and Elizabeth. For, even during the reigns of Edward VI., and of Elizabeth, not a few of those pompous practices, which grew up, in the times of their respective predecessors, still clung upon the imaginations of the populace, and were reluctantly surrendered.

The church is the theatre of the Romish ecclesiastic. The service is an attractive spectacle. If the world were struck

blind, who does not perceive, that the principal supports of Romanism would be instantly taken away! It has been the practice of all churches, that deal somewhat extensively, in forms and ceremonies, to demand of their members, with a greater or less degree of peremptoriness, that certain acts shall be publicly performed—*au milieu d'une eglise*. Thus the ceremony of marriage—the baptism of infants—the churching of women—and the burial of the dead furnish occasion, for throwing open the temple, and exhibiting its showy furniture to the multitude; and of verifying a pleasing saying of the late eminent, and excellent Archbishop of Bordeaux, while Bishop of Boston—"If we cannot catch them, in one way, we catch them in another."

Nothing has ever been a more prolific source of capital to the Romish church, in former ages, than funereal parade, *au milieu d'une eglise*. Strype, with very few exceptions, speaks of the *herse* as a "*herse of wax*." To this I have alluded in an earlier number. It may require a brief explanation here. Wax candles, of divers colors and forms, were attached to the *herse*, and the wax chandler of those days was in great request, and often rose to wealth and distinction.

The reader will readily perceive, that the *herse*, of those early times, was identical with the *catfalque*, if he will give his attention to the following statements—"1554, on the 5th of October were the obsequies of the said Duke of Norfolk celebrated at St. Mary Overy's: an *herse* being made with timber, and hanged with black, with his arms, and four goodly candlesticks gilded, and as many great tapers standing about it, all the choir hung in black," &c. Mem. vol. iii., part 1, ch. 25. Here is no *car*, but a temporary structure, *au milieu d'une eglise*—not "*set over the grave*"—*the choir hung in black*, &c.

To show how Strype distinguished between the *herse* and a *car* for conveyance, the reader may turn to the Memorials, vol. iii., part 1, page 471, where, after describing the ceremonies, in the church, at the funeral of the Bishop of Winchester, Strype adds—"at the gate, the corpse was put into a *wagon* with four horses, all covered with black," &c. This is our modern *herse*, but was not so called by Strype.

"1557.—On the 5th of May was the Lady Chamberlin buried, with a fair *hearse* of wax." The following is sufficiently explicit—"1557, the same day (July 29) began the *hearse*, at

Westminster, for the Lady Anne of Cleves, consisting of carpenters' work of seven principals; being as goodly a hearse, as had been seen." Vol iii. p. 11.

"1557.—On the 3d of August, the body of the Lady Anne of Cleves was brought from Chelsy, where her house was, unto Westminster, to be buried; with all the children of Westminster, and many priests and clerks." Father Strype did not probably intend to say they were all to be buried together.

"Then the gray Amis of Paul's, and three crosses, and the monks of Westminster, and my Lord Bishop of London, and Lord Abbot of Westminster, rode together next the monks. Then the two secretaries, Sir Edmund Peckham and Sir Robert Freston, cofferer to the Queen of England, my Lord Admiral and Mr. Darcy, of Essex, and many knights and gentlemen. And before her corpse, her servants, her banner of arms. Then her gentlemen and her head officers; and then her chariot, with eight banners of arms, consisting of divers arms, and four banners of images of white taffeta, wrought with gold, and her arms. And so they passed by St. James's, and thence to Charing Cross, with an hundred torches burning, her servants bearing them. And the twelve beadmen of Westminster had new black gowns, bearing twelve torches burning. There were four white branches with arms; then ladies and gentlewomen, all in black with their horses; eight heralds of arms, in black, with their horses, &c., &c. At the church door all did alight; and there the Lord Bishop of London and the Lord Abbot, in their copes, did receive the good lady, censing her. Men bore her under a canopy of black velvet, with four black staves *and so brought her into the hearse*, and there tarried dirge, remaining there all night, with lights burning." Ibid. "On the 22d was the hearse of the Lady Anne of Cleves, lately set up in Westminster Abbey, taken down, which the monks, by night, had spoiled of all the velvet cloth, arms, banners, pensils, majesty, and valance and all,—the which was never seen afore so done." Ibid. page 15.

Hence it is manifest, that the *herse*, in the time of Strype, was identical with the *catafalque* of the present day. Nevertheless, *herse* and *catafalque* are as clearly not convertible terms, since the latter word can never be correctly applied to a funeral car.

Two and twenty pages of original record are devoted, by Strype, to an account of the "ceremonies and funeral solemnities, paid to the corpse of King Henry VIII." These pages are

extremely interesting, and full of curious detail. They also furnish additional evidence, that *the herse* was then understood to mean all, that is now meant by *the catafalque*. The works of Strype are not in the hands of very many; and the reader will not be displeased to know, in what manner they dealt with the dead body of an English King, some three hundred years ago. A few extracts are all, that my limits will allow:—

“After the corps was cold, and seen by the Lords of the Privy Council and others of the nobility of the realm, as appertained, commandment was given to the apothecaries, chirurgeons, wax-chandlers, and others, to do their duties in spurning, cleansing, bowelling, cering, embalming, furnishing, and dressing with spices the said corpse; and also for wrapping the same in cerecloth of many folds over the fine cloth of rains and velvet, surely bound and trammel’d with cords of silk: which was done and executed of them accordingly, as to the dignity of such a mighty prince it appertaineth; and a writing in great and small letters annexed against the breast, containing his name and style, the day and year of his death, in like manner. And after this don, then was the plumber and carpenter appointed to case him in lead, and to chest him. Which being don, the said chest was covered about with blew velvet, and a cross set upon the same.”

“And the corps being thus ordained, the entrails and bowels were honorably buried in the chappel,” &c. Mem., vol. 2, p. 289.

“Then was the corps in the chest had into the midds of the privy chamber, and set upon tressels, with a rich pall of cloth of gold, and a cross thereon, with all manner of lights thereto requisite.” Ibid.

“In the said chappel was ordained a goodly, formal herse, with four-score square tapers; every light containing two foot in length, poising in the whole eighteen hundred weight of wax, garnished about with pensils and escutcheons, banners and bannerols of descents. And, at the four corners, four banners of saints, beaten in fine gold upon damask, with a majesty thereover,” &c., &c. Ibid. 290.

“The second day of the month of February, being Wednesday and Candlemas day, betwixt eight and nine of the clock at night, the herse being lighted, and all other things appointed and prepared, the said most royal corps was reverently taken and removed from the chambers, &c., and so brought to the chappel,

&c., and there it was honorably set and placed within the said herse under a pall of rich cloth of tissue, garnished with escutheons, and a rich cloth of gold, set with precious stones." Ibid. 292.

"And the herse, standing in the midst of said choir, was of a wonderful state and proportion; that is to say formed in the compass of eight panes and thirteen principals, double storied, of thirty-five foot high, curiously wrot, painted and gilded, having in it a wonderful sort of lights, amounting, in price, of wax, to the sum of four thousand pound weight, and garnished underneath with a rich majesty, and a doome double vallanced: on the which, on either side, was written the King's word, in beaten gold, upon silk, and his arms of descents. And the whole herse was richly fringed with double fringes of black silk and gold on either side, both within and without very gorgeous and valiant to behold." Ibid. 295.

It does not appear, that, in those days any *single* English word was employed, to express the *vehicle*, which we call a *hearse*, at the present day, unless the word *bier* may suffice: and this, like the Roman *feretrum*, which I take to be much like our common graveyard article with legs, will scarcely answer the description of a four-wheeled car. I infer, that the *feretrum* was a thing, which might be taken up, and set down, from the word *posito* in Ovid's *Fasti*, iv., 851—

Osculaque applicuit posito suprema feretro.

The *feretrum* and the *capulus*, among the Romans, were designed mainly, for the poor. Citizens of any note were borne, as was our own practice, not very many years ago, on the shoulders of their friends.

The *funeral car* of Henry VIII. was a noble affair:—

"There was ordained for the corps a sumptuous and valuable chariot of four wheels, very long and large, with four pillars, overlaid with cloth of gold at the four corners, bearing a pillow of rich cloth of gold and tissue, fringed with a goodly deep fringe of blew silk and gold; and underneath that, turned towards the chariot, was a marvellous excellent cloth of majesty, having in it a doom artificially wrought, in fine gold upon oyl: and at the nether part of the said Chariot was hanged with blew velvet down to the ground, between the wheels, and at other parts of

the chariot, enclosed in like manner with blew velvet." Ibid. 295.

"The next day early, the 14 February, the chariot was brought to the court hall door; and the corps with great reverence brought from the *herse* to the same, by mitred prelates and others, temporal lords." Ibid. 598.

Then, over the area of thirteen remaining pages, the record contains the minute particulars of the monarch's obsequies, which, though full of interest, are no farther to our present purpose.

No. CIV.

BULL—I speak not of Ole, but of John—Bull, when the teazle of opposition has elevated the nap of his temper, is a pestilent fellow: whatever the amount—and there is enough—of the milk of human kindness within him, there is, then, but one way, known among men, of getting it out, and that is, by giving Bull a bloody nose; whereupon he comes to his senses directly, and to a just appreciation of himself and his neighbors. True indeed it is, Bull is remarkably oblivious; and it sometimes becomes necessary to give him another, which is invariably followed, by the same happy result.

Qui hæret in cortice will never come at the milk of a cocoa nut. It is necessary to strip off its rough coat, and punch sundry holes in its *wooden walls*, and give it a regular cracking. It is precisely so with Bull. When the fit is upon him, Bull is terrible. He is the very Bull of Crete—the Bull of Claudian, in his rape of Proserpine—

Dictæus quatiens mugitibus urbes
Taurus —————

Bull is a prodigious fellow;
Nations tremble at his bellow.

There seems to have existed a strange, political hallucination, in regard to Bull and Jonathan. We are clearly, all of us, of one and the same family—a Bull-begotten people; and have a great deal of pleasure, in believing, that old madam Bull was the mother of us all. A goodly number of highly respectable Bulls came over the water, of old, and were well contented with

the green pastures of the New World. They differed, upon some points, from the Bulls they had left behind. They did not believe, that there was a power or right, to bellow louder than the rest, vested in any particular Bull, which power came down from Bull to Bull, in unbroken succession, from the Bull of Bashan. Such a belief, in their opinion, would have been a terrible Bull. Well ; all at once, the trans-atlantic Bulls began to call the cis-atlantic Bulls—*Jonathans*. A very good name it was—a great deal better than *Bulls*. There could be no objection to the name, in the abstract.

But, unfortunately, it was bestowed, as a diminutive, and in derision ; and the old Bulls, ere long, began to beat their flanks with their tails, and paw up the earth, and look unutterable things, about Jonathan's cowardice ; and they came over the water in droves, and began to roar awfully ; and tore up the earth, under our very noses : and, after doing all, in our power to spare the world the miserable spectacle of a conflict, among Bulls, that were brothers, of the whole blood, we went to work, *ex necessitate*, with hoofs and horns ; and tossed up such a terrible dust, at Lexington, and Concord, and Bunker's Hill, and Long Island, and White Plains, and upon the Lakes, and at Sheensborough, and Albany, and Brandywine, and Saratoga, and Bennington, and Germantown, and Rhode Island, and Briar's Creek, and Camden, and Broad River, and Guilford, and Hobkirk's Hill, and the Eutaw Springs, and York Town, and at fifty places beside, that the old Bulls were perfectly astonished ; and so very severely gored withal, that their roaring sunk, at last, into something like Snug's, when he became fearful of frightening the ladies. The old Bulls—those that survived—went *back again*, like Sawney, out of the peach orchard ; and the mammoth Bull, in London, publicly acknowledged, that we were as independent a set of Bulls, as ever he saw, or heard of.

No man, in his senses, marvels, that a contemptuous, and supercilious sentiment, towards us, in our days of small things, should have been indulged, by the vulgar and unphilosophical, among the English people. It is matter for surprise, nevertheless, that so much ignorance of the American character should have existed, in the higher ranks of British society—such disparaging estimates of men and *materiel*, on this side the water—such mistaken conceptions—such a general belief of almost universal pusillanimity, among men, who were not a whit the less

Englishmen, than their revilers; as though there were something, particularly enervating, in breathing the bracing air of America, and listening to the thorough bass of the wild waters, breaking on our original walls of granite; and in struggling, with our horny hands, along the precipices, for bread—such an awful miscalculation of probabilities, as resulted at last, in the loss to King George of thirteen inestimable jewels, of the fairest water.

The impressions, entertained of the Americans, by the English people, or a great majority of them, about that period, were truly amusing. It is scarcely worth while to comment on the abuse of us, by the early reviewers, and the taunting inquiry, long—long ago, what American had ever produced an epic?—Unluckily, Joel did, at last.—This question, thus early and impudently propounded, was quite as sensible, as it might be, to ask men, who, by dint of industry and thrift, are just getting plain shirts to their backs—who among them ever had lace ruffles? We have improved since that time; and *halmost hevery man in the ole population can hutter imself hin werry decent Henglish.*

Josiah Quincy, *then* junior, father of the late President of Harvard University, has noted some curious facts, in his journal, as reported by Gordon, i. 438. In a conversation between him and Col. Barré, who, though he opposed the Stamp Act, in 1765, supported the Boston Port Bill, in 1774. Col. Barré said to Mr. Quincy—"About fourteen or fifteen years ago, I was through a considerable part of your country; for, in the expedition against Canada, my business caused me to pass by land, through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Albany; and, when I returned again to this country, I was often speaking of America, and could not help speaking well, of its climate, soil, and inhabitants; for you must know, sir, America was always a favorite with me. But, will you believe it, sir, yet I assure you it is true, more than two thirds of this island, at this time, thought the Americans were all negroes." Mr. Quincy replied that he did not in the least doubt it, for, if he was to judge by the late acts of Parliament, he should suppose, that a great majority of the people of Great Britain still thought so, for he found that their representatives still treated them as such.

The ministry had decided, that "*the punishment of a few of*

the worst sort of traitors, such as Hancock and his crew, might be sufficient to teach the rest their duty, in future."—"Some men of rank in the army," says Gordon, i. 457, "treated all idea of resistance, by the Americans, with the utmost contempt. They are neither soldiers, nor ever can be made so, being naturally of a pusillanimous disposition, and utterly incapable of any sort of order or discipline; and by their laziness, uncleanness, and radical defect of constitution, they are disabled from going through the service of a campaign. Many ludicrous stories, to that purport, were told, greatly to the entertainment of the house."

Jonathan turned out, at the end of the Bull baiting, to have been neither a fool nor a coward: and the American Congress received a memorable compliment from Lord Chatham—"For genuine sagacity, for singular moderation, for manly spirit, for sublime sentiments, and simplicity of language, for everything respectable and honorable, the Congress of Philadelphia shines unrivalled."

In the war of 1812, Bull was the very identical Bull, that he had been before: Frenchmen were frogs; Yankees were cowards—there was nobody that could fight, on the land or the sea, but Bull.

"It has always," says that wittiest, and, I fear, wickedest of wags, William Cobbett, while addressing Lord Liverpool, "been the misfortune of England, that her rulers and her people have spoken and have thought contemptuously of the Americans. Was there a man in the country, who did not despise the American navy? Was there a public writer beside myself, who did not doom that navy to destruction in a month? Did not all parties exceedingly relish the description given, in a very august assembly, of "*half a dozen of fir frigates, with bits of striped bunting tied to their mast heads!*" Did not the Guerriere sail up and down the American coast, with her name, written on her flag, challenging those fir frigates? Did not the whole nation, with one voice exclaim at the affair of the *Little Belt*—"Only let Rogers come *within reach* of one of our frigates!" If such was the opinion of the whole nation, with what justice is the Board of Admiralty blamed, for not sending out the means of combatting this extraordinary sort of foe? and for issuing a privilege to our frigates to run away from one of those *fir things with a bit of striped bunting at*

its mast head? The result of the former war, while it enlightened nobody, added to the vindictiveness of hundreds of thousands; so that we have entered into this war with all our old stock of contempt, and a vastly increased stock of rancor. To think that the American republic is to be a great power is unsupportable. Of the effect of this contempt I know nobody, who has so much reason to repent, as the officers of his Majesty's navy. If they had triumphed, it would only have been over half a dozen *fir things, with bits of bunting at their mast heads*. They were sure to gain no reputation in the contest; and, if they failed, what was their lot? The worst of it is, they themselves did, in some measure, contribute to their own ill fate: for, of all men living, none spoke of poor Jonathan with so much contempt. There are some people, who are for taking the American commodores at their word, and ascribing their victories to the immediate intervention of Providence. Both Perry and McDonough begin their despatches by saying—*Almighty God has given us a victory.*"

This is keen political satire; and it is well, that it should come to neighbor Bull's ears, from the mouth of an Englishman. It is more gracefully administered thus. That it was entirely deserved, no one will doubt, who has any recollection of Bull's unmeasured and unmitigated impudence, during the war of 1812, in its earlier stages. May God of his infinite mercy grant, that Peace Societies may have these matters, hereafter, very much their own way; though I have a little misgiving, I confess, as to the expediency of any sudden, or very general conversion of swords into ploughshares, or spears into pruning hooks.

No. CV.

Modus in rebus—an admirable proverb, upon all common occasions—is inapplicable, of course, to musical matters. No doubt of it. The luxury of sweet sounds cannot be too dearly bought; and, for its procurement, mankind may go stark mad, without any diminution of their respectability.

Such I infer to be the popular philosophy of today—*while it is called today*. The moderns have been greatly perplexed, by

the legends, which have come down to us, respecting the melody of swans. The *carmina cynorum* of Ovid, and the *Cantantes sublimē ferent ad sidera cynci*, of Virgil, are perfectly incomprehensible by us. Cicero also, in his Tusculan Questions, i. 74, says, they die, *cum cantu et voluptate*. Martial, xiii. 77, asserts the matter, very positively—

*Dulcia defecta modulatur carmina lingua
Cantator cycnus funeris ipse sui.*

I no more believe in the power of a living or a dying swan to make melody of any kind, than I believe in the antiquated humbug of immediate emancipation. Pliny had no confidence in the story, and expresses himself to that effect, x. 23, *Olorum morte narratur flebilis cantus (falso, ut arbitror) aliquot experimentis*.

No mortal has done more than Shakspeare, among the moderns, to perpetuate this pleasant fancy—no bard, when weary of Pegasus, and preferring a drive to a ride, has harnessed his cygnets more frequently—or compelled them to sing more sweetly, in a dying hour. A single example may suffice. When prince Henry is told, that his father, King John, sang, during his dying frenzy, he says—

“Tis strange, that death should sing—
I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,
Who chants a doleful hymn to his own death:
And, from the organ pipe of frailty, sings
His soul and body to their lasting rest.”

One brief example more—Emilia, after the murder of her mistress—

“Hark! canst thou hear me? I will play the swan;
And die in music.”

In all this there lurks not one particle of sober prose—one syllable of truth. The most learned refutation of it may be found, in the Pseudodoxia of Sir Thomas Browne, ii. 517, Lond. 1835.

In the “*Memoires de l’Académie des Inscriptions*,” M. Morin discusses the question very agreeably, why swans, that sang so delightfully, of old, sing so miserably, at the present day. Tame swans, he observes, are mutes: but the wild swan exerts its vocal powers, after a fashion of its own. He introduces the observations of the Abbé Arnaud, upon the performances of a couple of wild swans, which had located, upon the lagoons of Chantilly.

"One can hardly say," says the Abbé, "that the swans of Chantilly sing—they cry; but their cries are truly and constantly modulated. Their voice is not sweet; on the contrary, it is shrill, piercing, and rather disagreeable; I could compare it to nothing better than the sound of a clarionet, winded by a person unacquainted with the instrument." Nothing surely savors less of melody than this. So thought Buffon—"Des sons bruyans de clarion, mais dont les tons aigus et peu diversifiés sont néanmoins tres—éloignés de la tendre mélodie et de la variété douce et brillante du ramage de nos oiseaux chanteurs." Nat. Hist. des Oiseaux, ix. 25.

In his exposition of this error, imposed upon mankind, by the poets, Buffon expresses himself with singular beauty, in the concluding paragraph—"Nulle fiction en Histoire Naturelle, nulle fable chez les Anciens n'a été plus célébrée, plus répétée, plus accréditée; elle s'étoit emparée de l'imagination vive et sensible des Grecs; poètes, orateurs, philosophes même l'ont adoptée, comme une vérité trop agreable pour vouloir en douter. Il faut bien leur pardonner leurs fables; elles étoient aimables et touchantes; elles valoient bien de tristes, d'arides vérités c'étoient de doux emblèmes pour les ames sensibles. Les cygnes, sans doute, ne chantent point leur mort; mais toujours, en parlant du dernier essor et de derniers élans d'un beau génie prêt à s'éteindre, on rappellera avec sentiment cette expression touchante—*c'est le chant du cygne!*" Ibid. 28.

It is not surprising, that these celebrated naturalists, Buffon and Morin, who discourse, so eloquently, of Grecian and Roman swans, should say nothing of Swedish nightingales, for, between their time and the present, numerous additions have been made to the catalogue of songsters.

The very thing, which the barber, Arkwright did, for all the spinning Jennies, in Lancashire, some seventy years ago, has been done by Jenny Lind, for all the singing Jennies upon earth, beside herself—they are cast into the shade.

She came here with an irresistible prestige. A singing woman has been a proverb, since the world began; and, of course, long before Ulysses dropped in, upon the island of Ogygia, and listened to Calypso; or fell into serious difficulty, among the Sirens. A singing woman, a Siren, has been frequently accounted, and with great propriety, a singing bird of evil omen. How grateful then must it be, to know, that, while lending their ears and their

eyes to this incomparable songstress, our wives, our daughters, and our sisters have before them a pure, and virtuous, and gentle, and generous creature, as free, as poor, human nature can well be free, from life's alloy, and very much as she was, when created—a little lower than the angels.

Among other mythological matters, Pausanias relates, that the three Sirens, instigated by Juno, challenged the Muses to a trial of skill in singing. They were beaten, of course, for the Muses, being nine in number, there were three upon one. The victors, as the story goes, proceeded very deliberately, to pluck the golden feathers, from the wings of the vanquished, and converted them into crowns, for their own brows.

Now, it cannot be denied, that Jenny has vanquished us all, and made the golden feathers fly abundantly. But this is not Jenny's fault; for, whatever the wisdom or the folly, the affair was our own entirely. If, for the sake of distinction, any one has seen fit to pluck every golden feather from his back, and appear, like the featherless biped of Diogenes, and give the golden feathers to Jenny, to make her a crown; we have substantial facts, upon which to predict, that Jenny will make a better use of those golden feathers, than to fool them away, for a song. If Jenny plucks golden feathers, from the backs of the rich, she finds bare spots enough, for a large part of them all, upon the backs of the poor: and, as for the crown, for Jenny's brows, if she goes onward, as she has begun, investing her treasure in *Heaven*, and selecting the Lord for her paymaster, *there* will be her coronation; and her crown a crown of Glory. And, when she comes to lie down and die, let the two last lines of Johnson's imperishable epitaph, on Philips, be inscribed upon her tomb—

"Rest undisturb'd, beneath this marble shrine,
Till angels wake thee, with a note like thine."

Orpheus was changed into a swan; Philomela into a nightingale; and Jenny, in due time, will be changed into an angel. Indeed, it is the opinion of some competent judges, that the metamorphosis has already commenced.

Music is such a delightful, soothing thing, that one grieves, to think its professors and amateurs are frequently so excessively irritable.

The disputes, between Handel and Senesino, and their respective partisans, disturbed all London, and finally broke up the

Academy of Music, after it had been established, for nine years. The quarrels of Handel and Buononcini are said to have occasioned duels, among the amateurs; and the nation was filled, by these musical geniuses, with discord and uproar. Good humor was, in some degree, restored, by the following epigram, so often ascribed to Swift, the two last lines of which, however, are alone to be found in the editions of his works, by Nicholls, and Scott:

"Some say, that signor Buononcini,
Compar'd with Handel, is a ninny;
Others aver to him, that Handel
Does not deserve to hold a candle;
Strange, all this difference should be,
"Twixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee."

This epigram cannot be attributed to that contempt for music, which is sometimes occasioned, by a constitutional inability to appreciate its effect, upon the great mass of mankind. It undoubtedly sprang from a desire to put an end, by the power of ridicule, to these unmusical disturbances of the public peace.

Swift's musical pun, upon the accidental destruction of a fine Cremona fiddle, which was thrown down by a lady's mantua, has always been highly and deservedly commended; and recently, upon the very best authority, pronounced the finest specimen extant of this species of wit—"Perhaps," says Sir Walter Scott, in his life of Swift, speaking of his puns, i. 467, "the application of the line of Virgil to the lady, who threw down with her mantua a Cremona fiddle, is the best ever made—

"Mantua vae miseræ nimium vicina Cremonæ!"

In every nation, and in every age, the power of music has been acknowledged by mankind. Now and then, the negative idiosyncracies of certain persons place this particular department of pleasure, beyond the sphere of their comprehension, as effectually as utter blindness denies the power of enjoying the finest specimens of the painter's art. Occasionally, some pious divine, absolutely drunk with over-potent draughts of orthodoxy, like the friar, before Boccaccio, shakes his holy finger at this wicked world, and warns them to beware of the singing woman!

The vocal power of music is ascribed to the angels in Heaven; and my own personal knowledge has assured me, that it affords a melancholy solace, to the slave in bonds.

I passed the winter of 1840-41 with an invalid daughter, in the island of St. Croix. With a party of some six or eight, we

devoted one delightful, moonlight evening, to a ride, on horse-back, among the sugar-loaf summits of that beautiful speck amid the main. We were ascending the hills, in the neighborhood of the Annelly plantation—the moon was at full, that night; and the Caribbean Sea, far and wide, shone like a boundless prairie of burnished silver. As we were slowly winding our way, to the summit, one of our party called the attention of the rest to the sounds of music, coming from the slave cabins, at a distance. As we advanced, slowly and silently, towards the spot, the male and female voices were readily distinguished.

We drew near, unperceived, and, checking our horses, listened, for several minutes, to the wild, simple notes of these children of bondage. "There is melody in this"—said one of our party aloud, and all was hushed, in an instant. We rode down to the cabins, and begged them to continue their song—but our solicitations were in vain—even the offer of sundry five stiver pieces, which operate, like a charm, upon many occasions, with the *uncles* and the *aunties*, was ineffectual then. "*No massa—b'lieve no sing any more*"—were the only replies, and we went upon our way.

As we descended the Annelly hills, on the opposite side, after leaving the negroes and their cabins, at some distance, we halted and listened—they had recommenced—the same wild music was floating upon the breeze.

As we rode slowly along, my daughter asked me, if I could account for their reluctance to comply with our request. I told her, I could not. "Perhaps," said she, "they have a reason, somewhat like the reason of those, who sat down, by the waters of Babylon, and wept, and who could not sing one of the songs of Zion, in a strange land."

It might have been thus. "*They that carried us away captive, required of us a song! They, that wasted us, required of us mirth!*"

No. CVI.

WHILE pursuing his free inquiry into the origin of evil, I doubt, if Soame Jenyns had as much pleasure, as Sir Joseph

Banks enjoyed, in his famous investigation, if fleas were the prototypes of lobsters.

These inquiries are immeasurably pleasant. When a boy, I well remember my cogitations, what became of the old moons; and how joyously I accepted the solution of my nurse, who had quite a turn for judicial astrology, that they were unquestionably cut up, for stars.

It is truly delightful to look into these occult matters—*rerum cognoscere causas*. There are subjects of deep interest, which lie somewhat nearer the surface of the earth—the origin of certain usages and undertakings, and the authorship of certain long-lived works, which appear to be made of a species of literary everlasting, but whose original proprietors have never been discovered. I have great respect, for those antiquarians, whose researches have unlocked so many of these long hidden mysteries; and, however bare-headed I may be, when the venerated names of Speed, or Strype, or Stow, or Rushworth, or Wood, or Holinshed occurs to my memory, I have an involuntary tendency to take off my hat.

It was, doubtless, in allusion to their grotesque and uncouth versification, that the Earl of Rochester prepared his well-known epigram—

"Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms,
When they translated David's Psalms."

This version, which held its ground, for a century and a half, and, as Chalmers says, slowly gave place to the translation, by Tate and Brady, had an origin, of which, I presume, few individuals are apprized.

Thomas Sternhold lived to translate fifty-one only of the Psalms; and the first edition was published in 1549, with this title—"All such Psalms of David as Thomas Sterneholde, late groome of the king's majesty's robes did in his lyfetime drawe into Englyshe metre."

About this period, the larger cities of the kingdom had become inundated with obscene and blasphemous songs, to such a degree, that some powerful expedient seemed to be required, for the removal of this insufferable grievance. Accordingly, the felicitous idea occurred to Mr. Thomas Sternhold, of substituting the Psalms of David, as versified by himself, for the bacchanalian songs, then in use, throughout the realm. He anticipated a practical illustration of the command of St. James—"Is any merry let him sing Psalms."

Ostensibly prepared for the use of the churches, the moving consideration, for this version, with Mr. Sternhold, was such as I have shown it to be. The motive is plainly stated, in the title-page—"Set forth and allowed to be sung in churches of the people together, before and after evening prayer, as also before and after sermon; and moreover, in private houses, for their godly solace and comfort, laying apart all ungodly songs and ballads, which tend only to the nourishment of vice and the corrupting of youth."

Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i. 183, Lond. 1813, says of Sternhold—"Being a most zealous reformer and a very strict liver, he became so scandalized, at the amorous and obscene songs used in the court, that he, forsooth turned into English metre fifty-one of David's Psalms, and caused musical notes to be set to them, thinking thereby, that the courtiers would sing them, instead of their sonnets, but did not, only some few excepted."

How cheerfully would I go, undieted, for a long summer's day, to know who was the author of "Jonny Armstrong's Last Good Night;" and for a much longer term, to ascertain the writer of Chevy Chase, of which Ben Jonson used to say, he had rather have been the author of it, than of all his works. The words of Sir Philip Sidney, in his Discourse on Poetry, are quoted, by Addison, in No. 70 of the Spectator—"I never heard the old song of Percy and Douglas, that I found not my heart more moved than with a trumpet." The ballad of Chevy Chase was founded upon the battle of Otterburn, which was fought in 1388, and of which a brief account will be found in the fourteenth chapter of Sir Walter's first series of the Grandfather's Tales.

The author of those songs for children, which have been lisped, by the tongues of millions, shall never be forgotten, while dogs delight to bark and bite—but who was the author of Hush-a-bye baby—Now we go up, up, up—Cock Robin—or Dickory Dock, no human tongue can tell!

Poor André, we know, was the author of the Cow Chace; but the composer of our national air is utterly unknown. Who would not give more of the *siller*, to know to whose immortal mind we are indebted for Yankee Doodle, than to ascertain the authorship of the Letters of Junius?

Both France and England have been more fortunate, in re-

spect to the origin and authorship of their most popular, national songs. Speaking of Barbaroux and the Marseillois, Sir Walter Scott, in his *Life of Napoleon*, observes—"Besides the advantage of this enthusiastic leader, the Marseillois marched to the air of the finest hymn, to which Liberty or the Revolution had yet given birth."

I am aware that something like doubt or obscurity hangs over the reputed authorship of the Hymn of the Marseillais. But in respect to the national air of Great Britain—*God save the King*—the authorship appears to be more satisfactorily, if not perfectly, indicated.

It is certainly worthy of note, that this celebrated air, in which *John Bull* has taken so much delight, ever since it came into existence, is by some persons supposed to have been the production of JOHN BULL himself, a celebrated composer of his day. An engraving of him may be found, in the *History of Music*, by Hawkins. There is an original painting of him, by J. W. Childe, in the Music School, at Oxford, which was engraved by Illman, with the words below—"John Bull, Mus. Doct. Cantab. Instaur. Oxon. MDXCII." A portrait of Dr. Bull will also be found, in Richard Clarke's *Account of the National Anthem, God save the King*, 8vo. Lond. 1822."

The account of Bull, by Wood, in his *Fasti*, i. 235, Lond. 1815, is somewhat amusing—"1586, July 9.—John Bull, who had practised the fac. of music for 14 years, was then admitted batch. of music. This person, who had a most prodigious hand on the organ, and was famous, throughout the religious world, for his church music, had been trained up under an excellent master, named Blitheman, organist of Qu. Elizabeth's chappel, who died much lamented, in 1591. This Blitheman perceiving that he had a natural geny to the faculty, spared neither time nor labor to advance it to the utmost. So that in short time, he being more than master of it, which he showed by his most admirable compositions, played and sung in many churches beyond the seas, as well as at home, he took occasion to go incognito, into France and Germany. At length, hearing of a famous musician, belonging to a certain cathedral, (at St. Omers, as I have heard,) he applied himself, as a novice, to learn something of his faculty, and to see and admire his works. This musician, after some discourse had passed between them, conducted Bull to a vestry, or music school, joyning to the

cathedral, and shew'd him a lesson, or song of forty parts, and then made a vaunting challenge to any person in the world to add one more part to them, supposing it to be so compleat and full, that it was impossible for any mortal man to correct or add to it. Bull thereupon desiring the use of ink and rul'd paper (such as we call musical paper) prayed the musician to lock him up in the said school for 2 or 3 hours; which being done, not without great disdain by the musician, Bull, in that time or less, added forty more parts to the said lesson or song. The musician thereupon being called in, he viewed it, try'd it and retry'd it. At length he burst out into great ecstasy, and swore by the great God, that he that added those 40 parts must either be the Devil or Dr. Bull, &c. Whereupon Bull making himself known, the musician fell down and adored him."

Of music it may be said, as of most other matters—the *fashion of these things passeth away*. So great was the fame of Bull in his day, and such tempting offers of preferment were made him, by the Emperor, and by the Kings of France and Spain, that Queen Elizabeth commanded him home. It is stated, in the Biographical History of England, ii. 167, that the famous Dr. Pepusch preferred some of the lessons in Bull's Parthenia, to the productions of most of the composers of that time. Yet Dr. Burney says of these lessons—" *They may be heard, by a lover of music, with as little emotion as the clapper of a sawmill, or the rumbling of a post-chaise.*"

Musicians are a sensitive and jealous generation. "Handel," says Chalmers, "despised the pedantry of Pepusch; and Pepusch, in return, refused to join, in the general chorus of Handel's praise."

Handel, when a stripling at Hamburgh, laid claim to the first harpsichord, against a master, greatly his superior, in point of years, and the matter, upon trial, was decided in Handel's favor, which so incensed the other, that he drew, and made a thrust, at his young rival, whose life, according to Dr. Burney's version, was saved, by a fortunate contact, between the point of the rapier and a metal button.

The principles, which govern, in all mutual admiration societies, are deeply laid in the nature of man. If Handel had borne the pedantry of Dr. Pepusch, with forbearance, or common civility, the Doctor would have, doubtless, afforded Handel the advantage of his highest commendation.

The managers of musical matters act wisely, in tendering, to every conductor of a public journal, the

Melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam—

But I fear they are not always as cautious and discriminating, as the occasion appears to demand. How very different would have been the fate of the poor strolling player, whom Goldsmith so pleasantly describes, had he taken a little more pains—only a little—to propitiate “*the lady, who had been nine months in London!*”

The managers, upon such occasions, should never omit the most careful espionage, into the musical pretensions of every member of the press—I speak of their pretensions, and not of their actual knowledge—that, in the present connection, is of little importance: and, when they discover one of this powerful brotherhood, who, in musical matters, would be thought to know more than his neighbors, however mistaken he may be—let them pay him particular attention—let them procure him an excellent seat—once—twice perhaps—express a hope, that he is well accommodated—and occasionally, during the performance, be sure to catch his eye, as if with a “fearful longing after immortality,” such as tomorrow’s leader may possibly confer on the candidate for fame. How often the omission to observe these simple rules has been followed, by faint praise, and invidious discriminations!

No. CVII.

My great grandmother used to say, that she never desired to be told, that anything was broken, in her household; for, though she had been a housekeeper, for fifty years, nothing was ever broken, in her family, that had not been cracked before. I have the very same feeling in regard to the majority of all inventions and discoveries; for some ingenious fellow invariably presents himself, who, as it turns out, had verified the suggestion already.

I never found my mind in a very feverish condition, while pursuing the inquiry, whether the art of medicine was first invented, by Hermes, Isis, or Osiris; nor while examining the arguments,

ingenious though they are, of Clemens Alexandrinus, to prove, that Moses was a very respectable apothecary.

I have ever supposed, that Necessity, the mother of invention, was the inventress of the blessed art; and that the origin was somewhat on this wise:—before the transgression, all went on well—there were neither aches nor ails—the apple certainly disagreed with Adam—he sought relief, by hunting for an antidote; and finding great comfort, in chewing such carminative herbs, as catmint and pennyroyal, he prescribed them to the sharer of his joys and sorrows. It is quite likely, that, with no family, and a great deal of time upon her hands, while walking in her garden, as poppies were not forbidden, Eve, to satisfy her curiosity, might have sucked their narcotic juice; and thus acquired a knowledge of opiates, so useful, ever since the fall.

Physicking was, at first, a very general affair. Whether benevolence, or the desire of a little reputation lies at the bottom, there has ever existed, among mankind, a pungent, irresistible desire to physick one another. It is to be regretted, that Irenæus, who was just the man for it, had not given a few years of his life to ascertain, if Eve, during the parturition of Cain, or Abel, received any alleviation, from slippery elm. Plato, Theoctet. p. 149, says, the midwives of Athens did great, good service, on these occasions, with certain drugs and charms.

In the beginning, so little was to be known, upon this subject, it is not wonderful, that almost every man should have known that little. Thus, according to Homer, Od. iv., 320, every Egyptian was a doctor:—

"From Paeon sprung, their patron god imparts
To all the Pharian race his healing arts."

Herodotus, who was born, about 484, B. C., in Book II. of his history, sec. 84, speaks distinctly of the fact, that the Egyptian doctors were not physicians, in the general sense, but confined their practice, respectively, to particular diseases. The passage may be thus translated—*Now, in truth, the art of medicine with them was so distributed, that their physicians managed particular disorders, and not diseases generally; thus, though all were referred to the physicians, some were doctors for the eyes, some for the head, some for the teeth, some for the belly, and some for the occult diseases.*

The first mention of physicians, in Holy Writ, is in Genesis, 50, 2—"And Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians,

to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel." Physicians, to this extent, were mechanical operators; and the celebrated physicians of Greece, Chiron, Machaon, Podalirius, Pæon, and even Æsculapius, were *surgeons*. Their art, as Pliny says, did not go beyond curing a green wound. The cure of internal, or complicated, disorders was beyond their province. Celsus says, that Podalirius and Machaon, the physicians, who went with Agamemnon, to the wars of Troy, were never employed, to cure the plague, or internal maladies, nor anything but external injuries.

No physician was required to manage external applications, in certain cases of common occurrence. In Kings II. xx. 7, Hezekiah appears to have thought himself extremely sick; when Isaiah applied a poultice of figs to his boil, and he soon was upon his legs again. This seems to have been accounted a remarkable cure, in those days, for Isaiah thought it worth repeating, xxxviii. 21. Job does not appear to have resorted to fig poultices, nor to any remedies, whatever: and, while Hezekiah behaved like a great baby, and wept bitterly, Job toughed it out, like a man; and, instead of mourning and murmuring, under the torment, not of one, but of countless boils, he poured forth torrents of incomparable eloquence, all the while, on various topics.

Job's affliction, being viewed in the light of a direct judgment, it was deemed quite outrageous, by many, to stave off the wrath of Heaven, by interposing fig poultices, or remedies of any kind. Thus it appears, that Asa suffered severely with the gout; and there is a sharp fling against him, Chron. II. xvi. 12, on account of his want of faith—"Yet in his disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians."

This seems to be in accordance, with the opinion of those modern Fathers, who consider the use of ether or chloroform, in obstetric cases, a point blank insult to the majesty of Heaven, because of the primeval fiat—*in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children*.

The race of Cyclops entertained a similar sentiment of submission, in sickness, according to Homer, Od. IX. 485. When *Oudeis* (*Anglice Noman*) which always seemed to me an undignified pun, for an Epic, had put out the eye of Polyphemus, his roaring collected the neighboring giants. They inquired, outside the portal, what was the matter; and he replied, that *Oudeis*—*Noman*—was killing him; upon which they reply—

"If *Noman* hurts thee, but the power divine
 Inflict disease, it fits thee to resign.
 To Jove or to thy father Neptune pray,
 The Cyclops cried, and instant strode away."

The theory was, that God worked upon mortals, by the agency of a great number and variety of evil spirits, or devils; and that the employment of remedial means was therefore neither more nor less, than withstanding the Almighty. Hence arose the custom, being supposed less offensive, in the sight of Heaven, of resorting to charms and incantations; and of employing diviners and magicians; and, as old Sir Robert Walpole is reported to have said, that every man has his price; so it was supposed to be the case, with those devils, who were engaged, in the system of tormenting mankind. Instead therefore of turning directly to the Lord, the sufferers were much in the habit of making their propitiatory suit, directly, to some false god, or influential demon. Of this we have an example, in Kings II. i. 2, et seq. Ahaziah, King of Israel, went up into his garret, probably, in the dark, and fell through the scuttle. He was severely bruised, and sent a messenger, post haste, to Ekron, to consult the false god, Baalzebub. Elisha, who, though a prophet, had no reputation, as a physician, was consulted by Hazael and by Naaman, about their distempers.

Enchantments, talismans, music, phylacteries were in use, among the Hebrews, and formed no small part of their *materia medica*. Charms were used, as preventives against the bites of serpents. "Who," says Ecclesiasticus xii. 13, "*will pity a charmer, that is bitten with a serpent?*" This seems not to have availed, against the deaf adder, "which," Psalm lviii. 5, "*will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely.*" And Jeremiah, viii. 17, declares, that the Lord will send cockatrices and serpents, that will not be charmed, upon any terms whatever.

Some verses are preserved, by Cato, De Re Rustica, art. 160, which were used, in reducing a dislocated member. Dr. Johnson has informed us, though without naming his authority, that ABRACADABRA was a superstitious charm, against agues.

It is quite amusing, while reading Sir Thomas Browne's remarks on quackery, in his Pseudodoxia, ch. xi. to see how readily he admits satanic agency, himself. Take the following passage—"When Gracchus was slain, the same day the chickens

refused to come out of the coop; and Claudius Pulcher underwent the like success, when he commanded the tripudiary augurations; they died, not because the pullets would not feed, but because the devil foresaw their death, and contrived that abstinence in them."

Sir Thomas was a wise and safe counsellor, in all cases, in which there was no chance for the devil to operate; but whenever there was a loop hole, according to the belief in those days, for diabolical influence to creep through, no man was more inclined to give the devil his due, than Sir Thomas.

In this chapter, designed to be purely philosophical, he says of satan—"He deludeth us also by philters, ligatures, charms, ungrounded amulets, characters, and many superstitious ways, in the cure of common diseases, seconding herein the expectation of men with events of his own contriving, which, while some, unwilling to fall directly upon magic, impute unto the power of imagination, or the efficacy of hidden causes, he obtains a bloody advantage." This description of the devil and of his manoeuvres so precisely fits the empiric, and all his proceedings, that I should suspect Sir Thomas of the unusual sin of perpetrating a pleasantry; and, under the devil's *effigies*, presenting the image of a charlatan; were it not, for the knowledge we have of this great and good man's credulity, and his firm belief in satanic realities; and, that, in part upon his own testimony, two miserable women were condemned and executed, for witchcraft.

No. CVIII.

JOHN JAHN says, in his *Biblical Archæology*, Upham's translation, page 105, that, in Babylon, when first attacked with disease, the patients were placed in the streets, for the purpose of ascertaining, from casual passengers, what practices or medicines *they* had found useful, in similar cases. Imagine a poor fellow, suddenly attacked with a windy colic, and deposited for this purpose, in State Street, in the very place, formerly occupied, by the razor-strop man, or the magnolia merchant! If it be true—I very much doubt it—that, in a multitude of counsel-

lors, there is safety, this must be an excellent arrangement for the patient.

I have often thought, that benevolence was getting to be an epidemic; particularly when I have noticed the attentions of one or two hundred charitably disposed persons, gathered about a conservative horse, that would not budge an inch. They have not the slightest interest in the horse, nor in the driver—it's nothing under heaven, but pure brotherly love. The driver is distracted, by the advice of some twenty persons, pointing with sticks and umbrellas, in every direction, and all vociferating together. In the meanwhile, three or four volunteers are belaboring the shins of the refractory beast, while as many are rapping his nose with their sticks. Four stout fellows, at least, are trying to shove the buggy forward, and as many exerting their energies, to shove the horse backward. Half a dozen sailors, attracted by the noise, tumble up to the rescue; three seize the horse's head, and pull *a starboard*, and three take him, by the tail, and pull *to larboard*, and all yell together, to the driver, to put his helm hard down. At last, urged, by rage, terror, and despair, the poor brute shakes off his persecutors, with a rear, and a plunge, and a leap, and dashes through the bow window of a confectioner's shop, or of some dealer in naked women, done in Parian.

I am very sorry we have been delayed, by this accident. Let us proceed. Never has there been known, among men, a more universal diffusion of such a little modicum of knowledge. The knowledge of the *materia medica* and of pathology, what there was of it, seems to have been held, by the Babylonians, as tenants in common, and upon the Agrarian principle—every man and woman had an equal share of it. Such, according to John Jahn, Professor of Orientals in Vienna, was the state of therapeutics, in Babylon.

The Egyptians carried their sick into the temples of Serapis—the Greeks to those of *Æsculapius*. Written receipts were preserved there, for the cure of different diseases. Professor Jahn certainly seems disposed to make the most of the knowledge of physic and surgery, among the Israelites. He says they had "*some acquaintance with chirurgical operations.*" In support of this opinion, he refers to the rite of circumcision, and to—nothing else. He also says, that it is evident "*physicians*

sometimes undertook to exercise their skill, in removing diseases of an internal nature."

If the reader is good at conundrums, will he be so obliging as to *guess*, upon what evidence the worthy professor grounds this assertion? I perceive he gives it up—Well—on Samuel I. xvi. 16. And what sayeth Samuel?—"And Saul's servants said unto him, behold now an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our Lord now command thy servants, which are before thee, to seek out a man, who is a cunning player on a harp: and it shall come to pass, when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well." This, reduced into plain language, is simply this—Saul's servants took the liberty of telling his majesty, that the devil was in him, and he had better have a little music. Accordingly, David was called in—as a *physician*, according to Jahn—and drove the devil out of Saul, by playing on his Jews'-harp. Jahn also informs us, and the Bible did before, that the art of healing was committed to the priests, who were specially bound, by law, "*to take cognizance of leprosies.*" There were, as he admits, other *physicians*, probably of little note. *The priests* were the regular, legalized faculty. On this ground, we can explain the severe reproach, cast upon Asa, who, when he had the gout, "*sought not the Lord but to the physician:*" that is, he did not seek the Lord, in prayer, through the intermediation of the regular faculty, the priests.

There are ecclesiastics among us, who consider, that the Levitical law is obligatory upon the priesthood, throughout the United States of America, at the present day; and who believe it to be *their* bounden duty, to take cognizance of leprosies, and all other disorders; and to physick the bodies, not less than the souls, of their respective parishioners. To this I sturdily object—not at all, from any doubt of their ability, to practise the profession, as skilfully, as did the son of Jesse, and to drive out devils with a Jews'-harp; and to cure all manner of diseases, in the same manner, in which the learned Kircherus avers, according to Sir Thomas Browne, vol. ii. page 536, Lond. 1835, the bite of the tarantula is cured, by songs and tunes; and to soothe boils as big as King Hezekiah's, with fig poultices, according to Scripture; for I have the greatest reverence for that intuition, whereby such men are spared those *studia annorum*, so necessary for the acquirement of any tol-

erable knowledge of the art of medicine, by all, who are not in holy orders. My objection is of quite another kind—I object to the union of the cure of souls and the cure of bodies, in the same person; as I object to the union of Church and State, and to the union of the power of the purse and the power of the sword. It is true, withal, that when a sufferer is killed, by ministerial physic, which never can happen, of course, but for the patient's want of faith, nobody dreams of such an irrelevant proceeding, as pursuing the officious priest, for *mala praxis*.

Priests and witches, jugglers, and old women have been the earliest practitioners of medicine, in every age, and every nation: and the principal, preventive, and remedial medicines, in all the primitive, unwritten pharmacopœias, have been consecrated herbs and roots, charms and incantations, amulets and prayers, and the free use of the Jews' harp. The reader has heard the statement of Professor Jahn. In 1803, Dr. Winterbottom, physician to the colony of Sierra Leone, published, in London, a very interesting account of the state of medicine, in that colony. He says, that the practice of physic, in Africa, is entirely in the hands of old women. These practitioners, like the servants of Saul, believe, that almost all diseases are caused by evil spirits; in other words, that their patients are bedevilled: and they rely, mainly, on charms and incantations. Dr. W. states, that the natives get terribly drunk, at funerals—funerals produce drunkenness—drunkenness produces fevers—fevers produce death—and death produces funerals. All this is imputed to witchcraft, acting in a circle.

In the account of the Voyage of the Ship Duff to Tongataboo, in 1796, the missionaries give a similar statement of the popular notion, as to the origin of diseases—the devil is at the bottom of them all; and exorcism the only remedy.

In Mill's British India, vol. ii. p. 185, Lond. 1826, the reader may find a statement of the paltry amount of knowledge, on the subject, not only of medicine, but of surgery, among the Hindoos: "Even medicine and surgery, to the cultivation of which so obvious and powerful an interest invites, had scarcely attracted the rude understanding of the Hindus."

Sir William Jones, in the Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 354, says, "there is no evidence, that, in any language of Asia, there exists one original treatise on medicine, considered as a sci-

ence." Crawford, in his Sketches, and he has an exalted opinion of the Hindoos, states, that surgery is unknown among them; and, that, in cases of wounds from the sabre or musket, they do no more than wash the wound; bind it up with fresh leaves, and keep the patient on rice gruel. Buchanan, in his journey, through Mysore, vol. i. p. 336, informs us, that medicine was in the hands of ignorant and impudent charlatans. Origen, who was born, about 185 A.D., states that the Egyptians believed thirty-six devils divided the human body, among them; and that diseases were cured, by supplication and sacrifice, to the particular devil, within whose precinct the malady lay. This is a convenient kind of practice. May it not have some relation to the fact, referred to by Herodotus, in his History, book ii. sec. 84, that the doctors, in Egypt, were not practitioners, in a general sense, but for one part of the body only. Possibly, though I affirm nothing of the sort, Origen may have written *devils* for *doctors*, by mistake: for the doctors, in those days, were, manifestly, very little better.

If it be true—*et quis negat?*—that Hippocrates was the father of physic—the child was neither born nor begotten, before its father, of course, and Hippocrates was born, about 400 B.C., which, according to Calmet, was about 600 years after David practised upon Saul, with his Jews'-harp. His genealogy was quite respectable. He descended from Æsculapius, through a long line of doctors; and, by the mother's side, he was the eighteenth from Hercules, who was, of course, the great grandfather of physic, at eighteen removes; and who, it will be remembered, was an eminent practitioner, and doctored the Hydra. Divesting the subject of all, that is magical and fantastical, Hippocrates thought and taught such rational things, as no physician had thought and taught before. It appears amazing to us, the uninitiated, that the healing art should have been successfully practised at all, from the beginning of the world, till 1628, in utter ignorance of the circulation of the blood; yet it was in that year the discovery was made, when Dr. William Harvey dedicated to Charles I. and published his *Exercitatio anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis*.

No. CIX.

QUACKERY may be found, in every vocation, from the humblest, to the holiest.

If the dead rise not at all, says St. Paul, *what shall they do, who are baptized for the dead!* Nine different opinions are set forth, by Bosius, in regard to the true meaning of this passage. Scaliger and Grotius, who were men of common sense, conclude, that St. Paul referred to a practice, existing at the time; and St. Chrysostom tells a frolicsome story of this vicarious baptism; that a living sponsor was concealed under the bed of the defunct, and answered all the questions, put by the sagacious priest, to the corpse, about to be baptized.

The dead have been, occasionally, through inadvertence, summoned to give evidence, in courts of justice. But, fortunately for quacks, in every department, dead men are mute upon the stand.

Saul, if we may believe the singing women, who came out to meet him, after the fall of Goliath, hath slain his thousands; and, could dead men testify, it would, doubtless, appear, that quacks have slain their tens of thousands. When we consider the overbearing influence of that ignorant, impudent, and plausible jabber, which the quack has always at command, it must be admitted, that these, his fatal victories, are achieved, with the very same weapon, employed by Samson, in his destruction of the Philistines.

There is nothing marvellous, in the existence of quackery, if we recognize the maxim of M. Sorbierre, in his *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre*, p. 155, *homo est animal credulum et mendax*—man is a credulous and lying animal. David said, that all men were liars; but, as this is found in one of his lyrics, and he admits, that he uttered it in haste, it may be fairly carried to the account of *poetica licentia*. With no more, however, than a moderate allowance, for man's notorious diathesis towards lying, for pleasure or profit, it is truly wonderful, that credulity should preserve its relative level, as it does, and ever has done, since the world began. Many, who will not go an inch with the Almighty, without a sign, will deliver their noses, for safe keeping, into the hands of a charlatan, and be led by him, blindfold, to the charnel-house. Take away credulity, and the world

would speedily prove an exhausted receiver, for all manner of quackery.

At the close of the seventeenth century, there was a famous impostor in France, whom the royal family, on account of his marvellous powers, invited to Paris. His name was James Aymar. I shall speak of him more fully hereafter; and refer to him, at present, in connection with a remark of Leibnitz. Aymar's imposture had no relation to the healing art, but the remark of Leibnitz is not, on that account, the less applicable. That great man wrote a letter, in 1694, which may be found in the Journal of Tenzelius, in which he refers to Aymar's fraud, and to his subsequent confession, before the Prince of Condé. Aymar said, according to Leibnitz, that he was led on, *non tam propria audacia, quam aliena credulitate hominum, falli volentium, et velut obtrudentium sibi*—not so much by his own audacity, as by the credulity of others, who were not only willing to be cheated, but actually thrust themselves upon him. All Paris was occupied, in attempting to explain the mystery of Aymar's performances, with his wonderful wand: and Leibnitz says—

Nuper scripsi Parisios, utilius et examine dignius, mihi videri problema morale vel logicum, quomodo tot viri insignes Lugduni in fraudem ducti fuerint, quam illud pseudo-physicum, quomodo virga coryllacea tot miracula operetur—I wrote lately to the Parisians, that a solution of the moral or logical problem, how it happened, that so many distinguished persons, in Lyons, came to be taken in, seemed to me of much greater utility, and far more worthy of investigation, than how this fellow performed miracles, with his hazel wand.

It is worth noting, perhaps, that Leibnitz himself, according to the statement of the Abbé Conti, in the *Gazette Littéraire*, for 1765, fell a victim to a quack medicine, given him by a Jesuit, for the gout.

Ignorance is the hotbed of credulity. This axiom is not the less respectable, because the greatest philosophers, occasionally, place confidence in the veriest fools, and do their bidding. Wise and learned men, beyond the pale of their professional pursuits, or peculiar studies, are, very frequently, the simplest of simple folk—*non omnia possumus omnes*. Ignorance must be very common; for a vast majority of the human race have not proceeded so far, in the great volume of wisdom and knowledge, as that profitable but humiliating chapter, whose perusal is likely to

stimulate their energies, by convincing them, that they are of yesterday and know nothing. Credulity must therefore be very common.

Credulity has very little scope, for its fantastical operations among the exact sciences. Who does not foresee the fate of a geometrical quack, who should maintain, that the square of the hypotenuse, in a right-angled triangle, is either greater or less than the sum of the squares of the sides; or of the quack arithmetician, who would persuade our housewives, that of two and two pounds of Muscovado sugar, he had actually discovered the art of making five?

The healing art—the science of medicine, cannot be placed, in the exact category.

It is a popular saying, that *there is a glorious uncertainty in the law*. This opinion has been ably considered, by that most amiable and learned man, the late John Pickering, in his lecture, on the alleged uncertainty of the law—before the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, in 1834. The credulity of the client, to which Mr. Pickering does not refer, must, in some cases, be of extraordinary strength and quality. After presenting a case to his counsel, as favorably to himself as he can, and carefully suppressing much, that is material and adverse, he fondly believes, that his advocate will be able to mesmerise the court and jury, and procure a verdict, in opposition to the facts, apparent at the trial. He is disappointed of course; and then he complains of the uncertainty of the law, instead of the uncertainty of the facts.

In a dissertation, before the Medical Society, in June, 1828, Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck, after setting forth a melancholy catalogue of the troubles and perplexities of the medical profession, concludes by saying, that “all these trials, to which the physician is subjected, do not equal that, which proceeds from the *uncertainty* of the healing art.” When we contrast this candid avowal, from an accomplished and experienced physician, with the splendid promises, and infallible assurances of empirics—with their balms of Gilead, panaceas, and elixirs of everlasting life—we cannot marvel, that the larger part of all the invalids, in this uncertain and credulous world, fly from those conservative professors, who promise nothing, to such as will assure them of a perfect relief, from their maladies, no matter how

complicated, or chronic, they may be—with four words of inspiring import—NO CURE NO PAY.

I am no physician; my opinion therefore is not presented *ex cathedra*: but the averment of Dr. Shattuck is, I presume, to be viewed in no other light, than as the opinion of an honorable man, who would rather claim too little, than too much, for his own profession: who would rather perform more, than he has promised, than promise more, than he can perform. If the regularly bred and educated physician complains of uncertainty, none but a madman would seek for its opposite, in the palace, or the kennel, of a quack; for the charlatan may occasionally be found in either.

The first thing to be done, I suppose, by the regular doctor, is to ascertain what the disease is. This, I believe, is the very last thing, thought of by the charlatan. He is spared the labor of all pathological inquiry, for all his medicines are, fortunately, panaceas. Thus, he administers a medicine, for the gout; the patient does not happen to have the gout, but the gravel; it is the same thing; for the physic, like our almanacs, was calculated, for different meridians.

These gentlemen sometimes limit their practice to particular diseases, cancers, fistulas, fevers, &c. A memorial was presented, some few years since, to the legislature of Alabama, for the establishment of a medical college, to be devoted, exclusively, to vegetable practice. A shrewd, old member of the assembly rose, and spoke, much after this fashion—I shall support this measure, Mr. Speaker, on one condition, that a neighbor of mine shall be appointed president of this college. It is proper, therefore, that you should know how far he is qualified. He was a travelling merchant; dealt chiefly in apple-trade and other notions, and failed. He had once taken an old book, on fevers, in exchange for essences. This he got by heart. Fevers are common with us. He was a man of some tact; and, a week after he failed, he put up his sign, "BELA BODKIN, FEVER DOCTOR—ROOTS AND HERBS—F. R. S.—L. L. D.—M. D. No charge to the poor or the reverend clergy."—When asked, what he meant by adding those capital letters to his name, he said the alphabet was common property; that F. R. S. stood for Feverfew, Ragwort, and Slippery Elm—L. L. D. for Liverwort, Lichens, and Dill—and M. D. for Milk Diet.

The thing took—his garret was crowded, from morning till

sight, and the regular doctor was driven out of that town. Those, who got well, proclaimed Dr. Bodkin's praises—those, who died, were a very silent majority. Everybody declared, of the dead, 'twas a pity they had applied too late. Bodkin was once called to a farmer's wife. He entered the house, with his book under his arm, saying FEVER! with a loud voice, as he crossed the threshold. This evidence of his skill was astonishing. Without more than a glance at the patient, he asked the farmer, if he had a sorrel sheep; and, being told, that he had never heard of such a thing, he inquired, if he had a sorrel horse. The farmer replied, that he had, and a very valuable one. Dr. Bodkin assured him the horse must be killed immediately, and a broth made of the *in'ards* for the sick wife. The farmer hesitated; the wife groaned; the doctor opened the book, and showed his authority—there it was—readable enough—“*sheep sorrel, horse sorrel, good in fevers.*” The farmer smiled—the doctor departed in anger, saying, as he went, “you may decide which you will sacrifice, your wife or your nag.” The woman died, and, shortly after, the horse. The neighbors considered the farmer a hard-hearted man—the wife a victim to the husband's selfishness—the sudden death of the horse a particular providence—and Dr. Bodkin the most skilful of physicians.

No. CX.

No class of men, not even the professors of the wrangling art, are, and ever have been, more universally used and abused, than the members of the medical profession. It has always appeared to me, that this abuse has been occasioned, in some degree, by the pompous air and Papal pretensions of certain members of the faculty; for the irritation of disappointment is, in the ratio of encouragement and hope; and the tongue of experience can have little to say of the infallibility of the medical art. The candid admission of its uncertainty, by Dr. Shattuck, in his dissertation, to which I have referred, is the true mode of erecting a barrier, between honorable and intelligent practitioners, and charlatans.

The opinion of Cato and of Pliny, in regard to the art is, of

course, to be construed, with an allowance, for its humble condition, in their day. With the exception of the superstitious, and even magical, employment of roots and herbs, it consisted, essentially, in externals. There was nothing like a systematic nosology. The *iatroi* of Athens, and the *medici* of Rome were *vulnerarii*, or surgeons. Cato, who died at the age of 85, U. C. 605, is reported, by Pliny, lib. xxix. cap. 7, to have said of the doctors, in a letter to his son Marcus—*Jurarunt inter se, barbaros, necare omnes, medicina*. They have sworn among themselves, barbarians as they are, to kill us all with their physic. In cap. 5 of the same book, he thus expresses his opinion—*mutatur ars quotidie, toties interpolis, et ingeniorum Græciæ flatu impellimur: palamque est, ut quisque inter istos loquendo polleat, imperatorem illico vitæ nostræ necisque fieri: ceu vero non millia gentium sine medicis degant*. The art is varying, from day to day: as often as a change takes place, we are driven along, by some new wind of doctrine from Greece. When it becomes manifest, that one of these doctors gains the ascendancy, by his harangues, he becomes, upon the spot, the arbiter of our life and death; as though there were not thousands of the nations, who got along without doctors. In the same passage he says, the art was not practised, among the Romans, until the sixth hundredth year, from the building of the city.

The healing art seems to have been carried on, in those days, with fire and sword, that is, with the knife and the cautery. In cap. 6, of the same book, Pliny tells us, that, U. C. 535, *Romam venisse—vulnerarium—mireque gratum adventum ejus initio: mox a sævitia secandi urendique transisse nomen in carnificem, et in tædium artem*—there came to Rome a surgeon, who was, at first, cordially received, but, shortly, on account of his cuttings and burnings, they called him a butcher, and his art a nuisance.

A professional wrestler, who was unsuccessful, in his profession, met Diogenes, the cynic, as we are told, by Diog. Laertius, in Vita, lib. vi. p. 60, and told him, that he had given up wrestling, and taken to physic—"Well done," said the philosopher, "now thou wilt be able to throw those, who have thrown thee."

The revolutions, which took place, in the practice of the healing art, previously to the period, when Pliny composed his Natural History, are certainly remarkable. Chrysippus, as far as he was able, overthrew the system of Hippocrates; Erasistratus

overthrew the system of Chrysippus; the Empirics, or experimentalists, overthrew, to the best of their ability, the system of Erasistratus; Herophilus did the very same thing, for the Empirics; Asclepiades turned the tables, upon Herophilus; Vexius Valens next came into vogue, as the leader of a sect; then Thessalus, in Nero's age, opposed all previous systems; the system of Thessalus was overthrown by Crinas of Marseilles; and so on, to the end of the chapter—which chapter, by the way, somewhat resembles the first chapter of Matthew, substituting the word *overthrew* for the word *begat*.

Water doctors certainly existed, in those ancient days. After Crinas, says Pliny, cap. 5, of the same book, there came along one—*damnatis non solum prioribus medicis, verum, et balineis; frigidaque etiam hibernis algoribus lavari persuasit. Mergit ægros in lacus. Videbamus senes consulares usque in ostentationem rigentes. Qua de re exstat etiam Annæi Senecæ stipulatio. Nec dubium est omnes istos famam novitate aliqua aucupantes anima statim nostra negotiari.* Condemning not only all former physicians, but the baths, then in use, he persuaded his patients to use cold water, during the rigors of winter. He plunged sick folks in ponds. We have seen certain aged, consular gentlemen, freezing themselves, from sheer ostentation. We have the personal statement of Annæus Seneca, in proof of this practice. Nor can it be doubted, that those quacks, greedily seeking fame, by the production of some novelty, would readily bargain away any man's life, for lucre. The statement of Seneca, to which Pliny refers, may be found in Seneca's letters, 53, and 83, both to Lucilius; in which he tells his friend, that, according to his old usage, he bathed in the Eurypus, upon the Kalends of January.

It would be easy to fill a volume, with the railings of such peevish philosophers, as Michael De Montaigne, against all sorts of physic and physicians. We are very apt to treat doctors and deities, in the same way—to scoff at them, in health, and fly to them, in sickness.

That was a pertinent question of Cicero's, lib. i. de Divinatione, 14. *An Medicina, ars non putanda est, quam tamen multa fallunt? * * * num imperatorum scientia nihil est, quia summus imperator nuper fugit, amisso exercitu? Aut num propterea nulla est reipublicæ gerendæ ratio atque, prudentia, quia multa Cn. Pompeium, quadam Catonem, nonnulla etiam te ipsum fe*

fellerunt ? As to medicine shall it be accounted not an art, because of the great uncertainty therein ? What, then, is there no such thing as military skill, because a great commander lately fled, and lost his army ? Can there be no such thing as a wise and prudent government, because Pompey has been often mistaken, even Cato sometimes, and yourself, now and then ?

If much more than all, that has been proclaimed, were true, in regard to the uncertainty of the healing art, still the practice of seeking some kind of counsel and assistance, whenever a screw gets loose, in our tabernacle of the flesh, is not likely to go out of fashion. What shall we do ? Follow the tetotum doctor, and swallow a purge, if P. come uppermost ? This is good evidence of our faith, in the doctrine of uncertainty. Or shall we go for the doctor, who works the cheapest ? There is no reason, why we should not cheapen our physic, if we cheapen our salvation ; for pack horses of all sorts, lay and clerical, are accounted the better workers, when they are rather low in flesh. Or shall we follow the example of the mutual admiration society, and get up a mutual physicking association ? Most men are pathologists, by intuition. I have been perfectly astonished to find how many persons, especially females and root doctors, know just what ails their neighbors, upon the very first hint of their being out of order, without even seeing them.

It is a curious fact, that, while men of honor, thoroughly educated, and who have devoted their whole lives, to the study and practice of the healing art, candidly admit its uncertainty, the ignorant and unprincipled of the earth alone, who have impudently resorted to the vocation, suddenly, and as an antidote to absolute starvation, boast of their infallibility, and deal in nothing, but panaceas. The fools, in this pleasant world, are such a respectable and wealthy minority, that the charlatan will not cease from among us, until the last of mortals shall have put on immortality : and then, like the fellow, who entered Charon's boat, with his commodities, he will try to smuggle some of his patent medicines, or *leetil doshes*, into the other world.

A curious illustration of the popular notion, that no man is guilty of any presumptuous sin, merely because, after lying down, at night, a notorious *pedler* or *tinker*, he rises, in the morning, a *physician*, may be found, in the fact, that a watch-maker, who would laugh at a tailor, should he offer to repair a

timekeeper, will readily confide in him, as a physician, for himself, his wife, or his child.

The most delicate female will sometimes submit her person, to the rubbings and manipulations of a blacksmith, in preference to following the prescriptions of a regular physician. A respectable citizen, with a pimple on the end of his nose, resembling, upon the testimony of a dozen old ladies, in the neighborhood, the identical cancer, of which every one of them was cured, by the famous Indian doctress, in Puzzlepot Alley, will, now and then, give his confidence to a lying, ignorant, half-drunken squaw, rather than to the most experienced member of the medical profession.

Suffer me to close this imperfect sketch, with the words of Lord Bacon, vol. i. page 120, Lond. 1824. "We see the weakness and credulity of men is such, as they will often prefer a mountebank or witch, before a learned physician. And therefore the poets were clear-sighted, in discerning this extreme folly, when they made Æsculapius and Circe brother and sister. For, in all times, in the opinion of the multitude, witches, and old women, and impostors have had a competition with physicians. And what followeth? Even this, that physicians say, to themselves, as Solomon expresseth it, upon a higher occasion, *If it befall to me, as befalleth to the fools, why should I labor to be more wise?*"

No. CXI.

VAN BUTCHELL, the fistula-doctor, in London, some forty years ago, had a white horse, and he painted the animal, with many colored spots. He also wore an enormous beard. These tricks were useful, in attracting notice. In the Harleian Miscellany, vol. viii. page 135, Lond. 1810, there is a clever article on quackery, published in 1678, from which I will extract a passage or two, for the benefit of the fraternity: "Any sexton will furnish you with a skull, in hope of your custom; over which hang up the skeleton of a monkey, to proclaim your skill in anatomy. Let your table be never without some old musty Greek or Arabic author, and the fourth book of Cornelius

Agrippa's Occult Philosophy, wide open, with half a dozen gilt shillings, as so many guineas, received, that morning for fees. Fail not to oblige neighboring ale-houses to recommend you to inquirers; and hold correspondence with all the nurses and midwives near you, to applaud your skill at gossipings. The admiring patient shall cry you up for a scholar, provided always your nonsense be fluent, and mixed with a disparagement of the college, graduated doctors, and book-learned physicians. Pretend to the cure of all diseases, especially those, that are incurable."

There are gentlemen of the medical and surgical professions, whose high reputation, for science and skill, is perfectly established, and who have humanely associated their honorable names with certain benevolent societies. Such is the fact, in regard to Dr. John Collins Warren, who, by his adoption of the broad ground of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, as a beverage, by men in health, and by his consistent practice and example, has become entitled to the grateful respect of every well-wisher of the temperance cause. To the best of my ability, I have long endeavored to do, for the sextons, the very thing, which that distinguished man would accomplish for the doctors, and other classes. Never did mortal more certainly oppose his own interest, than a physician, or a sexton, who advocates the temperance reform.

There are, however, personages, in the medical profession, regulars, as well as volunteers, who cling to certain societies, with the paralyzing grasp of death—holding on to their very skirts, as boys cling behind our vehicles, *to get a cast*. The patronage and advocacy of some of these individuals are absolutely fatal. It may be surely affirmed of more than one of their number, *nihil tetigit quod non damnavit*.

I have long been satisfied, that, without a great increase of societies, it will be utterly impossible to satisfy the innumerable aspirants, for the offices of President, Vice President, &c., in our ambitious community. A sagacious, medical friend of mine, whose whole heart is devoted to the public service, and I am sorry to say it, to the injury of his wife and children, has handed me a list of several societies, for the want of which, he assures me, the citizens of Boston are actually suffering, at the present moment. For myself, I cannot pretend to judge of such mat-

ters. A publication of the list may interest the benevolent, and, possibly, promote the cause of humanity. I give it entire :—

A society, for soothing the feelings and relieving the apprehensions of criminals, especially midnight assassins.

A mutual relief society, in case of flatulent colic.

A society, for the diffusion of buttermilk, with funds to enable the visiting committee to place a full jug, in the hands of every man, woman and child, in the United States, upon the first Monday of every month.

A friendly cockroach-trap society.

A society, composed exclusively of medical men, without practice, for the destruction of sowbugs and pismires, throughout the Commonwealth.

A society, for the promotion of domestic happiness, with power to send for persons and papers.

A society, for elevating the standard of education, by introducing trigonometry into infant schools.

An association, for the gratuitous administration, to the poorer classes, by steam power, of anodyne clysters.

Let us return to the faculty. I am in favor of some peculiarity, in the dress and equipage of medical men. With the exception of certain stated hours, they cannot be found at home ; and the case may be one of emergency. Van Butchell's spotted horse was readily distinguished, from Charing Cross to Temple Bar. This was very convenient for those, who were in quest of that remarkable leech. A small mast, abaft the vehicle, whether sulky, buggy, chariot, or phaeton, bearing the owner's private signal, would afford great public accommodation. There is nothing more nautical in such an arrangement, than in the use of the *killeck*, or small anchor, which many of the faculty regularly cast, when they are about to board a patient, and as regularly weigh, when they are about to take a new departure.

The bright yellow chariot of Dr. Benjamin Rush was universally known in Philadelphia, and its environs ; and his peculiar features are not likely to escape from the memory of any man, who ever beheld them. These striking points were seized, by that arch villain, Cobbett, when he published his pictured libel, representing that eminent physician, looking out of his chariot window, with a label, proceeding from his mouth—*Bleed and purge all Kensington !* Upon Cobbett's trial for this libel, Dr. Rush swore, that, by making him ridiculous, it had seriously affected his practice.

Dr. James Lloyd was easily discovered, by his large bay horse—take him for all in all—the finest harness gelding of his day, in Boston. With the eyes of a Swedenborgian, I see the good, old doctor now; and I hear the tramp of those highly polished, white topped boots; and I almost feel the lash of his horse-whip, around my boyish legs, rather too harshly administered, for mild practice however—but he was an able physician, and a gentleman—*factus ad unguem*. His remarkable courtliness of manner, arose, doubtless, in some degree, from his relation to the nobility. During the siege, General Howe and Lord Percy were his intimate friends; the latter was his tenant in 1775, occupying the Vassal estate, for which Dr. Lloyd was the agent, and which afterwards became the residence of the late Gardner Greene.

Dr. Danforth, who resided, in 1789, near the residence of Dr. Lloyd, on Pemberton's Hill, nearly opposite Concert Hall, and, subsequently, in Green Street, might be recognized, by the broad top of his chaise, and the unvarying moderation of the pace, at which he drove. He was tall and thin. His features were perfectly Brunonian. There seemed to be nothing antiphlogistic about him. When pleased, he was very gentlemanly, in his manner and carriage. He ever placed himself, with remarkable exactitude, in the very centre of his vehicle, bolt upright; and, with his stern expression, wrinkled features, remarkably aquiline nose, prominent chin, and broad-brimmed hat, appeared, even some fifty years ago, like a remnant of a by-gone age. He had been a royalist. His manners were occasionally rough and overbearing.

I remember to have told my mother, when a boy, that I should not like to take Dr. Danforth's physic. The character of his practice is, doubtless, well remembered, by those, who have taken his *divers*, as they were called, and lived to tell of it. The late Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse being interrogated, by some aged spinsters, as to the difference, between the practice of Dr. Danforth and his opponents, replied, that there were two ways of putting a disordered clock in tolerable condition—the first, by taking it apart, cleaning its various members of their dust and dirt, applying a little oil to the pivots, and attaching no other than its former weight; “and then,” said he, “it will go very well, for a considerable time; and this we call the anti-Brunonian system.”

The second method he described, as follows: "You are to take no pains about examining the parts; let the dust and dirt remain, by all means; apply no oil to the pivots; but hitch on three or four times the original weight, and you will be able to drag it along, after a fashion; and this is the Brunonian system." In this, the reader will recognize one of the pleasantries of Dr. Waterhouse, rather than an impartial illustration.

Dr. Isaac Rand, the son of Dr. Isaac Rand, of Charlestown, lived, in 1789, some sixty years ago, in Middle Street, just below Cross: in after years, he resided, till his death, in 1822, in Atkinson Street. He was a pupil of Dr. Lloyd. His liberalities to the poor became a proverb. The chaise, in which he practised, in his latter days, was a notable object. The width of it, though not equal to that of Solomon's temple, was several cubits. It became the property of the late Sheriff Badlam, who filled it to admiration. The mantle of Elijah was not a closer fit, upon the shoulders of Elisha.

Dr. Rand was an able physician, and a truly good man. He made rather a more liberal use of the learned terms of his profession, than was the practice of other physicians. With him, this arose from habit, and a desire to speak with accuracy, and not from affectation. Charles Austin was shot dead, in State Street, by Thomas O. Selfridge, August 4, 1806, in self-defence. Dr. Rand was a witness, at the trial; and his long and learned, professional terms, so completely confounded the stenographers, that they were obliged to beat the *chamade*, and humbly beg for plainer English.

I have more to say of these interesting matters, but am too near the boundary wall of my paper, to enter upon their consideration, at present.

No. CXII.

In my last number, I referred to three eminent physicians, of the olden time, Drs. Lloyd, Danforth, and Rand. Some sixty years ago, there were three and twenty physicians, in this city, exclusive of quacks. The residences of the three I have already stated. Dr. James Pecker resided, at the corner of

Hanover and Friend Street—Thomas Bulfinch, in Bowdoin Square—Charles Jarvis, in Common Street—Lemuel Hayward, opposite the sign of the White Horse, in Newbury Street—Thomas Kast, in Fish Street, near the North Square—David Townsend, in Southack's Court—John Warren, next door to Cromwell's Head, in South Latin School Street, then kept by Joshua Brackett—Thomas Welsh, in Sudbury Street, near Concert Hall—William Eustis, in Sudbury Street, near the Mill Pond—John Homans, No. 6 Marlborough Street—John Sprague, in Federal Street—Nathaniel W. Appleton, in South Latin School Street, near the Stone Chapel—Joseph Whipple, in Orange Street—Aaron Dexter, in Milk Street, opposite the lower end of the rope walks, that were burnt, in the great fire, July 30, 1794—Abijah Cheever, in Hanover Street—William Spooner, in Cambridge Street—John Fleet, in Milk Street—Amos Winship, in Hanover Street—Robert Rogerson, in Ship Street—Alexander A. Peters, in Marlborough Street—John Jeffries, who, in 1776, went to Halifax, with the British garrison, did not return and resume practice in Boston, till 1790.

Ten years after, in 1799, the number had increased to twenty-nine, of whom nineteen were of the old guard of 1789.

In 1816, the number had risen to forty-three, of whom eight only were of 1789. In 1830, the number was seventy-five, two only surviving of 1789—Drs. William Spooner and Thomas Welsh.

In 1840, we had, in Boston, one hundred and twenty-two physicians, surgeons, and dentists, and a population of 93,383. There are now, in this physicky metropolis, according to the Directory, for 1848-9, physicians, of all sorts, not including those for the soul, but doctors, surgeons, dentists, regulars and quacks, of all colors and both sexes, 362. THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO: an increase of two hundred and forty, in eight years. This is certainly encouraging. If 122 doctors are quite as many, as 93,383 Athenians ought to bear, 362 require about 280,000 patients, and such should be our population. Let us arrange this formidable host. At the very *tete d'armee*, marching left in front, we have seven *Female Physicians*, preceded by an *Indian doctress*—next in order, come the surgeon *Dentists*, seventy in number—then the main body, to whom the publisher of the Directory courteously and indiscriminately applies the title of *Physicians*, two hundred and fifty-seven, rank

and file;—seven and twenty *Botanic Doctors* bring up the rear! How appropriate, in the hand of the very last of this enormous *cortege*, would be a banner, inscribed with those well known words—GOD SAVE THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS!

I shall devote this paper to comparative statistics. In 1789, with twenty-three physicians in Boston, four less, than the present number of *botanic doctors* alone, and three hundred and thirty-nine less, than the present number of regulars and pretenders, there were nine only of *our* profession, regularly enrolled, as F. U., funeral undertakers, and placed upon a footing with the Roman *designatores*, or *domini funerum*. There were several others, who bore to our profession the same relation, which bachelors of medicine bear to theirs, and who were entitled to subscribe themselves D. G., diggers of graves. Yet in 1840, the year, which I take, as a *point d'appui* for my calculations, there were only twenty, enrolled as F. U., with 362 medical operatives, busily at work, day and night, upon the insides and outsides of our fellow-citizens! Here is matter for marvel! How was it done? Did the dead bury the dead? I presume the solution lies, in the fact, that there existed an unrecorded number of those, who were D. G. only.

There were few dentists, *eo nomine*, some sixty years ago. Our ancestors appear to have gotten along pretty comfortably, in spite of their teeth. Many of those, who practised the "*dental art*," had so little employment, that it became convenient to unite their dental practice, with some other occupation. Thus John Templeman, was a *broker and dentist*, at the northeast corner of the Old State House. Whitlock was, doubtless, frequently called out, from a rehearsal, at the play house, to pull a refractory grinder. Isaac Greenwood advertises, in the Columbian Sentinel of June 1, 1785, not only his desire to wait upon all, who may require his services, at their houses, in the dental line; but a variety of umbrellas, canes, silk caps for bathing, dice, chess men, and cane for hoops and bonnets, by the dozen, or single stick. In the Boston Mercury of Jan. 6, 1797, W. P. Greenwood combines, with his dental profession, the sale of piano-fortes and guitars. In 1799, the registered dentists were three only, Messrs. Isaac and Wm. P. Greenwood, and Josiah Flagg. In 1816, there were three only, Wm. P. Greenwood, Thomas Parsons, and Thomas Barnes.

It would appear somewhat extravagant, perhaps, to state, that, including doctors of all sorts, there is a fraction more than two doctors to every one merchant, *eo nomine*, excluding commission merchants, of course, in the city of Boston. Such, nevertheless, appears to be the fact, unless Mr. Adams has made some important error, which I do not suspect, in his valuable Directory, for 1848-9.

It will not be utterly worthless, to contemplate the quartermaster's department of this portentous army; and compare it with the corresponding establishment of other times. In 1789, there were fifteen druggists and apothecaries, in the town of Boston. Examples were exceedingly rare, in those days, of wholesale establishments, exclusively dealing in drugs and medicines. At present, we have, in this city, eighty-nine apothecaries, doing business, in as many different places—drugs and medicines are also sold, at wholesale, in forty-four establishments—there are fourteen special depots, for the sale of patent medicines, Gordak's drugs, Indian purgatives, Holman's restorative, Brandreth's pills, Sherry wine bitters, and pectoral balsam, Graefenberg's medicines, and many other kinds of nastiness—eighteen dealers exclusively in botanic medicines—ninety-seven nurses—twenty-eight undertakers—and eight warehouses for the sale of coffins!

It is amusing, if nothing worse, to compare the relative increase, in the number of persons, who are, in various ways, employed about the sick, the dying, and the dead, in killing, or curing, or comforting, or burying, with the increase in some other crafts and callings. In 1789, there were thirty-one bakers, in Boston: there are now fifty-seven. The number has not doubled in sixty years. The number of doctors then, as I have stated, was twenty-three: now, charlatans included, it falls short, only six, of sixteen times that number.

There were then sixty-seven tailors' shops; there are now one hundred and forty-eight such establishments. There were then thirty-six barbers, hair-dressers, and wig-makers: there are now ninety-one. There were then one hundred and five cabinet-makers and carpenters: there are now three hundred and fifty. This ratio of comparison will, by no means, hold, in some other callings. There were then nine auctioneers: there are now fifty-two. There were then seven brokers, of all sorts: there are now two hundred and ten. The source from

which I draw my information, is the Directory of 1789, "printed and sold by John Norman, at Oliver's Dock," and of which the writer speaks, in his preface, as "*this first attempt*." For want of sufficient designation, it is impossible, in this primitive work, to pick out the members of the legal profession. Compared with the present fraternity, whose name is legion, they were very few. There are more than three hundred and fifty practitioners of the law, in this city. In this, as in the medical profession, there are, and ever will be, *ex necessitate rei*, infernal scoundrels, and highly intelligent and honorable men—blind guides and safe counsellors. Not very long ago, a day of purification was appointed—some plan seemed to be excogitating, for the ventilation of the brotherhood. For once, they were gathered together, brethren, looking upon the features of brothers, and knowing them not. This was an occasion of mutual interest, and the arena was common ground—they came, some of them, doubtless, from strange quarters, lofty attics and lowly places—

"From all their dens the one-eyed race repair,
From rifted rocks, and mountains high in air."

When doctors, lawyers, and brokers are greatly upon the increase, it is very clear, that we are getting into the way of submitting our bodies and estates, to be frequently, and extensively, tinkered.

I cannot doubt, that in 1789, there were quacks, about town, who could not contrive to get their names inserted, in the same page, with the regular physicians. I cannot believe, however, that they bore any proportion to the unprincipled and ignorant impostors, at the present time. In the "Massachusetts Centinel," of Sept. 21, 1785, is the following advertisement—"John Pope, who, for eighteen years past, has been noted for curing Cancers, schrophulous Tumours, fetid and phagedenic Ulcers, &c., has removed into a house, the north corner of Orange and Hollis Street, South End, Boston, where he proposes to open a school, for Reading, Writing, Arithmetick, &c."

In 1789 there were twenty-two distillers of rum in Boston: there are nine only, named in the Directory of 1848-9. The increase of doctors and all the appliances of sickness and death have not probably arisen from the falling off, among distillers. In 1789, there were about twenty innholders: there are

now eighty-eight public houses, hotels, or taverns—ninety-two restaurants—thirty-five confectionery establishments—thirty-nine stores, under the caption of “liquors and wines”—sixty-nine places, for the sale of oysters, which are not always the *spiritless* things they appear to be—one hundred and forty-three wholesale dealers, in West India goods and groceries—three hundred and seventy-three retailers of such articles: I speak not of those, who fall below the dignity of history; whose operations are entirely subterraneous; and whose entire stock in trade might be carried, in a wheelbarrow. We have also one hundred and fifty-two provision dealers. We live well in this city. It would be very pleasant, to walk over it, with old Captain Keayne, who died here, March 23, 1656, and who left a sum of money to the town, to erect a granary or storehouse, for the poor, in case of famine!

No. CXIII.

THE Quack is commonly accounted a spurious leech—a false doctor—clinging, like a vicious barnacle, to the very bottom of the medical profession. But impostors exist, in every craft, calling, and profession, under the names of quacks, empirics, charmers, magicians, professors, sciolists, plagiaries, enchanters, charlatans, pretenders, judicial astrologers, quacksalvers, muffs, mountebanks, medicasters, barrators, cheats, puffs, champertors, cuckoos, diviners, jugglers, and verifiers of suggestions.

Butler, in his *Hudibras*, says, of medical quacks, they

Seek out for plants, with signatures,
To quack of universal cures.

In the *Spectator*, Addison has this observation—“At the first appearance, that a French quack made in Paris, a boy walked before him, publishing, with a shrill voice, ‘*my father cures all sorts of distempers* ;’ to which the doctor added, in a grave manner, ‘*what the boy says is true*.’”

The imposture of James Aymar, to which I have alluded, was of a different kind. Aymar was an ignorant peasant of Dauphiné. He finally confessed himself to be an impostor, before

the Prince of Condé ; and the whole affair is narrated, by the apothecary of the prince, in a *Lettre à M. L'Abbé, D. L., sur les véritables effets de la baguette de Jaques Aymar par P. Buisiere ; chez Louis Lucas, à Paris, 1694.*

The power of this fellow's wand was not limited, to the discovery of hidden treasures, or springs of water ; nor were his only dupes the lowly and the ignorant. As I have said, he was detected, and made a full confession, before the Prince of Condé. The magistrates published an official account of the imposture ; yet such is the energy of the credulous principle, that M. Vallemont, a man of note, published a treatise "*on the occult philosophy of the divining wand ;*" in which he tries to show, that Aymar, notwithstanding his mistakes, before the Prince, was really possessed of all the wonderful power he claimed, of divining with his wand. The measure of this popular credulity will be better understood, after perusing the following translation of an extract from the *Mercure Historique*, for April, 1697, page 440.—"The Prior of the Carthusians passed through Villeneuve with Aymar, to discover, by the aid of his wand, some landmarks, that were lost. Just before, a foundling had been left on the steps of the monastery. Aymar was employed, by the Superior, to find out the father. Followed by a great crowd, and guided by the indications of his wand, he went to the village of Comaret, in the County of Venaissin, and thence to a cottage, where he affirmed the child was born.

"Bayle says, on the authority of another letter from M. Buisiere, in 1698, that Aymar's apparent simplicity, and rustic dialect, and the rapid motion of his wand went far, to complete the delusion. He was also exceedingly devout, and never absent from mass, or confession. While he was at Paris, and before his exposure, the Pythoness, herself, would not have been more frequently, and zealously consulted, than was this crafty and ignorant boor, by the Parisians. Fees showered in from all quarters ; and he was summoned, in all directions, to detect thieves ; recover lost property ; settle the question of genuine identity, among the relics of *prima facie* saints, in different churches ; and, in truth, no limit was set, by his innumerable dupes, to the power of his miraculous wand. "I myself," says M. Buisiere, "saw a simple, young fellow, a silk weaver, who was engaged to a girl, give Aymar a couple of crowns, to know if she were a virgin."

Joseph Francis Borri flourished, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and a most complicated scoundrel he was—heresiarch, traitor, alchymist, and empiric. He had spiritual revelations, of course. He was an intelligent and audacious liar, and converts came in apace. At his suggestion, his followers took upon themselves an oath of poverty, and placed all they possessed in the hands of Borri, who told them he would take care it should never again interfere with their devotions, but would be spent in prayers and masses, for their ulcerated souls. The bloodhounds of the Inquisition were soon upon his track, at the moment he was about to raise the standard of insurrection in Milan.

He fled to Amsterdam—made capital of his persecution by the Inquisition; and won the reputation of a great chemist, and wonderful physician. He then went to Hamburg, and persuaded Queen Christina, to advance him a large sum of money, to be reimbursed, from the avails of the philosopher's stone, which Borri was to discover. This trick was clearly worth repeating. So thought Borri; and he tried it, with still better success, on his Majesty of Denmark. Still the stone remained undiscovered; and the thought occurred to Signor Borri, that it might not be amiss, to look for it, in Turkey. He accordingly removed; but was arrested at Vienna, by the Pope's agents; and consigned to the prisons of the Inquisition, for life. His fame, however, had become so omnipotent, that, upon the earnest application of the Duke d'Etrée, he was let loose, to prescribe for that nobleman, whom the regular physicians had given over. The Duke got well, and the world gave Borri the credit of the cure. When a poor suffering mortal is given over, in other words, *let alone*, by half a dozen doctors—I am speaking now of the regulars, not less than of the volunteers—he, occasionally, gets well.

A wit replied to a French physician, who was marvelling how a certain Abbé came to die, since he himself and three other physicians were unremitting, in their attentions—"My dear doctor, how could the poor abbé sustain himself, against you all four?" The doctors do much as they did of old. Pliny, lib. xxix. 5, says, of consultations—"Hinc illæ circa agros miseræ sententiarum concertationes, nullo idem censente ne videatur accessio alterius. Hinc illa infelicis monumenti inscriptio, TURBA SE MEDICORUM PERIISSE. Hence those contemptible consulta-

tions, round the beds of the sick—no one assenting to the opinion of another, lest he should be deemed his subaltern. Hence the monumental inscription, over the poor fellow, who was destroyed in this way—KILLED BY A MOB OF DOCTORS!

Who has not seen a fire rekindle, *sua sponte*, after the officious bellows have, apparently, extinguished the last spark? So, now and then, the vital spark, stimulated by the *vis medicatrix naturæ* will rekindle into life and action, after having been well nigh smothered, by all sorts of complicated efforts to restore it.

This is the *punctum instans*, the very nick of time, for the charlatan: in he comes, looking insufferably wise, and brim full of sympathetic indignation. All has been done wrong, of course. While he affects to be doing everything, he does exactly nothing—stirs up an invisible, impalpable, infinitesimal, incomprehensible particle, in a little water, which the patient can neither see, feel, taste, nor smell. Down it goes. The patient's faith, as to the size of it, rather resembles a cocoanut than a grain of mustard seed. His confidence in the *new* doctor is as gigantic, and as blind, as Polyphemus, after he had been gouged, by him of Ithaca. He plants his galvanic grasp, upon the wrist of the little doctor, much in the manner of a drowning man, clutching at a full grown straw. He is absolutely better already. The wife and the little ones look upon the mountebank, as their preserver from widowhood and orphanage. "*Dere ish noting*," he says, "*like de leetl doshes*;" and he takes his leave, regretting, as he closes the door, that his sleeve is not large enough, to hold the sum total of his laughter. Yet some of these quacks become *honest men*; and, however surprised at the result, they are finally unable, to resist the force of the popular outcry, in their own favor. They almost forget their days of duplicity, and small things—they arrive, somehow or other, at the conclusion, that, however unexpectedly, they are great men, and their wild tactics a system. They use longer words, move into larger houses, and talk of first principles: and all the practice of a neighborhood finally falls into the hands of Dr. Ninkempaup or Dr. Pauketpeeker.

Francis Joseph Borri died, in prison, in 1695. Sorbiero in his *Voyage en Angleterre*, page 158, describes him thus—"He is a cunning blade; a lusty, dark-complexioned, good-looking fellow, well dressed, and lives at considerable expense, though not

at such a rate, as some suppose ; for eight or ten thousand livres will go a great way at Amsterdam. But a house, worth 15,000 crowns, in a fine location, five or six footmen, a French suit of clothes, a treat or two to the ladies, the occasional refusal of fees, five or six rix dollars distributed, at the proper time and place among the poor, a spice of insolence in discourse, and sundry other artifices have made some credulous persons say, that he gave away handfulls of diamonds, that he had discovered the philosopher's stone, and the universal medicine." When he was in Amsterdam, he appeared in a splendid equipage, was accosted, by the title of "*your excellence*," and they talked of marrying him to one of the greatest fortunes.

I have no taste for unsocial pleasures. Will the reader go with me to Franklin Place—let us take our station near No. 2, and turn our eyes to the opposite side—let us put back the hand of the world's timekeeper, some thirty years. A showy chariot, very peculiar, very yellow, and abundantly supplied with glass, with two tall bay horses, gaudily harnessed, is driven to the door of the mansion, by a coachman, in livery ; and there it stands ; till, after the expiration of an hour, perhaps, the house door is flung open, and there appears, upon the steps, a tall, dark visaged, portly personage, in black, who, looking slowly up and down the avenue, proceeds, with great deliberation, to draw on his yellow, buckskin gloves. Rings glitter upon his fingers ; seals, keys, and safety chain, upon his person. His beaver, of an unusual form, is exquisitely glossy, surpassed, by nothing but the polish of his tall suwarrows, surmounted with black, silk tassels.

He descends to the vehicle—the door is opened, with a bow of profound reverence, which is scarcely acknowledged, and in he gets, the very *fac simile* of a Spanish grandee. The chariot moves off, so very slowly, that we can easily follow it, on foot—on it goes, up Franklin, and down Washington, up Court, into Tremont, down School, into Washington, along Washington, up Winter, and through Park to Beacon Street, where it halts, before the mansion of some respectable citizen. The occupant alights, and, leaving his chariot there, proceeds, through obscure and winding ways, to visit his patients, on foot, in the purlieus of *La Montagne*.

This was no other than the celebrated patentee of the famous bug liquid ; who was forever putting the community on its guard, by admonishing the pill-taking public, that they *could not be too particular*, for none were genuine, unless signed *W. T. Conway*.

No. CXIV.

CHARITY began at home—I speak of Charity Shaw, the famous root and herb doctress, who was a great blessing to all undertakers, in this city, for many years—her practice was, at first, purely domestic—she began at home, in her own household; and, had she ended there, it had fared better, doubtless, with many, who have received the final attentions of our craft. The mischief of quackery is negative, as well as positive. Charity could not be fairly classed with those reckless empirics, who, rather than lose the sale of a nostrum, will send you directly to the devil, for a dollar: Charity was kind, though she vaunted herself a little in the newspapers. She was, now and then, rather severely handled, but she bore all things, and endured all things, and hoped all things; for, to do her justice, she was desirous, that her patients should recover: and, if she believed not all things, her patients did; and therein consisted the negative mischief—in that stupid credulity, which led them to follow this poor, ignorant, old woman, and thus prevented them, from applying for relief, where, if anywhere, in this uncertain world, it may be found—at the fountains of knowledge and experience. In Charity's day, there were several root and herb practitioners; but the greatest of these was Charity.

Herb doctors have, for some two thousand years, attempted to turn back the tables, upon the faculty—they are a species of *garde mobile*, who have an old grudge against the *corps regulier*: for they have not forgotten, that, some two thousand years ago, herb doctors had all things pretty much in their own way. Two entire books, the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh of Pliny's Natural History, are devoted to a consideration of the medicinal properties of herbs—the twentieth treats of the medicinal properties of vegetables—the twenty-third and twenty-fourth of the medicinal properties of roots and barks. Thus, we see, of what importance these simples were accounted, in the healing art, in that early age. Herbs, barks, and roots were, and, for ages, had been, the principal *materia medica*, and were employed, by the different sects—by the Rationalists, of whom Pliny, lib. xxvi. cap. 6, considers Herophilus the head, though this honor is ascribed, by Galen, to Hippocrates—the Empirics, or experimentalists—and the Methodics, who avoided all actions, for *mala*

praxis, by adhering to the rules. Pliny manifestly inclined to herb doctoring. In the chapter, just now referred to, after alluding to the *verba, garrulitatemque* of certain lecturers, he intimates, that they and their pupils had an easy time of it—*sedere namque his in scholis auditioni operatos gratus erat, quam ire in solitudines, et querere herbas alias aliis diebus anni*—for it was pleasanter to sit, listening in the lecture-rooms, than to run about in the fields and woods, culling certain simples, on certain days in the year.

Herb doctors were destined to be overthrown; and the account, given by Pliny, in chapters 7, 8 and 9, book xxvi. of the sudden and complete revolution, in the practice of the healing art, is curious and interesting.

Asclepiades, of Prusa, in Bythinia, came to Rome, in the time of Pompey the Great, about one hundred years before Christ, to teach rhetoric; and, like an impudent hussy, who came to this city, as a cook, from Vermont, some years ago, and, not succeeding, in that capacity, but hearing, that wet nurses obtained high wages here, prepared herself, for that lucrative occupation—so Asclepiades, not succeeding, as a rhetorician, prepared himself for a doctor. He was ignorant of the whole matter; but a man of genius; and, as he knew nothing of root and herb practice, he determined to cut up the whole system root and branch, and substitute one of his own—*torrenti ac meditata quotidie oratione blandiens omnia abdicavit: totamque medicinam ad causam revocando, conjecturæ fecit*. By the power of his forcible and preconcerted orations, pronounced from day to day, in a smooth and persuasive manner, he overthrew the whole; and, bringing back the science of medicine to cause and effect, he constructed a system of inference or conjecture. Pliny is not disposed to be altogether pleased with Asclepiades, though he recounts his merits fairly. He says of him—*Id solum possumus indignari, unum hominem, e levissima gente, sine ullis opibus orsum, vectigalis sua causa, repente leges salutis humano genere dedisse, quas tamen postea abrogavere multi*—at least, we may feel rather indignant, that one, born among a people, remarkable for their levity, born also in poverty, toiling for his daily support, should thus suddenly lay down, for the human race, the laws of health, which, nevertheless, many rejected afterwards.

Now it seems to me, that Asclepiades was a very clever fellow; and I think, upon Pliny's own showing, there was more reason, for indignation, against a people, who had so long toler-

ated the marvellous absurdities of the herb system, such as it then was, than against a man, who had the good sense to perceive, and the courage and perseverance to explode, them. What there was in the poverty of Asclepiades, or in the character of his countrymen, to rouse Pliny's indignation, I cannot conceive. Pliny says, lib. xxvi. cap. 9, after naming several things, which promoted this great change, in the practice of Physic—*Super omnia adjuvere eum magicæ vanitates, in tantum erectæ, ut abrogare herbis fidem cunctis possent.* He was especially assisted in his efforts, by the excesses, to which the magical absurdities had been carried, in respect to herbs, so that they alone were enough to destroy all confidence, in such things.

Pliny proceeds to narrate some of these magical absurdities—the plant Æthiops, thrown into lakes and rivers, would dry them up—the touch of it would open everything, that was shut. The Achæmenis, cast among the enemy, would cause immediate flight. The Latace would ensure plenty. Josephus also, De Bell. Ind. lib. vii. cap. 25—speaks of an excellent root for driving out devils.

Pliny says, Asclepiades laid down five important particulars—*abstinentiam cibi, alias vini, frictionem corporis, ambulationem, gestationes*—abstinence from meat, and, at other times, from wine, friction of the body, walking, and various kinds of gestation, on horseback, and otherwise. There were some things, in the old practice, *nimis anxia et rudia*, too troublesome and coarse, whose rejection favored the new doctor greatly, *obruendi agros veste sudoresque omni modo ciendi; nunc corpora ad ignes torrendi*, etc.—smothering the sick in blankets, and exciting perspiration, by all possible means—roasting them before fires, &c. Like every other ingenious physician, he had something pleasant, of his own contriving, to propose—*tum primum pensili balnearum usu ad infinitum blandientem*—then first came up the employment of hanging baths, to the infinite delight of the public. These hanging baths, which Pliny says, lib. ix. 79, were really the invention of Sergius Orata, were rather supported than suspended—fires were kindled below—there were different *ahena*, or caldrons, the *caldarium*, and *frigidarium*. The *corrivatio* was simply the running together of the cold and hot water. Annexed was the *laconicum*, or sweating room. The curious reader may compare the Roman baths with those at Constantinople, described by Miss Pardoe.

Alia quoque blandimenta, says Pliny, *excogitabat, jam suspendendo lectulos, quorum jactatu aut morbos extenuaret, aut somnos alliceret*. He excogitated other delights, such as suspended beds, whose motion soothed the patient, or put him to sleep. The principle here seems pretty universal, lying at the bottom of all those simple contrivances, rocking-chairs, cribs, and cradles, swings, hammocks, &c. This is truly Indian practice—

Rock-a-bye baby upon the tree top,
And, when the wind blows, the cradle will rock.

Præterea in quibusdam morbis medendi cruciatus detraxit, ut in anginis quas curabant in fauces organo demisso. Damnavit merito et vomitiones, tunc supra modum frequentes. He also greatly diminished the severity of former practice, in certain diseases, in quinsies for example, which they used to cure, with an instrument, introduced into the fauces. He very properly condemned those vomitings, then frequent, beyond all account. This refers to the Roman usage, which is almost incomprehensible by us. Celsus, *De Med. lib. i. 3*, refers to it, as the practice *eorum, qui quotidie ejiciendo, vorandi facultatem moliantur*—of those, who, by vomiting daily, acquired the faculty of gormandizing. Suetonius says of the imperial brute, Vitellius, *sec. xiii.* that he regularly dined, at three places daily, *facile omnibus sufficiens, vomitandi consuetudine*—easily enabled to do so, by his custom of vomiting.

Pliny's reflection, upon the success of the new doctor, is very natural—*quæ quum unusquisque semetipsum sibi præstare posse intelligeret, faventibus cunctis, ut essent vera quæ facillima erant, universum prope humanum genus circumegit in se, non alio modo quam si cælo emissus advenisset*. When every one saw, that he could apply the rules for himself, all agreeing that things, which were so very simple, must certainly be true, he gathered all mankind around him, precisely as though he had been one, sent from Heaven.

In the following passage, Pliny employs the word, *artificium*, in an oblique sense. *Trahebat præterea mentes artificio mirabili, vinum promittendo agris*. He attracted men's minds, by the remarkable artifice of allowing wine to the sick.

During the temperance movement, some eminent physicians have asserted, that wine was unnecessary, in every case—others have extended their practice, and increased their popularity, by

making their patients as comfortable, as possible—*while they continued in the flesh*. A German, who had been very intemperate, joined a total abstinence society, by the advice of a temperance physician. In a little time the *tormina* of his stomach became unbearable. Instead of calling his temperance physician, who would, probably, have eased the irritation, with a little worm-wood, or opium, he sent for the popular doctor, who told him, at once, that he wanted brandy—"How much may I take?" inquired the German. "An ounce, during the forenoon;" replied the doctor. After he had gone, the German said to his son, "Harman, go, get de measure pook, and zee how mooch be won ounce." The boy brought the book, and read aloud, eight drachms make one ounce—the patient sprang half out of bed; and, rubbing his hands, exclaimed—"dat ish de toctor vor me; I never took more nor voor trams in a morning, in all my porn days—dat ish de trouble—I zee it now."

No. CXV.

MISS BUNGS is dead. It is well to state this fact, lest I should be suspected of some covert allusion to the living. She firmly believed in the XXXIX. articles, and in a fortieth—namely—that man is a fortune-hunter, from his cradle. She often declared, that, sooner than wed a fortune-hunter, she would die a cruel death—she would die a maid—she did so, in the full possession of her senses, to the last.

Her entire estate, consisting of sundry shares, in fancy stocks, two parrots, a monkey, a silver snuff-box, and her paraphernalia, she directed to be sold; and the avails employed, for the promotion of celibacy, among the heathen.

Yet it was the opinion of those, who knew her intimately, that Miss Bungs was, at heart, sufficiently disposed to enter into the holy state of matrimony, could she have found one pure, disinterested spirit; but, unfortunately, she was fully persuaded, that every man, who smiled upon her, and inquired after her health, was "*after her money*." Miss Bungs was not unwilling to encourage the impression, that she was an object of particular regard, in certain quarters; and, if a gentleman picked up her

glove, or escorted her across a gutter, she was in the habit of instituting particular inquiries, among her acquaintances—in strict confidence of course—in regard to his moral character—ejaculating with a sigh, that men were so mercenary now-a-days, it was difficult to know who could be trusted.

Now, this was very wrong, in Miss Bungs. By the English law, if a man or a woman pretends, falsely, that he or she is married to any person, that person may libel, in the spiritual court, and obtain an injunction of silence; and this offence, in the language of the law, is called *jactitation of marriage*. I can see no reason why an injunction in cases of *jactitation of courtship*, should not be allowed; for serious evils may frequently arise, from such unauthorized pretences.

After grave reflection, I am of opinion, that Miss Bungs carried her opposition to fortune-hunters, beyond the bounds of reason. Let us define our terms. The party, who marries, only for money, intending, from the very commencement, to make use of it, for the selfish gratification of vain, or vicious, propensities—is a fortune-hunter of the very worst kind. But let us not forget, as we go along, that this field is occupied by huntresses, as well as by hunters; and that, upon such voyages of discovery, the cap may be set, as effectually, as the compass.

There is another class, with whom the degree of personal attachment, which really exists, is too feeble, to resist the combined influence of selfishness and pride. Such also, I suppose, may be placed in the category of fortune-hunters. We find an illustration of this, in the case of Mr. Mewins. After a liberal arrangement had been made, for the young lady, by her father; Mr. Mewins, having taken a particular fancy to a little, brown mare, demanded, that it should be thrown into the bargain; and, upon a positive refusal, the match was broken off. After a couple of years, the parties accidentally met, at a country ball—Mr. Mewins was quite willing to renew the engagement—the lady appeared not to have the slightest recollection of him. "Surely you have not forgotten me," said he—"What name, sir?" she inquired—"Mewins," he replied; "I had the honor of paying my addresses to you, about two years ago."—"I remember a person of that name," she rejoined, "who paid his addresses to my father's brown mare."

In matrimony, wealth is, of course, a very comforting accessory. It renders an agreeable partner still more so—and it often

goes, not a little way, to balance an unequal bargain. Time and talent may as wisely be wasted, in pursuit of the philosopher's stone, as of an unmixed good or evil, on this side the grave. Temper may be mistaken, or it may change; beauty may fade; but £60,000, well managed, will enable the *happy man or woman*, to bear up, with tolerable complacency, under the severest trials of domestic life. What a blessed thing it is, to fall back upon, when one is compelled to mourn, over the infirmities of the living, or the absence, of the dead! What a solace!

It was therefore wrong, in Miss Bung, to designate, as fortune-hunters, those, of either sex, who have come to the rational conclusion, that money is essential to the happiness of married life. No man or woman of common sense, who is poor, will, now-a-days, commit the indiscretion of *falling in love*, unless with some person of ample possessions.

What, then, is to become of the penniless, and the unpretty! We must adopt the custom of the ancient Babylonians, introduced about 1433 B. C., by Atossa, the daughter of Belochus. At a certain season of the year, the most lovely damsels were assembled, and put up, singly, at auction, to be purchased, by the *highest* bidder. The wealthy swains of Babylon poured forth their wealth, like water; and rivals settled the question, not by the length of their rapiers, but of their purses. The money, thus obtained, became the dowry of those, whose personal attractions were not likely to obtain them husbands. They also were put up, and sold to the *lowest* bidder, as the poor were formerly disposed of, in our villages. Every unattractive maiden, young, old, and of no particular age, was put up, at a *maximum*, and bestowed on him, who would take her, with the smallest amount of dowry. It is quite possible, that certain lots may have been withdrawn.

I rather prefer this practice to that of the Spartans, which prevailed, about 884 B. C. At an appointed time, the marriageable damsels were collected, in a hall, perfectly dark; and the young men were sent into the apartment; walking, evidently, neither by faith nor by sight, but, literally, feeling their way, and thus selected their helpmates. This is in perfect keeping with the principle, that love is blind.

The ancient Greeks lived, and multiplied, without marriage. Eusebius, in the preface to his Chronicon, states, that marriage

ceremonies were first introduced among them, by Cecrops, about 1554 B. C. The Athenians provided by law, that no unmarried man should be entrusted with public affairs, and the Lacedemonians passed severe laws against those, who unreasonably deferred their marriage. It is not easy to reconcile the general policy of promoting marriages, with the statute, 8 William III., 1695, by which they were taxed; as they were again, in 1784.

The earliest celebration of marriages, in churches, was ordained by Pope Innocent III., A. D. 1199. Marriages were forbidden in Lent, A. D. 364, conforming, perhaps, to the rule of abstinence from flesh.

Fortune-hunting has not always been unaccompanied with violence. Stealing an heiress was made felony, by 3 Henry VII. 1487, and benefit of clergy denied, in such cases, by 39 Eliz. 1596. In the first year of George IV. 1820, this offence was made punishable by transportation. In the reign of William III., Captain Campbell forcibly married Miss Wharton, an heiress. The marriage was annulled, by act of Parliament, and Sir John Johnston was hanged, for abetting. In 1827, two brothers and a sister, Edward, William, and Frances Wakefield, were tried and convicted, for the felonious abduction of Miss Turner, an heiress, whose marriage with Edward Wakefield was annulled, by act of Parliament.

No species of fortune-hunter appears so entirely contemptible, as the wretch, who marries for money, intending to employ it, not for the joint comfort of the parties, but for the payment of his own arrearages; and who resorts to the expedient of marriage, not to obtain a wife, but to avoid a jail. And the exultation is pretty universal, when such a vagabond falls, himself, into the snare, which he had so deliberately prepared, for another.

In the fifth volume of the Diary of Samuel Pepys, pages 323, 329 and 330, Lord Braybrooke has recorded three letters to Pepys, from an extraordinary scoundrel of this description. The first letter from this man, Sir Samuel Morland, who seems to have had some employment in the navy, bears date "Saturday, 19 February, 1686-7." After communicating certain information, respecting naval affairs, he proceeds, as follows:—

"I would have wayted on you with this account myself, but I presume you have, ere this time, heard what an unfortunate and

fatall accident has lately befallen me, of which I shall give you an abreviat."

"About three weeks or a month since, being in very great perplexities, and almost distracted for want of moneys, my private creditors tormenting me from morning to night, and some of them threatening me with a prison, and having no positive answer from his Majesty, about the £1300 which the late Lord Treasurer cutt off from my pension so severely, which left a debt upon me, which I was utterly unable to pay, there came a certain person to me, whom I had relieved in a starving condition, and for whom I had done a thousand kindnesses; who pretended, in gratitude to help me to a wife, who was a very vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady, and an heiress, who had £500 per ann. in land and inheritance, and £4000 in ready money, with the interest since nine years, besides a mortgage upon £300 per ann. more, with plate, jewels, &c. The devil himself could not contrive more probable circumstances than were layd before me; and when I had often a mind to enquire into the truth, I had no power, believing for certain reasons, that there were certain charms or witchcraft used upon me; and, withall, believing it utterly impossible that a person so obliged should ever be guilty of so black a deed as to betray me in so barbarous a manner. Besides that, I really believ'd it a blessing from Heaven for my charity to that person: and I was, about a fortnight since, led as a fool to the stocks, and married a coachman's daughter not worth a shilling, and one who, about nine months since, was brought to bed of a bastard; and thus I am both absolutely ruined, in my fortune and reputation, and must become a derision to all the world."

"My case is at present in the Spiritual Court, and I presume, that one word from his Majesty to his Proctor, and Advocate, and Judge, would procure me speedy justice; if either our old acquaintance or Christian pity move you, I beg you to put in a kind word for me, and to deliver the enclosed into the King's own hands, with all convenient speed; for a criminal bound and going to execution is not in greater agonies than has been my poor, active soul since this befell me: and I earnestly beg you to leave in three lines for me with your porter, what answer the King gives you, and my man shall call for it. A flood of tears blind my eyes, and I can write no more, but that I am your most humble and poor distressed servant, S. MORLAND."

All that befell Sir Samuel and *Lady Morland*, after his application to Pepys and the King, will be found fully set forth, by this prince of fortune-hunters, in the two remaining letters to which I have referred, and which I purpose to lay before the reader in the ensuing number.

No. CXVI.

THE reader will remember, that we left Sir Samuel Morland, in deep distress, his eyes, to use his own words, in the letter to Pepys, *blinded by a flood of tears*. Of all fortune-hunters he was the most unfortunate, who have recorded, with their own hands, the history of their own most wretched adventures. Instead of marrying a "*vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady, with £500 per ann. in land, and £4000 in ready money, with plate, jewels, &c.*," he found himself in silken bonds, with a coachman's daughter, "not worth a shilling," who, nine months before, had been introduced to a new code of sensations, by giving birth to a child, whose father was of that problematical species, which the law terms *putative*.

I have promised to lay before the reader two additional letters, from Sir Samuel Morland, to Pepys, on the subject of his difficulties with *Lady Morland*. Here they are: the first will be found, in Pepys' Diary, vol. v. page 329.

"17 May, 1688. Sir: Being of late unable to go abroad, by reason of my lame hip"—no wonder he was hipped—"which gives me great pain, besides that it would not be safe for me, at present, because of that strumpet's"—*Lady Morland's*—"debts, I take the boldness to entreat you, that, according to your wonted favors, of the same kind, you will be pleased, at the next opportunity, to give the King this following account."

"A little before Christmas last, being informed, that she was willing, for a sum of money, to confess in open court a pre-contract with Mr. Cheek, and being at the same time assured, both by hir and my own lawyers, that such a confession would be sufficient for a sentence of nullity, I did deposit the money, and accordingly a day of tryall was appoynted; but after the cause had been pleaded, I was privately assured, that the Judge

was not at all satisfyd with such a confession of hers, as to be sufficient ground for him to null the marriage, and so that design came to nothing."

"Then I was advised to treat with her, and give her a present sum and a future maintenance, she giving me sufficient security never to trouble mee more; but her demands were so high, I could not consent to them."

"After this she sent me a very submissive letter, by her own advocate. I was advised, both by several private friends, and some eminent divines, to take her home, and a day of treaty was appoynted for an accommodation."

"In the interim, a certain gentleman came on purpose, to my house, to assure me that I was taking a snake into my bosome, forasmuch as she had for six months last past, to his certain knowledge, been kept by, and cohabited with Sir Gilb. Gerrard, as his wife, &c. Upon which making further enquiry, that gentleman furnishing me with some witnesses, and I having found out others, I am this term endeavoring to prove adultery against her, and so to obteyn a divorce, which is the present condition of your most humble and faithful servant,
SAMUEL MORLAND."

It was fortunate, that Sir Samuel, whose *naïveté* and rascality are most amusingly mingled, did not take the "*snake into his bosome*," notwithstanding the advice of those "*eminent divines*," whose counsel is almost ever too celestial, for the practical occasions of the present world.

The issue of Sir Samuel's fatal plunge into the abyss of matrimony, in pursuit of "£500 per annum in land and £4000 in ready money," and of all that befell the Lady Morland, until she lost her title, is recorded, in the third and last letter to Pepsys, in vol. v., page 330.

"19 July, 1688. Sir: I once more begg you to give yourself the trouble of acquainting His Majesty that upon Munday last, after many hott disputes between the Doctors of the Civil Law, the sentence of divorce was solemnly pronounced in open Court against that strumpet"—*Lady Morland*—"for living in adultery with Sir Gilbert Gerrard, for six months last past; so that now, unless shee appeal, for which the law allows her 15 days, I am freed from her for life, and all that I have to do, for the future, will bee to gett clear of her debts, which she has contracted from the day of marriage to the time of sentence, which is like to give me no small trouble, besides the charge, for sev-

erall months in the Chancery. And till I gett cleared of these debts, I shall bee little better than a prisoner in my own house. Sir, believing it my duty to give His Majesty this account of myselfe and of my proceedings, and having no other friend to do it for mee, I hope you will forgive the trouble thus given you, by, yours, &c.,

S. MORLAND."

This must have interested His Majesty, very deeply. Poor James had then enough of care. If he had possessed the hands of Briareus, they would have been full already. In less than four months, after the date of this letter, William of Orange had landed at Torbay, Nov. 5, 1688, and the last days of the last of the Stuarts were at hand.

If Miss Bungs were living, even that inexorable hater of all fortune-hunters would admit, that the punishment of Sir Samuel Morland was sufficient for his crimes. Few will pretend, that his sufferings were more than he deserved. A more exact retribution cannot well be imagined. It was his intention to apply "*£4000 ready money*," belonging to "*a very vertuous, pious, and sweet disposition'd lady*," to the payment of his pre-contracted debts. Instead of effecting this honorable purpose, he becomes the husband of a low-born strumpet, who is not worth a shilling, and for whose debts, contracted before, as well as after marriage, he is liable; for the law decrees, that a man takes his wife and her circumstances together.

There are few individuals, of either sex, however constitutionally grave, who have not a little merriment to spare, for such happy contingencies as these. Retributive justice seldom descends, more gracefully, or more deservedly, or more to universal acceptance, upon the crafty heads of unprincipled projectors. For all, that may befall him, the fortune-hunter has little to expect, from male or female sympathy. The scolding tongue—those bewitching tresses, nocturnally deposited on the bedpost—those teeth of pearly brilliancy, which Keep or Tucker could so readily identify—the perpetual look of distrust—the espionage of jealousy—these and all other *tormina domestica* are the allotments of the fortune-hunter, by immemorial prescription, and without the slightest sympathy, from man or woman.

The case of Sir Samuel Morland is a valuable precedent, on account of his station in society, and the auto-biographical character of the narrative. But there are very few of us, who have not the record of some similar catastrophe, within the

compass of our knowledge, though, probably, of a less aggravated type.

There is a pleasant legend, in the humbler relations of life, to which I have listened, in earlier days, and which illustrates the principle, involved in these remarks. Molly Moodey was an excellent cook, in the family of an avaricious old widower, whose god was mammon, and who had been deterred, by the expensiveness of the proceeding, from taking a second goddess.

The only sentiment, in any way resembling the tender passion, which had ever been awakened, in the bosom of Molly Moodey, was a passion for lotteries.

She gave such of her waking hours, as were not devoted to roasting and boiling, to the calculation of chances, and her sleeping hours to the dreaming of dreams, about £20,000: and by certain combinations, she had come to the conclusion, that No. 26,666 was the fortunate number, in the great scheme, then presented to the public.

Molly avowed her purpose, and demanded her wages, which, after severely berating her, for her folly, were handed over, and the identical ticket was bought. With the hope of being the first to inform her, after the drawing, that her ticket was a blank, her old master noted down the number, in his tablets.

In about seven weeks after this occurrence, the old gentleman, while reading the newspaper, in one of the public offices, came upon the following notice—"HIGHEST PRIZE! £20,000. No. 26,666 the fortunate number, sold at our fortunate office, in one entire ticket, SKINNER, KETCHUM, & CLUTCH, and will be paid to the lucky proprietor, after the 27th current."

The old gentleman took out his tablets; compared the numbers; wiped his spectacles; collated the numbers again; resorted to the lottery office; and, upon inquiry there, became satisfied, that Molly Moodey had actually drawn £20,000.

A new code of sensations came over the spirit of his dreams. He hastened home, oppressed by the heat and his emotions. He bade Molly lay aside her mop, and attend him in the parlor, as he had something of importance to communicate.—"Molly," said he, after closing the doors—"I find a partner absolutely necessary to my happiness. Let me be brief. I am not the man to make a fool of myself, by marrying a young flirt. I have known you, Molly, for many years. You have what I prize above all things in a wife, solid, substantial qualifications. Will you have me?"

Taken thus by surprisc, she gave a striking evidence of her self-possession, by requesting leave of absence, for a moment, to remove a kettle of fat, which she was trying out, lest it should boil over. She soon came back, and turned her eye—she had but one—with great respect, upon her old master—said something of the difference of their stations—and consented.

The old gentleman's attachment for Molly appeared to be very extraordinary. Until the wedding-day, which was an unusually early one, he would not suffer her to be out of his sight. The day came—they were married. On their way from church—"Molly," said the bridegroom, "whereabouts is your ticket, with that fortunate number?"—"Oh," she replied, "when I came to think of it, I saw, that you were right. I thought, 'twas quite likely it would draw a blank. Crust, the baker, offered me what I gave for it, and a sheet of bunnns, to boot, and I let him have it, three weeks ago."—"Good God," exclaimed the poor old gentleman—"£20,000 for a sheet of bunnns!"

The shock was too much for his reason; and, in less than six weeks, Molly was a widow. She attended him, with great fidelity, to the last moment; and his dying words were engraven upon her heart—"Twenty thousand pounds for a sheet of bunnns!"

How true to reality are the gay words of Tom Moore—

"In wedlock a species of lottery lies,
Where in blanks and in prizes we deal."

No. CXVII.

THE Archbishop of Cambray, the amiable Fenelon, has remarked, that God shows us the high value he sets upon time, by giving us, in absolute possession, one instant only, leaving us, in utter uncertainty, if we shall ever have another. And yet, so little are we disturbed, by this truly momentous consideration, that, long before the brèath is fairly out of the old year's body, we are found busily occupied, in gathering chaplets, for the brows of the new one.

The early Christians were opposed to New Year's Gifts, as fixedly, as some of the latter Christians are opposed to the song

and the dance. But I am inclined to believe the rising generation will take steps, very like their fathers—that light fantastic tongues and toes, will continue to wag, to all eternity—and that the unmusical and rheumatic will deplore over such heterodox and ungodly proceedings, till the world shall be no more.

The New Year's gifts of the Romans were, originally, exceedingly simple. Sprigs of vervain, gathered in a wood, consecrated to Strenia, the goddess of Strength, somehow or other, came into favor, and were accounted of good omen. A custom arose of sending these sprigs about the neighborhood, as tokens of friendship, on New Year's day; and these trifling remembrancers obtained the name of *Strenæ*. These sprigs of vervain, ere long, wore out their welcome; and were followed, in after years, by presents of dates, figs and honey. Clients thus complimented their patrons; and, before many anniversaries, the coin of Rome began to mingle with the donative, whatever it might be; and, very soon, the advantage of the receiver came less to be consulted, than the reputation of him, who gave.

When I contemplate those ample storehouses of all, that is gorgeous and glittering—those receptacles of useless finery, which nobody actually wants—and, at the same time, reflect upon all that I know, and much that I conjecture, of the necessities and distresses of mankind, I am not certain, that it may not be wise to resume the earlier custom of the Romans, and embody, in certain cases, our annual tokens of friendship and good will, in such useful materials, as *figs, dates and honey*.

Are there not individuals, who, upon the reception of some gaudy and expensive bagatelle, are ready to exclaim, with the cock in *Æsop*—“*I had rather have one grain of dear, delicious, barley, than all the jewels under the sun!*”

I am not so utopian, as to anticipate any immediate or very extensive reformation, in this practice, which, excellent as it is, when restrained within reasonable bounds, is, unquestionably, under certain circumstances, productive of evil. It is not to be expected, that expensive *bijour*, for new year's gifts, will speedily give place to *sugar and molasses*. But there are cases, not a few, when, upon a new year's day, the wealthy giver, without pain to the recipient, may convert the annual compliment, into something better than a worthless toy—a fantastical token of ostentatious remembrance.

The Christian world has settled down, at last, upon the first of January, as New Year's day. It was not always thus; and, even now, no little difficulty occurs, in our attempts to refer historical events to particular years. We can do no better, perhaps, than to devote this number to a brief exposition of this difficulty.

Every schoolboy knows, that Romulus divided the year into ten months. The first was March, and, from March to December, they have retained their original names, for some six and twenty centuries, excepting the fifth and sixth month, which, from *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*, have been changed, in honor of *Julius* and *Augustus*.

Numa added two months, *Januarius* and *Februarius*. Numa's year consisted therefore of twelve months, according to the moon's course. But Numa's lunar year did not agree with the course of the sun, and he therefore introduced, every other year, an *intercalary* month, between the 23d and 24th of February. The length of this month was decided by the priests, who lengthened or shortened the year, to suit their convenience. Cicero, in a letter to Atticus, x. 17, writes, in strong disfavor, of Numa's calendar.

Julius Cæsar, with the aid of Sosigenes of Alexandria, adjusted this astronomical account. To bring matters into order, Suetonius, in his life of Julius Cæsar, 40, says, they were constrained to make one final year of fifteen months, to close the confusion.

Hence arose the Julian or Solar year, the year of the Christian world. The "*alteration of the style*" is only an amendment of the Julian calendar, in one particular, by Pope Gregory, in 1582. In 325, A. D., the vernal equinox occurred March 21, and in 1582 it occurred March 10. He called the astronomers to council, and, by their advice, obliterated ten days from the current year, between October 4, and 15.

These ten days make the difference, from 1582 to February 29, 1700. From March 1, 1700, to February 29, 1800, eleven days were required, and from March 1, 1800, to February 29, 1900, twelve days. In all Roman Catholic countries, this alteration of the style was instantly adopted; but not in Great Britain, till 1752. The Greeks and Russians have never adopted the Gregorian alteration of the style.

The commencement of the year has been assigned to very different periods. In some of the Italian states, as recently as 1745, the year has been taken to commence, at the Annuncia-

tion, March 25. Writers of the sixth century have, occasionally, like the Romans, considered March 1 as New Year's day. Charles IX. by a special edict, in 1563, decreed, that the year should be considered to commence, on the first of January. In Germany, about the eleventh century, the year commenced at Christmas. Such was the practice, in modern Rome, and other Italian cities, as late as the fifteenth century.

Gervais of Canterbury, who lived early in the thirteenth century, states, that all writers of his country considered Christmas the true beginning of the year. In Great Britain, from the twelfth century, till the alteration of the style in 1752, the Annunciation, or March 25, was commonly considered the first day of the year. After this, the year was taken to commence, on the first of January.

The Chaldæan and Egyptian years commenced with the Autumnal equinox. The Japanese and the Chinese date their year from the new moon, nearest the Winter solstice.

As Diemschid, king of Persia, entered Persepolis, the sun happened to be entering into Aries. In commemoration of this coincidence, he decreed, that the year should change front, and commence, forever more, in the Vernal, instead of the Autumnal equinox. The Swedish year, of old, began, most happily, at the Winter solstice, or at the time of the sun's reappearance in the horizon, after the usual *quarantine*, or absence of forty days. The Turks and Arabs date the advent of their year, upon the sixteenth of July.

In our own country, the year, in former times, commenced in March. In the Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. xvii. p. 136, may be found certain votes, passed in Boston, Nov. 30, 1635, among which is the following—"that all such as have allotments for habitations allotted unto them, shall build thereon, before the first of the first month next, called March." In Johnson's Wonder-working Providence, ch. 27, the writer says of the Boston pilgrims, in 1633: "Thus this poor people, having now tasted liberally of the salvation of the Lord, &c. &c., set apart the 16 day of October, which they call the *eighth Moneth*, not out of any pevish humor of singularity, as some are ready to censor them with, but of purpose to prevent the Heathenish and Popish observation of Dayes, Moneths, and Yeares, that they may be forgotten, among the people of the Lord." If October was their *eighth* month, March was necessarily their *first*. Whatever the practice

may have been, in this respect, it was by no means universal, in New England, during a considerable period, before the alteration of the style in 1752.

A reference to the record will show, that, until 1752, the old style was adhered to, by the courts, in this country, and the 25th of March was considered to be New Year's day. But it was not so with the public journals. Thus the Boston News Letter, the Boston Gazette, the New England Courant and other journals, existing here, before the adoption of the new style, in Great Britain, in 1752, considered the year, as commencing on the first of January.

Private individuals very frequently did the same thing. At this moment, a letter from Peter Faneuil is lying at my elbow, addressed to Messrs. Lane and Smethurst of London, bearing date January 1, 1739, at the close of which he wishes his correspondents *a happy new year*, showing, that the first of January, for ordinary purposes, and in common parlance, was accounted New Year's day.

The little people, of both sexes, would, doubtless, have voted for the adoption of the old style and of the new; in other words, for having two new year's days, in every year. They would have been as much delighted with the conceit, as was Rousseau, with the pleasant fancy of St. Pierre, who wrote, from the Isle of France, to a friend in Paris, that he had enjoyed two summers in one year; the perusal of which letter induced Rousseau, to seek the acquaintance of the author of Paul and Virginia.

No. CXVIII.

DION remarks, while speaking of Trajan—he *that lies in a golden urn, eminently above the earth, is not likely to rest in peace*. The same thing may be affirmed of him, who has raised himself, eminently above his peers, wherever he may lie. During the Roman Catholic rage for relics, the graves were ransacked, and numberless sinners, to supply the demand, were dug up for saints. Sooner or later, the finger of curiosity, under some plausible pretext, will lift the coffin lid; or the foot of political sacrilege will trample upon the ashes of him, whom a former

generation had delighted to honor; or the motiveless spirit of mischief will violate the sanctity of the tomb.

When Charles I. was buried, in the same vault with Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, a soldier, as Wood relates, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iv. p. 39, Lond. 1820, attempted to steal a royal bone, which was afterwards found upon his person, and, which he said, upon examination, he had designed, for a handle to his knife.

John Milton died, according to the respective accounts of Mitford, Johnson, and Hayley, on the 8th—about the 10th—or on the 15th of November, 1674. He was buried, in the chancel of St. Giles, Cripplegate. In the *London Monthly Magazine*, for August, 1833, there appeared an extract from the diary of General Murray, giving a particular account of the desecration of Milton's remains. The account was given to General Murray, at a dinner party, Aug. 23, 1790, by Mr. Thornton, who received it, from an eye-witness of the transaction. The church of St. Giles requiring repairs, the occasion was thought a proper one, to place a monument, over the body of Milton. Messieurs Strong, Cole, and others, of that parish, sought for, and discovered, the leaden coffin, the outer coffin of wood having mouldered away. Having settled the question of identity, these persons replaced the coffin, and ordered the workmen to fill up the grave. The execution of this order was postponed, for several days. In the interim, some of the parish, whose names are given, by General Murray, having dined together, and become partially drunk, resolved to examine the body; and proceeded, with lights, to the church. With a mallet and chisel, they cut open the coffin, rolled back the lead, and gazed upon the bones of John Milton! General Murray's diary shall relate the residue of a proceeding, which might call the rouge to the cheeks of a Vandal:—

“The hair was in an astonishingly perfect state; its color a light brown, its length six inches and a half, and, although somewhat clotted, it appeared, after having been well washed, as strong as the hair of a living being. Fountain said he was determined to have two of his teeth; but as they resisted the pressure of his fingers, he struck the jaw, with a paving stone, and several teeth then fell out. There were only five in the upper jaw, and these were taken by Fountain; the four, that were in the lower jaw, were seized upon, by Taylor, Hawkesworth, and the sexton's man. The hair, which had been carefully combed,

and tied together, before the interment, was forcibly pulled off the skull, by Taylor and another; but Ellis, the player, who had now joined the party, told the former, that being a good hair-worker, if he would let him have it, he would pay a guinea-bowl of punch. Ellis, therefore, became possessed of all the hair: he likewise took a part of the shroud, and a bit of the skin of the skull: indeed, he was only prevented from carrying off the head, by the sextons, Hoppy and Grant, who said, that they intended to exhibit the remains, which was afterwards done, each person paying sixpence to view the body. These fellows, I am told, gained near one hundred pounds, by the exhibition. Laming put one of the leg-bones in his pocket."

After reading this short, shameless record, one half inclines to cremation; even if, instead of being enshrined or inurned, our dust be given, in fee simple, to the winds. How forcibly the words of Sir Thomas ring in our ears—" *To be gnawed out of our graves, to have our skulls made drinking bowls, and our bones turned into pipes, to delight and sport our enemies, are tragical abominations, escaped in burning burials.*" The account from General Murray's diary, and at greater length, may be found also, in the appendix to Mitford's life of Milton, in the octavo edition of his poetical works, Cambridge, Mass., 1839.

Great indignation has lately been excited, in England, against a vampyre of a fellow, named Blore, who is said to have destroyed one half of Dryden's monument, and defaced Ben Jonson's, and Cowley's, in Westminster Abbey. Inquiring after motive, in such cases, is much like raking the ashes, after a conflagration, to find the originating spark. There is a motive, doubtless, in some by-corner of the brain; whether a man burns the temple, at Ephesus; or spears the elephant of Judas Maccabæus, with certain death to himself; or destroys the Barberrini vase. The motive was avowed, on the trial, in a similar case, by a young man, who, some years ago, shot a menagerie elephant, while passing through a village, in the State of Maine, to be a wish, "*to see how a fellow would feel, who killed an elephant.*"

Dryden's, and Cowley's monuments are on the left of Ben Jonson's, and before you, as you approach the Poet's Corner. Dryden's monument is a lofty affair, with an arch and a bust, and is thus inscribed: "J. Dryden, born 1632, died May 1,

1700.—John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, erected this monument, 1720." It is not commonly known, that the original bust was changed, by the Duchess, for one of very superior workmanship, which, of course, is the one mutilated by Blore. The monument, erected by George, Duke of Buckingham, to Cowley, is a pedestal, bearing an urn, decorated with laurel, and with a pompous and unmeaning epitaph, in Latin hexameters. If Blore understood the language, perhaps he considered these words, upon the tablet, a challenge—

———Quis temerarius ausit—
Sacilega turbare manu venerabile bustum.

The monument of Ben Jonson is an elegant tablet, with a festoon of masks, and the inscription—*Oh rare Ben Jonson!* It stands before you, when Dryden's and Cowley's are upon your left, and is next to that of Samuel Butler. In the north aisle of the nave, there is a stone, about eighteen inches square, bearing the same inscription. In the "History of Westminster Abbey," 4to ed Lond. 1812, vol. ii. p. 95, note, it is stated, that "Dart says one Young, afterwards a Knight in the time of Charles II., of Great Milton, in Oxfordshire, placed a stone over the grave of Ben Jonson, which cost eighteen pence, with the above inscription:" but it is not stated, that the stone, now there, is the same.

Dr. Johnson, in his Life of Dryden, recites what he terms "*a wild story, relating to some vexatious events, that happened, at his funeral.*" Dryden's widow, and his son, Charles, had accepted the offer of Lord Halifax, to pay the expenses of the funeral, and five hundred pounds, for a monument. The company came—the corpse was placed in a velvet hearse—eighteen coaches were in attendance, filled with mourners.—As they were about to move, the young Lord Jeffries, son of the Chancellor, with a band of rakes, coming by, and learning that the funeral was Dryden's, said the ornament of the nation should not so be buried, and proceeded, accompanied by his associates, in a body, to wait upon the widow, and beg her to permit him to bear the expense of the interment, and to pay one thousand pounds, for a monument, in the Abbey.

The gentlemen in the coaches, being ignorant of the liberal offers of the Dean and Lord Halifax, readily descended from their carriages, and attended Lord Jeffries and his party to the

bedside of the lady, who was sick, where he repeated his offers; and, upon her positive refusal, got upon his knees, as did the whole party; and he there swore that he would not rise, till his entreaty was granted. At length, affecting to understand some word of the lady's, as giving permission, he rushed out, followed by the rest, proclaiming her consent, and ordered the corpse to be left at Russell's, an undertaker's, in Cheapside, till he gave orders for its embalment. During this proceeding, the Abbey having been lighted up, Lord Halifax and the Dean, who was also Bishop of Rochester, to use the tea-table phrase, waited and waited, and waited. The ground was opened, the choir attending, and an anthem set. When Mr. Dryden went, next day, to offer excuses, neither Lord Halifax, nor the Dean, would accept of any apology. After waiting three days for orders, the undertaker called on Lord Jeffries, who said he knew nothing about it, and that it was only a tipsy frolic, and that the undertaker might do what he pleased with the corpse. The undertaker threatened to set the corpse before the widow's door. She begged a day's respite. Mr. Charles Dryden wrote to Lord Jeffries, who replied, that he knew nothing about it. He then addressed the Dean and Lord Halifax, who refused to have anything to do with it. He then challenged Lord Jeffries, who refused to fight. He went himself, and was refused admittance. He then resolved to horsewhip his Lordship; upon notice of which design, the latter left town. In the midst of this misery, Dr. Garth sent for the body, to be brought to the college of physicians; proposed a subscription; and set a noble example. The body was finally buried, about three weeks after the decease, and Dr. Garth pronounced a fine Latin oration. At the close of the narrative, which, as repeated by Dr. Johnson, covers more than three octavo pages of Murphy's edition, the Doctor remarks, that he once intended to omit it entirely, and that he had met with no confirmation, but in a letter of Farquhar's.

The tale is simply alluded to, by Gorton, and told, at some length, by Chalmers. Both, however, consider it a fabrication, by Mrs. Thomas, the authoress, whom Dryden styled *Corinna*, and whom Pope lampooned, in his comatose and vicious performance, the *Dunciad*, probably because she provoked his wrath, by publishing his letters to H. Cromwell.

In the earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the tale is told, as sober matter of fact: in the last, Napier's, of

1842, it is wholly omitted. Malone, in his *Life of Dryden*, page 347, ascribes the whole to Mrs. Thomas.

Dryden died, in 1700. The first four volumes of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, containing Dryden's, went to the press in 1779. Considering the nature of this outrage; the eminence, not only of the dead, but of some of the living, whose names are involved; its alleged publicity; and its occurrence in the very city, where all the parties flourished; it is remarkable, that this "*wild story*," as Johnson fitly calls it, should have obtained any credit, and survived for nine-and-seventy years.

No. CXIX.

DEEPLY to be commiserated are all those, who have not read, from beginning to end, the writings of the immortal Oliver—a repast, *ab ovo usque ad mala*, to be swallowed, and inwardly digested, while our intellectual stomachs are young and vigorous, and to be regurgitated, and chewed over, a thousand times, when the almond tree begins to flourish, and even the grasshopper becomes a burden. Who does not remember his story of the Chinese matron—the widow with the great fan!

The original of this pleasant tale is not generally known. The brief legend, related by Goldsmith, is an imperfect epitome of an interesting story, illustrating the power of magic, among the followers of Laou-keun, the founder of a religious sect, in China, resembling that of Epicurus.

The original tale was translated from the Chinese, by Père Dentrecolles, who was at the head of the French missionaries, in China, and died at Peking, in 1741. The following liberal version, from the French, which may, perhaps, be better called a paraphrase, will not fail, I think, to interest the reader.

Wealth, and all the blessings it can procure, for man, are brief and visionary. Honors, glory, fame are gaudy clouds, that flit by, and are gone. The ties of blood are easily broken; affection is a dream. The most deadly hate may occupy the heart, which held the warmest love. A yoke is not worth wearing, though wrought of gold. Chains are burdensome, though adorned with jewels. Let us purge our minds; calm our pas-

sions; curb our wishes; and set not our hearts upon a vain world. Let our highest aim be liberty—pleasure.

Chuang-tsze took unto himself a wife, whose youth and beauty seduced him from the busy world. He retired, among the delightful scenery of Soong, his native province, and gave himself up, entirely, to the delights of philosophy and love. A sovereign, who had become acquainted with the fame of Chuang-tsze, for superior wisdom, invited him to become his wuzzeer, or prime minister. Chuang-tsze declined, in the language of parable—"A heifer," said he, "pampered for the sacrifice, and decked with ornaments, marched triumphantly along, looking, as she passed, with mingled pride and contempt, upon some humble oxen, that were yoked to the plough. She proudly entered the temple—but when she beheld the knife, and comprehended that she was a victim, how gladly would she have exchanged conditions with the humblest of those, upon whom she had so lately looked down with pity and contempt."

Chuang-tsze walked by the skirts of the mountain, absorbed in thought—he suddenly came among many tombs—the city of the dead. "Here then," he exclaimed, "all are upon a level—caste is unknown—the philosopher and the fool sleep, side by side. This is eternity! From the sepulchre there is no return!"

He strolled among the tombs; and, ere long, perceived a grave, that had been recently made. The mound of moistened clay was not yet thoroughly dry. By the side of that grave sat a young woman, clad in the deepest mourning. With a white fan, of large proportions, she was engaged, in fanning the earth, which covered this newly made grave. Chuang-tsze was amazed; and, drawing near, respectfully inquired, who was the occupant of that grave, and why this mourning lady was so strangely employed. Tears dropped from her eyes, as she uttered a few inaudible words, without rising, or ceasing to fan the grave. The curiosity of Chuang-tsze was greatly excited—he ascribed her manner, not to fear, but to some inward sense of shame—and earnestly besought her to explain her motives, for an act, so perfectly novel and mysterious.

After a little embarrassment, she replied, as follows: "Sir, you behold a lone woman—death has deprived me of my beloved husband—this grave contains his precious remains. Our love was very great for each other. In the hour of death, his

agony, at the thought of parting from me, was immoderate. These were his dying words—"My beloved, should you ever think of a second marriage, it is my dying request, that you remain a widow, at least till my grave is thoroughly dry; then you have my permission to marry whomsoever you will." And now, as the earth, which is quite damp still, will take a long time to dry, I thought I would fan it a little, to dissipate the moisture."

Chuang-tsze made great efforts, to suppress a strong disposition to laugh outright, in the woman's face. "She is in a feverish haste," thought he. "What a hypocrite, to talk of their mutual affection! If such be love, what a time there would have been, had they hated each other."

"Madam," said the philosopher, "you are desirous, that this grave should dry, as soon as possible; but, with your feeble strength, it will require a long time, to accomplish it; let me assist you." She expressed her deep sense of the obligation, and rising, with a profound courtesy, handed the philosopher a spare fan, which she had brought with her. Chuang-tsze, who possessed the power of magic, struck the ground with the fan repeatedly; and it soon became perfectly dry. The widow appeared greatly surprised, and delighted, and presented the philosopher with the fan, and a silver bodkin, which she drew from her tresses. He accepted the fan only; and the lady retired, highly gratified, with the speedy accomplishment of her object.

Chuang-tsze remained, for a brief space, absorbed in thought; and, at length, returned slowly homeward, meditating, by the way, upon this extraordinary adventure. He sat down in his apartment, and, for some time, gazed, in silence, upon the fan. At length, he exclaimed—"Who, after having witnessed this occurrence, can hesitate to draw the inference, that marriage is one of the modes, by which the doctrine of the metempsychosis is carried out. People, who have hated each other heartily, in some prior condition of being, are made man and wife, for the purpose of mutual vexation—that is it, undoubtedly."

The wife of the philosopher had approached him, unobserved; and, hearing his last words, and noticing the fan, which he was still earnestly gazing upon—"Pray, be so good, as to inform me," said she, "what is the meaning of all this; and where, I should like to know, did you obtain that fine fan, which appears to interest you so much?" Chuang-tsze, very faithfully, nar-

rated to his wife the story of the young widow, and all the circumstances, which had taken place, at the tomb.

As soon as the philosopher had finished the narrative, his wife, her countenance inflamed with the severest indignation, broke forth, with a torrent of contemptuous expressions, and unmeasured abuse, against the abominable, young widow. She considered her a scandal to her sex. "Aye," she exclaimed, "this vile widow must be a perfect monster, devoid of every particle of feeling."

"Alas," said the philosopher, "while the husband is in the flesh, there is no wife, that is not ready to flatter and caress him—but no sooner is the breath out of his body, than she seizes her fan, and forthwith proceeds to dry up his grave."

This greatly excited the ire of his wife—"How dare you talk in this outrageous manner," said she, "of the whole sex? You confound the virtuous with such vile wretches, as this unprincipled widow, who deserves to be annihilated. Are you not ashamed of yourself, to talk in this cruel way? I should think you might be restrained, by the dread of future punishment."

"Why give way," said Chuang-tsze, "to all this passionate outcry? Be candid—you are young, and extremely beautiful—should I die, this day—do you pretend, that, with your attractions, you would suffer much time to be lost, before you accepted the services of another husband?"

"Good God," cried the lady, "how you talk! Who ever heard of a truly faithful wuzzeer, that, after the death of his master, served another prince? A widow *indeed* never accepts a second partner. Did you ever know a case, in which such a wife as I have been—a woman of my qualities and station, after having lost her tenderly beloved, forsook his memory, and gave herself to the embraces of a second husband! Such an act, in my opinion, would be infamous. Should you be taken from me, today, be assured, that I should follow you, with my imperishable love, and die, at last, your disconsolate widow."

"It is easy to promise, but not always so easy to perform," replied the philosopher. At this speech, the lady was exasperated—"I would have you to know," said she, "that women are to be found, without much inquiry, quite as noble-hearted and constant, as *you* have ever been. What a pattern of constancy you have been! Dear me! Only think of it! When your first wife died, you soon repaired your loss: and, becoming

weary of your second, you obtained a divorce from her, and then married me! What a constant creature you have been! No wonder you think so lightly of women!" Saying this, she snatched the fan out of her husband's hand, and tore it into innumerable pieces; by which act she appeared to have obtained very considerable relief; and, in a somewhat gentler tone, she told her husband, that he was in excellent health, and likely to live, for very many years; and that she could not, for the soul of her, see what could induce him to torment her to death, by talking in this manner.

"Compose yourself, my dear," said Chuang-tsze, "I confess that your indignation delights me. I rejoice to see you exhibit so much feeling and fire, upon such a theme." The wife of the philosopher recovered her composure; and their conversation turned upon ordinary affairs.

Before many days, Chuang-tsze became suddenly and severely attacked, by some unaccountable disease. The symptoms

No. CXX.

LET us continue the story of Chuang-tsze, the great master of magic.

Before many days, as I have stated, Chuang-tsze became suddenly and severely attacked, by some unaccountable disease. The symptoms were full of evil. His devoted wife was ever near her sick husband, sobbing bitterly, and bathing him in tears. "It is but too plain," said the philosopher, "that I cannot survive—I am upon the bed of death—this very night, perhaps—at farthest, tomorrow—we shall part forever—what a pity, that you should have destroyed that fan—it would have answered so well, for the purpose of drying the earth upon my tomb!"

"For heaven's sake," exclaimed the weeping wife, "do not, weak and feeble as you are, harass yourself, with these horrible fancies. You do me great wrong. Our books I have carefully perused. I know my duties well. You have received my troth—it shall never be another's. Can you doubt my sincerity! Let me prove it, by dying first. I am ready." "Enough," said the philosopher—"I now die in peace—I am satisfied of

your constancy. But the world is fading away—the cold hand of death is upon me.” The head of Chuang-tsze fell back—the breath had stopped—the pulse had ceased to beat—he was already with the dead.

If the piercing cries of a despairing, shrieking widow could have raised the dead, Chuang-tsze would have arisen, on the spot. She sprang upon the corpse, and held it long, in her fond embrace. She then arrayed her person in the deepest mourning, a robe of seamless white, and made the air resound with her cries of anguish and despair. She abjured food; abstained from slumber; and refused to be comforted.

Chuang-tsze had the wide-spread fame of an eminent sage—crowds gathered to his obsequies. After their performance, and when the vast assemblage had all, well nigh, departed—a youth of comely face, and elegantly arrayed, was observed, lingering near the spot. He proclaimed himself to be of most honorable descent, and that he had, long before, declared to Chuang-tsze his design of becoming the pupil of that great philosopher. “For that end,” said he, “and that alone, I have come to this place—and behold Chuang-tsze is no more. Great is my misfortune!”

This splendid youth cast off his colored garments, and assumed the robes of lamentation—he bowed himself to the earth, before the coffin of the defunct—four times, he touched the ground with his forehead; and, with an utterance choked by sobs, he exclaimed—“Oh Chuang-tsze, learned and wise, your ill-fated disciple cannot receive wisdom and knowledge from your lips; but he will signify his reverence for your memory, by abiding here an hundred days, to mourn, for one he so truly revered.” He then again bent his forehead, four times, to the earth, and moistened it with his tears.

The youthful disciple, after a few days, desired permission to offer his condolence to the widow, which she, at first declined; but, upon his reference to the ancient rites, which allow a widow to receive the visits of her late husband's friends, and especially of his disciples, she finally consented. She moved with slow and solemn steps to the hall of reception, where the young gentleman acquitted himself, with infinite grace and propriety, and tendered the usual expressions of consolation.

The elegant address and fine person of this young disciple were not lost upon the widow of Chuang-tsze. She was fas-

minated. A sentiment of tenderness began to rise in her bosom, whose presence she had scarcely the courage to recognize. She ventured, in a right melancholy way, to suggest a hope, that it was not his purpose immediately to leave the valley of Soong. "I have endured much in the loss of my great master," he replied. "Precious forever be his memory. It will be grateful to my heart to seek here a brief home, wherein I may pass those hundred days of mourning, which our rites prescribe, and then to take part in the obsequies, which will follow. I may also solace myself the while, by perusing the works of my great master, of whose living instructions I am so unhappily deprived."

"We shall feel ourselves highly honored, by your presence, under our roof," replied the lady; "it seems to me entirely proper, that you should take up your abode here, rather than elsewhere." She immediately directed some refreshments to be brought, and caused the works of Chuang-tsze to be exhibited, on a large table, together with a copy of the learned Taou-te-King, which had been a present to her late husband, from Laou-keun himself.

The coffin of Chuang-tsze was deposited, in a large hall; and, on one side, was a suite of apartments, opening into it, which was assigned to the visitor. This devoted widow came, very frequently, to weep over the remains of her honored husband; and failed not to say a civil word to the youth, who, notified of her presence, by her audible sobs, never omitted to come forth, and mingle his lamentations with hers. Mutual glances were exchanged, upon such occasions. In short, each, already, was effectually smitten with the other.

One day, the pretty, little widow sent privately for the old domestic, who attended upon the young man, in the capacity of body servant, and inquired, all in a seemingly casual way, if his master was married. "Not yet"—he replied.—"He is very fastidious, I suppose"—said the lady, with an inquiring look.—"It is even so, madam," replied the servant—"my master is, indeed, not easily suited, in such a matter. His standard is very high. I have heard him say, that he should, probably, never be married, as he despaired of ever finding a female resembling yourself, in every particular."—"Did he say so?" exclaimed the widow, as the warm blood rushed into her cheeks.—"He certainly did," replied the other, "and much more, which I do not feel at liberty to repeat."—"Dear me," said the widow,

"what a bewitching young man he is! go to him, and if he really loves me, as you say, tell him he may open the subject, without fear, for his passion is amply returned, by one, who is willing, if he so wishes, to become his wife."

The young widow, from day to day, threw herself repeatedly, and as if by accident, into the old servant's way; and began, at last, to feel surprised, and somewhat nettled, that he brought her no message from his master. At length, she became exceedingly impatient, and asked him directly, if he had spoken to his master on the subject. "Yes, madam," the old man replied.—"And pray," asked the widow, eagerly, "what said he?"—"He said, madam, that such an union would place him upon the pinnacle of human happiness; but that there was one fatal objection."—"And do, for pity's sake, tell me," said she, hastily interrupting the old man, "what that objection can be."—"He said," rejoined the old domestic, "that, being a disciple of your late husband, such a marriage, he feared, would be considered scandalous."—"But," said she, briskly, "there is just nothing in that. He was never a disciple of Chuang-tsze—he only proposed to become one, which is an entirely different thing. If any other frivolous objections arise, I beg you to remove them; and you may count upon being handsomely rewarded."

Her anxiety caused her to become exceedingly restless. She made frequent visits to the hall, and, when she approached the coffin, her sobs became more audible than ever—but the young disciple came not forth, as usual. Upon one occasion, after dark, as she was standing near the coffin, she was startled, by an unusual noise. "Gracious Heaven!" she exclaimed, "can it be so! Is the old philosopher coming back to life!" The cold sweat came upon her lovely brow, as she started to procure a light. When she returned, the mystery was readily explained. In front of the coffin there was a table, designed as an altar, for the reception of such emblems and presents, as were placed there by visitors. The old servant, had become tipsy, and finding no more convenient place, in which to bestow himself, while waiting his master's bidding, he had thrown himself, at full length, upon this altar; and, in turning over, had occasioned the noise, which had so much alarmed the young widow. Under other circumstances, the act would have been accounted sacrilegious, and the fellow would have been subjected to the bastinado. But, as matters stood, the widow passed it by, and even suffered the sot to remain undisturbed.

On the morning of the following day, the widow encountered the old domestic, who was passing her, with as much apparent indifference, as though she had never entrusted him, with any important commission. Surprised by his behavior, she called him to her private apartment.—“Well,” said she, “have you executed the business, which I gave you in charge?”—“Oh,” said he, with an air of provoking indifference, “that is all over, I believe.”—“How so,” inquired the widow—“did you deliver my message correctly?”—“In your own words,” he replied—“my master would make any sacrifice to make you his wife; and is entirely persuaded, by your arguments, to give up the objection he stated, in regard to his being the disciple of Chuang-tsze; but there are three other objections, which it will be impossible to overcome; and which his sense of delicacy forbids him to exhibit before you.”—“Poh, poh,” said the widow, “let me hear what they are, and we shall then see, whether they are insurmountable or not.”—“Well, madam,” said the old man, “since you command me, I will state them, as nearly as I can, in the words of my young master. The first of these three objections is this ——”

No. CXXI.

We were about to exhibit those three objections of the young disciple, to his marriage, with the widow of Chuang-tsze, when we were summoned away, by professional duties. Let us proceed—“The first of my master’s objections,” said the old domestic, is this—“the coffin of Chuang-tsze is still in the hall of ceremony. A sight, so sad and solemnizing, is absolutely inconsistent with the nuptial celebration. The world would cry out upon such inconsistency. In the second place, the fame of your late husband was so great—his love for you so devoted—yours for him so ardent and sincere, and founded, so obviously, upon his learning and wisdom—that my master fears it will be impossible for him, to supply the place of so good, and so great, a man; and that you will, ere long, despise him, for his inferiority; and that your affections will be entirely and unchangeably fixed, on the memory of the great defunct. The third and last

objection, named by my master, whose passion for you knows no bounds, is serious indeed. Though of lofty pedigree, he is very poor. He has neither money nor lands; and has not the means of purchasing those marriage gifts, which custom requires him to offer."

"And are these the only objections?" said she. "There are no others," he replied; "if it were not for these insurmountable objections, the happiness of my master would be complete, and he would openly manifest that passion, by which he is now secretly consumed."

"They are, by no means, insurmountable," said the young widow, with animation. "As for the coffin, what is it? A mere shell, containing the remains of poor Chuang-tsze. It is not absolutely necessary, that it should remain in the hall, during these one hundred days. At the farther end of my garden is an ancient smoke-house. It is quite dilapidated, and no longer in use. Some of my people shall carry the coffin thither, without farther delay. So you may inform your sweet, young master, that his first objection will be instantly removed. And why should he distress himself so needlessly, in regard to the second? Chuang-tsze certainly passed, with the world, for a great philosopher, and a wonderful man. The world sees from a distance. A sort of haze or mist impedes its vision. Minute particulars escape its observation. That, which is smooth and fair, seen from afar, may appear full of inequalities to one, who is near at hand. God forbid, that I should undervalue the dead; but it is well known, that Chuang-tsze repudiated his second wife, because she did not precisely suit his humor, and then married me. His great reputation induced a certain sovereign, to appoint him his chief minister. But the philosopher was not deficient in shrewdness—he knew his incapacity, and resolved to hide himself, in that solitude, where we have vegetated, so long."

"About a month ago, he encountered a young widow, who, with a large fan, was endeavoring to dry up her husband's grave, because she could not marry again, under the condition her husband had imposed upon her, until this was done. Chuang-tsze, if you will believe it, made the acquaintance of this shameless woman; and actually assisted her, in drying up her husband's grave. She gave him a fan, as a keepsake; and he valued it highly. I got possession of it however, and tore it to tatters. You see how great my obligations are to this wonderful philoso-

pher; and you may judge of the real affection, which I must feel, for the memory of such a man."

"The last objection," continued the widow, "is easily disposed of. I will furnish your master with all the means he can desire. Chuang-tsze, to do the man justice, has left me the absolute mistress of an ample fortune—here, present these twenty taels to your master, from me, with such expressions of devotion, as may befit the lips of one, whose heart is all his own; and say to him, unless he himself is desirous of a longer delay, that, as the whole of life is not too long for love, I shall be happy, if he desires it, to become his bride, this very day."

Thus far the course of true love, in despite of the proverb, certainly ran smooth.

"Here," said the young disciple, upon sight of the twenty taels, as he turned them over, "is something substantial—run back immediately to the widow, and tell her my passion will endure the curb no longer. I am entirely at her disposal." The widow was quite beside herself, upon receiving these tidings; and, casting off her garments of heaviness, she began to embellish her fine person. The coffin of Chuang-tsze, by her directions, was immediately transferred to the old smoke-house.

The hall was made ready, for the approaching nuptials. If murmurs occasionally arose, among the old, faithful domestics of Chuang-tsze, the widow's passion was more blind than moonless midnight, and deeper than the time-stricken adder. A gorgeous feast was made ready. The shades of evening drew on apace—the lanterns were lighted up, in all directions—the nuptial torch cast forth its bright beams from an elevated table.

At the appointed signal, the bridegroom entered, most skilfully and splendidly arrayed,—so that his fine, manly figure was exhibited, to the greatest advantage. The young widow soon appeared, her countenance the very tabernacle of pleasure, and her bewitching form, adorned in the most costly silks, and splendid embroidery. They placed themselves, side by side, in front of the hymeneal taper, arrayed in pearls, and diamonds, and tissue of gold. Those salutations, which custom demands, having been duly performed, and the bride and bridegroom having wished each other eternal felicity, in that manner, which the marriage rites prescribe, the bridegroom holding the hand of the bride, they proceeded to the festal hall; and having drunk from the goblet of mutual fidelity, they took their places, at the banquetting board.

The repast went joyously forward—the darkest cloud—how suddenly will it come over the smiling face of the bewitching moon! The festival had not yet passed, when the bridegroom fell to the floor, in horrible convulsions. With eyes turned upward, and mouth frightfully distorted, he became an object of horror. The bride, whose passion for the young disciple was ardent and sincere, screamed aloud. She threw herself, in all her bridal array, upon the floor, by his side; clasped him in her arms; covered him with kisses; and implored him, to say what she could do, to afford him relief. Miserable youth! He was unable to reply, and seemed about to expire.

The old domestic rushed into the apartment, upon hearing the noise, and taking his master from the floor, proceeded to shake him with violence. "My God," cried the lady, "has this ever happened before?" "Yes, Madam," he replied, "he has a return of it about once, in every year." "And, for Heaven's sake, tell me what remedies do you employ?" she eagerly inquired. "There is one sovereign remedy," the old man replied; "his physician considers it a specific." "And what is it? tell me, in the name of Confucius," she passionately exclaimed, for the convulsions were growing more violent. "Nothing will restore him, but the brains of a man, recently dead, taken in warm wine. His father, who was governor of a province, when his son was last attacked, in this way, caused a criminal to be executed, that his brains might be thus employed." "Good God!" exclaimed the agonizing bride, for the convulsions, after a short remission, were returning, with redoubled violence, and the bridegroom was foaming terribly, at the mouth. "Tell me instantly, will the brains of a man who died a natural death answer as well?" "Undoubtedly," the old servant replied. "Well then," said she, in a tone somewhat subdued—"there is Chuang-tsze in the smoke-house." "Ah, Madam," said the old domestic, "I am aware of it—it occurred to me—but I feared to suggest it." "And of what possible use," she exclaimed, "can the brains of old Chuang-tsze be to him now, I should like to know?"

At this moment, the convulsions became absolutely terrific. "These returns," said the old man, "will become more and more violent, till they destroy my poor master. There is no time to be lost." The wretched bride rushed from the apartment, and, seizing a hatchet, which happened to be lying in the

outer passage, she hastily made her way to the old smoke-house. Elevating the hatchet above her head, she struck a violent blow, on the lid of the coffin.

If the whole force of the blow had descended upon a secret spring, the lid could not have risen more suddenly. It seemed like the power of magic. The bride turned her eyes upon the closed lids of the corpse—they gradually opened; and the balls were slowly turned, and steadily fixed, upon her. In an instant Chuang-tsze sat, bolt upright, in his coffin! She sent forth a shriek of terror—the hatchet fell from her paralyzed hand—the cold sweat of confusion gathered thickly upon her brow.

"My beloved wife," said the philosopher, with perfect calmness, "be so obliging as to lend me your hand, that I may get out.—I have had a charming nap," continued he, as he took the lamp from her hand, and advanced towards the hall. She followed, trembling at every step, and dreading the meeting, between the old philosopher and the young disciple.

Though the air of unwonted festivity, under the light of the waning tapers, still hung over the apartment, fortunately the youth and the old servant seemed to have departed. Upon this, her courage, in some measure, revived, and, turning a look of inexpressible tenderness upon Chuang-tsze—"Dearest husband," said she, "how I have cherished your memory! My day thoughts and dreams have been all of you. I have often heard, that the apparent dead were revived, especially if not confined within closed apartments. I therefore caused your precious coffin to be removed, where the cool, refreshing air could blow over it. How I have watched, and listened, for some evidence of returning life! And how my heart leaped into my mouth, when my vigilance was at last rewarded. I flew with a hatchet to open the coffin; and, when I saw your dear eyes turned upon me, I thought I should"—"I can never repay your devotion," said the philosopher, interrupting her, with an expression of ineffable tenderness, "but why are you thus gaily apparelled—why these robes—these jewels—my love?"

"It seemed to me, my dear husband," she readily replied, "that some invisible power assured me of your return to life. How, thought I, can I meet my beloved Chuang-tsze, in the garments of heaviness? No; it will be like a return of our wedding day; and thus, you see, I have resumed my bridal array, and the jewels you gave me, during our honeymoon."—"Ah,"

said the philosopher, "how considerate you are—you always had your thoughts about you." He then drew near the table. The wedding taper, which was then burning low in its socket, cast its equivocal rays upon the gorgeous bowls and dishes, which covered the festal board. Chuang-tsze surveyed them attentively, in silence; and, calling for warm wine, deliberately drained the goblet, while the lady stood near him, trembling with confusion and terror.

At length, setting down the goblet, and pointing his finger—"Look behind you!" he exclaimed. She turned her head, and beheld the young disciple, in his wedding finery, with his attendant—a second glance, and they were gone. Such was the power of this mighty master of magic. The wife slunk to her apartment; and, resolving not to survive her shame and disappointment, unloosened her wedding girdle, and ascending to the garret, hung herself therewith, to one of the cross-beams, until she was dead. Tidings were soon brought to Chuang-tsze, who, deliberately feeling her pulse, and ascertaining that she was certainly dead, cut her down, and placed her precious remains, in the coffin, in the old smoke-house.

He then proceeded to indulge his philosophical humor. He sat down, among the flickering lamps, at the solitary board, and struck up a dirge, accompanying his voice, by knocking with the chopsticks, and whatever else was convenient to his purpose, upon the porcelain bowls and dishes, which he finally broke into a thousand pieces, and setting fire to his mansion, he consumed it to ashes, together with the smoke-house, and all its valuable contents.

He then, abandoning all thoughts of taking another wife, travelled into the recesses of Latinguin, in pursuit of his old master, Laoukeun, whom, at length, he discovered. There he acquired the reputation of a profound philosopher; and lay down, at last, in the peaceful grave, where wicked widows cease from troubling, and weary widowers are at rest.

No. CXXII.

A GRASSHOPPER was not the crest of Peter Faneuil's arms. I formerly supposed it was; for a gilded grasshopper, as half the world knows, is the vane upon the cupola of Faneuil Hall; and a gilded grasshopper, as many of us well remember, whirled about, of yore, upon the little spire, that rose above the summer-house, appurtenant to the mansion, where Peter Faneuil lived, and died. That house was built, and occupied, by his uncle, Andrew; and he had some seven acres, for his garden thereabouts. It was upon the westerly side of old *Treamount* Street, and became the residence of the late William Phillips, whose political relations to the people of Massachusetts, as their Lieutenant Governor, could not preserve him from the sobriquet of *Billy*.

I thought it not unlikely, that Peter's crest was a grasshopper, and that, on that account, he had become partial to this emblem. But I am duly certified, that it was not so. The selection of a grasshopper, for a vane, was made, in imitation of their example, who placed the very same thing, upon the pinnacle of the Royal Exchange, in London. The arms of the Faneuils I have seen, upon the silver castors, which once were Peter's own; and, upon his decease, became the property of his brother, Benjamin, from whom they descended to his only daughter, Mary Faneuil, who became, October 13, 1754, the wife of George Bethune, now deceased; and was the mother of George Bethune, Esquire, who will complete his eighty-second year, in April, 1851. From this gentleman, whose grand-uncle Peter Faneuil was, and from other descendants of old Benjamin Faneuil, of Rochelle, I have received some facts and documents—interesting to me—possibly to others.

In conversation with an antiquarian friend, not long ago, we agreed, that very much less was generally known of Peter Faneuil, than of almost any other great, public benefactor. His name, nevertheless, is inseparably associated, with the cradle of American liberty. Drs. Eliot and Allen, in their Biographical Dictionaries, have passed him over, very slightly, the former finishing up this noble-hearted Huguenot, with fifteen lines; and the latter, with eight; while not a few of their pages have been

devoted, to the very dullest doctors of the drowsiest theology, and to—

"Names ignoble, born to be forgot."

Mr. Farmer, in his Genealogical Register, does not seem to be aware, that the name of Faneuil existed, for he has not even found a niche for it there. His Register, I am aware, purports to be a register of the "*First Settlers*." But he has found room for the Baudouins (Bowdoin) and their descendants. They also were Huguenots; and came hither, with the Faneuils, after 1685. One of that family, as will be more fully shown, Claude Baudoin, presented Peter Faneuil in baptism. Yet, such was the public sense of Peter's favors, *when they were green*, that John Lovell—that same Master Lovell, who retired with the British army, in 1776—delivered, under an appointment of the town, an oration, to commemorate the virtues, and laud the munificence of Peter Faneuil. Such, in truth, was the very first occasion, upon which the citizens were summoned to listen to the voice of an orator, in Faneuil Hall; and then, in honor of him, who perfected the noble work, at his own proper cost, and whose death so speedily followed its completion—for a noble work assuredly it was, relatively to the times, in which it was wrought.

The Faneuils were Huguenots. The original pronunciation of this patronymic must have been somewhat different from the present: there was an excusable *naïveté*, in the inquiry of a rural visitant of the city—if a well known mechanical establishment, with a tall, tubular chimney, were not *Funnel* Hall?

After the revocation of the edict of Nantes, by Louis XIV., in 1685, the Faneuils, in common with many other Huguenots of France,—the Baudouins, the Bernons, the Sigourneys, the Boudinots, the Pringles, the Hegers, the Boutineaus, the Jays, the Laurenses, the Manigaults, the Marions, the Prioleaus, and many others, came to these North American shores—as our pilgrim fathers came—to worship God, in security, and according to their consciences. Many of these persecuted men conferred, upon their adopted home, those blessings, which the exercise of their talents, and the influence of their characters, and of the talents and characters of their descendants have confirmed to our common country, for many generations.

They came, by instalments, and arrived at different points. Thirty families of these expatriated Protestants came hither, and settled upon a tract, eight miles square, in the "Nipmug coun-

try," where now stands the town of Oxford, in the County of Worcester. This settlement commenced, in Gov. Dudley's time, and under his particular auspices; but continued only till 1696, when it was broken up, by the inroads of the savages. In the overthrow of this settlement, rum was a material agent, and occasioned, though upon a very small scale, a second massacre of some of these Huguenots. There is a letter to Gov. Dudley, from M. Bondet, the Huguenot clergyman, dated July 6, 1691, complaining bitterly of the unrestricted sale, among the Indians, of this fatal fire water; and giving a graphic account of the uproar and outrage it produced.

After the failure of this attempt, many of the scattered planters collected, in Boston. For several years, they gathered, for devotional purposes, in one of the larger school-houses. Jan. 4, 1704, they purchased a piece of land, in South School Street, of John Mears, a hatter, for "£110 current silver money of New England;" but, for several years, the selectmen, for some cause, unknown to us, refused their consent, that these worthy French Protestants should build their church thereon. About twelve years after the purchase of the land, the little church—the visible temple—went up. It was of brick, and very small. Monsieur Pierre Daillé was their first pastor, André Le Mercier the second; and, if there be any truth, in tradition, these Huguenot shepherds were pure and holy men. Daillé died testate, May 20, 1715. His will bears date May 15, of that year. He directs his body to be interred, at the discretion of his executor, James Bowdoin, "*with this restriction, that there be no wine at my funeral, and that none of my wife's relations have mourning cloaths.*" He empowers his executor to give them gloves; and scarfs and gloves to all the ministers of Boston. To his wife, Martha, he gives £350, Province bills, and his negro man, Kuffy. His Latin and French books he gives to the French Church, as *the nucleus of a library*. £100 to be put at interest for the use of the minister. £10 to be improved by the elders, for the use of the church, and should a meeting-house be built, then in aid of that object. To John Rawlins the French schoolmaster, £5. He then makes his brother Paul, of Armsfort, in Holland, residuary legatee. His "*books and arms*" were appraised at £2. 10. The whole estate at £274. 10. sterling.

Le Mercier dedicated his book, on Detraction, to his people. Therein he says, "You have not despised my youth, when I first

came among you ; you have since excused my infirmities ; and, as I did the same, in respect to yours, it has pleased our Saviour, the head of his church, to favor us with an uninterrupted peace and union in our church, for the almost eighteen years that I have preached the word of salvation to you." His book was published in 1733. He therefore became their pastor between 1715, when Daillé died, and 1716. He died March 31, 1764, aged 71. He was therefore born in 1693, and ordained about the age of 22.

Le Mercier's will is dated, at Dorchester, Nov. 7, 1761. A codicil was added, at Boston, Feb. 3, 1764. He left his estate to his four children, "*Andrew, Margaret, Jane, and my son Bartholomew, if living.*" He enjoins upon his heirs the payment of Bartholomew's debt to Thomas Hancock, for which he had become responsible, and which he had partly paid. By his will, he appointed Jane and Margaret to execute his will. In the codicil, he refers to the disordered state of Margaret's mind, and appoints Zachariah Johonnot, in her stead, requesting him to be her guardian. The whole estate was appraised at £232. 18. 6. sterling.

Years rolled on : juxtaposition and intermarriage were Americanising these Huguenots, from month to month ; and, ere long, they felt, less and less, the necessity of any separate place of worship. On the 7th of May, 1748, "Stephen Boutineau, the only surviving elder," and others, among whom we recognize the Huguenot names of Johonnot, Packinett, Boudoin, and Sigourney, conveyed their church and land to Thomas Fillebrown, Thomas Handyside Peck, and others, trustees for the "new congregational church, whereof Mr. Andrew Croswell is pastor." After a while, this church became the property of the Roman Catholics ; and mass was first celebrated there, Nov. 2, 1788. The Catholics, in 1803, having removed to Franklin Place, the old Huguenot church was taken down ; and, upon the site of it, a temple was erected, by the Universalists ; showing incontrovertibly, thank God, that the soil was most happily adapted to toleration.

The reader fancies, perhaps, that I have forgotten Peter Fan-euil. Not so : but I must linger a little longer with these Huguenots, who attempted a settlement in the Nipmug country. In the southwesterly part of Oxford, there rises a lofty hill, whose summit affords an extensive and delightful prospect. Beneath,

at the distance of a mile, or more, lies the village of Oxford; and the scenery, beyond, is exceedingly picturesque. Upon this eminence, which now bears the name of Mayo's Hill, are the well-defined remains of an ancient fort. Its construction is perfectly regular. The bastions are clearly marked; and the old well, constructed within the barrier, still remains. As recently, as 1819, says the Rev. Dr. Holmes, in his able and interesting account of the Huguenots, "grapevines were growing luxuriantly, along the line of this fort; and these, together with currant bushes, roses, and other shrubbery, nearly formed a hedge around it. There were some remains of an apple orchard. The currant and asparagus were still growing there."

Such were the vestiges of these thirty families, who, in 1696, fled from a foe, not more savage and relentless, though less enlightened, than the murderers of Coligny, in 1572.

The Faneuils formed no part of these thirty families; but, not many years after the little Oxford colony was broken up, and the fugitive survivors had found their way to Boston, the Faneuils, one after another, seem to have been attracted hither, from those points of our country, where they first arrived, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes, in 1685, or from other, intermediate stations, to which they had removed.

There are not elements enough, I fear, for a very interesting memoir of Peter Faneuil. The materials, even for a brief account, are marvellously few, and far between; and the very best result, to be anticipated, is a warp and woof of shreds and patches.

But, if I am not much mistaken, I know more of Peter Faneuil, than Master Lovell ever wot of, though he delivered the funeral oration; and, albeit the sum total is very small, it seems but meet and right, that it should be given to the world. I think it would so be decided, by the citizens, if the vote were taken, this very day—in *Faneuil Hall*.

Our neighbors, all over the United States have heard of *Faneuil Hall*; and, though, of late years, since we have had a race, or breed, of mayors, every one of whom has endeavored to be *worthier* or more *conceding* than his predecessor, Faneuil Hall has been converted into a sort of omnibus without wheels; yet the glory of its earlier, and of some, among its latter days, is made, thank God, of that unchangeable stuff, that will never shrink, and cannot fade.

No man has ever heard of Faneuil Hall, who will not be pleased to hear somewhat of that noble-minded, whole-souled descendant of the primitive Huguenots—and such indeed he was—who came, as a stranger and sojourner here, and built that hall, at his own proper cost and charge, and gave it—the gift of a cheerful giver—to those, among whom he had come to dwell—and all this, in the midst of his days, in the very prime of his life, not waiting for the almond tree to flourish, and for desire to fail, and for the infirmities of age to admonish the rich man, that he must set his house in order, and could carry nothing with him, to those regions beyond.

Faneuil Hall has been called the *Cradle of Liberty*, so long and so often, that it may seem to savor of political heresy, to quarrel with the name—but, for the soul of me, I cannot help it. If it be intended to say, that Faneuil Hall is the *birth place* of Liberty, I am not aware of a single instance, on record, of a baby, *born in a cradle*. The proverbial use of the cradle has ever been to rock the baby to sleep; and Heaven knows our old fathers made no such use of Faneuil Hall, in their early management of the bantling; for it was an ever-wakeful child, from the very moment of its first, sharp, shrill, life cry.

No. CXXIII.

GENERAL Jackson has been reported—how justly I know not—upon some occasion, in a company of ladies, to have given a brief, but spirited, description of all his predecessors, in the Presidential chair, till he came down to the time of President Tyler, when, seizing his hat, he proceeded to bow himself out of the room. The ladies, however, insisted upon his completing the catalogue—“*Well, ladies,*” said he, “*it is matter of history, and may therefore be spoken—President Tyler, ladies, was—pretty much nothing.*”

A very felicitous description; and not of very limited application to men and things. I cannot find a better, for Master John Lovell’s funeral oration, upon Peter Faneuil. This affair, which Dr. Snow, in his history of Boston, calls “*a precious relic,*” is certainly a wonderfully flatulent performance. A time-stained

copy of the original edition of 1743 lies under my eye. I hoped, not unreasonably, that it would be a lamp to my path, in searching after the historical assets of Peter Faneuil. But not one ray of light has it afforded me; and, with one or two exceptions, in relation to the *Hall*, and the general beneficence of its founder, it is, in no sense, more of a funeral oration, upon Peter Faneuil, than upon Peter Smink. In their vote of thanks to Master Lovell, passed on the day of its delivery, the committee speak of "*his oration*," very judiciously abstaining from all unwarrantable expletives. From this oration we can discover nothing of Faneuil's birth-place, nor parentage, nor when, nor whence, nor wherefore he came hither; nor of the day of his birth, nor of the day of his death, nor of the disease of which he died; nor of his habits of life, nor of the manner, in which he acquired his large estate; nor of his religious opinions, nor of his ancestors.

We collect, however, from these meagre pages, that Mr. Faneuil meditated other benefactions to the town—that his death was sudden—that votes of thanks had been passed, for his donation of the Hall, "a few months before"—that the meeting, at which the oration was pronounced, March 14, 1742, was the very first annual meeting, in Faneuil Hall—that Peter Faneuil was the owner of "a large and plentiful estate"—that "no man managed his affairs with greater prudence and industry"—that "he fed the hungry and clothed the naked; comforted the fatherless and the widows, in their affliction, and his bounty visited the prisoner."

Master Lovell, not inelegantly, observes of Faneuil's intended benefactions, which were prevented by his death—"His intended charities, though they are lost to us, will not be lost to him. Designs of goodness and mercy, prevented as these were, will meet with the reward of actions." This passage appears to have found favor, in the eyes of the late Dr. Boyle, who has, accordingly, on page 21, of his memoir of the Boston Episcopal Charitable Society, when speaking of Faneuil, made a very free and familiar appropriation of it, with a slight verbal variation.

Master Lovell's fervent aspirations, in regard to Faneuil Hall, one hundred and nine years ago, have not been fulfilled, to the letter. The gods have granted the orator's prayer—"May Liberty always spread its joyful wings over this place"—but not with Master Lovell's conditions annexed; for he adds—"May

LOYALTY to a KING, under whom we enjoy that Liberty, ever remain our character."

In this particular, Master Lovell was not to be indulged. Yet he steadily adhered to his tory principles; and, like many other conscientious and honorable men, whom it is much less the fashion to abuse, at present, than it was, of yore, adhered to his royal master; and relinquished his own sceptre, as monarch of the South Grammar School, with all the honors and emoluments thereof, choosing rather to suffer affliction, with his thwarted and mortified master, than to enjoy the pleasures of rebellion, for a season. He retired to Halifax, with the British army, in 1776, and died there, in 1778.

Original copies of Master Lovell's oration are exceedingly rare; though the "*precious relic*" has been reprinted, by Dr. Snow, in his history of Boston. The title may be worth preserving—"A funeral oration, delivered at the opening of the annual meeting of the town, March 14th, 1742. In Faneuil Hall, in Boston. Occasioned by the death of the founder, Peter Faneuil Esq. By John Lovell, A. M., Master of the South Grammar School, in Boston. *Sui memores alios fecere merendo*. Boston, printed by Green, Bushell & Allen, for S. Kneeland & T. Green, in Queen Street, 1743."

As an eminent historian conceived it to be a matter of indifference, at which end he commenced his history, I shall not adhere to any chronological arrangement, in the presentation of the few facts, which I have collected, relating to Peter Faneuil and his family. On the contrary, I shall begin at the latter end, and, first, endeavor to clear up a little confusion, that has arisen, as to the time of his death. Allen, in his Biog. Dic., says, that Peter Faneuil died, March 3, 1743. I am sorry to say, that, in several instances, President Allen's *dates* resemble Jeremiah's *figs*, in the second basket; though, upon the present occasion, he is right, on a certain hypothesis. In a note to the "Memoir of the French Protestants," also, M. H. C. vol. xxii. p. 55, Peter Faneuil is said to have died, March 3, 1743. Pemberton, in his "Description of Boston," Ibid. v. 3, p. 253, by stating that the funeral oration was delivered, March 14, 1742, makes 1742 the year of Faneuil's death. The title page of the oration itself, quoted above, fixes the death, in 1742. Dr. Eliot, in his Biog. Dic., says 1742. The Probate records of Suffolk show administration granted, on Peter Faneuil's estate, March 18, 1742. His *obit*, on a mourning ring, that I have seen, is 1742.

Now, if all dealers in dates, of the olden time, would discriminate, between the old style and the new, we should be spared a vast deal of vexation; and the good people of Boston, notional as they proverbially are, would not appear, in their creditable zeal to do honor to a public benefactor, to have given him a funeral oration, a twelve month before he was dead. If the year be taken to begin, on the first of January, then Dr. Allen is right; and Peter Faneuil died March 3, 1743. But if it did not begin, till the twenty-fifth of March, and, legally, it certainly did not, before 1752, when the new style was adopted, in Great Britain, and the Provinces, then Eliot, and Pemberton, and the title page of the oration, and the records of the court, and the mourning ring are right, and Peter Faneuil died, in 1742.

An illustration of this principle may be found, on the title page of the oration itself. It is stated to have been delivered, March 14, 1742, and printed in 1743. Having been delivered near the close of the year 1742, it was printed, doubtless, soon after March 25, which was New Year's day for 1743.

The public journals, nevertheless, seem to have adopted, and adhered to the idea, that January 1, was the first day of the historical year, long before the style was altered; and thus, in the Weekly News Letter, published in Boston, Faneuil is stated to have died, in 1743. This journal contains an obituary notice. A few imperfect numbers of this paper are all that remain, and its extreme rarity leads me to copy the obituary here:—

“Thursday, March 10, 1743. On Thursday last, dyed at his seat in this Town, PETER FANEUIL, Esq., whose remains, we hear, are to be enterred this afternoon; a gentleman, possessed of a very ample fortune, and a most generous spirit, whose noble benefaction to this town, and constant employment of a great number of tradesmen, artificers and labourers, to whom he was a liberal paymaster; whose hospitality to all, and secret unbounded charity to the poor—made his life a public blessing, and his death a general loss to, and universally regretted by, the inhabitants; who had been so sensible of their obligations to him, for the sumptuous edifice, which he raised at his private expence, for their Market house and Town Hall, that, at a general town meeting, as a testimony of their gratitude, they voted, that the place of their future consultations should be called by his name forever: in doing which they perpetuated their own honor as much as his memory; for, by this record posterity will know

the most publick spirited man, in all regards, that ever yet appeared on the Northern continent of America, was a member of their community."

In the Boston Evening Post of March 7, 1743, in a brief notice of Peter Faneuil's death, the disease of which he died is said to have been "*dropsey*."

Now that we have established the period of Peter's death, it may be well, to establish the period of his birth; and this we can do, with certainty, even to an hour, from authentic documents. In addition to other means, for ascertaining dates, and various particulars, respecting Peter Faneuil, and the members of his family—through the kindness of the Genealogical Society, I have, before me, a folio volume of his commercial correspondence: mutilated, indeed it is, by some thoughtless hand, but furnishes some curious and interesting matter. Many of his letters are written in French; and those, which are in English, are well composed. I have found but a single instance, in which he writes our language, like a Frenchman. Upon that occasion, he was in a passion with a certain judge of the admiralty, complained of his ill usage, and charged him with "*capporice*."

No. CXXIV.

I AM indebted to Mr. Charles Faneuil Jones, a grandson of Mary Ann Jones, Peter Faneuil's sister, for the use of some ancient papers, and family relics; and to George Bethune, Esquire, of Boston, the grandson of *Benjamin Faneuil*, Peter's brother, for the loan of a venerable document—time worn, torn, and sallow—the record of the birth of Peter Faneuil, and of his brothers and sisters. This document, from its manifest antiquity, the masculine character of the hand writing, and the constant use of the parental expressions—*notre fils*—*notre fille*—I, at first, supposed to be the original autograph of *Benjamin*, the father of Peter. This conjecture was, of course, demolished, by the last entry, on the record, which is of old *Benjamin's* de-
cease, but in the same peculiar hand.

The document is in French; and, after a careful comparison—*literatim*—with the volume of Peter's commercial cor-

respondence, now in my possession—I have very little doubt, that this record was copied, by Peter, from the paternal original, with the additional entry, by himself, of the date of his father's death. At the bottom, and beneath a line of separation, and by another hand, with a fresher ink, is the following entry—"Le 6 D'Aout 1725, M. Gillam Phillips de Boston a epousee ma Fille Marie Faneuil agée de dix sept et quatre mois." The 6th of August, 1725, Mr. Gillam Phillips, of Boston, married my daughter, Marie, aged seventeen and four months. The expression *ma fille*, shows this entry to have been made by Peter's mother, then the widow of *Benjamin*, who appears, by this record, to have died, at New York, March 31, 1718-9, aged 50 years and 8 months.

This unusual prænomén, *Gillam*, I, at first, supposed to be a corruption of *Guillaume*. But there was a merchant, of that day, in Boston, bearing the name of *Gillam Phillips*. In the Registry of Deeds, for Suffolk, lib. 43, fol. 13, there is recorded a deed, from "*Wentworth Paxton, and Faith, his wife, formerly Faith Gillam*," in which, reference is made to Faith's father, *Benjamin Gillam*. Mr. Gillam Phillips is thus named, in the will of his wife's uncle, Andrew Faneuil, to which I shall have occasion to refer. Jan 22, 1738, Peter, in a letter to Lane & Smethurst, of London, speaks of his brother-in-law, *Mr. Gillam Phillips*.

This gentleman was the elder brother of *Mr. Henry Phillips*, who was indicted, for killing Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, in a duel, fought with swords, and without seconds, on Boston Common, upon the evening of July 3, 1728. This extremely interesting affair cannot be introduced, as an episode here, on account of the space it must necessarily occupy. The original documents, relating to this encounter, which terminated in the immediate death of Mr. Woodbridge, have fallen into my possession; and, as Peter Faneuil personally assisted, in the escape of the survivor, who found a city of refuge, in Rochelle, and a friend and protector, in Peter's uncle, *Jean Faneuil*; it seems, in some degree, related to the history of Peter and his kinsfolk. I may, possibly, refer to it hereafter.

In 1685, the period of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, there were living, in or near Rochelle, in France, three brothers and two sisters of the Faneuil family. One of these, *Benjamin*, became the father of our Peter Fan-

euil—the others, his uncles and aunts, when the persecution commenced, so ably and touchingly described, by James Saurin, fled for safety to foreign lands. Andrew, the elder brother, escaped into Holland, and took up his abode in Amsterdam; where he married that preëminently beautiful lady, whose portrait is now in the possession of Col. Benjamin Hunt, whose mother was Jane Bethune, a daughter of Mary Faneuil, the neice of Peter.

Andrew Faneuil, before many years, came to this country—precisely when, I cannot say. That he was here, as early as 1709, is evident, from the proposals of Oliver Noyes and others, to build a wharf from the bottom of King Street, to low-water mark, “of the width of King Street, between Mr. East Aphthorp’s and Mr. Andrew Faneuil’s.” These proposals are dated Feb. 20, 1709, and are inserted in Dr. Snow’s History of Boston, p. 209.

In Holland, doubtless, Andrew acquired that passion, for flowers, which he gratified, in his seven-acre Eden, on the westerly side of Treamount Street, where he is said to have erected the first hothouse, that ever existed in New England. His warehouse, the same, by him devised, for the support of the minister of the French Church, was at the lower end of King Street, near Merchant’s Row, from which Butler’s Wharf then extended, as laid down, by John Bonner, in 1722. This warehouse, under the will of Andrew, reverted, to his heirs, upon the extinction of the French Church. It was then, just where we find it, in the New England Weekly Journal, of Jan. 13, 1729. “*Good New York Flower. To be sold, at Mr. Andrew Faneuil’s Warehouse, at the lower end of King Street, at 35s per Hundred, as also good chocolate, just imported.*” He was engaged in commerce; and, for those days of small things, acquired a large estate, which his forecast taught him to distribute, among the public funds of France, England, and Holland. His warehouse was purchased of one of his descendants, by the late John Parker.

Jean Faneuil, another of Peter’s uncles, held fast to the faith of his fathers; and lived, and died, a Roman Catholic. He died in Rochelle, of apoplexy, June 24, 1737, about four months after the decease of his brother Andrew, as appears by Peter’s letter of Sept. 8, 1737.

Susannah Faneuil also continued, in the Roman Catholic

faith, and remained in Rochelle; where she became the wife, and the widow, of Abraham de la Croix. She survived her brother Andrew, the date of whose decease is clearly shown to have been Feb. 13, 1737, by Peter's letter to S. & W. Baker, of London, giving them the inscription, "*for the handsomest mourning rings.*"

Jane Faneuil was a Huguenot. She became the wife of Pierre Cossart, and took refuge, with her husband, in Ireland, where she died.

Benjamin Faneuil, the father of *our* Peter, was closely associated with that little band of Huguenots, who clustered about the town of Narragansett, otherwise called Kingstown, and the region round about, at the very close of the seventeenth century. In that village, in 1699, he married a French lady, whose name was Anne Bureau. The record, in Peter's transcript from his father's original, is now upon my table—"Le 28 de Juillet 1699. *Benjamin Faneuil et Anne Bureau ont été marié a Narragansett, en nouvelle Angleterre, en la maison de Mons. Pierre Ayross, par Mons. Pierre Daillé ministre de L'Eglise françoise de Boston.*" The 28th of July, 1699, Benjamin Faneuil and Ann Bureau were married at Narragansett, in New England, at the house of Mr. Peter Ayross, by Mr. Peter Daillé, minister of the French Church in Boston. Three years before, in 1696, Sept. 4, the name of this Benjamin Faneuil will be found, M. H. C., xxii. 60, attached to a certificate, in favor of Gabriel Bernon, referring to the massacre of John Johnson and his three children, at New Oxford. Johnson had married the sister of old *André Sigournay*.

This *Benjamin Faneuil*, the præpositus, or stirps, became the father of eleven children, by his wife, *Anne Bureau*, who were all born in New Rochelle, in the State of New York, and of whom *our* Peter was the first born. Their names, in the order of birth, are these—*Peter, Benjamin, Francis, Anne, Anne, Marie, John, Anne, Susannah, Mary Anne, and Catherine*. The two first Annes, John, and Catherine, died in infancy.

The birth of *our* Peter is thus chronicled, in the family record—"Le 20 de Juin, 1700, *Estant Jeudy a 6 heures du soir est né nostre fils Pierre Faneuil, et a été baptisé le 14 Juillet, par M. Peyret, ministre de l'Eglise françoise de la Nouvelle York, présenté au Bâptême par M. Claude Baudoin et par Sa Mere.*" The 20th of June, 1700, being Thursday, at 6 o'clock

in the evening, was born our son, Peter Faneuil, and he was baptized the 14th of July, by Mr. Peyret, minister of the French Church, in New York; presented in baptism, by Mr. Claude Bowdoin and its mother.

Benjamin, our Peter's brother, was born Dec. 29, 1701. He was a merchant in Boston, about the time of his uncle Andrew's death, in 1737. Shortly after that event, he went to England, and France, and returned, about two years before the death of his brother Peter, in 1742-3, upon whose estate he administered. His nephew, Edward Jones, in a letter to his mother, June 23, 1783, informs her, that "*Uncle Faneuil seems to be growing very low; I think he will not continue long.*" He was then in his eighty-second year. He died in October, 1785.

After Peter's death, Benjamin resided in Brighton, then Cambridge, in the street, which now bears the family name, where he erected an expensive mansion, successively occupied, after his decease, by Messieurs Bethune, English, Parkman, and Bigelow. By his wife, Mary Cutler, he had three children, Benjamin, Mary, and Peter.

This Benjamin, nephew of our Peter, is the "*Benjamin Faneuil, junior*," whose name appears, among the signers of the "*Loyall Address*" to Gov. Gage on his departure Oct. 6, 1775. He left Boston for Halifax, with the British army, in March, 1776. He is the person, referred to, by Ward, in his *Memoirs of Curwen*—"the merchant of Boston, and with Joshua Winslow, consignee of one third of the East India Company's tea, destroyed in 1773, a refugee to Halifax, afterwards in England." He married Jane, daughter of Addington Davenport, by his first wife, Jane, who was the daughter of Grove Hirst, and sister of the Lady Mary Pepperell; and, with his wife, lived many years, abroad, chiefly in Bristol, England, which became the favorite resort of many refugees, and where he died. I have, in my possession, several of his letters, written to his relatives, during his exile. These letters are spiritedly written; and, to the very last, in the most perfect assurance, that the colonies must submit.

Mary, our Peter's niece, became the wife of George Bethune, Oct. 13, 1754, and died in 1797. A portrait, by Blackburn, of this beautiful woman, is in the possession of her son, George Bethune, Esquire, of Boston. After a very careful

inspection of this portrait, not long ago, I went directly to the rooms of the Historical Society, to compare it with the portrait there of her uncle Peter, to which it seems to me to bear a strong family resemblance. This portrait of Peter was presented to the Society, by Miss Jones, the grand niece of *our* Peter, now the wife of Dr. Cutter of Pepperell. It has been erroneously ascribed to Copley. If its manifest inferiority to the works of that eminent master were not sufficiently germane to this question—Copley was born in 1738, and not quite five years old, when Peter Faneuil died.

Peter, the youngest child of Benjamin, and, of course, the nephew of *our* Faneuil Hall Peter, who may be otherwise distinguished, as Peter the Great—was baptized, in Trinity Church, in Boston, in 1738, and entered the Latin School, in 1746. He entered into trade—went to Montreal—failed—resorted to the West Indies—and, after his father's death, returned to Boston.

No. CXXV.

LET us conclude our post mortem examination of the brothers and sisters of Peter Faneuil.

Francis, the third son of *Benjamin*, the old Rocheller, Peter's father, was born Aug. 21, 1703, of whom I know nothing, beyond the fact, that he was baptized, by M. Peyret, minister of the French church in New York, and presented "*par son grand pere, Francois Bureau, et Mad'selle Anne Delancey.*"

Mary, the eldest sister of *our* Peter, that came to maturity, was born April 16, 1708, and is the *Marie*, to whom I have already referred, as having married Mr. Gillam Phillips, Aug. 6, 1725. Their abode, before the revolution, was in the mansion, more recently occupied by Abiel Smith, at the corner of State and Devonshire Streets; or, as they are called, on Bonner's plan of 1722, King Street and Pudding Lane. Her husband was a refugee. After his death, she resided in Cambridge, Mass., where she died, in April, 1778.

Anne, the next, in order of time, was born Oct. 9, 1710, and married Addington Davenport. This fact is stated, by Peter, in a letter, of Sept. 26, 1738. This is the same gentleman, un-

doubtedly, to whom the ancient record of King's Chapel refers : " Oct. 11, 1733. Voted, that the brass stand for the hourglass be lent to the church at Scituate, as also three Diaper napkins, provided the Rev. Mr. Addington Davenport, their minister, gives his note to return the same," &c. He was, afterwards, promoted, to be assistant minister of King's Chapel, in 1737, and Rector of Trinity Church, in 1740, and was, probably, the son of Addington Davenport, who was the Register of Deeds, for Suffolk, in 1706.

Susannah, the third sister of our Peter, in the order of birth, was born March 14, 1712, and became the wife of James Boutineau, the son of Stephen Boutineau, that "*only surviving elder*," who joined in the conveyance of the French Church, in 1748. James was a royalist; and, according to Ward's Curwen, died in exile. This marriage is also referred to, by Peter, in his letter of Sept. 26, 1738. Mr. James Boutineau was a lawyer, in Boston; and occupied the "*old Dorr house*," so called, in Milk Street.

Mr. Sabine, in his "*American Loyalists*," says *his fate is unknown, but he was in England, in 1777*. An original letter from his widow, "*Susanna Boutineau*," now before me, is dated *Bristol, Eng., Feb. 20, 1784*, and refers to the recent decease of her husband there.

Mary Ann was the last of Peter's sisters, that survived her infancy. She was born April 6, 1715, and died October, 1790. She became the wife of John Jones, who died at Roxbury, in 1767, and whose son, Edward, died in Boston, in 1835, at the age of 83. *She* was a refugee; and resided, for some time, in Windsor, Nova Scotia. She is omitted by Mr. Sabine, in his list of refugees; but named by Ward, page 444. A letter, from her son, Edward, dated at Boston, June 23, 1783, advises her, if desirous of returning, not to come directly to Boston, as the law was still in force; but first, to some other State, and thence to Boston.

Such were Peter Faneuil's brothers and sisters; with whom, so far as I have been able to ascertain, from his correspondence, and from all other sources, he appears to have maintained an amiable and becoming relation, as the file leader of the flock—the elder brother of the house; and it speaks a folio volume, in favor of Benjamin's equanimity, that he continued to fraternize, as the correspondence abundantly proves, that he did, in the most

cordial and affectionate manner, with his brother Peter, to whom uncle Andrew had, with the exception of a few legacies, willed the whole of his "*large and plentiful estate*," as Master Lovell calls it—while five vindictive shillings were all, that were found, after the death of this unforgiving, old gentleman, in the mouth of poor Benjamin's sack.

Uncle Andrew's testamentary phraseology, though not so anathematical, as that of some other obstinate, old uncles, is sufficiently uncivil, and even bitter, in relation to his "loving sister, Susannah," and his nephew, Benjamin.

But, of the will of Andrew Faneuil, and his motive—an exceedingly preposterous motive, to be sure, for cutting his adopted nephew off, with five shillings—in other words, of the cause, manner, and instrument, whereby Benjamin was put in the ablativè, I shall treat, more fully, hereafter.

There were collaterals of the Boston Faneuils, residing in St. Domingo, in 1738. There was then, in that island, a Benjamin Faneuil, to whom Peter addressed a letter of mere friendship, in the French language, informing him, that Peter's brother Benjamin was then in Europe. It was probably a son of, the St. Domingo Benjamin, the "*Monsieur Fanneuil*," of whom Washington writes to the President of Congress, Feb. 20, 1777, Sparks, iv. 327, as having memorialized, for leave to raise and command troops. The application failed, principally, on the ground of his entire ignorance of the English language.

We have seen, that Peter Faneuil died, at the early age of forty-two. His premature decease becomes the more remarkable, when contrasted with the longevity of all his brothers and sisters, who lived beyond the period of infancy. Marie attained the age of seventy—Susannah was living, in Bristol, at seventy-two—Mary Ann died at seventy-five—Benjamin died, in October, 1735, being two months less than eighty-four years old.

This veteran had been a generous liver, all his days. He was not a man, whose devotion was abdominal—whose God was his belly. He was no anchorite, but an advocate for social worship—he was preëminently hospitable. For more than forty years, from the period, when Peter's death afforded him the means, his hospitality had been a proverb—a by-word—but never a reproach. There was a refinement about it—it was precisely such hospitality, as Apicius would have practised, had Apicius been a bishop.

His appetite never forsook him. He died suddenly—ate a cheerful dinner, on the day of his death—and went not to his account, on an empty stomach. A post mortem examination, under the autopsy of that eminently shrewd, and most pleasant, gentleman, Dr. Marshall Spring of Watertown, exhibited the whole gastric apparatus, in admirable working order, for a much longer campaign. A nephritic malady occasioned his decease.

The death of Benjamin Faneuil, *the elder*, in 1718, and the previous adoption of his son Benjamin, Peter's brother, by Andrew, the wealthy Boston uncle, naturally turned the thoughts of the family, in this direction. Their interest in Boston was necessarily increased, by the marriage of sister Marie with Mr. Gillingham Phillips, and her consequent removal hither. The entry of the marriage—"ma fille"—on the family record, shows, that her mother was then living. The time of her death I have not ascertained, but suppose it to have occurred within a year or two after, for all the daughters were wending hither, and I find no mention of the mother. Peter was here, as early, as 1728, in which year, his name is associated, with the duel, in which Woodbridge was killed. Anne had married Mr. Davenport, and Susannah Mr. Boutineau, before uncle Andrew's death, in 1737. His will was dated, in 1734. From that document, it is evident, that Mary Ann was here then.

The elder Benjamin having died, in 1718,—Andrew, his brother, in 1737,—and Peter, in 1742-3, there were living Peter's brother and sisters, Benjamin, Anne, Susannah, Marie, and Marianne. They were living, during the revolution. So were their husbands, excepting Mr. Addington Davenport, who died Sept. 8, 1746. Their children also were living. The object of this particular statement is to invite the reader's attention to the extraordinary fact, that, while a religious persecution, in 1685, drove the Huguenot ancestors of these very individuals hither, for security—in 1776, a political persecution here drove many of their descendants into exile, and confiscated their estates.

That very many of those refugees, during the phrensy of political excitement, were just as truly persecuted, for conscience' sake, as were the Huguenots, in 1685, is a simple truth, which the calm, impartial voice of an after-age has been willing to concede. Among those refugees, the Huguenot and the old Anglo-Saxon patronymics are blended together. The Boutineaus and the Bethunes, the Faneuils and the Johonnots are mingled with

the Sewalls and the Hutchinsons, the Hollowells and the Paxtons.

While perusing the letters of Samuel Curwen—and a most kind-hearted, conscientious, old gentleman was he—the veriest saint in crape cannot restrain a smile, as he contemplates the conflict, in Curwen's mind, between the loyal and the patriotic—*his most gracious majesty, and his poor bleeding country!* Mr. Curwen met frequently with Mr. Benjamin Faneuil, Peter's nephew, at Bristol. Thus, on page 240, of the Journal, under date, April 28, 1780—“*Afternoon and evening at Judge Sewall's; company, Mrs. Long, of Ireland, Mr. and Mrs. Faneuil, Mr. Oxnard, with young Inman and his wife, a son of Ralph's, in the military line, and Miss Inman.*”

The more intelligent of the refugees, who resorted to Bristol, hovered about the former Attorney General of Massachusetts, Jonathan Sewall, as their *Magnus Apollo*. Of all the New England tories he was the most illustrious. He was a man of eminent talents, and easy eloquence. His opinions were the opinions of the rest. As crowed the great tory cock, so crowed the bantams, the Faneuils, the Boutineaus, and the others, around the Attorney General's hospitable board, at Bristol. I mean not to intimate, that this worthy gentleman maintained, at this period, anything, beyond the most frugal hospitality. He and his associates were mainly dependent upon the British government, for their daily bread.

One or two extracts from the letters of “*Benjamin Faneuil junior*,” Peter's nephew, while they establish this fact, may serve to exhibit the confidence, in the entire subjugation of the colonies, entertained—*cherished*, perhaps—by him and his companions.

March 9, 1777, he writes to his aunt, Mary Ann Jones, at Halifax, thus—“I cannot say I am very sorry, for your disappointment, in missing your passage for England, for unless you could bring a barrel of guineas, you are much better anywhere than here.” * * * * “As soon as the Christmas holidays were over, we presented a petition to the Lords of the Treasury, setting forth our suffering, and praying for a support, till the affairs in America are settled. This method was taken, by the council, and indeed by all the refugees. Within these few days, the Lords of the Treasury have agreed to allow, for the present, Chief Justice Oliver £400 a year, Lieut. Governor Oliver and

Mr. Flucker £300. The council (Mr. Boutineau among the rest) £200, the refugees in general £100, some only £50. Our affair is not yet absolutely determined, on account of Lord North's sickness; but we are told we shall be tucked in, between the council and the refugees, and be allowed £150 a year. This is a very poor affair, and we can by no means live upon it: but there are such a confounded parcel of us, to be provided for, that I am told no more will be allowed." * * * * "Should there be any opportunity of writing to Boston, I should take it kind, if cousin Betsey would write to my father and let him know what I now write, and give our loves to Mr. Bethune's family, and my aunt Phillips. I do not mention my poor mother, as, from the accounts I have received, I doubt, whether she be alive at this time." She died in October, 1777.

"When we shall be able to return to Boston I cannot say; but hope and believe it will not exceed one year more; for, sooner or later, America will be conquered, and on that they may depend."

May 14, 1777. He writes from London thus—"We were promised, three months ago, that some provision should be made for us; and, about ten days since, we were assured, at the Treasury, that, in a very few days, something should be done for us. As soon as there is, we propose to set out for Bristol, and fix ourselves there, or, at least, in that part of the country, till the American affairs are settled, which, from the last advice from New York, we flatter ourselves will not be longer than this year; though I am not without my doubts, at least as to the time: but submit they must, sooner or later. Mr. Boutineau and my aunt were very well, at their lodging, at Bristol, a few days ago. Mr. Robinson has bought himself a new post chaise, horses, &c., and sets out for Wales, in five or six days; where, I suppose, they will remain, till the American affairs are brought to a conclusion."

This Mr. Robinson was James Boutineau's son-in-law, the officer of the customs, who inflicted that fatal blow, upon James Otis, which is said to have affected his brain, and compelled him to retire from public life. The issue of that affair is not generally known. Mr. Sabine, in his "American Loyalists," p. 169, says—"the jury assessed £2000 sterling, damages. Boutineau appeared, as attorney, for Robinson, and, in his name, signed a submission, asking the pardon of Otis, who, thereupon, executed

a free release for the £2000." The same statement may be found in Allen, and elsewhere.

Mr. Benjamin Faneuil, junior, continues thus—"Mrs. Faneuil received a letter, a few days since, from Mrs. Erving (at Bristol). She sends her the prices of provisions, which are much the same they were in Boston, before the troubles came on. * * * * Miss Peggy Hutchinson has been at death's door. * * * * All the rest of us Yankees are well, but growl at each other most confoundedly, for want of money." * * * * "We hope to see you in Boston, in the course of another year." * * * * "Mrs. Faneuil is sitting by me, trying to transmogrify an old gown. No money to buy new."

No. CXXVI.

To some persons it has appeared a mystery, how Peter Faneuil, having had but a short lease of life, some two and forty years, should have acquired the "*large and plentiful estate*," that Master Lovell speaks of, in his funeral oration. This mystery is readily explained. He had, for several years, before the death of his uncle, Andrew, been engaged in commerce. As Master Lovell justly observes—"No man managed his affairs with greater prudence and industry." His commercial correspondence proves that his relations were extensive and diversified, though it must be admitted, that *rum, fish, sugar and molasses*, are the chorus, or burden, of the song. It will also appear, that the *large and plentiful estate*, was, probably overrated.

Though he had a high sense of commercial honor, no man had a sharper eye for the main chance, as it is called, by money getting men. Let me illustrate both these positions, by extracts—not from "*Peter's letters to his kinsfolks*," but from Peter's letters to his correspondents. He repeatedly scolds Signor Miguel Pacheco de Silva, and Monsieur Sigal, severely, for inattention to his drafts. To S. & W. Baker, of London, who, by reason of the informality of a power to transfer stock, were unsupplied with funds, to meet his drafts, yet paid them, for the honor of the drawer; he writes a letter of cordial thanks, Sept. 7, 1737, in which he says—"I would not for £500 you had not accepted all

those drafts; for, if you had not, it would have been a slur to my character, which I value more than all the money upon earth."

January 22, 1738, he requests Mr. Peter Baynton to advise him, on several points—"also what good French brandy is worth, and if it be possible to cloak it so, as to ship it for rum." On the 13th of March, in the same year, he writes Mr. Peter Baynton, that he has sent him four hogsheads of brandy, and adds—"Pray be as cautious as possible, in taking them on shore, by reason the man has signed bills of lading, for four hogsheads rum, not knowing the contents, which it is not convenient he should."

What a goodly number will openly pronounce Peter a very bad fellow, who, if they have not done this identical thing, have done things, quite as exceptionable, or more so, and who are willing to—

"Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to."

Merchant princes, if I am rightly instructed, do not place the offence of cheating the Government, in the category of cardinal, or unpardonable, sins. And, notwithstanding all, that we so frequently hear, of commercial integrity, and the chivalry of trade; I rather doubt, upon the whole, if traffic is really the "*ne plus ultra strap*," upon which the very finest possible edge can be given to the moral sense. Exceptions there are, but they only establish, more fully, the general rule: and, in accordance with the spirit of the old, prudential legend, we are rather too much in the habit of postponing prayers, till we have sanded the sugar, and watered the molasses. I have long entertained the opinion, that a cheap *vade mecum* edition of Dr. Chalmers' Commercial Discourses, for New Year's gifts, might be very beneficially distributed.

Exceptions certainly there are. I have one, within my own memory. The collector of a Southern port—a Huguenot withal—of whom my personal recollections are exceedingly agreeable, and whose integrity was a proverb, was surprised one day, upon his return, at the dinner hour, by the display of a costly service of plate, which his lady had procured from London. A few inquiries developed the fact, that, by the agency of a gentleman, a friend of the family, it had been gotten over, with his baggage, duty free—in other words, *smuggled*. In an instant,

the old gentleman ordered his wife's whole service of silver to the public stores; and seized it for the government. Such cases, I apprehend, are not of frequent occurrence.

If Peter Faneuil made not broad his phylactery, he made broad that mantle of charity, which covereth a multitude of sins. If such had not been the fact, and notoriously so, Master Lovell would not have ventured to proclaim, in Faneuil Hall, one hundred and eight years ago, and before a scanty population, as cognizant, as the population of a village, of all the shortcomings of their neighbors that—

"Peter's acts of charity were so secret and unbounded, that none but they who were the objects of it could compute the sums, which he annually distributed"—that "his alms flowed, like a fruitful river"—that "he fed the hungry, clothed the naked, comforted the fatherless, and the widows in their affliction, and his bounty visited the prisoner. So that Almighty God, in giving riches to this man, seems to have scattered blessings all abroad among the people"—that the building "erected by him at an immense charge, for the convenience and ornament of the town, is incomparably the greatest benefaction ever yet known to our Western shoar"—that this act of munificence, however great, "is but the first fruits of his generosity, a pledge of what his heart, always devising liberal things, would have done for us, had his life been spared." To all this good Master Lovell adds the assertion—*"I am well assured from those, who were acquainted with his purposes, that he had many more blessings in store for us, had Heaven prolonged his days."*

These statements, publicly pronounced, one hundred and eight years ago, have never been gainsayed, nor even qualified. They must therefore be viewed, in the light of an ancient deposition, read before the grand inquest of the whole people, before whom Peter Faneuil was tried, shortly after his decease, according to the fashion of the Egyptians, while dealing with their departed kings.

I, by no means, approve of Peter's conduct, in jostling the Government, out of the excise, on a few casks of brandy; but, in full view of all these public and private charities, there seems to be something about it, like the gallantry of Robin Hood, whose agrarian philosophy taught him to rob the rich, and feed the poor. And, when the trial comes on, in the Higher Court, about the

duties upon these four hogsheads of brandy ; and Peter Baynton is summoned to testify ; and, upon his evidence, Peter Faneuil is convicted ; most truly, do I believe, that some good natured angel, will slyly draw, over the record, a corner of that broad mantle of gold and tissue—that mantle of charity—whose warp and woof were formed of private alms and public benefactions, and which good Peter Faneuil spent so many of his hours, in weaving, in this lower world.

If Peter Faneuil was otherwise an offender, I am sorry for it ; having a passion for rarities, I should like to behold the *tabula immaculata*—the unsullied sheet of one human being ! I am not aware of anything, in the life of Peter Faneuil, which that mantle will not abundantly cover.

It may be otherwise. If the schoolmaster is not always abroad, the antiquarian is—the moral virtuoso—who delights, metaphorically speaking, to find spots on snow, and specks in amber. This species of antiquarian, male or female, may be found in every city and village. It is a curious creature, and, in the cabinet of a malicious memory, has stowed carefully away the weak points, and the peccadilloes of the living and the dead. In its contracted receptacle, there is no room for public or private charities, nor for merits of any kind : it is capable of holding nothing but delinquencies.

Nothing is more refreshing to this species of antiquarian, than any fair pretence, for opening his cabinet, and showing his precious collection. Nollkens, among his *terra cottas*, was not more adroit, in fitting the heads and members of Priapi to the trunks of fauns and satyrs, than is the ingenious character, of whom I speak, in adapting the legendary gossip, which has been told, till it is stale, of one individual, to the person of another. Such personages are, characteristically, selfish and ungenerous. It would not be a very notable miracle, if some person, of this description, pained and offended, by the trying contrast, between the munificent and charitable career of Peter Faneuil, and the extremely dry and unprofitable character of his own existence, should ransack the charnel-house of his memory, for some offensive offset, against Master Lovell's laudation of Peter.

For this I can truly vouch, excepting that affair of the brandy, the commercial correspondence of Peter Faneuil—and I have read the whole volume, that remains, French and English—is highly honorable to the head and the heart of the writer.

The charity of Peter Faneuil was not that clap-trap munificence, examples of which are frequently heralded, among us, in demi-stipendiary journals—it did not so truly *spring*—it *oozed* from Peter's warm heart, continually, and constitutionally. He required no impressive hints, to be charitable—he *felt* for the poor and needy, habitually. His letter of Sept. 19, 1738, is before me, to one of his commercial correspondents, to whom he has just then made a shipment, Mons. Thomas Bayeaux—"Inclosed you have Madame Guinneau's account, by which you are indebted to that poor widow £16, which you will do well to pay her, it being for money she advanced, for the board of you and your family. One would have thought you should have paid that, before you left the country, and not to have served the poor widow as you did."

However direct, and even severe, while addressing delinquents, his French politeness never forsakes him. Such letters always conclude—"Sir, *I salute you,*" or "*I kiss your hand.*"

April 24, 1740, he writes thus to Peter Baynton—"This accompanies Capt. Burgess Hall, who carries with him to your parts two unfortunate Palatine women, that were some time ago shipwrecked, in their voyage from Europe to your place, who, being objects of charity, which the providence of God has thrown in our way, I take leave to recommend to you, as such, not doubting you will so far commiserate their condition, as to direct them the nearest way, to get among their friends, with such other relief as you may think necessary."

Though Peter Faneuil had acquired property, before the death of his uncle Andrew; yet, as we shall presently see, by far the larger part of his "*large and plentiful estate*" came to him, by that uncle's will.

No. CXXVII.

PETER FANEUIL was thirty and seven years old, when he began to reign—that is, when his uncle, Andrew, died, Feb. 13, 1737, according to Peter, in his letter to the Bakers, of London, or 1738, agreeably to the historical style, adopted by the public journals. In the News Letter of February "16, to 23," we

have the following account of the funeral.—“Last Monday the Corpse of *Andrew Faneuil* Esquire, whose death we mentioned in our last, was honorably interr'd here; above 1100 Persons, of all Ranks, besides the Mourners, following the Corpse, also a vast number of Spectators were gathered together on the Occasion, at which time the half-minute guns, from on board several vessels, were discharged. And 'tis suppos'd that as this Gentleman's Fortune was the greatest of any among us, so his funeral was as generous and expensive as any that has been known here.”

Peter was appointed executor sole of Andrew's will, and residuary legatee. He appears to have proceeded with great propriety. He immediately announced his uncle's death to foreign correspondents; and furnished those, who had been custodiers of his property, with duly authenticated copies of the will; and took prompt measures, for the procurement of “*the handsomest mourning rings.*”

John, Archbishop of Canterbury, as was usual then, sent his commission to Judge Willard, from the Prerogative Court, to swear Peter, to render a true inventory, &c.; and Peter responded to John, that, although he was not bound so to do, by the laws of the Province, yet, for his “*own satisfaction,*” he should. Peter probably changed his mind, for no inventory of Andrew's estate appears, among the ancient records of the Probate Court, in Suffolk. It is not, therefore, possible, to estimate the value of that “*large and plentiful estate,*” which came to Peter, from his uncle. That it was very considerable, for the times, there cannot be a doubt; but the times—one hundred and fourteen years ago—were the days of small things.

It has been observed, by an eminent man, that prayer and almsgiving are the pathways to Paradise. Andrew Faneuil commences his will, with a supplication, for the *perfecting of his charities*—“*I commit my soul to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, humbly begging the pardon of my sins, the perfecting of my charities, and everlasting life above.*” This will was made, Sept. 12, 1734, and witnessed, by John Read, William Price and Charles Morris; and a codicil was added, Jan. 23, 1737; and both were proved, Feb. 15, 1737, two days after the testator's death.

Wills have ever been accounted an interesting department of *belles lettres*; and I shall therefore furnish the reader with an abstract of Uncle Andrew's.

First. He gives his warehouse in Boston, in trust, to the minister of the French Church, in Boston, and his successors; two thirds of the income for the minister's support, and one third to the elders, to create a fund for repairing the warehouse; and after the creation of such fund, the whole income to the minister; and, should the French church cease to be, then said warehouse to revert to his heirs—"excluding Benjamin Faneuil, of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever."

Secondly. To said French Church, three pieces of plate, of the value of £36 sterling, "*a flaggon for the communion table, a plate for the bread, and a bason to christen the children, with the coat of arms and name of the donor, engraven upon each of them.*" On the 27th of February, fourteen days after his uncle's death, Peter sent a copy of the will to Claude Fonnereau, in France, requesting him to purchase the plate, and added—"of the best fashion, and get engraved, agreeably to his orders, for which end you have his coat of arms in wax herewith, and if it should cost some small matter more, be pleased to charge the same."

Thirdly. £100, in Province Bills, to be paid to the elders, for the poor of the French Church.

Fourthly. £50, in Province bills, and "*a suit of mourning throughout,*" to the French minister.

Fifthly. £100, in Province bills, to the overseers, for the poor of Boston.

Sixthly. To the Rev. Benjamin Colman, "*a suit of mourning throughout.*"

Seventhly. "To my loving brother, John Faneuil, of Rochelle, £100, sterling."

Eighthly. "To my loving brother-in-law, Peter Cossart, of Cork, in Ireland, and his sister Susannah Cossart, of Amsterdam, £50 each to buy mourning."

Ninthly. "To Benjamin Faneuil of Boston, son of my brother, Benjamin Faneuil, deceased, *five shillings and no more.*"

Tenthly. To his executor, in trust, 8000 ounces of silver, or pieces of eight, to purchase an estate of inheritance, at his discretion, within one year after the testator's death, for his loving niece, Mary, wife of Gillam Phillips, and the heirs of her body, remainder to her right heirs. Peter, in correspondence with S. & W. Baker, refers to this purchase, and directs them to sell stocks of his late uncles, to meet the drafts.

Eleventhly. To her son, Andrew, 500 ounces of silver, or pieces of eight, to be put at interest, till majority—to his mother, in case of his death before—and, in case of *her* death and *his* before—to her other children.

Twelfthly, thirteenthly, and fourteenthly. To his nieces, Anne, Susannah, and Marian, £2000 sterling, each; the two first to be paid six months, after his death, and the last, at majority, or marriage; four per cent. to be allowed her, per annum, ad interim, and she to be maintained by the executor, till she attained full age, or married. These legacies were paid from the funds of Uncle Andrew, in the hands of S. & W. Baker, of London.

Fifteenthly. To his loving sister, Susannah F., widow of Abraham de la Croix, of Rochelle, £1000 sterling.

Sixteenthly. To his servant maid, *Hendrine Boyltins*, who probably came, with the family, from Holland, "*a suit of mourning throughout*," and 500 ounces of silver, in pieces of eight, or the value, in Province bills, at her election.

Seventeenthly. To Henry Johnson, her son, who became the confidential clerk of Peter Faneuil, 150 ounces, in pieces of eight, to be paid, at majority.

Eighteenthly. "I give, bequeath, and devise all the rest of my estate, both real and personal, whatsoever and wheresoever 'tis, in New England, Great Britain, France, Holland, or any other part of the world, to my loving nephew, PETER FANEUIL, eldest son of my late brother, Benjamin Faneuil, to hold to him and his heirs forever."

He then appoints Peter, sole executor.

The codicil revokes the legacy to his *loving* sister, the widow Susannah de la Croix, of Rochelle—"my mind and my will is, that my said sister, Susannah F., shall not have the said thousand pounds, *nor any part of it.*"

The severity of these five last words—and the phrase, in relation to his nephew—"excluding Benjamin Faneuil of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever;" and those final words of the ninth clause, by which the testator cuts off poor Benjamin, with "*five skillings and no more,*" are sufficiently piquant. Well may such an *avunculus Hector* commence his last will, with a fervent supplication to "God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," for the *perfecting of his charities.*

How the widow, Susannah, came to lose her thousand pounds

I do not know. Something, that she said or did, or did not say or do, was wafted, all the way over the water, from Rochelle, no doubt, and came to the old gentleman's irritable ears, and roused his ire.

But I well comprehend the occasion, upon which he came to disinherit his nephew, Benjamin Faneuil. My female readers have already arrived at the conclusion, doubtless, that Benjamin so far forgot himself, and his duty to his opulent, old uncle, as to fall in love without asking his permission. Well : they are perfectly right—such was the fact. Benjamin fell in love. He was determined not to be found, like tinkling brass, even at the hazard of losing the good will, and the gold of his uncle Andrew—so he fell in love. And, if the girl of his heart resembled her daughter, *Mary Faneuil*, as she is represented by Blackburn, how the poor fellow could have helped it, God only knows.

There is nothing, in all Amboyna, more spicy, than this little incident, in the history of the Faneuils ; and, having spoilt it, perhaps, by this *avant courier*, I will now venture to tell the story ; premising, that it was far better told, by the lady, who related it to me, and who is a lineal descendant of Benjamin, himself.

To give proper effect to this little episode, I must take the reader to a, pretty village, as it was just then beginning to be, one hundred and fifty years ago, on the banks of the Hudson, some twenty miles, only, from the city of New York. There, the persecuted Huguenots gathered together, and planted their new home, their *New Rochelle*. Almost immediately after his marriage with Anne Bureau, in 1699, at Narragansett, Benjamin Faneuil rejoined his Huguenot friends, and fellow-townsmen, in *New Rochelle* ; and there his children were born. *New Rochelle*, as I have stated, was the birth-place of PETER FANEUIL.

Andrew, having arrived in Boston from Holland, very soon after the beginning of the eighteenth century ; having buried his wife ; and being childless, selected Benjamin, the second son of his brother, Benjamin Faneuil, as an object of particular regard. The boy, was, accordingly, transferred from New Rochelle to Boston. He was educated, and brought up, under his patron's eye ; and was considered, by the world, as the heir apparent of his opulent uncle. As he grew up, towards man's estate, it would have been an unheard of circumstance, if the

dowagers of Shawmut, with their marriageable daughters, had not fixed their hopeful eyes, upon young Benjamin, if it were only for the sake of whatever might be found, sooner or later, in the mouth of his sack. It would have been a miracle, if their exhibitions of regard, for the young man, had not visibly increased; and their fears had not been frequently and feelingly expressed, lest that excellent, old gentleman, Andrew Faneuil Esquire, had taken cold.

A patron is rather too prone to look upon a *protégé*, as a puppet. The idea, that Benjamin could be led astray, however tempting the provocation, to commit the crime of matrimony, however lawful and right, however accomplished, and virtuous, and lovely the object, without leave, first had and obtained, from him, at whose board he ate his daily bread, never occurred to Uncle Andrew, for an instant. He supposed, of course, that he had the key to Benjamin's soul. It never occurred to the old gentleman, whose courtship was carried on, in Holland, that falling in love was precisely as much of an accident, as falling into the fire, or into the water.

Well: Benjamin was an intelligent young man; and he was admirably posted up, upon the subject of his uncle's opinions, and prejudices. Nevertheless, he fell in love, very emphatically; and with a girl, as pretty, doubtless, as she was poor. He knew, that his uncle would never consent to such a marriage. But he knew, that he had plighted his troth; and he clearly saw, since he must run the hazard of breaking *one* heart, or *two*, that it would be rather more equitable to risk the old gentleman's, instead of the girl's and his own.

Accordingly, Benjamin secretly took unto himself a lawful wife; and, for a while, though Benjamin was, doubtless, much the happier, Uncle Andrew was nothing the wiser. However strange it may appear, though there were no giants, there were mischievous women, in those days. One of this category, in an evil hour, like a toad, as she was, whispered the secret, into the ear of Uncle Andrew.

The old Huguenot was not of the melting mood. The conduct of his nephew produced not grief, but anger. It reached no tender spot, in the recesses of his heart, but chafed the old man's pericardium, till it drew a blister there. He bottled up his wrath, and corked it well; that the offender might have the full benefit of the fermentation, when the old gentleman came

to pour the contents of the vial, on the devoted head of his unsuspecting nephew.

The following morning, they met, at the breakfast table. The meal passed, as usual. But with what feelings must that old man have contemplated the poor fellow, the boy of his adoption, whom he was about to prostrate, as he finished the last mouthful he was ever to partake at that board! The repast was finished. —A brief colloquy ensued—“*I hear you are married*”—“*Yes, uncle, I am*”—“*Then you will leave my house.*” The young man instantly took his departure. They never met again, until years had passed away,—and then, in that place, where there is no work nor device. There they lie, in the Faneuil tomb, in the Granary Ground; the unforgiving uncle and the disinherited nephew, side by side. Benjamin Faneuil died, at his residence in Brighton, in October, 1785, and was buried, in the family vault.

No. CXXVIII.

NOTWITHSTANDING the “*large and plentiful estate*,” which Peter Faneuil derived from his uncle’s will, it is my opinion, that his munificence, his unbounded charities, his hospitalities, his social, genial temperament were such, that, had he lived a much longer life, he would have died a much poorer man. Almost immediately, upon the death of his uncle, it is manifest, from his letters, that certain magnificent fancies came over the spirit of his waking dreams. And it is equally certain, that, subsequently, he had occasional misgivings, as to the just relation between his means and his prospective arrangements, which, for the times, and upon our little peninsula, were sufficiently expanded.

Feb. 27, 1737, fourteen days after his uncle’s death, he announced that event to his commercial friends, Messrs. S. & W. Baker of London; prescribed the arrangement of funds, for the payment of legacies; and instructed them to honor his draft, in favor of James Pope & Company, of Madeira, in payment for five pipes of wine.

Four days after, on the first of March, he writes Pope & Company thus—“Send me, by the very first opportunity, for this

place, five pipes of your very best Madeira wine, of an amber color, of the same sort, which you sent to our good friend, De Lancey, of New York."

He directs them to draw on the Bakers of London, and adds—"As this wine is for the use of my house, I hope you will be careful, that I have the best. I am not over fond of the strongest. I am to inform you, that my uncle, Mr. Andrew Fan-euil, departed this life, the 13 current, and was interred the 20, for which God prepare all his friends. I shall expect to hear from you, by the first opportunity."

Feb. 27, 1737, the same day, on which he writes the Bakers, he addresses Lane & Smethurst, of London, as follows—"Be so good as to send me a handsome chariot with two sets of harness, with the arms, as enclosed, on the same, in the handsomest manner, that you shall judge proper, but at the same time nothing gaudy: and send me also, well recommended, two sober men, the one, for a coachman the other a gardener; and agree with the same, to be paid either in London, quarterly, or here, allowing for the exchange of the money, which they shall choose. And, as most servants from Europe, when here, are too apt to be debauched with strong drink, rum, &c., being very plenty, I pray your particular care in this article."

On the 6th of March, he writes Gulian Verplanck, of New York—"Send me the pipe of wine, having none good to drink." Again, March 20—"By the first good opportunity the best pipe of wine you can purchase." On the 25th of April, he acknowledges the receipt of the wine from Verplanck—"The wine I hope will prove good—comes in very good time, there being none good in town."

On the 22d of May, he writes the Bakers, for a bountiful supply of glass and China, and for "enough of the best scarlet cloth to trim a cloak:" and, in September of that year, for silver spoons and "silver forks with three prongs, with my arms cut upon them: let them be made very neat and handsome." Shortly after, he writes for several pairs of silver candlesticks, "with my arms engraved thereon," and sends out a piece of wax candle, as a pattern of the size.

On the 1st of January, 1738, he writes Lane & Smethurst, to send him a pair of spectacles, "for a person of 50 years, as also, for the use of my kitchen, the latest, best book of the several sorts of cookery, which pray let be of the largest char-

acter, for the benefit of the maid's reading." As Peter then was not quite thirty-eight years of age, the spectacles were probably for "the maid," to enable her to master "the *best book of the several sorts of cookery.*"

Dec. 20, 1738, he writes for "four stone horses." On the 18th of September of that year, he writes Thomas Kilby—"Pray dont forget the larding pins, wine, and sweetmeats, which I have wrote you about before." He frequently writes to his friend Verplanck, for "Albany horses."

In a brief sketch of Brighton, published in 1850, it is stated that Peter's "*large and heavy silver punch bowl*" is in the possession of George Bethune, Esquire, of this city. This is an error. Peter's punch bowl came into the possession of James Lovell, who married a grand-daughter of Benjamin Faneuil, a sister of Mr. Bethune; and it is now in the possession of Mr. Lovell's descendants.

Oh, if that "*large and heavy silver punch bowl*" could speak out, in good French or English, what glorious tales it would tell of Peter, in all his glory, enjoying, as Master Lovell says, "*that divine satisfaction, which results from communicating happiness to others*"—around that preëminently hospitable board, where, in the language of the writer of the obituary, in the News Letter of March 10, 1743—

"Divites ac parvi gustârunt dulcia menseæ."

Peter's punch bowl was not at all like Oliver's "*broken tea-cups, wisely kept for show.*" June 22, 1741, some twenty months before his death, he writes Lane & Smethurst, to send him "*six gross of the very best London King Henry's Cards, and six half chests of lemons, for my house winter supply.*"

Let not the reader surmise, for all this, that Peter had denied his Lord, or was exclusively absorbed in his care for creature comforts. March 5, 1738, he writes the Bakers, to send him "four handsome, large, octavo, Common Prayer Books, of a good letter and well bound, with one of the same, in French, for my own use."

March 13, 1738, he writes John Depuister, to send him "six of the largest bearskins, and two large, fine, well painted beaver coats, to use in a slay."

It is, in no sense, discreditable to Peter Faneuil, that his correspondence shows him to have been exceedingly partial to

sweetmeats and citron water. Nor does it lower him, in my humble esteem, that his letters clearly indicate his temperament to have been somewhat irritable and fiery. I have found such to be the case, almost ever, when generosity, frankheartedness, and a noble spirit are blended together, as closely as they were, in the character of Peter Faneuil. The converse of this position, to be sure, it is not easy to maintain.

It is quite amusing, to contemplate, now and then, in men, whose brains are brim full of magnificent purposes, and whose habitual dealings are with tens and hundreds of thousands—a remarkable concentration of thought and care, upon some one insignificant item of property, which is in jeopardy of falling into naught. It is, doubtless, the spirit of the woman, who lighted her candle and swept the house, and called her neighbors together, to rejoice with her, over the recovery of that one piece of silver.

A brief episode will exhibit this trait, in Peter's character, and show, at the same time, that his spirit was perfectly placable. Some time before his death, Uncle Andrew, being aware, that pulmonic affections were benefited, by the air of the tropics, consigned a broken-winded horse to Mr. Joseph Ward, of Barbadoes, for sale. No account having been rendered, the fate of the old horse appears to have become a subject of exciting interest, with the residuary legatee. Before he writes to Ward, he addresses three letters of inquiry, in other directions. He then opens upon Mr. Joseph Ward, Jan. 12, 1738. I give the entire letter, as illustrative of Peter's character—"I have been very much surprised, that, ever since the death of Captain Allen, you have not advised me of the sale of a horse, belonging to my deceased uncle, left in your hands by him, which I am informed you sold for a very good price, and I am now to request the favor you would send me the net proceeds, with a fair and just account for the same, in sweetmeats and citron water; your compliance with which will stop me from giving some of my friends the trouble of calling you to an account there. I shall be glad to know, if Captain Allen did not leave a silver watch and some fish, belonging to a servant of mine, with some person of your island, and with who. I expect your speedy answer."

Mr. Ward appears to have responded, more calmly, than tropical gentlemen commonly do, when accosted in this piquant style. He sent his account, and Peter was manifestly mollified, by a box

of sweetmeats. Mr. Ward, however, complained of Peter's want of grace. March 24, 1738, Peter wrote to Mr. Ward—"Yours of 7 February, with the account sales of a horse, left by Captain Allen, accompanying a box sweetmeats I received, in which I observe you refer to my former, which you are pleased to look upon as in too unhandsome a stile. I must own it was not in so soft terms, as I sometimes make use of; but, at that time, I really thought the state of the case required it, not having heard anything to be depended upon, concerning the horse in dispute, either if he was dead, sold, or run away; upon either of which, I presumed the common complaisance, if not honor, among merchants, might have entitled either my uncle, in his lifetime, or myself, after his decease, to some advice at least. I had indeed transiently heard here you had kept him, for your own use, but had undervalued him, which, in some measure prest my writing you on that head, &c. I thank you for your speedy answer, and am, with return of your own compliment, as much as you are mine," &c.

March 6, 1737.—Peter informs M. Isaac Beauchamp, that, he, Peter, has been empowered, by his Excellency, M. Brouillon, Governor of Cape Breton, to call him to account and says—"I am now to let you know, that out of honor and of the regards I have ever had to that gentleman, I am obliged to see some honorable issue made to that affair, for which reason I shall be glad you will advise me, after what manner you propose to satisfy the gentleman or me, without forcing violente means." This affair was occasioned, by a dispute, about tobacco, and ended in smoke.

One brief illustration more. April 6, 1738, he complains to Captain Greenou of certain ill usage and says—"You may see what handsome parcell of protested bills I must pay. If this be the honor of you Ragon men, God deliver me from them, for the future. I would not take their word for a groat &c. These pretended gentlemen think I will tamely sit down by their unhand-some usage, but they will find themselves very much mistaken," &c.

Many years ago, while standing by the artist, as he was working up, from the old portrait, belonging to the Historical Society, the lineaments of Peter, as he is represented, in Faneuil Hall, we agreed, that his temperament must have been choleric. He had that conformation of body, which hints of apoplexy. John,

his uncle, the Rocheller, died of that disease; and Peter, as Master Lovell inform us, died *suddenly*. He belonged not to any total abstinence society. And though there is no evidence, nor the slightest suspicion, that he fell below that standard of gentlemanly temperance, which was in vogue, among those, who were given to hospitality, in our peninsula, one hundred years ago—yet I have not any reasonable doubt, that Peter would have lived longer, had it been the pleasure of his uncle Andrew to have disinherited *him*, instead of *his brother Benjamin*.

No. CXXIX.

PETER FANEUIL was an affectionate brother. I have it from the lips of Benjamin's lineal descendants, who have preserved the tradition, that, after he had sacrificed his hopes of the inheritance, not for a mess of pottage, but for a lovely wife; and Peter had been called from New Rochelle, to supply his place, as the heir apparent; uncle Andrew, probably, without exacting an absolute promise, enjoined it upon Peter, to abstain from assisting Benjamin; to which injunction Peter paid no practical regard whatever; but, like a Christian brother, remembered, that old Benjamin Faneuil and Anne Bureau had been the father and the mother of them both. The commercial correspondence shows, that Peter gave Benjamin his confidence and affection. The relation between them plainly demonstrates, that there was no deficiency of kind and generous offices.

The ease and intimacy of their friendship will be perceived, by the following note, which I copy literally from the original, in my possession. There was a difference of eighteen months only, in their ages. In this note, which was written, after Benjamin's return from Europe, Peter addresses him, by a cant name. "Boston the 18 August, 1741. Dear Cockey: The Occasion of my not Sending my Chase for you was on Account of Mr. Shirley's receiving of his Majties Commission Last Thursday appointing him Govr of this Province wh. was read the Next day, upon which Occasion he ask't me to Loane of my Charrot wh. I granted him till Last Night, so that I presume will plede my xcuse. I now Send you up the Chase, to bring you home,

and have deliver'd ye Coachman Some Boild Beef, a dozen of brown biskett 6 bottles of Madera and 2 of Frontinan with adozen of Lemmons. Your relations and friends are all well, and desire their Love and service may be made acceptable to you. pray my Compliments to the Gentn and Ladys with you—and give me Leave to assure you that I am, Dear Cockey, Your Affectionate Brother, Peter Faneuil."

The superscription of this note is torn off, but to Benjamin alone can it apply. Mr. Jones was not married, till after Peter's death. His relation to Phillips was rather formal; and still more so with Boutineau; and he never would have thought of calling his brother Addington Davenport, the Rector of Trinity, his *dear cockey*. His letters also record the evidences of his kindness to his sisters, and his attention to their most trifling wishes. Nov. 24, 1736, he writes Lynch and Blake—"My youngest sister desires, that you wont forget to send her the Canary birds, which you promised her, when you was here." May 16, 1736, he writes Lane and Smethurst of London—"My sisters have received their things, in good order and to their liking, except the stockings: for the Hosier put up white worsted, instead of thread, although the patern was sent. I have sent them back to you to be changed, in the ship Union, John Homans, master. Be pleased to send them, by the first opportunity: viz, for Mrs. Anne Faneuil, 3 pairs thread hose, with worsted clogs, and a pair of, Galoushoses. Mrs. Susannah Faneuil, 2 pairs thread ditto. Mrs. Mary Anne Faneuil, 4 pairs thread stockings, and 3 pairs clogs." It is of small moment, at this late day, whether these ladies wore thread or worsted stockings, one hundred and fourteen years ago; but this ancient example of brotherly regard may not be altogether lost, upon the race of brothers, that has sprung up, during the present century. It is remarkable, that Peter, though he applies the title, *Mrs.* to each of his sisters, gives them the maiden name. The two, first named, were then the wives of Addington Davenport and James Boutineau; the last, Mary Ann, afterwards the wife of John Jones, was then single.

At that early day, the moral sense of the people of the North appears to have been thoroughly asleep, on the subject of slavery. The reverend clergy were no exception from the general rule. After the decease of Parson Moorhead, in 1774, a slave was sold, among his effects, "at his late residence, near

Liberty Tree." Jonny Moorhead was a cotemporary of Peter Faneuil, having assumed the charge of the Presbyterian Church, as it then was, in 1730. The reader will not be startled, therefore, when he comes to be informed, as, in good time he will be, at how many pounds, old tenor, each of Peter Faneuil's five slaves were appraised, after his decease. Slavery was not uncommon then, in the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Douglass, in his Summary, vol. i. page 351, states, that in 1735, about seven years before Peter's death, the whole number of whites, of 16 years and upwards, in the Province, was 35,427; and of negroes, 2600.

Feb. 3, 1738. Peter Faneuil writes thus, to Peter Buckley—"Herewith you have invoice of six hogshheads fish and eight barrells of alewives, amounting to £75.9.2, which, when you arrive at Antigua, be pleased to sell, for my best advantage, and, with the nett produce of the same, purchase, for me, for the use of my house, as likely a strait negro lad as possibly you can, about the age of from 12 to 15 years; and, if to be done, one that has had the small-pox, who being for my own service, I must request the favor, you would let him be one of as tractable a disposition as you can find, which I leave to your prudent care and management, desiring, after you have purchased him, you would send him to me, by the first good opportunity, recommending him to a particular care, from the captain." I have no doubt, that Peter was a kind, considerate master; and, though I have an unconquerable aversion to being the slave of anybody, I had rather have been Peter's *born thrall* than his *uncle Andrew*. What a glorious kitchen Peter's must have been!

My female readers will scarcely find it in their eyelids to be weary, or in their hearts to blame me, for giving them one or two passages more, from Peter Faneuil's letters; when they are told, that those passages relate to a love affair, in which Peter, though not a principal, performed an important part.

The Faneuils and the Jekylls were intimate—so much so, at least, as to bring the Jekylls within the circle of those, who, upon Uncle Andrew's death, were accounted the legitimate recipients of mourning rings. In a letter to Mr. Joseph Jekyll, of Jan. 22, 1738, Peter alludes to Miss Jekyll's extraordinary conduct; and, most happily and truthfully, remarks, that "*there is no accounting for the sex, in affairs of love.*" On the same day, he writes Mr. Richard Blacket Jekyll—"Doubtless, you'll be

surprised to find, that, by this opportunity, only your sister, Mrs. Hannah, of the family, who I hope will arrive safe to you, has the pleasure of seeing you, and her other brothers, in England. I am sorry Mrs. Mary does not consult her own interest, so much, as I could wish, whose conduct I should say nothing of, were it not out of regard to the family in general. It is now only one month past, since she suffered herself to be published to one Mr. Linnington, of St. Christophers, formerly known here, by the name of My Lord Linnington, or My Lord, whose character, if you remember the man, I need not trouble you with a description of it; but, if you do not, I can only say, that he is a worthless pretender to a great deal of money and wit, without, according to the best account I can learn, any of either: with whom she would, inevitably have been married, had not some other friends joined forces with me, and interposed."

"Inclosed I send you my letter to her, on that head, and her answer, for your more private satisfaction. That affair being tolerably well over, and Captain Homan's state-room hired for the two young ladies, and their maid, I had supplied them, according to your desire, with what money they might have occasion for, to fit them out for the voyage, and paid the captain, for their laying in, and tomorrow being the appointed time to go aboard, I was, in the morning, advised Mrs. Mary had changed her mind, on account of some new proposals of matrimony, made her, by Col. Saltonstall of Haverhill, which sudden alteration, I find to be, on examination, from a visit or two, within these two or three days last past, at farthest, but, however, concluded upon and determined, so that she does not come to you," &c., &c.

Peter proceeds to comment, with great discretion, upon the absence of any reasonable interval, for the heart of Miss Mary Jekyll to recover its due tone and tension, after its first expansion towards *My Lord Linnington*, and before the second spasm. But, truly, in the language of the anatomist, the heart is a "wonderful muscle."

I had surmised a relation of consanguinity between Peter Faneuil and the late Peter Chardon Brooks, from the fact, that, on the 29th of March, 1737, Peter Faneuil writes to the executors of Isaac Chardon, in South Carolina, whom he calls his cousin; and, in that letter, speaks of his cousin, *Peter Chardon*. But, from the best authority, I have learned, that the name of Pe-

ter Chardon was bestowed, by the Rev. Edward Brooks, formerly of North Yarmouth, and more recently of Medford, upon his son, *causa amicitiae*; the Rev. Mr. Brooks and Peter Chardon, having been classmates, of the year 1757. It was, probably, the father of this Peter Chardon, whom Peter Faneuil calls his cousin, in 1737, and the same Peter Chardon, who is named, on the record, as one of the appraisers of Peter Faneuil's estate, in 1742-3. The name is rare; it occurs once only, on the Cambridge Catalogue; and, from its rarity, it may not be unreasonable, to look for the *stirps*, on the pages of Charlevoix, iii. 392, who speaks of *Peter Chardon*, the Jesuit, a missionary, among the Indians, bordering upon Lake Michigan, at the very close of the seventeenth century. Our Peter Chardon, the cousin of Faneuil, resided in Bowdoin Square, near the street, that bears his name.

After the death of his uncle Andrew, Peter Faneuil, by the power of wealth, in addition to his other qualities, intelligence, industry, and courtesy, necessarily became an influential character; and the use, which he immediately began to make of his wealth, his public spirit, his private benevolence, all conspired to make him an object of very general interest. His hospitalities were unbounded. He associated himself with the Episcopal Church. He subscribed £2000 old tenor, £200 sterling for the rebuilding of King's Chapel, in 1740, and was chosen treasurer of the building fund. His death, in 1742-3, put a stop to the project. No money had ever been collected, for that object. In 1747, the project was revived. New subscriptions were solicited, and the old ones demanded, "*at the end of this year 1748.*" Peter Faneuil died March 3, 1742-3, and had therefore been dead, between five and six years. "For the subscription of Peter Faneuil," says Mr. Greenwood, in his history of the Chapel, "they were unfortunately obliged to sue his brother, and executor, Benjamin Faneuil, from whom, after a disagreeable lawsuit, they at last recovered it." Mr. Greenwood erred, in the supposition, that Peter left a will. He died intestate, and administration was granted to Benjamin, March 18, 1742, old style. The estate, of course, had been settled, doubtless, some years before the demand on the administrator, "*at the end of 1748.*" Having other heirs to consult, he very properly resisted this tardy and unexpected claim; and cast the responsibility upon the court.

For several years, Peter Faneuil worshipped in Trinity Church,

of which his brother-in-law, Addington Davenport, became rector, in 1740. Peter's pew, in Old Trinity, was No. 40. He was an active and liberal member of the Episcopal Charitable Society. "Mr. Faneuil," says the late Dr. Boyle, "was one of the earliest members of the society. He was a liberal subscriber to its funds, and acted, as a trustee of the institution."

Peter Faneuil's heart was proverbially warm, and sensitive to the necessities and distresses of his *neighbor*; and he seems to have cherished the true scriptural construction of that *ubiquitary* word. The accession of wealth, upon his uncle's death, hardened not his heart, but gave it a deeper, fuller, and stronger pulse, upon every call of charity. To him, as to other men, who admit their motives to be human, upon common occasions, the applause of the *wise* and *good* was exceedingly agreeable. Whatever the prominence of higher and holier considerations, he turned a willing and a grateful ear to the approbation of the judicious and upright. Not contented with the opportunities of doing good, on a small scale, which were, doubtless, frequently presented, before a man, whose wealth and warmheartedness were equally notorious; he coveted some fair occasion, for pouring forth of his abundance, in a more magnificent manner—pleased—naturally and justifiably pleased—with the thought, that his name and his memory would be associated with the deed, in after times.

No. CXXX.

ONE may, as successfully, search for that identical peck of pickled peppers, that Peter Piper picked, as for the original Hall, that Peter Faneuil built. Like Rachel's first born, *it is not*. After all the reparations, and changes, and hard hammerings she has undergone, we may as well search, within the walls of Old Ironsides, for those very ribs of live oak, which, some fifty years ago, were launched, in the body of the frigate Constitution.

In the olden time, the market men, like the mourners, went "about the streets." The inhabitants were served, at their doors. As early as 1634, Gov. Winthrop, in his journal, speaks

of a market, which was kept in Boston, "on Thursday, the fifth day of the week." This weekly market on the fifth day is mentioned, by Douglass, as of 1639, vol. i. p. 434. This, I think, refers only to a gathering of sellers and buyers, at one spot, and not to any "visible temple," for storage and shelter. Citizens differed, as to the best method of getting their *provant*; some preferred the old mode, as it was supposed to save time; others were in favor of having a common point, with a covered building. Parties were formed; the citizens waxed wroth; and quarrelled about their meat, like angry dogs. Those, who were in favor of market-houses, prevailed. Three were erected; one, at the Old North Square—one, where Faneuil Hall now stands—and one, near Liberty Tree. People were no longer supplied, at their houses.

It seems very strange, that this sensible arrangement should have led to violent outrage. The malcontents assembled together, in the night, "disguised like clergymen"—the devil, sometimes assumes this exterior—and "totally demolished the centre market-house." This occurred, about the year 1736-7, or about the time of Andrew Faneuil's death. Such is the account of good old Thomas Pemberton. M. H. C. iii. 255.

The popular sentiment prevented the reconstruction of the centre market-house, till, in 1740, July 14, a town meeting was held to consider a petition, for this object, from Thomas Palmer and 340 others. At this meeting, it was stated, that Peter Faneuil had offered, at his own cost, to build a market-house, on the town's land, in Dock Square, for the use of the town, if the citizens, would legally empower him so to do; place the same under proper regulations; and maintain it, for that use.

An impression has, somewhat extensively, prevailed, that Mr. Faneuil's proposal was not courteously received, by his fellow-citizens, and that a majority of seven only were in favor of it.

On the contrary, Mr. Faneuil's proposal was received, with the most ample demonstrations of grateful respect. There were two questions before the meeting—first: shall a vote of thanks be passed to Peter Faneuil, for his liberal offer? Secondly: shall we give up the itinerant system, and have a market-house, on *any* conditions? Upon the first question, there was but *one* mind—on the second, there were *two*. A vote of thanks to Mr. Faneuil was instantly passed, without a dissentient. But the

second question was the vexed question, revived, and excited the passions of the people. Of 727 persons present, 367 only voted in favor of granting the petition of Palmer and others, giving a majority of seven only.

Accordingly, the work was commenced; and it was completed, Sept. 10, 1742, "on which day," says Dr. Snow, "Mr. Samuel Ruggles, who was employed, in building the market house, waited on the selectmen, by order of P. Faneuil, Esq., and delivered them the key of said house."

Peter was a magnificent fellow. An antiquarian friend, to whom the fancy has lineally descended, through a line of highly respectable, antiquarian ancestors, informs me, that his father handed down to him a tradition, which is certainly plausible. It runs thus: while the market-house was in progress—probably on paper—it was suggested to Peter, that, with very little additional expense, a splendid town hall might be constructed over it. Peter's heart was quite as *roomy* as the market-house, and town hall together, and he cheerfully embraced the suggestion. The tradition goes a little farther—when the cost was summed up, Peter scolded—a little. Very likely. Mr. Peter Faneuil was not an exception, I presume, to the common rule.

The keys, as I have stated, were presented to the town, Sept. 10, 1742, with all that courtesy, doubtless, for which he was remarkable. Peter's relatives and connections are somewhat numerous. The descendants of Benjamin his brother are scattered over the country. It will be equally grateful to them, and honorable to our forefathers, to exhibit a portion of the record.

Sept. 13, 1742, at a meeting, in the new hall, a vote of thanks was moved, by the Hon. John Jeffries, uncle of the late Dr. John Jeffries. In this vote, it is stated, that, whereas Peter Faneuil has, "at a very great expense, erected a noble structure, far exceeding his first proposal, inasmuch, as it contains, not only a large and sufficient accommodation for a market place, but a spacious and most beautiful town hall over it, and several other convenient rooms, which may prove very beneficial to the town, for offices or otherwise. And the said building being now finished, he has delivered possession thereof to the selectmen for the use of the town; it is therefore voted, that the town do, with the utmost gratitude, receive and accept this most generous and noble benefaction, for the use and intentions it is designed for; and do appoint the Hon. Thomas Cushing Esquire, the modera-

tor of this meeting, the Hon. Adam Winthrop, Edward Hutchinson, Ezekiel Lewis, and Samuel Waldo, Esquires, Thomas Hutchinson, Esq. the selectmen and representatives of the town of Boston, the Hon. Jacob Wendell, James Bowdoin, Esq., Andrew Oliver, Esq., Captain Nathaniel Cunningham, Peter Char-don, Esq., and Mr. Charles Apthorp, to wait upon Peter Faneuil, Esq., and in the name of the town, to render him their most hearty thanks, for so bountiful a gift, with their prayers, that this and other expressions of his bounty and charity may be abundantly recompensed with the divine blessing."

In addition to this vote, the citizens passed another, that the hall should be called Faneuil Hall, forever; and that the portrait of Faneuil should be painted, at full length, and placed therein. On the 14th of March, 1744, a vote was passed "to purchase the Faneuil arms, carved and gilt, by Moses Deshon, to be fixed in the hall."

Pemberton says—"Previous to the Revolution, the portraits of Mr. Faneuil, General Conway, and Colonel Barré were procured by the town, and hung up in the hall. It is supposed they were carried off by the British." The portrait of Faneuil at present, in the hall, was painted by Henry Sargent, from the portrait, presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society, by Miss Jones, a grandchild of Peter's sister, Mary Ann.

The original building was but half the width of the present, and but two stories high. The hall could contain but 1000 persons. In the memorable fire of Tuesday, Jan. 13, 1761, Faneuil Hall was destroyed, and nothing left standing but the walls. On the 23d of the following March, the town voted to rebuild, and the State authorized a lottery, to meet the expense. There were several classes. A ticket, of the seventh class, lies before me, bearing date March, 1767, with the spacious autograph of John Hancock, at the bottom.

The building retained its primitive proportions, till 1806, when, the occasions of the public requiring its enlargement, its width was increased, from 40 to 80 feet, and a third story added. A very simple rule may be furnished, for those, who would compare the size of the present building, with that of the genuine Peter Faneuil Hall. Take a northeast view of the Hall—there are seven windows before you, in each story—run a perpendicular line, from the ground, through the centre of the middle window to the top of the belt, at the bottom of the third story—carry

a straight line from that point nearly to the top of the second window, on the right, in the third story. That point is the apex of the old pediment. From that point, draw the corresponding roof line down to the belt, at the corner; and you have a profile of the ancient structure; all which is well exhibited by Dr. Snow, on the plan, in his History of Boston.

Small as the original structure may appear, when compared with the present, it was a magnificent donation, for the times. It may well be considered a munificent gift, from a single individual, in 1742, when we consider, that its repairs, in 1761, were accomplished, by the aid of the Commonwealth, and the creation of a lottery, which continued to curse the community, for several years.

Peter Faneuil was then in all his glory. How readily, by the power of Imagination, I raise him from the dead, bolt upright; with his over portly form, and features full of *bon homie*; speaking volumes, about those five pipes of amber-colored Madeira, such as his friend Delancey had; and that best book of all sorts of cookery, of a large character, for the maid's reading! There he is, at the door of his English chariot, "handsome, but nothing gaudy," with his arms thereon, and his English coachman, and his English horses, and that "strait negro lad" perched behind. I see him now, helping in Miss Mary Anne, his youngest maiden sister; and, as he ascends the steps, wrapping his cloak around him, trimmed with that identical "*scarlet cloth of the very best quality*."

The vanity of man's anticipations, the occasional suddenness of his summons away—seldom find a more graphic illustration, than in the case of this noble hearted, and most hospitable gentleman. When he received the grateful salutations of the magnates of the town, who came to thank him, for his munificence, what could have been so little in his thoughts, or in theirs, as the idea, that he was so soon to die!

In about five years—five, short, luxurious years—after the death of Andrew Faneuil, Peter, his favorite nephew, was committed to the ground, March 10, 1742, old style. The event, from its suddenness, and from the amiable and benevolent character of the individual, produced a deep sensation, in the *village*, for Boston was nothing but a seashore village then. In 1728, some fourteen years before, we learn from Douglass, i. 531, that there were but 3000 rateable polls, on the peninsula. This

event was unexpected, by the living, and had been equally unexpected, by the dead. Death came to Peter, like a thief in the still night. He had not looked for this unwelcome visitor. He had made no will. By this event, Benjamin came into possession; and old Andrew is supposed to have turned over, indignantly, in his coffin.

No. CXXXI.

To such of my readers, as the Lord has abundantly blessed, in their basket and their store, and who have loaned him very little, on his simple promise, to be repaid, in Paradise; and who are, peradventure, at this very moment, excogitating revengeful wills; the issue of uncle Andrew's vindictive, posthumous arrangements may prove a profitable lesson, for their learning. Verily, God's ways are not as our ways, nor God's will as Uncle Andrew's.

It may be remembered, that, in the devise of his warehouse, in trust, for the benefit of the French Church, Andrew Faneuil provided, that, in the event of the extinction of that church, the estate should revert to his *right heirs—excluding Benjamin Faneuil, of Boston, and the heirs of his body forever*, whom he cuts off, as the popular phrase runs, with "*five shillings, and no more.*" In passing along, it may not be amiss to notice this popular error. The law has, at no time, required the bequest of a farthing, to one, near of kin, whom the testator intends to cut off. It is enough, if it be manifest, that the testator has *not forgotten him*; and, to leave no possible doubt upon the subject, a churlish curmudgeon, as in the present case, will transmit, in this offensive manner, the record of his vindictiveness and folly, to future generations.

When Andrew Faneuil makes Peter his residuary legatee, there is no provision, for the exclusion of Benjamin, in the event of Peter's death, without heirs of his body. Prepared, as this amiable, old gentleman was, to believe, in the possible extinction of the French Church, he seems to have looked upon Peter, an inveterate old bachelor, as immortal. Yet, in regard to Peter, the issue hung, by a single hair. There was no child, with

the cup in his hand, to catch the ball, and prevent it from lapsing directly into Benjamin's sack, who, with his sisters, stood close at hand, the next of kin to Peter, and heirs at law.

Well: as I have said, God's will was not as Uncle Andrew's. After a few flying years, during which Peter executed the intentions of the testator, with remarkable fidelity; and lived, as magnificently, as a nobleman, and as hospitably, as a bishop, and, as charitably, as an apostle—suddenly, the silver cord was loosed, and the golden bowl was broken, and Peter dropped into the grave. The title of Benjamin and his sisters to all Peter's estate, and to all Andrew's estate, that remained, as the heirs at law of Peter, passed into them, through the atmosphere, at once; and Andrew's will, by the act of God, was set aside, in the *upper Court*.

Administration was granted to Benjamin, March 18, 1742, O. S., who returned an inventory, April 21, 1744. The appraisers of the estate were William Price, Joseph Dowse, and Peter Chardon; and the sum total of their valuation was £44,451. 15. 7. This, certainly, will incline the reader to Master Lovell's idea, of "*a large and plentiful estate*," until I add those words of withering import—*Old Tenor*. Sterling decimates old tenor with a vengeance—*ten* pounds, old tenor, were but *one* pound, sterling. The valuation, therefore, amounted to about £4,445 sterling, or, in dollars, at five to the pound, to \$22,225. It may seem rather surprising, that the balance, which fell to Peter, from his uncle, under the will, and his own accumulations, should amount to no more. But a few reflections may tend to moderate our surprise.

The estate of his uncle had been seriously diminished, by the payment of legacies, £2,000 stg. to each of his three nieces, \$30,000—more than \$8,000 to his niece, Marie Phillips; and about \$2,000, in smaller legacies, raising the amount of legacies to \$40,000. He had also given his warehouse, in King Street, to the French Church. These legacies Peter had paid. He had also built and presented the Market-house and the Hall to the town. But there is another important consideration. Funds still remained, in other countries, part and parcel of Andrew's property. This is evident, from an original document before me, the marriage settlement of Peter's sister, Mary Anne with John Jones, bearing date March 15, 1742, the very month of Peter's death. This document recites, that one part of her estate, as one of the heirs of Peter Faneuil, "*is in Public Funds, such as*

the Bank of England." As this does not figure in Benjamin's inventory here, it is impossible to say what was the amount of foreign funds, which Peter owned, at the time of his death. For some five years, while he had been living, in a style of unbounded hospitality, he had also enjoyed the luxury of doing good, and paid, most liberally, for that enjoyment. From his commercial correspondence, I infer, that his enterprise suffered no material abatement, after his uncle's decease.

I cannot doubt, that his free expenditure of money, for his personal enjoyment, the gratification of his pride, and the pleasure of ministering to the wants of the poor and needy, had lessened, and was lessening, from month to month, the amount of his estate. There is yet another consideration, which belongs to this account, the great disparity, between the value of money, then, and at the present day.

The items, or particular heads, of the inventory, are one hundred and fifty-eight; and cover near four folio pages of the record. Some of them may not be wholly uninteresting to the reader. The mansion-house, the same, as I have stated, in which Lieutenant Governor Billy Phillips lived and died, and Isaiah Doane before him, the extensive garden, outhouses and yard were appraised, one hundred and eight years ago, at £12,375, or £1,237 stg., about \$6,185, at five dollars to the pound. Fourteen hundred ounces of plate, at £2,122 10. This plate was divided into five parts, for the brother, and four sisters of the deceased. A memorandum lies upon my table, labelled, in the original hand of Gillam Phillips—"An account of my proportion of plate, belonging to the estate of Peter Faneuil, Esq., deceased." This document contains a list of "*Gillam Phillips' Lot*," and side by side—"a coffee pot—a large, handsome chamber pot." They made a free use of the precious metals, in those days.

A parcel of jewels are appraised, at £1,490—1 white horse, £15—2 Albany horses, £100—2 English horses, £250—2 other English horses, £300—4 old and 4 new harnesses, £120—2 pairs runners, £15—1 four-wheel chaise, £150—1 two-wheel chaise, £50—a coach, £100—1 chariot, £400—5 negroes, £150—130—120—120—100. Then follows a variety of articles—fowling pieces—fishing tackle—silver-hilted sword—pistols—china, glass, hangings, carpets, and culinary articles, in profusion—hignum vitæ coffee cups, lined with silver—silver snuff-

boxes—gold sleeve-buttons and rings—195 dozen of wine—arrack—beer—Cheshire and Gloucester cheeses. Indeed, Peter's establishment appears to have been a variorum edition of all manner of elegancies, luxuries, and creature comforts. The inventory comprehends eight tenements, in Cornhill, and King Street; a number of vessels, and parts of vessels; and various other items of property.

The remains of this noble-spirited descendant of the Huguenots of Rochelle were deposited, in the Faneuil tomb, in the westerly corner of the Granary Ground. This tomb is of dark freestone, with a freestone slab. Upon the easterly end of the tomb, there is a tablet of slate, upon which are sculptured, with manifest care and skill, the family arms; while, upon the freestone slab, are inscribed, at the top, *M. M.—memento mori*, of course,—and, at the bottom of the slab—a cruel apology for the old Huguenot patronymic—"PETER FUNEL. 1742," and nothing more.

The explanation, which arises, in my mind, of this striking inconsistency, is this: I believe this tomb, whose aspect is simple, solid, and antique, to have been built by Andrew Faneuil, who was a wealthy merchant here as early as 1709: and I think it is quite certain, that the lady, whom he married, in Holland, and whose beauty is traditional, among her descendants, made the great exchange—beauty for ashes—in this very sepulchre. In this tomb, Andrew was buried, by Peter, Feb. 20, 1737, and Peter, by his brother, Benjamin, March 10, 1742, old style, and here Benjamin himself, was laid, after an interval of two-and-forty years, where there is neither work, nor device, nor will, nor codicil.

The arms of Peter Faneuil—I have them before me, at this moment, on his massive, silver pepper-pot—he found a place for them, on many of his possessions, though I cannot say, if on all the articles which came into the possession of Gillam Phillips,—were a field argent—no chevron—a large heart, truly a suitable emblem, in the centre, gules—seven stars equidistant from each other, and from the margin of the escutcheon, extending from the sinister chief to the dexter base—in the sinister base a cross molin, within an annulet—no scroll—no supporters; crest, a martlet.

The arms upon the tomb, though generally like these, and like the arms, on other articles, once Peter's, and still extant,

differ in some important particulars; and seem to have been quartered with those of another family, as the arms of Andrew, being a collateral, might have been. A helmet, beneath the martlet, especially, is wholly different from Peter's crest. Such precisely are the arms, on the seal of wax, upon Andrew's will, in the Registry. Hence I infer, that Uncle Andrew built this ancient sepulchre. Arms, in days of old, and still, where a titled nobility exists, are deemed, for the popular eye, sufficient evidence of ownership, without a name. So thought Uncle Andrew; and he left the freestone tablet, without any inscription.

Some five years after the testator's burial, the tomb was again opened, to let in the residuary legatee. Peter's was a grand funeral. The Evening Post, of March 3, 1742-3, foretold, that it would be such; but the papers, which, doubtless, gave an account of it, are lost—the files are imperfect, of all those primitive journals. At first, and for years, the resting place of Peter's remains was well enough known. But the rust of time began to gather upon men's memories. The Faneuil arms, ere long, became unintelligible, to such, as strolled among the tombs. That "*handsome chariot, but nothing gaudy*," with Peter's armorial bearings upon its panels, no longer rolled along Treamount, and Queen Streets, and Cornhill, and drew up, of a Sabbath morning, before Trinity Church, that brother Peter and the ladies might sit upon their cushions, in No. 40, while brother Addington Davenport gave them a sermon, upon the Apostolical succession. The good people had therefore forgotten all about the Faneuil arms; and, before a great many years had rolled away, the inquiry naturally arose, in popular phraseology—"Whereabouts was it, that Peter Faneuil was buried?"

Some worthy old citizen—God bless him—who knew rather more of this matter than his neighbors, and was well aware, that the arms would be but a dead letter to posterity, resolved to serve the public, and remedy the defect. Up he goes into the Granary Ground, in the very spirit of Old Mortality, and, with all his orthography in his ear, inscribes P. FUNEL upon the tablet!

•

No. CXXXII.

"*But Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever.*" Mark i. 30. From this text, a clergyman—*of the old school*—had preached just as many, consecutive sermons, as I have already published articles, concerning Peter Faneuil and his family. A day or two after the last discourse, the bell of the village church was tolled, for a funeral; and a long-suffering parishioner, being asked, whose funeral it was, replied, that he had no doubt it was Simon's wife's mother's; for she had been sick of a fever, for nine weeks, to his certain knowledge. Let the reader possess himself in patience—our dealings with the Faneuils cannot last forever.

We have stated, that Peter's death was sudden, the very death, from which, as a churchman, he had prayed to be delivered. But let us not forget, that no death is sudden, in the sense of the good man's prayers, however instantaneously the golden bowl may be broken, to him, whose life has been well spent, and who is prepared to die.

In this connection, two interesting questions arise—how Peter Faneuil came to be a churchman—and if his life was a well-spent life, affording him reasonable assurance of admission into Paradise.

The old Huguenots styled themselves "THE REFORMERS," and embraced the doctrines of Calvin, in full. Oppression commonly teaches even intolerant men the value of toleration. Our Puritan fathers, it is true, who fled from Episcopal, as the Huguenots from Roman Catholic tyranny, profited very little, by the lesson they had learned; and turned upon the Catholics and Quakers, in the spirit of preposterous cruelty. The government of Massachusetts, according to Hazard, received a profitable lesson of moderation, from that of Rhode Island.

The Huguenots soon began to abate somewhat of that exorbitant severity and punctiliousness, in their religion, which, in no slight degree, had brought upon them that persecution, which was gathering, and impending over them, in 1684, a twelvemonth before the revocation of the edict of Nantes; compelling many of them, thus early, to fly from their homes, into other lands. The teachings of James Saurin, the great Huguenot preacher of the refugees, at the Hague, in 1705, and in subsequent years,

were of a milder type. He was "*a moderate Calvinist*." Such, also, were Daillé and Le Mercier, the ministers of the French Church, in Boston.

Peter Faneuil, undoubtedly, worshipped in this church, during a certain period. We have seen the liberal arrangement of his uncle, in 1734, for the support of its minister, and the testator's provision for its poor. Even then, he evidently anticipated, that it might cease to be; and shaped his testamentary provisions accordingly. Natural causes were in operation; I have referred to them—intermarriage, with our English people—merging the language of the few, in that of the many—juxtaposition—all tending to diminish the necessity for maintaining a separate church.

There was no dissolution of the society, at first, by any formal vote. The attendance became irregular and scanty—the members went elsewhere—Le Mercier, "a worthy character," says the Rev. Dr. Holmes, ceased to officiate, and the church broke up. For years, there were no services, within the little temple; and, in 1748, it was sold, as I have stated, to the members of another denomination.

It became a question with these Huguenots, the Faneuils, the Boutineaus, the Johonnots, the Oliviers, the Sigourneys, and their associates, where they should worship God. In 1740–41, the preachers, in Boston, were Charles Chauncey, at the Old Brick—at the Old North, Increase Mather, supplying the place of his brother Samuel, who, though ordained, in 1732, preached but one winter, and parted—at the Old South, Joseph Sewall, and Thomas Prince—at the Baptist, in Back Street, Jeremy Condry—at King's Chapel, Stephen Roe—at Brattle Street, William Cooper—at the Quaker meeting-house, in Leverett's Lane, whoever was moved by the Spirit—at the New North, John Webb—at the New South, Samuel Checkley—at the New Brick, Ellis Gray—at Christ Church, Timothy Cutler—at Long Lane, Jonny Moorhead—at Hollis Street, Mather Byles—at Trinity, Addington Davenport—at Lynde Street, William Hooper.

Several of the descendants of the Huguenots, not at all deterred, by the resemblance, whatever that might be, between the forms of Episcopalian worship, and those of their religious persecutors, the Roman Catholics, mingled with the Episcopalians. Thus they clung to the common element, the doctrine of the Trinity; and escaped, like Saurin, from the super-sulphuretted vapors of primitive Calvinism.

It is not very surprising, that the Faneuils should have settled down, upon the new and fashionable temple—Trinity had been erected but a few years before ; and the new rector was Peter's brother-in-law, Mr. Addington Davenport.

Peter therefore became, *pro tanto*, an Episcopalian—a liberal subscriber to the Charitable, Episcopal fund, and to the fund for the rebuilding of King's Chapel ; and identified himself with the Episcopal interest.

The religious character of Peter Faneuil, and the present whereabouts of this public benefactor, will be determined, by different individuals, according to the respective indications of their spiritual thermometers.

I have already ventured an opinion, that the mantle of charity, which covereth a multitude of sins, should be extended, for Peter's behoof, over that little affair with Peter Baynton, touching the duties, on those four hogsheads of brandy. But there is another matter, over which, I am aware, that some very worthy people will doubt, if the mantle of charity, can be stretched, without serious danger of lesion—I refer to the importation, about the same time with the prayer books, of that enormous quantity—six gross—of “the very best King Henry's cards.” I have often marvelled, how the name of the Defender of the Faith ever came to be connected, with such pestilent things.

I am well aware, how closely, in the opinions of some learned divines, cards are associated with the idea of eternal damnation. If it be so ; and a single pack is enough to send the proprietor to the bottomless pit, it is truly grievous to reflect how much deeper Peter, our great public benefactor, has gone, with the oppressive weight of six gross of the very best, upon his soul. Now-a-days, there seem to be very few, the Romanists excepted, who believe in purgatory ; and it is pretty generally agreed, that all, who attempt the bridge of *Al Sirat*, will surely arrive, either at Paradise, or Pandemonium.

How delightful it would be, to have the opinion of good old André Le Mercier, in a case like this. Though Peter no longer waited upon Le Mercier's ministrations ; but, for several years, before the dissolution of the French Church, had settled down, under brother Addington Davenport, first, as the assistant at King's Chapel, and, afterwards, as the Rector of Trinity ; yet Le Mercier could not forget the nephew of his benefactor, Andrew Faneuil. He was, doubtless, at Peter's funeral, who died one

and twenty years, before the holy man was summoned to his account, in 1764. Yes, he was there.

I have heard of a man, who accounted, for the dryness of his eyes, when all around him wept, at a pathetic discourse, on the ground, that he belonged to another parish. I have known Christian ministers—*very*—not many, thank heaven—who were influenced, to such a degree, by that spirit, which may be supposed to govern the proprietors of opposition omnibuses, as to consider the chord of human sympathy cut, through and through, and forever, between themselves, and a parishioner, who, for any cause, elected to receive his spiritual treasures out of some other earthen vessel, albeit of the very same denomination of crockery ware.

Poverty, and disease, and death, and misery, in every type, might stalk in, and upon, and over that homestead, and hearth, where these Christian ministers had been warmed, and refreshed, and fostered—but it was no longer a concern of theirs. No visit of condolence—no kind inquiry—not one, cheap word of consolation had they, for such, as had ceased to receive their ideas of damnation from them—enough—these individuals had sold their pews—“*crimen difficile expiandum*”—they belonged to another parish!

André Le Mercier, was not a man of this description. He was not a holy huckster of spiritual things, having not one crumb of comfort, for any, but his regular customers. André was a man, whose neighbor's ubiquity was a proverb.

But what he would say, about these six gross of King Henry's cards, I am by no means, certain. He was a man of a tolerant spirit; but on certain points, the most tolerant are, occasionally, found to be imbued, with unalterable prejudices. On page 85, of his Church History of Geneva, which I have read with pleasure, he quotes approvingly, the maxim of “a doctor of the church.” “*In necessariis rebus sit unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.*” This breathes the spirit of toleration:—what are *dubia*, what *necessaria* are not quite so readily settled, however.

On page 100, I find a passage, not quite so favorable for Peter, in this matter of the six gross. Referring to Calvin's return to Geneva, in 1536, after his banishment, Le Mercier says—“And then *Balls and Dances* and profane songs were forbidden, by the magistrates. And that form of Discipline remains entire, to the present Time, notwithstanding the repeated Attempts, that have

been made by wicked People to overset it. King Henry's cards, I fear, even of the very best quality, would, undoubtedly, fall into this category, of things Calvinized on earth, in the opinion of André Le Mercier.

The meaning of the words, "*profane songs*," may not be universally intelligible. It undoubtedly meant, as used by the Council, *all songs not sacred*. Calvin, undoubtedly, adopted the commendation of Scripture, to such, as were merry, to sing psalms. It appears, however, that certain persons entertained conservative notions, in those early days; even beyond the dictum of holy writ; for, on page 101, Le Mercier states, that Sebastian Castalio, a preacher, and professor, in the College of Geneva, "*condemned Solomon's Songs, as being profane and immodest*;" the very charge, as the reader is aware, which has been so often urged, against the songs of Tom Moore. Moore, at last, betook himself to sacred melodies. Solomon, had his life been spared, would, probably, have done the same thing, to the entire satisfaction of Sebastian Castalio.

I see wisdom, and mercy, and truth, in a part of the maxim, quoted by André Le Mercier—*in dubiis libertas*. I have long suspected there were some angels in Heaven, who were damned by Calvin, on earth. I verily believe, that Peter Faneuil is in Paradise.

No. CXXXIII.

SOME of my readers, I doubt not, have involuntarily clenched their fists, and set their teeth hard, while conning over the details of that merciless and bloody duel, so long, and so deliberately projected, and furiously fought, at last, near Bergen op Zoom, by the Lord Bruce, and Sir Edward Sackville, with rapiers, and in their shirts. Gentle reader, if you have never met with this morceau, literally dripping with blood, and are born with a relish for such rare provant—for I fear the appetite is congenital—you will find an ample account of the affair, in numbers 129 and 133 of the Guardian.

This wrathful fight is of an early date, having taken place, in 1613. Who could measure the popular excitement, if tomorrow's dawn should bring the tidings of a duel, fought the

night before, on Boston Common, by two young gentlemen, with rapiers, not, perhaps, quite so brutal, in its minute details, but quite as deliberately planned, and quite as fatal, in its result! What then must have been the effect of such an announcement, on the morning of the fourth of July, 1728, one hundred and twenty-three years ago, when Boston was a seaport village, just six years, after the "*perlustration*" of Mr. Salter had rated the population, at 10,670 souls.

It is matter of sober history, that such a duel was actually fought, then and there, on the evening of the third of July, 1728, near the powder-house, which is indicated, on Bonner's plan of 1722. This was a very different affair from the powder-house, erected at West Boston, in 1774, with walls of seven feet in thickness.

The parties, engaged, in this fatal affair were two young gentlemen, whose connections were highly respectable, whose lives had been amiable, whose characters were of good report, and whose friends were numerous and powerful. The names of Peter Faneuil and of his uncle, Jean Faneuil, of Rochelle, are associated with this transaction.

The parties were very young; the survivor twenty-two, and the victim but little more. The survivor, Henry Phillips, was the brother of Gillam Phillips, who, the reader of the preceding articles will remember, married Marie, the sister of Peter Faneuil. Peter was then just twenty-eight; and, doubtless, if there were dandies in those days, one of the foremost, on the peninsula. The natural interest he felt, in the brother of his sister's husband, engaged his efforts, to spirit the wretched survivor away. He was consigned to the uncle of Peter, beyond the sea—to whom Marie, his niece, very probably, wrote a few lines, bespeaking kind offices, for the unfortunate brother of her husband. It is not impossible, that old André added a prudential word or two, by way of postscript, confirming brother Jean, as to the safety of the operation. Be this as it may, Henry Phillips escaped from his pursuers, who were speedily put upon the scent, by Governor Dummer. Henry Phillips arrived safely in Rochelle. What befel him, in the strange land, is not the least interesting portion of the narrative.

Benjamin Woodbridge—such was the name of the individual, who was the victim, in this fatal encounter—was a young merchant, in partnership with Mr. Jonathan Sewall. Of his particu-

lar origin I am not entirely satisfied. The name, among us, is of the olden time. Benjamin Woodbridge was the very earliest alumnus of Harvard College: born in England in 1622, and graduated here in 1642.

The originating cause of this duel, like that, which produced the terrible conflict, between the Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, is unknown.

That the reader may walk along with me, confidently, upon this occasion, it may be well to indicate the sources, from which I derive my knowledge of a transaction, so exciting at the time, so fatal in its results, and so almost universally unknown, to those, who daily pass over the very spot, on our Common, upon which these young gentlemen met, and where young Woodbridge fell.

I have alluded to the subsequent relation of Peter Faneuil, and of his uncle, Jean, of Rochelle, to this affair. In my investigation into the history of Peter and his relatives, I have been aided by Mr. Charles Faneuil Jones, the grandson of Peter's sister, Mary Ann. Among the documents, loaned me, by that gentleman, are sundry papers, which belonged to Gillam Phillips, the brother of Henry, the survivor in the duel.

Among these papers, are original documents, in Jean Faneuil's handwriting, relative to the fate of the miserable wanderer, after his arrival in Rochelle—accounts of disbursements—regularly authenticated copies of the testimony, relative to the duel, and to the finding of the dead body of Woodbridge, and to the coöperation of Peter Faneuil and others, in concealing the survivor, on board the *Sheerness*, British man of war, and of his indictment, the "*Billa Vera*," in August, 1728, by the grand jury of Suffolk, for murder. In addition to these documents, I have found a certified copy of a statement, highly favorable to the character of Henry Phillips, the survivor, and manifestly intended to have an influence upon the public mind. This statement is subscribed, by eighty-eight prominent citizens, several of them holding high official stations, and among the number, are four ministers of the Gospel, with the Rev. Timothy Cutler, of Christ Church, at their head. Appended is the certificate of Governor Burnett, who, in that very month, succeeded Governor Dummer, stating the official, professional and social position of the signers of this document, with which it was clearly intended to fortify an application to George II. for a pardon of the offender.

The discovery of these papers, affording, as they do, some account of a transaction, so very remarkable, for the time and place of its occurrence, and of which I had never heard nor read before, excited my curiosity, and led me to search for additional information.

If my reader is of the fancy, he will readily comprehend my chagrin, when, upon turning over the leaves of Green's "*Boston Weekly News Letter*"—the imperfect files—all that time has left us—preserved in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society—the very paper, that next ensued, after July 3, 1728, the date of the duel, and which, doubtless, referred to an occurrence, so very extraordinary, was among the "*things lost upon earth*." I was not less unfortunate with the files of the old "*Boston Gazette*," of that early day. I then took up Kneeland's "*New England Weekly Journal*," but with very little confidence of success. The file, however, was there—No. 68—July 8, 1728, and my eyes soon fell, as the reader's fall at this moment, upon Governor Dummer's proclamation:—

"Whereas a barbarous murder was last night committed, on the body of Benjamin Woodbridge, a young gentleman, resident in the town of Boston; and Henry Phillips, of said town, is suspected to be the author of said murder, and is now fled from justice; I have therefore thought proper to issue this proclamation, hereby commanding all justices, sheriffs, constables, and all other officers, within this Province, and requiring all others, in his Majesty's name, to use their utmost endeavors, that the said Henry Phillips may be apprehended and brought to justice; and all persons, whosoever, are commanded, at their utmost peril, not to harbor nor conceal him. The said Henry Phillips is a fair young man, about the age of twenty-two years, well set, and well dressed; and has a wound in one of his hands. Given at Boston, the 4th of July, 1728, in the second year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord and King, George II." This proclamation bears the signature of his Excellency, William Dummer.

The editor of the journal, which contains the proclamation, expresses himself as follows—"On Thursday last, the 4th current, about 3 in the morning, after some hour's search, was found dead, near the Powder House, the body of Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, a young gentleman, merchant of this place. He had a small stab, under the right arm; but what proved fatal to him was a thrust he received, under his right breast, which came

out, at the small of his back. The fore-finger of his left hand was almost cut off, at the uppermost joint, supposed to be done, by grasping a naked sword. The coroner's inquest immediately set upon the body; and, after the best information and evidence they could obtain, upon their oaths say, that 'the said Benjamin Woodbridge was killed, with a sword, run through his body, by the hands of Henry Phillips, of Boston, merchant, on the Common, in said Boston, on the third of this instant, as appears to us, by sundry evidences.' The body was carried to the house of Mr. Jonathan Sewall, (his partner,) and, on Saturday last, was decently and handsomely interred, his funeral being attended, by the Commander-in-Chief, several of the Council, and most of the merchants and gentlemen of the town. There are many and various reports respecting this tragic scene, which makes us cautious of relating any of them. But the above, being plain matters of fact, we thought it not improper to give the public an account thereof. The unhappy gentleman, who is supposed to have committed the act, is not as yet found. This new and almost unknown case has put almost the whole town into great surprise."

A sermon, upon this occasion, of uncommon length, was delivered July 18, 1728, by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Sewall, of the Old South, at the Public Lecture, and published, with a preface, by the "*United Ministers*" of Boston. To give dignity to this discourse, it is adorned with a Latin prefix—" *Duellum est damnandum, tam in acceptante quam in provocante; quamvis major sit culpa provocantis.*" This discourse is singularly barren of all allusion to the cause and circumstances of this event; and appears, like our almanacs, adapted to any meridian.

At his Majesty's Court of Assize and General Gaol Delivery, on the second Tuesday of August, 1728, the grand jurors, under the Attorney General Hiller's instructions, found a "*Vera Billa*" against Henry Phillips, for the murder of Benjamin Woodbridge. Phillips was then far beyond the influence and effect of the *vera billa*—on the high sea—upon his voyage of expatriation. For some cause, which I am entirely unable to comprehend, and can barely conjecture, a sympathy existed, for this young man, extending far beyond the circle of his personal friends and relatives, and engaging, on his behalf, the disinterested efforts, not only of several persons in high official stations, but in holy orders, who cannot be supposed to have undervalued the crime, of

which he was unquestionably guilty, before God and man. The reader, as we proceed, may possibly be more successful than I have been, in discovering the occasion of this extraordinary sympathy.

No. CXXXIV.

THAT strong sympathy, exhibited for Henry Phillips, by whose sword a fellow creature had so recently fallen, in a duel, must have sprung, if I am not greatly mistaken, from a knowledge of facts, connected with the origin of that duel, and of which the present generation is entirely ignorant.

Truth lies not, more proverbially, at the bottom of a well, than, in a great majority of instances, a woman lurks at the bottom of a duel. If Phillips, unless sorely provoked, had been the challenger, I cannot think the gentlemen, who signed the certificate, in his behalf, would have spoken of him thus:—

“These may certify to all whom it may concern, that we, the subscribers, well knew and esteemed Mr. Henry Phillips of Boston, in New England, to be a youth of a very affable, courteous, and peaceable behavior and disposition, and never heard he was addicted to quarrelling, he being soberly brought up, in the prosecution of his studies, and living chiefly an academical life; and verily believe him slow to anger, and with difficulty moved to resentment.”

Among the eighty-eight signers of this certificate, the names of Peter and Benjamin Faneuil, and of their uncle, Andrew, occur, almost as a matter of course. They were family connections. Who the others were, appears, by the Governor's certificate, under the seal of the Province:—

“By his Excellency, William Burnet, &c. &c. These may certify whom it may concern, that John Wentworth Esquire is Lieut. Governor of the Province of New Hampshire; that William Tailor Esquire was formerly Lieut. Governor of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, and is now a member of his Majesty's Council for said Province; that James Stevens is Surveyor General of the Customs, for the Northern district, in America; that Thomas Lechmere Esquire was late Surveyor

General of the same ; that John Jekyll Esquire is Collector of the Customs, for the port of Boston ; that Thomas Steele is Justice of the Peace ; that William Lambert Esquire is Controller of the Customs, at Boston ; that J. Minzies Esquire was Judge of the Vice Admiralty ; that Messieurs Timothy Cutler, Henry Harris, George Pigot, and Ebenezer Miller are ministers of the Gospel ; and that the other subscribers to the certificate on the other side, are, some of them merchants and others gentlemen of the town of Boston." This certificate, bearing the signature of Gov. Burnet, is dated Oct. 21, 1728.

Of the origin of this affair, I have discovered nothing. Immediately after its consummation, Phillips manifested deep distress, at the result. About midnight, of July 3, 1728, with the assistance of his brother, Gillam, Peter Faneuil, and several other persons, Henry Phillips was removed to a place of safety. He was first conducted, by Peter Faneuil, to the house of Col. Estis Hatch, and there concealed. His brother, Gillam, in the meanwhile, applied to Captain John Winslow, of "*the Pink, Molly*," for a boat, to carry Henry, on board the British man of war, then lying between the Castle and Spectacle Island. Gillam and the Captain repaired to Hatch's, and had an interview with Peter and Henry, in the yard. It was then concluded, that Henry should go to Gibbs' Wharf, probably as the most retired wharf, for embarkation. The reader, who loves to localize—this word will do—will find this little wharf, on Bonner's plan, of 1722, at the southeastern margin of Fort Hill, about half way between Whitehorn's Wharf and South Battery. It lay directly north-east, and not far distant from the lower end of Gibbs' Lane, now Belmont Street.

Henry Phillips, with Peter Faneuil, accordingly proceeded, as quietly as possible, to Gibbs' Wharf. I see them now, stealing through Hatch's back gate, and looking stealthily behind them, as they take the darker side of Belcher's Lane. I trust there was no moon, that night. It was very foggy. The reader will soon be sure, that I am right, in that particular.

Gillam and Captain Winslow had gone to the Long Wharf, where the Molly's boat lay ; and, as the distance was very considerable to the man-of-war, they went first to the Pink, Molly—named, doubtless, for the Captain's lady. There they took on board, four of the Pink's crew.

How heavily the moments passed that night ! That "*fair*

young man," as Governor Dummer calls him, in the *lettres de cachet*—too young, it may seem, at twenty-two, to commence a pilgrimage, like Cain's—how sublimated his misery must have been! What sacrifice would he not have made, to break the dead man's slumber! There he lay; as yet unfound, stark, and stiff, and with eyes unclosed—

"Cut off, ev'n in the blossoms of my sin,
Unbousel'd, unanointed, unanneal'd."

Bootless sorrow! He had made his bloody bed—and therein must he lie o' nights, and in no other. There were no hops in that pillow, for his burning brain. The undying memory of a murdered victim—what an everlasting agrypnic it must be!

Time, to this wretched boy, seemed very like eternity, that night—but the sound of the splashing oar was audible at last—the boat touched the wharf—for the last time he shook the hand of his friend, Peter Faneuil, and left the land of his birth, which he was destined never to revisit.

The boat was turned from the shore, and the rowers gave way. But so intense was the fog, that night, that they got on shore, at Dorchester Neck; and, not until long after midnight, reached the Sheerness, man of war. They were received on board. Captain Conrad and Lieutenant Pritchard were very naturally disposed to sympathize with "*a fair young man*," in a predicament, like this—it was all in their line. Gillam, the elder brother, related the occurrence; and, before day, parted from Henry, whom he was destined to meet no more. Early, on the following morning, the events of the preceding night had been whispered, from man to man; for the pleasure of being among the earliest, to communicate the intelligence of a bloody murder, was precisely the same, in 1728, as it is, at the present day. Mrs. Winslow, the lady of the Captain of the Molly, had learned all the details, doubtless, before the morning watch. The surgeons, who dressed the wounds of Henry Phillips, for he also was wounded, felt themselves under no obligation to be silent. The sailors of the Molly, who had overheard the conversation of several of the party, were under no injunction of secrecy. Indeed, long before the dawn of the fourth of July—not then the glorious Fourth—the intelligence had spread, far and wide; and parties were scouring the Common, in quest of the murdered man. At an early hour, Governor Dummer's proclamation was

in the hands of some trusty compositor, in the office of Samuel Kneeland, in Queen Street; and soon the handbills were upon all the town pumps, and chief corners, according to the usage of those days.

There is a pleasure, somewhat difficult of analysis, undoubtedly, in gazing for hours upon the stuffed skin of a beast, that, when in the flesh, has devoured a respectable citizen. When good Mr. Bowen—not the professor—kept his museum in the mansion, occupied, before the Revolution, by the Rev. Dr. Caner, and upon whose site the Savings Bank, and Historical Society have their apartments, at present, nothing in all his collection—not even the Salem Beauty—nor Marat and Charlotte Cordé—interested me so much, as a broken sword, with a label annexed, certifying, that, during the horrors of St. Domingo, seven and twenty of the white inhabitants had fallen, beneath that sword, in the hands of a gigantic negro! How long, one of the fancy will linger—“*patiens pulveris atque solis*” for the luxury of looking upon nothing more picturesque than the iron bars of a murderer’s cell!

It had, most naturally, spread abroad, that young Philips was concealed, on board the man of war. Hundreds may be supposed to have gathered, in groups, straining their eyes, to get a glimpse of the Sheerness; and the officer, who, in obedience to the warrant, proceeded, on that foggy morning, to arrest the offender, found more difficulty, in discovering the man of war, than was encountered, on the preceding evening, by those, who had sought for the body of Woodbridge, upon the Common. At length, the fog fled before the sun—the vista was opened between the Castle and Spectacle Island—but the Sheerness was no longer there—literally, the places that had known her, knew her no more.

Some of our worthy fathers, more curious than the rest, betook themselves, I dare say, to the cupola of the *old* townhouse—how few of us are aware, that the present is the third, that has occupied that spot. There, with their glasses, they swept the eastern horizon, to find the truant ship—and enjoyed the same measure of satisfaction, that Mr. Irving represents the lodger to have enjoyed, who was so solicitous to get a glimpse of the “Stout Gentleman.”

Over the waters she went, heavily laden, with as much misery, as could be pent up, in the bosom of a single individual.

He was stricken with that malady, which knows no remedy from man—a mind diseased. In one brief hour, he had disfranchised himself for ever, and become a miserable exile.

Among the officers of the Sheerness, he must have been accounted a young lion. His *gallantry*, in the estimation of the gentlemen of the wardroom, must have furnished a ready passport to their hearts—he *had killed his man!*—with the *civilized*, not less than with the *savage*, this is the proudest mark of excellence! How little must he have relished the approbation of the thoughtless, for an act, which had made him the wretched young man, that he was! How paltry the compensation for the anguish he had inflicted upon others—the mourning relatives of him, whom he had, that night, destroyed—his own connections—*his mother*—he was too young, at twenty-two, to be insensible to the sufferings of that mother! God knows, she had not forgotten her poor, misguided boy; as we shall presently see she crossed the ocean, to hold the aching head, and bind up the broken heart of her expatriated son—and arrived, only in season, to weep upon his grave, while it was yet green.

No. CXXXV.

It is known, that *old* Chief Justice Sewall, who died Jan. 1, 1730, kept a diary, which is in the possession of the Rev. Samuel Sewall, of Burlington, Mass., the son of the *late* Chief Justice Sewall. As the death of the *old* Chief Justice occurred, about eighteen months after the time, when the duel was fought, between Phillips and Woodbridge, it occurred to me, that some allusion to it, might be found, in the diary.

The Rev. Samuel Sewall has, very kindly, informed me, that the diary of the Chief Justice does not refer to the duel; but that the event was noticed by him, in his interleaved almanac, and by the Rev. Joseph Sewall, who preached the occasional sermon, to which I have referred—in *his* diary: and the Rev. Mr. Sewall, of Burlington, has obligingly furnished me with such extracts, as seem to have a bearing on the subject, and with some suggestions, in relation to the parties.

On the 4th of July, 1728, Judge Sewall, in his interleaved

almanac, writes thus—"Poor Mr. Benjam. Woodbridge is found dead in the Comon this morning, below the Powder-house, with a Sword-thrust through him, and his own Sword undrawn. Henry Phillips is suspected. The town is amazed!" This wears the aspect of what is commonly called foul play; and the impression might exist, that Phillips had run his antagonist through, *before he had drawn his sword.*

It is quite likely, that Judge Sewall himself had that impression, when he made his entry, on the fourth of July: the reader will observe, he does not say *sheathed* but *undrawn*. If there existed no evidence to rebut this presumption, it would seem, not that there had been murder, in a duel, but a case of the *most atrocious* murder; for nothing would be more unlikely to happen, than that a man, after having received his death wound, in this manner, should have sheathed his own sword. The wound was under the right pap; he was run through; the sword had come out, at the small of his back. How strongly, in this case, the presumptive evidence would bear against Phillips, not that he killed Woodbridge, for of this there is no doubt; but that he killed him, *before he had drawn his own sword.*

When the reader shall have read the authenticated testimony, which now lies before me, he will see, not only that the swords of both were drawn—but that both were wounded—that, after Woodbridge was wounded, he either dropped his sword, or was disarmed—and, that, when he had become helpless, and had walked some little distance from the spot, Phillips picked up the sword of his antagonist, and returned it to the scabbard. The proof of this, by an eye-witness, is clear, direct, and conclusive.

The next extract, in order of time, is from the diary of the Rev. Joseph Sewall, under date July, 1728—"N. B. On ye 4th (wch was kept, as a Day of Prayr upon ye account of ye Drought) we were surpris'd wth ye sad Tidings yt Mr. Henry Phillips and Mr Woodbridge fought a duel in wch ye latter was slain. O Ld Preserve ye Tow. and Land from the guilt of Blood."—"In ye Eveng. I visited Mrs. Ph. O Ld Sanctify thine awful judgt to her. Give her Son a thorow Repentce."

These extracts are of interest, not simply because they are historical, but as illustrative of the times.

"1728, July 18. I preached ye Lecture from yese words, Ps. 119, 115, Depart from me ye evil Doers, &c. Endeav

to shew ye evill and danger of wicked Company.—Condemned Duelling as a bloody crime, &c. O Lord, Bless my poor labours."

"1728-9, January 22. Mr. Thacher, Mr. Prince, and I met at Mrs. Phillip's, and Pray'd for her son. I hope G. graciously assisted. Ld Pardon the hainous Sins of yt young man, convert and Heal his soul."

Writing to a London correspondent, June 2, 1729, Chief Justice Sewall says—"Richard put the Letter on board Capt. Thomas Lithered, who saild this day; in who went Madam Hannah Phillips." In his interleaved almanac is the following entry—"1729, Sept. 27, Saturday Madam Phillips arrives; mane." The explanation of these two last entries is at hand. Jean Faneuil of Rochelle had, doubtless, written, either to his brother André, in Boston, or to his nephew, by marriage, Gillam Phillips, giving an account of the wanderer, Gillam's brother. At length, the tidings came hither, that he was sick; and, probably, in May, 1729, intelligence arrived, that he was *dangerously ill*. The mother's heart was stirred within her. By the first vessel she embarked for London, on her way to Rochelle. The eyes of that unhappy young man were not destined to behold again the face of her, whose daylight he had turned into darkness, and whose heart he had broken.

He died about the twentieth of May, 1729, as I infer from the documents before me. The first of these is the account, rendered by Jean Faneuil, to Gillam Phillips, in Jean's own hand—"Deboursement fait par Jean faneuil pour feu Monsieur heny Philipe de Boston," &c. He charges in this account, for amount paid the physician, "*pendant sa maladie*." The doctor's bill is sent as a voucher, and is also before me. Dr. "*Girard De Vilars, Aggrégé au College Royal des Mediciens de la Rochelle*" acknowledges to have received payment in full *pour l'honoraire des consultations de mes confreres et moy a Monsieur Henry Phillipe Anglois*, from the fourth of April, to the twentieth of May.

The apothecary's bill of Monsieur Guinot, covering three folio pages, is an interesting document, for something of the nature of the malady may be inferred, from the *materia medica* employed—*potion anodine*—*baume tranquille sant*—*cordial somnifere*. How effectually the visions, the graphic recollections of this miserable young man must have *murdered sleep*!

The Rev. Mr. Sewall of Burlington suggests, that Mr. Benja-

min Woodbridge, who fell in this duel, was, very probably, the grandson of the Rev. John Woodbridge of Andover, and he adds, that his partner, Jonathan Sewall, to whose house the body was conveyed, was a nephew of the *old* Chief Justice, and, in 1717, was in business with an elder brother, Major Samuel Sewall, with whom he resided. In 1726, Major Sewall "lived in a house, once occupied by Madam Usher, near the Common;" whither the body of Woodbridge might have been conveyed, without much trouble.

The General Court, which assembled, on the 28th of that month, in which this encounter took place, enacted a more stringent law, than had existed before, on the subject of duelling.

I shall now present the testimony, as it lies before me, certified by Elisha Cook, J. P., before whom the examination was had, on the morning after the duel:—

"Suffolk, ss. Memorandum. Boston, July 4, 1728. Messrs. Robert Handy, George Stewart and others being convened on examination, concerning the murther of Benja. Woodbridge last night, Mr. Handy examined saith—that sometime before night Mr. Benja. Woodbridge come to me at the * White horse and desired me to lett him (have) his own sword. I asked ye reason: he replied he had business called him into the Country. I was jealous he made an excuse. I urged him to tell me plainly what occasion he had for a sword, fearing it was to meet with Mr. Henry Phillips, who had lately fell out. He still persisted in his first story, upon which I gave him his sword and belt,† and then he left the Compy, Mr. Thomas Barton being in Company, I immediately followed, and went into the Common, found said Woodbridge walking the Common by the Powder house, his sword by his side. I saw no person save him. I againe urged the occasion of his being there. He denied informing. In some short time, I saw Mr. Henry Phillips walking towards us, with his Sword by his side and Cloke on. Before he came nere us I told them I feared there was a Quarrel and what would be the events. They both denied it.

"Mr. Phillips replied again Mr. Woodbridge and he had some particular business that concerned them two onley and desired I

* Nearly opposite the residence of Dr. Lemuel Hayward, deceased, where Hayward Place now is.

† Woodbridge, I suppose, belonged to some military company, whose arms and accoutrements were probably kept at the White Horse tavern, under the charge of Robert Handy.

would go about my business. I still persuaded them to let me know their design, and if any quarrel they would make it up. Mr. Phillips used me in such a manner with slites (slights) that I went of and left them by the powder house, this was about eight in the evening. I went up the Common. They walked down. After some short space I returned, being justly fearful of their designe, in order to prevent their fiteing with Swords. I mett with them about the Powder House. I first saw Mr. Woodbridge making up to me, holding his left hand below his right breast. I discovered blood upon his coat, asked the meaning of it. He told me Mr. Phillips had wounded him. Having no Sword I enquired where it was. He said Mr. Phillips had it. Mr. Phillips immediately came up, with Woodbridge's sword in his hand naked, his own by his side. I told them I was surprized they should quarrel to this degree. I told Mr. Phillips he had wounded Mr. Woodbridge. He replied yes so he had and Mr. Woodbridge had also wounded me, but in the fleshy part onley, shewing me his cut fingers. Mr. Phillips took Mr. Woodbridge's scabbard, sheathed the Sword, and either laid it down by him, or gave it to him.

"Mr. Woodbridge beginning to faint satt down, and begged that surgeons might be sent for. I immediately went away, leaving these two together. Phillips presently followed, told me for God's sake to go back to Woodbridge, and take care of him, till he returned with a surgeon. I prayed him to hasten, but did not care to returne. Mr. Phillips went away as fast as he could and went down the lane by the Pound.* I returned to the White Horse. I found Mr. Barton and Geoe Reason together. I told Mr. Barton Phillips and Woodbridge having quarreled, Woodbridge was much wounded. I asked Barton to go and see how it was it with Woodbridge. We went a little way from the house, with a designe to go, but Barton, hearing Phillips was gone for a Chirurgeon, concluded Phillips would procure a Chirurgeon, and so declined going, and went to Mr. Blin's house where we were invited to supper. I have not seen Mr. Hy Phillips or (heard) any from him, since I left him going for a Chirurgeon."

Such is the testimony of Robert Handy; and the reader will agree with me, that, if he and Barton had been choked with their supper at Mr. Blin's, it would have been a "Providence."

* *Hog Alley.* See Bonner's plan, of 1722.

It would be difficult to find the record of more cruel neglect, towards a dying man. When urged to go back and sustain Woodbridge, till a surgeon could be procured, he "*did not care to returne.*" And Barton preferred going to his supper. The principle, which governed these fellows, was a grossly selfish and cowardly fear of personal implication. Upon an occasion of minor importance, a similar principle actuated a couple of Yorkshire lads, who refused to assist, in righting the carriage of a member of parliament, which had been overturned, because their father had cautioned them never to meddle with state affairs.

I shall present the remaining testimony, in the following number.

No. CXXXVI.

LET us proceed with the examination, before Justice Elisha Cook, on the fourth of July, 1728.

"John Cutler, of Boston, Chirurgion, examined upon oath, saith, that, last evening, about seven, Dr. George Pemberton came to me, at Mrs. Mears's, and informed, than an unhappy quarrel hapned betwene Mr. Henry Phillips and Benja. Woodbridge, and it was to be feared Mr. Woodbridge was desperately wounded. We went out. We soon mett Mr. Henry Phillips, who told us he feared he had killed Mr. Woodbridge, or mortally wounded him; that he left him at the bottom of the Common, and begged us to repaire there and see if any relief might be given him. Doct. Pemberton and I went, in compy with Mr. Henry Phillips, in search of said Woodbridge, but could not find him, nor make any discovery of the affair. Mr. Phillips left us. I bid him walk in Bromfield's lane. We went to Mr. Woodbridge's lodgings, and severall other houses, but heard nothing of him. Upon our return Mr. H. Phillips was at my house. I dresed his wound, which was across his belly and his fingers. Mr. Phillips shew a great concern and fear of having killed Mr. Woodbridge. I endeavored to appease him, and hope better things; but he said, could he think he was alive, he should think himself a happy man."

"Doct. George Pemberton, sworn, saith that last evening about seven or eight o'clock Mr. Henry Phillips came to the Sun Tavern and informed me, first desiring me to go out wch I did and went to my house, where said Phillips shew me some wounds, and that he had wounded Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, and feared they would prove mortal—begged of me to repair to the Comon. Accompanied with Dr. Cutler and said Phillips, in quest of said Woodbridge, we went to the Powder house, and searched the ground there, but could make no discovery. Mr. Phillips then left us, and walked towards Mr. Bromfield's lane. Dr. Cutler and I went to Mr. Woodbridge's lodging, and several other places, but could hear nothing of him. We returned and found Henry Phillips, at Dr. Cutler's, who was very greatly concerned; fearing he had killed Mr. Woodbridge. We dressed Mr. Phillips' wounds which were small."

"Capt. John Winslow examined saith that last night being at Mr. Doring's house, Mr. Gillam Phillips, about eleven in the evening, came to me and told me he wanted my boat to carry off his brother Henry, who had wounded or killed a man. I went, by appointment, to Mr. Vardy's where I soon mett Gillam Phillips. I asked him where his brother was—who he had been fiteing with. He made answer I should see him presently. Went down to Colo. Estis Hatche's where Mr. Gillam Phillips was to meet me. I gott there first, knocked at Mr. Hatche's door. No answer. From Mr. Hatche's house Mr. Peter Faneuil and Henry Phillips came into Mr. Hatche's yard—Mr. Gillam Phillips immediately after with Mr. Adam Tuck. I heard no discourse about the man who was wounded. They concluded, and sent Mr. Henry Phillips to Gibb's wharf. Then Gillam Phillips with me to the long wharf. I took boat there, and went on board my ship, lying in the harbor. Mr. Phillips (Gillam) being in the bote, I took four of the Ship's crew, and rowed to Gibb's Wharf, where we mett with Mr. Henry Phillips, Peter Faneuil, and Adam Tuck. I came on shore. Henry Phillips and Tuck entred the boat. I understood by discourse with Gillam Phillips, they designed on board his Majestys Ship-Sheerness, Captain James Conrad Comdr. This was about twelve and one of the Clock."

"Adam Tuck of Boston farier, examined upon oath saith, that, about eleven of the clock, last evening, being at Luke Vardy's I understood there had bin a quarril betwene Henry Phillips

and Benja. Woodbridge, and that Phillips had killed or mortally wounded Woodbridge. Gillam Phillips Esq. being there, I walked with him towards Colo. Hatches, where we came up with Capt. Jno. Winslow, and Henry Phillips, and Peter Faneuil. We all went to Gibb's wharf, when we, that is Mr. Gillam and Henry Phillips, with the examinant went on board Capt. John Winslow's boat. We designed, as I understood, to go on board his Majesie's ship Sheerness, in order to leave Mr. Henry Phillips on board the man of War, who, as he told me, had, he feared, wounded a man, that evening on the Comon, near the water side. The person's name I understood was Woodbridge. Soon after our being on board Lt. Pritchard caried us into his apartment, where Gillam Phillips related to the Leut. the ran-counter that hapned betwene his brother Henry and Benja. Woodbridge. I took the intent of their going on board the man of War was to conceale Mr. Henry Phillips. We stayed on board about an hour and a half. We left Mr. Henry Phillips on board the Man of War and came up to Boston."

"John Underwood, at present residing in Boston, mariner, belonging to the Pink Molle, John Winslow Comdr. now lying in the harbour of Boston, being examined upon oath, concerning the death or murder of Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, saith, that about twelve o'clock last night, his Captn John Winslow, with another person, unknown to him came on board. The Captn ordered the boat with four of our hands, I being one, to go to a Wharf at the South end of the Town, where we went, and there the Capt. went on Shore, and two other persons came into the Boat without the Captn. We put of and by the discourse we were designed to go on board the Man of Whar, but by reason of the fogg or thick weather we gott on shore at Dorchester neck, went up to a house and stayed there about an hour and half, then returned to our boat, took in the three persons affore-named, as I suppose, with our crew, and went on board the Man of War, now lying betwene the Castle & Specta Island. We all went on board with the men we took in at the Wharf, stayed there for the space of an hour, and then came up to Boston, leaving one of the three onley on board, and landed by Oliver's Dock."

"Wm. Pavice of Boston, one of the Pink Molly's crew, examined upon oath, saith as above declared by John Underwood."

"James Wood and John Brown, mariners, belonging to the Pink Molly, being examined upon oath, declare as above. John Brown cannot say, or knows not how many persons they took from the shore, at Gibb's wharf, but is positive but two returned to Boston. They both say they cant be sure whether the Capt. went in the boat from the ship to the shoar."

"Mr. Peter Faneuil examined saith, that, last evening, about twelve, he was with Gillam Phillips, Henry Phillips and Adam Tuck at Gibb's wharf, and understood by Gillam Phillips, that his brother Henry had killed or mortally wounded Mr. Benja. Woodbridge this evening, that Henry Phillips went into Capt'n Winslow's boat, with his brother and Adam Tuck with the Boat's crew, where they went he knows not."

Such was the evidence, presented before the examining justice, on the fourth of July, 1728, in relation to this painful, and extraordinary occurrence.

I believe I have well nigh completed my operation, upon Peter Faneuil: but before I throw aside my professional apron, let me cast about, and see, if there are no small arteries which I have not taken up. I perceive there are.

The late Rev. Dr. Gray, of Jamaica Plains, on page 8 of his half century sermon, published in 1842, has the following passage—"The third or Jamaica Plain Parish, in Roxbury, had its origin in the piety of an amiable female. I refer to Mrs. Susanna, wife of Benjamin Pemberton. She was the daughter of Peter Faneuil, who, in 1740 erected and gave to the Town of Boston the far-famed Hall, which still bears his name; and who built also the dwelling house, now standing here, recently known, as late Dr. John Warren's Country seat."

Nothing could have been farther from the meaning of the amiable Mr. Gray, than a design to cast a reproach, upon the unimpeachable pedigree of this excellent lady. But Peter Faneuil was, unfortunately, never married. He was a bachelor; and is styled "*Bachelour*," in the commission, from John, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Judge Willard, to administer the oath to Benjamin Faneuil, as administrator, on Peter's estate. Peter's estate was divided, among his brother, Benjamin, and his four sisters, Anne Davenport, Susanna Boutineau, Mary Phillips, and Mary Ann Jones. This fact is established, by the original indenture of marriage settlement, now before me, between John Jones and Mary Ann Faneuil, dated the very month of Peter's decease.

He had no daughter to inherit. Mrs. Susanna Pemberton had not a drop of the Faneuil blood, in her veins. Her nearest approximation consisted in the fact, that George Bethune, her own brother, married, as I have already stated, Mary Faneuil, Peter's niece, and the daughter of Benjamin. Benjamin occupied that cottage, before he removed to Brighton. He had also a town residence, in rear of the Old Brick Meeting-house, which stood where Joy's buildings now stand.

Thomas Kilby was the commercial agent of Peter Faneuil, at Canso, Nova Scotia, in 1737, 8 and 9. He was a gentleman of education; graduated at Harvard, in 1723, and died in 1740, and according to Pemberton, published essays, in prose and verse. Not long ago, a gentleman inquired of me, if I had ever heard, that Peter Faneuil had a wooden leg; and related the following amusing story, which he received from his collateral ancestor, John Page, who graduated at Harvard, in 1765, and died in 1825, aged 81.

Thomas Kilby was an unthrifty, and rather whimsical, gentleman. Being without property and employment, he retired, either into Maine, or Nova Scotia. There he made a will, for his amusement, having, in reality, nothing to bequeath. He left liberal sums to a number of religious, philanthropic, and literary institutions—his eyes, which were very good, to a blind relative—his body to a surgeon of his acquaintance, “excepting as hereinafter excepted”—his sins he bequeathed to a worthy clergyman, as he appeared not to have any—and the choice of his legs to Peter Faneuil.

Upon inquiry of the oldest surviving relative of Peter, I found, that nothing was known of the wooden leg.

A day or two after, a highly respectable and aged citizen, attracted by the articles, in the Transcript, informed me, that his father, born in 1727, told him, that he had seen Peter Faneuil, in his garden, and that, on one foot, he wore a very high-heeled shoe. This, probably, gave occasion to the considerate bequest of Thomas Kilby.

The will, as my informant states, upon the authority of Mr. John Page, coming to the knowledge of Peter, he was so much pleased with the humor of it, that, probably, having a knowledge of the *testator* before, he sent for him, and made him his agent, at Canso.

Peter was a kind-hearted man. The gentleman who gave me

the fact, concerning the high-heeled shoe, informed me, upon his father's authority, that old Andrew Faneuil—the same, who, in his will, prays God, for “*the perfecting of his charities*”—put a poor, old, schoolmaster, named Walker, into jail, for debt. Imprisonment then, for debt, was a serious and lingering affair. Peter, in the flesh—not his angel—privately paid the poor man's debt, and set the prisoner free.

No. CXXXVII.

THOSE words of Horace were the words of soberness and truth—*Oh imitatores, vulgum pecus!*—I loathe imitators and imitations of all sorts. How cheap must that man feel, who awakens *hesterno vitio*, from yesterday's debauch, on *imitation* gin or brandy! Let no reader of the Transcript suppose, that I am so far behind the times, as to question the respectability of being drunk, on the real, original Scheidam or Cogniac, whether at funerals, weddings, or ordinations. But I consider *imitation* gin or brandy, at a funeral, a point blank insult to the corpse.

Everybody knows, that old oaks, old friendships, and old mocha must grow—they cannot be made. My horse is frightened, nearly out of his harness, almost every day of his life, by the hissing and jetting of the steam, and the clatter of the machinery, as I pass a manufactory, or grindery, of *imitation* coffee. *Imitation* coffee! What would my old friend, Melli Melli, the Tunisian ambassador, with whom—long, long ago—I have taken a cup of his own particular, once and again, at Chapotin's Hotel, in Summer Street, say to such a thing as this!

This grindery is located, in an Irish neighborhood, and there used to be a great number of Irish children thereabouts. The number has greatly diminished of late. I know not why, but, as I passed, the other day, the story that Dickens tells of the poor sausage-maker, whose broken buttons, among the sausage meat, revealed his unlucky destiny, came forcibly to mind. By the smell, I presume, there is a roastery, connected with the establishment; and, now I think of it, the atmosphere, round about, is filled with the odor of roast pig—a little overdone.

Good things, of all sorts, have stimulated the imitative powers of man, from the diamond to the nutmeg. Even death—and death is a good thing to him, whose armor of righteousness is on, *cap-a-pie*—death has been occasionally imitated; and really, now and then, the thing has been very cleverly done. I refer not to cases of catalepsy or trance, nor to cases of total suspension of sensibility and voluntary motion, for a time, under the agency of sulphuric ether, or chloroform.

In 1843, at the request of her Majesty's principal Secretary of State, for the Home Department, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Barrister at Law, made "*a report on the results of a special inquiry into the practice of interment in towns.*" This report is very severe upon our fraternity; but, I must confess, it is a most able and interesting performance, and full of curious detail. The demands of the English undertaker, it appears, are so oppressive upon the poor, that burial societies have been formed, upon the mutual principle. It is asserted by Mr. Chadwick, that parents, under the gripings of poverty, have actually poisoned their children, to obtain the burial money. At the Chester assizes, several trials, for infanticide, have occurred, on these grounds. "*That child will not live, it is in the burial club,*" is a cant and common phrase, among the Manchester paupers.

Some very clever impositions, have been practised, to obtain the burial allowance. A man, living in Manchester, resolved to play corpse, for this laudable object. His wife was privy to the plot, of course,—and gave notice, in proper form, of her bereavement. The agent of the society made the customary domiciliary visit. There the body lay—stiff and stark—and a very straight and proper corpse it was—the jaw decently tied up. The visitor, well convinced, and quite touched by the widow's anguish, was turning on his heel to depart, when a slight motion of the dead man's eyelid arrested his attention: he began to smell—not of the body, like the bear in *Æsop*—but a rat. Upon feeling the pulse, he begged the chief mourner to be comforted; there was strong ground for hope! More obstinate than Rachel, she not only would not be comforted, but abused the visitor, in good Gaelic, for questioning her veracity. Had she not laid out the daar man, her own daar Tooly Mashee, with her own hands! and didn't she know better than to be after laying him out, while the brith was in his daar buddy! and would she be guilty of so cruel a thing to her own good man! The doctor was called;

and, after feeling the pulse, threw a bucket of water, in the face of the defunct, which resulted in immediate resurrection.

The most extraordinary case of imitation death on record, and which, under the acknowledged rules of evidence, it is quite impossible to disbelieve, is that of the East India Fakeer, who was buried alive at Lahore, in 1837, and at the end of forty days, disinterred, and resuscitated. This tale is, *prima facie*, highly improbable: let us examine the evidence. It is introduced, in the last English edition of Sharon Turner's Sacred History of the World, vol. iii., in a note upon Letter 25. The witness is Sir Claude M. Wade, who, at the time of the Fakeer's burial, and disinterment, was political resident, at Loodianah, and principal agent of the English government, at the court of Runjeet Singh. The character of this witness is entirely above suspicion; and the reader will observe, in his testimony, anything but the marks and numbers of a credulous witness, or a dealer in the marvelous. Mr. Wade addressed a letter to the editor of Turner's History, from which the following extracts are made:—

“I was present, at the court of Runjeet Singh, at Lahore, in 1837, when the Fakeer, mentioned by the Hon. Capt. Osborne, was buried alive, for six weeks; and, though I arrived, a few hours after his interment, I had the testimony of Runjeet Singh, himself, and others, the most credible witnesses of his court, to the truth of the Fakeer having been so buried before them; and from having been present myself, when he was disinterred, and restored to a state of perfect vitality, in a position so close to him, as to render any deception impossible, it is my firm belief that there was no collusion, in producing the extraordinary fact, that I have related.”

Mr. Wade proceeds to give an account of the disinterment. “On the approach of the appointed time, according to invitation, I accompanied Runjeet Singh to the spot, where the Fakeer had been buried. It was a square building, called, in the language of the country, *Barra Durree*, in the midst of one of the gardens, adjoining the palace at Lahore, with an open verandah all around, having an enclosed room in the centre. On arriving there, Runjeet Singh, who was attended on the occasion, by the whole of his court, dismounting from his elephant, asked me to join him, in examining the building, to satisfy himself that it was closed, as he had left it. We did so. There had been an open door, on each of the four sides of the room, three of which

were perfectly closed with brick and mortar. The fourth had a strong door, also closed with mud, up to the padlock, which was sealed with the private seal of Runjeet Singh, in his own presence, when the Fakeer was interred. In fact, the exterior of the building presented no aperture whatever, by which air could be admitted, nor any communication held, by which food could possibly be conveyed to the Fakeer; and I may also add, that the walls, closing the doorways, bore no marks of having been recently disturbed or removed."

"Runjeet Singh recognized the impression of the seal, as the one, which he had affixed: and, as he was as skeptical, as any European could be, of the successful result of such an enterprise, to guard, as far as possible, against any collusion, he had placed two companies, from his own personal escort, near the building, from which four sentries were furnished, and relieved, every two hours, night and day, to guard the building from intrusion. At the same time, he ordered one of the principal officers of his court to visit the place occasionally, and report the result of his inspection to him; while he himself, or his minister, kept the seal which closed the hole of the padlock, and the latter received the reports of the officers on guard, morning and evening."

"After our examination, and we had seated ourselves in the verandah, opposite the door, some of Runjeet's people dug away the mud wall, and one of his officers broke the seal, and opened the padlock."

"On the door being thrown open, nothing but a dark room was to be seen. Runjeet Singh and myself then entered it, in company with the servant of the Fakeer. A light was brought, and we descended about three feet below the floor of the room, into a sort of cell, in which a wooden box, about four feet long, by three broad, with a square sloping roof, containing the Fakeer, was placed upright, the door of which had also a padlock and seal, similar to that on the outside. On opening it, we saw"—

But I am reminded, by observing the point I have reached, upon my sheet of paper, that it is time to pause. There are others, who have something to say to the public, of more importance, about rum, sugar and molasses, turtle soup and patent medicine, children, that are lost, and puppies, that are found.

No. CXXXVIII.

SIR CLAUDE M. WADE, the reader may remember, was proceeding thus—"On opening it," (the box containing the Fakeer) "we saw a figure, enclosed in a bag of white linen, drawn together, and fastened by a string over the head; on the exposure of which a grand salute was fired, and the surrounding multitude came crowding to the door to see the spectacle. After they had gratified their curiosity, the Fakeer's servant, putting his arms into the box, took the figure of his master out; and, closing the door, placed it, with his back against the door, exactly as he had been squatted, like a Hindoo idol, in the box itself. Runjeet Singh and I then descended into the cell, which was so small, that we were only able to sit on the ground in front, and so close to the body, as to touch it with our hands and knees. The servant then began pouring warm water over the figure, but, as my object was to watch if any fraudulent practice could be detected, I proposed to Runjeet Singh, to tear open the bag, and have a perfect view of the body, before any means of resuscitation were attempted. I accordingly did so; and may here remark, that the bag, when first seen by us, looked mildewed, as if it had been buried for some time. The legs and arms of the body were shrivelled and stiff, the face full, as in life, and the head reclining on the shoulder, like that of a corpse."

"I then called to the medical gentleman, who was attending me, to come down and inspect the body, which he did, but could discover no pulsation, in the heart, temples or the arms. There was however, a heat, about the region of the brain, which no other part of the body exhibited. The servant then commenced bathing him with hot water, and gradually relaxing his arms and legs from the rigid state, in which they were contracted; Runjeet Singh taking his right and left leg, to aid by friction in restoring them to their proper action, during which time the servant placed a hot wheaten cake, about an inch thick, on the top of the head—a process, which he twice or thrice repeated. He then took out of his nostrils and ears the wax and cotton plugs, with which they were stopped, and after great exertion, opened his mouth, by inserting the point of a knife between the teeth, and while holding his jaws

open, with his left hand, drew the tongue forward, with the forefinger of the right, in the course of which the tongue flew back, several times, to its curved position upwards, that in which it had originally been placed, so as to close the gullet. He then rubbed his eyelids with ghee (clarified butter) for some time, till he succeeded in opening them, when the eye appeared quite motionless and glazed. After the cake had been applied for the third time, to the top of the head, the body was convulsively heaved, the nostrils became violently inflated, respiration ensued, and the limbs began to assume a natural fulness. The servant then put some ghee on his tongue, and made him swallow it. A few minutes afterwards, the eyeballs became slowly dilated, recovered their natural color, and the Fakeer, recognizing Runjeet Singh, sitting close by him, articulated, in a low sepulchral tone, scarcely audible—"Do you believe me now?"

"Runjeet Singh replied in the affirmative; and then began investing the Fakeer with a pearl necklace, a superb pair of gold bracelets, shawls, and pieces of silk and muslin, forming what is called a *khilet*, such as is usually conferred, by the princes of India, on persons of distinction. From the time of the box being opened to the recovery of the voice, not more than half an hour could have elapsed; and, in another half an hour, the Fakeer talked with himself and those about him freely, though feebly, like a sick person, and we then left him, convinced that there had been no fraud or collusion, in the exhibition, which we had witnessed."

The Hon. Captain Osborne, who was attached to the mission of Sir William Macnaughten, in the following year, 1838, sought to persuade the Fakeer to repeat the experiment, and to suffer the keys of the vault to remain in Captain Osborne's custody. At this the Fakeer became alarmed, though he afterwards consented, and, at the request of Runjeet Singh, he came to Lahore for the purpose; but, as he expressed a strong apprehension, that Captain Osborne intended to destroy him, and as Sir William Macnaughten and his suite were about to depart, the matter was given up. This is related by Captain Osborne, in his "Court and Camp of Runjeet Singh."

After avowing his entire belief in all the facts, set forth in the previous narrative, Sir Claude M. Wade remarks—"I took some pains to inquire into the mode, by which such a result

was effected ; and was informed, that it rested on a doctrine of the Hindoo physiologists, that heat constitutes the self-existent principle of life ; and, that, if the functions are so far destroyed, as to leave that one, in perfect purity, life could be sustained for considerable lengths of time, independently of air, food, or any other means of sustenance. To produce such a state, the patients are obliged to go through a severe preparation. How far such means are calculated to produce such effects physiologists will be better able to judge than I can pretend to do. I only state what I saw, and heard, and think."

This narrative certainly belongs to the very first part of the very first book of very wonderful things. But this marvellous book is no longer a closed volume. Millions of ingenious fingers have, for fifty years, been busily employed, in breaking its mysterious seals, one after another. Demonstration has trampled upon doubt, and the world is rapidly coming to my shrewd old grandmother's conclusion, that nothing is so truly wonderful, as that we wonder at all. There is nothing more difficult, than to exonerate the mind from the weight of its present consciousness, and to wonder by rule. We readily lose the recollection of our doubt and derision, upon former occasions, when matters, apparently quite as absurd and impossible, are presented for contemplation, *de novo*.

If putrefaction can be kept off, mere animal life, the vital principle, may be preserved, for a prodigious length of time, in the lower ranks of animal creation, while in a state of torpidity. Dr. Gillies relates, that he bottled up some *cerastes*, a species of small snakes, and kept them corked tight, with nothing in the bottle, but a little sand, for several years ; and, when the bottle was uncorked, they came forth, revived by the air, and immediately acquired their original activity.

More than fifty years ago, having read Dr. Franklin's account of the flies, which he discovered, drowned, in a bottle of old wine, and which he restored to life, by exposure to the sun's rays ; I bottled up a dozen flies, in a small phial of Madeira—took them out, at the expiration of a month—and placed them under a glass tumbler, in a sunny window. Within half an hour, nine revived ; got up ; walked about, wiped their faces with their fore legs ; trimmed their wings, with their hinder ones ; and began to knock their heads, against the tumbler, to escape. After waiting a couple of hours, to give the remaining

three a fair chance, but to no purpose, and expecting nothing from the humane society, for what I had already accomplished, I returned the nine to their wine bath, in the phial. After rather more than three months, I repeated the experiment of resuscitation. After several hours, two gave evidence of revival, got upon their legs, reeled against each other, and showed some symptoms of *mania a potu*. At length they were fairly on their trotters. I lifted the tumbler; they took the hint, and flew to the window glass. It was fly time. I watched one of those, who had profited by the revival—he got four or five flies about him, who really seemed to be listening to the account of his experience.

“Ants, bees, and wasps,” says Sharon Turner, in his *Sacred History*, vol. i. ch. 17, “especially the smallest of these, the ants, do things, and exercise sensibilities, and combine for purposes, and achieve ends, that bring them nearer to mankind, than any other class of animated nature.” Aye, I know, myself, some of our fellow-citizens, who make quite a stir, in their little circles, petty politicians, who extort responses from great men, and show them, *in confidence*, to all they meet—overgrown boys, in bands and cassocks, who, for mere exercise, edit religious newspapers, and scribble *treason*, under the name of *ethics*—who, in respect to all the qualities, enumerated by Sharon Turner, are decidedly inferior to pismires.

The hybernation of various animals furnishes analogous examples of the matter, under consideration. A suspension of faculties and functions, for a considerable time, followed by a periodical restoration of their use, forms a part of the natural history of certain animals.

Those forty days—that wonderful quarantine of the Fakeer, in the tomb, and his subsequent restoration, are marvels. I have presented the facts, upon the evidence of Sir Claude M. Wade. Every reader will philosophize, upon this interesting matter, for himself. If such experiments can be made, for forty days, it is not easy to comprehend the necessity of such a limit. If trustees were appointed, and gave bonds to keep the tomb comfortable, and free from rats, and to knock up a corpse, at the time appointed, forty years, or an hundred, might answer quite as well. What visions are thus opened to the mind. An author might go to sleep, and wake up in the midst of posterity, and find himself an entire stranger. Weary partners might

find a temporary respite, in the grave, and leave directions, to be called, in season to attend the funeral. The heir expectant of some tenacious ancestor might thus dispose of the drowsy and unprofitable interval. The gentleman of *petite fortune* might suffer it to accumulate, in the hands of trustees, and wake up, after twenty or thirty years, a man of affluence. Instead of making up a party for the pyramids, half a dozen merry fellows might be buried together, with the pleasant prospect of rising again in 1949. No use whatever being made of the time thus relinquished, and the powers of life being husbanded in the interim, years would pass uncounted, of course ; and he, who was buried, at twenty-one, would be just of age when he awoke. I should like, extremely, to have the opinion of the Fakeer, upon these interesting points.

No. CXXXIX.

" And much more honest to be hir'd, and stand
With auctionary hammer in thy hand,
Provoking to give more, and knocking thrice,
For the old household stuff or picture's price."

DRYDEN.

OLD customs, dead and buried, long ago, do certainly come round again, like old comets ; but, whether in their appointed seasons, or not, I cannot tell. Whether old usages, and old chairs, and old teapots revolve in their orbits, or not, I leave to the astronomers. It would be very pleasant to be able to calculate the return of hoops, cocked hats, and cork rumpers, buffets, pillions, links, pillories, and sedans.

I noticed the following paragraph, in the Evening Transcript, not long ago, and it led me to turn over some heaps of old relics, in my possession—

" A substitute for the everlasting ' going, going, gone,' was introduced at a recent auction in New York. The auctioneer held up a sand-glass, through which the sand occupied fourteen seconds in passing. If a person made a bid, the glass was held up in view of all, and if no person advanced on the bid before the sand passed through, the sale was made. This idea is a novel one, though we believe it has long been practised in Europe."

It was formerly the custom in England, to sell goods, at auc-

tion, "by inch of candle." An inch of candle was lighted, and the company proceeded to bid, the last crier or bidder, before the candle went out, was declared the purchaser. Samuel Pepys, who was Secretary of the Admiralty, in the reigns of the two last Stuarts, repeatedly refers to the practice, in his Diary. Thus, in Braybrook's edition, of 1848, he says, vol. i. page 151. under date Nov. 6, 1660—"To our office, where we met all, for the sale of two ships, by an inch of candle, (the first time that I saw any of this kind,) where I observed how they do invite one another, and at last how they all do cry; and we have much to do to tell who did cry last."

Again, Ibid., vol. ii. page 29, Sept. 3, 1662—"After dinner, we met and sold the Weymouth, Successe, and Fellowship hulkes, where pleasant to see how backward men are at first to bid; and yet, when the candle is going out, how they bawl, and dispute afterwards who bid the most first. And here I observed one man cunninger than the rest, that was sure to bid the last man, and carry it; and, inquiring the reason, he told me, that, just as the flame goes out, the smoke descends, which is a thing I never observed before, and, by that he do know the instant when to bid last." Again, Ibid., vol. iv. page 4, Ap. 3, 1667, he refers to certain prize goods, "bought lately at the candle."

Haydn says this species of auction, by inch of candle is derived from a practice, in the Roman Catholic Church. Where there is an excommunication, by inch of candle, and the sinner is allowed to come to repentance, while yet the candle burns. The sinner is supposed, of course, to be *going—going—gone*—unless he avails of the opportunity to bid, as it were, for his salvation. This naturally reminds the reader of the spiritual distich—

"For while the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

Where the bids are, from a maximum, downward, the term—*auktion*—is still commonly, though improperly employed, and in the very teeth of all etymology. When I was a boy, the poor, in many of our country towns, were disposed of, in this manner. The question was, who would take Daddy Osgood, one of the town's poor, for the smallest weekly sum, to be paid by the town. The old man was started, at four shillings, and bid down to a minimum. There was yet a little work in his old bones; and I well remember one of these auctions, in 1798, in the town

of Billerica, at which Dr. William Bowers bid off Daddy Osgood, for two and sixpence.

The Dutch have a method of selling fresh fish, which is somewhat analogous to this, and very simple and ingenious. An account of it may be found, in Dodsley's Annual Register, for 1760, vol. iii. page 170. The salesman is called the Affslager. The fish are brought in, in the morning, and placed on the ground, near the fish stalls of the retailers. At ten, precisely, the Affslager rings his bell, which may be heard, for half a mile. Retailers, and individual consumers collect, and the Affslager—the auctioneer—puts up a lot, at a maximum price. No one offers a less sum, but the mynheers stand round, sucking at their pipes, and puffing away, and saying nothing. When the Affslager becomes satisfied, that nobody will buy the lot, at the price named, he gradually lowers it, until one of the mynheers takes his pipe from his mouth and cries "*mine!*" in High Dutch. He is, of course, the purchaser; and the Affslager proceeds to the sale of another lot.

It will be seen, from one of the citations from Pepys, that some of the auctions of his time were called the *candles*; precisely as the auctions, at Rome, were called *hasta*; a spear or *hasta*, instead of a flag, being the customary signal for the sale. The proper word, however, was *auctio*, and the auctioneer was called *auctor*. Notice of the sale was given, by the crier, a *præcone prædicari*, Plaut. Men., v. 9, 94, or, by writing on tables. Such is the import of *tabulum proscriptis*, in Cicero's letter to his brother Quintus, ii. 6.

In the year 1824, passing through the streets of Natchez, I saw a slave, walking along, and ringing a bell, as he went; the bell very much resembled our cowbells, in size and form. Upon a signal from a citizen, the slave stopped ringing, and walked over to him, and stood before him, till he had read the advertisement of a sale at auction, placarded on the breast of the slave, who then went forward, ringing his bell, as before. The Romans made their bids, by lifting the finger; and the auctioneer added as many *sesterces*, as he thought amounted to a reasonable bid.

Cicero uses this expression in his fine oration against Verres, i. 54—*digitum tollit*. Junius patruus—Junius, his paternal uncle, raised his finger, that is, he made a bid.

The employment of a spear, as the signal of an auction sale,

is supposed to have arisen from the fact, that the only articles, originally sold, in this manner, were the spoils of war. Subsequently, the spear—*hasta*—came to be universally used, to signify a *sale at auction*. The auction of Pompey's goods, by Cæsar, is repeatedly alluded to, by Cicero, with great severity, as the *hasta Cæsaris*. A passage may be found, in his treatise, *De Officiis*, ii. 8, and another, in his eighth Philippic, sec. 3—“Invitus dico, sed dicendum est. Hasta Cæsaris, Patres Conscripti, multis improbis spem affert, et audaciam. Viderunt enim, ex mendicis fieri repente divites: itaque hastam semper videre cupiunt ii, qui nostris bonis imminet; quibus omnia pollicetur Antonius.” I say it reluctantly, but it must be said—Cæsar's auction, Conscript Fathers, inflames the hopes and the insolence of many bad men. For they see how immediately, the merest beggars are converted into men of wealth. Therefore it is, that those, who are hankering after our goods and chattels, and to whom Antony has promised all things, are ever longing to behold such another auction, as that.

The auctioneer's bell, in use, at the Hague, in 1760, was introduced into Boston, seventy-seven years ago, by Mr. Bicker, whose auction-room was near the Market. Having given some offence to the public, he inserted the following notice, in the Boston Gazette and Country Journal, Monday, April 18, 1774—“As the method, lately practised by the Subscriber, in having a Person at his Door, to invite Gentlemen and others to his public Sales—has given Dissatisfaction to some (Gentlemen Shopkeepers in particular) to avoid giving Offence for the future, he shall desist from that Practice, and pursue one (as follows) which he flatters himself cannot fail giving universal Satisfaction, as he sincerely wishes so to do. The Public are most earnestly requested to remember (*for their own advantage*) that, for the future, Notice will be given, by sounding a Bell, which he has purchased for that Purpose, which is erected over the Auction Room Door, near the Market, Boston, where constant Attendance is given both early and late, to receive the favors of all such who are pleased to confer on their *Much obliged, Most Obedient, and very humble Servant*, M. Bicker.”

Albeit there is no less bickering or dickering here now, than of yore, yet Bicker and his bell have gone, long ago, to the “receptacle of things lost upon earth.” The very name is no more.

Haydn says, the first auction in Britain was about 1700, by

Elisha Yale, a Governor of Fort George, in the East Indies, of the goods he had brought home with him. That Mr. Haydn must be mistaken is manifest, from the citation from Pepys, who speaks of auctions, by inch of candle, as early as 1660; and not then as a novelty, but the first of the kind that he had witnessed.

Fosbroke says, in his *Antiquities*, page 412—"In the middle age, the goods were cried and sold to the highest bidder, and the sound of a trumpet added with a very loud noise. The use of the spear was retained, the auctions being called *Subhastationes*; and the *Subhastator*, or auctioneer, was sworn to sell the goods faithfully. In Nares, we have, *sold at a pike or spear*, i. e. by public auction or outcry; and auctions called *port sales*, because originally, perhaps, sales made in ports—the crier stood under the spear, as in the Roman æra, and was, in the thirteenth century, called *cursor*."

Of late, *mock auctions*, as they are termed, have become a very serious evil, especially in the city of New York. In 1813 petitions, in regard to these public impositions, were sent to the Lords of the Treasury, from many of the principal cities of Great Britain. In 1818 a select committee reported, very fully, upon this subject, to the British Parliament. This committee, after long and critical investigation, reported, that great frauds were constantly committed on the public, by *mock* or fraudulent *auctions*. The committee set forth several examples of this species of knavery. Goods are sold, as the furniture of gentlemen, going abroad. For this purpose, empty houses are hired for a few days, and filled with comparatively worthless furniture. Articles of the most inferior manufacture are made for the express purpose of being put into such sales, as the property of individuals of known character and respectability. To impose, more effectually, on the public, the names of the most respectable auctioneers have been used, with the variation of a letter. This bears some analogy to the legislative change of name, in this city, for the purpose of facilitating the sale of inferior pianos. Respectable auctioneers have been compelled, in self-defence, to appear at such mock auctions, and disclaim all connection therewith. Great masses of cutlery and plated ware of base manufacture, with London makers' names, and advertised, as made in London, are constantly sold, at these auctions; forcing the London makers to appear at the sales rooms, and expose the fraud.

The committee say that no imposition is more common than the sale of ordinary wine, in bottles, as the *bonne bouche* of some respectable Amphitryon deceased.

They farther state, that daring men are known to combine, attend real sales, and by various means, drive respectable purchasers away, purchase at their own price, and afterwards privately sell, under a form of public sale, among themselves, at *Knock Out* auctions, as they are called.

The committee recommended an entire revision of the auction laws—an increase of the license—heavier penalties for violation—no sale, without previous exposure of the goods for twenty-four hours, or printed catalogue—name and address of the auctioneer to be published—severe penalty, for using a fictitious name, &c.

The whole advertising system of mock auctions, like that, connected with the kindred impostures of quackery and patent medicines, furnishes a vast amount of curious and entertaining reading; and affords abundant scope, for the exercise of a vicious ingenuity. I have heard of a horse, that could not be compelled, by whip or spur, to cross a bridge, which lay in the way to his owner's country residence—the horse was advertised to be sold at auction for no fault but that his owner was *desirous of going out of the city*.

No. CXL.

Few things are more difficult, than shaving a cold corpse, and making, what the *artistes* call a *good job of it*. I heard Robert New say so, forty years ago, who kept his shop, at the north-easterly corner of Scollay's buildings. He said the barber ought to be called, as soon, as the breath was out of the body, and a little before, if it was a clear case, and you wished the corpse "*to look wholesome*." I think he was right. Pope's Narcissa said—

"One need not sure be ugly, though one's dead."

There is considerable mystery, in shaving a living corpse. I find it so; and yet I have always shaved myself; for I have never been able to overcome a strong, hereditary prejudice, against being taken by the nose.

My razor is very capricious; so, I suppose, is everybody's razor. There is a deep and mystical philosophy, about the edge of a razor, which seems to have baffled the most scientific; and is next of kin to witchcraft. A tract, by Cotton Mather, upon this subject, would be invaluable. The scholar will smile, at any comparison, between Pliny the elder and Cotton Mather. So far, as respects the scope of knowledge, and power of intellect, and inexhaustible treasures, displayed in Pliny's thirty-seven books of Natural History, one might as well compare Hyperion to a mummy. I allude to nothing but the *Magnalia* or *Improbabilia*; and, upon this point of comparison, Mather, witchcraft and all fairly fade out of sight, before the marvels and fantastical stories of Pliny. In lib. xxviii. 23, Pliny assigns a very strange cause, why *aciem in cultris tonsorum hebetescere*—why the edge of a barber's razor is sometimes blunted. The reader may look it up, if he will—it is better in a work, *sub sigillo latinitatis*, than in an English journal.

I have often put my razor down, regretting, that my beard did not spread over a larger area; so keenly and agreeably has the instrument performed its work. It really seemed, that I might have shaved a sleeping mouse, without disturbing his repose. After twelve hours, that very razor, untouched the while, has come forth, no better than a pot-sherd. The very reverse of all this has also befallen me. I once heard Revailon, our old French barber, say, that a razor could not be strapped with too light a hand; and the English proverb was always in his mouth—"a good lather is half the shave."

Some persons suppose the razor to be an instrument, of comparatively modern invention, and barbers to have sprung up, at farthest, within the Christian era. It is written, in Isaiah vii. 20, "In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor, that is hired," &c. Ezekiel began to prophecy, according to Calmet, 590 years before Christ: in the first verse of ch. v. he says—"take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber's razor, and cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard." To cause a razor to *pass upon the beard* seems to mean something very different from *shaving*, in the common sense of that word. Doubtless, it does: the *culter* or *novacula*, that is, the *razor*, of the ancients, was employed, for *shearing* or *shortening*, as well as for *shaving* the beard. Barbers were first known, among the Romans A. U. C. 454, i. e. 298 years before Christ. Pliny says,

vii. 59—*Sequens gentium consensus in tonsoribus fuit, sed Romanis tardior.* In Italiam ex Sicilia venere post Romam conditam anno quadringentesimo quinquagesimo quarto, adducens P. Ticinio Mena, ut auctor est Varro: antea intonsi fuere. Primus omnium radi quotidie instituit Africanus sequens: Divus Augustus cultris semper usus est. Then barbers came into use, among the nations, but more slowly among the Romans. In the year of the city 454, according to Varro, P. Ticinius Mena introduced barbers into Italy from Sicily: until that time, men wore their beards. The latter Africanus first set the example of being shaven daily. Augustus constantly used razors. The passage of Varro, referred to by Pliny, showing, that, before A. U. C. 454, men wore their beards, states the fact to be established, by the long beards, on all the old male statues. That *passing of the sharp knife or razor, upon the beard*, spoken of, by Ezekiel, I take to be the latter of the two modes, employed by the Romans—"vel strictim, hoc est, ad cutem usque; vel paulo longius a cute, interposito pectine"—either close to the skin, or with a comb interposed. That both modes were in use is clear from the lines of Plautus in his play of the Captives, Act ii. sc. 2, v. 16—

Nunc senex est in tonstrina; nunc jam cultros adinet;
Sed utrum strictissime adtonsurum dicam esse, an per pectinem,
Nescio.

Now the old man is in the barber's shop and under the razor; but whether to be close shaved, or clipped with the comb, I know not.

Pliny, as we have seen, states, that the practice came from Sicily. There it had been long in use. There is a curious reference to the custom in Cicero's Tusculan Questions, v. 20. Speaking of the tyrant, Dionysius he says—*Quin etiam, ne tonsori collum committeret, tondere suas filias docuit.* Ita sordido ancillarique artificio regię virgines, ut tonstriculę tondebant barbam et capillum patris. For, not liking to trust his throat to a barber, he taught his daughters to shave him, and thus these royal virgins, descending to this coarse, servile vocation, became little, she barbers, and clipped their father's beard and hair.

There is a curious passage in Pliny which not only proves, that barbers' shops were common in his time, but shows the very ancient employment of cobweb, as a styptic. In lib. xxix. 36, he says—*Fracto capiti aranei tela ex oleo et aceto imposita, non*

nisi vulnere sanato, abscedit. Hæc et vulneribus tonstrinarum sanguinem sistit. Spiders' web, with oil and vinegar, applied to a broken head, adheres, till the wound heals. This also stops the bleeding from cuts, in barbers' shops.

Razors were sharpened, some two thousand years ago, very much as they are at present. Pliny devotes sec. 47, lib. xxxvi. to hones and whetstones, oil stones and water stones—quarta ratio—he says—est saliva hominis proficientium in tonstrinarum officinis—the fourth kind is such as are used in the barbers' shops, and which the man softens with his saliva.

Most common, proverbial sayings are, doubtless, of great antiquity. Chopping-blocks with a razor is a common illustration of the employment of a subtle ingenuity, upon coarse and uninteresting topics. Thus Goldsmith, in his *Retaliation*, says of Burke—

In short, 'twas his fate, unemploy'd, or in place, sir,
To eat mutton cold, and chop blocks with a razor.

The latter illustration is as old as Livy—*novacula cotem discindere*.

The Romans made a prodigious fuss, about their beards. The first crop, called *prima barba*, and sometimes *lanugo*, was, according to Petronius, consecrated to some god. Suetonius says, in his *Life of Nero*, 12—Gymnico quod in septis edebat, inter buthysiæ apparatus, barbam primam posuit, conditamque in auream pyxidem, et pretiosissimis margaritis adornatam, capitolio consecravit.—During the games, which he had given in the enclosures, and in the very midst of the splendor of the sacrifice, for the first time, he laid down his beard, and having placed it in a golden box, adorned with precious stones, he made a sacred deposit thereof, in the capitol.

After the custom of shaving had been introduced, by Mena, A. U. C. 454, it went out, for a short time, in Rome, during the time of Adrian, who as Spartianus relates, in his *Life of that Emperor*, having some ugly excrescences on his chin, suffered his beard to grow to conceal them—of course the courtiers followed the example of the emperor—the people, that of the courtiers. The grave concealed those excrescences, more effectually, A. D. 139, and the *navacula* again came into use, among the Romans: Marcus Antoninus, his successor, had no excrescences on his chin.

The day, upon which a young Roman was said *ponere barbam*,

that is, to shave for the first time, was accounted a holiday; and Juvenal says, iii. 187, he received presents from his friends.

Ovid, *Trist.* iv. 10, 67, dates his earliest literary exhibitions, before the people, by his first or second shave, or clip—

*Carmina quum primum populo juvenilia legi,
Barba resecta mihi bisve semel fuit.*

Which may be thus translated—

When first in public I began
To read my boyish rhymes,
I scarcely could be call'd a man,
And had not shav'd three times.

Cæsar says of the Britons, *B. G. V.* 14—*omni parte corporis rasa, præter caput et labrum superius*—they shave entirely, excepting the head and upper lip.

Half-shaving was accounted, in the days of Samuel, I suppose, as reducing the party to a state of semi-*barbarism*: thus, in Samuel II. x. 4—“Wherefore Hanan took David’s servants, and shaved off the one half of their beards.”

To be denied the privilege of shaving was accounted dishonorable, among the Catti, a German nation, in the days of Tacitus; for he says, *De Moribus Germanæ*, 31—*Apud Cattos in consensum vertit, ut primum adoleverint, crinem barbamque submittere, nec, nisi hoste cæso*—It was settled among the Catti, that no young man should cut his hair, or shave his beard, till he had killed his man.

Seneca, *Cons. Polyb.* xxxvi. 5, blames Caius, for refusing to shave, because he had lost his sister—*Idem ille Caius furiosa in constantia, modo barbam capillumque submittens*—There is that Caius, clinging so absurdly to his sorrow, and suffering his hair and beard to grow on account of it.

There is an admirable letter, from Seneca to Lucillus, *Ep.* 114, which shows, that the dandies, in old Rome, were much like our own. He is speaking of those—*qui vellunt barbam, aut intervellunt; qui labra pressius tondent et abradunt, servata et submissa cætera parte*—who pull out the beard, by the roots, or particular parts of it—who clip and shave the hair, either more closely, or leave it growing, on some parts of their lips.

Juvenal, ii. 99, and Martial, vi. 64, 4, laugh at such, as use a mirror while shaving. Knives and razors of *brass*, are of great antiquity, according to the *Archæological Æliana*, p. 39.—Fos-

broke, p. 351, says, that razors are mentioned by Homer. But I am going to a funeral, this afternoon, as an amateur, and it is time for me to shave—not with a razor of brass, however—Pradier is too light for me—I use the Chinese. Hutchinson, i. 153, says, that Leverett was the first Governor of Massachusetts, who is painted without a beard, and that he laid it aside, in Cromwell's court.

China is the paradise of barbers. There, according to Mr. Davis, they abound. No man shaves himself, the part, to be shorn, being out of his reach. There would be no difficulty in removing the scanty hair upon their chins; but the exact tonsure of the crown, without removing one hair from the Chinaman's long tail, that reaches to his heels, is a delicate affair. Their razors are very heavy, but superlatively keen.

No. CXLI.

BARBERS were chiefly peripatetics, when I was a boy. They ran about town, and shaved at their customers' houses. There were fewer shops. This was the genteel mode in Rome. The wealthy had their domestic barbers, as the planters have now, among their slaves. I am really surprised, that we hear of so few throats cut at the South. Some evidence of this custom—not of cutting throats—may be found, in one of the neatest epitaphs, that ever was written; the subject of which, a very young and accomplished slave-barber, has already taken a nap of eighteen hundred years. I refer to Martial's *epitaphium*, on Pantagathus, a word, which, by the way, signifies one, who is good at everything, or, as we say—a man of all works. It is the fifty-second, of Book VI. Its title is *Epitaphium Pantagathi, Tonsoris*:

Hoc jacet in tumulo raptus puerilibus annis
Pantagathus, domini cura, dolorque sui,
Vix tangente vagos ferro resecare capillos
Doctus, et hirsutas excoluisse genas.
Sic, licet, ut debes, Tellus placata, levisque;
Artificis levior non potes esse manu.

In attempting a version of this, I feel, as if I were about to disfigure a pretty spinster, with a mob-cap.

Here lies Pantagathus, the slave,
 Pettet he liv'd, and died lamented;
 No youth, like him could clip and shave,
 Since shears and razors were invented.

So light his touch, you could not feel
 The razor, while your cheeks were smoothing;
 And sat, unconscious of the steel,
 The operation was so soothing.

Oh, mother Earth, appeas'd, since thou
 Back to thy grasping arms hast won him,
 Soft be thy hand, like his, and now
 Lie thou, in mercy, lightly on him.

Rochester was right; few things were ever benefited, by translation, but a bishop.

The *Tonstrinae*, or barbers' shops, in Rome, were seldom visited by any, but the humbler classes. They were sometimes called the *Shades*. Horace, Ep. i. 7, 50, describes Philippus, an eminent lawyer, as struck with sudden envy, upon seeing Vultius Mena, the beadle, sitting very much at ease, in one of these shades, after having been shaved, and leisurely cleaning his own nails, an office commonly performed by the barbers:—

Abrasum quendam vacua tonsoris in umbra,
 Cultello proprios purgantem leniter ungues.

There were she-barbers, in Rome, residing in the *Saburra* and *Argiletum*, very much such localities, as "*the Hill*," formerly in Boston, or *Anthony Street*, in New York. Martial describes one of these *tonstrices*, ii. 17—

Tonstrix Saburræ fancibus sedet primis, etc.

Some there were, of a better order. Plautus, Terence, and Theophrastus have many allusions to the barbers' shops. They have ever been the same "*otiosorum conciliabula*," that they were, when Terence wrote—resorts of the idle and garrulous. In old times—very—not now, of course—not now, a dressmaker, who was mistress of her business, knew that she was expected to turn out so much work, and so much *slander*. That day has fortunately gone by. But the "barber's tale" is the very thing that it was, in the days of Oliver Goldsmith, and it was then the very thing, that it was, as I verily believe, in the days of Ezekiel. There are many, who think, that a good story, not less than a good lather, is half the shave.

It is quite *in rerum natura*, that much time should be con-

sumed, in waiting, at the *tonstrina*—the barbers' shops; and to make it pass agreeably, the craft have always been remarkable, for the employment of sundry appliances—amusing pictures around the walls—images and mechanical contrivances—the daily journals—poodles, monkeys, squirrels, canaries, and parrots. In the older countries, a barber's boy was greatly in request, who could play upon the *citterne*, or some other musical instrument.

If there had not been a curious assemblage of *materiel*, in an old Roman *tonstrina*, it would not have been selected as an object for the pencil. That it was so selected, however, appears from a passage in Pliny, xxxv. 37. He is writing of *Pureicus*—*arte paucis postferendus: proposito, nescio an destruxerit se: quoniam humilia quidem sequutus, humilitatis tamen summam adeptus est gloriam. Tonstrinas, sutrinque pinxit, et asellos, et obsonia, ac similia*—He had few superiors in his art: I know not if the plan he adopted was fatal to his fame; for, though his subjects were humble, yet, in their representation, he attained the highest excellence. He painted barbers' and shoemakers' shops, asses, eatables, and the like.

A rude sketch of Heemskerck's picture of a barber's shop lies now upon my table. Here is the poodle, with a cape and fool's cap, walking on his hind legs—the suspended bleeding basin, and other *et cætera* of the profession.

Little is generally known, as to the origin and import of the barber's pole. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, surgery was in such low repute, that farriers, barbers, sow-spayers, and surgeons were much upon a level. The truth of this, in respect to surgeons and barbers, has been established by law: and, for about two hundred years, both in London and Paris, they were incorporated, as one company. I remember a case, reported by *Espinasse*—not having the book at hand, I cannot indicate the volume and page—which shows the judicial estimate of surgery then, compared with the practice of physic. A physician's fees, in England, were accounted *quiddam honorarium*, and not *matter of lucre*, and therefore could not be recovered, in an action at law. Upon an action brought for surgical services, the fees were recoverable, because surgeons, upon the testimony of Dr. Mead, were of a lower grade, having nothing to do with the pathology of diseases, and never prescribing; but simply performing certain mechanical acts; and being, like all other artificers and operatives, worthy of their hire.

Nothing can more clearly exhibit the low state of this noble science, at the time, and the humble estimation of it, by the public. Chirurgery seemed destined to grovel, in etymological bondage, χειρ ἔργον, a mere *handicraft*. Barbers and surgeons were incorporated, as one company, in the fifteenth century, in the reign of Edward IV., and were called barber-surgeons. At the close of the sixteenth century, Ambrose Paré, the greatest surgeon of his time in France, did not reject the appellation of *barber-surgeon*. Henry VIII. dissolved this union, and gave a new charter in 1540, when it was enacted, that "*no person, using any shaving or barbery in London, shall occupy any surgery, letting of blood, or other matter, excepting only the drawing of teeth.*" The *barber-surgeon* was thus reduced to the *barber-dentist*, which seems not so agreeable to the practitioner, at present, as the loftier appellation of *surgeon-dentist*. Sterne was right: there is something in a name. The British surgeons obtained a new charter, in 1745, and another, in 1800, and various acts have been subsequently passed, on their behalf. July 17, 1797, Lord Thurlow, in the House of Peers, opposed a new bill, which the surgeons desired to have passed. Thurlow was a man of morose temperament, and uncertain humor.

He averred, that so much of the old law was in force, that, to use his own words, "the barbers and surgeons were each to use a pole, the barbers were to have theirs blue and white, striped, with no other appendage; but the surgeons', which was the same, in other respects, was likewise to have a gallipot and a red rag, to denote the particular nature of their vocation."

Brand, in his *Popular Antiquities*, says, that the barber's pole, used in bleeding, is represented, in an illuminated missal, of the time of Edward I., Longshanks, whose reign began in 1272. Fosbroke, in his *Encyc. of Antiquities*, page 414, says—"A staff, bound by a riband, was held, by persons being bled, and the pole was intended to denote the practice of phlebotomy." According to Lord Thurlow's statement, in the House of Peers, the pole was required, by the statute, to be used, as a sign. The first statute, incorporating the barber-surgeons, was that of Edward IV., as I have stated. The missal of Edward I., referred to by Brand, shows, that the usage was older than the law, and, doubtless, that the popular emblem was adopted, in the statute, to which Lord Thurlow refers, as still in force, in 1797.

In Brand's *Newcastle*, I find, that "it is ordered, Dec. 11,

1711, that periwig-making be considered part and branch of the Company of Barber-*Chirurgeons*."

The history of the pole is this: A staff about three feet high, with a ball on the top, and inserted, at the bottom, in a small cross-piece, was very convenient for the person to hold, who extended his arm, as he sat down, to be bled; and a fillet, or tape, was equally convenient for the ligature. These things the barber-surgeons kept, in a corner of their shops; and, when not in use, the tape or fillet was wound or twirled round the staff. When the lawgivers called for a sign, no apter sign could be given unto them, than this identical staff and fillet; much larger of course, and to be seen of men much farther.

No. CXLII.

ANCIENT plays abound with allusions to the barber's *citterne*, or lute, upon which not only he himself, and his apprentices were accustomed to play, but all the loiterers in the *tonstrina*. Much of all this may be found, in the Glossary of Archdeacon Nares, under the article CITTERNE, and in Fosbroke's Antiquities.

The commonness of its use gave rise to a proverb. In the Silent Woman, Act II., scene 2, Ben Jonson avails of it. Morose had married a woman, recommended by his barber, and whose fidelity he suspected, and the following passage occurs, between Morose and Truewit. Lond., 1816, iii. 411.

Morose. That cursed barber!

Truewit. Yes, faith, a cursed wretch indeed, sir.

Morose. I have married his *cittern*, that's common to all men.

Upon this passage is the following note—"It appears from innumerable passages, in our old writers, that barbers' shops were furnished with some musical instrument, commonly a cittern or guitar, for the amusement of such customers as chose to strum upon it, while waiting for their turn to be shaved, &c. It should be recollected, that the patience of customers, if the shop was at all popular, must, in those tedious days of love-locks, and beards of most fantastical cuts, have been frequently put to very severe trials. Some kind of amusement therefore was necessary, to beguile the time."

In old times, in old England, barbers were in the habit of making a variety of noises, with their fingers and their shears, which noises were supposed to be agreeable to their customers. Fosbroke, p. 414, refers to Lily's old play of *Mydas*, iii. 2, as showing the existence of the custom, in his time. Lily was born about 1553. There were some, who preferred to be shaved and dressed quietly. Nares, in his Glossary, refers to Plutarch, De Garrulitate, for an anecdote of King Archelaus, who stipulated with his barber to shave him in silence. This barbers' trick was called the "*knack with the fingers*;" and was extremely disagreeable to Morose, in Ben Jonson's play, to which I have referred. Thus, in i. 2, Clerimont, speaking of the partiality of Morose for Cutbeard, the barber, says—"The fellow trims him silently, and has not the knack with his shears or his fingers: and that continence in a barber he thinks so eminent a virtue, as it has made him chief of his counsel."

As barbers were brought first into Rome, from Sicily, so the best razors, according to Nares and Fosbroke, before the English began to excel in cutlery, were obtained in Palermo. Their form was unlike those now in use, and seems more perfectly to correspond with one of the Roman names, signifying a razor, i. e. *culter*. The blade, like that of a pruning knife, or sickle, curved slightly inward, the reverse of which is the modern form.

Smith, in his Ancient Topography of London, says—"The flying barber is a character now no more to be seen in London, though he still remains in some of our country villages: he was provided with a napkin, soap, and pewter basin, the form of which may be seen, in many of the illustrative prints of Don Quixote. His chafer was a deep leaden vessel, something like a chocolate pot, with a large ring or handle, at the top; this pot held about a quart of water, boiling hot; and, thus equipped, he flew about to his customers."

Old Randle Holme says, "*perawickes*" were very common in his time, about 1668, though unused before "contrary to our forefathers, who wore their own hair." A barber, in Paris, to recommend his bag wigs, hung over his door the sign of Absalom. Hone, i. 1262, states that a periwig-maker, to recommend his wares, turned the reason into rhyme:

"Oh, Absalom, oh Absalom,
Oh Absalom, my son,
If thou hadst worn a periwig,
Thou hadst not been undone."

Hutchinson, i. 152, says periwigs were an eyesore in New England, for thirty years after the Restoration of Charles II.

Among the Romans, after Mena introduced the practice of shaving, those, who professed philosophy, still maintained their dignity, and their beards, as an *ecce signum*. Hence the expression of Horace, Sat. ii. 3, 35, *sapientem pascere barbam*: and of Persius, iv. 1, when speaking of Socrates:

barbatum hæc crede magistrum
Dicere, sorbitio tollit quem dira cicutæ.

Of those, who wear beards, at the present day, it has been computed, that, for one philosopher, there are five hundred fools, at the very lowest estimate. Manage them as you will, they are troublesome appendages; of very questionable cleanliness; and mightily in the way of such, as are much addicted to gravy and spoon victual. Like the burden of our sins, the post-prandial odor of them must be sometimes intolerable.

What an infinite variety of colors we have now-a-days! Bottom, in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, i. 2, is in doubt, what beard he shall play Pyramus in, and, at last, he says—"I will discharge it in either your straw-colored beard, your orange tawny beard, your purple ingrain beard, or your French crown-colour beard, your perfect yellow." Now I can honestly aver, that every fifth dandy I meet, looks precisely like Bottom, performing Pyramus. Now and then, I meet a fine, full, black beard; but, even then, it seems to me, that the proud satisfaction the fortunate proprietor must feel, in going about town with it, must be, in some degree, counterbalanced, by the necessity of sleeping in it, during the summer solstice.

The fancy colors, proposed by Bottom, refer to the dyes, in use, at the period, when Bottom flourished. Indeed, dyeing the beard is of the highest antiquity. I have no authority that Aaron dyed his. In 1653, John Bulwer published his "*Anthropo-Metamorphosis*," or Artificial Changeling, a very able and curious production. For the antiquity of the silly practice of dyeing the beard, he refers to Strabo. Old John Bulwer, ch. ix., comments, with just severity, upon the conduct of those ancient fools, who adopt the practice—"In every haire of these old coxcombs, you shall meet with three divers and sundry colors; white at the roots, yellow in the middle, and black at the point, like unto one of your parrat's feathers." What a graphic de-

scription of this nasty appendage! It has ever been to me a matter of infinite surprise, how any mortal can presume to say his prayers, with one of these pied abominations on his chin; giving the lie direct to the volume of inspiration, which avers that he cannot make one hair black nor white.

Another mystery—how can any man's better half become reconciled to a husband, dyed thus, in the wool! The colors are not all fast colors, I believe; and are liable to be rubbed off, by attrition.

Beards were cultivated, to such an excess, in Elizabeth's time, as to require and receive a check from the legislature. "The growth of beards," says Nares, in his Glossary, "was regulated by statute, at Lincoln's Inn, in the time of Eliz.—Primo Eliz. it was ordered, that no fellow of that house should wear a beard above a fortnight's growth. Transgression was punished with fine, loss of commons, and finally expulsion. But fashion prevailed, and in November, the following year, all previous orders, touching beards, were repealed."

It was formerly calculated, by Lord Stanhope, that the sum, expended upon snuff, and the value of the time, consumed in taking it, and the cost of snuff-boxes, handkerchiefs, &c., if duly invested, would pay off the national debt. I have a proposal to offer, and I offer it, timidly and respectfully, for the consideration of those amiable females, who go about, so incessantly, doing good. Perhaps I may not be able to awaken their interest, more effectually, than by suggesting the idea, that here is a very fair opportunity, for the formation of another female auxiliary society. I take it for granted, that there are some of these bearded gentlemen, from whom contributions in money, could not easily be obtained, for any benevolent object. There are some, whose whole estate, real, personal, and mixed, comprehends very little, beyond a costly malacca joint, a set of valuable shirtstuds, and a safety chain. Still if we cudgel the doctrine of political economy, we may get some small contributions, even from them.

Cortez found, in the treasury of Montezuma, a multitude of little bags, which were, at last, discovered to be filled with dead lice. The Emperor, to keep the Mexican beggars out of mischief, had levied this species of tax. I am well aware, that the power of levying taxes is not vested in young ladies. They have certain, natural, inherent rights, however, and, among

them, the right and the power of persuasion. Let them organize, throughout the Union, and establish committees of correspondence. Let them address a circular to every individual, who wears a beard; and, if their applications succeed, they will enjoy the luxury of supplying a comfortable hair mattress, to every poor widow, and aged single woman in the United States.

No. CXLIII.

THE barber's brush is a luxury of more modern times. Stubbe, in his "Anatomy of Abuses," says—"When they come to washing, oh, how gingerly they behave themselves therein. For then shall your mouths be bossed with the lather or some that rinseth of the balles, (for they have their sweete balles, wherewith all they use to washe) your eyes closed must be anointed therewith also. Then snap go the fingers, ful bravely, God wot. Thus, this tragedy ended; comes the warme clothes to wipe and dry him with all." Stubbe wrote, about 1550.

Not very long ago, a writer in the Gentleman's Magazine, observed—"I am old enough to remember when the operation of shaving in this kingdom, was almost exclusively performed by the *barbers*: what I speak of is some threescore years ago, at which time gentlemen shavers were unknown. Expedition was then a prime quality in a barber, who smeared the lather over his customer's face with his hand; for the delicate refinement of the brush had not been introduced. The lathering of the beard being finished, the operator threw off the lather, adhering to his hand, by a peculiar jerk of his arm, which caused the joints of his fingers to crack, this being a more expeditious mode of clearing the hand, than using a towel for that purpose; and, the more audible the crack, the higher the shaver stood, in his own opinion, and in that of the fraternity. This I presume is the custom alluded to by Stubbe."

The Romans, when bald, wore wigs. Some of the emperors wore miserable periwigs. Curly locks, however becoming in a male child, are somewhat ridiculous, trained with manifest care, and descending upon the shoulders of a full grown boy of forty. In addition to the pole, a peruke was frequently employed, as the

barber's sign. There was the short bob, and the full bottom ; the "hie perrawycke" and the scratch ; the top piece, and the periwig with the pole lock ; the curled wig with a dildo, and the travelling wig, with curled foretop and bobs ; the campaign wig, with a dildo on each side, and the toupet, a la mode.

It may seem a paradox to some, that the most *barbarous* nations should suffer the hair and beard to grow longest. The management of the hair has furnished an abundant subject matter for grave attention, in every age and nation. Cleansing, combing, crimping, and curling, clipping, and consecrating their locks gave ample occupation to the ladies and gentlemen of Greece and Rome. At the time of adolescence, and after shipwreck, the hair was cut off and sacrificed to the divinities. It was sometimes cut off, at funerals, and cast upon the pile. Curling irons were in use, at Rome. Girls wore the hair fastened upon the top of the head ; matrons falling on the neck. Shaving the crown was a part of the punishment of conspirators and thieves. We know nothing, at present, in regard to the hair, which was unknown at Rome—our *frizzing* was their *capillorum tortura*. They had an instrument, called *tressorium*, for plaiting the hair. In the time of Edward the Confessor, the hair was worn, universally, long, the laws of England not compelling all, but the nobility, as in France, to cut the hair short, in that age.

The Romans are said, occasionally to have worn wigs of an enormous size, which gave occasion to the term, in Martial's epigram, *caput calceatum*. We have no exact record of the size of those Roman wigs—but I sincerely wish, that Augustus Cæsar or—

"Mæcenæ, whose high lineage springs,
From fair Etruria's ancient kings,"

could have seen the Rev. Dr. Lathrop's ! In Mr. Ward's journal of Samuel Curwen, that venerable and truly respectable, and amiable, old tory is represented, with precisely such a wig, but of much smaller diameter. Dr. John Lathrop died, Jan. 4, 1816, at the age of 75. He published a considerable number of sermons on various occasions, no one of which is remarkable for extraordinary talent, or learning. It was, by some intelligent persons, supposed, that the wig was a great help to him. In his latter days, he found himself unable, any longer, to bear up, under such a portentous superstructure, which really appeared to "overhang," contrary to the statute, and he laid it aside. His

influence certainly appeared to diminish, in some measure, probably, from the increasing infirmities of age; but, doubtless, in some degree, from the deposition of the wig. I honestly confess, that I never felt for Dr. Lathrop the same awful reverence, after he had laid aside this emblem of wisdom. A "wig full of learning" is an ancient saying, and Cowper makes use of it, in one of his lighter poems.

I have always looked upon barbers, as an honorable race of men, quite as much so, as brokers; the barbers seldom fail to shave more gently, and commonly dismiss an old customer, without drawing blood, or taking off the skin. We owe them a debt of gratitude withal, on other scores. How very easily they might cut our throats!

In this goodly city, at the present time, there are more than one hundred and ten gentlemen, who practice the art of barbering, beside their respective servants and apprentices. When I was a small boy—very—some sixty years ago, there were but twenty-nine, and many of them were most respectable and careful operators—an honor to their profession, and a blessing to the community.

There was Charles Gavett, in Devonshire Street, the Pudding Lane of our ancestors. Gavett was a brisk, little fellow; his *tonstrina* was small, and rather dark, but always full.

In Brattle Square, just behind the church, John Green kept a shop, for several years. But John became unsteady, and cut General Winslow, and some other of his customers, and scalded several others, and lost his business.

In Fish Street, which had then, but recently, ceased to be the court end of the town, there were several clever barbers—there was Thomas Grubb, and Zebulon Sylvester, and James Adams, and Abraham Florence. I never heard a syllable against them, or their lather.

At No. 33, Marlborough Street, William Whipple kept a first rate establishment, and had a high name, among the dandies, as an accomplished haircutter.

Jonathan Edes kept a small shop, in Ann Street, and had a fair run of transient custom. He had always a keen edge and a delicate hand. He was greatly urged to take a larger establishment, in a more fashionable part of the town, near Cow Lane, but Mr. Edes was not ambitious, and turned a wiry edge to all such suggestions.

William Mock kept a shop, in Newbury Street, an excellent shaver, but slow; his shop was not far from the White Horse. He was a peripatetic. I suspect, but am not certain, that he shaved Dr. Lemuel Hayward.

At the corner of Essex Street, old Auchmuty's Lane, George Gideon kept a fine stand, clean towels, keen edge, and hot lather; but he had a rough, coarse hand. He had been one of the sons of liberty, and his shop being near the old site of Liberty tree, he was rather apt to take liberties with his customers' noses, especially the noses of the disaffected.

There were two professed wig-makers, in Boston, at that time, who performed the ordinary functions of barbers beside, William Haslet, in Adams Street, and John Bosson, in Orange Street. Mr. Bosson was very famous, in his line, and in great request, among the ladies.

In Marshall's Lane, Edward Hill was an admirable shaver; but, in the department of hair cutting, inferior to Anthony Howe, whose exceedingly neat and comfortable establishment was in South Latin School Street. An excellent hotel was then kept, by Joshua Bracket, at the sign of Cromwell's Head, on the very spot, where Palmer keeps his fruit shop, and the very next door below the residence of Dr. John Warren. Bracket patronized Howe's shop, and sent him many customers. Captain John Boyle, whose house and bookstore were at No. 18 Marlborough Street, patronized Anthony Howe.

Samuel Jepson kept his *barbery*, as the shop was sometimes called, in Temple Street, between the two bakeries of William Breed and Matthew Bayley.

James Tate was established in Purchase Street. He would have been a good barber, had he not been a poor poet. He was proud of his descent from Nahum Tate, the psalmist, the copartner of Brady. Richard Fox kept also in Purchase Street, and had a large custom.

A much frequented barber's shop was kept, by William Pierce, near the Boston Stone. Jonathan Farnham was an excellent barber, in Back Street. He unluckily had an ominous squint, which was inconvenient, as it impressed new comers, now and then, with a fear lest he might cut their throats. Joseph Alexander shaved in Orange Street, and Theodore Dehon, on the north side of the Old State House.

Joseph Eckley was one of the best shavers and hair cutters in

town, some sixty years ago. His shop was in Wing's Lane. Daniel Crosby, who was also a wig maker, in Newbury Street, was clerk of Trinity Church.

Augustine Raillion, whose name was often written Revailion kept his stand, at No. 48 Newbury Street. He was much given to dogs, ponies, and other divertisements.

State Street was famous, for four accomplished barbers, sixty years ago—Stephen Francis, John Gould, John M. Lane, and Robert Smallpiece. The last was the father of Robert Smallpiece, who flourished here, some thirty years ago or more, and kept his shop, in Milk Street, opposite the Old South Church.

It is well known, that the late Robert Treat Paine wrote an ode, upon the occasion of the Spanish successes, to which he gave the title of "*Spain, Commerce and Freedom, a National Ode.*" It bore unquestionable marks of genius; but some of the ideas and much of the phraseology were altogether extravagant. It commenced finely—

"Sound the trumpet of fame! Strike that paean again!
Religion a war against tyranny wages;
From her seat springs, in armor, regenerate Spain,
Like a giant, refresh'd by the slumber of ages.
From the place, where she lay,
She leaps in array,
Like Ajax, to die in the face of the day."

The ode contained some strange expressions—"redintegrant war"—"though the dismemberd earth effervesce and regender," and so many more, that the ode, though evidently the work of a man of genius, was accounted bombastic. A wag of that day, published a parody, of which this Robert Smallpiece was the hero. It was called, if I mistake not—"Soap, Razors, and Hot Water, a Tonsorial Ode." The first stanza ran thus—

"Strap that razor so keen! Strap that razor again!
And Smallpiece will shave 'em, if he can come at 'em;
From his stool, clad in aprons, he springs up amain,
Like a barber, refresh'd by the smell of pomatum.
From the place, where he lay,
He leaps in array,
To lather and shave, in the face of the day.
He has sworn from pollution our faces to clean,
Our cheeks, necks, and upper lips, whiskers and chin."

"Paullo majora canamus."

No. CXLIV.

IN 1784, Mr. Thomas Percival, an eminent physician, of Manchester, in England, published a work, against duelling, and sent a copy to Dr. Franklin. Dr. Franklin replied to Mr. Percival, from Passy, July 17, 1784, and his reply contains the following observations—"Formerly, when duels were used to determine lawsuits, from an opinion, that Providence would in every instance, favor truth and right, with victory, they were excusable. At present, they decide nothing. A man says something, which another tells him is a lie. They fight; but whichever is killed, the point in dispute remains unsettled. To this purpose, they have a pleasant little story here. A gentleman, in a coffee-house, desired another to sit further from him. 'Why so?'—'Because, sir, you stink.'—'That is an affront, and you must fight me.'—'I will fight you, if you insist upon it; but I do not see how that will mend the matter. For if you kill me, I shall stink too; and, if I kill you, you will stink, if possible, worse than you do at present.'"

This is certainly german to the matter. So far from perceiving any moral courage, in those, who fight duels, nothing seems more apparent, than the triumph of one fear, over four other fears—the fear of shame, over the fear of bringing misery upon parents, wives and children—the fear of the law—the fear of God—and the fear of death. Many a man will *brave* death, who fears it.

Death is the king of terrors, and all men stand in awe of him, saving the Christian, with his armor of righteousness about him, *cap-a-pie*; and even he, perhaps, is slightly pricked, by that fear, now and then, in articulo, between the joints of the harness. I must honestly confess, that I once knew a man, who had a terrible vixen of a wife, and, when about to die, he replied to his clergyman's inquiry, if he was not afraid to meet the king of terrors, that he was not, for he had lived with the queen, for thirty years.

I do not suppose there is a more hypocritical fellow, upon earth, than a duellist. Mandeville, in his Fable of the Bees, in the second dialogue, part ii., puts these words into the mouth of Cleomenes, when speaking to Horatio, on the subject of his duel: "I saw you, that very morning, and you seemed to be sedate

and void of passion: you could have no concern." Horatio replies—"It is silly to show any, at such times; but I know best what I felt; the struggle I had within was unspeakable: it is a terrible thing. I would then have given a considerable part of my estate, that the thing which forced me into it, had not happened; and yet, upon less provocation, I would act the same part again, tomorrow." Such is human nature, and many, who sit down quietly, to write in opposition to this silly, senseless, selfish practice, would be quite apt enough, upon the emergency, to throw aside the pacific steel, wherewith they indite, and take up the cruel rapier. When I was a young man, a Mr. Ogilvie gave lectures, in Boston, on various subjects. He was the son of Mr. Ogilvie, to whose praises of the prospects in Scotland, Dr. Johnson replied, by telling him, that "the noblest prospect, which a Scotchman ever sees, is the high road, that leads him to England."

The son of this gentleman gave his lectures, in the old Exchange Coffee House, where I heard him, several times. Under the influence of opium, which he used very freely, he was, occasionally, quite eloquent. He lectured, one evening, with considerable power, against duelling. On his way to his lodgings, some person repeated to him, several piquant and cutting things, which a gentleman had said of his lecture. Ogilvie was exceedingly incensed, and swore he would call him out, the very next day.

This law of honor is written nowhere, unless, in letters of blood, in the volume of pride, envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. "What," says Cleomenes, in the work I have just now referred to—"What makes so just and prudent a man, that has the good of society so much at heart, act knowingly against the laws of his country?"—"The strict obedience," says Horatio, "he pays to the laws of honor, which are superior to all others."—"If men of honor," says Cleomenes, "would act consistently, they ought all to be Roman Catholics."—"Why so?"—"Because," he rejoins, "they prefer oral tradition, to all written laws; for nobody can tell, when, in what king's or emperor's reign, in what country, or by what authority, these laws of honor were first enacted: it is very strange they should be of such force."

It is certainly very strange, that their authority should have been acknowledged, in some cases, not only by professing Chris-

tians, but even by the ministers of religion. Four individuals, of this holy calling, stand enrolled, as duellists, on the blood-guilty register of England. In 1764, the Rev. Mr. Hill was killed in a duel, by Cornet Gardner. On the 18th of June, 1782, the Rev. Mr. Allen killed Mr. Lloyd Dulany, in a duel. In August, 1827, Mr. Grady was wounded in a duel, by the Rev. Mr. Hodson. The Rev. Mr. Bate fought two duels—was subsequently made Baronet—fought a third duel, and was made Dean. If such atrocities were not preëminently horrible, how ridiculous they would be!

It would not be agreeable to be placed in that category, in which a worthy bishop placed those, who, after Dr. Johnson's death, began to assail his reputation. "*The old lion is dead,*" said the bishop, "*and now every ass will be kicking at his hide.*" Better and safer, however, to be there, than to bide with those, who receive all the coarse, crude, mental eructations of this truly good and great man, for *dicta perennia*. A volume of outrageously false teachings might readily be selected, from the recorded outpourings of this great literary whale, whenever Boswell, by a little tickling, caused his Leviathan to spout. Too much tea, or none at all, too much dinner, or too little certainly affected his qualifications, as a great moral instructor; and, under the teazle of contradiction, the nap of his great spirit fairly stood on end; and, at such times, he sought victory too often, rather than the truth. It has always seemed to me, that dinner-table philosophy, especially *après*, is often of very questionable value.

Dr. Johnson has frequently been quoted, on the subject of duelling. Some of his opinions were delivered, on this subject, suddenly, and seem entirely unworthy of his majestic powers. At a dinner party, at Gen. Oglethorpe's—I refer to Boswell's Johnson, in ten volumes, Lond. 1835, vol. iii. page 216—Boswell brought up the subject of duelling. Gen. Oglethorpe, *the host*, "fired at this, and said, with a lofty air, 'undoubtedly a man has a right to defend his honor.'"

Dr. Johnson, the *principal guest*, did the civil thing, and took the same side, and is reported, by Boswell, to have said substantially—"Sir, as men become in a high degree refined, various causes of offence arise; which are considered to be of such importance, that life must be staked to atone for them; though, in reality, they are not so. A body, that has received a very

fine polish, may be easily hurt. Before men arrive at this artificial refinement, if one tells his neighbor he lies—his neighbor tells him he lies—if one gives his neighbor a blow, his neighbor gives him a blow: but, in a state of highly polished society, an affront is held to be a serious injury. It must therefore be resented, or rather a duel must be fought upon it; as men have agreed to banish, from society, one, who puts up with an affront, without fighting a duel. Now, sir, it is never unlawful to fight, in self-defence. He, then, who fights a duel, does not fight from passion against his antagonist, but out of self-defence, to avert the stigma of the world, and to prevent himself from being driven out of society. I could wish there was not that superfluity of refinement; but, while such notions prevail, no doubt a man may lawfully fight a duel." I must have another witness, besides Mr. Boswell, before I believe, that Dr. Johnson uttered these words. Dr. Johnson could never have maintained, that the *lawfulness* of an act depended upon the existence of certain popular *notions*. Nor is it true, nor was it then true, that *men have agreed to banish, from society, one, who puts up with an affront, without fighting a duel*.

Dr. Johnson seems to have made no distinction, between military men and the rest of the world. It is impossible to doubt, that the Doctor was graciously disposed to favor Gen. Oglethorpe's *notions*, and that he would have taken the opposite side, had he been the guest of the Archbishop of Canterbury. "*It is not unlawful to fight, in self-defence:*" the law, by punishing all killing, in a duel, as murder, in the very first degree, shows clearly enough, that duelling is never looked upon, as fighting, in self-defence. It is remarkable, that Mr. Boswell, himself a lawyer, should have thought this paragraph worthy of preservation.

On page 268, of the same volume, Mr. Boswell has the following record—"April 19, 1773, he again defended duelling, and put his argument upon what I have ever thought the most solid basis; that, if public war be allowed to be consistent with morality, private war must be equally so." And this, in Mr. Boswell's opinion, was *the most solid basis*! It is difficult to perceive what is stubble, if this is not. Whither does this argument carry us all, but back to the state of nature—of uncovenanted man—of man, who has surrendered none of his natural rights, as a consideration for the blessings of government and

law? A state of nature and a state of society are very different things. Who will doubt, that, if Dr. Johnson really uttered these things, he would have talked more warily, could he have imagined, that Boszy would have transmitted them to distant ages?

It is, nevertheless, perfectly clear, that Dr. Johnson, upon both these occasions, had talked, only for the pride and pleasure of talking; for Mr. Boswell records a very different opinion, vol. iv. page 249. Sept. 19, 1773.—Dr. Johnson then had thoroughly digested General Oglethorpe's dinner; and Mr. Boswell's record runs thus—"*He fairly owned he could not explain the rationality of duelling.*"

Poor Mr. Boswell! It is not unreasonable, to suppose, that he had inculcated his notions, upon the subject of duelling, in his own family, and repeated, for the edification of his sons, the valuable sentiments of Dr. Johnson. Mr. Boswell died, May 19, 1795. Seven and twenty years after his death, his son, Sir Alexander Boswell, was killed, in a duel, at Auchterpool, by Mr. James Stuart, March 26, 1822. Upon the trial of Stuart, for murder, Mr. Jeffrey, who defended him, quoted the very passage, in which Dr. Johnson had justified, to the father, that fatal sin and folly, which had brought the son to an untimely grave!

No. CXLV.

DR. FRANKLIN, in his letter to Mr. Percival, referred to, in my last number, observes, that, "formerly, when duels were used, to determine lawsuits, from an opinion, that Providence would, in every instance, favor truth and right with victory, they were excusable." Dr. Johnson did not think this species of duel so absurd, as it is commonly supposed to be: "it was only allowed," said he, "when the question was in equilibrio, and they had a notion that Providence would interfere in favor of him, who was in the right." Bos., vol. iv. page 14. The lawfulness of a thing may excuse it: but there are some laws, so very absurd, that one stares at them, in the statute book, as he looks at flies in amber, and marvels "*how the devil they*

got there." There was, I am gravely assured, in the city of New Orleans, not very long ago, a practitioner of the healing art, who was called *the Tetotum doctor*—he felt no pulse—he examined no tongue—he asked no questions for conscience' sake, nor for any other—his tetotum was marked with various letters, on its sides—he sat down, in front of the patient, and spun his tetotum—if B. came uppermost, he bled immediately—if P., he gave a purge—if E., an emetic—if C., a clyster, and so on. If there be less wisdom, in this new mode of practice, than in the old wager of Battel, I perceive it not.

Both Drs. Franklin and Johnson refer to it, as an *ancient* practice. It was supposed, doubtless, to have become obsolete, and a dead letter, extinguished by the mere progress of civilization. Much surprise, therefore, was excited, when, at a period, as late as 1818, an attempt was made to revive it, in the case of *Ashford vs. Thornton*, tried before the King's Bench, in April of that year. This was a case of appeal of murder, under the law of England. Thornton had violated, and murdered the sister of Ashford; and, as a last resort, claimed his right to *wager of battel*. The court, after full consideration, felt themselves obliged to admit the claim, under the unrepealed statute of 9, William II., passed A. D. 1096. Ashford, the appellant, and brother of the unfortunate victim, declined to accept the challenge, and the murderer was accordingly discharged. This occurred, in the 58th year of George III., and a statute was passed, in 1819, putting an end to this terrible absurdity. Had the appellant, the brother, accepted this legalized challenge, what a barbarous exhibition would have been presented to the world, at this late day, through the inadvertence of Parliament, in omitting to repeal this preposterous law!

In a former number, I quoted a sentiment, attributed, by Boswell, to Dr. Johnson, and which, I suppose, was no deliberate conviction of his, but uttered, in the course of his dinner-table talk, for the gratification of Gen. Oglethorpe, "*Men have agreed to banish from society, a man, who puts up with an affront without fighting a duel.*" This is not asserted, as an independent averment, but assumed or taken for granted, as the basis of the argument, such as it was. Is this a fact? Cannot cases innumerable be stated, to prove, that it is not? The words, ascribed to Dr. Johnson, are not confined to any class or profession, but

are of universal application. Have men agreed to banish from society every man, who refuses to fight a duel, when summoned to that refreshing amusement? Let us examine a few cases. General Jackson did not lose caste, because he omitted to challenge Randolph, for pulling his nose. Josiah Quincy was not banished from society, for refusing the challenge of a Southern Hotspur. I believe, that Judge Thacher, of Maine, would have been much less respected, had he gone out to be shot, when invited, than he ever has been, for the very sensible answer to his antagonist, that he would talk to Mrs. Thacher about it, and be guided by her opinion. Nobody ever supposed, that Judge Breckenridge suffered, in character or standing, because he told his challenger, that he *wouldn't come*; but, that he might sketch his, the Judge's, figure, on a board, and fire at that, till he was weary, at any distance he pleased; and if he hit it, upon a certificate of the fact, the Judge would agree to it.

Had Hamilton refused the challenge of Burr, his *deliberate murderer*, his fame would have remained untarnished—his countrymen would never have forgotten the 14th of October, 1781—the charge of that advanced corps—the fall of Yorktown! On his death-bed, Hamilton expressed his abhorrence of the practice; and solemnly declared, should he survive, never to be engaged in another duel. "*Pendleton knows*," said he, in a dying hour, referring to Burr, and addressing Dr. Hossack, "*that I did not intend to fire at him*." How different from the blood-thirsty purposes of his assassin! In vol. x. of Jeremy Bentham's works, pages 432-3, the reader will find a letter from Dumont to Bentham, in which the Frenchman says, referring to a conversation with Burr, in 1808, four years after the duel—"His duel with Hamilton was a savage affair:" and Bentham adds—"He gave me an account of his duel with Hamilton; he was sure of being able to kill him, so I thought it little better than murder."

In England, *politics* seem to have given occasion to very many affairs of this nature—the duels of the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Mohun, in 1712, fatal to both—Mr. Martin and Mr. Wilkes, in 1763—the Lords Townshend and Bellamont, in 1773—C. J. Fox and Mr. Adam, in 1779—Capt. Fullerton and Lord Shelburne, in 1780—Lord Macartney and Major General Stuart, in 1786—the Duke of York and Colonel Lenox, in 1789—Mr. Curran and Major Hobart, in 1790—Earl of Lons-

dale and Capt. Cuthbert, in 1792—Lord Valentia and Mr. Gawler, in 1796—William Pitt and George Tierney, in 1798—Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Paull, in 1807—Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, in 1809—Mr. O'Connell and Mr. D'Esterre, in 1815—Mr. Grattan and the Earl of Clare, in 1820—Sir A. Boswell and James Stuart, in 1822—Mr. Long Wellesly and Mr. Crespigny, in 1828—the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Winchelsea, in 1829—Lord Alvanley and Morgan O'Connell, in 1835—Sir Colquhoun Grant and Lord Seymour, in 1835—Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Black, in 1835—Mr. Ruthven and Mr. Scott, in 1836—the Earl of Cardigan and Mr. Tuckett, in 1840.

Sir J. Barrington says, that, during his grand climacteric, two hundred and twenty-seven duels were fought. In different ages and nations, various preventives have been employed. Killing in a duel, here and in England, is murder, in the surviving principal, and seconds. To add effect to the law, it was proclaimed, by 30, Charles II., 1679, to be *an unpardonable offence*.

Disqualification from holding office, and dismissal from the army and navy have, at different times, been held up, in terrorem. In England, eighteen survivors have suffered the penalty, provided against duelling. Major Campbell was hung, in 1808, for having killed Capt. Boyd, in a duel.

In 1813, Lieutenant Blundell was killed in a duel at Carisbroke Castle: the survivor and both seconds were tried, and convicted of murder; and, though subsequently pardoned, dismissed the service. "Duels," says Sir George Mackenzie, "are but illustrious murders." Mr. Addison recommends the pillory. The councils of Valentia and Trent excommunicated such combatants; but a man, who has made up his mind to fight a duel, cares little for the church.

During the first eighteen years of the reign of Henry IV., four thousand persons were slain, in duels, in France. He published his famous edict of Blois, against duels, in 1602: and, in 1609, added, to the existing penalties, punishment by death, confiscations, fines, and imprisonment, respectively, for all, concerned in fighting or abetting, even as spectators, or as casual passers, who did not interpose. All this, however, was the work of Sully: for this consistent king, at this very time, gave Crequi leave to fight the Duke of Savoy, and even told him, that he would be his second, were he not a king.

Duels were so frequent, in the reign of his successor, Louis

XIII., that Lord Herbert, who was then ambassador, at the court of France, used to say, there was not a Frenchman, worth looking at, who had not killed his man. "*Who fought yesterday?*" was the mode of inquiring after the news of the morning. The most famous duellist of the age was Montmorenci, Count de Boutville. He and the Marquis de Beuron, setting their faces against all authority, and, persisting in this amusement, it was found necessary to take their stubborn heads off. They were tried, convicted, and beheaded. A check was, at length, put to these excesses, by Louis XIV. A particular account of all this will be found in Larrey, *Histoire de France, sous le Règne de Louis XIV.*, tom. ii. p. 208. Matters, during the minority of Louis XIV., had come to a terrible pass. The Dukes de Beaufort and Nemours had fought a duel, with four seconds each, and converted it into a *Welch main*, as the cock-fighters term a *melée*. They fought, five to five, with swords and pistols. Beaufort killed Nemours—the Marquis de Villars killed D'Henricourt, and D'Uzerches killed De Ris. In 1663, another affair took place, four to four. The king finally published his famous edict of 1679. The marshals of France and the nobility entered into a solemn league and covenant, never to fight a duel, on any pretence whatever; and Louis le Grand adhered to his oath, and resolutely refused pardon to every offender. This greatly checked the evil, for a time.

Kings will die, and their worthy purposes are not always inherited by their successors; soon after the death of the great monarch, the practice of duelling revived in France.

The only radical and permanent preventive, of this equally barbarous, and foolish custom, lies, in the moral and religious education of the people. The infrequency of the practice, in New England, arises entirely from the fact, that the moral and religious training of the community has taught them to look upon a duellist, as an exceedingly unfashionable personage.

New Englanders are a calculating race. They *calculate*, that it is infinitely better to mind their business, and die quietly in their beds, than to go out and be shot, by the very fellow, who has not the decency to say he is sorry, for treading on their toes, when he was drunk—and they are a fearful race, for they fear the reprehension of the wise and good, and the commands of God, more than they fear the decisions of a lawless tribunal, where fools sit in judgment, and whose absurd decrees are written on the sand.

No. CXLVI.

SOME nine and thirty years ago, I was in the habit, occasionally, when I had no call, in my line, of strolling over to the Navy Yard, at Charlestown, and spending an evening, in the cabin of a long, dismantled, old hulk, that was lying there. Once in a while, we had a very pleasant dinner party, on board that old craft. That cabin was the head-quarters of my host. It was the cabin of that ill-fated frigate, the Chesapeake. My friend had been one of her deeply mortified officers, when she was surrendered, by James Barron, to the British frigate Leopard, without firing a gun, June 23, 1807.

A sore subject this, for my brave, old friend. I well remember to have dined, in that cabin, one fourth of July, with some very pleasant associates—there were ten of us—we were very noisy then—all, but myself, are still enough now—they are all in their graves. I recollect, that, towards the close of the entertainment, some allusion to the old frigate, in which we were assembled, revived the recollection of the day, when those stars and stripes came down. We sat in silence, listening to the narrative of our host, whose feelings were feverishly and painfully excited—"It would have been a thousand times better," said he, "if the old hulk had gone to bottom and every man on board. The country might then, possibly, have been spared the war; for our honor would have been saved, and there would have been less to fight for. Unprepared as we were, for such an attack, at a time of profound peace, we ought to have gone down, like little Mudge, who, while his frigate was sinking, thanked God the *Blanche* was not destined to wear French colors!"

When he paused, and, with the back of his hand, brushed away the tears from his eyes, we were all of his mind, and wished he had been in command, that day, instead of James Barron; for this old friend of mine was a very, very clever fellow—a warmer heart never beat in a braver bosom. There was one thing, however, that I could never break him of, and yet I had some little influence with him, in those days—I mean the *habit* of fighting duels. He would not harm a fly, but he would shoot a man, in an honorable way, at the shortest notice, and the shortest distance. He fought a duel, on one oc-

casion, when, being challengee, and having the choice of distance, he insisted on three paces, saying he was so near-sighted, he could not hit a barn door, at ten. He was apt to be, not affectedly, but naturally, jocular, on such occasions.

Another old friend of mine, in by-gone days, the elder son of the late Governor Brooks, was second, in one of these duels, to the friend, of whom I am speaking. Major Brooks had, occasionally, indulged himself, in the publication of poetical effusions. When the parties and their seconds came upon the ground, he found, that he had brought no leather, to envelop the ball, as usual, in loading; and, drawing a newspaper from his pocket, tore off the corner, on which some verses were printed: at this moment, his principal drawing near, said, in an under tone, "*I hope that isn't one of your fugitive pieces, Alek.*"

Though our lines were, of late years, cast far apart, I always rejoiced in his good fortune. After having occupied a very elevated position, for some time, in the naval department, he fell—poor fellow—not in a duel—but in a moment, doubtless, of temporary, mental derangement, by his own hand. The news of my old friend's death reached me, just before dinner—I postponed it till the next day—went home—sat alone—and had that old dinner, in the cabin of the Chesapeake, warmed over, upon the coals of the imagination, and seated around me every guest, who was there that day, just as fresh, as if he had never been buried.

James Barron was an unlucky dog, to say the least of it. Striking the stars and stripes, without firing a gun, was enough for one life. For this he was tried, found guilty, and suspended from duty, for five years, from Feb. 8, 1808, and deprived of his pay. He went abroad; and, during his absence, war was declared, which continued about two years, after the termination of his suspension. He returned, at last, and sought employment; Decatur officially opposed his claims; and thereupon he challenged, and killed Decatur, the pride of the American navy; and, after this, he received employment from the government. The services of James Barron are not likely to be undervalued. Decatur's offence consisted, in his declaration of opinion, that Barron did not return to the service of his country, as in duty bound. The duel took place March 22, 1820. After this, Barron demanded a Court of Inquiry, to settle this point. The Court consisted of Commodores Stewart and Morris and Captain

Evans, and convened May 10, 1821, and the conclusion of the sentence is this—"It is therefore the opinion of the court, that his (Barron's) absence from the United States, without the permission of the government, was contrary to his duty, as an officer, in the navy of the United States."

Here then was another silly and senseless duel. Mr. Allen, in his Biographical Dictionary remarks—"The correspondence issued in a challenge from Barron, though he considered duelling '*a barbarous practice, which ought to be exploded from civilized society.*' And the challenge was accepted by Decatur, though he '*had long since discovered, that fighting duels is not even an unerring criterion of personal courage.*'"

They fired at the same instant; Barron fell immediately, wounded in the hip, where Decatur had mercifully declared his intention to wound him; Decatur stood erect, for a moment—put his hand to his right side—and fell, mortally wounded. He was raised, and supported, a few steps, and sunk down, exhausted, near Barron. Captain Mackenzie, in his Life of Decatur, page 322, gives his opinion, that this duel could have been gracefully prevented, on the ground; and such will be the judgment, doubtless, of posterity. Capt. Jesse D. Elliot was the second of Barron—Com. Bainbridge of Decatur. After they had taken their stands, Barron said to Decatur, that "he hoped, *on meeting, in another world, they would be better friends, than they had been in this.*"

To this Decatur replied, "*I have never been your enemy, sir.*" "Why," says Captain Mackenzie, "could not this aspiration for peace, between them, in the next world, on one part, and this comprehensive disclaimer of all enmity, on the other, have been seized by the friends, for the purposes of reconciliation?" A pertinent question truly—but of very ready solution. These seconds, like most others, acted, like military undertakers; their office consists, as they seem to suppose, in seeing the bodies duly cared for; and all consideration for the chief mourners, and such the very principals often are, is out of the question. With all his excellent qualities, Commodore Bainbridge, as every one, who knew him well, will readily admit, was not possessed of that happy mixture of qualities, to avail of this pacific *prestige*. It was an overture—such Barron afterwards avowed it to have been. On the 10th of October, 1818, Decatur had been the second of Com. Perry, in his duel with Captain Heath, which

was terminated, after the first fire, by Decatur's declaration, that Com. Perry had avowed his purpose, not to fire at Capt Heath. Had Perry lived, and been at hand, it is highly probable, that Decatur would not have fallen, for Perry would, doubtless, have been his second, and readily availed of the expressions of the parties, on the ground.

Had Charles Morris, whose gallantry and discretion have mingled into a proverb—had he been the second of his old commander, by whose side, he stood, on the Philadelphia's deck, in that night of peril, February, 1804, who can doubt, the pacific issue of this most miserable adventure ! Seconds, too frequently, are themselves the instigators and supporters of these combats. True or false, the tale is a fair one, of two friends, who had disputed over their cups ; and, by the exciting expressions of some common acquaintances, were urged into a duel. They met early the next morning—the influence of the liquor had departed—the seconds loaded the pistols, and placed their principals—but, before the word was given, one of them, rubbing his eyes, and looking about him, exclaims—“ there is some mistake, there can be no enmity between us two, my old friend ; these fellows, who have brought us here, upon this foolish errand, are our enemies, let us fire at them.” The proposition was highly relished, by the other party, and the seconds took to their heels.

Well : we left Decatur and Barron, lying side by side, and weltering in their blood. The strife was past, and they came to a sort of friendly understanding. Barron, supposing his wound to be fatal, said all things had been conducted honorably, and that he forgave Decatur, from the bottom of his heart. Mackenzie, in a note, on page 325, refers to a conversation between them, as they lay upon the ground, until the means of transportation arrived. He does not give the details, but says they would be “ creditable to the parties, and soothing to the feelings of the humane.” I understood, at the time, from a naval officer of high rank, and have heard it often, repeated, that Decatur said, “ Barron, why didn't you come home and fight your country's battles ?” that Barron replied, “ I was too poor to pay my debts, and couldn't get away,”—and that Decatur rejoined, “ If I had known that, we should not be lying here.” Strip this matter of its honorable epidermis, and there is something quite ridiculous in the idea of doing such an unpleasant thing, and all for nothing !

These changes, from hostility to amity, are often extremely sudden. I have read, that Rapin, the historian, when young, fought a duel, late in the evening, with small swords. His sword broke near the hilt—he did not perceive it, and continued to fence with the hilt alone. His antagonist paused and gave him notice; and, like the two girls, in the Antijacobin, they flew into each other's arms, and "swore perpetual amity."

No. CXLVII.

M. DE VASSOR wrote with a faulty pen, when he asserted, in his history, that the only good thing Louis XIV. did, in his long reign of fifty-six years, consisted in his vigorous attempts, to suppress the practice of duelling. Cardinal Richelieu admits, however, in his *Political Testament*, that his own previous efforts had been ineffectual, although he caused Messieurs de Chappelle and Bouteville to be executed, for the crime, in disregard of the earnest importunities of their numerous and powerful friends. No public man ever did more, for the suppression of the practice, than Lord Bacon, while he was attorney general. His celebrated charge, upon an information in the star chamber, against Priest & Wright, vol. iv. page 399, Lond. 1824, was ordered to be printed, by the Lords of Council; and was vastly learned and powerful, in its way. It is rather amusing, upon looking at the decree, which followed, dated Jan. 26, 2 James I., to see how such matters were then managed; the information, against Priest, was, "*for writing and sending a letter of challenge together with a stick, which should be the length of the weapon.*"

Such measures are surely well enough, as far as they go; but can be of no lasting influence, unless certain processes are simultaneously carried on, to meliorate the moral tone, in society. Without the continual employment of moral and religious alteratives—laws, homilies, charges, decrees, ridicule, menaces of disinherison here, and damnation hereafter will be of very little use. They are outward applications—temporary repellants, which serve no other purpose, than to drive back the distemper, for a brief space, but reach not the seat of the disorder. As was stated, in a former number, nothing will put an end to this

practice, but indoctrination—the mild, antiphlogistic system of the Gospel. Wherever its gentle spirit prevails, combined with intellectual and moral culture, there will be no duels. Temperance forms, necessarily, an important part of that antiphlogistic system—for a careful examination will show, that, in a very great number of cases, duels have originated over the table—we import them, corked up in bottles, which turn out, now and then, to be vials of wrath.

One of the most ferocious duels, upon record, is that, between Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, of which the survivor, Sir Edward, wrote an account from Louvain, Sept. 8, 1613. These fellows appear to have been royal tigers, untameable even by Herr Driesbach. This brutal and bloody fight took place, at Bergen op Zoom, near Antwerp. The *cause* of this terrible duel has never been fully ascertained, but the *manner and instrument*, by which these blood-thirsty gentlemen were put in the ablative, are indicated in the letter—they fought with *rapiers and in their shirts*. I have neither room nor taste for the details: by the curious in such matters, some account may be gathered, in Collins's *Peerage*, which refers to the correspondence, preserved in manuscript, in Queen's College library, Oxford. These, with Sir Edward's letter, may be found in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* also, vol. iii. page 314, Lond. 1817. Wood says—"he (*Sackville*) entered into a fatal quarrel, upon a subject very unwarrantable, with a young Scottish nobleman, the Lord Bruce." Sackville was afterward Earl of Dorset. A more accessible authority, for the reader, probably, is the *Guardian*, vol. iii. No. 133, though the former is more full, and taken from the original manuscript, in the Ashmole Museum, with the ancient spelling.

The duel, with swords, between the Lords Mohun and Hamilton, in Hyde Park, Nov. 15, 1712, was nearly as brutal. Both were killed. Richard Brinsley Sheridan's duel with Matthews—the second I mean, for they had two duels—was a very doglike thing indeed. They fought, first, with pistols, and, not killing each other, as speedily as they wished, resorted to their swords. They cut and pricked each other, at a terrible rate; and, losing all patience and temper, closed, rough and tumble, went heels over head, rolled, and puffed, and tussled, in the dust and dirt, till, at last, they were literally pulled apart, like two dogs, by their tails, and a part of Matthews' sword was found sticking in Sheridan's ear. Gentlemanly satisfaction this! It has some-

times occurred, that advantages, unduly taken, on the ground, such as firing out of order, for example, have converted the killing into murder, in the eyes even of the seconds, which it ever is, at all such meetings, in the eye of the law. Such was the case in the duels, between M'Keon and Reynolds, Jan. 31, 1768, and between Campbell and Boyd, June 23, 1808.

Doubtless, there are men of wonderfully well balanced minds, who go about their business, with great apparent composure, after they have killed their antagonists in duels. Now and then, there is one, who takes things more gravely—*nervously*, perhaps. Poor fellow, he feels rather unpleasantly, when he chances to go by the husbandless mansion—or passes that woman, whom he has made a widow—or sees, hand in hand, those little children, in their sober garments, whom the accursed cunning of his red, right hand has rendered orphans! Such feeble spirits there are—the heart of a duellist should be made of sterner stuff.

June 8, 1807, Mr. Colclough was killed in a duel, by Mr. Alcock, who immediately lost his reason, and was carried from the ground to the madhouse. Some years ago, I visited the Lunatic Hospital in Philadelphia; and there saw, among its inmates, a well known gentleman, who had killed *his friend*, in a duel. He had referred, while conversing, to his hair, which had grown very gray, since I last saw him. A bystander said, in a mild way—gray hairs are honorable—“*Aye*,” he replied, “*honor made my hairs gray*.”

I know, very well, that the common, lawless duel is supposed, by many persons, to have sprung from the old *wager of battel*, defined, by Fleta, in his law Latin, *singularis pugnus inter duos ad probandum litem, et qui vicit probasse intelligitur*. The first time we hear of the *wager of Battel*, as a written judicial rule, is A. D. 501, in the reign of Gundibald, king of Burgundy; and it was in use, among the Germans, Danes, and Franks. The practice or usage was common, however, to all the Celtic nations. It came into England, with William the Conqueror. It happens, however, that men have ever been disposed to settle their disputes, by fighting about them, since the world began.

If the classical reader will open his Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii., and read the first sentence of section 118, he will see, that, when Quintilius Varus endeavored to persuade the rude Germans, to adopt the laws and usages of Rome, in the adjustment of their disputes, between man and man, they laughed at his

simplicity, and told him they had a summary mode of settling these matters, among themselves, by the arm of flesh. This occurred, shortly after the birth of Christ, or about 500 years *before* the time of Gundibald. Instead of attempting to trace the origin of modern duelling to the legalized *wager of battel*, we may as well look for its moving cause, in the heart of man.

Duels are of very ancient origin. Abel was a noncombatant. Had it been otherwise, the affair, between him and Cain, would have been the first affair of honor; and his death would not have been *murder*, but *killing in a duel*! One thousand and fifty-eight years, according to the chronology of Calmet, before the birth of Christ, the very first duel was fought, near a place called *Shochoh*, which certainly sounds as roughly, on the ear, as *Hoboken*. There seems not to have been, upon that occasion, any of the ceremony, practised, now-a-days—there were no regular seconds—no surgeons—no marking off the ground—and each party had the right, to use whatever weapons he pleased.

Two armies were drawn up, in the face of each other. A man, of unusually large proportions, stepped between them, and proposed an adjustment of their national differences, by single combat, and challenged any man of his opponents, to fight a duel with him. He was certainly a fine looking fellow, and armed to the teeth. He came, without any second or friend, to adjust the preliminaries; and no one was with him, but an armor bearer, who carried his shield. The audacity of this unexpected challenge, and the tremendous limbs of the challenger, for a time, produced a sort of panic, in the opposite army—no man seemed inclined to break a spear with the tall champion. At last, after he had strutted up and down, for some time, there came along a smart little fellow, a sort of cowboy or sheep-herd, who was sent to the army by his father, with some provisions, for his three brothers, who had enlisted, and a few fine cheeses, for the colonel of their regiment, the father thinking, very naturally, doubtless, that a present of this kind might pave the way for their promotion. The old gentleman's name was Jesse—an ancestor, doubtless, of John Heneage Jesse, whose memoirs of George Selwyn we have all read, with so much pleasure. The young fellow arrived with his cheeses, at the very time, when this huge braggart was going about, strutting and defying. Hearing, that the King had offered his daughter in marriage, with a handsome dowry, to any one, who would kill this great bugbear out of the way, this stripling offered to do it.

When he was brought into the royal presence, the King, struck by his youth and slender figure, told him, without ceremony, that the proposition was perfect nonsense, and that he would certainly get his brains knocked out, by such a terrible fellow. But the young man seemed nothing daunted, and respectfully informed his majesty, that, upon one occasion, he had had an affair with a lion, and, upon another, with a bear, and that he had taken the lion by the beard, and slain him.

The King finally consented, and proceeded to put armor on the boy, who told his majesty, that he was very much obliged to him, but had much rather go without it. The challenge was duly accepted. But, when they came together, on the ground, all the modern notions of etiquette appear to have been set entirely at defiance. Contrary to all the rules of propriety, the principals commenced an angry conversation. When the challenger first saw the little fellow, coming towards him, with a stick and a sling, he really supposed they were hoaxing him. He felt somewhat, perhaps, like Mr. Crofts, when he was challenged, in 1664, by Humphrey Judson, the dwarf; who, nevertheless, killed him, at the first fire.

When the youngster marched up to him, the challenger was very indignant, and asked if he took him for a dog, that he came out to him, with a stick; and, in a very ungentlemanly way, hinted something about making mince meat of his little antagonist, for the crows. The little fellow was not to be outdone, in this preparatory skirmish of words; for he threatened to take off the giant's head in a jiffy, and told him the ravens should have an alderman's meal, upon his carcass.

Such bandying of rough words is entirely out of order, on such occasions. At it they went; and, at the very first fire, down came the bully upon his face, struck, upon the frontal sinus, with a smooth stone from a sling. The youngster, I am sorry to say, contrary to all the rules of duelling, ran up to him, after he was down, and chopped off his head, with his own sword; for, as I have already stated, there were no seconds, and there was no surgeon at hand, to attend to the mutilated gentleman, after he was satisfied.

The survivor, who seems to have been the founder of his own fortune—*novus homo*—became eminently distinguished for his fine poetical talents, and composed a volume of lyrics, which have passed through innumerable editions. The one hundred

and forty-fourth of the series is supposed, by the critics, to have been commemorative of this very affair of honor—*Blessed be the Lord, my strength, who teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight.*

No. CXLVIII.

THE duel, between David and Goliath, bears a striking resemblance to that, between Titus Manlius and the Gaul, so finely described, by Livy, lib. vii. cap. 10. In both cases, the circumstances, at the commencement, were precisely alike. The armies of the Hernici and of the Romans were drawn up, on the opposite banks of the Anio—those of the Israelites and of the Philistines, on two mountains, on the opposite sides of the valley of Elah. “*Tum eximia corporis magnitudine in vacuum pontem Gallus processit, et quantum maxima voce potuit, quem nunc inquit Roma virum fortissimum habet, procedat, agetum, ad pugnam, ut noster duorum eventus ostendat, ultra gens bello sit melior.*” Then, a Gaul of enormous size, came down upon the unoccupied bridge, and cried out, as loud as he could, let the bravest of the Romans come forth—let him come on—and let the issue of our single combat decide, which nation is superior in war.—And there went out a champion out of the camp of the Philistines, named Goliath of Gath, whose height was six cubits and a span. * * * * And he stood, and cried unto the armies of Israel, and said unto them, why are ye come out to set your battle in array? Am not I a Philistine, and ye servants of Saul? Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me and to kill me, then will we be your servants; but if I prevail against him and kill him, then shall ye be our servants, and serve us.

The next point, is the effect upon the two armies: “*Diu inter primores juvenum Romanorum silentium fuit, quum et abnuere certamen vererentur, et præcipuam sortem periculi petere nolent.*” There was a long silence, upon this, among the chiefs of the young Romans; for, while they were afraid to refuse the challenge, they were reluctant to encounter this peculiar kind of

peril.—When Saul and all Israel heard those words of the Philistine, they were dismayed and greatly afraid.

After Titus Manlius had accepted the challenge, he seems desirous of giving his commander a proof of his confidence in himself, and the reasons, or grounds, of that confidence: “*Si tu permittis, volo ego illi belluæ ostendere, quando adeo ferox præ-sultat hostium signis, me ex ea familia ortum, quæ Gallorum agmen ex rupe Tarpeia dejecit.*” If you will permit me, I will show this brute, after he has vaunted a little longer, in this brag-gart style, before the banners of the enemy, that I am sprung from the family, that hurled the whole host of Gauls from the Tarpeian rock.—And David said to Saul, let no man’s heart fail because of him, thy servant will go and fight with this Philistine. * * * * Thy servant kept his father’s sheep, and there came a lion and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock. And I went out after him, and delivered it out of his mouth; and when he arose against me, I caught him, by his beard, and smote him and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear, and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them.

The difference in their port and appearance may also be considered. “*Nequaquam visu ac specie æstimantibus pares. Corpus alteri magnitudine eximium, versicolori veste, pictisque et auro cælati refulgens armis; media in altero militaris statura, modicaque in armis habilibus magis quam decoris species.*” In size and appearance, there was no resemblance. The frame of the Gaul was enormous. He wore a vest whose color was changeable, and his refulgent arms were highly ornamented and studded with gold. The Roman was of middle military stature, and his simple weapons were calculated for service and not for show. Of Goliath we read—He had a helmet of brass upon his head, and he was armed with a coat of mail. * * * And he had greaves of brass upon his legs, and a target of brass between his shoulders, and the staff of his spear was like a weaver’s beam; and David took his staff in his hand, and chose him five smooth stones out of the brook, and put them in a shepherd’s bag which he had, even in a scrip, and his sling was in his hand. The General’s consent is given to Titus Manlius, in these words—“*Perge et nomen Romanum invictum, juvantibus diis, præsta.*” Go, and have a care, the gods assisting thee, that the Roman name remains unconquered. And Saul said unto David, Go,

and the Lord be with thee. The Philistine and the Gaul were both speedily killed, and here the parallel ends; for David hewed off the Philistine's head. The Roman was more generous than the child of Israel—"Jacentis inde corpus, ab omni alia vexatione intactum, uno torque spoliavit; quem, respersum cruore, collo circumdedit suo." He despoiled the body of his fallen foe, in no otherwise insulted, of a chain, which, bloody, as it was, he placed around his own neck. I cannot turn from this gallant story, without remarking, that this Titus Manlius must have been a terrible wag: Livy says, that his young companions having prepared him for the duel—"armatum adornatumque adversus Gallum stolide lætum, et (quoniam id quoque memoria dignum antiquis visum est) linguam, etiam ab irrisu exserentem, producunt"—they brought him forward, armed and prepared for his conflict with the Gaul, childishly delighted, and (since the ancients have thought it worth repeating) waggishly thrusting his tongue out of his mouth, in derision of his antagonist.

Doubtless, the challenge of Charles V. by Francis I., in which affair, Charles, in the opinion of some folks, showed a little, if the cant phrase be allowable, of the white feather, gave an impetus to the practice of duelling. Doubtless, the *wager of battel* supplied something of the form and ceremony, the use of seconds, and measuring the lists, the signal of onset, &c. of modern duels: but the principle was in the bosom of Adam, and the practice is of the highest antiquity.

Woman, in some way or other, has been, very often, at the bottom of these duels. Helen, as the chief occasion of the Trojan war, was, of course, the cause of Hector's duel with Ajax, which duel, as the reader will see, by turning to his *Iliad*, lib. viii. v. 279, was stopped, by the police, at the very moment, when both gentlemen, having thrown their lances aside, were drawing their long knives. Lavinia set Turnus and Æneas by the ears. Turnus challenged him twice. Upon the first occasion, Æneas was unwell; but, upon the second, they had a meeting, and he killed his man. David would not have accepted Goliath's challenge, had not his heart been set upon Saul's daughter, *and the shekels*. I find nothing of this, in the commentators; but the reader may find it, in the Book of Nature, *passim*. For one so young, David practised, with all the wariness of an old bachelor. When he first arrived in camp, some one asked him, if he had seen Goliath, and added, *and it shall*

be that the man who killeth him the King will enrich him with great riches, and will give him his daughter. David had no idea of going upon a fool's errand; and, to make matters sure, he turned to those about him, and inquired, clearly for confirmation, *what shall be done to the man that killeth this Philistine?* And they repeated what he had heard before. David was a discreet youth, for one of his time, the titman, as he was, of Jesse's eight children—and, to avoid all chance of mistake, he walks off to another person, near at hand, and repeats his inquiry, and receives a similar answer. Sam. I. xvii. 30. A wide difference there is, between the motives of Titus Manlius, in accepting the challenge of the Gaul, and those of David, in accepting that of the Philistine—the love of country and of glory in the first—in the last, the desire of possessing Saul's daughter and the shekels.

Duels have been occasioned, by other Helens than her of Troy. A pleasant tale is told, by Valvasor, in his work, *La Gloire de Duche de Carniole*, Liv. ii. p. 634—of Andrew Eberhard Rauber, a German Knight, and Lord of the fortress of Petronel. Maximilian II., Emperor of Germany, had a natural daughter, Helen Scharsegin, of exquisite beauty, who had a brace of gallant admirers, of whom Rauber was one—the other was a Spanish gentleman, of high rank. Both were at the court of Maximilian, and in such high favor, that the Emperor was extremely unwilling to disoblige either. Upon the lifting of a finger, these gallants were ready to fight a score of duels, for the lady's favor, in the most approved fashion of the day. To this the Emperor was decidedly opposed; and, had they resorted to such extremities, neither would have taken anything, by his motion. The Emperor secretly preferred the German alliance, but was unwilling to offend the Spaniard. He was young and of larger proportions, than his German rival; but Rauber's prodigious strength had become a proverb, through the land. He had the power of breaking horse-shoes with his thumbs and fingers; and, upon one occasion, at Gratz, in the presence of the Archduke Charles, according to Valvasor's account, he seized an insolent Jew, by his long beard, and actually pulled his jaw off. He was a terrible antagonist, of course.

Maximilian, heartily wearied with their incessant strife and importunity, finally consented, that the question should be settled, by a duel, in presence of the whole court. The hour was

appointed, and the parties duly notified. The terms of the conflict were to be announced, by the Emperor. The day arrived. The Lords and Ladies of the Court were assembled, to witness the combat; and the rivals presented themselves, with their weapons, prepared to struggle manfully, for life and love.

The Emperor commanded the combatants to lay their rapiers aside, and each was presented with a large bag or sack; and they were told, that whichever should succeed, in putting the other into the sack, should be entitled to the hand of the fair Helen Scharsegin.

Though, doubtless, greatly surprised, by this extraordinary announcement, there appeared to be no alternative, and at it they went. After a protracted struggle, amid shouts of laughter from the spectators, Rauber, Lord of the fortress of Petronel, obtained the victory, bagged his bird, and encased the haughty Spaniard in the sack, who, shortly after, departed from the court of Maximilian.

Would to God, that all duels were as harmless, in their consequences. It is not precisely so. When the gentleman, that does the murder, and the two or more gentlemen, who aid and abet, have finished their handiwork, the end is not yet—mother, wife, sisters, brothers, children are involuntary parties—the iron, or the lead, which pierced that selfish heart, must enter their very souls.

Where these encounters have proved fatal, the survivors, as I have stated, have, occasionally, gone mad. It is not very common, to be sure, for duels to produce such melancholy consequences, as those, which occurred, after that, between Cameron and McLean, in 1722. McLean was killed. Upon receiving the intelligence, his aged mother lost her reason, and closed her days in a mad-house. The lady, to whom he was betrothed, expired in convulsions, upon the third day, after the event—*n'importe!*

No. CXLIX.

It is quite unpleasant, after having diligently read a volume of memoirs, or voyages, or travels, and carefully transferred a goodly number of interesting items to one's common-place book

—to discover, that the work, *ab ovo usque ad mala*, is an ingenious tissue of deliberate lies. It is no slight aggravation of this species of affliction, to reflect, that one has highly commended the work, to some of his acquaintances, who are no way remarkable, for their bowels of compassion, and whose intelligible smile he is certain to encounter, when they first meet again, after the *éclaircissement*.

There is very little of the *hæc olim meminisse juvabit*, in store, for those, who have been thus misled. If there had been, absolutely, no foundation for the story, in the credulity of certain members of the Royal Society, Butler would not, probably, have produced his pleasant account of "*the elephant in the moon*." There were some very grave gentlemen, of lawful age, who were inclined to receive, for sober truth, that incomparable hoax, of which Sir John Herschell was represented, as the hero.

Damberger's travels, in Africa, and his personal adventures there gave me great pleasure, when I was a boy; and I remember to have felt excessively indignant, when I discovered, that the work was written, in a garret, in the city of Amsterdam, by a fellow who had never quitted Europe.

I never derived much pleasure or instruction, from Wraxall's memoirs of the Kings of France of the race of Valois, nor from his tour through the Southern Provinces, published in 1777. But his Historical memoirs of his own time, prepared, somewhat after the manner of De Thou, and Bishop Burnet, and extending from 1772 to 1784, I well remember to have read, with very considerable pleasure, in 1816; and was pained to find them cut up, however unmercifully, with so much irresistible justice, in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, and the British Critic. Mr. Wraxall made matters immeasurably worse, by his defence. There could be no adequate defence, for a man, who had asserted, that Lord Dorset told him an anecdote, touching an event, *which event did not happen, till Lord Dorset was dead*. A single instance of this kind, in a writer of common accuracy, might be carried, in charity, to the debit of chance, or forgetfulness; but the catalogue, presented by the reviewers, is truly overpowering. To close the account, Sir N. W. Wraxall was, in May, 1816, convicted of a libel, in these very memoirs, upon Count Woronzow, the Russian minister; and Mr. Wraxall was imprisoned in Newgate, for that offence.

After this disqualification of my witness, I am, nevertheless,

about to vouch in Mr. Wraxall, by reciting one of his stories, in illustration of a principle. I quote from memory—I have not the work—the reviewers prevented me from buying it. June 16, 1743, the battle of Dettingen was fought, and won, by George II. in person, and the Earl of Stair, against the Marechal de Noailles and the Duke de Grammont. Mr. Wraxall relates—*me memoria mea non fallente*—the following incident. After the battle, the Earl gave a dinner, at his quarters; and, among the guests, were several of the French prisoners of war. Of course, the Earl of Stair presided, at one end of the table—at the other sat a gentleman, of very common-place appearance, of small stature, thin and pale, evidently an invalid, and who, unless addressed, scarcely opened his lips, during the entertainment. This unobtrusive, and rather unprepossessing, young man was the Lord Mark Kerr, the nephew, and the aid-de-camp of the Earl. After the removal of the cloth, the gentlemen discussed the subject of the battle, and the manœuvres, by which the victory had been achieved. A difference of opinion arose, between the Earl and one of the French Colonels, as to the time of a particular movement. The latter became highly excited, and very confident he was right. The Earl referred to Lord Mark Kerr, whose position, at the time of that movement, rendered his decision conclusive. Lord Mark politely assured the French Colonel, that he was mistaken; upon which the Frenchman instantly insulted him, without saying a word, but in that felicitous manner, which enables a Frenchman to convey an insult, even by his mode of taking snuff. Soon after, the party broke up, and the Earl of Stair was left alone. In about half an hour, Lord Mark Kerr returned, and found his uncle very much disturbed.

“Nephew,” said he, “you know my strong dislike of duelling. In our situation we are sometimes, perhaps, unable to avoid it. The French Colonel insulted you, at table; others noticed it, besides myself. I fear, my dear nephew, you will have to ask him to apologize.”

“I noticed it myself, my Lord,” replied the Lord Mark; “you need have no trouble, on that account—we have already met—I ran him through the body; and they are now burying him, in the outer court.”

Duels are often produced, by a foolish, and fatal misestimate, which one man makes of another's temperament. The diminu-

tive frame, the pale cheek, and small voice, modest carriage, youth, and inexperience, afford no certain indicia: *nimum ne crede colori*. Men of small stature, are sometimes the more *brusque*, and more on the *qui vive*, from this very circumstance.

Ingentes animos angusto in pectore volvunt.

'That a man will not fight, like a dragon, simply because he has neither the stature of Falstaff, nor the lungs of Bottom, is a well authenticated *non sequitur*.

A well told, and well substantiated illustration of all this, may be found, in Mackenzie's *Life of Decatur*, page 55. I refer to the case of Joseph Bainbridge, who, in 1803, when a midshipman, and an inexperienced boy, was purposely and wantonly insulted, at Malta, by a professed duellist, the Secretary of Sir Alexander Ball, the Governor. No one can read Mackenzie's Narrative, without a conviction, that Bainbridge owed the preservation of his life, to the address of Decatur. They met—fired twice, at four paces; and, at the second fire, the English duellist fell, mortally wounded in the head: Bainbridge was untouched.

When I was a school boy, more than fifty years ago, I remember to have read, in an English journal, whose name I have now forgotten, a story, which may have been a fiction; but which was very naturally told, and made a deep impression upon me then. I will endeavor to draw it forth from the locker of my memory; and engage, beforehand, to be very much indebted to any one, who will indicate its original source.

Three young gentlemen, who had finished the most substantial part of their repast, were lingering over their fruit and wine, at an eating-house, in London; when a man, of middle age, and middle stature, entered the public room, where they were sitting; seated himself, at one end of a small, unoccupied table; and, calling the waiter, ordered a simple mutton chop, and a glass of ale. His appearance, at first view, was not likely to arrest the attention of any one. His hair was getting to be thin and gray; the expression of his countenance was sedate, with a slight touch, perhaps, of melancholy; and he wore a gray surtout, with a standing collar, which, manifestly, had seen service, if the wearer had not—just such a thing, as an officer would bestow upon his serving man. He might be taken for a country magistrate, or an attorney, of limited practice, or a schoolmaster.

He continued to masticate his chop, and sip his ale, in silence, without lifting his eyes from the table, until a melon seed, sportively snapped, from between the thumb and finger of one of the gentlemen, at the opposite table, struck him upon the right ear. His eye was instantly upon the aggressor; and his ready intelligence gathered, from the illy suppressed merriment of the party, that this petty impertinence was intentional.

The stranger stooped, and picked up the melon seed, and a scarcely perceptible smile passed over his features, as he carefully wrapped up the seed, in a piece of paper, and placed it in his pocket. This singular procedure, with their preconceived impressions of their customer, somewhat elevated, as they were, by the wine they had partaken, capsized their gravity entirely, and a burst of irresistible laughter proceeded from the group.

Unmoved by this rudeness, the stranger continued to finish his frugal repast, in quiet, until another melon seed, from the same hand, struck him, upon the right elbow. This also, to the infinite amusement of the other party, he picked from the floor, and carefully deposited with the first.

Amidst shouts of laughter, a third melon seed was, soon after, discharged, which hit him, upon the left breast. This also he, very deliberately took from the floor, and deposited with the other two.

As he rose, and was engaged in paying for his repast, the gayety of these sporting gentlemen became slightly subdued. It was not easy to account for this. Lavater would not have been able to detect the slightest evidence of irritation or resentment, upon the features of the stranger. He seemed a little taller, to be sure, and the carriage of his head might have appeared to them rather more erect. He walked to the table, at which they were sitting, and with that air of dignified calmness, which is a thousand times more terrible than wrath, drew a card from his pocket, and presented it, with perfect civility, to the offender, who could do no less than offer his own, in return. While the stranger unclosed his surtout, to take the card from his pocket, they had a glance at the undress coat of a military man. The card disclosed his rank, and a brief inquiry at the bar was sufficient for the rest. He was a captain, whom ill health and long service had entitled to half pay. In earlier life he had been engaged in several affairs of honor, and, in the dialect of the fancy, was a dead shot.

The next morning a note arrived at the aggressor's residence, containing a challenge, in form, and one only of the melon seeds. The truth then flashed before the challenged party—it was the challenger's intention to make three bites at this cherry, three separate affairs out of this unwarrantable frolic! The challenge was accepted, and the challenged party, in deference to the challenger's reputed skill with the pistol, had half decided upon the small sword; but his friends, who were on the alert, soon discovered, that the captain, who had risen by his merit, had, in the earlier days of his necessity, gained his bread, as an accomplished instructor, in the use of that very weapon. They met and fired, alternately, by lot; the young man had elected this mode, thinking he might win the first fire—he did—fired, and missed his opponent. The captain levelled his pistol and fired—the ball passed through the flap of the right ear, and grazed the bone; and, as the wounded man involuntarily put his hand to the place, he remembered that it was on the right ear of his antagonist, that the first melon seed had fallen. Here ended the first lesson. A month had passed. His friends cherished the hope, that he would hear nothing more from the captain, when another note—a challenge of course—and another of those accursed melon seeds arrived, with the captain's apology, on the score of ill-health, for not sending it before.

Again they met—fired simultaneously, and the captain, who was unhurt, shattered the right elbow of his antagonist—the very point upon which he had been struck by the second melon seed: and here ended the second lesson. There was something awfully impressive, in the *modus operandi*, and exquisite skill of this antagonist. The third melon seed was still in his possession, and the aggressor had not forgotten, that it had struck the unoffending gentleman, upon the left breast! A month had past—another—and another, of terrible suspense; but nothing was heard from the captain. Intelligence had been received, that he was confined to his lodgings, by illness. At length, the gentleman who had been his second, in the former duels, once more presented himself, and tendered another note, which, as the recipient perceived, on taking it, contained the last of the melon seeds. The note was superscribed in the captain's well known hand, but it was the writing evidently of one, who wrote *deficiente manu*. There was an unusual solemnity also, in the manner of him, who delivered it. The seal was broken, and there was the

melon seed, in a blank envelope—"And what, sir, am I to understand by this?"—"You will understand, sir, that my friend forgives you—he is dead."

No. CL.

A CURIOUS story of vicarious hanging is referred to, by several of the earlier historians, of New England. The readers of *Hudibras* will remember the following passage, Part ii. 407—

"Justice gives sentence, many times,
On one man for another's crimes.
Our brethren of New England use
Choice malefactors to excuse,
And hang the guiltless in their stead,
Of whom the churches have less need :
As lately 't happen'd :—in a town
There liv'd a cobbler, and but one,
That out of doctrine could cut use,
And mend men's lives, as well as shoes.
This precious brother having slain,
In times of peace, an Indian,
Not out of malice, but mere zeal,
Because he was an infidel ;
The mighty Tottipotmoy
Sent to our elders an envoy ;
Complaining sorely of the breach
Of league, held forth by brother Patch,
Against the articles in force
Between both churches, his and ours,
For which he crav'd the saints to render
Into his hands, or hang th' offender :
But they, maturely having weigh'd
They had no more but him o' the trade,
A man that serv'd them, in a double
Capacity, to teach and cobble,
Resolv'd to spare him ; yet to do
The Indian Hoghan Moghan too
Impartial Justice, in his stead did
Hang an old weaver, that was bedrid."

This is not altogether the sheer *poetica licentia*, that common readers may suppose it to be. Hubbard, *Mass. Hist. Coll.* xv. 77, gives the following version, after having spoken of the theft—"the company, as some report pretended, in way of satisfaction, to punish him, that did the theft, but in his stead, hanged a poor, decrepit, old man, that was unser-

vicious to the company, and burthensome to keep alive, which was the ground of the story, with which the merry gentleman, that wrote the poem, called Hudibras, did, in his poetical fancy, make so much sport. Yet the inhabitants of Plymouth tell the story much otherwise, as if the person hanged was really guilty of stealing, as may be were many of the rest, and if they were driven by necessity to content the Indians, at that time to do justice, there were some of Mr. Weston's company living, it is possible it might be executed not on him that most deserved, but on him that could be best spared, or was not likely to live long, if let alone."

Morton published his English Canaan, in 1637, and relates the story Part iii. ch. iv. p. 108, but he states, that it was a proposal only, which was very well received, but being opposed by one person, "they hanged up the real offender."

As the condemned draw nigh unto death—the scaffold—the gibbet—it would be natural to suppose, that every avenue to the heart would be effectually closed, against the entrance of all impressions, but those of terrible solemnity; yet no common truth is more clearly established, than that ill-timed levity, vanity, pride, and an almost inexplicable pleasure, arising from a consciousness of being the observed of all observers, have been exhibited, by men, on their way to the scaffold, and even with the halter about their necks.

The story is well worn out, of the wretched man, who, observing the crowd eagerly rushing before him, on his way to the gallows, exclaimed, "gentlemen, why so fast—there can be no sport, till I come!"

In Jesse's memoirs of George Selwyn, i. 345, it is stated, that John Wisket, who committed a most atrocious burglary, in 1763, the evidence of which was perfectly clear and conclusive, insisted upon wearing a large white cockade, on the scaffold, as a token of his innocence, and was swung off, bearing that significant appendage.

In the same volume, page 117, it is said of the famous Lord Lovat, that, in Scotland, a story is current, that, when upon his way to the Tower, after his condemnation, an old woman thrust her head into the window of the coach, which conveyed him, and exclaimed—"You old rascal, I begin to think you will be hung at last." To which he instantly replied—"You old b—h, I begin to think I shall."

In Walpole's letters to Mann, 163, a very interesting and curious account may be found, of the execution of the Lords Kilmarnock, and Balmarino. These Lords, with the Lord Cromartie, who was pardoned, were engaged, on the side of the Pretender, in the rebellion of 1745. "Just before they came out of the Tower, Lord Balmarino drank a bumper to King James's health. As the clock struck ten, they came forth, on foot, Lord Kilmarnock all in black, his hair unpowdered, in a bag, supported by Forster, the great Presbyterian, and by Mr. Home, a young clergyman, his friend. Lord Balmarino followed, alone, in a blue coat, turned up with red, *his rebellious regimentals*, a flannel waistcoat, and his shroud beneath, the hearses following. They were conducted to a house near the scaffold; the room forwards had benches for the spectators; in the second was Lord Kilmarnock; and in the third backwards Lord Balmarino—all three chambers hung with black. Here they parted! Balmarino embraced the other, and said—'My lord, I wish I could suffer for both.'"

When Kilmarnock came to the scaffold, continues Walpole,—“He then took off his bag, coat, and waistcoat, with great composure, and, after some trouble, put on a napkin cap, and then several times tried the block, the executioner, who was in white, with a white apron, out of tenderness concealing the axe behind himself. At last the Earl knelt down, with a visible unwillingness to depart, and, after five minutes, dropped his handkerchief, the signal, and his head was cut off at once, only hanging by a bit of skin, and was received in a scarlet cloth, by four undertakers' men kneeling, who wrapped it up, and put it into the coffin with the body; orders having been given not to expose the heads, as used to be the custom. The scaffold was immediately new strewed with sawdust, the block new covered, the executioner new dressed, and a new axe brought. Then came old Balmarino, treading with the air of a general. As soon as he mounted the scaffold, he read the inscription on his coffin, as he did again afterwards: he then surveyed the spectators, who were in amazing numbers, even upon masts of ships in the river; and, pulling out his spectacles, read a treasonable speech, which he delivered to the sheriff, and said the young Pretender was so sweet a prince, that flesh and blood could not resist following him; and, lying down to try the block, he said—'if I had a thousand lives I would lay them all down here in the same cause.' He

said, if he had not taken the sacrament the day before, he would have knocked down Williamson, the Lieutenant of the Tower, for his ill usage of him. He took the axe and felt of it, and asked the headsman how many blows he had given Lord Kilmar-nock, and gave him two guineas. Then he went to the corner of the scaffold, and called very loud to the Warder, to give him his periwig, which he took off, and put on a night cap of Scotch plaid, and then pulled off his coat and waistcoat and lay down; but being told he was on the wrong side, vaulted round, and immediately gave the sign, by tossing up his arm, as if he were giving the signal for battle. He received three blows, but the first certainly took away sensation. As he was on his way to the place of execution, seeing every window open, and the roofs covered with spectators—"Look, look," he cried, "see how they are piled up like rotten oranges!"

Following the English custom, the clergymen of Boston were in the habit, formerly, of preaching to those, who were under sentence of death. I have before me, while I write, the following manuscript memoranda of Dr. Andrew Eliot—"1746, July 24. Thursday lecture preached by Dr. Sewall to three poor malefactors, who were executed P. M." "1747, Oct. 8. Went to Cambridge to attend Eliza Wakefield, this day executed. Mr. Grady began with prayer. Mr. Appleton preached and prayed." There is a printed sermon, preached by Dr. Andrew Eliot, on the Lords' day before the execution of Levi Ames, who was hung for burglary Oct. 21, 1773. Ames was present, and the sermon was preached, by his particular request. The desire of distinction dies hard, even in the hearts of malefactors.

Dr. Andrew Eliot was a man of excellent sense, and disapproved of the practice, then in vogue, of lionizing burglars and murderers, of which, few, at the present day, I believe, have any just conception. For their edification I subjoin a portion of a manuscript note, in the hand writing of the late Dr. Ephraim Eliot, appended to the last page of the sermon, delivered by his father. "Levi Ames was a noted offender—though a young man, he had gone through all the routine of punishment; and there was now another indictment against him, where there was positive proof, in addition to his own confession. He was tried and condemned, for breaking into the house of Martin Bicker, in Dock Square. His condemnation excited extraordinary sympathy. *He was every Sabbath carried through the streets with*

chains about his ankles and handcuffed, in custody of the Sheriff's officers and constables, to some public meeting, attended by an innumerable company of boys, women and men. Nothing was talked of but Levi Ames. The ministers were successively employed in delivering occasional discourses. Stillman improved the opportunity several times, and absolutely persuaded the fellow, that he was to step from the cart into Heaven."

It is quite surprising, that our fathers should have suffered this interesting burglar—"misguided" of course—to be hung by the neck, till he was dead. When an individual, as sanguine, as Dr. Stillman appears to have been, in regard to Levi Ames, remarked of a notorious burglar, a few days after his execution, that he had certainly been *born again*, an incredulous bystander observed, that he was sorry to hear it, for some dwelling-house or store would surely be broken open before morning.

No. CLI.

WE are sufficiently acquainted with the Catholic practice of roasting heretics—that of boiling thieves and other offenders is less generally known. *Caldarius decoquere*, to boil them in cauldrons, was a punishment, inflicted in the middle ages, on thieves, false coiners, and others. In 1532, seventeen persons, in the family of the Bishop of Rochester, were poisoned by Rouse, a cook; the offence was, in consequence, made treason, by 23 Henry VIII., punishable, by boiling to death. Margaret Davie was boiled to death, for the like crime, in 1541. Quite a number of Roman ladies, in the year 331 B. C., formed a poisoning society, or club; and adopted this quiet mode of divorcing themselves from their husbands: seventy of the sisterhood were denounced, by a slave, to the consul, Fabius Maximus, who ordered them to be executed. None of these ladies were boiled.

Boiling the dead has been very customary, after beheading or hanging, and drawing, and quartering, whenever the criminal was sentenced to be hung afterwards, in chains. Thus father Strype—"1554.—Sir Thomas Wyatt's fatal day was come, being the 11th of April, when, between nine and ten of the clock, aforenoon, on Tower Hill, he was beheaded; and, by eleven of

the clock, he was quartered on the scaffold, and his bowels and members burnt beside the scaffold; and, a car and basket being at hand, the four quarters and the head were put into the basket, and conveyed to Newgate, to be parboiled." One more quotation from Strype—"1557.—May 28th, was Thomas Stafford beheaded on Tower Hill, by nine of the clock, Mr. Wode being his ghostly father; and, after, three more, viz., Stowel, Proctor, and Bradford were drawn from the Tower, through London, unto Tyburn, and there hanged and quartered: and, the morrow after, was Stafford quartered, and his quarters hanged on a car, and carried to Newgate to boil."

How very ingenious we have been, since the days of Cain, in torturing one another! Boiling and roasting are not to be thought of. The Turkish bowstring will never be adopted here, nor the Chinese drop, nor their mode of capital punishment, in which the criminal, having been stripped naked, is so confined, that he can scarcely move a muscle, and, being smeared with honey, is exposed to myriads of insects, and thus left to perish. Crucifixion will never be popular in Massachusetts, though quite common among the Syrians, Egyptians, Persians, Africans, Greeks, Romans, and Jews. Starving to death, sawing in twain, and rending asunder, by strong horses, have all been tried, but are not much approved of, by the moderns. The rack may answer well enough, in Catholic countries, but, in this quarter, there is a strong prejudice against it. Exposure to wild beasts is objectionable, for two reasons; one of these reasons resembles the first of twenty-four, offered to the Queen of Hungary, for not ringing the bells upon her arrival,—there were no bells in the village—we have no wild beasts. The second reason is quite german—man is savage enough, without any foreign assistance. Burying alive, though it has been employed, as a punishment, in other countries, is, literally, too much for flesh and blood; and, I am happy to say, there is not a sexton in this city, who would, knowingly, be a party to such a barbarous proceeding.

Death has been produced, by preventing sleep, as a mode of punishment. Impaling, and flaying alive, tearing to pieces with red hot pincers, casting headlong from high rocks, eviscerating the bowels, firing the criminals from the mouths of canons, and pressing them slowly to death, by weights, graaually increased, upon the breast, the *peine forte et dure*, are very much out of fashion; though one and all have been frequently employed, in

other times. There is a wheel of fashion, as well as a wheel of fortune, in the course of whose revolutions, some of these obsolete modes of capital punishment may come round again, like polygon porcelain, and antiquated chair-backs. Should our legislature think proper to revive the practice, in capital cases, of heading up the criminal in a barrel, filled with nails, driven inward, a sort of inverted *cheval de frize*, and rolling him down hill, I have often thought the more elevated corner of our Common would be an admirable spot for the commencement of the execution, were it not for interrupting the practice of coasting, during the winter; by which several innocent persons, in no way parties to the process, have been very nearly executed already.

Shooting is apt to be performed, in a bungling manner. Hanging by the heels, till the criminal is dead, is very objectionable, and requires too much time. The mode adopted here and in England, and also in some other countries, of hanging by the neck, is, in no respect agreeable, even if the operator be a skilful man; and, if not, it is highly offensive. The rope is sometimes too long, and the victim touches the ground—it is too frail, and breaks, and the odious act must be performed again—or the noose is unskilfully adjusted, the neck is not broken, and the struggles are terrible.

The sword, in a Turkish hand, performs the work well. It was used in France. Charles Henry Sanson, the hereditary executioner, on the third of March, 1792, presented a memorial to the Constituent Assembly, in which he objected to decollation, and stated that he had but two swords; that they became dull immediately; and were wholly insufficient, when there were many to be executed, at one time. Monsieur Sanson knew nothing then of that delightful instrument, which, not long afterward, became a mere plaything, in his hands.

Stoning to death and flaying alive have been employed, occasionally, since the days of Stephen and Bartholomew. The axe, so much in vogue, formerly, in England, was a ruffianly instrument, often mangling the victim, in a horrible manner.

After all, there is nothing like the guillotine; and, should it ever be thought expedient to erect one here, I should recommend, for a location, the knoll, near the fountain, on our Common, which would enable a very large concourse of men, women, and children, to witness the performances of both, at the same moment.

The very best account of the guillotine, that I have ever met with, is contained in the London Quarterly Review, vol. lxxiii. page 235. It is commonly supposed, that this instrument was invented by Dr. Guillotin, whose name it bears. It has been frequently asserted, that Dr. Guillotin was one of the earliest, who fell victims to its terrible agency. It has been still more generally believed, that this awfully efficient machine was conceived in sin and begotten in iniquity, or in other words, that its original contrivers were moved, by the spirit of cruelty. All these conjectures are unfounded.

The guillotine, before its employment, in France, was well known in England, under the name of the Halifax gibbet. A copy of a print, by John Doyle, bearing date 1650, and representing the instrument, may be found, in the work, to which I have, just now, referred. Pennant, in his Tour, vol. iii. page 365, affirms, that he saw one of the same kind, "in a room, under the Parliament house, at Edinburgh, where it was introduced by the Regent, Morton, who took a model of it, as he passed through Halifax, and, at length, suffered by it, himself."

The writer in the London Quarterly, puts the question of invention at rest, by exhibiting, on page 258, a copy of an engraving, by Henry Aldgrave, bearing date 1553, representing the death of Titus Mælius, under the operation of "an instrument, identical with the guillotine."

During the revolution, Dr. Guillotin was committed to prison, from which he was released, after a tedious confinement. He died in his bed, at Paris, an obscure and inoffensive, old man; deeply deploring, to the day of his decease, the association of his name, with this terrible instrument—an instrument, which he attempted to introduce, in good faith, and with a merciful design, but which had been employed by the devils incarnate of the revolution, for the purposes of reckless and indiscriminating carnage.

Dr. Guillotin was a weak, consequential, well-meaning man, willing to mount any hobby, that would lift him from the ground. He is described, in the *Portraits des Personnes célèbres*, 1796, as a simple busybody, meddling with everything, *à tort et à travers*, and being both mischievous and ridiculous.

He had sundry benevolent visions, in regard to capital punishment, and the suppression, *by legal enactment*, of the *senti-ment* of prejudice, against the families of persons, executed for

crime! Among the members of the faculty, in every large city, there are commonly two or three, at least, exhibiting striking points of resemblance to Dr. Guillotin. In urging the merits of this machine, upon merciful considerations, his integrity was unimpeachable. He considered hanging a barbarous and cruel punishment; and, by the zeal and simplicity of his arguments, produced, even upon so grave a topic, universal laughter, in the constituent assembly—having represented hanging, as a tedious and painful process, he exclaimed, “Now, with my machine, *Je vous sauter le tête*, I strike off your head, in the twinkling of an eye, and you never feel it.”

No. CLII.

THE Sansons, hereditary executioners, in Paris, were gentlemen. In 1684, Carlier, executioner of Paris, was dismissed. His successor was Charles Sanson a lieutenant in the army, born in Abbeville, in Picardy, and a relative of Nicholas Sanson, the celebrated geographer. Charles Sanson married the daughter of the executioner of Normandy, and hence a long line of illustrious executioners. Charles died in 1695; and was succeeded by his son Charles.

Charles Sanson, the second, was succeeded by his son, Charles John Baptiste, who died Aug. 4, 1778, when his son Charles Henry was appointed in his place; and, in 1795, retired on a pension. By his hand, with the assistance of two of his brothers, the King, Louis XVI. was guillotined. This Charles Henry had two sons. His eldest, the heir-apparent to the guillotine, was killed, by a fall from the scaffold, while holding forth the head of a man, executed for the forgery of assignats. Henry, the younger son of Charles Henry, therefore became his successor, at the time of his retirement, in 1795. To fill this office, he gave up his military rank, as captain of artillery. He died Aug. 18, 1840. He was an elector, and had a taste for music and literature. He was succeeded by his son, Henry Clement, Dec. 1, 1840. These particulars will be found on page 27 of *Recherches Historiques et Physiologiques, sur la Guillotine, &c.*, par M. Louis du Bois. Paris, 1843. Monsieur du Bois informs

us, that all these Sansons were very worthy men, and that the present official possesses a fine figure, features stamped with nobility, and an expression sweet and attractive. How very little all this quadrates with our popular impressions of the common hangman !

The objection to the guillotine, which was called, for a time, *Louison*, after M. Louis, Secretary of the College of Surgeons, that it would make men familiar with the sight of blood, was urged by the Abbé Maury, and afterwards, by A. M. La Cheze. The Duke de Liancourt, inclined to *mercy*, that is, to the employment of the guillotine. He contended, that it was necessary to efface all recollections of hanging, which, he gravely remarked, had recently been so *irregularly applied*, referring to the summary process of lynching, as we term it—*à la lanterne*.

It is curious to note the doubt and apprehension, which existed, as to the result of the first experiment of decollation. March 3, 1792, the minister, Duport du Tertre, writes thus to the Legislative Assembly—"It appears, by the communications, made to me, by the executioners themselves, that, without some precautions, the act of decollation will be horrible to the spectators. It will either prove them to be monsters, if they are able to bear such a spectacle ; or the executioner, himself, alarmed, will fall before the wrath of the people.

The matter being referred to Louis, then Secretary of the Academy of Surgeons, he made his report, March 7, 1792. The new law required, that the criminal should be decapitated—*aura la tête tranchée* ; and that the punishment should be inflicted *without torture*. Louis shows how difficult the execution of such a law must be—"We should recollect," says he, "the occurrences at M. de Lally's execution. He was upon his knees, with his eyes covered—the executioner struck him, on the back of his neck—the blow was insufficient. He fell upon his face, and three or four cuts of the sabre severed the head. Such *hacherie* excited a feeling of horror." To such a polite and gentle nation, this must have been highly offensive.

April 25, 1798. Rœderer, Procureur Général, wrote a letter to Lafayette, telling him, that a public trial of the new instrument would take place, that day, in the *Place de Grève*, and would, doubtless, draw a great crowd, and begging him not to withdraw the gens d'armes, till the apparatus had been removed. In the *Courrier Extraordinaire*, of April 27, 1792, is the following notice—"They made yesterday (meaning the 25th) the first

trial of the *little Louison*, and cut off a head, one Pelletier. I never in my life could bear to see a man hanged; but I own I feel a greater aversion to this species of execution. The preparations make me shudder, and increase the moral suffering. The people seemed to wish, that M. Sanson had his old gallows."

After the *Louison*, or guillotine, had been in operation rather more than a year, the following interesting letter was sent, by the Procureur Général, Rœderer, to citizen Guideu. "13 May, 1793. I enclose, citizen, the copy of a letter from citizen Chaumette, solicitor to the commune of Paris, by which you will perceive, that complaints are made, that, after these public executions, the blood of the criminals remains in pools, upon the *Place de Grève*, that dogs came to drink it, and that crowds of men feed their eyes with this spectacle, which naturally instigates their hearts to ferocity and blood. I request you therefore to take the earliest and most convenient opportunity, to remove from the eyes of men a sight so afflicting to humanity."

Voltaire, who thought very gravely, before he delivered the sentiment to the world, has stated of his countrymen, that they were a mixture of the monkey and the tiger. Undoubtedly he knew. In the revolution of 1793, and in every other, that has occurred in France—those excepted which may have taken place, since the arrival of the last steamer—the tiger has had the upper hand. Prudhomme, the prince of pamphleteers, having published fifteen hundred, on political subjects, and author of the General History of the crimes, committed, during the revolution, writing of the execution of Louis XVI. remarks—"Some individuals steeped their handkerchiefs in his blood. A number of armed volunteers crowded also to dip in the blood of the despot their pikes, their bayonets, and their sabres. Several officers of the Marseillais battalion, and others, dipped the covers of letters in this impure blood, and carried them, on the points of their swords, at the head of their companies, exclaiming 'this is the blood of a tyrant.' One citizen got up to the guillotine itself, and plunging his whole arm into the blood of Capet, of which a great quantity remained; he took up handfuls of the clotted gore, and sprinkled it over the crowd below, which pressed round the scaffold, each anxious to receive a drop on his forehead. 'Friends,' said this citizen in sprinkling them, 'we were threatened, that the blood of Louis should be on our heads, and so you see it is.'"

Rev. de Paris, No. 185, p. 205.

Upon the earnest request of the inhabitants of several streets, through which the gangs of criminals were carried, the guillotine was removed, June 8, 1794, from the *Place de la Revolution* to the *Place St. Antoine*, in front of the ruins of the Bastille; where it remained five days only, during which time, it took off ninety-six heads. The proximity of this terrible revolutionary plaything annoyed the shopkeepers. The purchasers of finery were too forcibly reminded of the uncertainty of life, and the brief occasion they might have, for all such things, especially for neckerchiefs and collars. Once again then, the guillotine, after five days' labor, was removed; and took its station still farther off, at the *Barrière du Trône*. There it stood, from June 9 till the overthrow of Robespierre, July 27, 1794: and, during those forty-nine days, twelve hundred and seventy heads dropped into its voracious basket. July 28, it was returned to the *Place de la Revolution*.

Sanson, Charles Henry, the executioner of Louis XVI. had not a little *bonhomie* in his composition—his infernal profession seems not to have completely ossified his heart. He reminds me, not a little, of Sir Thomas Erpingham, who, George Colman, the younger, says, carried on his wars, in France, in a benevolent spirit, and went about, I suppose, like dear, old General Taylor, in Mexico, "pitying and killing." On the day, when Robespierre fell, forty-nine victims were ascending the carts, to proceed to the guillotine, about three in the afternoon. Sanson, at the moment, met that incomparable bloodhound, the *Accusateur Public*, Fouquier de Tinville, going to dinner. Sanson suggested the propriety of delaying the execution, as a new order of things might cause the lives of the condemned to be spared. Fouquier briefly replied, "the law must take its course;" and went to dine—the forty-nine to die; and, shortly after, their fate was his.

The guillotine, viewed as an instrument of justice, in cases of execution, for capital offences, is certainly a most merciful contrivance, liable, undoubtedly, during a period of intense excitement, to be converted into a terrible toy.

During the reign of terror, matters of extreme insignificance, brought men, women, and children to the guillotine. The record is, occasionally, awfully ridiculous. A few examples may suffice—Jean Julian, wagoner, sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment, took it into his head, on the way—*s'avisé*—to cry—

Vive le Roi ; executed September, 1792.—Jean Baptiste Henry sawed a tree of liberty ; executed Sept. 6, 1793.—M. Baulny, ex-noble, assisted his son to emigrate ; executed Jan. 31, 1794.—La veuve Marbeuf *hoped* the Austrians would come ; executed Feb. 5, 1794.—Francis Bertrand, publican, sold sour wine ; executed May 15, 1793.—Marie Angelique Plaisant, sempstress, exclaimed—" a fig for the nation ;" executed July 19, 1794.

No. CLIII.

AN interesting, physiological question arose, in 1796, whether death, by decollation, under the guillotine, were instantaneous or not. Men of science and talent, and among them Dr. Sue, and a number of German physicians, maintained, that, in the brain, after decapitation, there was a certain degree—*un reste*—of thought, and, in the nerves, a measure of sensibility. An opposite opinion seems to have prevailed. The controversy, which was extremely interesting, acquired additional interest and activity, from an incident, which occurred, on the scaffold, immediately after the execution of Marie Anne Charlotte de Corday d'Armont—commonly known, under the imperishable name of *Charlotte Corday*. A brute, François Le Gros, one of the assistant executioners, held up the beautiful and bleeding head, and slapped the cheek with his hand. A blush was instantly visible to the spectators. In connection with the physiological question, to which I have referred, a careful inquiry was instituted, and it was proved, very satisfactorily, that the color—the blush—appeared on *both* cheeks, after the blow was given. Dr. Sue's account of this matter runs thus—"The countenance of Charlotte Corday expressed the most unequivocal marks of indignation. Let us look back to the facts—the executioner held the head, suspended in one hand ; the face was then pale, but had no sooner received the slap, which the sanguinary wretch inflicted, than both cheeks visibly reddened. Every spectator was struck, by the change of color, and with loud murmurs cried out for vengeance, on this cowardly and atrocious barbarity. It cannot be said, that the redness was caused by the blow—for we all know, that no blows will recall anything like color to the cheeks

of a corpse; besides this blow was given on one cheek, and the other equally reddened." *Sue; Opinion sur le supplice de la guillotine*, p. 9.

Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Religio Medici*, remarked, that he had never known a religion, in which there were impossibilities enough to give full exercise to an active faith. This remark greatly delighted Sir Kenelm Digby, who was an ultra Catholic. The faith of Browne, in regard to things spiritual, was not an overmatch for his credulity, in regard to things temporal, which is the more remarkable, as he gave so much time to his Pseudodoxia, or exposition of vulgar errors? He was a believer in the existence of invisible beings, holding rank between men and angels—in apparitions; and affirmed, *from his own knowledge*, the certainty of witchcraft. Hutchinson, in his essay on witchcraft, repeats the testimony of Dr. Browne, in the case of Amy Duny and Rose Cullender, who were tried, before Sir Matthew Hale, in 1664; and executed, at St. Edmunds Bury, as witches. Sir Thomas stated in court, "*that the fits were natural, but heightened, by the devil's coöperating with the malice of the witches, at whose instance he did the villanies.*" He added that "a great discovery had lately been made, in Denmark, of witches, who used the very same way of afflicting persons, by conveying pins into them." Now it would be curious to know what Sir Thomas thought of the famous and apposite story of Sir Everard Digby, the father of Sir Kenelm, and if the faith of Sir Thomas were strong enough, to credit that extraordinary tale.

Charlotte Corday was *beheaded*, and Sir Everard Digby was *hanged*. The difference must be borne in mind, while considering this interesting subject. Sir Everard, who was an amiable young man, was led astray, and executed Jan. 30, 1606, for the part he bore, in the gunpowder plot. Wood, in his "*Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iii. p. 693, Lond. 1817, has the following passage—"Sir Everard Digby, father to Sir Kenelme, was a goodly gentleman, and the handsomest man of his time, but much pitied, for that it was his ill fate to suffer for the powder plot, in 1605, aged 24, at which time, when the executioner pluck'd out the heart, when the body was to be quartered, and, according to the manner, held it up, saying, *here is the heart of a traitor*, Sir Everard made answer, *thou liest*. This a most famous author mentions, but tells us not his name, in his *Historia Vitæ et*

Mortis." This most famous author is Lord Bacon—Hist. Vit. et Mort., vol. viii. p. 446, Lond. 1824. The passage is so curious, that I give it entire—"Anguillæ, serpentes et insecta diu moventur singulis partibus, post concisionem. Etiam aves, capitibus avulsis, ad tempus subsultant: quin et corda animalium avulsa diu palpitant. Equidem meminimus ipsi vidisse hominis cor, qui evisceratus erat (supplicii genere apud nos versus proditores recepto) quod in ignem, de more, injectum, saltabat in altum, primo ad sesquipedem, et deinde gradatim ad minus; durante spatio (ut meminimus) septem aut octo minutarum. Etiam vetus et fide digna traditio est, de bove sub evisceratione mugiente. At magis certa de homine, qui eo supplicii genere (quod diximus) evisceratus, postquam cor avulsum penitus esset, et in carnificis manu, tria aut quatuor verba precum auditus est proferre"—which may be Englished thus—Snakes, serpents, and insects move, a long time, after they have been cut into parts. Birds also hop about, for a time, after their heads have been wrung off. Even the hearts of animals, after they have been torn out, continue long to palpitate. Indeed, we ourselves remember to have seen the heart of a man, who had been drawn, or eviscerated, in that kind of punishment, which we employ against traitors, and which, when cast upon the fire, according to custom, leapt on high, at first, a foot and a half, and gradually less and less, during the space, if we justly remember, of seven or eight minutes. There is also an ancient tradition, well entitled to credit, of a cow, that bellowed, under the process of evisceration. And more certain is the story of the man, who was eviscerated, according to the mode of punishment we have referred to, who, when his heart was actually torn out, and in the hands of the executioner, was heard to utter three or four words of imprecation. Sir Everard was executed, as I have stated, in 1605. Lord Bacon was born Jan. 22, 1561, and died April 9, 1626, twenty-one years only after Digby's execution, and at the age of 65. Lord Bacon was therefore 44 years old, when Digby's execution took place, which fact has some bearing upon the authenticity of this extraordinary story. Lord Bacon speaks confidently of the fact; and his suppression of the name was very natural, as the family of Sir Everard were then upon the stage.

A writer in the London Quarterly Review remarks, in a note on page 274, vol. 73, comparing the case of Charlotte Corday

with that of Sir Everard Digby—"This" (Sir Everard's) "was a case of *evisceration*, and not of *decapitation*, which makes the whole difference, as to the credibility of the story."

Chalmers relates the anecdote, and refers to Wood's *Athenæ*, and Lord Bacon's *Historia Vitæ et Mortis*, but speaks of the tale, as "*a story, which will scarcely now obtain belief*." In the *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. iii. page 5, Lond. 1809, there is an account of the discovery of the gunpowder plot, imprinted at London, by Robert Barker, 1605. On page 47, a very brief cotemporaneous account is given of Digby's execution, in St. Paul's churchyard, which contains no allusion whatever to the circumstance, stated by Wood, and so very confidently, by Lord Bacon.

I suppose few will really believe, that any man's conversational abilities can be worth much, after his head is off, or his heart is out. From the expression of the Quarterly reviewer, it may be inferred, that he did not consider the story of Sir Everard Digby utterly impossible and incredible. For my own part, I am very much inclined to hand over this extraordinary legend to Judæus Appella. Every man, who has not, by long experience, like George Selwyn, acquired great self-possession, while enjoying an execution, inclines to the marvellous. Sir Everard, before the work of *evisceration* began, it must be remembered, had been hanged, the usual length of time; and the words—"thou liest"—are stated to have been uttered, at the moment, when the heart, having been plucked out, was held up by the executioner. It is more easy of belief, that some guttural noise, like that, spasmodically uttered by certain birds, after their heads have been chopped off, may have sounded to the gaping bystanders, who looked and listened, *auribus arrectis*, not very unlike the words in question. The belief, that Digby spoke these words, seems to be analogous to the belief, that, in *hydrophobia*, the sufferers bark like dogs, simply because, oppressed with phlegm, and nearly strangled, their terrific efforts, to clear the breathing passages, are accompanied with a variety of unintelligible, and horrible sounds.

There are some curious cases, on record, which may have something to do with our reasoning, upon this subject. A similar species of death, attended by spasms or convulsions, is said to have been produced, by the bite of other animals. Dr. Fothergill relates cases of death, from the bite of a cat. Thiermayer

recites two cases, both terminating fatally, from the bite of a goose, and a hen. Le Cat, *Receuil Periodique*, ii. page 90, presents a similar case, from the bite of a duck. But we are not informed, that, the patient, in either of these cases, during the spasms, mewed, quacked, cackled, or hissed; and yet there seems to be no rational apology for a patient's *barking*, simply because he has been bitten, by a cat, or a duck, a goose, or a hen.

Spasmodic or convulsive motion, in a human body, which has been hung, or shot, or eviscerated, is a very different thing, from an intelligent exercise of the will, over the organs of speech, producing the utterance even of a word or syllable.

In the cases of persons, who have been shot through the heart, violent spasmodic action is no unusual phenomenon. When I was a boy, the duel took place, between Rand and Millar, at Dorchester Point, then a locality as solitary, as Hoboken, or the Hebrides. The movements of the parties were observed, and their purposes readily surmised, by the officers, on Castle William; and a barge was immediately despatched, from the fort. Shots were exchanged, between the combatants, while the barge was passing over. Rand fell, wounded through the heart; and, after lying motionless, for a very brief space, was seen to leap into the air. several feet, and fall again, upon the earth.

No. CLIV.

WE are living and learning, forever. Life is a court of cassation, where truth sits, as chancellor, daily reversing the most incomparably beautiful decrees of theoretical philosophy.

It is not unlikely, that a very interesting volume of 600 pages, folio, might be prepared, to be called the *Mistakes of Science*. The elephant in the moon, and the weighing of the fish have furnished amusement, in their day. Even in our own times, philosophers, of considerable note, have seriously *doubted* the truth of that incomparable hoax, concerning Sir John Herschell's lunar discoveries.

Savans were completely deceived, for a considerable period, by the electrical beatifications of Mr. Bose. One of the most

amusing occurrences, upon record, on which occasion, the philosopher, unlike Mr. Bose, was a perfectly honest man, befell the famous mathematical instrument-maker, Mr. Troughton. He became fully possessed, by the idea, that certain persons, a select few, were capable of exerting a magnetic influence, over the needle, by advancing their faces towards it. So far from being common, this power was limited to a very small number. The statements of Mr. Troughton, and his well-established reputation, for integrity, caused the subject to be gravely discussed, by members of the Royal Society.

Every individual of the very small number, who possessed this remarkable power—every *medium*—was carefully examined. Collusion seemed utterly impossible. A new theory appeared to be established. Amazement ran through the learned assembly. A careful inquiry was instituted, in relation to the manner of life of these *mediums*, from their youth upwards, their occupations, diet, &c., and some very learned papers would, ere long, have been read, before the Royal Society, if Mr. Troughton himself had not previously made a most fortunate discovery—he discovered, that he wore a wig, constructed with *steel springs*—such, also, was the case with every other *medium*!

The tendency to predicate certainty, of things, manifestly doubtful, is exceedingly common. I fell, recently, into the society of some very intelligent gentlemen, who were *certain*, that Sir John Franklin was lost, irrecoverably lost.

There are some—perhaps their name is not Legion—whose faith is of superior dimensions to the mustard seed, and who believe, that Sir John Franklin is not destroyed; that he yet lives; and, that, sooner or later, he will come back to his friends and the world, with a world of wonders to relate, of all that he has seen and suffered. God, all merciful, grant it may be so. To all human observation, after a careful balancing of probabilities, there is certainly nothing particularly flattering in the prospect. Yet, on the other hand, absolute, unqualified despair is irrational, and unjustifiable.

The present existence of Sir John Franklin is certainly *possible*. No one, I presume, will say it is *probable*. Some half a dozen good, substantial words are greatly needed, to mark shades between these two, and to designate what is more than *possible*, and less than *probable*.

A careful consideration of the narrative of Sir John Ross, the

narrative, I mean, of his second voyage, in quest of a northwest passage, and of his abode in the Arctic regions, and of the opinion, very generally entertained, for a great length of time, that he was lost, will strengthen the impression, that Sir John Franklin also may be yet alive, *somewhere* ! Even then, a question may arise, in connection with the force of certain currents, referred to, by those, who have lately returned, from an unsuccessful search for Sir John Franklin, whether it may be possible to return, against those currents, with such means and appliances, as he possessed ; and whether, even on this side the grave, there may not be a bourne, from which no presumptuous voyager ever shall return.

The residence of Sir John Ross, in the Arctic regions, continued, through five consecutive years, 1829, '30, '31, '32, '33. To such, as imagine there is any effective summer, in those regions, and who have been accustomed to associate spring and summer, with flowers and fruits, it may not be amiss, by way of corrective, to administer a brief passage, from the journal of Sir John Ross, in August, 1832—"But to see, to have seen, ice and snow, to have felt snow and ice forever, and nothing forever but snow and ice, during all the months of a year ; to have seen and felt but uninterrupted and unceasing ice and snow, during all the months of four years, this it is, that has made the sight of those most chilling and wearisome objects an evil, which is still one in recollection, as if the remembrance would never cease."

At this period, August, 1832, very little hope was entertained, that Sir John Ross and his companions were living. Even a year before, they were generally supposed to be lost.

The abandonment of their ship, which had been locked fast in the ice, for years, and their almost inconceivable toil, while crossing, with their boats, on sledges, to the confluence of Regent's Inlet, and Barrow's Strait, are fully presented in the narrative. Their hour of deliverance came at last, and the event cannot be better described, than in the words of Sir John Ross himself. As they were standing along the southern shore of Barrow's Strait, in their boats, on the 26th of August, a sail, to their inexpressible joy, hove in sight. After a period of great anxiety, lest she should not observe their signals of distress, their deep delight may be imagined, even by an unpractised landsman, when they first became assured, that they had attracted the notice of the crew, in one of the ship's boats. The reader

will be better satisfied with an account from the lips of the *πολυτροπος ὃς μάλλα πολλὰ*, himself.

"She was soon along side, when the mate in command addressed us, by presuming, that we had met with some misfortune and lost our ship. This being answered in the affirmative, I requested to know the name of his vessel, and expressed our wish to be taken on board. I was answered, that it was the 'Isabella, of Hull, once commanded by Captain Ross;' on which I stated, that I was the identical man in question, and my people the crew of the Victory. That the mate, who commanded this boat, was as much astonished, as he appeared to be, I do not doubt; while, with the usual blunderheadedness of men, on such occasions, he assured me, that I had been dead two years. I easily convinced him, however, that what ought to have been true, according to his estimate, was a somewhat premature conclusion; as the bear-like form of the whole set of us, might have shown him, had he taken time to consider, that we were certainly not whaling gentlemen, and that we carried tolerable evidence of our being 'true men and no imposters,' on our backs, and in our starved and unshaven countenances."

However close the resemblance, between Sir John Ross and his comrades to *bears*, they soon become *lions* on board the *Isabella*. Sir John continues thus—

"A hearty congratulation followed, of course, in the true seaman style, and, after a few natural inquiries, he added, that the *Isabella* was commanded by Captain Humphreys; when he immediately went off in his boat to communicate his information on board; repeating, that we had long been given up as lost, not by them alone, but by all England."

In this precedent, there is kindling stuff for hope, if not substantial fuel. After reading this account, the hearts of the strong-hearted cannot fail to be strengthened the more. A scientific and elaborate comparison of all the facts and circumstances, in the respective cases of Ross and Franklin, may lead to dissipate our hope. But hope is a vivacious principle, like the polypus, from the minutest particle remaining, growing up to be the integral thing, that it was. Science, philosophy, perched upon theoretical stilts, occasionally walk confidently into the mire. Sir John Franklin may yet be among the living, notwithstanding those negative demonstrations, in which many so very plausibly indulge themselves. ...

Let us follow Sir John Ross and his companions on board the *Isabella*.—"As we approached slowly after him (the mate of the *Isabella*) he jumped up the side, and, in a minute, the rigging was manned; while we were saluted with three cheers, as we came within cable's length, and were not long in getting on board my old vessel, where we were all received, by Captain Humphreys, with a hearty seaman's welcome. Though we had not been supported by our names and characters, we should not the less have claimed, from charity, the attentions we received; for never was seen a more miserable looking set of wretches. If to be poor, wretchedly poor, as far as all our present property was concerned, were to have a claim on charity, none could well deserve it more; but, if to look so, be to frighten away the so called charitable, no beggar, that wanders in Ireland, could have outdone us, in exciting the repugnance of those, who know not what poverty can be. Unshaven, since I know not when, dirty, dressed in the rags of wild beasts, instead of the tatters of civilization, and starved to the very bones, our gaunt and grim looks, when contrasted with those of the well dressed and well fed men around us, made us all feel, I believe, for the first time, what we really were, as well as what we seemed to others."

Very considerable training must, doubtless, be required, to reconcile a Mohawk Indian to a feather bed. A short passage from the *Journal* of Sir John Ross forcibly illustrates the truth, that we are the creatures of habit. "Long accustomed, however, to a cold bed, on the hard snow or the bare rock, few could sleep, amid the comforts of our new accommodations. I was myself compelled to leave the bed, which had been kindly assigned me, and take my abode in a chair for the night, nor did it fare much better with the rest. It was for time to reconcile us to this sudden and violent change, to break through what had become habit, and to inure us, once more, to the usages of our former days."

No. CLV.

Good, old Sir William Dugdale was certainly the prince of antiquaries. His labors and their products were greater, than

could have been anticipated, even from his long and ever busy life. He was born, Sept. 12, 1605, and died, in his eighty-first year, while sitting quietly, in his antiquarian chair, Feb. 6, 1686.

It seemed not to have occurred, so impressively, to other men, how very important was the diligent study of ancient wills, not only to the antiquarian, but to the historian, of any age or nation. Dugdale's annotations, upon the royal and noble wills of England, are eminently useful and curious. A collection of "royal wills" was published, by Mr. John Nicholls, the historian of Leicestershire, and the "*Testamenta Vetusta*," by Mr. Nicolas. These works are in very few hands, and some of them almost as rarely to be met with, as those of Du Cange, Charpentiere, Spelman, or Lacombe.

There is no small amount of information and amusement, to be gathered from these ancient declarations of the purposes of men, contemplating death, at a distance, or about to die; though it cannot be denied, that the wills of our immediate ancestors, especially, if they have amassed great wealth, and, after a few unimportant legacies to others, have made us their residuary legatees, furnish a far more interesting species of reading, to the rising generation.

There are worthy persons, who entertain a superstitious horror, upon the subject of making a will: they seem to have an actual fear, that the execution of a will is very much in the nature of a dying speech; that it is an expression of their willingness to go; and that the King of Terrors may possibly take them, at their word.

There are others, who are so far from being oppressed, by any apprehension, of this nature, that one of their most common amusements consists in the making, and mending of their wills.

"Who," says the compiler of the *Testamenta Vetusta*, "would have the hardihood to stain with those evil passions, which actuate mankind, in this world, that deed, which cannot take effect, until he is before the Supreme Judge, and consequently immediately responsible for his conduct?" To this grave inquiry I, unhesitatingly answer—*thousands!* The secret motives of men, upon such occasions, if fairly brought to light, would present a very curious record. That record would, by no means, sustain the sentiment, implied, in the preceding interrogatory. Malice

and caprice, notoriously, have governed the testator's pen, upon numberless occasions. The old phrase—*cutting off with a shilling*—has been reduced to practice, in a multitude of instances, for considerations of mere hatred and revenge, or of pique and displeasure. The malevolent testator, who would be heartily ashamed, to avow what he had done, on this side the grave, is regardless of his reputation, on the other.

Goldsmith places in the mouth of one of his characters, a declaration, that he was disinherited, for liking gravy. This, however it may have been intended as a pleasantry, by the author, is, by no means, beyond the region of probability. Considerations, equally absurd and frivolous, have, occasionally, operated upon the minds of passionate and capricious people, especially in the decline of life; and, though they are sensible of the Bible truth, that they can carry nothing with them, they may, yet a little while, enjoy the prospective disappointment of another.

The Testamenta Vetusta contain abstracts of numerous wills of the English kings, and of the nobility, and gentry, for several centuries, from the time of Henry second, who began to reign, in 1154. The work, as I have stated, is rare; and I am mistaken, if the general reader, any more than he, who has an antiquarian diathesis, will complain of the exhumation I propose to make of some, among the “reliques of thae antient dayes.”

It is almost impossible, to glance over one of these venerable testaments of the old English nobility, without perceiving, that the testator's thoughts were pretty equally divided, between beds, masses, and wax tapers. Beds, with the gorgeous trappings, appurtenant thereto, form a common subject of bequest, and of entailment, as heir-looms.

Edward, the Black Prince, son of Edward III., died June 8, 1376. In his will, dated the day before his death, he bequeaths “To our son Richard,* the bed, which the King our father gave us. To Sir Roger de Clarendon,† a silk bed. To Sir Robert de Walsham, our confessor, a large bed of red camora, with our arms embroidered at each corner; also embroidered with the arms of Hereford. To Monsr. Allayne Cheyne our bed of camora, powdered with blue eagles. And we bequeath all our goods and chattels, jewels, &c., for the payment of our funeral and debts; after which we will, that our executors pay certain

* Afterwards Richard II.

† His natural son.

legacies to our poor servants. All annuities, which we have given to our Knights, Esquires, and other, our followers, we desire to be fully paid. And we charge our son Richard, on our blessing, that he fulfil our bequests to them. And we appoint our very dear and beloved brother of Spain, Duke of Lancaster,* &c., &c., executors," &c.

Joan, Princess of Wales, was daughter of Edmund Plantagenet. From her extreme beauty, she was styled the "*Fair Maid of Kent*." I find the following record in regard to Joan—"She entered into a contract of marriage with Thomas Montacute, Earl of Salisbury; but Sir Thomas Holland, H. G., on a petition to Pope Clement VI. alleged a precontract, *consensus et concubitus*, but that, he being abroad, the Earl of Salisbury unjustly kept her from him; and his Holiness gave her to Sir Thomas."

Joan seems to have been a wilful body, and the reader may like to know what sort of a will she made, four hundred and sixty-six years ago. She finally became the wife of Edward, the Black Prince, and, by him, the mother of Richard II. An abstract of her will runs thus—"In the year of our Lord, 1385, and of the reign of my dear son, Richard, King of England and France, the 9th at my castle of Walyngford, in the Diocese of Salisbury, the 7th of August, I, Joan, Princess of Wales, Duchess of Cornwall, Countess of Chester, and Lady Wake. My body to be buried, in my chapel, at Stanford, near the monument of our late lord and father, the Earl of Kent. To my dear son, the King, my new bed of red velvet, embroidered with ostrich feathers of silver, and heads of leopards of gold, with boughs and leaves issuing out of their mouths. To my dear son, Thomas, Earl of Kent, my bed of red camak, paid with red and rays of gold. To my dear son, John Holland, a bed of red camak."

Katherine of Arragon wills, *inter alia*—"I supplicate, that my body be buried in a convent of Observant Friars. Item, that for my soul be said C. masses. Item, that some personage go to our Lady of Walsingham, in pilgrimage, and in going by the way, dole XX nobles. Item, I ordain that the collar of gold, that I brought out of Spain be to my daughter. * * * Item, if it may please the King, my good Lord, that the house ornaments of the church be made of my gowns, which he holdeth, for to serve the

* John of Gaunt.

convent thereat I shall be buried. And the furs of the same I give for my daughter."

William de Longspee, Earl of Salisbury, was a natural son of Henry II., by Fair Rosamond, daughter of Walter de Clifford, and distinguished himself in the Holy Land. He bequeaths to the Monastery of the Carthusians—"A cup of gold, set with emeralds and rubies; also a pix of gold with XLII. s. and two goblets of silver, one of which is gilt; likewise a chesible and cope of red silk; a tunicle and dalmatick of yellow cendal; an alba, amice, and stole; also a favon and towel, and all my reliques; likewise a thousand sheep, three hundred muttons, forty-eight oxen, and fifteen bulls."

It was not unusual, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, to dedicate children, at the hour of their baptism, to the *military* service of God, in Palestine. An example of this may be found, in the will of William de Beauchamp, who was the father of the first Earl of Warwick, and died before 1269—"My body to be buried in the Church of Friars Minors at Worcester. I will, that a horse, completely harnessed with all military caparisons, precede my corpse: to a priest to sing mass daily, in my chapel without the city of Worcester, near unto that house of Friars, which I gave for the health of my soul, and for the soul of Isabel my wife, Isabel de Mortimer, and all the faithful deceased, all my rent of the fee of Richard Bruli, in Wiche and Winchester, with supply of what should be short, out of my own proper goods. * * * To William, my oldest son, the cup and horns of St. Hugh. * * * To Isabel, my wife, ten marks*: to the Church and nuns of Westwood one mark: to the Church and nuns without Worcester one mark: to every Anchorite in Worcester and the parts adjacent four shillings: to the Church of Salewarp, a house and garden, near the parsonage, to find a lamp to burn continually therein to the honor of God, the blessed Virgins St. Katherine, and St. Margaret."

The will of his son, the Earl of Warwick, is full of the spirit of the age. He died in 1298—"My heart to be buried where-soever the Countess, my dear consort, may, herself, resolve to be interred: to the place, where I may be buried two great horses, viz., those which shall carry my armor at my funeral, for the solemnizing of which, I bequeath two hundred pounds: to the maintenance of two soldiers in the Holy Land one hundred

* An English mark was two-thirds of a pound sterling, or 13s. 4d.

pounds: to Maud, my wife, all my silver vessels, with the cross, wherein is contained part of the wood of the very cross, on which our Saviour died. * * * To my said wife a cup, which the Bishop of Worcester gave me, and all my other cups, with my lesser sort of jewels and rings, to distribute for the health of my soul, where she may think best: to my two daughters, nuns at Shouldham, fifty marks."

Elizabeth De Burgh, Lady of Clare, was the daughter of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, by Joan D'Acres, daughter of Edward I. She was thrice married. Her will is a curious affair, and bears date Sept. 25, 1355. She leaves legacies to her "servants" numbering, about one hundred and forty, and among whom are several knights and "peres."—"My body to be buried in the Sisters Minories, beyond Aldgate. I devise c. c. lb. of wax, to burn round my corpse. I will that my body be not buried for fifteen days after my decease. * * * For masses to be sung for the souls of Monsr. John de Bourg, Monsr. Theobaud de Verdon, and Monsr. Roger Dammory, my lords, my soul, and for the souls of all my good and loyal servants, who have died or may die in my service CXL., li.: To find five men for the Holy Land C. marks, to be spent, in the service of God and destruction of his enemies, if any general voyage be made within seven years after my decease: To my daughter Bardoff my bed of green velvet."

Elizabeth, Countess of Northampton, wife of William de Bohnn, made her will, in 1356. To the Church of the Friars Preachers, in London, she bequeaths: "C. marks sterling, and also the cross, made of the very wood of our Saviour's cross which I was wont to carry about me, and wherein is contained one of the thorns of his crown; and I bequeath to the said Church two fair altar cloths of one suit, two of cloth of gold, one chalice, one missal, one graille,* and one silver bell; likewise thirty-one ells of linen cloth for making of albes, one pulpitry, one portfory,† and a holy water pot of silver." She also wills, that "one hundred and fifty marks be distributed to several other convents of Friars Preachers, in such manner as Friar David de Stirrington shall think best, for my soul's health: To the Grey Friars, in London five marks: To the Carmelites five marks: and to the Augustines five marks * * * to Elizabeth my daughter a bed of red worsted embroidered:

* A church book.

† Breviary.

To my sister, the Countess of Oxford a black horse and a nonche.* "

Believers in the doctrine of transubstantiation must extend their faith to the very cross; for, to comprehend all the wood, in possession of the faithful, it must have consisted of many cords of substantial timber.

No. CLVI.

THE testamentary recognition of bastards, *eo nomine*, was very common, in the olden time. There were some, to whom funereal extravagance and pomp were offensive. Sir Ottro De Grandison says, in his will, dated Sept. 18, 1358—"I entreat, that no armed horse or armed man be allowed to go before my body, on my burial day, nor that my body be covered with any cloth, painted, or gilt, or signed with my arms; but that it be only of white cloth, marked with a red cross; and I give for the charges thereof xxl. and x. quarters of wheat: to a priest to celebrate divine service, in the church at Chellesfield for three years after my decease, xvl.: to Thomas, my son, all my armor, four horses, twelve oxen, and two hundred ewe sheep. * * * * To my bastard son," &c.

Henry, Duke of Lancaster, 1360, wills, "that our body be not buried for three weeks after the departure of our soul."

Humphrey De Bohun, Earl of Hereford, 1361, bequeaths to his nephew Humphrey—"a nonchet of gold, surrounded with large pearls, with a ruby between four pearls, three diamonds, and a pair of gold paternosters of fifty pieces, with ornaments, together with a cross of gold, in which is a piece of the true cross of our Lord: to Elizabeth, our niece of Northampton, a bed with the arms of England. * * * * We will also that a chaplain of good condition be sent to Jerusalem, principally for my Lady my mother, my Lord my father, and for us; and that the chaplain be charged to say masses by the way, at all times that he can conveniently, for the souls."

Agnes, Countess of Pembroke, daughter of Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, wills, in 1367, that her body be buried, "within

* A button of gold.

† A button.

two days after my death. without any other cost than a blue cloth and two tapers of ten pound weight."

Robert, Earl of Suffolk, 1368—"I will, that five square tapers and four mortars,* besides torches, shall burn about my corpse, at my funeral: To William my oldest son my sword, which the King gave me, in name of the Earldom, also my bed with the eagle, and my summer vestment, powdered with leopards."

Roger, Lord de Warre, personally took John, King of France, prisoner, at the battle of Poitiers, and obtained the crampet or chape of his sword, as a memorial of his chivalry. His will bears date 1368—"My body to be buried without pomp, and I will that, on my funeral day, twenty-four torches be placed about my corpse, and two tapers, one at my head and one at my feet, and also that my best horse shall be my principal, without any armour or man armed, according to the custom of mean people." He orders his estate to be divided into three parts—"one to be disposed of for the health of my soul."

Joan, Lady Cobham, 1369—"I will that vii. thousand masses be said for my soul by the canons of Tunbrugge and Tanfugge and the four orders of Friars in London, viz. the Friars Preachers, Minors, Augustines, and Carmelites, who, for so doing shall have xxixl. iiis. iſd. Also I will that, on my funeral day, twelve poor persons, clothed in black gowns and hoods, shall carry twelve torches."

Sir Walter Manney, 1371—"My body to be buried at God's pleasure * * * but without any great pomp * * * twenty masses to be said for my soul, and that every poor person coming to my funeral shall have a penny to pray for me, and for the remission of my sins. * * * To my two bastard daughters, nuns, viz., Mailosel and Malplesant, the one cc. franks, the other c. franks. * * * To Margaret Mareschall, my dear wife, my plate, which I bought of Robert Francis; also a girdle of gold, and a hook for a mantle, and likewise a garter of gold, with all my girdles and knives, and all my beds and clossers in my wardrobe, excepting my folding bed, paly of blue and red, which I bequeath to my daughter of Pembroke."

Thomas, Earl of Oxford, 1371—"For my funeral expenses cxxxiil. To Maud my wife all my reliques now in my own keeping, and a cross made of the very wood of Christ's cross. To Sir Alberic de Vere, my brother, a coat of mail, which Sir

* Round funeral tapers.

William de Wingfield gave me, also a new helmet and a pair of gauntlets."

Anne, Lady Maltravers, 1374—"No cloth of gold to be put upon my corpse, nor any more than five tapers, each weighing five pounds, be put about it."

Edward, Lord Despencer, 1375—"To the Abbot and Convent of Tewksbury one whole suit of my best vestments, also two gilt chalices, one gilt hanap, likewise a ewer, wherein to put the body of Christ, on Corpus Christi day, which was given to me by the King of France. To Elizabeth, my wife, my great bed of blue camaka with griffins; also another bed of camaka, striped with white and black, with all the furniture, thereto belonging."

Mary, Countess of Pembroke, 1376—"To the Abbey of Westminster a cross with a foot of gold and emeralds, which Sir William de Valence, Kt., brought from the Holy Land."

Philipa, Countess of March, 1378—"To Edmond, my son, a bed, &c. Also a gold ring, with a piece of the true cross, with this writing, *In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen.* Which I charge him, on my blessing to keep."

Sir John Northwood, Knight, 1378—"I will that two Pilgrims be sent to visit the shadow of St. Peter, Paul, and James, in Gallacia."

Sir Roger Beauchamp, Kt., 1379—"My body to be buried in the church of the Friars Preachers, near to the grave, where Sybil, my wife resteth. And I desire, that, at my funeral, there be a *placebo* and *dirige* with note, and, on the morrow after, two masses, one of our Lady, and another of Requiem. And whereas I am bound to do a service on the Infidels, by devise of my grandsire, Sir Walter Beauchamp, to the expense of two hundred marks, I will, that Roger, son to Roger, my son, shall perform the same, when he comes of age. To my Chauntrey of Bletneshe one hundred pounds, for the maintenance of one priest, to sing there perpetually, for my soul, and also for the soul of Sybil, late my wife, and for all Christian souls."

William, Lord Latimer, 1380—"I will that my house in the parish of St. Mary's be sold, to found prayers for King Edward's soul."

Guichard, Earl of Huntington, 1380—"I will that my heart be taken out of my body and preserved with spices, and deposited in the said church of Engle. I will that the expenses of

my funeral, if celebrated with pomp, be bestowed in masses for my soul."

Edmond, Earl of March, was a man of great note. His will is dated May 1, 1380—"To the Abbey of Wigmore a large cross of gold, set with stones with a relique of the cross of our Lord, a bone of St. Richard the Confessor, Bishop of Chicester, and a finger of St. Thomas de Cantelowe, Bishop of Hereford and the reliques of St. Thomas, Bishop of Canterbury. T Roger, our son and heir, the cup of gold with a cover called *Benesonne*, and our sword, garnished with gold, which belonged to the good King Edward, with God's blessing and ours. * * * Also our large bed of black satin, embroidered with white lions and gold roses."

William, Earl of Suffolk, 1381—"I will that, on the eve and day of my funeral, there shall be five square tapers of the height, which my nearest of kin shall think fit, and four morters; also forty-eight torches borne by forty-eight poor men, clothed in white. * * * I will that a picture of a horse and man, armed with my arms, be made in silver, and offered to the altar of our Lady of Walsingham; and another the like be made and offered at Bromeholme."

One of the most interesting, among the olden wills, is that of John, Duke of Lancaster—the famous John of Gaunt. He died in February, 1399. His will bears date Feb. 3, 1397—"My body to be buried, in the Cathedral church of St. Paul of London, near the principal altar, beside my most dear wife, Blanch, who is there interred. If I die out of London, I desire that the night my body arrives there, it be carried direct to the Friars Carmelites, in Fleet Street, and the next day taken strait to St. Paul's, and that it be not buried for forty days, during which I charge my executors, that there be no cering or embalming my corpse. * * * I desire that chauntries and obits be founded for the souls of my late dear wives Blanch and Constance, whom God pardon; to the altar of St. Paul's my vestment of satin embroidered, which I bought of Courtnay, embroider of London. * * * To my most dear wife, Katherine, my two best nonches, which I have, excepting that, which I have allowed to my Lord and nephew, the King, and my large cup of gold, which the Earl of Wilts gave to the King, my Lord, upon my going into Guienne, together with all the buckles, rings, diamonds, rubies and other things, that will be found, in a little box of

cypress wood, of which I carry the key myself, and all the robes, which I bought of my dear cousin, the Duchess of Norfolk;* also my large bed of black velvet, embroidered with a circle of fether lockst and garters, all the beds, made for my body, called trussing beds, my best stay with a good ruby, my best collar, all which my said wife had before her marriage with me, also all the goods and jewels, which I have given her, since my marriage. To my Lord and nephew, the king,† the best nonche, which I have, on the day of my death, my best cup of gold, which my dear wife Katherine gave me, on New Year's day last, my gold salt-cellar with a garter, and the piece of arras, which the Duke of Burgoyne gave me, when I was in Calais." This is a mere extract. The will bequeaths numerous legacies of nonches, beds, and cups of gold; and abundantly provides for chauntries, masses, and obits.

Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, 1399—"To the Abbess and Convent of the Sisters Minoresses, near London, without Aldgate, vii. xliis. iiiid. and a tonel of good wine. * * * To my Lady and mother, the Countess of Hereford, a pair of paternosters of coral."

Thomas Mussenden, 1402—"I will, that all my arms, swords, bastard,§ and dagger be sold, and disposed of, for my soul."

William Heron, Lord Say, 1404—"Whereas I have been a soldier, and taken wages from King Richard and the Realm, as well by land as by water, and peradventure received more than my desert, I will that my Executor pay six score marks to the most needful men, unto whom King Richard was debtor, in discharge of his soul."

Sir Lewis Clifford, Kt.—"I, Lewis Clifford, false and traitor to my Lord God, and to all the blessed company of Heaven, and unworthy to be called a Christian man, make and ordaine my testament and my last will the 17th of September, 1404. At the beginning, I, most unworthy and God's traitor, recommend my wretched and sinful soul to the grace and to the mercy of the blissful Trinity, and my wretched carrion to be buried in the furthest corner of the churchyard, in which parish my wretched soul departeth from my body. And I pray and charge my executors, as they will answer before God, that on my stinking carrion be neither laid cloth of gold nor of silk, but a black cloth,

* Margaret Plantagenet, grand-daughter of King Edward I.

† The badge of the house of Lancaster. ‡ Richard II. § A culverin.

and a taper at my head and another at my feet; no stone nor other thing, whereby any man may know where my stinking carrion lieth." In the original, this word is written *careyne*.

The reader will be amused to know the cause of all this humility. Sir Lewis had joined the Lollards, who rejected the doctrines of the mass, penance for sins, extreme unction, &c.; but was brought back to the church of Rome; and thus records his penitence.

No. CLVII.

"Tell thou the Earl his divination lies." SHAKESPEARE.

AN impertinent desire to pry into the future, by unnatural means—to penetrate the hidden purposes of God—is coeval with the earliest development of man's finite powers. It is Titanic insolence—and resembles the audacity of the giants, who piled Pelion upon Ossa, to be upon a level with the gods.

Divination, however old it may be, seems not to wear out its welcome with a credulous world, nor to grow bald with time. It has been longer upon the earth, than from the time, when Joseph's silver cup, "whereby he divineth," was deposited, in Benjamin's sack, to the days of Moll Pitcher of Lynn, whose divining cup was of crockery ware.

"*Mediums*" are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles—"And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel, possessed with a spirit of divination, met us, which brought her masters much gain, by soothsaying." Paul cast out the evil spirit; an example worthy of consideration, by those, to whom the power is given, in the statute, to commit "*all persons, who use any juggling*," to the house of correction, unless their exhibitions are licensed, according to law.

All manner of rogues and roguery has immemorially delighted in *aliases*. So has it been with that species of imposture, which assumes, that man's *finite* powers are sufficient, for *infinite* purposes. The black art, magic, fortune telling, sorcery, divination, soothsaying, augury, oracular responses, witchcraft, judicial astrology, palmistry, which is the same thing as chiromancy, or divination, by the lines of the hand or palm, horoscopy, which

is a part of judicial astrology, haruspicy, or divination, from an inspection of entrails, aeromancy, the art of divining by the air, pyromancy, by flame or fire, hydromancy, by water, geomancy, by cracks or clefts in the earth, hepatoscopy, by the liver, stercromancy, by the elements, theomancy, by the spirit, demonomancy, by the revelation of genii or devils, idolomancy, by images, psychomancy, by the will or inward movement of the soul, antiopomancy, by the viscera of animals, theriomancy, by beasts, ornithomancy, by birds, ichthyomancy, by fishes, botanomancy, by herbs, lithomancy, by stones, cleromancy, by lots, oneiromancy, by dreams, onomancy, by names, arithmancy, by numbers, logarithmancy, by logarithms, sternomancy, by the chest, gastromancy, by abdominal sounds, omphelomancy, by the signs of the navel, pedomancy, by the feet, onychomancy, by the nails, cephalonomancy, by the marks of the head, tuphramancy, by ashes, capnomancy, by smoke, livanomancy, by the burning of frankincense, carromancy, by the burning of wax, lecanomancy, by basins of water, catoptromancy, by mirrors, chartomancy, by certain writings on paper, machanomancy, by knives, chrystallomancy, by glasses, dactylomancy, by rings, coseinomancy, by seives, axinomancy, by saws, cattobomancy, by brazen chalices, roadomancy, by stars, spatalamancy, by bones and skins, sciomancy, by shadows, astragalomancy, by dice, oinomancy, by wine, sycomancy, by figs, typomancy, by the coagulation of cheese, alphetomancy, by flour or bran, crithomancy, by grain or corn, alectromancy, by cocks and hens, gyromancy, by rounds and circles, lampadomancy, by candles and lamps, nagomancy, or necromancy, by consulting, or divining with, by, or from the dead.

The reader must bear in mind, that this list of absurdities is brief and imperfect. All these *mancies*, and many more may be found in Gaule's *Mag-Astro-Mancer*, page 165, and many of them are described in the *Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria*.

These mischievous follies have prevailed, in a greater or less degree, in every age, and among every people. During the very days of auguries, nevertheless, individuals have appeared, whose rough, common sense tore itself forcibly away, from the prevailing delusions of the age. A pleasant tale is related, by Claude Millot, of an old Roman Admiral. He was in pursuit of the Carthaginian fleet; and, as he gained upon the enemy, and a battle seemed to be unavoidable, the

haruspex, or priest, who, as usual, accompanied the expedition, with the birds of omen, and who had probably become alarmed, for his personal safety, came suddenly on deck, exclaiming, that the sacred pullets *would not eat*, and that, under such circumstances, it would be unsafe to engage. The old Roman tar ordered the sacred pullets, then in their cage, to be brought before him, and, kicking them overboard, exclaimed, "*let them drink then.*"

The etymology of the word necromancy, *νεκρος μάντις*, shows its direct application to the scandalous orgies, which are matters of weekly exhibition, in many of our villages and cities, under the name of *spiritual knockings*. Though Sir Thomas Browne could mark, learn, and inwardly digest a witch, a *necromancer* was beyond his powers; and in Book I., Chap. X. of his *Pseudodoxia*, he speaks, with deep contempt, of such as "can believe in the real resurrection of Samuel, or that there is anything but delusion, in the practice of *necromancy*, and popular raising of ghosts."

Necromancers are those, who pretend to a power of communing with the dead, that is, conjuring up spirits, and of consulting them, in regard to the affairs of this or the other world. In the strictest sense, the Fishes and the Foxes and their numerous imitators are *necromancers*, of course.

This impious and eminently pernicious practice has been condemned, in every age, and by every civilized nation. It was condemned, by the law of Moses—"There shall not be found among you any one, that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." Deut. xviii. 10, 11, 12.

Conjurers may justly be accounted disturbers of the public peace; and such undoubtedly they are, most effectually, by unsettling the minds of credulous people, murdering sleep, and, occasionally, as in repeated instances, during the progress of the present delusion, by driving their infatuated victims to despair, insanity, and suicide. Severe laws have often been enacted, against these pestilent impostors. Conjurament was made felony by statute 1, James I., 1603. This was repealed by 9 Geo. II., 1763. This repeal was in keeping with the ascendancy of com-

mon sense, which decreed, that all conjuration was an absurdity : but, at the same time, all *pretensions* to exercise this or any similar art was made punishable, as a misdemeanor. All laws, against witchcraft and sorcery, founded on the presumption of their possibility, are now justly accounted cruel and absurd. Laws, for the punishment of such, as disturb the public repose, by pretending to exercise these unnatural agencies, are no less judicious ; though they have not always been effectual, against the prejudices of the people. The *Genethliaci*, who erected their horoscopes in Rome, for the purpose of foretelling future events, by judicial astrology, were expelled, by a formal decree of the senate ; yet they long retained their hold, upon the affections of a credulous people.

This species of divination, by the heavenly bodies, commenced with the Chaldeans, and, from them, passed to the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. Henault informs us, that it was much in vogue, in France, during the days of Catherine de Medicis. Roger Bacon was greatly devoted to the practice of Judicial Astrology. Cecil, Lord Burleigh, is known, gravely and elaborately to have calculated the nativity of Queen Elizabeth, who was feverishly addicted to magic. The judicial astrologers of the middle ages were a formidable body, and their conjuring cups and glasses were in high esteem. In Sweden, judicial astrology was in the greatest favor, with kings and commoners. A particular influence was ascribed to the conjuring cup of Erricus, king of Sweden. The Swedes firmly believed, that Herlicius, their famous astrologer, had truly predicted the death of the monarch, Gustavus Adolphus, in 1632, at the battle of Lutzen, or Lippstadt.

In the reigns of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France, this absurd delusion was in such repute, that judicial astrologers were consulted, upon the most trivial occasions ; and their daily predictions were the theme of grave and constant conversation, with every class of society. It was no uncommon thing, even in England, for those, who were desirous of communicating with the dead, to make a previous arrangement with some favorite astrologer, and *bespeak a spirit*, as we bespeak a coach, for some particular hour.

In the Autobiography of William Lilly, the famous astrologer, in the time of the Stuarts, a curious account is given of Alexander Hart, an astrologer, living in Houndsditch, about the year

1632. It seems, that Hart had entered into a contract with a countryman, who had paid him twenty or thirty pounds, to arrange a meeting between this countryman and a particular spirit, at an appointed time. But, either Hart's powers of raising the dead were unequal to the task, or the spirit had no inclination to keep up the countryman's acquaintance; certain it is, the spirit was unpunctual; and, the patience of the countryman becoming exhausted, he caused the astrologer to be indicted, for a cheat. He was convicted, and about to be set in the pillory, when John Taylor, the water poet, persuaded Chief Justice Richardson to bail him, and Hart was fairly spirited away. He then fled into Holland, where, a few years after, he gave up the spirit, in reality.

Its unintelligible quality is the very essence of delusion. Nothing can be more unreasonable, therefore, than to mistake our inability to explain a mystery, for conclusive evidence of its reality and truth. That it is unintelligible or inexplicable surely affords less evidence of its reality, and truth, than is furnished of its falsehood, by its manifest inconsistency with all known natural laws. Bruce informs us, that the inhabitants of the western coasts of Africa pretend to hold a direct communication with the devil; and the evidence of the thing they assert is so very curious and imposing, that he and other travellers are entirely at fault, in their attempts to explain the mystery. Yet no one, for a moment, supposes, that Bruce had the slightest confidence in these absurdities.

And yet, so great, so profound, was the belief of Friar Bacon, in this preposterous delusion, that, in his *Opus Majus*, page 65, he exclaims—"Oh, how happy had it been for the church of God, and how many mischiefs would it have prevented, if the aspects and qualities of the Heavenly bodies had been predicted, by learned men, and known to the princes and prelates of those times! There would not then have been so great a slaughter of Christians, nor would so many miserable souls have been sent to hell."

This eminently learned man, Roger Bacon, refers, in this remarkable passage, to the various calamities, which existed, in England, Spain, and Italy, during the year 1264.

The word, mathematician, seems to have been applied, in that age, exclusively to astrologers. Peter de Blois, one of the most learned writers of his time, who died A. D. 1200, says, in the

folio edition of his works, by Gussanville, page 596—"Mathematicians are those, who, from the position of the stars, the aspect of the firmament, and the motion of the planets, discover things, that are to come."

"These prognosticators," says Henry, in his History of Great Britain, vol. vi. page 109, "were so much admired and credited, that there was hardly a prince, or even an earl, or great baron, in Europe, who did not keep one or more of them, in his family, to cast the horoscopes of his children, discover the success of his designs, and the public events, that were to happen."

No. CLVIII.

THERE are sundry precepts, delivered by Heathen poets, some eighteen hundred years ago, which modern philosophy may not disregard with impunity. If it be true, and doubtless it is true, that a certain blindness to the future is given, in mercy, to man, how utterly unwise are all our efforts to rend the veil, and how preposterous withal!

The wiser, even among those, who were not confirmed in the belief, that there was absolutely nothing, in the doctrines of auguries, and omens, and judicial astrology, have discountenanced all attempts to pry into the future, by a resort to such mystical agencies. The counsel of Horace to Leuconoe is fresh in the memory of every classical reader:—

*"Tu ne quæsieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi
Finem Di dederint, Leuconoe, neu Babylonios
Tentâris numeros. Ut melius, quidquid erit pati!
Seu plures hyemes, seu tribuit Jupiter ultimam,
Quæ nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare
Tyrrhenum"*——

The version of Francis, however imperfect, may not be unwelcome to the English reader:—

*"Strive not, Leuconoe, to pry
Into the secret will of fate;
Nor impious magic vainly try
To know our life's uncertain date.

Whether th' indulgent Power divine
Hath many seasons yet in store,
Or this the latest winter thine,
Which breaks its waves against the shore."*

This passage from Horace is not required, to establish the fact, that magical arts were practised, among the Babylonians. A certain measure of superstition seems to belong to the nature of man; and to grow greater or less, in proportion to the exercise, or neglect, of his reasoning faculties. From this general rule history has furnished us with eminent exceptions. Cunning, and cupidity, and credulity are destined to be ever present: it is therefore to be expected, that, from age to age, the most egregious absurdities will pass, upon a portion of the community, for sober truths.

The fact, that popular absurdities have won the patient, if not the respectful, consideration of certain distinguished individuals, who have spoken, and written, doubtfully, if not precisely, in their favor, goes but a very little way, in their behalf. There was a time, when all the world believed, that the sun revolved around the earth, and that the blood was a stagnant pool, in the human body. There are none, I presume, of all, who give their confidence to any marvel of modern times, who are more learned or more wise, than Sir Matthew Hale, or Sir Thomas Browne. Yet both these wise and learned men were firm believers, in witchcraft; and two miserable people, Cullender and Duny, were given over to be hung, by Sir Matthew, partly upon the testimony of Sir Thomas.

Though nobody, whose sense is of the common kind, believes in witchcraft, at the present day, there was formerly no lack of believers, in any rank, or profession, in society. The matter was taken for a fixed and incontrovertible fact. The evidence was clear and conclusive, in the opinion of some, among the most eminent judges. If to doubt was not exactly to be damned, it often brought the audacious unbeliever, in danger of being hanged. Competent witnesses gravely swore, that pins and needles were run into their bodies, by persons, at the distance of a mile or more. For this offence, the witches were sentenced to be hanged; and, upon the gallows, confessed, with tears in their eyes, that they did really stick those identical pins, into the bodies of their accusers, being at the time, at the distance of a mile or more; and were swung off; having thus made their peace with God. Witnesses actually swore, that their houses were rocked, by old women, apparently too feeble to rock an infant's cradle, and that tables and chairs were turned topsy turvy; and the old ladies confessed, that they had actually

rocked two-story houses and upset those tables, and seemed to be pleased with the distinction of being hanged, for the achievement.

Whoever doubted these miracles was called upon to *explain*, or *believe*; and, if he could not indicate clearly the mode, in which this jugglery was effected, he was required to believe in a thing, which was manifestly not *in rerum natura*. In this dilemma, he might suggest an example of legerdemain, familiar to us all—a juggler puts an egg into an ordinary hat, and, apparently, in an instant, the egg is converted into a pancake. If the beholder cannot demonstrate how this is done, he, of course, must believe in the actual conversion, that is in transubstantiation. I have seen this little miracle performed, and confess I do not understand it; and yet I exceedingly doubt, if an egg can be so instantly converted into a pancake.

The witch of Endor pretended to conjure up the dead. The effigy was supposed to be made manifest to the eye. Our modern witches and wizards conjure, up or down, whichever it may be, invisible spirits. These spirits have no power of audible speech; thus far, at least, they seem not to have recovered the use of their tongues. To be sure, spirit without matter cannot be supposed to emit sounds; but such is not the case here, for they convey their responses, audibly, by knockings. This is rather a circuitous mode of conveying intelligence, with their fingers and toes, which might be more easily conveyed by the voice.

The difference, between our Blitzes and Samees, and the Fishes and the Foxes, consists in this—the former never, for a moment, pretend, that eggs are in reality pancakes, or that they actually perform the pretty miracles, which they seem to perform—the latter gravely contend, as it was contended, in the days of witchcraft, those days, that tried old women's souls, that their achievements are realities.

So long as these matters are merely harmless, even though they consume much valuable time, that might be more worthily employed, and transfer the illy-spared coin of the credulous poor, from their own pockets, to the pockets of unprincipled jugglers and imposters, perhaps it may be well to suffer the evil to correct itself, and die even a lingering death. But, when it is manifestly spreading, broadcast, over the land, and even receiving a dash of something like grave importance from the pen,

occasionally, of some professional gentleman, whose very doubt may dignify delusion; the matter seems really to demand some little consideration, at least: not that the doubts, even of a respectable physician, elaborately uttered, in a journal of fair repute, can do more to establish the power of mother Fish or mother Fox, to raise the dead, than was achieved, by the opinion of Lord Chief Justice Hale, in favor of witchcraft. That has fallen, as, in due time, this will fall, into merited contempt. But the expression of doubts, from a respectable quarter, upon an occasion like the present, tends, obviously, to strengthen those hands, which probably deserve to be paralyzed.

So long, as a matter, like this, is confined to speculation, it may be suffered to flit by, like the folly of a day. But the pestilent thing, of which I am speaking, has, long ago, assumed an entirely different, and a severer, type. At this very time, individuals, who are strictly entitled to the name of vagabonds, male and female, are getting their bread, by cheating the curious and the credulous, in a great number of our towns and villages, by the performance of these frightful antics. This term is altogether too feeble, to express the meaning, which I would gladly fix, in the public mind. By these infernal agencies, children are imbued with a superstitious fear, which tends to enfeeble their intellects, and has a mischievous influence, upon life and conduct, to the end of their days—upon children of a larger growth, especially upon those of nervous temperament, and feeble health, the pernicious effect is incalculable. The fact is perfectly well known, and thoroughly established, that these diabolical orgies, and mystical teachings have not only inflicted the deepest misery on many minds, but have induced several infatuated persons, to commit self murder; and driven others to despair; deprived them of their reason; and caused them to be placed, in asylums for the insane.

It is no longer therefore the part of wisdom to treat this evil, with sheer contempt. The conflagration has advanced too far, for us to hope it will go out, ere long, of its own accord. What is then the part of wisdom?

There are individuals, whose opinions are certainly entitled to respect, and who conceive, that these mysteries deserve a full and formal examination, by a committee of wise and learned men, that the world may be guided by their decision. I am fearful, that such a course would result in nothing better than disappointment, if in nothing worse.

These mysteries are Protean, in their character—

"Verum, ubi correptum manibus vinclisque tenebis,
Tum variæ eludent species atque ora ferarum."

If the members of the learned inquisition should furnish an explanation of one, or more, of these *mirabilia*, a new series of perplexing novelties would speedily arise, and demand their attention;—so that the *savans* would, necessarily, become a standing committee, on modern miracles. The incomparable Blitz, if the process were discovered, by which he appears, instantaneously, to convert an egg into a pancake, would challenge you to explain another, by which he rapidly deduces some thirty yards of ribbon from the nose of a bystander. And, if we cannot explain this mystery, he may as reasonably demand of us to believe it a reality, as goody Fox or goody Fish may require her *customers*—for raising the dead is a trade—to believe in her power, to conjure up spirits, because we may not be able to discover the process, by which the rappings are produced.

But, even if an investigation were made, by the most competent physiologists, and the decree should go forth, *ex cathedra*; it would, probably, produce a very slight impression upon the whole community. That same self-conceit, which often fills an old woman to the brim, with the belief, that she is a more skilful leech, than *Æsculapius* ever was, will continue to stand the credulous instead; and the rappings will go on, in spite of the decree of the *savans*; the spirits of the dead will continue to be raised, as they are, at present, at fifty cents apiece; men, women, and children will insist upon their inalienable right to believe, that eggs are pancakes, and that, in violation of all the established laws of nature, ghosts may be conjured up, at the shortest notice; and examples will continue to occur, of distressing nervous excitement, domestic misery, self-murder, and madness.

The question recurs—what shall be done, for the correction of this increasing evil? Some suggestions have been made, sufficiently germain to several of the extraordinary pretensions of the present day. Thus, in respect to *clairvoyance*, a standing offer of several thousand francs has been made, by certain persons, in Paris, to any individual, who will prove his ability to see through a pine plank. In regard also to the assumption of knowledge, obtained, through a pretended communication with spirits, a purse of gold has been offered to any person, who, with

the aid of all the spirits he can conjure up to his assistance, will truly declare the amount it contains, with a moderate forfeit, in case of failure.

This whole matter of conjuration, and spiritual rapping has become an insufferable evil. It is a crying nuisance, and should be dealt with accordingly. It is, by no means, necessary, before we proceed to abate a nuisance, to inquire, in what manner it is produced. It is not possible to distinguish, between the *chevaliers d'industrie*, who swindle the credulous out of their money, by the exhibition of these highly pernicious orgies, from conjurers and jugglers. If this construction be correct, and I perceive nothing to the contrary, then these mischief-makers come within the fifth section of chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes of Massachusetts. Any police court or justice of the peace, has power to send to the house of correction, "*all persons who use any juggling.*" It would be a public service to apply this wholesome law to goody Fox, or goody Fish, or any other goody, of either sex, holding these conjurations within our precinct. Upon a complaint, the question would necessarily arise if the offence charged were "*juggling*" or not; and the rule of evidence, *cuique in sua arte*, would bring out the opinions of men, learned in their profession. I am aware of no other mode, by which those persons are likely to be gratified, who believe these proceedings entitled to serious examination. Let us not drop this interesting subject here.

No. CLIX.

In the olden time, almanacs were exclusively the work of judicial astrologers. The calendar, in addition to the registration of remarkable events, and times, and tides, and predictions, in relation to the weather, presumed to foretell the affairs of mankind, and the prospective changes, in the condition of the world; not by any processes of reasoning, but by a careful contemplation of the heavenly bodies.

On most occasions, these predictions were sufficiently vague, for the soothsayer's security; quite as much so, as our more modern foreshadowings, in relation to the weather, whose admo-

nitions, to *expect a change, about these times*, are frequently extended from the beginning to the end of the calendar month. An example of this wariness appears, in a letter of John of Salisbury, written in 1170. "The astrologers," says he, "call this year the wonderful year, from the singular situation of the planets and constellations; and say, that, in the course of it, the councils of kings will be changed, wars will be frequent, and the world will be troubled with seditions; that learned men will be discouraged; but, towards the end of the year, they will be exalted."

Emboldened, by the almost universal deference, paid to their predictions, the astrologers soon began to venture, on a measure of precision, which was somewhat hazardous.

In the commencement of the year 1186, the most distinguished judicial astrologers, not only in England, but upon the continent, proclaimed, that there existed an unprecedented conjunction of the planets, in the sign *Libra*. Hence they predicted, that, on Tuesday, the sixteenth day of September, at three o'clock in the morning, a storm would arise, such as the world had never known before. They asserted, with an amazing confidence, that, not only individual structures would be destroyed, by this terrible storm, but that great cities would be swept away, before its fury. This tempest, according to their predictions, would be followed, by a far spreading pestilence, and by wars of unexampled severity. A particular account of these remarkable predictions may be found, on page 356 of the annals of Roger de Hoveden.

No more conclusive evidence is necessary of the implicit, and universal confidence, which then prevailed, in the teachings of judicial astrology, than the wide spread dismay and consternation, produced by these bold and positive predictions. It is not possible to calculate the sum of human misery, inflicted upon society, by the terrible anticipations of these coming events. As the fatal day drew near, extraordinary preparations were everywhere made, to secure property, from the devastating effects of the approaching tempest. Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, commanded a solemn fast of three days' continuance, throughout his precinct. On the night of the fifteenth of September, very many persons sat up, in solemn expectation of the coming tempest.

It has been cruelly observed of medical men, that, to some of

their number, the death of a patient would, on the whole, be rather more agreeable, than that he should falsify their prediction, by the recovery of his health. How powerfully a sentiment, similar to this, must have exercised the spirits of these astrologers, as the appointed hour drew nigh ! It came at last—bright and cloudless—followed by a day of unusual serenity. The season was one of extraordinary mildness ; the harvest and vintage were abundant ; and the general health of the people was a subject of universal observation. Old Gervase, of Tilbury, in his Chronicles, alluding to the Archbishop's fears and fastings, remarks, that there were no storms, during the whole year, other than such, as the Archbishop himself raised in the church, by his own absurdity and violence.

The astrologers hung their heads, for very shame, and lost caste, for a time, with the people.

Divination was, of old, emphatically, a royal folly ; and kings have been its dupes and votaries, from the earliest ages of the world. The secret manner, in which Saul betook himself to the witch of Endor, arose, partly, from his knowledge, that such orgies were a violation of divine and human laws. The evils, resulting from such absurdities, had become so apparent, that Saul, himself, had already banished all the soothsayers and magicians from his kingdom. It is manifest, from the experience of Saul, that it is unwise to consult a witch, upon an empty stomach—“ *Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel : and there was no strength in him ; for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night.*”

Lucan, lib. vi. v. 570, et seq., represents young Pompey, just before the battle of Pharsalia, as paying a nocturnal visit, to a sorceress of Thessaly, of whom he inquires, in relation to the issue of the combat. With the ordinary preliminaries, charms, and incantations, the necromancer conjures up the ghost of a soldier, who had recently fallen in battle. At length, she pronounces a denunciation, between which and the prediction of the witch of Endor, delivered to Saul, the resemblance is certainly remarkable.

The laws of France, in the time of Louis XIV., were extremely rigorous, against sorcery and divination, inflicting the severest penalties, upon all, who pretended to exercise their skill, in these worse than unprofitable mysteries. Nevertheless, an

extraordinary story is related, in the autobiography of Madame Du Barri, as communicated to her, by Louis XV., of several visits stealthily paid, by Louis XIV., and Madame de Maintenon, to a celebrated judicial astrologer, in Paris. This narrative may be found recorded, at length, in the first volume of Madame Du Barri's Memoirs, commencing on page 286.

The age of Louis XIV. was an age of superstition. An Italian priest, a secret professor of the art of necromancy, was induced, upon the King's promise of protection, against the parliament, in the event of a discovery, to satisfy the royal curiosity, and open the book of fate. At the hour appointed, being midnight, Madame de Maintenon and the *Duc de Noailles* were conveyed to a house in Sevrès, where they met the sorcerer, who had celebrated the mass alone, and consecrated several wafers. After performing a variety of ceremonies, he drew the horoscope of the King, and Madame de Maintenon. He promised the King, that he should succeed, in all his undertakings. He then gave his Majesty a parcel, wrapped in new parchment, and carefully sealed, saying to the King—"the day, in which you form the fatal resolution of acquainting yourself with the contents of this package, will be the last of your prosperity; but, if you desire to carry your good fortune to the highest pitch, be careful, upon every great festival, Easter, Whitsunday, the Assumption, and Christmas, to pierce this talisman with a pin; do this, and be happy."

Certain events confirmed the sorcerer's predictions—others gave them the lie direct. The royal confidence was shaken.

Upon one occasion, the Bishop of Meaux, the great Bossuet, chanced to be at the apartments of Madame de Maintenon; and the subject of magic and sorcery being introduced, the good Bishop expressed himself, with such abhorrence of the profanation, as effectually to stir up a sentiment of compunction, in the bosom of the King and Madame. At length, they disclosed the secret to their confessors, to whom the most effectual means of breaking the charm appeared to be, to break open the talismanic package; and this was accordingly imposed, as a penance, on the King.

His sacred Majesty was thus painfully placed, *inter cornua*, or, as we trivially say, between hawk and buzzard—between the priest and the sorcerer. His good sense, if not his devotion, prevailed. The package was torn open, in the presence of

Madame de Maintenon, and father la Chaise. It contained a consecrated wafer, pierced with as many holes, as there had been saints' days in the calendar, since it had been in the King's possession. That consternation fell upon the King, which becomes a good Catholic, when he believes, that he has committed sacrilege. He was long disordered, by the recollection, and all, that masses and starvation could avail, to purge the offence, was cheerfully submitted to, by the King. Louis XV. closes this farcical account, with a grave averment, that his ancestor, after this, lost as many male descendants, in the right line, as he had stuck pins, in the holy wafer. There may, possibly, be some little consolation, in the reflection, that, if the private history of Louis le Grand be entitled to any credit, like Charles the Second of England, he could well afford the sacrifice—of whom Butler pleasantly remarks—

"Go on, brave Charles, and if thy back,
As well as purse, but hold thee tack,
Most of thy realm, in time, the rather
Than call thee king, shall call thee father."

The Millennarians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—and these enthusiasts are, by no means, of modern origin—may be said to have hunted, in company with the judicial astrologers. Herlicius and the Millennarians solemnly predicted the destruction of the Turkish Empire, in 1665, the one relying upon the aspect of the stars, and the other upon their fantastical interpretation of the Scriptures; and both, in all likelihood, chiefly, upon the good sword and stubborn will of the Emperor; who, to their infinite disappointment and mortification, finally made peace with the Ottomans. Yet David Herlicius was no impostor, or if so, there was no greater dupe to his astrological doctrines than himself. He was a learned, pious, and honest man.

There is, probably, no more extensively popular error, than that a deceiver must possess, on all occasions, a greater measure of knowledge than the deceived. Herlicius was an eminent physician; and Bayle says of him, vol. vi. page 137—"One can hardly imagine why a man, who had so much business, in the practice of physic, and who never had any children, should fear to want bread in his old age, unless he drew horoscopes."

This eminent man had doubtless some little misgivings, as to the infallibility of the art, after the failure of his prediction, in relation to the Ottomans. Bayle recites an extract of a letter, from Herlicius to a friend, in which the writer says: "Oh that fortune would look kindly upon me! that, without meddling with those astrological trifles, I might make provision for old age, which threatens me with blindness; and I would never draw any horoscope. In the mean time, when a great many persons inquire for, and desire to know more things, than are within the compass of our art, or more than it can explain, I choose rather to act with conscience, than to disgrace, and, as it were, to defile, our sacred Astrology, and to cast a blemish upon it. For our art abounds with a great number of Chaldean superstitions, which several of our countrymen are still obstinately fond of. A great many ask me what color of clothes and horses will be lucky for them? Sometimes I laugh heartily, at these and other such absurd questions, but I do also often abhor them. For I am enamored with the virgin state of our art, nor can I suffer that it should be so abominably defiled, as to give the enemies of astrology an opportunity to object to us those abuses, to the contempt of the art itself."

At the period, when Herlicius unfortunately predicted the destruction of the Ottoman power, Judicial Astrology was in the highest favor in England. The date of the prediction, 1665, was the sixth year of Charles the Second. Whatever space remained, unoccupied by other follies, during the reign of the Stuarts, and even during the interregnum, was filled by the preposterous doctrines of Judicial Astrology. It is perfectly well established, that Charles the First, when meditating his escape from Carisbrook castle, in 1647, consulted the famous astrologer, Sir William Lilly.

No. CLX.

ISABEL, Countess of Warwick, 1439—"My body is to be buried, in the Abbey of Tewksbury; and I desire, that my great

Templys* with the Baleyst be sold to the utmost, and delivered to the monks of that house, so that they grutched not my burial there. Also I will that my statue be made, all naked, with my hair cast backwards, according to the design and model, which Thomas Porchalion† has, for that purpose, with Mary Magdalen laying her hand across, and St. John the Evangelist on the right side, and St. Anthony on the left." The singularity of this provision would lead one to believe that the testatrix made her will, under the influence of St. Anthony's fire.

John, Lord Fanhope, 1443—"To John, my bastard son, now at Ampthill, ccc. marks; and, in case he should die, before he attain the age of twenty-one, I will that Thomas, my other bastard son, shall have the said ccc. marks."

Henry Beaufort was the second son of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, by Katherine Swinford, a bastard born, but with his brothers and sister, legitimated by act of Parliament, 20 Rich. II., became Bishop of Lincoln 1397—translated to Winchester, 1404, and made a Cardinal. He was remarkable, for his immense wealth, prudence, and frugality. He was four times Chancellor of England. He is reported to have clung to life with a remarkable tenacity. Rapin says, he died for grief, that wealth could not save him from death. The death bed of this Cardinal is admirably described by Shakspeare, in the second part of King Henry VI., Act III., Scene III.:

K. Henry. How fares my lord? Speak Beaufort to thy Sovereign.

Cardinal. If thou be'st Death, I'll give thee England's treasure,
Enough to purchase such another island,
So thou wilt let me live, and feel no pain.

* * * * *

Warwick. See how the pangs of death do make him grin.

Salisbury. Disturb him not, let him pass peaceably.

K. Henry. Peace to his soul, if God's good pleasure be!
Lord Cardinal, if think'st on Heaven's bliss,
Hold up thy hand, make signal of thy hope.
He dies, and makes no sign; Oh God forgive him!

Warwick. So bad a death argues a monstrous life.

K. Henry. Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all.—

Close up his eyes, and draw the curtains close.

The Cardinal's will, though without date, was made about 1443.—"I will that ten thousand masses be said for my soul,

* Dugdale says these were jewels, hanging over the forehead, on bodkins, thrust through the hair.

† Pale or peach-colored rubies.

‡ This effigy is referred to by Walpole, in his *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. i. p. 37.

as soon as possible after my decease, three thousand of requiem, three thousand of *de rorate cali desuper*, three thousand of the Holy Ghost, and one thousand of the Trinity. * * * * Item, I bequeath to my Lord, King Henry, a tablet with reliques, which is called the tablet of Bourbon, and a cup of gold with a ewer, which belonged to the illustrious prince, his father, and offered by him on Easter Eve, and out of which cup he usually drank, and for the last time drank. * * * * Item, I bequeath to my Lord the King, my dish or plate of gold for spices, and my cup of gold, enamelled with images."

In two codicils to this will, Cardinal Beaufort refers to certain crown jewels, and vessels of silver and gold, pledged to him by the King and Parliament, for certain sums lent. When the King went into France and Normandy, and upon other subsequent occasions, the Cardinal had loaned the King £22,306 18s. 8d. It appears in Rymer, vol. x. page 502, that the King redeemed the sword of Spain and sundry jewels, pledged to the Cardinal, for £493 6s. 8d.

John, Duke of Exeter, 1447—"I will that four honest and cunning priests be provided, to pray perpetually every year, for my soul." He then conveys certain manors to his son Henry, "provided always, that an annuity of xl*l*. be reserved for my two bastard sons, William and Thomas."

William Burges, garter King of Arms, 1449, bequeaths to the church of St. George at Staunford—"to the seyd chirch for ther solempne feste dayes to stand upon the high awter 11 grete basque of silver, and 11 high candlesticks of sylver, 1 coupe of sylver, in the whych is one litel box of yvory, to put in the blessid sacrament." He also gives to said church "two greter candelstykkes, and for eiche of these candelstykkes to be ordayned a taper of waxe of 1 pound wight, and so served, to be lighted atte dyvyne servyce at pryncipal fest dayes, and al other solempne festes, as, at matyns, pryme, masse, and the yeven songs."

John, Lord Scrope, 1451—"To the altar, in the chapel of St. Mary, at York, a jewel, with a bone of St. Margaret, and xls. for ringing their bells, at my funeral."

Ann, Duchess of Exeter, 1457—"I forbid my executors to make any great feast, or to have a solemn hearse, or any costly lights, or largess of liveries according to the glory or vain pomp of the world, at my funeral, but only to the worship of God, after the discretion of Mr. John Pynchebeke, Doctor of Divinity."

Edmund Brudenell, 1457—"To Agmondesham Church; "to the Provosts of the Church for the maintenance of the great light before the cross *xxs.* To the maintenance of the light before St. Katherine's Cross, *liis. iyd.*"

John Younge, 1458—"To the fabrick of the Church of Herne, viz., to make seats, called puyinge, *x. marks.*"

John Sprot, Clerk, 1461—"To each of my parishioners *xld.*"

The passion for books, merely because of their antique rarity, and not for their intrinsic value, is not less dangerous, for the pursuer, than that, for collecting rare animals, and forming a private menagerie, at vast expense. Even the entomologist has been known to diminish the comforts of his family, by investing his ready money in rare and valuable bugs. It has been pleasantly said of him,

"He leaves his children, when he dies,
The richest cabinet of flies."

There is no doubt, that, in those superstitious days, the traffic in relics must have been a source of very great profit to the priests; equal, at least, to the traffic in *ancient terra cottas*, in the days of Nollekens. The sleeves of those crafty friars could not have been large enough, to hold their laughter, at the expense of the faithful. The heir apparent, whose grief, for the death of his ancestor, was sufficiently subdued, by his refreshing anticipations of some thousands of marks in ready money, must have been somewhat startled, upon the reading of the will, to find himself residuary legatee, *for life*, of the testator's "reliques, remainder over to the Carthusian Friars!"

Such, and similar, things were of actual occurrence. William Haute, Esquire, made his will, May 9, 1462, of course, in the reign of Edward the Fourth. This worthy gentleman ordains—"My body to be buried, in the Church of the Augustine Friars, before the image of St. Catherine, between my wives. * * * I bequeath one piece of that stone, on which the Archangel Gabriel descended, when he saluted the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the image of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Church of Bourne, the same to stand under the foot of the said image. I bequeath one piece of the bone of St. Bartholomew to the Church of Waltham. One piece of the hair cloth of St. Catherine, the Virgin, and a piece of the bone of St. Nicholas, to the Church of the Augustine Friars aforesaid. I bequeath all the remainder of

my relicks to my son William, *for life*, with remainder to the Augustine Friars forever."

Humphrey, Earl of Devon, 1463—"I will, that Mr. Nicholas Goss and Mr. Watts, Warden of the Grey Friars, at Exeter, shall, for the salvation of my soul, go to every Parish Church, in the Counties of Dorset, Somerset, Wilts, Devon, and Cornwall, and say a sermon, in every Church, town, or other; and as I cannot recompense such as I have offended, I desire them to forgive my poor soul, that it be not endangered."

William, Earl of Pembroke, 1469—"In nomine Jesu, &c. And wyfe, that ye remember your promise to me, that ye take the ordre of widowhood, as ye may the better mayster your owne * * * * Wyfe pray for me, and take the said ordre, that ye promised me, as ye had, in my lyfe, my hert and love." This lady, who was the daughter of Sir Walter Devereux, observed her vow, and died the widow of the Earl; which is the more remarkable, as these injunctions have often produced an opposite effect, and abbreviated the term of continency.

Sir Harry Stafford, Kt., 1471—"To my son-in-law, the Earl of Richmond, a trappur, four new horse harness of velvet; to my brother, John, Earl of Wiltshire, my bay courser; to Reynold Bray, my Receiver General, my grizzled horse."

Cecilia Lady Kirriel, 1472—"In my pure widowhood, &c. To John Kirriel, bastard, &c."

It is not unusual for the consciences of men, in a dying hour, to clutch, for security, at the veriest straws. It is instructive to consider the evidences, exhibited in these ancient testaments, of superfluous compunction. Sir Walter Moyle, Knt., 1479, directs his feoffees "to make an estate, in two acres of land, more or less, lying in the parish of Estwell, in a field called Calinglond, and deliver the same, in fee simple, to three or four honest men, to the use and behoof of the Church of Estwell aforesaid, in recompense of a certain annual rent of £2 of wax, by me wrested and detained from the said Church, against my conscience."

It was not unusual, to appoint overseers, to have an eye upon executors; a provision, which may not be without its advantages, occasionally, even in these days of more perfect morality, and higher law. Sir Ralph Verney, Knt., 1478, appoints four executors, and "my trewe lover, John Browne, Alderman of London, to be one of the *overseers* of this my present testament, and

to have a remembrance upon my soul, one of my cups, covered with silver gilt."

Monks and Friars were pleasant fellows in the olden time, and Nuns are not supposed to have been without their holy comforts. Landseer's fine picture of Bolton Abbey is a faithful illustration. The fat of the land, when offered to idols, has commonly been eaten up by deputy. However shadowy and attenuated the souls of their humble and confiding tributaries, the carcasses of abbots are commonly represented as superlatively fat and rubicund.

Bequests and devises to Lights and Altars were very common. Eustace Greville, Esquire, 1479, bequeaths "to the Light of the Blessed Mary, in the said Church of Wolton, three pounds of wax in candles and two torches; to the Altar of the Blessed Mary in the said church, one bushel of wheat and as much of barley; and to the Lights of the Holy Cross there one bushel of barley and as much of beans; and the same to the Light of St. Katherine there."

FINIS.

DUST TO DUST.

IN utter disregard of all precedent, I have placed this dedication at the end of the volume, deeming it meet and right, that the corpse should go before.

How very often the publication of a ponderous tome has been found to resemble the interment of a portly corpse! How truly, ere long, it may be equally affirmed, of both—the places, that knew them, shall know them no more!

Mæcenas was the friend and privy counsellor of Augustus Cæsar; and, accordingly, became, in some measure, the dispenser of executive patronage. The name of Mæcenas has been employed, ever since, to signify a patron of letters and the arts. Dedications are said to have been coeval with the days of his power.

In almost every case, a dedication is neither more nor less, than an application for convoy, from the literary mariner, who is scarcely willing to venture, with his fragile bark, "*in mare Creticum*" or *criticum*, unaided and alone. He solicits permission to dedicate his work to some distinguished individual—in other words, to place his influential name, upon the very front of the volume, as an amulet—a sort of passover—to keep evil spirits and critics, at a

distance. If the permission be granted, of which the public is sure to be informed, the presumption, that the patron has read and approved the work, amounts to a sanction, of course, to the extent of his credit and authority. In some cases, however, I have reason to believe, that the only part of the work, which the patron ever reads, is the dedication itself. That most amiable and excellent man, and high-minded biblioplist, the late Mr. JAMES BROWN, informed me, that an author once requested permission, to dedicate his work, to a certain professor, in the State of New York, tendering the manuscript, for his perusal; and that the professor declined reading the work, as superfluous; but readily accepted the dedication, observing, that he usually received five dollars, on such occasions.

There was one, to whom it would afford me real pleasure to dedicate this volume, were he here, in the flesh; but he has gone to his account. GROSSMAN is numbered with the dead!

READER—if you can lay your hand upon your heart, and honestly say, that you have read these pages, or any considerable portion of them, with pleasure—that they have afforded you instruction, or amusement—I dedicate this volume—with your permission, of course—most respectfully, to you; having conceived the most exalted opinion of your taste and judgment.

L. M. SARGENT,

ROCK HILL, DECEMBER, 1855.

GENERAL INDEX.

The figures refer to the numbers—not to the pages.

- A.**
ABNER, cautioned by his father, as to his behavior to aged people, 1.
ADAMS, John, anecdote of, 45 :—lines written under his name, in a lady's album, 46.
AIRS, national, authorship of, 106.
ALMSGIVING, 56.
AMBASSADORS, from U. S. A. to G. B. 73.
ANCESTRY, pride of, 97.
ANTIQUARIES, sometimes malicious, 126.
APOTHECARIES, in Boston—some notice of, 112.
ARISTOCRACY, of Boston—examples of, 90 :—among the dead, 1.
ARMS, reversed, at military funerals, of great antiquity, 30.
ARNOLD, Benedict, what made him a traitor, 87.
ARUNDINES CAMI, 92.
ASCLEPIADES, of Prusa, his medical practice, 114.
ASTROLOGERS, Judicial, formerly part of a nobleman's household, 157.—False prediction of, in 1186. Ibid.—Consulted by Louis XIV. and Madame de Maintenon, 159.
ASTROLOGY, Judicial, Q. Elizabeth addicted to.—Much practised, in the middle ages, 157, 159.
AVARICE, 31.
EVERY, steals three negroes :—attempts to sell them :—their rescue, 47.
AYMAR, James, a famous impostor, 113.
AUCTIONS, various modes of :—by inch of candle :—by sand glass :—of fish among the Dutch :—various modes of notifying, and bidding at, 139.
AUCTIONEER'S BELL, used at the Hague :—formerly in Boston, 139.
B.
BABYLONIANS, their mode of obtaining husbands, for homely women, 115.
BACHELORS punished by the Lacedæmonians for their celibacy :—not trusted with affairs of state at Athens, 115.
BARBERS, 140, 141, 142, 143 :—their antiquity, 140 :—formerly peripatetics, 141 :—their shops and poles, 141 :—female, 141 :—their citherns and “knack with the fingers,” 142.
BAPTISM, vicarious, 109.
BATHS, ancient, 114.
BATTEL, wager of, 145.
BEARDS, habits of the ancients, respecting, 140 :—modern, 142 :—dyeing them an ancient practice, 142.
BELKNAP, Jeremy, Rev. 47 :—his desire for a sudden death, 75 :—regard for historical truth, 75 :—error, as to Gosnold, 75.
BELLS, and bell ringing :—weight of several :—a terror to “evil spirytes,” 37.
BENEVOLENCE, remarkable example of, 55.
BENTHAM, Jeremy, dissected by his own request, 8.
“BLEED AND PURGE all Kensington,” 111.
BODIES, posthumous preservation of, 20.
BODKIN, the famous root and herb doctor, 109.
BOILING TO DEATH, a mode of punishment, 151.
BOODLE, William, his self-conceit, 49.
BOORN, Stephen and Jesse, remarkable case of erroneous conviction, on circumstantial evidence, 79 to 85, both inclusive.
BORRIT, Joseph Francis, a famous impostor, 113.
BRADFORD, Sheriff, anecdote of, 5.
BROCKLEBANK, Parson, anecdote of, 49.
BURIAL, joint stock companies, 53 :—their profits enormous, 58 :—of weapons, by the slaves, at Charleston, 34.
“BRING OUT YOUR DEAD,” 27.
BUCHANAN, James, his errors, in relation to Major André, corrected, 19.
BURKE AND BISHOP, executed, for murder, with intent to sell the bodies, 7.
BURYING THE DEAD, manner of, commended, 21 :—in cities and under churches, objections to, 10, 11, 60, 61 :—manner of, and practices, connected therewith, in different ages and nations, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 21, 30, 38, 96, 101 :—premature, 15, 91, 95 :—means for preventing, 91, 95.

- BULL JOHN**, and brother Jonathan, 104 :
—John, the musician, author of "God save the King," 106.
- BYLES**, Mather, anecdotes of, 93, 94.
- C.**
- CADES**, sexton, how he lost his office, 44.
- CALIFORNIA** fever, 31.
- CAMPBELL**, hung for killing Boyd in a duel, 145.
- CAMPBELL**, Captain, steals an heiress, 115.
- CANDLES**, burnt in the day, at a church, in Nantucket, 24 :—of wax, at Popish funerals, in old times, 2. by inch of, ancient mode of selling at auction, 139.
- CANER**, Rev. Dr., some notice of, 78.
- CAPITAL PUNISHMENT**, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 89.
- CAPITAL OFFENCES**, in Massachusetts, in 1648, 62.
- CARTER**, sexton, insulted by a chirurgion, 43.
- CATACOMBS**, 10 :—of Paris, 12, 13.
- CATAFALQUE**, its import, 103.
- CHADWICK**, Edwin, his report on interments, to the British Parliament, 58.
- CHAPPEL**, King's, some account of, 78.
- CHARLES I.** funeral of, 39 :—his body discovered, in 1813, 40 :—V. legend of his mock funeral, denied, 99.
- CHILDREN**, female, destruction of, in China, and elsewhere, 29.
- CHINESE**, habits of the, 101.
- CHUANG-TSZE**, story of, 119, 120.
- CLARENDON**, in error, as to the burial place of King Charles I. 40.
- CLARKE**, Barnabas, anecdote of, 90.
- CLARK**, Alvan, his versatility of talent, 46.
- CLAY**, Henry, his frequent leavetakings, 99.
- COBBETT**, William, his letter to Lord Liverpool, on the American triumphs, 104.
- CONGRESS**, American, Lord Chatham's opinion of, 104.
- COURAGE**, personal, externals no sure criterion of—two remarkable examples, 149.
- CONSCIENCE PARTIES**, 29.
- CORDAY**, CHARLOTTE de, an interesting question, connected with her decapitation, 153.
- CREMATION**, cost of—least expensive mode, excepting the urns, 74 :—of Henry Laurens, 95 :—of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley :—their diet in prison, 74.
- CRIMINALS**, how to dispose of, 89 :—bodies of, delivered for dissection, 7 :—number waiting to be hung, 51.
- CROMWELL**, Oliver, various estimates of his character :—views and handles the dead body of Charles I. :—his funeral :—his body dug up, and hung, at Tyburn, 39.
- CRUCIFIXION**, 151.
- D.**
- DADDY OSGOOD**, sold at auction, 139.
- DANFORTH**, Dr. Samuel, notice of, 111.
- DEACONS**, their dispute about a tomb, 11.
- DEAD SEA**, some account of, 35, 36.
- DEATH**, certain evidence of, 91 :—condition of the soul, after, 96 :—imitation of, 137 :—by shipwreck, 102.
- DENTISTS**, in Boston, some notice of, 112.
- DESECRATION**, of the dead, 14, 21, 23.
- DICKSON**, provost of Dundee, his epitaph, 9.
- DIEDRICK VAN PRONE**'s widow, anecdote of, 7.
- DIGBY**, Everard, account of his having spoken, after the removal of his heart, 153.
- DINAH FURBUSH**, her corpse insulted, 77.
- DIogenEs**, anecdote of, 4.
- DISTILLERS**, in Boston, number of, 112.
- DIVINATION**, some account of, 157, 158.
- DIVINING ROD**, of James Aymar, 113.
- "Don't go too near that hedge," 91.
- DREAMS**, of Martin Smith and King's Chapel, by the Old Sexton, 76, 77, 78.
- DRUNKENNESS**, at ordinations, 37.
- DRYDEN**, John, disturbance at his funeral, 118.
- DUELS**, between Benjamin Woodbridge and Henry Phillips, on Boston Common, 133 to 136, both inclusive :—various, 144 to 149, both inclusive :—punishment of, 145 :—number killed in, 145 :—Decatur and Barron, 146 :—Lord Bruce and Sir Edward Sackville, 147 :—Lords Mohun and Hamilton, 147 :—Sheridan and Matthews, 147 :—M'keon and Reynolds, 147 :—Campbell and Boyd, 147 :—Colclough and Alcock, 147 :—David and Goliath, 147 :—Titus Manlius and the Gaul, 148 :—Hector and Ajax, 148 :—Turnus and Aeneas, 148 :—Rauben and a Spanish gentleman, 148 :—Cameron, and McLean, 148 :—Lord Mark Kerr and a French Colonel, 149 :—Joseph Bainbridge and the Secretary of Sir Alexander Ball, 149 :—Rand and Miller, 153.
- DUGDALE**, Sir William, the antiquary, 155.
- DYONISIUS**, to save his throat, taught his daughters to shave, 140.
- E.**
- EFFIGIES** of the dead, made of cinnamon, and carried in the procession, 30.
- EGYPTIANS**, trials of their kings, after death, 5 :—every Egyptian a doctor, 107.

- ELI, the sexton, his hallucinations, 55.
 ELIOT, Rev. Andrew, gloves and rings, given him at funerals, and the sale of, 28.
 EMBALMING, process of, 4.
 EMPIRICS, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114.
 EPITAPHS, 5, 9.
 ESTIMATE OF AMERICANS by the English people, in 1775 and 1812, 104.
 EVIDENCE, circumstantial, remarkable examples of, 79 to 85, both inclusive: Webster's case, 86.
 EXECUTION, in Ballyconnel, 54.
 F.
 FAKEER, East India, account of his apparent death, and resurrection, 137, 138.
 FAMINE, Keayne's granary in case of, 112.
 FANEUIL HALL, origin of:—burnt:—rebuilt and enlarged, 130, 131.
 FANEUIL PETER, and his relatives, some account of, 122 to 132, both inclusive:—saves Henry Phillips, to escape, after his fatal duel, with Woodbridge, 134.
 FOOD for ghosts, 25.
 FORTUNE-HUNTERS, remarkable disappointment of one, 115, 116.
 FRANKLIN, Benjamin, his account of the resurrection of flies, drowned in wine, 138:—his letter to Thomas Percival, on duelling, 144:—Sir John, probably lost, 154.
 FREEMAN, Dr., manner of his ordination, 78.
 FRIENDSHIPS rarely lifelong:—examples of, 69:—Cicero's first law of, 69.
 FRIZZELL'S BELL, 37.
 FUNERALS, invitations to, 8:—baked meats at:—games, and festivals at, 25.
 G.
 GIFTS, New Year's, 117.
 GLOVES and rings, at funerals, 28.
 GOSNOLD, Bartholomew, his abode, at Cuttyhunk, 75.
 GOVERNOR of Mass., anecdote of a, 52.
 GRANNY, anecdote of skinning, 58.
 GROSSMAN threatened to be shot, 13.
 GUILLOTIN, Dr. 151:—the instrument that bears his name, 151, 152.
 H.
 HAIR, management of the, 143.
 HALLEY, Thomas, great pomp, and much guzzling, at his funeral, 25.
 HALIFAX GIBBET and the guillotine identical, 151.
 HANDEL, rivalry, between him, and Senesino, and Buononcini, 105:—Swift's epigram, on their squabbles, 105.
 HANGING, sensations produced by, 95:—vicarious, 160:—persons differently moved, in prospect of, 160.
 HANWAY, Sir Jonas, his account of the practice of giving vales, 23.
 HAPPINESS, 43.
 HASTÆ, why auctions were so called, at Rome, 139.
 HAWES, Dr. William, his work on premature interment, 95.
 HEIRESS, stealing an, made felony:—remarkable examples of, 115.
 HENRY VIII. bone stolen from his corpse, 39:—some account of his funeral, 103.
 HERSE, ancient import of the word, 103.
 HOOK, Theodore, anecdote of, 24.
 "How could the poor Abbé sustain himself against you all four?" 113.
 HOWLERS, at funerals, ancient and modern, 32, 38.
 HUGUENOTS, in Boston:—their early settlement, in Oxford, Mass. 122:—their church in Boston, 122, 123.
 I.
 IDLENESS, effects of, 22.
 INFANTICIDE, 29.
 INNOLDERS, in Boston, number of, 112.
 INTOLERANCE, in Massachusetts, 62.
 J.
 JAMES II., his gallantry, when Duke of York, in a sea-fight, 66.
 JEWS usurious, 15,000 banished, 52.
 JE vous sauter le tête, 151.
 L.
 LACERATION, of the cheeks and hair, at funerals, in Greece, Rome, and elsewhere, 30, 32, 38.
 LARGESSES at funerals, 25.
 LAURENS, Henry, his body burnt, after death, by his request, 95.
 LAWYERS, in Boston, their number at different periods, 112.
 LE MERCIER, André, minister of the Huguenots, in Boston, 132.
 LEVI, M. de, his pride of ancestry, 97.
 LIBERTY TREE, 41, 42. Philip Billes devises his estate, on condition of being buried under that tree, 42.
 LICINIUS, P., games, &c., at his funeral, 25.
 LILLY, Sir William, the astrologer, notice of, 157.
 LIND, Jenny, some account of, 105.
 LLOYD, Dr. James, his appearance, 111.
 LOCALITIES, certain interesting, 7.
 LONGEVITY, some examples of, 45.
 LOT'S WIFE, pillar of salt, &c., 35, 36:—seen by Irenæus and others, after she was salted, 36.
 LOUIS XVI., brutal behaviour of the French people, at his execution, 152.
 LOVAT, Lord, his repartee, on his way to be hung, 150.
 LUDII, HISTRIONES, SCURRÆ, 30.
 LUXURY, ever injurious, and often fatal, to Republics, 87, 88.
 LYMAN, Theodore, notice of him, and his public and private charities, 66.

M.

- MARCUS FLAVIUS, anecdote of, 25.
 MARRIAGES, taxed—first celebration of, in churches—:—forbidden during Lent, 115.
 MARINER bound for Africa, reaches Norway, 48.
 MARSHALL, Tommy, anecdote of, 90.
 MARTYRS, cremation of:—cost of burning Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, 24.
 MASHEE, Tooley, plays corpse, 137.
 MCPHEE, widow Nelly, anecdote of, 7.
 MEDICINE, origin of the practice of, 107:—practice of, among the Babylonians, Greeks, Egyptians, Israelites, and Hindoos, 108.
 MEDIUMS, some notice of, 157.
 MEXICAN BEGGARS, how employed by Montezuma, 142.
 MILTON, John, his marriages, 98:—writes in favor of polygamy, 98:—desecration of his remains, 118.
 MINGLING the ashes of dear friends, in the same urn, practice of, 21.
 MINISTERS of the Gospel, in Boston, in 1740, 132.
 MIRTHFULNESS, its advantages, 92.
 MONEY, George Herbert's address to, 31.
 MONTGOMERY, Gen. Richard, his exhumation, and reinterment, 18.
 MONUMENTS, Dryden's, Ben Jonson's, and Cowley's, mutilation of, 118.
 MOONCURSERS, laws for their punishment:—anecdote of, 102.
 MOORHEAD, Rev. John, some notice of, 99.
 MOSES, an apothecary, 107.
 MOURNERS, their peculiar consolations, 32:—for the year 1848, 33.
 MOURNING, time allowed for:—color of the vesture, in different countries, 32.
 Irish, consists in the number of coaches and the quantity of whiskey, 74.
 MULE, a bad one, 30.

N.

- NAPOLEON's last words, 31.
 NEW YEAR'S DAY, when, 117, 123.
 NEW NORTH CHURCH, uproar there, 37.
 NORTH CHURCH, peal of bells there, 37.
 NUISANCE, affecting the air, not necessary to prove it noxious, 60.

O.

- OBSEQUIES, provisions for, by persons, while living, 7.
 OTIS, James, anecdote of, 90.

P.

- PARKMAN, Dr. George, his murder:—his peculiarities, 72.
 PENN, William, reply to Macaulay's abuse of:—memoir of, 62 to 71, both inclusive:—death bed of his son, 71.
 PERCIVAL, Thomas, his work, on duelling, 144.
 PERE LA CHAISE, 11.

- PESTILENCE, numbers destroyed by, 27.
 PHILADELPHIANS, saved from being Welchmen, 68.
 PHYSICIANS, various schools of, named by Pliny, 110, 114:—number of the old Boston doctors, and their residences, 112.
 PIPERS, at funerals, 8.
 PIRATES, hung on Boston Common, 50.
 PITCAIRN, Major, the honor of killing him, claimed by many:—the remains, under Westminster Abbey, said to have been erroneously selected, from under the North Church, 17.
 PLAGUE, some account of the, 27.
 PLINY, in favor of herb doctoring, 114.
 PLANTER, funeral of an old, in St. Croix, 30.
 POLHAMUS, the good Samaritan, 83.
 POMPADOUR, Madame de, her remains transferred to the Catacombs, 13.
 PONTRACI, the prince of undertakers, 12.
 PORTLAND VASE, history of the, 20.
 PRIDE and POVERTY, excess of, dangerous, 87.
 PUNISHMENT, various kinds of, 151.
 PUNSTERS habitual, nuisances, 94.
 PWAN YAKOO, and other Chinese, their visit to Boston:—description of her golden lilies, 102.

Q.

- QUACKS of great use to sextons, 27.
 QUAKERS, persecution of, in Massachusetts, 62, 63.

R.

- RAND, Dr. Isaac, brief notice of, 111.
 RAZORS, their antiquity:—mentioned by Homer, Samuel, Ezekiel:—how sharpened:—of brass, 140:—the best formerly from Palermo, 142.
 RECHERCHES, Historiques et Physiologiques sur la Guillotine, 152.
 RELICS, traffic and jugglery in, by the priests, 17.
 REPUBLICS, extravagance fatal to, 87, 88.
 REVENGE Church of Christ, 37.
 REVIVAL, amusing example of, on the way to the grave, 91:—of a child of Henry Laurens, which caused him to order his own corpse to be burnt, 95.
 ROCHEFOUCAULT, maxim erroneously ascribed to, 59.
 ROMAN CATHOLICS, persecution of, in Massachusetts, 29.
 ROSS, Sir John, his residence, in the Arctic regions:—discovery of him and his company, 154.
 ROTHSCHILD, Nathan Meyer, his funeral solemnities, 3.
 RUM, mainspring of the slave trade in Massachusetts, 47.
 RUSH, Dr. Benjamin, alluded to:—anecdote of, 111.

S.

- "SACRED TO THE MEMORY"! 77.
 SANTA CRUZ, gross extortion there, from surviving friends, 16.
 SANSONS, the hereditary executioners of Paris, 151, 152.
 SAYINGS, of eminent men, in articulo, or just before death, 100.
 SCOTCH WEAVER'S VANITY, 39.
 SELWYN, George, seldom absent from an execution, 50.
 SENECA, quotation from, 43.
 SEXTONS, their office, its origin, and duties, of old — their extortion, occasionally, in the hour of affliction, 16 — their business much benefited by steam, 2.
 SCIENCE, some curious mistakes of, 154.
 SHAYS, his insurrection, 29.
 SHAVING, suggestions concerning, 140.
 SHELLEY, the poet, cremation of, 20.
 SHIPWRECKS, their number, 102.
 SLAVERY, 34: — in Boston, 43, 47: — early attempts to abolish, in Massachusetts, 44: — how and when abolished there, 47: — Slave trade, in Boston, 47.
 SLAVES, example of their ingenuity, 34.
 SMITH, Martin, sexton of King's Chapel. his apparition to the sexton of the old school, 76, 77, 78.
 SOLDIERS, their sufferings, as statesmen, 100.
 *SONS OF LIBERTY, some account of the, 41.
 SOUTHERN STATES, liberality to Boston, in 1774, 44.
 SPARTANS, their mode of selecting wives, 115.
 SPIDER and chambermaid, 29.
 SPIRITUAL KNOCKINGS, sometimes resulting in madness, and self-murder, 157, 158: — remedy for, 158.
 STAMP ACT, resolutions in Faneuil Hall, 58.
 STEAM, of great benefit to sextons, 27.
 STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS, their version of the Psalms gave place to that of Tate and Brady: — motive of Sternhold little suspected, 100.
 STONECUTTER, anecdote of a, 6.
 STYLE, old and new, some account of, 117.
 SUCCESSION, Apostolic, 78.
 SUMNER, Governor, funeral of, 39.
 SUMPTUARY LAWS, some account of, 88.
 SURGEONS, the earliest — limited nature of their functions, 107: — among the Israelites, 108.
 SUTTEES, description of, 74.
 SWANS, their musical power fabulous, 105.
 SWEATING SICKNESS, some account of, 27.
 SWEDENBORG, his notions of Heaven: — of the soul, 96.

T.

- TALLOW CHANDLER, retired from business, anecdote of, 22.
 TASMAN'S BOWL, used for conjuration, in Tongataboo, 38.
 TEA, thrown overboard, 44.
 TEARS, power of shedding at will, 32.
 TEMPERANCE "has done for funerals," 2.
 TETOTUM DOCTOR, 111.
 THACHER, Rev. Peter, installation of, 37.
 THREE CHEERS for the elephant, 39.
 TOMBS, reasons for preferring graves: — outrage upon five, in Salem, Massachusetts, 13, 14.
 "TOO HEARTILY of nutmegs," 103.
 TORIES, their faith in the royal cause, 125.
 TREASURES, buried with the dead, 21.
 TURENNE, singular fate of his remains, 23.
 U.
 URNS, funeral, forms, and materials of, 20: — occasionally large enough to contain the mingled ashes of whole families, 21.
 USURY, some remarks on, 48, 52.

V.

- VALES, practice of giving, 27.
 VANITY, illustration of, 49.
 VIANDS, deposited near the dead, 25.
 VISCERATION among the ancients, 25.
 VOLTAIRE, his description of a Frenchman, 152.

W.

- WADE, Sir Claude M. his account of the East India Fakcer, who was restored, after a suspension of consciousness, for six weeks, 137, 138.
 WAGER OF BATTLE, the law of England, so late, as 1319, 145.
 WAKES, their origin: — some account of, 91.
 WARREN, Gen. Joseph, manner of discovering his remains: — the bullet, by which he was killed, in possession of the Montague family, 17.
 WASHINGTON, George, illustration of the reverence for his memory, in New England: — opinion of, by Lords Erskine and Brougham: — national neglect of his monument: — sale of some of his effects, 26.
 WATERHOUSE, Dr. Benjamin, anecdote of, 111.
 "WEEL THEN sing as mony as there be," 99.
 WEBSTER, Dr. John White, his trial for the murder of Dr. Parkman, 72: — his case stated, at the close of, 89.
 WEVER's funeral monuments, 24.
 "WHAT that boy says is true," 113.
 WIDOWS, Nunn severe upon: — marrying within ten months accounted infamous, 32: — unjustly censured, 98: — "with the great fan," 119.

- Wigs, scratches, bows, and full bottomed :—their antiquity, 142, 143 :—periwigs in N. England, 142 :—Roman, 143.
- WILLS, ANCIENT, 155, 156, 160 :—superstitious dread of making, 155 :—Andrew Faneuil's, 127.
- WITCHES, their right to travel through the air, decided by Lord Mansfield, 29.
- WOODBIDGE, Benjamin, killed in a duel on Boston Common, 133 to 137 : both inclusive.
- WRAITHALL'S MEMOIRS, inaccurate, 149, Z.
- ZISCA, John, anecdote of, 7.

INDEX TO PROPER NAMES.

The figures refer to the pages—not to the numbers.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>A.
 Abbeville, 636.
 Abbott, 112, 204.
 Abel, 429.
 Aberdeen, 364.
 Abner, 9, 13, 108, 172, 173, 197, 289.
 Absalom, 591.
 Achilles, 12, 17, 67, 107.
 Adam, 70, 429, 605.
 Adams, 596.
 Adams, John, 142, 156, 157, 160, 275, 276, 394.
 Adams, John Q., 156, 394.
 Adams, Samuel, 142.
 Addison, 35, 38, 454, 606.
 Admetus, 12.
 Adrian, 584.
 Æneas, 382.
 Æsculapius, 433, 436, 445, 667.
 Affslager, 587.
 Africa, 33, 168, 435, 622, 662.
 Africans, 632.
 Africanus, 583.
 Agamemnon, 17, 430.
 Agathias, 16.
 Agrigentum, 373.
 Agmondesham, 676.
 Agrippa, 261.
 Agrippa, Cornelius, 445.
 Abaziah, 431.
 Alaricus, 65.
 Albany, 38, 415.
 Alecock, 614.
 Aldgate, 652.
 Aldgrave, 634.
 Aleet Mong, 398.
 Alexander, 373.
 Allen, 353, 495, 502, 503, 601, 610.
 Allwick, 69.
 Almotanah, 123.
 Almshouse, 24.
 Alvanley, 606.
 America, 265, 416.
 Ames, 91, 630, 631.
 Ammanus, 64.
 Amphytrion, 217, 581.</p> | <p>Amoon, 398.
 Amory, 94.
 Amsterdam, 456, 622.
 Anderson, 309.
 Andover, 561.
 André, 57 to 62, passim.
 Andrews, 24, 169.
 Andros, 298.
 Anecy, 56.
 Angoulême, 124.
 Anio, 617.
 Annan, 286.
 Anne Boleyn, 477.
 Annelly, 423.
 Anne of Cleves, 78, 81, 410.
 Anne, Queen, 186, 248, 262, 365, 406.
 Antijacobin, 612.
 Antoninus, 67.
 Antony, 579.
 Antwerp, 618.
 Appleton, 450, 506, 538, 630.
 Aphorp, 297.
 Arabian Nights, 269.
 Arabs, 119, 123.
 Aratus, 12.
 Archelaus, 102, 591.
 Archimimus, 98.
 Arcueil, 39, 42.
 Argiletum, 587.
 Aristotle, 186, 217, 218.
 Arkwright, 420.
 Arnaud, 419.
 Arnold, 62, 228, 338, 339, 340.
 Arundel, 157.
 Asa, 430, 434.
 Asclepiades, 358, 373, 443, 460, 461.
 Ashford, 604.
 Ashmole Museum, 613.
 Asiatic Researches, 435.
 Athenæ Oxonienses, 133, 136, 232, 248, 250, 425, 640, 642.
 Athens, 11, 88, 343, 373, 423, 442.
 Atherton, 30, 167.
 Atossa, 465.
 Atticus, 51, 474.</p> | <p>Attleborough, 31.
 Auchterpool, 603.
 Augustines, 652, 654, 677.
 Augustus, 99, 583.
 Auld Reekie, 334.
 Aulus Gellius, 218.
 Austin, 449.
 Austria, 321.
 Austrians, 539.
 Auxerre, 220.
 Avery, 166, 167.
 Aviola, 49, 373.
 Avis, 92.
 Aymar, 438, 454, 455.
 Azotus, 33.
 B.
 Bacon, Roger, 360, 361, 362.
 Bacon, Lord, 185, 188, 375, 376, 445, 641, 642.
 Babylon, 406, 422, 432, 433.
 Babylonians, 664.
 Baie, 320.
 Bahar Loth, 123.
 Bailey, 246.
 Bainbridge, 610, 624.
 Balch, 269, 353.
 Baldwin, 67, 181, 303, 311.
 Ball, 624.
 Ballyconnel, 194.
 Ballymahon, 195.
 Ballyshannon, 355.
 Balmario, 629.
 Bancroft, 277.
 Banians, 377.
 Banks, 298, 424.
 Barataria, 123, 265.
 Barbaroux, 426.
 Barbary, 88.
 Barbut, 29.
 Barcephas, 120.
 Barclay, 252.
 Barker, 642.
 Barlow, 238, 361.
 Barnes, 451.
 Barnard, 24.
 Barra Durree, 570.
 Barré, 140, 145, 416.
 Barrington, 606.
 Barron, 608, 609.
 Barrow, 398, 400, 402, 403.</p> |
|---|---|--|

- Barrow's Strait, 645.
 Barton, 561, 562, 563.
 Bartholomew, 633.
 Bartholomew's Eve, 93.
 Bassorah, 88.
 Bastile, 84.
 Bate, 601.
 Battenkill, 303.
 Baulny, 639.
 Baulsion, 228.
 Baxter, 252.
 Bayard, 393.
 Bayeaux, 519.
 Bayle, 56, 358, 380, 388,
 391, 455, 672, 673.
 Bayley, 597.
 Baynton, 516, 519.
 Bay State, 163.
 Beattie, 360.
 Beauchamp, 529, 651, 655.
 Beaufort, 607, 674, 675.
 Beccaria, 207.
 Beckford, 145.
 Bedouin, 119.
 Beecher, 372.
 Belcher, 298.
 Belfast, 389.
 Belknap, 163 to 167, and
 283 to 286, *passim*: 368.
 Bellamont, 605.
 Bellingham, 228, 229, 230.
 Belochus, 465.
 Belzoni, 33.
 Bengal, 281.
 Benin, 33.
 Bennington, 415.
 Bentham, 27, 52, 176, 605.
 Benton, 159.
 Bergen-op-Zoom, 549, 613.
 Berlin, 89.
 Bernon, 496, 508.
 Berthier, 109.
 Bertrand, 639.
 Bethune, 495, 506, 508
 514, 567.
 Beuron, 607.
 Bias, 217, 218.
 Bichai, 357.
 Bildad, 217.
 Billes, 147.
 Biographia Britannica, 363.
 Bishop, 27, 227.
 Blackburn, 508, 523.
 Black Prince, 649.
 Blackstone, 301.
 Blackwood's Mag., 243.
 Blaisdell, 182, 183.
 Blanche, 608.
 Blin, 562.
 Blitheman, 426.
 Blitz, 665.
 Blundell, 606.
 Boccacio, 218, 422. [441
 Bodkin, 189, 190, 192, 440,
- Bogle, 195.
 Boles, 159.
 Bolton Abbey, 678.
 Bondet, 497.
 Bonet, 49.
 Bonner, 506, 550, 562.
 Bonrepaux, 239, 240, 242.
 Booodle, 171, 172, 173.
 Boorn, 301 to 331, *passim*.
 Borri, 456.
 Borromeo, 220.
 Bose, 643, 544.
 Bosius, 437.
 Bosphorus, 22.
 Bosson, 597.
 Bossuet, 671.
 Boston, 66, 125, 151, 153,
 165, 167, 179, 184, 191,
 194, 210, 221, 223, 270,
 351, 452, 497, 514, 536.
 Boston Athen'm, 269, 324.
 Boston Common, 549.
 Boswell, 601, 602, 603, 606.
 Bottom, 592, 624.
 Boudinot, 496.
 Bourbon, 393, 675.
 Bourbon, Jeanne of, 74.
 Bourdeaux, 210.
 Boutineau, 496, 498, 510,
 512, 514, 531, 566.
 Boutville, 607.
 Bowdoin, 284, 496, 498,
 508, 538.
 Bowen, 557.
 Bowers, 82.
 Boyd, 606, 614.
 Boyle, 243, 535, 597.
 Brachmans, 377.
 Brackett, 592.
 Bradlock, 394.
 Bradford, 19, 301, 632.
 Brady, 31, 55, 597.
 Brague, 220.
 Brand, 402, 589.
 Brandreth, 86.
 Brandywine, 415.
 Branodunum, 65.
 Bray, 81, 677.
 Braybrooke, 577.
 Breck, 270, 271.
 Breckenridge, 605.
 Breed, 597.
 Briareus, 56, 91.
 Briar's Creek, 415.
 Briggs, 175.
 Brighton, 508, 525, 527.
 Bristol, 508.
 British Critic, 622.
 Britons, 585.
 Brocklebank, 174.
 Brockwell, 297.
 Bromeholme, 656.
 Bromfield, 269, 564. [609
 Brooks, 352, 353, 553, 564,
- Brougham, 84, 347.
 Broullan, 529.
 Brown, 580.
 Browne, 42, 65, 67, 118,
 122, 131, 180, 215, 227,
 282, 419, 431, 478, 640,
 660, 664, 677.
 Bruce, 549, 551, 662.
 Bruhi, 651.
 Buchanan, 58, 59, 61, 436.
 Buckingham, 479.
 Buckley, 532.
 Buddikin, 108.
 Buffon, 420.
 Buissiere, 455.
 Bulfinch, 460.
 Bull, 414, 415, 426, 427.
 Bullivant, 298.
 Bulwer, 592.
 Bungs, 463.
 Bunker's Hill, 54, 55, 415.
 Buononcini, 422.
 Burdett, 606.
 Bureau, 507, 530.
 Burgoyne, 353, 617.
 Burgundy, 614.
 Burke, 27, 268, 613.
 Barleigh, 76, 661.
 Burnett, 33, 76, 233, 262,
 551.
 Burney, 427.
 Burr, 332, 605.
 Burrit, 177.
 Burton, 26, 66.
 Busching, 119.
 Bute, 140, 146.
 Butler, 56, 208, 361, 454,
 622.
 Byles, 143, also 363 to 372,
passim: also 546.
 C.
 Cades, 152.
 Cæsar, Augustus, 29, 36,
 99, 595, 679.
 Cæsar, Julius, 29, 474, 579,
 585.
 Cæsar, the twelve, 67.
 Cæsar, the slave, 31.
 Caffraria, 103.
 Cain, 377, 429, 556, 615.
 Cairo, 241.
 Caius, 88, 585.
 Calabria, 87.
 Calais, 657.
 Calhoan, 114.
 Calcraft, 346.
 California, 101.
 Calinglond, 677.
 Callender, 163.
 Calmet, 119, 120, 187, 436,
 582, 615.
 Callowhill, 267.
 Calvin, 548, 549.
 Calypso, 420.

- Cambridge, 630.
 Camden, 145, 146, 383, 415.
 Camerarius, 373.
 Cameron, 621.
 Camillus Papers, 277.
 Campbell, 614.
 Caner, 289 to 300, *passim*.
 Canning, 606.
 Canso, 567.
 Canterbury, 520, 656, 669.
 Cape Anne, 16.
 Capet, 73, 81, 637.
 Capulets, 351.
 Cardigan, 606.
 Caribs, 130.
 Carisbroke Castle, 606, 673.
 Carmelites, 652, 654.
 Carne, 117, 119.
 Carroll, 181.
 Carter, 148.
 Carthago, 152.
 Carthusians, 651.
 Cartwright, 240.
 Cass, 85, 110.
 Cassiers, 59.
 Castalia, 549.
 Castellan, 358.
 Castelnau, 384.
 Castlereagh, 606.
 Catanea, 33.
 Catholics, 535.
 Catlin, 23.
 Cato, 71, 431, 442, 443, 444.
 Catti, 585.
 Caulfield, 382.
 Cavan, 193.
 Cecil, 661.
 Cecrops, 64.
 Celsus, 429, 462.
 Cemetery des Innocens, 30, 43, 65.
 Cephrenes, 384.
 Chace, 310 to 330, *passim*.
 Chadsey, 80.
 Chadwick, 212, 278, 320, 321, 322, 333, 669.
 Chaise, Père la, 672.
 Chaldeans, 661.
 Chalmers, 49, 238, 248, 249, 268, 363, 427, 480, 516, 642.
 Chamberlain, 77, 80.
 Chamouni, 400.
 Chantilly, 419, 420.
 Chapel Yard, 225.
 Chapotin, 568.
 Chappelle, 612.
 Chardon, 533, 534, 538, 541.
 Charles, Archduke, 620.
 Charles I., 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 157, 177, 248, 436, 477, 673.
 Charles II., 99, 136, 159, 170, 177, 248, 249, 259, 309, 426, 479, 592, 606, 672, 673.
 Charles V., 25, 74, 390, 392, 619.
 Charles IX., 475.
 Charles XII., 217.
 Charleston, 112, 405.
 Charlestown, 608.
 Charlemagne, 37, 73.
 Charlotte, Queen, 145.
 Charlton, 125.
 Charon, 68.
 Charpentiere, 648.
 Chartreuse, 162.
 Chateaubriand, 117, 118, 119, 122.
 Chatham, 146, 417.
 Chaumette, 637.
 Chauncey, 148, 546.
 Chazlett, 244.
 Checkley, 545.
 Cheever, 450.
 Cheshfield, 653.
 Chenoo, 129.
 Cheops, 384.
 Chesapeake, 608, 609.
 Chester, 239, 240, 650.
 Chesterfield, 108.
 Chevy Chace, 425.
 Cheverus, 210, 410.
 Cheyne, 649.
 Chicago, 357.
 Chigwell, 243.
 Childe, 426.
 Chilperic, 56, 67.
 China, 93, 94, 106, 397, 401, 481, 586.
 Chinese, 67, 632.
 Chiron, 429.
 Chitty, 192.
 Chrisl Church, 143.
 Christian Observer, 281.
 Christianstadt, 97.
 Christina, 456.
 Christmas, 124, 671.
 Christopherson, 228.
 Chronicles, 122, 430.
 Chrysippus, 442, 443.
 Chrysostom, 437.
 Chuang-tsze, 482 to 494, *passim*.
 Cicero, 51, 64, 79, 97, 176, 214, 217, 218, 279, 282, 377, 381, 419, 443, 578, 579, 583.
 Cimon, 11.
 Circe, 445.
 Claffin, 124. [649.
 Clarendon, 135, 136, 137.
 Clarissa, 320.
 Clare, 606, 652.
 Clarke, 121, 122, 129, 132, 159, 378.
 Clarkson, 237 to 269, *pass.*
 Claudius, 67, 99.
 Claudius Pulcher, 432.
 Clemens Alexandrinus, 429.
 Clement, 121, 650.
 Cleomenes, 590, 600.
 Clerimont, 591.
 Clifford, 271, 651, 657.
 Clinton, 60, 62.
 Clytemnestra, 11.
 Cobbett, 417, 447.
 Cobham, 20, 654.
 Coke, 181.
 Colclough, 614.
 Colebrooke, 22.
 Colman, 214, 638.
 Columbus, 362.
 Colvin, 301 to 331, *passim*.
 Commodus, 67.
 Concord, 415.
 Condé, 455.
 Condy, 546.
 Coneyball, 299.
 Confucius, 383.
 Congo, 129.
 Conrad, 556, 564.
 Constantinople, 22, 55, 87, 88.
 Constantius, 55.
 Conway, 145, 458, 538.
 Cook, 129, 561.
 Cooley, 316.
 Coolidge, 180.
 Cooper, 181, 546.
 Copeland, 227.
 Copley, 371, 508.
 Corday, 639, 640, 641.
 Cornish, 237, 332.
 Cornwall, 650, 676.
 "Corpse Hill," 92.
 Corry, 232.
 Cortez, 593.
 Cassart, 507.
 Cotton, 229, 230.
 Courland, 227.
 Courrier Extraordinaire, 639.
 Courtmay, 656.
 Coventry, 180.
 Cow Lane, 596.
 Cowley, 478.
 Cowper, 222, 596.
 Cox, 252.
 Craumer, 279.
 Crawford, 436.
 Creech, 244.
 Crequi, 606.
 Crespigney, 606.
 Creusa, 382.
 Crinas, 443.
 Cripplelegate, 477.
 Crocker, 405.
 Crockett, 209.
 Croese, 239, 240, 242, 262.

- Crofts, 616.
 Cromartie, 629.
 Cromwell, 134, 135, 170, 177.
 Cromwell's Head, 597.
 Crosby, 598.
 Croyland Abbey, 124.
 Cruikshanks, 401.
 Cullender, 33, 664.
 Cunningham, 538.
 Curran, 605.
 Curwen, 513, 595.
 Cushing, 537.
 Cutbeard, 591.
 Cuthbert, 37, 606.
 Cutler, 508, 546, 551, 553, 554, 563.
 Cutter, 509.
 Cyclops, 430.
 Cyrus, 382.
 D.
 Daddy Osgood, 578.
 Dagobert, 74.
 Daille, 497, 498, 507, 546.
 Damberger, 622.
 Dammory, 652.
 Dana, 142, 190, 191, 276, 337.
 Danes, 614.
 Danforth, 448.
 Darden, 184.
 Davenport, 299, 509, 510, 512, 531, 535, 546, 547, 566.
 David, 16, 221, 617, 618, 619, 620.
 Davis, 397, 399, 400, 402, 586.
 Dead Sea, 116, 118, 119, 121, 123.
 D'Acres, 652.
 D'Arblay, 103.
 De Blois, 24, 662.
 De Burgh, 652.
 Decatur, 609, 610, 611, 624.
 Dedication, 679.
 Defoe, 87.
 De Grandison, 653.
 De Henricourt, 607.
 Dehon, 597.
 De Hoveden, 669.
 De la Croix, 507.
 Delancey, 509.
 Delaware, 252.
 Delia, 100.
 Demades, 52.
 Demarat, 58, 59.
 De Medicis, 661.
 Demetrius, 97.
 Deming, 302, 312, 322.
 Democritus, 360.
 Demosthenes, 97.
 Dentrecolles, 481.
 Denmark, 52, 53, 88, 640.
 De Pauw, 400, 402.
 Deptford, 267.
 De Ris, 607.
 Desdemona, 82.
 Deshon, 538.
 Despencer, 655.
 De Thou, 622.
 Dettlingen, 623.
 De Uzerches, 607.
 De Valence, 655.
 De Vassor, 612.
 De Verdon, 652.
 Devergie, 357.
 Devereux, 677.
 Devon, 677.
 De Warre, 654.
 De Worde, 125.
 Dexter, 25, 450.
 Didian Law, 342.
 Dido, 382.
 Dickens, 568.
 Dickson, 31.
 Diemerbroeck, 49.
 Diemschid, 475.
 Digby, 640, 641, 642.
 Diodorus, 18, 342.
 Diogeues, 16, 17, 18, 217.
 Diogenes Laertius, 373.
 Dionysius, 12, 98, 583.
 Dirk Halteraick, 238.
 Dodsley's Annual Register, 578.
 Domitian, 67, 106, 120.
 Don Quixote, 591.
 Doolittle, 330.
 Dorchester Neck, 575.
 Dorchester Point, 643.
 Doring, 564.
 Dorsett, 66, 613, 622, 677.
 Douglas, 425, 536.
 Dover, 319.
 Doyle, 634.
 Dowse, 541.
 Draco, 206, 207, 209, 226.
 Draper, 91.
 Drury, 361.
 Druses, 400, 401.
 Dryden, 478, 480, 481, 576.
 Du Barri, 671.
 Dullin, 89, 249.
 Dubois, 635.
 Ducange, 648.
 Dudley, 181, 298, 427.
 Duff, 120, 435.
 Dugdale, 647, 648, 674.
 Du Halde, 402.
 Dulany, 601.
 Dummer, 550, 551, 552, 556.
 Dumont, 605.
 Dundee, 31.
 Duncald, 480.
 Dunmow, 124.
 Duny, 331, 640, 664.
 Dupont, 636.
 Durandus, 124.
 Dutch, 578.
 Dyer, 232.
 E.
 Earle, 94.
 Easter Eve, 675.
 Eastman, 182, 183.
 Easton, 158.
 Eatona, 378.
 Ecclesiastes, 111, 267.
 Ecclesiasticus, 431.
 Echeloot Indians, 378.
 Eckley, 597.
 Eden, 70.
 Edes, 596.
 Edessa, 57.
 Edgeworth, 103.
 Edinburgh, 89, 241.
 Edinburgh Review, 178, 209, 346.
 Edmund I., 124.
 Edmund Plantagenet, 650.
 Edom, 116.
 Edward, I., 26, 187, 589, 652.
 Edward III., 342, 406, 649.
 Edward IV., 342, 589, 676.
 Edward, the Confessor, 595.
 Egypt, 33, 88, 106, 129, 400, 436.
 Egyptians, 19, 102, 110, 111, 129, 131, 206, 377, 378, 400, 517, 632, 661.
 Ekron, 431.
 Elah, 617.
 Eldon, 192, 193, 230.
 El Dorado, 71, 103.
 Eli, 197, 198.
 Eliot, 91, 495, 502, 630.
 Elliot, 610.
 Eliphaz, 217.
 Elizabeth, 103, 170, 407, 409, 593, 661.
 Elizabeth Island, 285.
 Embomma, 129, 130.
 Empedocles, 373.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, 268.
 Endor, 363, 480, 665, 670, 678.
 England, 188, 206, 210, 229, 253, 268, 346, 407, 409, 576, 588, 591, 595, 599, 600, 601, 604, 605, 606, 614, 632, 633, 634.
 English Canaan, 628.
 English Mark, 651.
 Enoch, 57.
 Epicurus, 481.
 Erasistratus, 442, 443.
 Erasmus, 152.
 Erfurth, 125.
 Erpingham, 638.
 Errieus, 661.

- Erskine, 84.
 Erving, 515.
 Eastwell, 677.
 Espinasse, 598.
 Ethiopia, 106.
 Europe, 106, 131, 576, 622, 665.
 Eurypus, 443.
 Eusebins, 465.
 Eustis, 430.
 Entwaw Springs, 415.
 Evans, 610.
 Eve, 429.
 Evelyn, 134.
 Everett, 55, 204, 277.
 Ewins, 159.
 Exeter, 20, 204, 214, 675, 677.
 Ezekiel, 582, 583, 587.
 F.
 Fabius Maximus, 631.
 Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria, 659.
 Fagan, 193.
 Fairbanks, 190, 191, 337.
 Fakcer, 570, 571, 573, 576.
 Fales, 190, 337.
 Falmouth, 243.
 Falstaff, 624.
 Faneuil, 476 :—495 to 568, passim.
 Faneuil Hall, 211, 499, 500, 501, 535.
 Fanhope, 674.
 Farmer, 496.
 Farnham, 597.
 Farnsworth, 314, 327, 328.
 Farquhar, 480.
 Faraday, 103.
 Farrar, 159.
 Farrago, 189, 347.
 Fasti, 426.
 Faulconbridge, 321.
 Favor, 98.
 Feild, 228.
 Fenelon, 472.
 Fenner, 228.
 Ferrari, 27.
 Fielding, 272.
 Fillebrown, 498.
 Fire Island, 406.
 Fish, 665, 666, 667.
 Flaccus, 106, 337.
 Flauders, 88.
 Florence, 125, 596.
 Fleet, 147.
 Fleet Prison, 268.
 Fleet Street, 656.
 Fleta, 614.
 Flagg, 431.
 Flaberty, 196.
 Flechier, 215.
 Flucker, 514.
 Folsom, 189.
 Fontenelle, 357.
 Fonteneau, 521.
 Foote, 367, 371.
 Ford, 25, 268, 391.
 Fordyce, 27.
 Forresters, 286.
 Forest Hills, 68, 225.
 Forster, 629.
 Fosbrooke, 591.
 Fothergill, 642.
 Fox, 597, 665, 666, 667.
 Foxcroft, 298.
 France, 68, 88, 188, 426, 438, 595, 606, 607, 633, 634, 637, 638, 661, 670, 675.
 Francis I., 73, 97, 619, 654.
 Francis, 598, 663.
 Frankfort, 15.
 Franklin, 20, 142, 574, 599, 603, 604, 644, 645, 646.
 Franks, 614.
 Freund, 56.
 Frederick I., 28.
 Freedly, 181.
 Freeman, 165.
 French Church, 521.
 Freseati, 64.
 Frizzell, 126.
 Frizzles, 189.
 Fuller, 66, 265, 466.
 Fullerton, 605.
 G.
 Gabriel, 57, 119.
 Galen, 459.
 Galilee, 57.
 Gannett, 92, 286.
 Gardner, 299, 601.
 Garth, 430.
 Gates, 77, 81.
 Gathi, 617.
 Gato, 33.
 Gaul, 617, 618, 619.
 Gaule, 659.
 Gauls, 618.
 Gaunt, 217, 656, 674.
 Gavett, 596.
 Gawler, 606.
 Gellia, 107.
 Genesis, 122, 429.
 Genothiaci, 661.
 Genevieve, 73, 75.
 Gonoa, 89.
 Gentleman's Magazine, 376, 594.
 George I., 28, 218, 406.
 George II., 406, 407, 551, 625, 660.
 George III., 59, 90, 103, 144, 145, 147, 275, 604.
 George IV., 207, 209.
 Gerard, 469.
 Germanicus, 29.
 Germaus, 614.
 Germantown, 415.
 Germany, 88, 426, 620.
 Gervais, 475, 670.
 Glizeh, 33.
 Gibraltar, 88.
 Gideon, 597.
 Gill, 61.
 Gillies, 514.
 Gilpin, 74.
 Girondists, 68, 74.
 Glossin, 388.
 Gloucester, 349, 404, 652, 657.
 Goethe, 287.
 Golgotha, 35.
 Goliath, 437, 617, 618, 619.
 Gold, 227.
 Goldsmith, 24, 123, 362, 481, 584, 587, 619.
 Gommorrah, 117, 119, 221.
 Good, 49.
 Goode, 181, 184, 338.
 Gooseberry, 70.
 Gordon, 62, 147, 153, 416, 417.
 Gore, 277.
 Gorton, 480.
 Gosnold, 283.
 Goss, 677.
 Gould, 598.
 Gracchus, 431.
 Grady, 601.
 Grammont, 623.
 Granger, 260.
 Granary, 24, 46, 48, 148, 197, 428, 525, 543.
 Grant, 401, 606.
 Grattan, 606.
 Gratz, 620.
 Graunt, 103.
 Gray, 161, 162, 269, 546, 556.
 Great Britain, 186, 207, 277, 347, 416, 474, 580, 663.
 Great Tom, 125.
 Greece, 105, 126, 204, 355, 373, 430, 535.
 Greeks, 68, 106, 131, 632, 661.
 Green, 596.
 Greene, 62, 150, 474.
 Greenlanders, 35.
 Greenleaf, 192, 329, 330.
 Green Mount, 38.
 Greenwood, 300, 451, 534.
 Gregory, Pope, 474.
 Grey, 347.
 Grey Friars, 632.
 Greville, 678.
 Gridley, 142.
 Griswold, 160, 360.
 Grossman, 7, 8, 18, 24, 25, 41, 50, 115, 132, 288, 680.
 Grotius, 487.

- Grouchy, 132.
 Grozier, 397.
 Grubb, 596.
 Guardian, 613.
 Guerriere, 417.
 Guiana, 130.
 Guideu, 637.
 Guienne, 656.
 Guilford, 413.
 Guillotine, 634, 635.
 Guillotine, 634, 635, 638.
 Guineau, 519.
 Gundebald, 614, 615.
 Gussanville, 663.
 Gustavus Adolphus, 661.
 H.
 Hades, 345.
 Hague, 445.
 Hakin, 400.
 Hale, 62, 124, 177, 188, 189,
 190, 209, 220, 301, 310,
 315, 324, 331, 332, 334,
 640, 664, 666.
 Halford, 134, 135, 136, 139.
 Halifax, 223, 479, 480, 634.
 Hall, 130.
 Hallam, 361.
 Haller, 157.
 Halley, 81.
 Hamilton, 277, 298, 605,
 613.
 Hammond, 180.
 Hancock, 142, 143, 166,
 299, 417, 498, 589.
 Handel, 297, 422, 427.
 Handy, 561.
 Hanaan, 585.
 Hannibal, 45.
 Hanover Square, 140.
 Hanway, 90.
 Harleian Miscellany, 217,
 445, 642.
 Harper, 227.
 Harris, 555.
 Harrison, 255, 395, 396.
 Hart, 661, 662.
 Hartop, 138.
 Harvey, 157, 436.
 Haslett, 597.
 Hatch, 555, 564, 565.
 Haute, 676.
 Hawes, 375.
 Hawkins, 426.
 Hawkes, 332.
 Hawtre, 361.
 Haydn, 346, 407, 577, 579,
 590.
 Hayes, 301.
 Hayley, 477.
 Haynes, 302, 307, 310, 316,
 317, 321, 322.
 Hayward, 430, 561, 597.
 Hazael, 431.
 Hazzard, 226, 545.
 Heath, 172, 610, 611.
 Heber, 360.
 Hebrews, 33, 431.
 Hebrides, 643.
 Hector, 619.
 Heemskerk, 588.
 Helen, 619.
 Henault, 661.
 Henderson, 304.
 Henry II., 649, 651.
 Henry III., 187, 241, 661.
 Henry IV., 73, 74, 342, 352,
 409, 606, 661.
 Henry VI., 349, 674.
 Henry VII., 87, 88, 134,
 185.
 Henry VIII., 78, 133, 136,
 138, 139, 170, 185, 188,
 342, 346, 385, 409, 411,
 413, 477, 589, 631.
 Henry, 639, 663.
 Hephestion, 373.
 Herbert, 104, 133, 138, 607.
 Hercules, 436.
 Hereford, 649, 656, 657.
 Herlicius, 661, 672, 673.
 Hermes, 428.
 Herne, 676.
 Herod, 93.
 Herodotus, 18, 21, 436.
 Heron, 657.
 Herophylus, 413, 459.
 Herr Driesbach, 613.
 Herschell, 622, 643.
 Hertford, 133, 135.
 Highgate, 37.
 Hildanus, 49, 373.
 Hill, 298, 307, 308, 310, 368,
 369, 597.
 Hiller, 553.
 Hindoos, 22, 436.
 Hindostan, 93, 100.
 Hippocrates, 436, 442, 459.
 Hirst, 508.
 Hobart, 134, 605.
 Hobkirk's Hill, 415.
 Hoboken, 615, 643.
 Hodgson, 361.
 Hodson, 601.
 Hog Alley, 562.
 Hogarth, 271.
 Holborn, 134.
 Holbrook, 408.
 Holden, 124, 227.
 Holmshed, 87, 424.
 Holland, 88, 506, 650, 662.
 Holme, 591.
 Holmes, 363, 499, 546.
 Holy Land, 651, 652.
 Homans, 450.
 Homer, 15, 17, 143, 429,
 430, 585, 586.
 Hone, 591.
 Hook, 76, 367.
 Hooper, 309, 546.
 Hopkins, 221, 422, 424.
 Horace, 36, 51, 97, 160,
 360, 367, 404, 568, 587,
 592, 663, 664.
 Horatio, 599, 660.
 Horne, 178.
 Horstius, 373.
 Hossack, 605.
 Hottentots, 34.
 Hough, 245, 246.
 Houndsditch, 661.
 Howe, 55, 597.
 Hubbard, 627.
 Hudibras, 260, 454, 627,
 628.
 Huger, 496.
 Huguenots, 496 to 500, pas-
 sim : also, 506, 507, 523,
 545, 546.
 Hull, 66, 274, 646.
 Hume, 186, 241.
 Humphreys, 646, 647.
 Hungary, 632.
 Hungerford, 233.
 Hunt, 506.
 Huntington, 655.
 Hutchinson, 226, 228, 229,
 230, 515, 538, 586, 592,
 640.
 Hydriaphia, 42, 65, 131,
 281.
 Hydrophobia, 193.
 Hyperion, 582.
 I.
 Idumea, 116.
 Inman, 513.
 Innocent III., 466.
 Ireland, 87, 93.
 Irenæus, 171.
 Ireton, 134.
 Irish, 193.
 Irving, 557.
 Isabella, 646.
 Israel, 431.
 Israelites, 102.
 Isis, 428.
 Isip, 406.
 Istampol, 186.
 J.
 Jahbok, 118.
 Jackson, 55, 500, 605.
 Jacobs, 312.
 Jahn, 33, 432, 433, 434,
 435.
 Jamaica Pond, 69.
 James I., 170, 612, 660.
 James II., 232, 243, 248,
 253, 259.
 Jardin des Plantes, 75.
 Jasper, 256.
 Jay, 276.
 Jefferson, 85, 163, 344, 392.
 Jeffrey, 603.

- Jeffreys, 235.
 Jeffries, 450, 479, 480, 537.
 Jekyll, 532, 535.
 Jenkins, 157.
 Jenks, 117, 118.
 Jenyns, 42.
 Jepson, 597.
 Jeremiah, 105.
 Jerusalem, 119.
 Jesse, 615, 620, 628.
 Jew, 620.
 Jews, 106, 131, 170, 186, 188, 632.
 Job, 217, 225, 430.
 Jonathan, 116, 167, 414, 417.
 Jones, 159, 181, 435, 510, 513, 531, 541, 551, 566.
 Johnson Samuel, 31, 90, 107, 108, 183, 277, 409, 421, 477, 480, 481, 601, 602, 603, 604.
 Johnson, 55, 305, 308, 475.
 Johnnot, 493.
 Jonny Armstrong, 425.
 Jonson Ben, 59, 479, 591.
 Jordan, 117, 118.
 Joseph, 57, 429.
 Josephus, 118, 120.
 Josselyn, 283.
 Judah, 116.
 Judæus Apella, 642.
 Judd, 77.
 Judea, 105, 116, 128, 355.
 Judicial Astrology, 661, 673.
 Judson, 616.
 Julia, 67.
 Junius, 525, 578.
 Juno, 421.
 Juvenal, 79, 535.
 K.
 Kaimes, 367.
 Kamschatka, 35.
 Kast, 450.
 Katherine of Arragon, 650.
 Keatinge, 128.
 Keayne, 454.
 Keith, 239.
 Kensall Green, 37.
 Kent, 650.
 Kerr, 623.
 Kidd, 285.
 Kidder, 86.
 Kilby, 567.
 Kilmarnock, 629, 630.
 King, 276.
 Kings, 431.
 King's Chapel, 48, 55, 288, 297, 510, 534.
 Kingsmill, 247.
 Kingstreet, 509.
 Kingstown, 607.
 Kircherus, 434.
 Kirchmaun, 106.
 Kirriel, 677.
 Kishon, 118.
 Kitchen, 231, 232.
 Kittal-al-Machaid, 401.
 Knox, 369.
 Koran, 21.
 L.
 Lacedemonians, 12, 13, 17.
 La Chceze, 636.
 Lacombe, 648.
 Lafayette, 62, 64, 636.
 Lahore, 570.
 Lally, 636.
 Lamartine, 68.
 Lambert, 555.
 Lamia, 49, 373.
 Lancashire, 420.
 Lancaster, 650.
 Landgrave of Hesse, 387.
 Landseer, 678.
 Lane, 598.
 Langdon, 92, 127.
 Langstaff, 92.
 Lansdowne, 365.
 Laou-Keun, 481.
 Larassy, 179.
 Lares, 64.
 Larkin, 101.
 Larrey, 607.
 Larvæ, 64.
 Lathrop, 595.
 Latimer, 75, 279, 655.
 Laurel Hill, 38.
 Laurens, 374, 496.
 Lavater, 625.
 Lavinia, 619.
 Lazarus, 56.
 Leadenhall Market, 213, 220.
 Le Cat, 643.
 Lechemere, 554.
 Lectouse, 37.
 Ledeæ, 228.
 Lee, 126, 276.
 L'Etombe, 166.
 Le Gros, 639.
 Leibnitz, 438.
 Leicestershire, 68, 648.
 Le Mercier, 497, 498, 546, 547, 548, 549.
 Lemures, 64.
 Lenoie, 40.
 Lenox, 605.
 Leopard, 608.
 Lepidus, 52.
 Leneæ, 663.
 Levi, 382.
 Leviticus, 230.
 Lewis, 378.
 Lewyn, 81.
 Lexington, 415.
 Liancourt, 636.
 Libo, 99.
 Licinius, 80.
 Lilly, 591, 661, 673.
 Lincoln, 94, 312, 674.
 Lincoln's Inn, 593.
 Lind, 420.
 Lindsey, 133, 135.
 Linneus, 399.
 Linnington, 533.
 Lippstadt, 661.
 Lithered, 560.
 Little Belt, 417.
 Liverpool, 417.
 Livingston, 276.
 Livy, 52, 80, 617, 619.
 Lizard, 407.
 Lloyd, 35, 265, 367, 449, 449.
 Lloyd's Lists, 404.
 Locke, 266.
 Locrian Law, 342.
 Loe, 248, 249.
 Lollards, 658.
 Lombards, 106.
 London, 37, 56, 67, 76, 87, 88, 89, 94, 118, 211, 215, 220, 237, 346, 421, 588, 589, 591, 624, 632, 632, 676.
 London Quarterly Review, 212, 356, 397, 391, 622, 634, 641.
 London Times, 358.
 Long, 513.
 Long Branch, 320.
 Long Island, 62.
 Longshanks, 187, 583.
 Longspee, 651.
 Lot's Wife, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122.
 London, 213, 214.
 Louis, 636.
 Louis XI., 74.
 Louis XII., 73.
 Louis XIII., 74, 352, 607.
 Louis XIV., 38, 74, 75, 351, 607, 612, 670, 671.
 Louis XV., 671, 672.
 Louis XVI., 635, 637, 638.
 Louison, 636, 637.
 Lovat, 628.
 Lovell, 159—496 to 530, passim.
 Lowell, 83.
 Lucan, 670.
 Lucilius, 106, 107, 168, 377, 443.
 Ludlow, 226.
 Lum Akum, 398.
 Luther, 388.
 Lutton, 123, 133.
 Lutzengen, 661.
 Lyeurgus, 17.
 Lyman, 202, 203.
 Lynn, 658.
 Lyon, 324.
 Lyons, 438.

- M.**
 Mabillon, 123.
 Macabe, 195.
 McAndrew, 181.
 Macartney, 402, 605.
 Macaulay, 231 to 269, *passim*—also 361.
 McDonough, 418.
 McGammon, 196.
 McGill, 332.
 Machaon, 430.
 Machiavelli, 95, 115, 220, 234.
 Machyl, 82.
 McKeon, 614.
 Mackenzie, 606, 610, 611, 624.
 Mackintosh, 207, 346.
 McLean, 621.
 McNamara, 197.
 McNaughten, 573.
 Machpelah, 299.
 Mæcenæus, 36, 679.
 Mag-Astro-Mancer, 659.
 Magdalen College, 243, 244, 246.
 Magdalene, 56.
 Magee, 195.
 Magnalia, 582.
 Mahomet, 171.
 Mahoney, 195.
 Maillard, 73.
 Mailoel, 654.
 Maintenance, 671, 672.
 Majoribanks, 401.
 Malmesbury, 87.
 Malone, 481.
 Malpèrant, 654.
 Malta, 33, 624.
 Maltravers, 655.
 Mammon, 170.
 Mamre, 299.
 Manchester, 303 to 325, *passim*.
 Mandans, 23, 41.
 Mandeville, 118, 344, 345, 599.
 Manlius, 617, 618, 619, 634.
 Maues, 64.
 Manigault, 496.
 Mann, 382, 629.
 Mannerling, 360.
 Manney, 654.
 Mansfield, 95, 115, 220, 234.
 Mantua, 422.
 Marat, 217.
 Marbeuf, 639.
 Marc Antony, 387.
 Marcellinus, 64.
 March, 653, 655, 666.
 Marco Polo, 400.
 Marcus Antoninus, 584.
 Mareschall, 654.
 Maret, 37.
 Mariner, 129.
 Marion, 496.
 Mariù, 88.
 Marius, 63.
 Marseillais, 425, 637.
 Marseilles, 88.
 Marshall, 55, 83, 355.
 Martel, 73.
 Martial, 107, 419, 586, 587, 595.
 Martin, 189.
 Martinico, 166.
 Martinique, 29.
 Mary, Bloody, 75, 82, 93, 405.
 Maryland, 153, 154.
 Masbee, 596.
 Mason, 101, 102.
 Massachusetts, 84, 94, 114, 155, 156, 164, 165, 166, 176, 187, 231, 276, 632.
 Mather, 94, 280, 327, 364, 367, 646, 582, 668.
 Mathews, 180, 367, 613.
 Matcoara, 378.
 Maury, 636.
 Maverick, 163.
 Maximilian II., 620, 621.
 Maynard, 81.
 Mazarin, 135.
 Mazzei, 163.
 Mead, 588.
 Mears, 497, 563.
 Meaux, 671.
 Mediterranean, 118.
 Megret, 217.
 Melancthon, 388.
 Melli Melli, 568.
 Mena, 130, 583, 587, 592.
 Menalcas, 90.
 Menander, 217.
 Menu, 130.
 Merrick, 221.
 Merrill 313 to 325, *passim*.
 Mewins, 464.
 Mexico, 101, 638.
 Michaelis, 119.
 Midsummer Night's Dream, 592.
 Milan, 220, 456.
 Mildmay, 133.
 Miletum, 342.
 Milford Haven, 88.
 Millar, 643.
 Millionarians, 672.
 Millingen, 36, 49.
 Millens, 92.
 Miller, 555.
 Millot, 659.
 Mills, 435.
 Miltiades, 11.
 Milton, 159, 385, 387, 477.
 Minuzies, 555.
 Minoreesses, 657.
 Minors, 654.
 Minsbull, 386.
 Mirepoix, 382.
 Mirfield, 380.
 Misson, 56.
 Missouri, 23.
 Mitford, 477.
 Moab, 116.
 Mock, 597.
 Mohawk Indian, 647.
 Mohun, 605, 613.
 Momus, 368.
 Montmouth, 235.
 Montacute, 650.
 Montaigne, 27, 104, 343, 443.
 Montague, 55.
 Montefiore, 15.
 Monte Notte, 381.
 Montesquieu, 342.
 Montezuma, 63, 593.
 Montmorenci, 607.
 Moody, 30, 189, 471.
 Moore, 472.
 Moorhead, 150, 286, 389, 531, 532, 546.
 Moors, 138.
 Moravians, 379.
 More, 359, 361.
 Morin, 419, 420.
 Morland, 466 to 470, *passim*.
 Morose, 591.
 Morris, 420, 609, 611.
 Mortimer, 651, 653.
 Morton, 628, 634.
 Moses, 429, 660.
 Mount Auburn, 38, 46, 68, 225.
 Mounts Bay, 407.
 Mount Hope, 33.
 Moyle, 677.
 Mudge, 608.
 Mullowny, 194.
 Mun Chung, 398.
 Murphy, 101, 102, 107, 193.
 Murray, 477.
 Murulus, 106.
 Moses, 421.
 Muskerry, 243.
 Mussenden, 657.
 Mydas, 591.
 Mysore, 436.
 Mytelene, 12.
N
 Naaman, 431.
 Nain, 320.
 Nantasket, 408.
 Nantes, 37.
 Nantucket, 77.
 Naples, 33, 88.
 Napoleon, 105, 381, 393.
 Narcissa, 22.
 Nares, 580, 591, 595.

- Narragansett Bay, 283, 284.
 Naseby, 131, 386.
 Natchez, 587.
 Nau, 122.
 Negoose, 189, 190, 191
 347.
 Nemours, 607.
 New, 681.
 Newcastle, 90.
 New England, 177, 221,
 283, 408, 476, 607, 627.
 Newgate, 179, 183, 259,
 622, 632.
 New London, 363.
 New North Church, 125,
 126.
 New Orleans, 604.
 New Rochelle, 523, 530.
 Newton, 66.
 New York, 576.
 New York Evening Post,
 330, 331.
 New Zealand, 23, 94.
 Nicholls, 193, 422, 648.
 Nicolas, 648.
 Ninkempanp, 456.
 Niobe, 121.
 Nipmug, 496.
 Noah, 176.
 Noailles, 623, 671.
 Noble, 262.
 Noddie's Island, 163.
 Nollekens, 676.
 Norfolk, 677.
 Norman, 453.
 Normandy, 635, 675.
 Norris, 232.
 North American Review,
 330.
 Norway, 88, 168.
 Norwich, 346.
 Notre Dame, 124.
 Nova Scotia, 568.
 Noyes, 506.
 Numa, 69, 105, 106.
 Numbers, 122.
 Nunhead, 37.
 O.
 Oak Hall, 133.
 O'Brien, 355.
 O'Connell, 606.
 Odyssey, 11.
 Ogilvie, 606.
 Oglethorpe, 601, 603, 604.
 Ogygia, 420.
 Olam Fodla, 93.
 Old Brick, 123, 132, 128
 567.
 Oldmixon, 268.
 Oliver, 140, 141, 142, 513
 533.
 Ombaus, 191, 347.
 Oporto, 55.
 Orde, 183.
 Orfila, 219.
 Origen, 436.
 Orinoco, 130.
 Orleans, 135.
 Oriery, 250.
 Osborne, 573.
 Osiris, 428.
 O'Shane, 194.
 Ossa, 658.
 Ossoli, 406.
 Otis, Harrison Gray, 159.
 Otis, James, 211, 354.
 Ottomans, 672, 673.
 Outhier, 51.
 Ovid, 64, 98, 105, 106, 223,
 248, 392, 413, 558.
 Oxford, 87, 125, 244, 245,
 248, 249, 360, 497, 498,
 499, 653, 654.
 Oxnard, 513.
 P.
 Packinett, 498.
 Page, 566.
 Paine, 598.
 Palestine, 34, 121, 204, 651.
 Palermo, 591.
 Palinurus, 168.
 Pallas, 99.
 Palmer, 536, 537, 597.
 Pantagathus, 586.
 Parant Duchatelet, 219.
 Paré, 589.
 Pareicus, 588.
 Parian Marbles, 382.
 Paris, 37, 39, 73, 89, 249,
 438, 634, 635, 637, 667,
 671.
 Parker, 246, 506.
 Parkman, 270 to 273, pas-
 sim :—also 278, 335, 336.
 Parr, 157.
 Parsces, 130.
 Parsons, 276, 451.
 Passy, 599.
 Patchogue, 406.
 Patroclus, 15, 67, 107.
 Pauketpeeker, 457.
 Paulding, 62.
 Paul, 658.
 Paul, 606.
 Pausanias, 421.
 Pavice, 565.
 Paxton, 513.
 Paybody, 175.
 Peake, 192.
 Pearson, 175, 189.
 Peck, 498.
 Perker, 449.
 Peel, 207, 346.
 Peckin, 481.
 Pelion, 658.
 Pelletier, 637.
 Pemberton, 536, 563, 566.
 Pembroke, 653, 654, 655, 677.
 Penn, 231 to 269 passim :—
 also 339.
 Pennant, 634.
 Pennsylvania, 94.
 Pseudoleon, 605.
 Pepin, 73.
 Pepperell, 508.
 Pepusch, 427.
 Pepys, 466, 468, 577.
 Percival, 599, 603.
 Percy, 425.
 Perry, 418, 610, 611.
 Persepolis, 475.
 Persia, 475.
 Persians, 632.
 Persius, 692.
 Peters, 450.
 Petre, 281.
 Petronel, 620, 621.
 Few, 49.
 Peyret, 508.
 Pharamond, 72.
 Pharsalia, 670.
 Phelps, 227.
 Philadelphia, 36, 38, 268,
 339, 614.
 Philip Augustus, 39.
 Philip the Bold, 73.
 Philippus, 588.
 Phillips, 408, 421, 495, 505,
 531, 541, 542 :—also 550
 to 566 passim :—also 568.
 Philistines, 617, 618, 619.
 Philomela, 42.
 Picardy, 635.
 Pickering, 165, 221, 439.
 Pickett, 189.
 Pickworth, 283.
 Pierce, 597.
 Pierre de Nemours, 39.
 Pierson, 226.
 Pigot, 655.
 Pinchbeck, 675.
 Pinckney, 277.
 Pindar, 96.
 Pineau, 49.
 Pinohe, 81.
 Pitcairn, 54, 223.
 Fitcher, 363, 658.
 Pitt, 145, 146, 606.
 Pitycus, 42.
 Place de Grève, 73, 636, 637.
 Place de la Revolution, 638.
 Place St. Antoine, 638.
 Plaine de Mont Louis, 40.
 Plaisant, 639.
 Plaistowe, 230.
 Plato, 20, 49, 373, 377, 429
 Plautus, 577, 587.
 Pleydell, 360.
 Plimouth, 283, 628.
 Pliny, 79, 99, 117, 121, 419,
 430, 442, 443, 450, 459,
 461, 462, 582, 583, 588.

- Plutarch, 105, 106, 217, 400, 591.
 Pococke, 111, 118.
 Podalirius, 430.
 Pœon, 430.
 Poitiers, 654.
 Poitou, 358.
 Polack, 23.
 Pole, 75.
 Polhamus, 319, 320, 323.
 Pollard, 29.
 Pompadour, 41, 43.
 Pompey, 443, 444, 670.
 Ponthia, 373.
 Pontraci, 39, 40, 54, 89.
 Popayan, 130.
 Pope, 111, 334, 364, 453, 480.
 Popple, 263.
 Porchalion, 674.
 Portland, 64, 65.
 Port Mahon, 42.
 Potter, 12.
 Powell, 386.
 Pratt, 314, 327.
 Pretender, 629.
 Prevot, 49.
 Priam, 322.
 Price, 520, 541.
 Priest, 612.
 Primrose, 111.
 Prince of Orange, 233.
 Pringle, 426.
 Prioleau, 496.
 Prior, 54, 233.
 Pritchard, 550.
 Proctor, 632.
 Prudhomme, 637.
 Psamatheus, 33.
 Pseudodoxia, 431, 660.
 Puddifant, 131, 133.
 Pudding Lane, 596.
 Purchase Street, 597.
 Puzzlepot, 189.
 Pwan Yekoo, 398.
 Pyramus, 592.
 Pythagoras, 377.
 Q.
 Quakers, 445.
 Quiney, 43, 156, 404, 416, 605.
 Quintilius Varus, 614.
 Quintus, 578.
 R.
 Rachel, 569.
 Radzivillo, 121.
 Rand, 449, 643.
 Randall, 228.
 Rantolph, 85, 603.
 Ranelagh, 266.
 Rapin, 17, 185, 186, 241, 349, 612, 674.
 Rauber, 620, 621.
 Ravallac, 73.
 Ravenscroft, 298.
 Raymond, 309, 315, 326, 327.
 Read, 520.
 Reason, 562.
 Recueil Periodique, 643.
 Reese, 357.
 Regent's Inlet, 645.
 Religio Medici, 640.
 Remus, 64.
 Reuben, 116.
 Revallion, 582.
 Richard II., 649, 650, 657.
 Richardson, 662.
 Richelieu, 612.
 Richmond, 133, 135, 677.
 Ridley, 279, 571.
 Riley, 181.
 Rivet, 20.
 Robertson, 241, 299, 391, 392, 393.
 Robespierre, 638.
 Robinson, 232, 260, 261, 514.
 Robin Hood, 517.
 Rochelle, 495, 506, 507, 551.
 Rochester, 216, 266, 424, 480, 587, 631.
 Rochefoucault, 217, 218, 338.
 Rockingham, 145.
 Rockport, 16.
 Roebuck, 606.
 Rœderer, 636, 637.
 Rogers, 279, 417.
 Rogerson, 450.
 Roma, 617.
 Roman, 618, 619.
 Romans, 68, 106, 131, 475, 592, 594, 595, 617, 632, 661.
 Roman Catholics, 600.
 Rome, 87, 89, 263, 343, 442, 460, 475, 614, 638, 661.
 Romilly, 207, 346.
 Romulus, 105, 474, 591, 595.
 Rosamond, 651.
 Roscius, 215.
 Rose Cullender, 640.
 Rose in Bloom, 405.
 Ross, 641, 645, 646, 647.
 Rothschild, 15, 54.
 Rous, 227.
 Rouse, 631.
 Rousseau, 476.
 Rowlett, 82.
 Roxbury, 220, 221, 227, 566.
 Royal Society, 622, 644.
 Rue d'Enfer, 39, 42.
 Rufus, 320.
 Runjeet Singh, 570, 571, 572, 573.
 Russell, 29.
 Rush, 447.
 Rushworth, 424.
 Russia, 276.
 Russians, 129, 474.
 Ruthven, 606.
 Rutland Herald, 318, 331.
 Rymer's Fœdera, 349, 675.
 S.
 St. Andrew, 55.
 St. Anne, 56.
 St. Augustine, 51.
 St. Clara, 52.
 St. Christophers, 533.
 St. Croix, 11, 52, 98, 422.
 St. Denis, 73, 75.
 St. Edmunds Bury, 640.
 St. James, 424.
 St. Katherine, 651.
 St. Luke, 55.
 St. Margaret, 651, 675.
 St. Martins, 124.
 St. Mary, 655, 675.
 St. Matthew, 217.
 St. Michael, 57, 124.
 St. Omers, 263, 426.
 St. Paul, 437.
 St. Paul's, 225, 642, 656.
 St. Peter, 56.
 St. Pierre, 476.
 St. Richard, 656.
 St. Saba, 122.
 St. Saturnin, 37.
 St. Thomas, 56, 321, 656.
 Sabine, 510.
 Sabura, 587.
 Sackville, 145, 549, 551, 613.
 Salem, 54.
 Salewarp, 651.
 Salisbury, 307, 650, 651, 669, 674.
 Sallust, 381.
 Salmon, 87.
 Salter, 550.
 Saltonstall, 533.
 Samce, 665.
 Samson, 437.
 Samuel, 111, 363, 434, 585, 620, 660, 670.
 Samuels, 15.
 Sancho Panza, 192, 265.
 Sanderston, 131.
 Sanson, 633, 635, 636, 637, 638.
 Sardinia, 88.
 Sargent, 190, 533.
 Sarsaparilla, 133.
 Sarum, 363.
 Saul, 16, 67, 434, 617, 618, 670.
 Saulien, 37.
 Saunders, 176.
 Sauvages, 101.

- Savage**, 55.
Savoy, 606.
Scaliger, 437.
Scarsegin, 620, 621.
Schmidt, 381.
Schrideder, 356.
Scipio Africanus, 22, 216.
Scott, 49, 227, 269, 360, 375, 376, 422, 426, 606.
Scrope, 675.
Scutari, 22.
Segor, 117.
Seignelay, 239.
Selridge, 449.
Selkirk, 171.
Selwyn, 179, 237, 615, 623, 642.
Seneca, 106, 107, 163, 169, 377, 443, 585.
Senisimo, 421.
Serampore, 231.
Sergius Orator, 461.
Servius, 97, 279.
Sevrès, 671.
Sewall, 142, 165, 513, 546, 553, 558, 561, 630.
Seymour, 133, 136, 608.
Shades, 587.
Shakespeare, 83, 409, 419, 658.
Shandois, 77, 82.
Sharp, 93.
Shattuck, 222, 439, 440.
Shaw, 112, 221, 459.
Shays, 941.
Shea, 54.
Sheerness, 558, 564.
Shelburne, 605.
Shelden, 261.
Sheldon, 314, 327.
Shelson, 229.
Sheridan, 613.
Shirley, 291, 297, 530.
Shochoh, 615.
Shouldham, 652.
Shrewsbury, 320.
Shute, 298.
Shylock, 171.
Siberia, 35.
Sicily, 33, 591.
Sicilies, the Two, 89.
Siddim, 117.
Sidney, 425.
Sigal, 515.
Sigourney, 496, 498.
Simmons, 130.
Skinner, 309, 331.
Smallpiece, 598.
Smith, Sidney, 367.
Smith, 24, 27, 71, 152, 164, 227, 289, 509, 591.
Smink, 101.
Smollett, 241, 243.
Snow, 537.
Socrates, 592.
Sodom, 117, 119, 120, 123, 215, 221.
Sodoma, 122.
Solomon, 192.
Solon, 209.
Somerset, 677.
Somnium Scipionis, 373.
Soo Chune, 398.
Soong, 482.
Sophia Charlotte, 28.
Sorbiere, 437, 457.
Sosigenes, 474.
Southampton, 135.
Southwick, 227.
Spain, 650, 662, 675.
Spaniards, 130.
Sparks, 62, 561.
Speed, 76, 424, 677.
Spelman, 648.
Spitalfields, 67, 256.
Spooner, 450.
Spring, 512.
Springett, 252.
Sprott, 676.
Stafford, 632.
Stair, 623.
Stanford, 650.
Stanhope, 593.
Starkie, 192.
Stauford, 675.
Steele, 555.
Stephanus, 105.
Stephens, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123.
Sterne, 37.
Sternhold, 231, 424, 425.
Steuben, 62.
Stevens, 554.
Stevenson, 232.
Stewart, 609.
Stillman, 631.
Stirling Castle, 95.
Stirrington, 652.
Stockholm, 52.
Stone Chapel, 296.
Story, 268.
Stow, 20, 67, 346, 349, 424.
Stowell, 632.
Strabo, 592.
Streatfield, 105.
Styrie, 77, 81, 82, 88, 139, 279, 280, 281, 409, 410, 424, 631, 632.
Stuart, 603, 605, 606.
Stuarts, 661.
Stubbe, 594.
Sue, 639, 640.
Suetonius, 29, 67, 79, 98, 99, 107, 462.
Suffolk, 654.
Sully, 352, 606.
Sulmo, 300.
Summer, 19, 132.
Sunderland, 89, 233.
Surinam, 351.
Sweden, 661.
Swedenborg, 378, 379.
Swedes, 661.
Swift, 32, 193, 367, 422.
Swingford, 674.
Switzerland, 394.
Sykes, 244.
Sylla, 63, 97.
Sylvester, 596.
Syracuse, 33.
Syrens, 421.
Syria, 34, 88.
Syrians, 632.

T.

Tacitus, 29, 99, 107.
Tahite, 378, 380.
Tailor, 554.
Tappan, 58, 60.
Tarpeian Rock, 618.
Tasman, 129.
Tate, 31, 596.
Taylor, 84, 110, 157, 215, 394, 395, 396, 397, 638, 662.
Taunton, 235.
Tees, 379.
Templeman, 451.
Terence, 587.
Tertullian, 122.
Testamenta Vetusta, 648, 649.
Tewksbury, 655, 673.
Thacher, 31, 58, 61, 126, 127, 568, 605.
Thebes, 16, 32.
Theodolpus, 37.
Theodosius, 36.
Theophrastus, 587.
Thessalus, 443.
Thessaly, 670.
Thevet, 118.
Thiermeyer, 642.
Thomas, 346, 480.
Thomas of Canterbury, 281.
Thompson, 86.
Thornton, 477, 604.
Thurlow, 589.
Tiberius, 98.
Tibullus, 100, 160.
Tierney, 606.
Tilbury, 670.
Tillotson, 178, 238, 240, 262, 266.
Timoleon, 12.
Tinville, 638.
Tonga Islands, 129.
Tongataboo, 129.
Tonstrina, 588.
Portugas, 407.
Touchet, 380.
Tournay, 67.
Tower Hill, 631, 632.

- Townshend, 145.
 Trajan, 476.
 Treuchard, 265.
 Trent, 606.
 Tresham, 77.
 Treviso, 381.
 Troughton, 644.
 Troulbeck, 297.
 Troy, 322, 430.
 Trunton, 221.
 Truro, 406.
 Taufugge, 654.
 Tubero, 373.
 Tuck, 564, 566.
 Tuckett, 606.
 Tuckey, 129, 130.
 Tudor, 76.
 Tunbrugge, 654.
 Turkey, 106.
 Turkish Empire, 672.
 Turks, 123.
 Turenne, 73, 75.
 Turner, 155, 157, 231, 570, 575.
 Twiss, 230.
 Tyburn, 340, 632.
 Tyler, 500.
 U.
 * Ucalegon, 143.
 Ula-Deguisi, 123.
 Ulysses, 106, 109, 420.
 United States, 347, 407, 434, 610.
 Usher, 561.
 Uxbridge, 16.
 V.
 Val de Grace, 68.
 Valentia, 606.
 Valerius Maximus, 374.
 Vallemont, 455.
 Valois, 622.
 Valvasor, 620.
 Van Buren, 85, 95, 96.
 Van Butchell, 445, 447.
 Vandyke, 137.
 Van Gelder, 59.
 Van Pronk, 25.
 Vans, 184.
 Van Wart, 63.
 Varden, 401.
 Vardy, 564.
 Varro, 583.
 Vassal, 296.
 Vaughan, 361.
 Velleius Paterculus, 614.
 Vere, 654.
 Verney, 677.
 Vermont, 114.
 Veronica, 57.
 Verulam, 258.
 Vespasian, 29, 67, 98.
 Vesuvius, 121.
 Vexius Valens, 443.
 Victoria, 208.
 Victory, 646.
 Vicq d'Azyr, 37.
 Vienna, 433.
 Villars, 607.
 Vincent, 256, 257, 258.
 Virgil, 76, 79, 97, 99, 419, 422.
 Virginia, 153, 154.
 Voiney, 117, 119, 121.
 Voltaire, 217, 637.
 W.
 Wade, 570, 572, 573, 575.
 Wakefield, 359, 466.
 Waldo, 90, 302.
 Walpole, 382, 431, 629, 674.
 Waltham, 676.
 Walsingham, 65, 83, 84, 650, 656.
 Ward, 281, 282, 528, 529, 595.
 Ward's Curwen, 510.
 Warre, 235, 236.
 Warren, 55, 66, 222, 446, 450, 597.
 Warwick, 651.
 Washington, 62, 277, 394, 511.
 Waterhouse, 448.
 Waterloo, 132.
 Watts, 366, 677.
 Webb, 91, 126, 546.
 Webster, 159, 160, 271, 280, 335, 336, 337.
 Wedgewood, 64.
 Weever, 76, 124.
 Wellesley, 606.
 Wellington, 606.
 Wells, 273.
 Welsh, 450.
 Wendell, 538.
 Wentworth, 554.
 Westminster, 37, 134.
 Westminster Abbey, 34, 78, 136, 290, 478.
 Weston, 628.
 Westwood, 651.
 Wharton, 227.
 Whelpley, 322.
 Whipple, 450, 596.
 Whiston, 120.
 White, 82.
 Whitehall, 134.
 Whitehead, 256, 257, 258.
 Whitehurst, 158.
 White Plains, 351, 415.
 Wiche, 651.
 Wigmore, 656.
 Wilkes, 145, 605.
 Willard, 520, 566.
 William the Conqueror, 614.
 William and Mary, 248.
 William III., 232, 233, 248, 253.
 William IV., 37, 207, 208.
 Williams, 27, 29, 63, 164, 204.
 Williamson, 630.
 Willis, 88, 181.
 Wilts, 656.
 Wiltshire, 677.
 Winchelsea, 606.
 Winchester, 220, 400, 651.
 Windsor, 133, 135, 136.
 Winkle, 281.
 Winslow, 555, 564, 565, 595.
 Winterbottom, 435.
 Winthrop, 535, 538.
 Wisigoths, 407.
 Wisket, 628.
 Wode, 632.
 Wolton, 678.
 Wood, 133, 181, 232, 248, 249, 424, 425, 426, 613, 642.
 Woodbridge, 550 to 564, passim.
 Woodcock, 386.
 Woods, 127.
 Worcester, 124, 651, 652.
 Woronzow, 622.
 Wraxall, 622, 623.
 Wyatt, 631.
 Y.
 Yale, 580.
 York, 675.
 York, Duke of, 252, 256.
 Yorktown, 415.
 Younge, 676.
 Z.
 Zaire, 129.
 Zeleucus, 342.
 Zeno, 49.
 Zeres, 56.
 Zimmerman, 347.
 Zion, 423.
 Zisca, 26.
 Zoar, 121.
 Zophar, 217.