

THE
AMERICAN MONTHLY MAGAZINE

AND

CRITICAL REVIEW.

VOL. III.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED FOR H. BIGLOW AND O. L. HOLLEY,

AT No. 19 WALL-STREET.

PRINTED BY BENJAMIN G. JANSEN,
No. 8 Warren-street.

1818.

THE
AMERICAN MONTHLY MAGAZINE

AND
CRITICAL REVIEW.

No. IV.....VOL. III.

AUGUST, 1818.

ART. I. *Demetrius, the Hero of the Don. An Epic Poem.* By ALEXIS EUSTAPHIEVE. 12mo. pp. 234. Boston. Monro and Francis. 1818.

(Continued from page 206.)

"NO fairy tale is mine: no special powers,
No spirits I invoke that love to dwell
Above the earthly sphere: I speak of deeds
By human means achieved, with only aid,
Such wonted aid as Worth may claim of Hea-
ven."

Mr. Eustaphie's unskilfulness in the idiom of our language frequently betrays him into the use of ungrammatical or inelegant expressions. Of such the most common is the omission of the before a noun, or its improper insertion. His punctuation is also, in very many instances, most absurd. "With only aid"—of what of heaven? No: for heaven refers to worth. If not, there ought to have been a comma at claim. Perhaps he intended that heaven should refer both to worth and aid. Thus the sentence may be interpreted different ways—"I speak of deeds achieved by human means, with only the aid of Heaven; such aid as worth may claim of Heaven.—Or—With only such aid of Heaven as worth may claim.—Or—With only such aid as worth may claim of Heaven. It must be allowed, however, that generally his language is perspicuous.

His invocation to the Deity—

☞ To thee, O God! from whom all wisdom flows,
To thee alone my pray'rs ascend! O deign
To guide my timid steps to that proud height
Where fain my bolder spirit would repose!
Instruct me in the choice of devious paths
That to the sacred fane of knowledge lead,
Where, hid from mortal sight, of many an age

The boarded treasures safely lie! send forth
A ray of thy divine unerring light,
That, while it shows me the abode of truth,
I may, in accents loud and measur'd sound,
Call ancient heroes from the silent grave,
And rescue from oblivion's whelming shade
Their virtue, deeds of valour, just renown."

The direction of this invocation appears to us to be highly improper. Milton with great propriety might solicit such inspiration as guided Moses and Isaiah: his same was theological. But at once to request the Deity to instruct or inspire a man in the execution of a work acknowledged to be altogether a fiction, is *outré* and audacious. *Prayers* is never two syllables, more than *tares*. It cannot be so sounded; though *hour*, *fire*, and other words of one syllable, might. Hence it ought not to have the apostrophe. The note of admiration is used unnecessarily. This is a fault common with many. What is its use? He who can read with propriety needs it not: and, to those who cannot understand what they read, it can be of no advantage. We have generally remarked that, where there is neither sublimity nor pathos, the constitution is supplied by abundant notes of admiration. We know a certain professor of the belles lettres who forbids its admission on any occasion.—We know not why the poet should request to be directed in *devious* (i. e. direct or erroneous,) paths to knowledge. In asking for more

ART. 4. *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia.* Vol. i. Part I. Philadelphia. 8vo. pp. 220, and 9 plates. May to December, 1817.

AMONG the several learned societies, which have lately been established in the United States, the Academy of Philadelphia, appears to have been one of the most industrious, having within a few years collected a valuable Museum of natural productions, a handsome library, a philosophical apparatus, and many important papers. Some of these last communications are now published in this volume, which may be considered as the first part of the transactions of that society. Following the example of the Philomatic Society of Paris, it has begun for the first time in our country to publish periodically such transactions in the shape of a monthly journal. This mode is peculiarly suitable to the purpose of spreading with rapidity new discoveries, and retains, at the same time, all the advantages of casual or regular volumes, into which they may be divided after a competent series is issued.

In the introduction, it is stated, that the society meant to publish a few pages whenever it appeared that materials worthy of publication should be put into its possession, without professing to make any formal periodical communications; yet, having begun in May, 1817, the journal has been continued monthly until December, when it has been interrupted after completing a volume; but with the intention of being renewed pretty soon to begin a second part.

Many of the papers introduced into this volume, are highly interesting, and contain much valuable and new matter, which we mean to take up in successive order; but before we undertake this, we shall venture some general remarks upon the whole tenor of these collective labours. The first peculiarity that surprised us on perusal, was the small number of contributors to this journal, only five names are affixed to the twenty tracts and papers included in this volume; whether no more than five members of the Academy, were able to afford materials worthy of the public eye, or whether that institution was unable or unwilling to select the papers of any other author, is immaterial in itself to the present purpose, since both circumstances, would militate severely against the capability of that society, and might invalidate more or less the respectable opinion we should have conceived of it. It had invited, in the first number of the journal, contributions from all the

lovers of science generally; yet, if we are correctly informed, several valuable papers, containing new discoveries, which were forwarded in compliance with that request, and in conformity to the directions given, were refused admittance in that publication. In that case an evident partiality for a few members of the society, would be thoroughly discernible: such a partiality accounts for the singularity new under notice, but ought not by any means to prevail in any periodical publication, and much less in one of the present nature. If the society could not pass a correct judgment upon the papers presented for publication, it would of course prove itself unable to conduct the task which it has assumed; but whereas it appears that it considers itself responsible for the doctrines and facts of every tract introduced and published, a very unusual responsibility indeed, it certainly follows that it ought to scrutinize, very minutely, every paper meant for publication. That it has not always complied with this necessary scrutiny, we shall have abundant proofs when we proceed to the successive investigation of the tracts already published: wherefore we cannot do less than express our astonishment at the assumption of such a responsibility. It is a general custom with nearly all the learned societies of Europe and America, to disclaim any collective responsibility for the tracts which they insert in their Transactions; but they leave it altogether upon the authors of each respective memoir. It would have been advisable for the members of the Academy of Philadelphia, to have imitated that custom; but since they have thought otherwise, we shall take them upon their own ground, and consider the labours now published, as belonging to their collective capacity, and having passed the test of an accurate scrutiny.

We are exceedingly sorry that, in so doing, we shall often feel the necessity of censuring some parts of their labours, and that the inaccuracies and errors which we may notice, will reflect upon the whole Academy, many of the members of which, we are well aware, will concur with us in our remarks, and ought not to be considered as guilty of the whole, since they have probably never been consulted. Any author, even of the most consummate experience and efficient ability, is occasionally liable to commit some mistakes,

he may be deceived as to facts or misled in his conclusions; such unfortunate occurrences may be easily pardoned to an individual whose solitary studies do not always enable him to acquire all the needful concomitant information; particularly since, whenever better informed, or at any future period, that the additional information may reach him, he is able, unaltered swelled with the pride of error, to retract or correct any of his former erroneous assertions. But the errors of public bodies and societies, when adopted after mature deliberation and apparent scrutiny, are liable to many difficulties, wherefore they ought to be very cautious in affording their assent to any peculiar fact or doubtful consequence: since we find by experience that their pledge carries a higher degree of conviction to the minds of the illiterate and the enlightened, than any individual responsibility or personal assertion: whereupon the belief of erroneous notions and doubtful facts are propagated and increased. Experience proves likewise that these societies have generally a higher degree of pride than any single individual, and every thing that has been assumed or asserted as a doctrine by them, becomes so far incorporated with themselves, that no consideration can induce them to retract it, even if it should prove afterwards to be founded upon error, illusion, or false reasoning. We have even seen whole universities, schools and academies, presuming to foster and teach obsolete doctrines, many years after experience and the unanimous consent of the learned had proved their fallacious nature. These considerations induce us to regret that the Academy to which we are indebted for the volume before us, should have ventured to give its assent and sanction to some conclusions whereof we trust to be able to show the inaccuracy; although we do not despair that it may forbear to assume the usual pride of consolidated bodies, and adopt the more correct doctrine, which leaves every one at liberty to improve one's self, and correct what deserves correction.

We are inclined to feel that confidence, while we observe that this Academy has already shown itself favourable to the improvements introduced in zoology and botany by the French schools. In its zoological papers, which exceed by far any other, the new genera of the French zoologists are adopted, instead of the old generic divisions of Linnæus; and in the botanical papers, an attempt is made to adopt the natural method, instead of the sexual

system. These bold attempts, which are quite a novelty on this side of the Atlantic, are highly commendable, since it is time that we should no longer follow the old inaccurate track of the worshippers of Linnæus, nor borrow every sort of knowledge from that insulated spot to the northwest of Europe, where a jealous rivalry often forbids the majority of writers to adopt any improvements originating beyond the narrow boundaries of their island. How long did they struggle against the Linnæan improvements? and how long will they yet keep blind to the evidence of late improvements, is difficult to say; but we trust that the example of their stubbornness will no longer be imitated, now that the Academy of Philadelphia has partly led the way.

But when we commend and urge the necessity of the adoption of such wise improvements, as are founded upon new discoveries and reasonable principles, we do not imply, by any means, that all the Linnæan doctrines should be set aside: nothing is farther from our intention; it is merely in such systematical and inaccurate parts as are rendered obsolete, that we deem useless to persist, and particularly in his zoological and sexual system, whose imperfections were incident on the actual state of knowledge at the time they were ushered, and are now become totally inadequate to fulfil the purpose for which they were intended; other superior methods having superseded them, which are more suitable to the actual state of natural knowledge. Thus very few have dared to oppose the rules introduced by Linnæus in his *Philosophia Botanica*, and *Critica Botanica*, they were the happy means of reforming the science of botany, and it is upon them that the scientific construction of that science reposes at this time, and will probably for ever: the only changes attempted have been some trifling corrections, modifications and additions; they have been since extended to zoology and other natural sciences with the greatest success. His sexual system has nothing to do with those rules: Linnæus admitted the natural method in zoology; but despaired of the practicability of its application to botany, wherefore he endeavoured to supply it by an artificial system, of which defects he was well aware, and attempted in vain to veil. Now that the national method of Botany is in successful forwardness, it must supersede altogether this uncouth and momentary system; we have no doubt that if Linnæus had lived to this day, he would have approved of this needful

change, and also of the improvements introduced in zoological classification.

Nobody would dare to propose the re-establishment of the old botanical nomenclature, when the name of a single plant was composed of ten or twenty words or names; nor ought any one to attempt to carry us back to the confusion of generic names, which was dispelled by the Linnæan reform, when a genus had several names, or compound names, or diminutive names, such as, *Aisine*, *Aisinoïdes*, *Aisinastrum*, *Aisinelia*, *Aisinaria*, *Aisinastroïdes*, *Pseudo-Aisine*, &c. Yet many botanists of the French school have committed such an error, because they study very little the Linnæan rules, and the Academy of Philadelphia is now beginning to follow the same mistaken path. We even know of a few botanists who do it intentionally, despising so far Linnæus, that they would overthrow altogether his mighty nomenclature, and if they have not dared yet to abolish the Linnæan names, they endeavour, whenever new genera are to be framed, to recall the old obsolete blundering names of former botanists, or to coin similar ones of the same stamp. When reminded of their mistake, they pretend that any name will do, as the old botanists used to say; that we have in the vulgar languages many synonymical, onomymical, derivative and compound names for different things, and that the language of botany and zoology, will not be the worse, for imitating our vulgar languages in that respect. But the absurdity and temerity of this evasive pretext must be evident to every reflecting mind. The language of those sciences, is founded upon sound scientific principles, it has been totally reformed and established by Linnæus, arising with splendour from the greatest confusion; it has its peculiar laws, rules, and grammar; it is common to all the nations of European origin; and, therefore, almost universal: it is intended to distinguish, at first glance, every generic object from every other, providing against the possibility of difficulties and ambiguities: every genus is the type of a peculiar structure and organization, and its name must be deemed typical and radical, &c. &c. We might proceed to state the evident consequences of this state of things; and we might fill a volume to prove at length the correctness of the principles which we advocate; but it will, perhaps, be sufficient to refer any one to the philosophical works of Linnæus, and we shall conclude by observing, that the ultimate consequence of this new confusion will be, that as soon as

a new genus shall be introduced by a bad or doubtful name, another good name will be given to it by those who contend for the purity of generic nomenclature, and sometimes many such names may be proposed by different authors at a distance; whereby such new genera will acquire two names, or perhaps several names, and in the succession of time, when deliberate attention will be paid to the subject, the evidence of correct principles must certainly prevail, and the erroneous names will have a poor chance of success; they will be forgotten, as those of Morison, Plukenet, Ray, Bauhin, &c. are at this time, and their authors will share the fate of those eminent authors, whose labours are of no use to nomenclature, owing to the defects which they fostered.

Nine new genera have been established in this Journal, 3 of which belong to botany, *Crypta*, *Hemianthus* and *Collinsia*; and 6 to zoology, *Firoloida*, *Cerapus*, *Sacarina*, *Catectomus*, *Monolepis* and *Mammillifera*. Many of these bear erroneous denominations.

Crypta of Nuttall. This name is already the root of several botanical genera, and of even the Linnæan class Cryptogamia; it is found in the genera *Cryptandra*, *Cryptocephalus*, *Cryptophthalmus*, *Cryptostemon*, &c. It is, besides, against the Linnæan rules to frame a generic name from a single adjective, without a modification: it would have been very easy and proper to have lengthened it into *Cryptina*, or *Cryptella*, or *Cryptaria*. We, therefore, propose to substitute the first of these names *Cryptina*.

Collinsia of Nuttall, is nearly in the same case, since it appears to be only a root or contraction of *Collinsiana*; it would be more proper to modify it into *Collinsiana*.

Firoloida of Lesueur, is composed from *Firola*, with an obsolete and obnoxious termination; it must be changed altogether: we propose to substitute the significative name of *Pyrrhymus*, meaning taked nucleus.

Mammillifera of Lesueur, is rather too long; it is too much like *Mammillaris* in meaning and sense, and is composed of two Latin names united, which are tolerated in the specific nomenclature, but not often in the generic; lastly, it has too much likeness to the classical name of *Mammalia* to be tolerated. It must then be changed into *Actimastus*; meaning radiated mammilla.

Cerapus of Bay, is a good name, if the bad name of *Apus*, Latreille, (*Phyllopus*

Rafinesque,) is not admitted; otherwise both become worse than bad.

Some bad genera of other authors, have been admitted, which it may be well to notice likewise.

Lissa of Leach, is too short, and is contained in *Melissa*, &c. it must be modified into *Lisula*.

Lupa of Leach, is too short, and the root of *Lupinus*; it must be changed into *Luparia*.

Lymnaea of Lamarck, root to *Lymnetis*, is too similar to *Limnaea*, &c.—it would be well to modify it into *Lymnella*.

Hippa of Fabricius, means a horse! and is partial root of 20 different genera, such as *Hippophaea*, *Hippomane*, *Hippuris*, &c. Why not admit and adopt the anterior and better name *Emerita* of Gronovius?

Caryophyllæa of Lamarck, is almost identical with *Caryophyllus*: Rafinesque had changed it into *Nerania*.

Corticifera is quite a specific name, inadmissible for genera; the name of *Phorophylus*, which has nearly the same meaning, might be substituted.

We shall proceed to notice the tracts of this Journal, in the order of succession.

1. Contains the descriptions of 6 new species of *Firola*, with figures, by Mr. Lesueur: from the Mediterranean, where the family they belong to is very common, and many new genera exist. A good anatomical description of the genus is prefixed.

2. Account of the *Ovis montana* by Mr. Ord. He calls by that name the white wild sheep of the rocky mountains, which has been called *Mazama dorsata* by Rafinesque, since it belongs to that genus rather than to the *Ovis*, having solid horns not spiral.

3. Twelve new species of American fresh water shells of the genera *Cyclostoma*, *Succinea*, *Ancylus*, *Paludina*, *Helix*, &c. by Mr. Say. This author has begun to elucidate with much ability the subject of American Conchology, and has adopted the improvements of French authors.

4. Descriptions of eight N. Sp. of North-American insects, of the genera *Cicindela*, *Nemognatha*, *Zonitis*, and *Diposis*, by Mr. Say, who shows himself an able entomologist of the modern school.

5. Observations on the genus *Eriogonum*, by Mr. Nuttall. He gives a sort of monography of it, and adds many pertinent remarks on the natural family of Polygonaceæ, which, however, awaits yet the reforming hand of an able botanist.

6. Description of the genus *Firoloida*, by Lesueur, or rather *Pyrtymnus*, and of

3 species of it, found in the Atlantic. This genus differs from the genus *Hypolemus* of Rafinesque, by its dorsal fin.

7. Description of 3 N. Sp. of the G. *Raja* from North America. This Linnean genus forms a natural tribe, containing many different genera: the *R. maculosa* of Lesueur belongs to the genus *Urocyx* Raf. having neither dorsal nor anal fin: the *R. say*, having both, belongs to the genus *Hypanus* Raf. and the *R. quadricloba*, belongs to the G. *Platopterus* Raf. having only a dorsal fin on the tail.

8. Account of the Hessian fly, *Cecidomyia destructor*, and its enemy the *Ceraphron destructor*, by Mr. Say; with a very good scientific description of them, with figures.

9. A N. G. of 4 rustaceous *Cerapus tubularis*, by Mr. Say; with a figure, very near to the genus *Jassa* of Leach.

10. Description of the *Tantulus mexicanus*, (found in New-Jersey and Maryland) by Mr. Ord.

11. Description of two new genera *Monolepis* and *Sesarma*, and 23 species of North-American Crustacea, whereof 15 are new, by Mr. Say; with many figures. They belong to the genera *Cancer*, *Portunus*, *Pinnotheres*, *Ocypede*, *Libinia*, *Plagusia*, *Pagurus*, *Stacus*, &c. Mr. Say has adopted the improvements of Latrille and Leach, on the genus *Cancer* of Linnaeus, which is now become, by the discoveries of many writers, a class, containing more than 100 genera and 1000 species! His descriptions are very minute, yet sometimes confused and defective in a few points. We advise to compare his *Ocypode reticulatus* with the *O. pusilla* of Rafinesque's account of some N. G. and Sp. of North American Crustacea, in American Monthly Magazine, vol. 2. p. 40. His *Stacus affinis* with *A. limosus* Raf. ditto; his *Pagurus longicarpus* with *P. truncatulus* Raf. ditto; and his *Hippa talpoida* to *Nectylus rugosus* Raf. ditto; as they may happen to be identical or very near related to each other.

12. On five new species of American eels, by Mr. Lesueur; he refers them to the genus *Murena* of Linnaeus and Lecepede; while they belong to the genus *Anguilla* of Shaw and Rafinesque; the *Murena* is a different genus from the eels, which name Lecepede has changed, without any reason, into *Gymnothorax*, a denomination that applies to 60 genera of fishes!

13. On two new species of cod, from lake Erie and the river Connecticut, by

Mr. Lesueur. They have only two dorsal fins, and belong therefore to the genus *Merluccius* rather than *Gadus*, which has three dorsal fins.

14. Description of the *Cyprinus maxillingua*, a N. Sp. by Mr. Lesueur. He intimates that it might form a new genus, which has been established by Rafinesque on this, and another species, by the name of *Exoglossum*, in the Physical Journal.

15. Description of the *Testudo geographica* of lake Erie, with a figure, by Mr. Lesueur. It has palmated feet, and is not, therefore, a real *Testudo* of Dumeril and the moderns.

16. Monography of the *Calostomus*, a new genus of fish, by Mr. Lesueur. It is a section from the extensive genus *Cyprinus*, of which Mr. L. describes 18 species. Many other sections must be made in that genus, before it becomes better understood.

17. Description of two N. G. of plants, *Crypta* and *Hemianthus*, and two species of *Tillea* and *Limosella*, by Mr. Nuttall, with figures of the N. G. He calls the *Tillea*, *T. Simplex*, which is right. Dr. Ives of New-Haven, had discovered it first (not since, as stated,) and described it under the name of the *T. connata* of Peru. The *Limosella* has been considered by both Dr. Ives and Mr. Nuttall, as the *L. tenuifolia* of Europe; but the figure given by Dr. Ives, in the Transactions of the Physico-Medical Society of New-York, is adequate to prove their error: it is a distinct species, which may be called *L. brachistema*. We shall now undertake to assert and prove that Mr. Nuttall and the Academy are mistaken, in regard to the natural affinities and arrangement of his two new genera. He states that the N. G. *Cryptina* belongs to the natural family of *Portulacaceae*, next to the genera *Portulaca* and *Montia*; but the *Portulacaceae* differs from *Cryptina* by having the stamina in heterogonous number, not inserted on the petals nor opposed thereto, and *Montia* by its peripetal corolla bearing the stamina, characters of the utmost consequence. We deem that the nearest genus to *Cryptina*, is *Claytonia*, which only differs by the number of stamina, petals, and cells, which are all characters of a variable and unessential nature. Its natural classification is then in the natural class *Elltrogyria*, 6th natural order *Ptyronia*, distinguished by having one ovary, the stamina isogone and opposed to the petals or alternate with the calyx: in this order *Rhamnus*, *Berberis*, and *Vitis*, are the types of as many natural families, and next to them *Cryp-*

tina and *Claytonia*, must form another natural family, to which many other genera will probably become annexed afterwards: it may be called *Epiomyxia*, or the *Epiopryxe*, and characterised as follows: calyx diphyllous; corolla several petals; stamina in equal number and inserted upon them. Several stigmas. Capsul with several cells, valves, and seeds. Leaves simple, opposite, &c.

The N. G. *Hemianthus* of Nuttall, is rightly approximated to *Micranthemum*; but both are very wrongly united to the natural order of *Lysimachioideae*, which has a regular corolla, the stamina in equal number and opposed to its divisions. It is by these unhappy attempts and examples that the correct botanists become disgusted with the beautiful natural classification, thinking that those connexions are perfectly illusive, since so many are founded on mistaken references. The genera *Hemianthus*, *Micranthemum*, and even the N. G. *Collinsia* of Mr. Nuttall, or rather *Collinsiana*, belong all to the second natural class *Mesogyria*, 5th natural order *Chasminthia* or the *Personate*, and to its first sub-order, *Monorimia* distinguished by its monolocular fruit. There are at least three distinct natural families included within this sub-order. 1. *Aplendina* distinguished by a berry for fruit, and to which belong the genera *Besleria*, *Brunfelsia*, *Crescentia*, *Tanacetum*, *Mitraria*, *Triptennaria*, &c. 2. The natural family *Clythrelia*, formed by *Utricularia* and *Pinguicula*, very distinct by its capsul, bilobed calyx, spurred corolla, 2 stamens, &c. And the third will be the natural family *Hemilidia*, whose characters are, a capsul, calyx with many divisions, corolla without spur, 2 or 4 stamens. &c. It may be subdivided in two sub-families, the first *Hemianthia*, will contain all the genera with two anthers only, such as *Micranthemum*, *Hemianthus*, *Stemopus*, (*Limosella diandra*, Wild.) &c. and perhaps *Lindernia*! while the second *Limosellina*, with 4 unequal stamina and 4 fertile anthers, shall contain the genera *Browallia*, *Limosella*, *Phyllopsis*, *Conobea*, *Mecardonia*, and *Collinsiana*, (*Collinsia* of Nuttall,) all united by the same characters.

18. Descriptions of four new species and two varieties of the G. *Hydrargyria*, by Mr. Lesueur. A North-American genus of fish.

19. Observations on the geology of the West-India islands, from Barbadoes to Santa Cruz, by Mr. Maclure. These observations are very valuable, although not entirely new: it was well known that all the Carribbean islands were of volcanic

origin; but Mr. M. has confirmed that fact, and thrown some light on the subject of their formation, and actual state.

20. Description of 15 new species of the *G. Actinia*; 3 N. Sp. of the *G. Zoanthus*; 2 N. Sp. of a N. *G. Mammifera*, &c. by Mr. Lesueur, with some figures. The genus *Actinia* of Linnæus is increasing so fast by new discoveries, that it will soon contain over 100 known species; some divisions and amendments will, therefore, become requisite, as it is invariably the case when our knowledge of beings increases: eight new genera have been proposed already in the Analysis of Nature, by Rafinesque: several species of Lesueur belong to his genera *Stomachus*, *Aptostepha*, &c.

21. New genus *Collinsia*, by Mr. Nuttall, with a coloured figure; we have already made the needful observations on the name and classification of this genus.

It will be perceived that implicit confidence is not always to be given to the la-

bours of this Academy; but we trust that the published facts and descriptions are correct and to be depended upon. Whatever be our reluctance to admit incorrect principles, from whomsoever they emanate, we are always glad to be furnished with new materials, and to perceive zealous exertions in the cause of science. Every single new species or new genus discovered or introduced is a conquest made by knowledge over nullity, and brings us at once in relative connexion with it. From this motive, and our conviction that numberless beings, unknown to us, exist as yet every where, we feel inclined to wish complete success to the Academy of Philadelphia in their future labours, exertions and publications, and we should wish that many other similar institutions in our country, which are merely known by name, might be induced to give us occasionally a similar evidence of their zeal.

C. S. R.

ART. 5. *The Lord of the Isles; a Poem.* By WALTER SCOTT, Esq. 12ms. pp. 307. Philadelphia. Moses Thomas. 1815.

THIS is a finely-told, though, perhaps, not a well-arranged tale; abounding in vivid description, though deficient in strongly-marked characters. The narrative, in its general tone, is rich and vigorous, yet occasionally perplexing, from the unexplained suddenness of its transitions, while, at the same time, it is but just to admit that it is not infrequently lighted up by a gleam of the diviner faculty. In common also with Mr. Scott's preceding works, it is disfigured by ungraceful abruptnesses, contorted phraseology, and passages of prosaic tameness.

"*Rokeby*," of all Mr. Scott's poems—we will not except even "*The Lay of the last Minstrel*"—is the best entitled to deliberate panegyric. Its story is interesting, arranged with clearness, and with no less attention to dramatic effect. The characters are strongly drawn, and vividly contrasted. In the descriptive parts, the poet has shown that though he may feel all the partiality of a native for the sublime landscapes of Scotland, he can, nevertheless paint, and with the hand of a master, the softer beauties of English scenery. The language of "*Rokeby*" is, generally speaking, decidedly superior to that of his former productions. Retaining what was estimable in the verse of "*The Lay*," "*Marmion*," and "*The Lady of the Lake*"—

its simplicity and pathos—the verse of *Rokeby* is distinguished by qualities of a higher kind. It is imbued with the evidence of a maturer genius than is exhibited in any of the poems we have enumerated. It is more condensed, vigorous, and palpably splendid. It has more dignity, and less puerility. The judicious employment of antithesis and inversion gives it increased energy, and much was gained by the adoption of alliterative words, and the repercussive effect of transposition. In fine, if the eulogium bestowed on Mr. Scott of having "*triumphed over the fatal facility of the octosyllabic verse*" be well deserved, its justification is to be sought for in the language of *Rokeby*. The verse of "*The Lord of the Isles*" displays no improvement in Mr. Scott's style since the publication of its predecessor. Its general complexion is more ballad-like, and it may be fairly stated to hold a medium rank between that of "*Rokely*" and the earlier compositions of Mr. Scott. It is more lax and diffuse than that of the first, yet more compressed than that of the last. Than that of "*Rokeby*," the language is less stern and stately; than that of "*The Lay*," &c. more lofty and emphatic. If it do not manifest so many of the lighter graces as "*The Lay*," neither is it so deeply marked with the