

Revised 8 June 1922

" 11 Apr 1924

" 12-22 September 1924

Revised 13-31 August 1928

Revised 16-22 February 1934

Revised 20 ~~January~~ ^{February} 1943 ± 24^{ph}

23

1181-1308

Monthly Magazine & American Review.

CHARLES BROCKDEN BROWN

His life and works
by
Daniel Edwards Kennedy

In nine volumes

I

An Introduction to
Charles Brockden Brown

II-IV

Charles Brockden Brown
a biography

V-VII

Studies of the works of
Charles Brockden Brown

VIII

Charles Brockden Brown
as precursor

IX

Charles Brockden Brown
miscellanies

(Name of the publisher)
(Address of the same)

C R I T I C A L S T U D I E S

of the works of

CHARLES BROCKDEN BROWN

by

Daniel Edwards Kennedy

#

Illustrated

In three volumes

Vol.II

#

Somewhere

Printed or published

Sometime

THE
MONTHLY MAGAZINE,

AND

AMERICAN REVIEW,

FOR THE YEAR

1800:

FROM JANUARY TO JUNE INCLUSIVE.

Viresque acquirit eundo.

VIRGIL.

VOL. I.



NEW-YORK:

Printed and sold by T. & J. SWORDS, No. 99 Pearl-street.

1800.

(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1181)

THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE AND AMERICAN REVIEW

1799-1800

Brown's first position in the editorial chair came with the beginning of the Monthly Magazine and American Review, ¹ ~~The first~~ number was dated April 1799 and T. & J. Swords of New York, who, besides books sold such a wonderful variety of things that even the modern stationery store ^{can} ~~could~~ not surpass, ~~them~~ were the printers and publishers..

~~The terms on which the work was published were; first, that the~~ ^{given on the original wrapper of the first number} issues should be monthly, each number to contain at least eighty pages, large octavo in size, handsomely printed on superfine paper; secondly, subscribers were to pay on delivery 37 1/2 cents a number; third, a half-yearly title-page and complete index was to be furnished free.

Twenty to thirty pages were given up to ~~what might be termed~~ the Monthly Magazine material, consisting mostly of essays and stories.

Ten or fifteen pages constituted the American Review of domestic publications, and republications of foreign works. About twenty more

1 In his letter to Beers, dated 12 February 1800 he speaks of being the compiler of it.

2 Griswold: Prose Writers of America, p. 110 says it was published in Philadelphia and discontinued the following year. Probably he had never seen the title-page or the complete work.

3 From the original cover of Vol. I, No. 1.

pages were given up to selections and the last few to poetry.

The complete work consists of three volumes comprising eighteen numbers, of which the first six are for April, May, June, July, August, and the number dated ^{the} ~~for~~ ^{four months} September, October, November and December, 1799. The other twelve numbers are regular issues for each month of ~~the year~~ 1800.

It was published in arrears; that is, the first number, for April 1799 came out in May, being issued, according to Johnson's letter to Kent, some time before ^{the twenty-ninth.} ~~29 May, the letter's date.~~ In the same letter ~~it is said that~~ the May number would be issued on the first of June. The editorial note at the end of the first number says each number was to be published "at the beginning of each month". At the foot of the first page of the sixth number Brown said there was "nothing in the nature of the work that demands a strict observance of particular divisions of time," which is all very true but it never seems to have occurred to him that for that reason he could have had it dated in advance.

It was modelled on the English ~~periodicals of the time~~ in some
~~the departments of original communications, new publications,~~
~~particulars, such as the notices of deaths and the literary and~~
~~philosophical intelligence, following the practise of the~~ ^{and the poetry,} ^{Monthly} ~~English~~

~~Magazine and British~~
~~Register, which had begun in 1796,~~

The idea of ^{the} ~~a~~ magazine to ^{be printed and} ~~be published~~ by the Swords at New
^{was proposed} ~~York may be found as early as~~ 5 June 1798 ^{by} ~~when Dunlap in his~~

diary, says:

"See Smith and talk of a Weekly Magazine for this
place, to be printed by the Swords and for their
emolument, we having all power over it."

~~_____~~
~~_____~~
~~_____~~

~~_____~~

Dunlap had been a patron of the Weekly Magazine of Philadelphia so that it was quite natural he thought of the projected periodical at New York as a Weekly. Of course we know the publication under consideration was a Monthly.

Dunlap again records the plan:

"7 August 1798. Talk on our project of the Weekly Magazine to be published by Swords under us."

From another source we learn that as far back as January of 1798 Brown's friends had had the plan ~~under way~~ of placing him in the editorial chair.

~~Under date of~~ 4 January 1798 William Johnson wrote to James

Kent at Poughkeepsie: ¹~~partly as follows.~~

"I take the liberty to double this letter by inclosing you a copy of proposals for a magazine. It is intended for the benefit of Mr. Brown, who designs to devote himself to the business of Editor, should sufficient encouragement be given for the commencement of the publication. The plan...."

¹ Kent papers, Library of Congress.

But Johnson was not the only one attempting to arouse interest in the magazine. According to the Life of Samuel Miller¹ the members of the Friendly Club started out as the supporters of the venture.

"After the yellow fever had passed away Mr. Brown's friends in New York, the Friendly Club in particular, busied themselves to find him employment, and a means of support, agreeable to his literary tastes. He was accordingly encouraged to establish "The Monthly Magazine and American Review" the first number of which bears the date of April 1799."

Like Johnson, Miller spared no effort of his own to promote the matter and under date of 24 December 1798 he wrote to Dr. Morse.

"You may rest assured, this is not an ordinary, nor a catch-penny plan. The principal editor is a gentleman of undoubted learning and taste, who will devote a large part of his time to the work; and he will be supported and assisted by an association, which includes some of the first literary characters in this city, so that I think you may, with confidence, recommend the work to the patronage of your friends, as one that will be ably conducted, and as one that will be decidedly favorable to the interests of morality and religion. I have no doubt that it may and will be rendered honorable and useful to the United States."

Morse offered some objections and Miller wrote again on 3 April 1799.

"The principal editor of the American Monthly Magazine is a Mr. Charles B. Brown, lately of Philadelphia. You may, I believe, fully confide in him as a Federalist. Of his learning and taste there can be no question. There is a society, or club, of some ten gentlemen, who meet once a week to consult about the magazine, and concert plans to make up its contents and to promote its interests. Of these ten, seven are decided Federalists; the other three are a little Democratic, but remarkably mild and moderate men. I am not at liberty to mention their names, but am persuaded you need be under no apprehension respecting the work in a political point of view."

1 Phila., 1869, p. 119.

~~The~~ ~~who~~ these ten members of the Friendly Club ~~were~~ is not certain,

but it is likely

~~Probably~~ they were Charles Adams, Anthony Bleecker, Charles Brock-

den Brown, William Dunlap, William Johnson, Edward Miller, Samuel

Miller, S.L. Mitchill, G.M. Woolsey and W.W. Woolsey. Adams, Dunlap

and Johnson may have been "a little Democratic", Mitchill ^{surely} ~~was a Democrat~~ ~~was~~ ~~known~~ from his election to Congress as a Democrat.

Of course Brown himself made ^{an} every effort to secure subscribers ^{from Philadelphia.} Dunlap's diary 6 December 1798 records ^{Brown} ~~that~~ ~~Brown~~ read

his ~~the~~ prospectus to him.

The plan of ~~the magazine~~ ¹ was detailed to Brown's brother
Armitt in December 1798, ^{by a} ~~The~~ selection ^{which} Dunlap ~~gives~~ quotes
from one of Brown's letters, ~~and reads:~~

"Eight of my friends here, men in the highest degree respectable for literature and influence, have urged me so vehemently to undertake the project of a magazine, and promised their contributions and assistance ~~to~~ its success, that I have written and published proposals. Four hundred subscribers will repay the annual expense of sixteen hundred dollars. As soon as this number is obtained, the printers will begin, and trust to the punctual payment of these for reimbursement. All above four hundred, will be clear profit to me; one thousand subscribers will produce four thousand five hundred dollars, and deducting the annual expense will leave two thousand seven hundred. If this sum be attainable, in a year or two you will allow that my prospect is consoling. The influence of my friends, and their unexpected and uncommon zeal, inspire me with a courage which I should be unable to derive from any other quarter."

xx

12
3 1/2
6
34
36
4500
1800 00
4500.00
18
2700

Eight friends should be nine.
1 Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 11. ¹ Sixteen hundred should be eighteen.

~~A paragraph in Brown's letter to the same brother, dated 20~~ ¹ *Amitt* 1185

December 1798, ~~states it was~~ hoped to publish the first number in February or March.

Despite the respectable and influential men who held out the fairest hopes to Brown ~~we see~~ the launching of the first number was delayed. There is no doubt ~~that~~ those ~~eight or ten~~ ^{five} friends did all that friends can do, but four hundred subscribers at 37 1/2 cents per number were in those days a great many and the probability that the printer did not begin until March would seem to indicate ~~that~~ it was no easy matter to secure ~~that number of~~ ^{them.}

At the end of the first number there is an editor's note, ~~presumably written by Brown~~, containing a few points worthy of notice. ~~It reads:~~

UNAVOIDABLE delays have taken place in the publication of the first number of this work. The readers may be assured that punctuality will hereafter be observed, and that each number shall be issued from the press at the beginning of each month. Some deviations will appear to have been made from the plan originally submitted to the public. These deviations were adopted after mature reflection, and it is hoped that they will be seen and acknowledged to be just and proper.

x Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 93.

[No. 1.]

— 179 —

(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1186)

These changes encroach but little on the original scheme, and were prescribed by a due regard to the opinions of every class of citizens. There already exists a sufficient number of vehicles of political discussion and political information, and it is presumed that readers in general will be best pleased with a performance limited to scientific and literary topics.

To promote the usefulness of this Review of American publications, it is desirable to obtain the copies of new works as speedily and seasonably as possible. Authors and publishers are therefore requested to transmit copies of new books to the printers of this work. All such communications shall receive the earliest and most impartial notice.

It is scarcely necessary to mention that every communication addressed to the Editor, and left free of postage at the publishers (Messrs. SWORDS), will be gratefully received and immediately attended to.

When he had hoped to have the first number issued in February or March and it was delayed until some time in May the editor's prospects were not very encouraging. The omission of political discussion and information--for which we may owe thanks to Morse--is noteworthy in ~~view of the fact~~ that it had been promised in the prospectus which Brown says he had written. The Friendly Club was wrecked on political shoals and it is certain ~~that~~ the eight or ten men who encouraged the magazine were among its members. Probably ^{politics} ~~those who were Democratic~~ ^{the} ~~stirred up a row and caused these months of delay.~~

The second number shows an unpardonable difficulty of another character. The editor's apology takes the form of a note at the end, which reads:

"SOME difficulty has been experienced in procuring a fit person to deliver the first numbers of the Magazine to Subscribers in this City. Those to whom they have not been sent, it is hoped, will excuse the delay, which has undoubtedly arisen from circumstances naturally incident to the commencement of a new publication. This, and other slight and temporary embarrassments, will shortly disappear."

The optimism of the closing sentence is a detail that has generally been neglected and considered wanting in Brown's character.

An advertisement which appears only on the original back cover of the August number, shows another arrow from Fortune's quiver:

"The public, it is hoped, will admit, as a sufficient apology for the long delay of this publication, the prevalence of the late epidemic, which compelled the publishers to leave the city for a time, and to suspend their business. This irregularity, though much to be regretted, seems inevitable at present; though, in future, the editor flatters himself that he shall be able to preclude this inconvenience."

The dating of this notice at New York December 1799 would indicate that the number for August was not issued until December and it gives^{us} a hint of the early irregular career of the magazine. As we can learn from his letter dated New York July 26, he probably left the city during the epidemic.

One would naturally think that, with the yellow fever as another obstacle overcome it was about time the course of the magazine should be made smooth. But such was not Brown's fate! The sixth number though carrying on its original back cover the old form

in which a number was promised for every month had to carry with it another apology. At the foot of the first page we read: ~~as follows:~~

⁴³ The unavoidable delay which has attended the publication of the last number, occasioned by the necessary removal of the Publishers from the city during the late epidemic, has induced them, to avoid *anachronisms*, and the *appearance of successive delays*, to conclude the present year with the publication of the first volume. The first number of the second volume will commence in January, 1800, and will be continued, it is hoped, without any interruption.—As there is, at present, nothing in the nature of the work that demands a strict observance of particular divisions of time, we trust our readers will approve of the form which the present number has assumed. ⁴⁴

The number bore at the head the date of September, October, November and December followed by an asterisk which referred the reader to the foregoing apology. Undoubtedly it was issued during December.

The number of adversities must have been discouraging, ~~and the irregularity was near getting on the nerves of the editor.~~ ^{may} As we ~~have~~ learned ^a from ~~the~~ letter which suggested ^a his trip to Niagara he also was ⁱⁿ ~~having a~~ bad ~~spell of~~ health. The sickness everywhere in the city depressed him more than it had when a year before he was actually fighting the disease. However his hopes were not gone and his activity after returning to the city about December was sufficient to get out two numbers so as to complete the volume. ~~Of course he suffered in silence the loss of at least three months profit about fifty dollars.~~

What he could call "the appearance of successive delays" was of course to the readers much more than an appearance, and if human

nature was in those days what it is in ours it is not too much of a conjecture to say that he probably lost a part of his subscribers at this time, not alone on account of possible deaths by the yellow fever.

The new year came around, the troubles ceased, the magazine regularly appeared for every month and no more apologies were necessary.

Bibliographically this magazine has been treated correctly so far as the cataloguers have gone in their claims. But they have gone only a part of the way. If their extravagant claims for the Weekly Magazine had been half as modest as they are here and their modesty twice as extravagant as here the truth in both cases would have been nearer approached.

Despite Miller's statement concerning the making up of the magazine it is clear that for two out of the three volumes, Brown's labors were much easier than those experienced by the usual editor in launching a new periodical. He was not compelled to forage round for contributions as for instance Lowell did for the Atlantic and

for the most part he needed only to turn over to the printer all

¹ Philip Hone: Diary New York 1889, Vol. II, p. 284 in speaking of the death of James Swords on 17 September 1846 notes that the Swords' were the first to publish a Monthly Magazine and to which he contributed.

that the ^{line} "ten" had ready and brought to their meetings. Any ~~deficiency from the failure of any in the charmed circle~~ to make up the required eighty pages, ^{had} to be supplied by the editor's pen or from his store of unpublished manuscripts. Thus the affair was managed on the lines of the "closed corporation" and it was not until the third volume that he was compelled to drive off outsiders. But, as we shall see, it was usually in the interest of the readers that he crowded out others and put himself in. How well he performed his autocratic ~~editorial~~ duties we shall see presently.

Before considering Brown's contributions to this magazine it is necessary ~~for us~~ to mention certain notes or similar items ^{which} ~~which being~~ signed E were undoubtedly written by Brown ~~in the~~ [^] ~~regular course of his work~~ as editor. To give detailed attention to them would be ~~needlessly~~ enlarging ~~our book~~ to no essential purpose. The magazine is not a scarce one and many copies are accessible in libraries all over our country.

When, however, volume three is studied we find on the last page of each number some notes "To Correspondents". Usually they are of the customary kind but occasionally they depart from the stereotyped expressions and come within the compass of our interest

by reason of their comments. With the acceptances^{ed} we ~~have~~ have nothing to do, for the ^{re}(articles ^{was} concerned are not commented on them.

To refuse a contribution because of its juvenility or lack of originality and spirit very properly accords with editorial license but when one is refused because of its length or its manner, or because it is "too humble a muse", or lacks tenderness, passion and poetic diction, it becomes material for ~~con-~~ siderable speculation on the editor's ability. ~~as an editor.~~

The first refusal is haughtily as follows:

"The Cottiger" is, indeed, too humble a muse for our miscellany."

Who the unfortunate victim of this vapidty was is not known but it would be interesting to learn. The next appearance of the editorial department concerns itself with five refusals ^{of which} ~~but only~~ the second ¹ is of interest to us. It reads:

"Kotzebue to the Emperor Paul" breathes generous indignation in vigorous and spirited verse; but a few lines have induced us to suspend its insertion."

Why the editor did not ask for an interview and alterations of the objectionable lines is beyond comprehension. ^{Perhaps he did,} ~~of one~~ and perhaps the poet refused — anyway, the lines never appeared. ^{Of the} remaining ~~ones~~ ² two notices deserve quotation and attention.

~~The first reads:~~

1 Vol. III, p. 160.

2 Vol. III, p. 400.

"Disconsolate Eliza," by "HENRICUS," does not possess all that tenderness and passion, and that *poetic diction*, which the subject demands, and which would entitle it to a place in our poetical department. It appears to be the production of *youthful* genius, and, as such, may afford the promise of better things. The judgment of the editor must controul his wishes to gratify this correspondent.

the
This is not only instance of Brown's wishing to encourage a contributor and as a refusal it shows not only careful and able consideration of the work offered but also a surprising appreciation of the feelings of the author. For these reasons it should be considered as the best example of all the refusals which "the judgment of the editor" saw fit to make. Whatever else may be said of Brown as editor the fact that he was seriously attempting to fill the position to the best of his ability, with few instances of partiality, is an excellence worthy of being noticed.

The second has the same seriousness and reads:

"Our fair correspondent "SCRIBLERA" will excuse us for not inserting the "*Dissertation on Bachelors*."—Some novelty of sentiment, some touches of wit, or strokes of humour, or some beauties of language, are necessary to enliven and adorn a subject so dry, stale, and unprofitable. We recommend a theme less trite, and more adapted for the exercise of her pen: for we should be sorry that the rejection of this first essay should discourage her from further correspondence.

Undoubtedly the material here considered was quite inferior to the effort of "Henricus" and yet here as well as in that better case he gives sound reasons for rejecting the essay. His suggestions are not only just but they are valuable as showing that he had

a keen sense for detecting the virtues (in even) a "dry" subject..

One of the editorial notes ~~supplied by Brown~~ is doubly convincing because it is added at the end of the article signed W. and is itself signed B. It is a note on the plays of Kotzebue.¹

In the E-signed Remarks on Female Politicians² the internal evidence corroborates the suspicion ~~that~~ it was written by the editor. The diction, ideas and structure recall Brown's Alcuin and while there is no ^{as} certainty of the article ~~being~~ his, there is the greatest probability. As a commentary on so-called Equal Suffrage it is excellent. ~~Unlike Alcuin it does not even approach the details that are usually debarred discussion in mixed company~~

Aside from the general character of the magazine which will be understood as we go on, the important part ~~of the venture~~ was the department ~~comprising what was~~ entitled the "American Review" with the section ~~entitled the~~ "Account of the American Editions of Foreign Publications."

~~There is no doubt that~~ This review part was principally the cause of the ultimate metamorphosis of the magazine. It drew

too much attention ³ ~~away~~ from better material, --after all it was

¹ Vol. I, p. 78.

² Vol. III, p. 416.

³ Willard Phillips has remembered it as the American Review and Monthly Magazine. See Godwin's Bryant, Vol. I, p. 154.

only one department ~~of the whole publication~~ --it finally developed too much along the lines of party politics which not only ^{defeated} ~~spoiled~~ all ~~chances~~ of the magazine ^{success} but also wrecked the fellowship of the Friendly Club. ~~It not only came to deal with what was at first severely eschewed but~~ through bad taste and unpopular policy it antagonized most of the authors of the books reviewed.

~~Though~~ ^{as} the Swords, ~~the publishers of the magazine~~, proved themselves most wonderful beings by looking on complacently ~~and un-~~ ^{other} ~~complainingly~~ while they saw their publications pillaried ^{though} the time was hardly the millenium of ~~the~~ reviewers when they could continue to express their honest opinions.

As a rule the reviews were a deal like the editor's refusals and of the ~~usual~~ character of the time but in some instances they overstepped all bounds of propriety and became entirely too severe and tasteless. For instance it is hard to find any satisfactory excuse for reviews such as were involved in the Candidus--Reviewer controversy; the Webster--Reviewer controversy; the notice of the two volumes of Low's Poems and the Adams--Hamilton controversy ¹ one of which is worse than Jeffrey's famous coup de grâce to Wordsworth. Weems ² may have deserved all he got for his lie

1 Vol. III, p. 378. 2 Vol. III, p. 210.

1195

1

about the Washington truth story but Searson's Mount Vernon did not need to have ridicule of publisher and author extended to the dangerous outskirts of libel. In all these cases better taste would have been shown and a better fortune would have befallen the magazine if Brown had only availed himself of his privilege of returning all such articles to the author or better still of flinging them in the fireplace.

What seems to be Brown's method of constructing his reviews may be best illustrated by ~~such as~~ the first two. ~~Generally the plan is as follows.~~ The general subject^{is} touched on, whether it be biography or history or what not,~~is~~ followed by the particular application. Then the plan or method is considered, the critical comment follows, sometimes an outline of the contents is added, and the whole is wound up by a formal, informal or implied closing sometimes unfavorable but usually encouraging.

The^{is} plan is occasionally varied by changing the order of the details, sometimes stating what will not be found in the work and sometimes developed by extracts or details relating to the author or the act of publication.

~~of course they comprise two characters those that are mostly favorable and those condemned, but they seldom differ in kind.~~^{essentially}

1 Vol. III, p. 144.

As reviews, Brown's, when constructed mostly according to his method, are all that can be desired. They will bear comparison with any of their kind even the causeries of Sainte-Beuve. They do not expose the comparative method ^{criticism} which Saintsbury over-emphasizes but they are not therefore lacking in their use of the comparison in forming their judgment; indeed no critic is compelled to parade or even in all modesty to suggest his mental process of comparison. A certain amount of reticence concerning a writer's knowledge of languages and literatures other than his own is often more attractive than a pyrotechnic display of his erudition. We know perfectly well what languages Brown did read and he probably knew more than we can demonstrate so that there is little likelihood that he did not meet most ^{of the} requirements for a comparative basis for his criticism. He made errors as we shall see but on the whole his appreciation of the value of a book when newly placed in his hands for review was ~~given~~ a just appraisal and seldom was inadequate or a cause for reversal of his decision.

~~favorable and those mostly unfavorable, but they seldom differ in kind.~~

~~One of the communications~~ ^{refers to} ~~of the magazine's "bench of critics"~~ ^{as that} ~~and it is undoubted that~~ ^{likely} most of the members of the

Friendly Club constituted the ~~critics~~ ^{actually} bench and ~~helped~~ ^{helped} supplied

these reviews. How much outside help ^{Brown} they had is not

^{known} ~~but it is certain that occasionally he admitted reviews by~~ ^{others than the "ten"} ~~to attempt identification is in most cases, from the very nature~~

^{if not impossible} of the work, very difficult ^{an assurance} but we are able to approach ~~it~~ by a

process of elimination.

~~Thus~~ ^{we} can hardly believe Brown wrote the numerous reviews of sermons. They are not in his method, they usually are marked as by ~~possibly Samuel Miller~~ ^{inordinate} some clergyman because of the ~~great~~ ^{great} attention to the text and ~~the~~ ^a lack of literary interest, ~~and undecided character, of the review.~~

Of them all there is no exception. Fair examples of both favorably and unfavorably reviewed orations or discourses or addresses,

all to be eliminated, ^{as Brown's} ¹ are Dagget's and ² Lowell's or ³ Davis'. ~~They~~

~~class of reviews~~ are mostly tied together and probably were written

by the same man, an unusual Latin scholar, ^{possibly James Kent} ~~possibly James Kent~~ certainly more learned

in that language than we know Brown to have been. Partly for a

similar reason, in this case a good knowledge of German, but also,
1 Vol. I, p. 369. 2 Vol. I, p. 373. 3 Vol. I, p. 372.

because of his personal friendship with one of the authors

criticised we would eliminate the dramatic reviews such as

concern Dunlap, Plumptre and Smith.¹ ~~For~~ Dunlap's ~~work~~ advertise-

ments were ~~carried~~ on the wrappers of ~~volume two~~, numbers 1, 3,

4 and 5 and ~~volume three~~, numbers 2 and 3. ^{Vol. II,} ^{Vol. III,} ^{hitchell may have done them.}

hott The reviews ~~of books~~ related to political science, of which

the Wortman² is a just sample; medicine, of which Barton on

Goitre³ is an example; theology, politics and military affairs:

were ~~probably~~ not ^{likely to be} written by ~~him~~ ^{Brown}. Certain reviews in the first

volume signed by initials and B. and C.B. we shall accept as

Brown's. In one instance, Rumford's Essays, we accept ^{ing} an O,⁴

^{we do so in} ~~as well as~~ other instances of the same initial. Two instances

of A.P. we accept conditionally though they ^{could be} ~~probably are~~ by

Bleecker. ^{Often} ~~Usually~~ with alphabetical signatures we cannot find

enough evidence to support a flimsy case. The Commerce of Spain⁶

has too little knowledge of the shipping business to have been

Brown's. The Description of Genessee County,⁷ signed H., recalls

Brown's Volney interest but has not his method, though it seems

¹ Vol. II, pp. 133, 225 and 365 and Vol. III, p. 453. ² Vol. II, p. 347.

³ Vol. III, p. 116. ⁴ Vol. I, p. 229 Cf. Gronke's Duty, etc., Vol. I, p. 128 signed O.

⁵ Vol. II, p. 344 and Vol. III, p. 172. ⁶ Vol. III, p. 137.

⁷ Vol. I, p. 119.

to be a development of it.

One of the articles, signed W, on ^uSothey's ¹Poems, is somewhat related to the ²Joan of Arc article, signed B, but not sufficiently strong to make it probable as Brown's. The ³Memoirs, signed N, ⁴also signed N, should be compared to the quincy oration, but seems too indefinite for belief, though it has some suggestions, as editor's work.

When we have ^{partially} ~~slightly~~ cleared the ground by ~~a process of~~ elimination there are left the reviews ~~of some books~~ relating to purely literary subjects, with ^a ~~few~~ ^{noticeable} exceptions; but we cannot gather ~~in~~ and claim them all for Brown because he was not the only man of purely literary tastes in the circle of contributors.

1 Vol. I, p. 135.
3 Vol. I, p. 124.

2 Vol. I, p. 225.
4 Vol. I, p. 217.

Those which have strong evidence of probability as Brown's will be considered at length in a later part of the present study, but for the present purpose of summarizing Brown's work as editor they should be considered in their respective order of appearance.

Trumbull's Connecticut, I, 45, is by the same author as Robertson's America, q.v.

Holmes' Stiles, I, 47, is in Brown's method.

Caldwell's Cooper, I, 50, is signed B and smacks of Brown throughout. It is an unfavorable review.

Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, I, 53, is a fitting example of a favorable review of a book which we know Brown had read.

Barton's New Views, I, 117, is signed C.B., the nearest we come to Brown's initials in this magazine. Another of Barton's, the Natural History of Pennsylvania, II, 36, is hardly of credit to its author no

matter who he may be and cannot be considered as at all related to Brown's method.

Robertson's America, I, 130, is signed B. and carries along with it the ^{first} review the one on Trumbull's Connecticut, q.v.

Rumford's Essays, I, 132; 229 signed O; 299; 376; 449; Vol. II, 61 and 139 we have shown in our Weekly Magazine study was Brown's.

The Encyclopaedia as published by Dobson, I, 134, has a recollection of Brown's early essay on the relation of all objects of knowledge and is on the whole characteristic of Brown.

Prout's Pennsylvania, I, 216, is signed B. It is only partly favorable.

Southey's Joan of Arc, I, 225, is signed B, and its reference to "childish chimeras and vulgar superstitions" and adverse comment on the supernatural side recall the preface to Edgar Huntly. It also shows an ignorance of the works of Voltaire and others which Brown did not have.

Belknap's American Biography, I, 282, has Brown's method and a significant correction of an error in regard to William Penn.

Those which appear to be but are not clear enough to warrant the suggestion that they are his are Linn's Discourse, I, 129;:

Roland's Appeal, I, 293; Transactions of the American Philosophical

Society, I, 365, 445, II, 47, 115, 213, 296, 424; Belknap's Foresters, I,

Adams' View of Religions, II, 38;

434; Adams' History of New England, I, 445; Gaudientio Di Lucca, II,

60; a few of the Washington sermons, ¹ such as Morris', II, 120,

Lee's, II, 122 and undoubtedly Beers', II, 131; S.L. Mitchell's Address,

II, 128; Trumbull's Discourses, II, 361; Low's Poems, III, 56 and 266;

the Trials of Levi Weeks and Croucher, III, 62; Dutton's State of

Literature, III, 273; and Clifton's Poems, III, 426.

2

In volume three there is a review of the anonymously published Serious Considerations on the Election of a President: addressed to the Citizens of the United States. This pamphlet has been ascribed to William Linn, the father of Elizabeth Linn whom Brown married in 1804, and it is possible that Brown wrote the review.

1 When they became so numerous as almost to swamp the department they were quickly despatched and the following heading was inserted. (Vol. III, p. 272.) "

[So many Sermons and Orations on the Death of Washington have already passed in review before our Readers, and so much time has elapsed since the publication of those announced in our present Number, that we presume we shall be readily excused for dispatching, in a concise and summary way, the five following Discourses. As they are all on the same subject, and display no views of character, or topics of reflection, but what have already become familiar to our Readers, we shall, at present, confine our examination to a few general remarks on their style and composition.]

The fact that it is unsigned means nothing; for the signing was given up after the first volume; but Brown's acquaintance with the author would perhaps explain the restrained nature of the work. The method and diction are Brown's. Throughout there seems to be an underlying doubt of the wisdom of the charge of infidelity against Jefferson, but it is only faintly suggested and not at all adequately considered.

Perhaps in Brown's days the general idea of the Old Testament was far different from that of ours, but it is evident that the writer saw the weakness of the charges and for some reason did not appear to have the courage to attack the pamphlet as he should have done. Too much is made of the good intentions of the author and too little of his erroneous conclusions based on the flimsiest sort of evidence. However, the faults of the review can be charitably overlooked, especially if the daughter of the author had formed a connection with the reviewer.

Connected with this Linn pamphlet, by reason of the subject and the possibility that Brown may have written it, is the review of The Voice of Warning to Christians¹. Here the reviewer goes further

into the discussion and actually expresses his doubts of the proof of the charge, though properly not taking any ^{political} position--pro or con--in relation to Jefferson. The liability of the author to erroneous conclusions is stated and though he finds him equally as sincere as Linn, he does not believe that his passionate appeal will affect its end.

At the same time that he is censuring the weaknesses of the author some guarded expressions escape him; expressions which he probably feared might offend by reason of the fact that any thing more direct and ^{more} ~~less~~ adverse ~~would~~ be applied to Linn's pamphlet equally as well as to the one ^{now} under review.

Throughout the three volumes there runs a department ^{called} ~~called~~

"Miscellaneous articles of Literary and Philosophical Intelligence."

At first it ^{was} ~~is~~ composed of notices of forthcoming books American and foreign ~~and~~ and notes on astronomy, travels, geography, drama, architecture, botany, zoology, ornithology and chemistry. An account of the graduations and degrees of Columbia, Brown, Pennsylvania and Yale Universities was given, what was probably America's first, the Chymical Society of Philadelphia was noticed and encouraged,

being ^X Only a part was original; ~~and~~ the foreign notices ~~were~~ probably selected from English and French periodicals.

the Medical Repository edited by Brown's friends was at first announced by a three page prospectus added at the end of Vol.III, in the body of the work it was for noticed, the second edition was a cause of congratulation and

a longer notice and finally when it came to give more articles of general information a great many extracts were reprinted from it. Notices of Brown's Edgar Huntly and the second volume of Arthur Mervyn were given.

Later this part of the magazine became more philosophical than literary, but in the latter respect it improved a great deal. What literary material was given now took on the character of short quasi-critical notices, and in volume three they were thought of sufficient importance to be indexed. The following notice concerning Joseph T. Dennie is of interest for more than the one obvious reason.

"Mr. Dennie, who deserves to be placed high in the list of American writers, is about to collect and to re-publish, with corrections and additions, two series of essays, one called *The Farrago*, and the other *The Lay-Preacher*, the first in one volume, and the latter in two vols. octavo.—Mr. Dennie has treated us American readers with considerable severity. He charges us with possessing a spirit sordidly devoted to traffic and gain, or servilely and tamely led in the trammels of European prejudices. We would willingly believe that these censures have been too indiscriminately applied, but must sincerely hope that the fate of his own performances may not be an example of their justice. The intrinsic merit of these essays, will entitle them to praise and to purchasers; and the world may evince, by its liberal patronage of this author, that it is able to distinguish and reward excellence, even though it be of the growth and culture of our own country."

be due
However severe this may appear it is not to be attributed to

pique. When the Portfolio was announced Brown came forward and

gave Dennie all ~~that~~ he deserved. The fact that we shall find him

contributing to the paper in 1802 shows ~~that~~ there was no lasting

bad feeling between them, whatever there may have been at ^{an earlier} ~~this~~ time when Brown was knocking at Dennie's editorial door in vain.

An announcement of Linn's Powers of Genius, deserves notice

but ~~our~~ commentary on it ^{may} ~~will~~ be deferred, ~~to the part of our work~~

^{Under date of 1804}
~~which concerns Brown's life in 1804.~~ We shall ~~then~~ find Brown

doing his greatest service to his brother-in-law by ~~writing the~~

a biographical sketch prefixed to Linn's Valerian.

On page 475 of volume three there is an interesting light thrown on Brown's opinion of his times and its journalists. It reads:

"WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS.

To mention newspapers among literary articles may seem unwarrantable; but, in reality, these are the only popular and legitimate offspring of American activity and genius. The number of these publications rapidly increase with the advancement of population; but the removal of the seat of government to the banks of the Patowmack has occasioned a *preternatural* addition of eight or ten Gazettes to the catalogue.

The eloquence and wisdom of our legislators are detailed to us by several hands, and every *puny whipster* is enabled to sit in judgment on the talents and adroitness of our governors.

~~That slap at the puny whipster is readily applicable to many newspaper writers of the present day.~~

The appropriate phrase is further of interest to us. ~~In the~~
~~editorial introduction to the Southern Literary Messenger~~¹ ~~it~~
~~was also used by the unidentified editor. Remarkable to relate~~
~~both uses were a part of the editorial work so that Brown may~~
~~have been the one to call attention to the phrase. In the~~
~~American Review~~² the idea will be found changed to "every
 trifling retailer of puns and witticisms"^{which} ~~In the Literary~~
~~Magazine~~³ ~~it becomes "every yelping cur joins in echoing the~~
~~cry of contempt". Now, in the Messenger in connection with Poe's~~
~~story of Hans Phaall we have "when every "puny whipster" is~~⁴
~~willing to risk his neck".~~

~~The tautological expression~~ which originates with the "But
 every punie whipster gets my sword" of Othello and ~~as used~~
~~by Brown includes the word "every" which should be a part of~~
~~the Messenger quotation. The variation used in the American~~
~~Review~~ would suggest ~~that~~ Brown was twisting it to mean "punny
 whipster" which is a pun on the Shakespearean sense but was
 a happy thought.

~~1 June 1835.~~

~~2 Vol. I, p. 64.~~

~~3 Vol. VII, p. 294.~~

~~4 The quotation marks are not ours.~~

~~5 First Folio, edition page 338 line 2, referring to Iago's lies.~~

¹ ~~in~~ Volume two ^{has} ~~there is~~ an editorial note introducing the

"Souvenir D'un sejour a Bombay" by John Davis ² and recommending it for its simplicity. ^{In the same volume} There is also a note on ^{Davis'} ~~the same author's~~ verses entitled "Coosohatchie" ³ and his odes and one on his

"Sejour dans les Bois de la Caroline du Sud," ⁴ in fact it is

^{his travels} very apparent ~~that about this time~~ Brown had acquired ^{an} ~~considerable~~ enthusiasm over his work so that ~~there~~ ^{he} ~~is~~ gave his readers ~~considerable~~ of it, perhaps more than was intrinsically warranted. We know they were well acquainted. Later Davis in recalled their familiarity supplying some interesting reminiscences of Brown's life. Whether ~~that~~ he had ^{in 1799} translated into French Wieland and Ormond ^{as Evans' suggests} cannot be proven - the very existence of any new York 1799 translation is even doubtful.

What were probably the most troublesome editorial tasks Brown had ~~on this magazine~~ have been mentioned as the Candidus-Reviewer controversy and the Webster-Reviewer controversy, ~~which~~

1 P.106

2 Brown's encouragement of Davis has been ^{noticed} ~~properly recognized~~ by Thelma L. Kellogg: Life and Works of John Davis, University of Maine Bulletin June 1924, p.59.

3 P.80.

4 P.247.

~~American Bibliography Vol. XII, p. 1, items~~
^{has} 35246 and 35247.

Who Candidus was is not definitely known, ^{for} ~~and the usual refer-~~
~~ence books on pseudonymity are of little assistance to us.~~ ^{they} Cushing
~~ing gives several authors none of whom could be the one here. The~~
~~nearest he comes is when he~~
notes that Noah Webster once wrote under the name of Candor, ~~and~~
~~From the fact that Webster was not a member of the Friendly Club,~~ ^{he often voiced his disapproval of reviews of his books} ~~and that he~~
though he was ~~at least~~ once a visitor there, he may have been
Candidus ^{but it is doubtful.} ~~the one who was one of those outside~~ ^{of} ~~the charmed circle.~~ ^{It should be}
~~noticed that the complaint was almost impossible while Webster was alive as it was~~
~~the other hand~~ ^a The introduction to the Candius reply to be

quoted presently and the review of the second volume of Low's
Poems while not speaking plainly about the defense seems to
hint ^{possibly} ~~that~~ Candidus was the author himself. However the point
^{to us so} ~~is not of importance~~ ^{that} ~~and to be on the safe side we~~ ^{shall} ~~should~~ con-
sider the controversies as two ^a ~~nowise related.~~



Candidus ^{introduced} ~~had made~~ himself popular ^{to} ~~with~~ the ^{periodical} ~~paper~~ by two contributions to the first volume ¹ ~~if~~ the first being ~~given the honor of~~ opening the publication, being ² on Periodical Publications and addressed to the editor in the form of a letter ^{and} ~~the~~ second was ^{another letter this time} ~~on American Literature~~. After these ² ~~two~~ appearances we ^{have} ~~hear~~ no more of ^{him} ~~Candidus~~ until we ³ ~~come to~~ the communication in ^{criticism} ~~defense~~ of the unfavorable review of Low's Poems, ⁴ ~~which is~~ introduced by the following, undoubtedly Brown's.

"Some strictures having been made, in this publication, on a volume of poems lately published by Mr. Low, we chanced luckily to meet with some criticisms on the strictures themselves. Our judicature, though self-created, plumes itself on its candour, and it is in submission to this principle, that we venture to make these animadversions a part of our miscellany. We, indeed, are merely advocates, before the general bar of the public; and, as we

¹ P. 332 ff.

² Vol. I, p. 338.

³ Vol. III, p. 179.

⁴ This applies only to the review of Vol. I in Vol. III of the Monthly Magazine, pp. 56-58.

claim a right to be heard in the exhibition of our opinions, we are not only willing, but extremely anxious that the author should enjoy the same privilege with ourselves; and that his voice may be heard at a greater distance, and by the same auditors who heard the accusation, we take the liberty to lend him our trumpet, and to place him in our pulpit. In doing this, however, we beg leave to suppress his proem, not because it is either trite or insipid, but merely because it would, like those of Cicero, suit any other production as well as this. We wish that justice may be satisfied at as small an expense of time and of breath as possible.

On the whole the defense of Candidus is a good one and with a few exceptions ~~easily deleted~~ it is justified. No one ~~can~~ ^{should however} excuse the opening slap at Brown:

"The first piece in the collection, is an Ode on the death of General Washington; which was for many successive evenings recited at the theatre, and received with that public applause, which was denied to the frigid and inanimate production of the author of "Wieland."

^{That} ~~It is not called for and~~ only tends to weaken the force of the rest of the article. Similar objection might be made against several ~~instances of~~ references to reviews and criticism but other than these, ~~few and pardonable details~~, as a piece of criticism, Candidus defense is ~~far~~ better than the review.

Though defeated on the battle field Brown retires from the controversy with no little honor. While he omitted the "proem", which

may have been mostly
~~probably was merely~~ a matter of asking for the publication of the
 complaint
 defense, he did not omit, as he might have been justified in doing,
 its sarcastic
 the various flings made by Candidus. Brown proved ^{thereby} his sincerity and
 his lack of ^{his} ~~figue or pride~~, by ~~the very publication of the article~~.
 When next heard of Candidus ^{he} is unable to secure a hearing for
 being justly
 his defense of Low's second volume ~~in the magazine and is~~ refused

thus:

"CANDIDUS" was received too late to appear in this Number. The great length of his quotations is some objection to the insertion of his communication. If they could be curtailed, or a reference be made to the pages of the printed volume, it would be more agreeable to the generality of readers. The change, however, which is about to take place in this publication, may induce Candidus to seek some other vehicle for a speedier publication, unless content to wait the appearance of the next Review."

without his communication

sobbed up again to make
 Candidus waited and when the first number of the ~~series~~ appeared he
 His final appearance ~~comes in the~~ American Review ~~where~~ ^{where} he

was effectually silenced as follows, never again appearing in Brown's
 magazines, unless he used some other mask.

"A NOTE has been received from Candidus, requesting the insertion of his remarks on the review of Low's Poems, agreeably to promise. See Monthly Magazine and American Review, vol. iii. p. 179, 266, and 480.

The distinct departments of Magazine and Review rendered it easy to gratify the wishes of those who were desirous to discuss points of criticism, or to vindicate their performances from any supposed injustice in our decisions, by giving a place to their remarks in the former. But the change which has taken place in the plan of the publication, it being now chiefly a Review, renders it impracticable to continue that indulgence to correspondents. A regard to the convenience of the public, and that of our own, as well as a sense of propriety, induces us to avoid all subordinate controversy about the rectitude of our own opinions as critics. It would be expecting too much from us as Reviewers, that we should consent to publish all the personal sarcasm and abuse which a splenetic or offended author, or author's friend, in the paroxysms of ill-humour, may think fit to utter against us; nor would the majority of our readers be pleased to see so much space occupied with things of that sort. Errors in language, or mistakes in matters of fact, we shall always be ready to rectify. We know of no perfect or unalterable standard of literary worth; and in whatever concerns the exercise of taste and judgment, the public must decide between us and the author.

We shall always, in justice to ourselves and that public, pronounce with deliberation and candour; nor shall we lightly retract opinions thus advisedly given.

We hope *Candidus* will perceive the propriety of the reasons which induce us, independent of the length of his communication, equal to a dozen of our printed pages, to decline inserting it in the 'American Review and Literary Journal.'

We repeat, that Mr. Low was, and is, wholly unknown to us, except from his book, and by that alone have we estimated his talents as a poet.

As an example of Brown's editorship that *Candidus* affair leaves him with his ~~honor unassailed and his~~ temper unruffled. He defeats his adversary by "calling the rules" on him.

The Webster controversy followed the *Candidus* with ¹~~only~~ an interval of one number of the magazine. It was waged on quite a different basis; Webster sending his objections and when the editor still stood by his guns he returned no answer.

Brown's points are made by two notes and a conclusion, the first of which relates to the dictionary use of a word; and signed E. X. the second, ~~being~~ an acknowledgment of an error but ~~attempted to~~ be thrown on the shoulders of a correspondent and the conclusion which sums up the whole matter and shows Brown at his best in matters of this kind. It is worthy of quotation; ~~and reads:~~

• [A sincere desire that ample justice should be done to the merits of every author, has induced us to insert the foregoing letter, which, as it concerns a subject interesting to science, and, indirectly, to sound

1 Vol. III, p. 332 ff. The "monarch" had a cantankerous controversy with the editor of the Columbian Magazine (Vols. VI and VII) that ended similarly.

criticism and literature, will, we hope, notwithstanding its length, be favourably received by our readers. We shall always be happy to have our decisions rectified when they are wrong; for, as men and individuals, we have neither the *vanity* or *folly* to suppose that our judgments are *infallible*.—In matters of *taste* and *criticism*, as well as of *morality* and *history*, we have not yet discovered any mode by which the truth of our opinions could be *demonstrated*.—To the mathematical and physical sciences, belongs that demonstrative power which at once unfolds the truth and removes all doubt and uncertainty; but, concerning those things about which *wiser*, *older*, and more *learned* men have differed in opinion, a reviewer may be allowed to doubt.

We are charged with being wanting either in *attention* or *candour*. Some discoveries of the author have not been particularly noticed by us; but, though it belongs to the critic to distinguish *excellencies* as well as *defects*, yet, if *all* are not pointed out, the omission is venial if a sufficient account is given of the book to enable the reader to form a pretty good opinion of its contents and merits. Those who consider that near thirty of the large and crowded pages of our Review are occupied with Mr. Webster's book, will not consider us as deficient in respectful attention. And a *candid* and *impartial* examiner will perceive that we have praised his industry, commended the ingenuity and acuteness of his reasonings, the plausibility of his conjectures, and that weight of fact and deduction which has given, if not

demonstration, at least probability, to his theory; have applauded the cogent and persuasive manner in which the means of prevention of epidemical diseases are recommended; and have *apologised* for the many negligences and repetitions which are to be found in the work, as well as for the want of chemical and technical knowledge in its author. True, we have casually objected to *one* metaphor and *one* verb; have endeavoured to caution Mr. W. against furnishing, unintentionally, arguments for the infidel against the scripture miracles; have ventured to defend an historian of *equal learning, industry, and integrity* as himself, from the charge of ignorance, *superficiality* and studied perversion of the truth; have questioned the necessity of that accumulation of horrors, by bringing together all the evils and miseries which have befallen mankind, and placing them in such strong colours as to terrify and dishearten the

reader; have recommended a spirit of mildness, candour, and conciliation towards those, who entertain opposite or different opinions on *doubtful* subjects, rather than the indulgence of anger, indignation, or contempt; and a becoming caution in the needless adoption of a *theory* of generation dangerous to religion and sound philosophy; and have expressed a regret that the work, on the whole, was not more perfect, more thoroughly compacted, concocted, and elaborated, and such as the literary and critical reader had a right to expect from the author of an English Grammar, and Dissertations on the English Language. For all *such* errors and ignorances, we crave the indulgence and protection of an enlightened public.

We have expressed, what we really feel, respect and gratitude for the industry and zeal of a writer who has submitted to so much laborious and painful research, not with

any view to emolument or fame, but "solely from motives of humanity." Our prepossessions are all strongly in his favour; but, though friends of Plato, we are more the friends of truth. At present, we do not see sufficient reasons for retracting any of the opinions, that have been given in our Review. We are sorry, unintentionally, to have called forth what we do not merit, the *anger* and *contempt* of Mr. W. Though surprised, we are not *indignant* at his censure and reproof. We charitably make allowances for the infirmities of human nature, and that too irritable temperament which sometimes belongs to men of genius. Though *age* and *experience* are not convertible terms, we intend that the increase of years *shall* add to our *learning*, and, if necessary, to our *modesty* and *discretion*. Its influence on *liberality* is less certain; but that quality is not the less to be desired by *all* who *examine* or *controvert* the opinions of others. In these respects the public will decide between the author and the reviewer. It was certainly intended to exercise as much indulgence towards the History of Pestilence as was consistent with a due regard for our own reputation, and a respect for the taste and discernment of our readers. Its dissatisfied author will, we hope, find ample compensation for our deficiencies in the more favourable and indulgent decisions of other courts, in the great republic of English literature, before whom his performance may be tried.]

12/2

From ^a ~~one~~ note to Webster's letter it ¹ ~~would perhaps~~ ^{might} be surmised that Brown was not the reviewer; ~~of the controversy~~ but there is evidence to indicate he was ^{in both} ~~the reviewer in both controversies~~. That the details warrant our assumption of Brown's authorship is ~~to be seen as follows.~~

The arguments ~~of the reviewer~~ are in the character of Brown; that is they have his ideas, his tone and language. The introduction to the Candidus defense of Low is presented as the editor's; the fling of Candidus at Brown's Monody would hardly have been made unless he had known the reviewer to be Brown; the very slight attempt to take the editorial position of defending another person is flimsy and not sufficiently emphasized as it could not help but be if another had written it; the recurring counter-blows by the editor have in them less of defense ~~and more venom~~ than a mere judging editor ⁴ should have under like circumstances, and on the whole they ~~retorts~~ are ~~at the same time~~ entirely too modestly presented..

^{renew instance}
In the ~~case~~ ^a of the Webster book we have the same character of a reply with the same peculiarities as ~~noticed~~ in the Candidus case. ~~but~~ In addition we should recall ~~the fact~~ that Webster had never become one of Brown's friends though he was undoubtedly introduced

1 Vol III p 339

to the Friendly Club and was an intimate of long standing with other members of the circle; ~~that~~ the reviews of Webster's book are in the Brown method; they contain references to a book of ^{his} ~~Brown's~~ reading, Lowman On the Civil Government of the Hebrews; the reviewer is a champion of Gibbon; he hits especially at the supernatural side of Webster's arguments; he criticises the exaggeration of the plague horrors which Brown had avoided in his handling of the theme; he maintains the same attitude of encouraging as well as condemning the work; he practically "lets the cat out of the bag" in the note in volume three and too readily he accepts the blame for a statement in which the reviewer is supposed to have erred.

Those two controversies are practically the closing of our study of Brown's work ^{purely} as editor, ~~on this magazine~~.

As ~~we have done~~ in the ^{study} ~~case~~ of the Weekly Magazine we shall treat the contributions according to a three-fold classification. ~~And~~ First we shall consider those undoubtedly or capable of decisive proof as by Brown.

The Memoirs of Stephen Calvert were published in this magazine for the first time. The story appeared in eight instalments in the numbers for the months of June, July, August, September (and October, November and December,) 1799 and January, April, May and June 1800. As we have seen the number for September 1799 was the last one of the year, it being a four-months number made necessary by the removal of the publishers from the city during the yellow fever epidemic. The story therefore continued as a serial regularly, with the exception of two numbers.

The February number appeared without any instalment and the March number contained a so-called note.

From internal evidence this fanciful explanation was written by Brown: every sentence in it bears the impress of his manner and ideas and diction. In this connection attention should be called to what detectives consider the criminal imperfection, the idea that the criminal is incapable of perfecting and executing a plan, some slight detail being always wanting, which gives the clue to the detective and which in this case is the heading. The reasoning is that if the communication were an actual communication it would not be spoken of as a note. It reads:

NOTE on STEPHEN CALVERT.

Mr. Editor,

A FRIEND of mine lately desired me to lay aside some very urgent business in which I was engaged, to attend to a certain *Mr. Calvert*, whom he solicited my leave to introduce to me. My attention was otherwise engaged, and I saw nothing in the character of this stranger that promised to reward me for the time bestowed upon him; but my friend was extremely importunate, and assured me that I should have no reason to repent of my compliance. He said I should be infinitely entertained with the adventures of the man, that his life abounded with surprising turns of fortune, and that he would prevail with him to tell me his story.

On this condition I consented, and the stranger was introduced accordingly. Being fairly seated by a winter-evening's fire, he began his narrative. For a time I listened to it only by snatches. There was nothing very interesting in the theme, and I thought civility required no more than to *seem* to listen; gradually, however, some little curiosity was excited. The dullest story, if we can once be persuaded to begin it, will have charms enough to induce us to continue. Our sympathy is wonderfully prone to make the cause of others our own. Whether the story-teller be Richardson, or Mother-Bunch, Shakespeare, or Esop, let us once have but fairly entered on the tale, and the inertest curiosity will not fail to exclaim at every interruption, "*what next?*"

Thus it was with me, but the unlucky rogue, as soon as he observed my eyes steadfastly fixed on him, that I no longer shifted my posture, nor coughed, nor hemmed every second minute, nor rubbed my eyes, nor left my seat to snuff the candles; in fine, when he saw that my attention was completely engaged, he started up suddenly, without warning or apology, in the very heart of an interesting dialogue, snatched his hat from the table, and whipped out of the house. You may well believe that I was vexed at such treatment, and the more so, because I had good reason to believe that it was done at the instigation, or at least with the connivance of the one who introduced him. I was heartily disposed to forswear all intercourse with my friend, and turn him out of doors. He, however, fearful, I supposed, of conse-

quences, made his escape at the same moment. I hereby give him notice that he need not give himself the trouble of calling at my house, unless he brings his acquaintance along with him to apologize for his abrupt departure, and to make an end of his story. I care not how soon he may lead me to the close of it; how many incidents he drops; whether it be prolix or concise, merry, or doleful; at any rate I beseech ye now, good Mr. Calvert, *do* bring your story to an end. H.

[The narrative of Calvert was interrupted for good reasons, with which, however, it would be absurd and impertinent to tease the reader. The obstacles are now removed, and the tale will be resumed in the ensuing number, and punctually continued. P.]¹

Whether the ascription of this H communication to Brown is warranted or whether it connects the initial with James Brown is of no particular importance. It may show James was interested to have made up ^{the} a communication ~~concerning the story~~ and if it does it merely confirms our belief that he showed more than brotherly interest in ^{Brown's} the literary affairs ~~of our author~~.

To his brother James in Philadelphia, Brown's letter ~~was dated~~
2.
New York April 1800, says:

"I gave you, I thought, a good reason for the temporary suspension of Calvert. It will, in the ensuing number, be resumed, and I hope not again checked in its course, till its course be finished."

1 The story was resumed in April. ~~What was the cause of the delay we do not know. If we consider the reviews Brown probably wrote and Mary Selwyn we should find in them sufficient of an excuse.~~
2 Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 99. The date should be March, (?), 1800.

The composition ~~of this work~~ is ~~well~~ determined by the diaries of Smith and Dunlap. The earliest record is Smith's ~~of~~ 4 September 1798.

"Read in his new-begun "Stephen Calvert"."

On the same day Brown ~~writing~~^a in his joint letter to Dunlap tells how he had abandoned Carwin and begun Stephen Calvert.

"I have desisted for the present from the prosecution of this plan, and betook myself to another which I mean to extend to the size of Wieland, and to finish by the end of this month, provided no yellow fever disconcert my schemes."

On the 11th. of September Smith records:

"Read in Brown's "Stephen Calvert"."

The yellow fever ~~ultimately~~ did upset Brown's plans ~~and the work~~
~~had to be interrupted~~^{it} but was resumed toward the end of September in
 Perth Amboy at ~~the lodgings in~~ Miss Thorpe's house.

Dunlap's diary for 25 September 1798 ~~not only records the composition~~
~~but~~ supplies a very important detail concerning the title. ~~It reads:~~

"Read the beginning of Charles' last novel called Calvert (proposed to be changed to Caillemour) or the lost brothers".

~~Apparently~~ The excellent change in title possibly though not necessarily suggested by Dunlap fell on deaf ears or at least on ears that were attuned to a different key when selecting titles. ~~In 1815 when Dunlap republished the work it bore Brown's selection--probably the~~

~~change was forgotten.~~

In Brown's days it was not necessary to explain the ~~choice of the~~ surname as due to the founder and first colonial proprietor of Baltimore but where the baptismal name came from is not clear for there is no Stephen Calvert known to fame.

1

The indistinguishable twin motive which forms ~~only~~ a small part and not by any means the foundation of the story is not ~~definitely to be traceable~~.
~~traced~~ In the Weekly Magazine Brown had made the query (No.16) as to the possibility of ^{indistinguishable} ~~lack of identification~~ of twins; the idea might also owe something to Mademoiselle Scudery's Grand Cyrus referred to in the course of the story but there were two famous literary sources possible: ~~of use by Brown;~~ the Menaechmi of Plautus and Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors. In both ~~of these dramas~~ the story was a comedy; in Brown's hands it becomes tragedy. In both the solution is given; in Brown's ~~story~~ the solution is to be guessed at by the reader. In both the puzzle is clear to the audience; in Brown's it is not known to the reader. In all three the complication is assisted by the duplication of the name. The doubt of the possibility of mistaken identity in the prologue; the search ~~by~~

1 The article Resemblance of the Weekly Magazine 20 April 1799, Vol. Vol.IV, pp.39-40 appeared seven or eight months too late to have given Brown any material.

the unmarried twin for his lost brother and the[^] separation of the twins
by flight to another country would suggest Brown had read Plautus.

The relation ~~of the story of his life~~ by Aegeon in the Comedy of Errors

finds an echo in Brown's recluse of Michigan. Brown ~~does~~ not use the

motive in the same spirit as Plautus and Shakespeare but merely as

a complication of the love story and the character of Stephen Calvert.

Shakespeare ~~indeed~~ was indebted to Plautus and if Brown only read the

Roman he achieved a remarkable coincidence in that he used the same

method of narration, ~~for his story~~. There is no reason why he could

not have been familiar with both antecedent authors.

The Memoirs of Stephen Calvert are the supposed autobiographic

narrative of the Recluse, ~~of Michigan~~ ^{a man} who lives on an almost inaccessible island in the middle of ~~the lake~~ ^{of that name}. It is ~~not~~ ^{though} a fragment ~~and similar to the original plan for Wieland as a drama in acts~~ ^{it is given as being} represented to be the first ~~act~~ of a five act drama, the four other acts not being ~~in existence~~ ^{even} or suggested.

~~Act one, which is all we have of~~ The story is mainly concerned with the various ~~difficulties through~~ ^{but} which Stephen Calvert ~~passes when he is involved in the complications which attend his being mistaken for his twin brother.~~ ^{because} He becomes engaged to his homely cousin Louisa ~~so as~~ to retain the fortune which has been bequeathed to him but which he believes to ~~justly~~ belong to her. The engagement is broken through ~~the power of~~ a friend and former rival who claims to have proof of his unworthiness. Stephen ~~rescues a beautiful young lady from a fire and becomes a lover of hers.~~ ^{the} ^{Clelia} ~~He visits her clandestinely until~~ ^{because} She refuses to marry him. ^{another} She is already a wife, having deserted her husband with ~~her~~ lover, Stephen's twin brother. Stephen forthwith runs away intending to go to Ireland, is rescued at sea and brought back. Meanwhile

~~I see query 16 is given and explained in our account of the Weekly Magazine. Perhaps the twins may owe something to Scudery Grand Cyrus.~~

Sydney Carlton, the friend, has discovered ~~that~~ Stephen has a "double" whom he has all along watched and taken for him and the explanation being made by three letters which Stephen reads, the long-lost and supposed-dead twin brother is found and the story ends.

The first fault ~~that~~ one finds ~~in this work~~ is the obvious one of incompleteness. How well the plot is worked up can not be judged when we are left with no definite information ~~of~~ how Louisa was ruined and died, as ~~faintly~~ suggested ~~in the story~~; how the fickle young man managed the Clelia Neville affair, especially when he found his real rival was his twin brother; how Stephen came to become the Recluse of Michigan; and who the friend was to whom he narrates the story. ^{We} ~~Of course one~~ can logically fit these details into ~~suitable~~ gaps in the fragment, but whether Brown would have done likewise is quite uncertain; in fact they are concerned only with the supposed fragmentary nature of the story. Perhaps after all as seems suggested in the closing paragraph, Brown intended logical assumptions and considered the story sufficiently complete. ~~However the matter is not of importance.~~

Minor faulty details can be easily found. Two Henrys, one the son

and another the ⁿgrandson of Sir Stephen; two ¹Felices, one the real one and the other ~~really~~ Stephen who was called Felix after the real ^{one}~~Felix~~ was supposed to be dead; and three Stephens, one the so-called Sir Stephen, another the son, often spoken of as father, and the third the hero of the story: all only tend to confuse the reader. The whole series of complicating ~~inter-woven~~ family history could very well have been compressed or ~~else~~ a good part of it could ~~equally as well~~ have been omitted.

The name of Ambrose Calvert is given to the Frenchman who married Louisa; but according to the earlier explanation his name should have been Gaspard.

In explaining ~~about~~ the loss of Felix, the twin brother, when he was a baby, there are two children mentioned. Who the other child was is not ~~made~~ clear, but it ^{may be} ~~probably is supposed that~~ the reader ^{should} ~~will~~ conclude it was the child of the old nurse Alice.

In the fourth instalment Mrs. Rivers the shop-keeper uses two expressions that properly Brown should have explained by his old custom of footnotes. She asks, Has she got shet of her cold? Shet is an obsolete dialectical form of shut and the question probably means, Is she confined by her cold? Then she asks, was the cruel 1 One of Sharpless' sons named Felix resided in North Carolina. See Dunlap's Arts of Design Vol. II, p. 72.

of the right color? Cruel should have been spelled crewel. and it is a ~~kind of~~ fine worsted or wool thread.

In the fourth instalment there is an excellent contrast of ~~the two characters~~ Louisa and Clelia. The former is ~~pictured as~~ poorly formed, diminutive, small-pox scarred, and with no particular accomplishment to make her attractive to a man too young to appreciate her virtues; while the latter is ideal in figure and manner, possessing all that charms the eye and ear, with a great love for reading and singing. The part involving the fire and the rescue is Brown's best work in the story.

A little later there is plenty of the sentimental and, though weak on the woman's side, ~~on the principle that all the world loves a lover~~ it is very good love making and should be better known than it has been.

That Brown intended to make Clelia an unusual musician is evident from his picturing her as playing a Viol D'Amour.¹

~~The two characters~~ Louisa and Clelia are almost symbolical of the spiritual and the temporal. All the characteristics of Louisa are those that we ought to follow and we are indeed fortunate

a/ 1 Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians says "The Viola d'Amore is a singularly beautiful and attractive instrument, but the inherent difficulties of execution are not easily surmounted..."

if we only have one or two of ~~the several~~ of Clelia. ¹~~At the same~~
~~time~~ there is no doubt ~~that~~ Brown intended Clelia to represent
 the visionary ^{romantic} ~~S~~ dream love, ^{an} ~~of romance, one's~~ elective affinity/
~~as it were~~, and Louisa ^{to be} the worthy ~~virtuous~~ woman suitable for a
 wife.

Up to this time Brown has not given us any prominent virtuous
 man character. He had ^{pictured} ~~given us~~ Constantia Dudley as a high type of
 woman in Ormond, but he has waited until now ¹ to give us a Sydney
 Carlton. In word and deed ^{he} ~~Sydney~~ is one of nature's true noblemen,
~~He is~~ unselfish, wise, brave and good, ~~one cannot help but picture~~
~~him as~~ a thoroughly sound man loveable to men as well as to
 women. As we have said there is no foundation for conjecturing
 just how the story was to end, but we cannot help but believe that
 if Brown had intended, in this work, as he always did in others, to
 have justice reign at the end, rather than to teach the unpleasant
 moral that ~~the~~ virtue often falls before the vice of the world,
 he would have had Sydney marry Louisa. But perhaps he preferred
 to give Sydney ~~even~~ a higher place ~~in the work~~ by making him a
 sort of omniscient deity. It is hardly possible to believe ~~that~~

there are any who, on reading the Memoirs of Stephen Calvert, would

1 An unfortunate circumstance connected with this work is that it
 has never been included in Brown's works where it might have

not prefer to know what Sydney's ^{later} ~~after~~ life was, rather than ~~that~~
^{to follow the career}
 of the man who is obviously the hero, ~~of the work.~~

Two excellent details are the surprise experienced by Calvert
 when he sees homely Louisa for the first time ^{his astonishment} and when he learns
 of the reported social position of the beautiful ~~and~~ woman whom he
 had rescued. The force of the latter is ^{practically} ~~also~~ doubled when we
 become aware ~~that~~ she was ~~really~~ not a servant at all. In the
 May 1800 instalment Calvert's mother is sent off to a friend's
 so ~~that~~ there would be no interested witness of his presence at
 the country estate. In the June instalment there is an excellent
 correspondence in the emotions of Calvert and the action of the
 sea.

The most conspicuous detail ~~that~~ suggests ^{why} the autobiographic is
 in the use of ~~the main facts of~~ the life of Charles Brockden, from
 whom ~~we have seen that~~ Brown received his name. Charles Brockden
 is the prototype for the senior Stephen Calvert, the father of the
 one who gives his name to ^{the} ~~Brown's~~ story. Some of the details given
 are new; either they were not generally known ~~about the real per-~~
~~sonage~~, or else they are pure ~~//~~ inventions. In religion and offspring
 and death they differ materially, but both were involved in political

plots heard under slightly different circumstances, both were married men, both lawyers, and both emigrated to America where they were employed as scriveners and conveyancers. Evidently the life of Charles Brockden when he had settled in America was not what would be expected from the cause of his flight from England. The beginning was dramatic but after that the even tenor of the life of an excellent lawyer was lacking in just the striking details that Brown saw fit to add.

Aside from the Charles Brockden material there are few details of an autobiographic nature. Stephen Calvert, the hero of the story, is said to have spent ten years at a Scottish adventurer's school in Woodbury, New Jersey which reminds us that Brown was ten years at Proud's school; Calvert is pictured as literary and bookish; like Edgar Huntly, Calvert made no use of his rifle except for wild beasts; like Brown's ancestors a farmer usually has his farm on the Delaware near Chester; and the exaggeration of self-condemnation; ¹comprise the principal details which may have been taken from Brown's own life in assembling those of Calvert.

The rescue of a young woman from a fire as pictured in this work reminds one of the same incident in Wieland. Though well
1 Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 452.

enough for an incidental to a romance with a motive in no ways related to that of Stephen Calvert, the treatment in Wieland is decidedly artificial and superficial in comparison. The possibilities of the scene in itself were of course wisely ignored because the rescue bore no relation to the main story. The scene was given from the interior or narrator's point of view, while in Stephen Calvert the incident is wholly from the exterior or spectator's point of view. In the former the fact of narration diminishes the strength of the dramatic situation for of course one has to survive a fire to narrate it. In the latter all things are within possibility. Apart from the excellence of the dramatic the Stephen Calvert fire is indispensable; the whole Clelia Neville affair, and through that the story itself, depending on its occurrence.

Clelia's latticed summer house in the garden recalls Clara Wieland's in Wieland; Calvert's entrance and surprising Clelia¹ by touching her elbow recalls Ormond's surprise of Helena Cleves; the use of the rifle for panthers, the Red men and the inaccessible banks of the island recall Edgar Huntly; and the name Ambrose given to the father of Louisa has also been used in the fragment named Jessica; in fact many of the names in this work did service

¹ Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 409.

in other works of Brown. Peggy will appear in Clara Howard, in Edgar Huntly she appeared as Peg; Alice will be found in Jane Talbot; Cicero recalls the Death of Cicero; Jenny appeared in Jessica; a landlady appeared in the Man at Home and as we have seen was a character which Brown never neglected; Mrs. Wallace was plain Wallace in the same work; and Carlton and a Miss Carlton appeared in Arthur Mervyn.

The picture of Ambrose Calvert the tyrant of an estate on which there were negro slaves, though short, is just as powerful an argument against slavery as Uncle Tom's Cabin, but the story has its own moral in the degraded life and ignominious death of the brutal, though the cruelty is only one side of the true situation. The negro dialect as here used¹ is one of the best details of characterization in the whole work.

The introduction has a passage which shows Brown's appreciation of the development that was sure to come to the country near Lake Michigan. It reads:

"Scarcely half a century will elapse, before this desolation will give place to farms and villages, and commerce will be busy on the banks of the Ohio, and in the islands of this lake."

¹ Vol. I, p. 277.

In one part of this work Brown made a strong charge against
 Mademoiselle Scudéry's Grand Cyrus¹. The passage reads:

"I took the book, and the first words I met with were Statira, Lysimachus, Perdiccas. I closed the volume with a deep sigh. She darted piercing eyes at me, and said "Why that sorrowful air? Do you know the book?" "Full well," I answered. "If I ever grow old and reflect upon the events that formed my character, I shall mark out this book as the most powerful of all the agents who made me what I am. If I am fickle and fantastic, not a moral or rational, or political being, but a thing of mere sex, this it was that fashioned me. I almost predict that I shall owe an ignominious life, and a shameful end, to this book."

While Brown's opinions of books are interesting they are of little value except as indicating the sources of his methods. With its episodes carried to the limit of a modern reader's patience the Grand Cyrus may have taught Brown the same faulty technique.

Although Stephen Calvert lacks completeness in that, at the end the hero is not married to the heroine, whoever she may be, it is marred by fewer faulty details than any other of Brown's stories. Ages and relationships and professions are consistently kept in mind throughout and with the few exceptions noted the story is mechanically well constructed.

This work was reprinted in the so-called Dunlap's Memoirs of Brown² and in the collection called Carwin the Biloquist and other American Tales; in the latter of which it was divided into thirteen 2 1815, Vol. II, pp. 274-472.

1 Artamenes, or the Grand Cyrus, Englished by F.G. Esq., London, 1691.

unnamed chapters. As there reprinted in 1822 they correspond

to the Monthly Magazine text as follows:

Chapter		As in Vol. I, <u>Monthly Magazine</u>	
II	begins	"The death of his brother..."	page 201
III	"	"I have mentioned that one..."	" 207
IV 1	"	"Such were the emotions..."	" 267
V	"	"There is but one goal..."	" 277
VI	"	"This state, so fertile..."	" 357
VII	"	"I should in vain attempt..."	" 431
		As in Vol. II of the same	
VIII	"	"Meanwhile, my first visit..."	" 22
IX	"	"From upbraiding Clelia..."	" 256
X	"	"When the interview..."	" 270
XI 2	"	"What a state..."	" 330
XII	"	"In this tumult..."	" 336
XIII	"	"The letters, for I afterwards..."	" 417

(This breaks up a paragraph.)

On page 192, Vol. I, there is a dash inserted before "My ancestry were English" so as to divide the introductory paragraphs from the main narrative.

Stephen Calvert has not been given its proper place of importance in Brown's work never having appeared as a separate book and not being included in the usual editions of his collected works.

As a part of Brown's life and work it stands in the relation of a connecting link between the romances and the novels. Were it not for the semi-mysterious nature of the mistaken identity motive the work would belong to the group including Clara Howard and Jane Talbot. Had the love incidents been idealized and the explanation of the twin brother omitted it could have been made a romance. But as a matter of fact the work is something of both,

1 Chapter IV begins Volume II.

2 Chapter XI begins Volume III.

without being distinctively either.

At the same time in considering the Memoirs of Stephen Calvert as a link we should bear in mind that Brown made no deliberate change. His romanticism was dovetailed into his realism. As an author he passed gradually from being a dreamer to being a practical man, and like all traits inherent in human nature the ideal one was not obliterated all at once but had its fits of return.

In volume one on page twenty-one there appears a fragment of Edgar Huntly, introduced by E.H. There seems to be sufficient

circumstantial evidence to prove the introduction Brown's. ~~Just~~

~~What~~ relation the fragment bore to the published book has been

treated in our study of Edgar Huntly, to which the reader is referred.

" " " 1
The Roman story ~~entitled~~ Thessalonica is unquestionably by Brown.

~~Just~~ When it was written is uncertain; its sentence formation would

~~at first~~ appear to indicate ~~that~~ it was one of his early studies,

possibly of his days of classical study, or ^{it} was written about the

time of its publication, ^{xx} when he reverted to his earlier style,

almost abandoning the characteristic staccato sentence. In the

absence of any clear evidence it seems as if the latter were the

truth, and this is confirmed by the fact that Brown showed his

greatest knowledge of Roman history and names when he was writing

Ormond.

When it was included in volume two of Dunlap's biography of Brown

no statement concerning it was made. ^{It} ~~Dunlap~~ ^{was} probably included ~~it~~

as one of the "rarest of his printed works," ~~as the title page~~

~~suggests~~ but ~~as we have stated~~ this magazine in which it appears

for the first time is not at all rare.

Thessalonica is, with The Death of Cicero (in Edgar Huntly)

another instance of what Brown was able to do with a few facts

as a foundation for a work of fiction. So far as it has its basis

1 Vol. I, p. 99, reprinted Dunlap, Vol. II, p. 170 ff.

The incident was the Helots in Grecian history.

in Roman history it is undoubtedly a practise piece just as the Cicero. In fact it is an unusually well constructed study of Roman life.

The plot is concerned with the massacre of the inhabitants of Thessalonica by the order of Theodosius. According to Gibbon¹ the wholesale proscription of seven thousand, or more, people of all classes regardless of sex or condition was the punishment for the action of a mob, when it learned that Botheric the general had imprisoned a favorite charioteer. The massacre in the circus to which the people had come expecting the usual amusement of a holiday was a climax in which Brown saw wonderful literary material.

If Gibbon was as seems probable the source of the story we can find Brown's alterations for dramatic effect in the justified purification of the motive of Botheric's death, in the air of secrecy thrown over the deliberations of Theodosius and in the suspension pictured in the minds of the leaders of the doomed people. Other than such variations from historical authority Brown chose to delineate the story only up to the climax, with no reference to the remorse suffered by Theodosius for his brutality.

Thessalonica has many of the defects and excellencies of Brown's

1 Decline and Fall, Vol. V, p. 64 ff., London, 1807. First edition, 1766-88.

other works.

There are several faulty details which are characteristic, ~~of~~^{is} ~~Brown~~ among which as most evident ~~we may mention~~ the apparent assassination of Macro, who, we learn later, was only wounded and went off home; the constant shifting of the scene from the city and its homes to the circus and vice versa; the messenger to Theodosius is first "a messenger" and later becomes a body of "horsemen"; the inconsistency of the numbers of the people massacred, at first being all and later we learn many escaped. To relate how the civil magistrate, who is the narrator, escaped never seems to have occurred to Brown to be worthy of even a hint.

Probably the most glaring fault in the construction is the changing^e of the point of view. Throughout there is a mingling of regular objective narrative as ~~being~~ by the author and of subjective narrative as ~~being~~ by the narrating character within the author's narrative. Had Brown adopted and stuck to one or the other method and only^{one,} certain needless repetitions would have been evident at the time of composition and would probably have been omitted.

Perhaps the best description in it is the scene at the Senate

when the people are awaiting the answer of Theodosius, and if we were using quotations to illustrate our point we should quote that one.

The opening paragraphs are excellent, the descriptions are thorough, the steps in the narrative are logical and follow one another with increasing force until they culminate in that of the shows.

In one detail Brown here made a master stroke. If we remember that the story was based on the real history in which the charioteer was missed by the mob in the circus we will see what an excellent use he made of the suggestion and will all the more appreciate the scene that follows, when the audience awaited the entrance of Valimer the general and the tribunes, and the charioteer of the first race was struck from his seat by a dart thrown by an unknown hand.

Characteristic touches may be found in the relation of the massacre by "I" who takes the trouble to state that he has drawn up a statement of the affair; the complication of the plot by the suggestion that Rufinus and Botheric were planning to take over the rule of the state; the moralizing of the narrator in closing

his narrative, the massacre ending at midnight and the burial of Botheric at night and the attempt of Eustace to escape by sailing on a vessel: all are Brown favorites.

~~"The pavements were beaten by numberless feet" should be compared with "the pavement....is beaten by innumerable feet" in the Series of Original Letters and Stephen Calvert for it helps us to prove Brown was the author of the Original Letters.~~

As a minor work of ~~the~~ practise, ~~kind~~, as a study that ignores the historical importance of the facts involved, ~~in the fiction~~, as a short story, if the reader prefers to call it such, for filling a number of the magazine, this "Roman story" has in its display of ~~Brown's~~ power of narration and analysis an excellence beyond the average ~~work~~ of its kind. For those who like historical fiction it will be found to be no feeble example.

Save for its appearance in the biography by Dunlap and a¹ present-day reprint in a collection of short stories, it has been left in the Monthly Magazine buried in an undeserved oblivion.

1 Edited by Alexander Jessop in Representative American Short Stories Boston (1923) pp.9-23. Brown's punctuation, spelling and capitalization are altered. On page 13 sword is used for sworis; pp.17 and 22 Mediolanum is not italicised; and p.23 the (motives) should be these. Why all the titles were entered in the alphabetical list p.60 (of what is really a nameless appendix) is beyond our comprehension. Thessalonica is the only short story in the whole ten.

Brown's ~~the~~ monody on the death of George Washington
 which was delivered as a prologue at the New
 York Theatre on Sunday evening 30 December
 1799. It has been noticed by Cooper to The Robbery
~~to be in our~~ biographical study of Brown.
~~let was reprinted~~ in the Monthly Magazine
Vol. I, p. 478. was published in the newspapers and Brown
reprinted it

Immediately following ~~the monody prologue to the Robbery~~ ^{in the}
~~Monthly Magazine~~ ^{drama.} is the epilogue to the same ~~performance~~. There are
 several Brown traits in it but for want of ^{conclu} decisive proof we ^{shall} ~~must~~
 consider it ~~in another place~~ among the third class of contributions ^{to}
 this periodical.
~~So far as we have been able to discover it appears that Brown's~~

~~It is Brown's~~

9 Brown's

his

practise was not uniform in supplying the material for the various periodicals, ~~with which he was connected.~~ In one ^{instance} ~~case~~ ^{would} he wrote for it, in another he merely pulled out some of his manuscript store; so ~~that~~ it is impossible for us to decide with accuracy the time when he composed certain of his contributions.

Jessica is one of these undated works, and when we have completed our study of it, the ~~decision~~ ^{of} dating it ~~as we have done~~ will be seen to be strengthened by the degree of perfection which he attains. ~~For the present purpose of opening the discussion~~ The appearance in this magazine of six of its twenty-nine letters makes it proper to include here our study of the fragment named in 1822 by Colburn's editor, Jessica.

According to Allen who gave all the information we have about its composition it was written immediately after Alcuin ~~was finished~~. We have no other evidence than that ~~single~~ flimsy detail, ~~and it which~~ is very ^{Likely} ~~doubtful~~ if Allen ~~there stated it~~ ⁱⁿ correct. ~~1/1~~

Brown's ~~own~~ account of it ¹ as given by Allen and reprinted by Dunlap ² ³ reads as follows.

1 The one beginning at bottom of Dunlap, Vol. I, p. 120 and five new ones not given by Allen ~~and~~ Dunlap.
2 P. 106 ff.
3 Vol. I, pp. 107-8.

1242

"When this was finished, I commenced something in the form of a Romance. I had at first no definitive conceptions of my design. As my pen proceeded forward, my invention was tasked, and the materials that it afforded were arranged and digested. Fortunately I continued to view this scheme in the same light in which it had at first presented itself. Time therefore did not diminish its attractions. The facility I experienced in composition, and the perception of daily progress encouraged me, and my task was finished on the last day of December.

"I hardly know how to regard this exploit. Is it a respectable proof of perseverance or not? Considering my character in its former appearances, this steadiness of application might not have been expected. What is the nature or merit of my performance? This question is not for me to answer. My decision is favourable or otherwise, according to the views which I take of the subject. When a mental comparison is made between this and the mass of novels, I am inclined to be pleased with my own production. But when the objects of comparison are changed, and I revolve the transcendent merits of Caleb Williams, my pleasure is diminished, and is preserved from a total extinction only by the reflection that this performance is the first. That every new attempt will be better than the last, and that considered in the light of a prelude or first link, it may merit that praise to which it may possess no claim, considered as a last best creation.

"It was at first written in an hasty and inaccurate way. Before I can submit it to a printer, or even satisfactorily rehearse it to a friend, it must be wholly transcribed. I am at present engaged in this employment. I am afraid, as much time will be required by it, as was necessary to the original composition. I

do not fear but that I shall finish my labour, barring all extraordinary accidents."

Whether or not this refers to the story about Jessy Arnot is not certain but it is given so by Allen and Dunlap and for want of proof to indicate that it refers to some other work it will have to stand as it is.

At best the whole quotation is vague and contradictory. From its mention of comparison with novels it seems as if it refers to a novel. But at the beginning it is spoken of as a romance. However either way Jessica could be meant. In one place it says the task

was completed on the last day of December; in another it mentions
 the necessity of copying it for the printer. This can hardly refer
 to Jessica unless Allen and Dunlap mutilated what promises to be one of
 Brown's best works, for we only have it as a fragment. So far as
 we know all of Jessica was never copied for the printer. ~~If Jessica~~
~~is referred to~~ It also does not seem probable that it ^{was} ~~had been~~
 finished in December 1798 for ^{it} ~~Jessica~~ has more traces of the
 influence of Ormond than of Wieland, so ^{quite likely} ~~that~~ it ~~probably~~ was
 1799. The reflection that it was his first ~~novel~~ ~~we presume~~
~~for Alcuin had been written~~ entirely ignores the story of
Julius. As ^{may be} ~~we shall~~ see at greater length when we ~~make our~~ study
 of Brown's indebtedness to Godwin the comparison with Caleb Williams
 is hardly indicative of Jessica; for in it there is nothing
^{at all} ~~in the least possibly~~ suggestive of Caleb Williams; and the only
^{right be} ~~possible~~ slight trace of Godwin ~~may be~~ in the ~~barely mentioned~~
 speculation on government of Colden and Harry Arnot. So that on ^{which it is likely was due to Rousseau} ~~or other~~
^{cannot} ~~the whole the quotation is not~~ to be relied on, and ^{sources of inspiration} ~~some day~~ it
 may be shown to be connected with some other work.

When in 1822 the series of letters which compose this work were
 included in the London publication entitled Carwin and other

American Tales and pieces the title of Jessica was given to them, and inasmuch as the name is ~~taken~~ from the principal character's signatures to some of the letters it is probably as satisfactory as any other. At the same time it is only proper to state that while we are justified in assuming ~~that~~ he would have named the story from the principal character because that was his custom, it should be noticed that the title was not given by Brown.

The name of Jessica is of course ~~taken~~ from the Merchant of Venice. Not only is she reminiscent of ~~that drama~~ because of her name, she is also more than a mere name because of the situation in which we find her. Her semi-recluse habits make profitable a comparison with the instructions given to the better-known Jessica by Shylock (Act II, pp. 169-70, First Folio edition). Brown remarkably places his heroine as Shylock would have his daughter. ~~However, in more than these details Brown was not here~~ more indebted to the Merchant of Venice.

- 1 Because Aaron Burr once assumed the name of Arnot is interesting but from Brown's use of it we are not warranted in assuming he based any part of it on Burr's life.
- 2 ~~It is improbable that Brown derived his idea from Burns' Cotter's Saturday Night (stanza X) for the name is different (Jenny) and so far as Brown gives the story we should not assume that evil of Colclough's character.~~

It has been erroneously ^{believed} ¹ ~~considered~~ that Jessica made its first appearance in Dunlap's book in 1815. In fact on page 108 it says ^{it} ~~that the work~~ "has never seen the press". That statement taken literally from Allen is only partially true.

The letter beginning on page 120 of volume one had already ^{ed} ~~made its appearance~~ in the ^{July 1860} Monthly Magazine ^(Vol. III, pp. 37-9) ~~in volume three~~ ~~on pages 37 to 39~~ under the title of Friendship: an original letter. But this is not all. Five ^{more} ~~of the~~ letters are to be ^{in the August number (pp. 101-11)} ~~found on pages 101 to 111 of this same periodical~~, introduced by Brown to his readers with this fictitious note:

"To the Editor of the Monthly Magazine.

Sir,

Some of your Readers, who may have been pleased with the simple ~~strait~~ of the Letter published in your last Number, page 29, may not be displeased with the following, by the same hand. N.O.2

Page 29 is an error for ³ 37 and the letter there given was taken from the body of Jessica.

1 The editor of the London 1822 edition of Dunlap's biography (p. 74 n.) fell into the same error.

2 This is the only appearance of these initials in all of the magazines with which Brown was in any way connected.

3 If Brown were interested in cryptography, which we do not know he was, this error might be used as a detail of our argument to prove the Trials of Arden to be his. Oftentimes errors are intentional and have wonderful meanings to the initiated.

These five newly-discovered letters were given as "Original Letters";¹unlike Jessica as given by Allen and Dunlap they were numbered and dated respectively:I, June 10, 1764;II, June 15;III, June 18;IV, June 21;and V, June 24. For the continuity of the story No.I should be placed after the first letter as given by Dunlap and No.II^{-Y} likewise should follow the third letter as[^] given by Dunlap.

The information imparted by these new letters is most important for they supply many details not otherwise given;especially the full account of the Arnot family and the misfortunes which lead up to the situation presented.

The story is located in New York, the letters of Jessica being written from her home on the Bowery. Unlike most of Brown's placing of his stories all the minute descriptive details are given even the green of the court and the ivy on the walls of the two-storied house.

¹ Why those given were not dated is not known.

With the five important additional letters Jessica still remains incomplete ^{but} ~~and~~ what there is of the story is simple and excellent and may be summarized as follows. Jessica, a very loveable ~~and feminine~~ girl of about twenty years of age, lives with her blind mother in a pretty little home on the Bowery, deriving their sustenance by her needle. In course of time her brother Harry a lawyer introduces a young mysterious man as a boarder in the house. As in almost all similar circumstances Jessica falls in love with him, and the fragment ends, ~~at the point~~ when she has succeeded in drawing Colden into conversation.

~~Had it been~~ Completed it might have been ~~better than~~ the best story Brown ever wrote; at least if what he have ~~here~~ is a fair sample. ~~of what the whole might have been.~~

^{It} ~~The work~~ is presented in epistolary form, and while it has traces of the influence of ^{Rousseau's Heloise and possibly more of} Richardson it attempts with slight exception what the ~~greater men~~ did not, the presentation of the story from a single point of view. Only three of the letters of Jessica's correspondent, Sophia or Julia, are given at the

opening of the story and they are unnecessary and might well have been omitted. The rest of the thirty letters, which includes the five newly discovered ones, are from Jessica to Sophia and except for two enclosures, the letters of Courtland and Sophia's father, no others are given.

Allen and Dunlap called attention in a note to the ¹ ^{unimportant} peculiarity that the names of Julia and Sophia were used indiscriminately for Jessica's friend. The former was used twenty-nine times and Sophia ninety-nine; but Julia was used twenty-two times, in fact always, in the five newly-discovered letters. Sophia was signed once, used ninety-three times in the text, and five times modified to Sophy; so that so far as Allen and Dunlap were concerned they ^{more correct} ~~statement~~ would have been ~~true~~ if the note had said that once in a great while the name of Julia was used for Sophia.

The situation and character of Colden is suggestive of the same ^{Jane Talbot} ~~named individual in a later work of Brown's~~; in ^{fact} ~~fact~~ this fragment was ^{possibly} ~~probably~~ drawn upon for the Trials of Arden where we have a supposed religious spy,

~~or for the character of Colden~~ In Jane Talbot as if

1 In Allen the text type was used; in Dunlap the note was in the customary smaller size.

~~in writing the latter work~~ Brown ~~had~~ simplified what had perhaps appeared as too complicated a situation.

Thus it is possible Jessica may belong to Jane Talbot in letter XXXV where Colden speaks of his "conduct towards the poor Jessy." That it may also bear some relation to the fragments Adini, Medway and Henry Colden seems probable but is not clear enough to be accurately defined.

How the story would have been completed is ~~mostly~~ ^{ed} conjectural ~~but we have~~ ^{from the} hints thrown out, ~~and by following them~~ ^{we} are lead to believe that Colden, the mysterious boarder, has renounced the Roman Catholic faith ^{to} ~~and~~ become a Protestant; ~~for that~~ ^{for} that reason he is greatly affected by the questions which Jessica asks. Possibly ~~he~~ ^{he} Colden was intended to ~~turn out~~ ^{prove} to be Watkins, the betrothed of her friend and correspondent and whom Jessica knows has never been loved by Sophia and will never be married by ~~her~~. What course the brother would pursue when he learned ~~that~~ Jessica ~~had~~ not heeded his warning and had fallen in love with Colden is uncertain. If Colden's life had been a stainless, though undoubtedly hard, one it is only too probable ~~that~~ Jessica would marry him, but the suggestion of some ~~possible~~ crime may have turned the matter into

another direction. What fate would await Sophia is quite possible to be conjectured--she ~~probably~~ would win over her father and ~~all~~ other objectors and marry her lover Courtland.

Jessica in distinct contrast to other ~~of~~ Brown's work, is a fascinating love story. It starts out with no moral and if it had been finished we could hardly have expected it to have one. It narrates ~~wonderfully~~ well the inception and development of the love of an extremely human and attractive young woman.

Its faults are the characteristic ~~faults~~ of Brown's work at all times. There is the ~~same~~ familiar method of introducing a character and naming him afterward; the lack of attention to minor details such as the unexplained changing age of Jessica, once being eighteen and another time twenty-two; a reference to the death of a sister, later to two of them; and the introduction of a cat and a book when they are convenient to the author's purpose. And yet they are surprisingly few in number.

First among the master strokes is the scheme of giving, with the slight exception of the first three, only the letters ~~written by~~

⌚ Jessica. Therein Brown made an improvement on the epistolary form, as applied to a story. ^{When you} ~~If one~~ makes a character of a letter-writing sympathetic nature there is no necessity for ^{jump} ~~skipping all over~~

here and there lessening the effect of a single point of view, and
 straining the reader's patience by inserting the retaliatory
 comments of the other characters, ~~in the story~~. ~~There can be~~ One
 character of predominating importance and the letters written by
 that one character to one correspondent or more can ^{be} follow Brown's
 method, ~~and suggest in~~ ^{supply any} a few words or sentences ^{the} intervening
 letter received. As a display of the author's ability for letter
 writing, as a novel of manners, Clarissa Harlowe is ~~undoubtedly~~ the
 superior ~~work~~ but as an unfinished example of the epistolary method
 of the literary composition of a story Brown's Jessica has much in
 it to be preferred. If we read Clarissa for the story, which of
 course we do not, we ~~shall~~ find ~~that~~ letter after letter, which
 only bring out the small details of the plot, first ^{anxiety,} ~~exasperate,~~
 then anger, and then invite the evil genius of the reader, the
 little Devil of Skimming. In fact we would venture the statement
 that ~~very~~ few now-a-days read Clarissa, though many, ~~may show them-~~
~~selves examples of our point by~~ skimming it. ~~The truth remains~~
~~that~~ ^{any} attempt to make an artistic work of the epistolary
 novel demands sufficient vital letters, but not too many. ~~and in~~
~~that particular Brown seems to have made a step in the right~~
 direction.

We are not ~~absolutely~~ sure that ~~the story of~~ Jessica has reached us as Brown left it. In the so-called Dunlap's biography we are told ~~that~~ "the reader may be gratified by extracts."

Whether Allen ~~here~~ meant, ~~as appears to be clear,~~ that he as editor had selected letters from the completed manuscript, or that the letters ~~as~~ given were all he found, ~~preserved,~~ we are at a loss to determine. The only fact we have to deal with is the work as we have it, and whether it is all that Brown left in manuscript, or what Paul Allen decided to give us, will have to be determined before we can give full credit to Brown for any ~~points of excellence to which we may call attention.~~ Fortunately, the Monthly Magazine has preserved five more of ~~Jessica's~~ letters and their value ^{could} ^{increased} ~~can~~ only be ~~lessened~~ if we reflect that ~~they should be more welcome if~~ they had concerned the outcome of the story, ~~rather than the situation which we already know.~~

With a few faulty details excepted the story is excellently told. The development of Jessica's love is natural and thorough, her reflections are delightfully introduced and described and are concerned with the essentials of the plot. Especially true to nature is her occasional outburst of self-condemnation, here

mollified into self-criticism, that comes when her thoughts have been too much engrossed in her attempt to gain the respect of the contemplative Colden. Her character is thoroughly feminine and as a loveable young woman she surpasses in definiteness of drawing, Brown's best womanly example--Constantia of Ormond.

To make up for any lack of ~~complete~~ character drawing one of the strongest details is the contrast of ¹~~the~~ situations¹ of Sophia and Jessica, one of Brown's favorite methods. In this case he presents the extremes, the rich and the poor.

When Brown had Jessica write ~~down even~~ the conversations she heard, we have an autobiographic reminder of ^{the}~~his~~ custom of his ~~own~~ youthful ~~days~~. Other autobiographic touches may be found in the interest Jessica has in books; in that investment of her father's in the shipping business which if not applicable to Brown himself was surely so to at least one of his brothers; and the brother Harry who was a lawyer and may be related to

1 Cf. the Contrast, attributed by us to Brown, in our study of the Weekly Magazine.

Brown himself as well as to Henry Colden. Hannah, Jessica's maid-servant, is ~~also~~ a Brown family name. As we shall see in our study of the Literary Magazine it is possible ~~that~~ Brown may be the stranger and Jessica may be the sister of the stranger's dead wife Sally. Thus the work may be strongly autobiographic. The name of Julia occasionally used for Sophia recalls the pet name Wilkins used for Dolly Madison. It is possible to consider the situation in Jessica as very like ~~the~~ ^{existed} ~~one~~ that [^]when Wilkins and Brown were intimate with Dolly Payne.

The idea that women have little to do with politics, in the fourth of the newly found letters, may be somewhat

related to the arguments in Alcuin. ~~But~~ Several ~~of the~~ details are familiar; such as the Ziska business used in Wieland. The whole matter ~~of~~ Jerome and Ziska and the Bohemian battles as taken from Mosheim's book, which Brown ~~may have read~~, is particularly appropriate because of the mystics of Molinos who believed in the quietist methods adopted by the Quakers. Sophia's summer house recalls the one Clara Wieland had; the vine-covered affair near the bank of the river. The "bench under the bank"¹ may also be related to ^{Wieland.} ~~the same work.~~

h. 4 Here again, as in Wieland, Brown makes use of a candle and its ~~heretofore neglected~~ possibilities. It lights up the face of Colden when he first appears in the story—it softens his face, Jessica says.

— Thus we find the work showing the influence of both of Brown's well-known works of 1798. ~~But we must go on further.~~

The relation Jessica bears to Ormond is stronger ~~than the two~~ ~~just considered~~ and may be found exemplified in ~~such details~~ as the situation of Jessica and her blind mother living, with a charity charge for their only maid-servant, in a suburb near a

¹ Dunlap, Vol. I, p. 111.

court, which corresponds to Constantia and her blind father living under similarly obscure circumstances in Philadelphia. In both cases the needle of the heroine is the means of sustenance. Jessica's reflection on the friend who goes away and dies and her reflections on her sisters who were dead, with the consolation of meeting again in a better world, recalls the song in Ormond

"We meet again to part no more."

Likewise the sister's sale of the harp when the Arnots were left penniless, recalls Constantia's sale of her lute, under the same circumstances. Jessica like Constantia had had a former love affair but in Constⁿatia's case she had calmly broken all ties while in Jessica's the lover had been lost at sea.

Besides its literary value this increase in the traceable influence of his own works on Jessica forces the composition ahead to a date after Ormond, and if we take the statement concerning the last day of December and consider with it the publication in July and August of 1800 of twenty per cent of the whole story as we have it, we must date its composition as December 1799:

In some instances we here find a survival of the sentimental

1255

stories of Brown's contemporaries. In the particular of introducing the four lines of verse, we have one trace of Mrs. Radcliffe's work.

"Some minstrel, Jessy, sing or say,
"To bide at home,
"Abroad to roam,
"But snatched me, from myself, away."

Though given as a quotation the verses are undoubtedly by Brown. In publishing the Jessica story in 1822 the London publisher's good taste lead him to omit this verse and the sentence¹ preceding it, and the less said about it as verse the better.

Another reminder of Mrs. Radcliffe is in the character of Colden. He seems born under the same star as The Italian, with his Lara, and Corsair and Giaur mystery as afterward made famous by Byron,² though we cannot believe that he was to be a real villain and from the discovery by Jessica of something divine in him we are inclined to suspect he may have been formerly connected officially with the Catholic church.

Besides any such indebtedness to Mrs. Radcliffe we may find some to Rousseau's Heloise to which he pays his acknowledgment in his letter of 5 May 1792.

¹ "They would not suffer me, as methinks I hear,..."

² See Mobius, The Gothic Romance, Leipsig, 1902, p. 113 ff.

As a part of his life and work Jessica is of ~~the highest~~ importance. ~~Already~~ ^U We have suggested its possibilities of being Brown's finest piece of work, a work showing ~~no touch of the~~ ~~amateur and all~~ the finger-prints of ^a ~~the~~ master, and had it met with anything but ~~what appears to be~~ ^{the} ~~an~~ evident stupidity of an Allen and Dunlap, we might have had in it the acme of his career as a novelist or romancist, what you will.

As we have it, ~~the best~~ ^{should} we ~~can~~ say ~~is that it is Brown's most~~ ~~admirable fragment and~~ can be neglected by no one seeking a true knowledge of ~~Brown~~.

Interesting in this connection, primarily because of its name, is a very remarkable modern love story entitled The Jessica Letters.¹ In it there is no evident influence of Brown, there is nothing to suggest ~~that~~ the author had ever read ~~any of~~ our author's work and yet there are ~~a few~~ details that immediately connect the two works. Both are epistolary in method, both contain philosophical and religious discussion, both have an unusual lack of acquaintance of the hero and heroine, both are presented as love stories interfered with ~~in development~~ by a near relative,

1 New York 1904.

in one by the brother in the other by the father. As probably the only and the best modern example of contrast, as a very beautiful story and a superior work of modern fiction The Jessica Letters may be profitably read by the Brown student as an ~~actual~~ instance where we might imagine Brown ~~//s soul~~ had been reborn so as to ~~make possible the completion of~~ what had been left as a fragment.

In the number for March 1800 ¹ ~~of this periodical~~ there appeared A Lesson on Concealment; or, Memoirs of Mary Selwyn. The evidence that Brown was its author amounts to a certainty; the proofs, with the exception of the appearance ~~of the work~~ in this magazine, are wholly internal and the case is probably one of the clearest ~~of all the field of ascriptions of unidentified pseudonymous and anonymous literature.~~

In Brown's days a work of fiction in America published under a secondary title such as here used is rarely recorded. Out of ² 142 titles examined there was only one during all the years of

1 Vol. II, p. 174.

2 Loshe: Early American Novel.

Brown's life which used the secondary title exactly as he did.

There were only two others using it ~~even~~ as a principal title. Of these three, two were New England publications. In the case of Brown, excluding those items ascribed to him by us it was used ~~as a title~~ four times; Arthur Mervyn; or, Memoirs of 1793; Edgar Huntly; or, Memoirs of a Sleep Walker; the Memoirs of Stephen Calvert and Memoirs of Carwin the Biloquist. Including those ascribed to him in this work we have it used six times. Besides this one of the common pastimes of Brown's characters is to write Memoirs.

~~So that so far~~ ^a ~~as the title is concerned it seems that in his day it was what might be said to be~~ characteristically Brownish.

In connection with the appearance of this work we should note ~~that~~ the temporary suspension of the Memoirs of Stephen Calvert happened just before the appearance of Mary Selwyn. Quite remarkably that ~~work~~ was ~~suspended~~ at the point where unexpectedly Calvert learns that Clelia was already a wife, so ~~that~~ it appears ~~that~~ this work was a development of the idea prominent in the mind of Brown ^{and} ~~fact~~ it had impressed him as early as Alcibiades^x at that time, ~~the~~ ~~entire~~ ~~subject~~. We can easily imagine Brown exclaiming in the Memoirs of Stephen Calvert: Clelia was a wife already, what would be the possibilities of the situation if she

x Dunlap Vol. I, p. 99.

had concealed the fact and married Calvert; why she had written her memoirs, ~~she must have a history~~, and behold we have the Memoirs of Mary Selwyn, ~~with its presentation of the situation imagined.~~

The story of ~~Mary Selwyn~~ told by the young man who has discovered her secret is sent ~~as~~ ^{an} answer to a letter from her husband. Having been married to Colmer whom she does not love Mary had been led astray by Haywood and had fled from both husband and lover to live ~~in secrecy~~ ^{hidden} in a remote village of Connecticut.

There she was found by Molesworth a physician who fell in love with her and married her. They moved to the city and having saved Kirvan from the plague, the husband was called away by his uncle's illness. Returning unexpectedly he found his wife in tears and his friend immediately leaving he became a prey to suspicions. Mary died and Molesworth wrote to Kirvan for an explanation of the circumstances under which he had discovered them.

The mechanical structure of the work is simple and satisfactory; namely an introductory letter to Kirvan and the answer with another letter inserted, ^{which} ~~in~~ which the history of Mary Selwyn Molesworth within the narrative of Henry Kirvan: all told in the confusing first person, the moral tag and the philosophical reflections

1259

due to insomnia are Brown characteristics of architectonic.

In general the details of style such as the ideas, similes, staccato sentences and diction are Brown's. The lack of attention to details; the impropriety of many situations in which men and women are placed; the subsistence by needle of the penniless woman; the thoughts and the attempts of Mary to commit suicide; the consolation of books; the arrival of the narrator from a foreign country; the loss of the father's money; the self-condemnation; the convenience of acquaintance such as that with the ship captain and the convenience of the nurse being the wife of the doctor; the cousin who makes the unsatisfactory wife or husband; and the prejudice for events happening on the shore of the Hudson and for musical instruments in the hands of the ladies: are all more or less favorites of Brown's.

The desire of the brother to make Mary "rational beyond the common reach of my sex" recalls Alcuin. The powerful and excellent lamp scene recalls the scene of the candle which we have praised in Wieland. The resemblance between Selwyn and his sister recalls query No. 16 in the Weekly Magazine and a reference to the study of that periodical will disclose Stephen Calvert among other instances of the use of the same motive.

Comparing details to Ormond we find there may be a relation, based on such a change as Mary Wakdegrave in Edgar Huntly to Mary Wilmot in Clara Howard, of the two names Sophia Weswyn and Mary Selwyn. But be that true or merely imagined there is certainty in the dragging of the naked corpse to a hole in the yard which recalls the burial of Miss De Moivre's father in ^{that part of} the Man at Home which later became a part of Ormond. Kirvan becomes an accountant of the merchant Haywood which recalls Brown's practise of giving his penniless heroes clerical work and in particular resembles the case of Craig in Ormond. The scene where Kirvan watches Selwyn walk up and down while waiting for Haywood resembles Dudley's watching Craig.

The sisters who depended for subsistence on Colmer and Molesworth recall the two sisters in similar plight and the challenge to a duel recalls the one who challenged the lover of his mistress in the story of Clithero; both in Edgar Huntly.

The situation of Mary and Colmer recalls that of Jessica and Colden in Jessica.

Compared to Arthur Mervyn there is a phonetic similarity of the names Kirvan and Mervyn; like the characters in Arthur Mervyn Kirvan has a personal acquaintance with the captain of the ship

which may or may not be common to sea voyages in Brown's days.

Kirvan carried a note to a young lady for Haywood and Arthur Mervyn similarly carried one for Welbeck. Kirvan's being a student of medicine under Molesworth resembles Arthur Mervyn's studying under Dr. Stevens. The suspicion of Kirvan that he had perhaps seen Mary Selwyn in his rambles through the streets suggests the

rambling adventures of Arthur Mervyn before being rescued by Dr. Stevens. The lamp-brother scene is constructed like the scene of the identification of the Jewess in chapter XLVI. The characters of Welbeck in Arthur Mervyn and Haywood

in this work have important similarities in that both had seduced¹ the sister of a friend; both gave an asylum to a penniless youth, and employed him in a clerical capacity; both fought duels with and killed the brother of the woman they had seduced; and both fled. The sickness of Kirvan the narrator, the pestilence and the death of Mary's sister, Jane and the death of Mary by the fever either repeat similar details or are reminiscent of the yellow fever, probably that of 1798 in New York. The compelled oath of secrecy of Kirvan, his detective work, his desire for flight and his discovery of the history of Mrs. Molesworth: all relate his character intimately to Arthur Mervyn's.

¹ Van Doren, Nation, 14 Jan. 1915, adds several details to the parallel.

Mary Selwyn's running away from Haywood as well as Colmer recalls Mary Wilmot's running away from Hartley in Clara Howard.

That there may be some relation of Mary Selwyn to the group of fragments, Adini, Medway, Henry Colden and Jane Talbot is probably true but exactly what it is is not clear.

Like the second set of details in Edgar Huntly there is a duplication of the parents and sisters in the cases of Colmer and Molesworth, a duplication of the seduced sisters of Kirvan and Selwyn and a duplication of the sudden and unexpected return of Haywood and Molesworth.

After having considered this convincing collection of concurrences we may sum it up by a general statement. One thing seems to be circumstantially evident; the author of the Lesson on Concealment was either the author of the Man at Home, Ormond, Jessica and Arthur Mervyn or else he was Brown's double. Any one who understands the character and work of Brown will not believe that his double ever lived but will conclude that the work is undoubtedly one of his hitherto unidentified stories.

As has been suggested by the details cited to prove this work Brown's it has the usual faults common to his work. Kirvan terrified

~~from the old appeals, and yet it actually does present Brown as having turned from romance to the realistic novel.~~

~~In the first number of the third volume of the Monthly Magazine~~

A In the department of original contributions there is, ~~an~~ unsigned, ~~story entitled~~ the Trials of Arden^X which has a number of details similar to ~~those found in~~ the Lesson on Concealment; or, the Memoirs of Mary Selwyn and which constitutes a body of evidence, conclusive ~~that Brown was the author.~~

The structure is one of the ~~customary~~ deceits practised by Brown most prominently in the newly-discovered part of Jessica published as Original Letters in the next number of the magazine.

The story is addressed to the Editor and dated New York, April 1800 but it is not ~~otherwise~~ perfected as a real letter, the closing and signature being lacking. This "criminal failure" to perfect the counterfeit ~~is a detail which~~ arouses suspicion.

At first the sentences are not characteristically Brown's but ^{it} as ~~the story~~ develops they fall into the staccato trip-hammer

^{is}
~~kind~~ which ~~we have found~~ ^{will} distinctively his. The diction ~~is to be~~
considered further in connection with ~~the~~ other details of ~~circum-~~
~~stantial~~ evidence; ~~but~~ here it is only necessary to say it appears
to be Brown's. The method of narration is ~~distinctively Brown's~~ ^{his}
the forged structure ~~of the work~~, the excuse for ~~the~~ writing ~~of~~ it,
the confusing first person narrator within the narration, the visit
to the old island hermit who recalls the recluse of the Lake
Michigan isle in Stephen Calvert, the ~~discussion of~~ general
topics and then the story: are all familiar ~~details of~~ Brown's
architectonic.

The representation of the story as real but to be given with
fictitious names; the Arthur-Mervyn-curiosity of the narrator;
the characters who had just come from Europe; the duplication ~~of the~~
~~story~~ so as to lend a plausible air to the telling of it; the
taking in by Brudenel of the newly arrived foreigner Arden; his
employment by Finch; the attitude of Finch toward him; Harriet's
evening walks; her betrothal; her refusal of Wingate when he returns;
her sudden compliance; the housekeeper of Finch; the naming of the
estate Ardenfield; the concealed correspondence between Arden and
Anna, which suggests shorthand; the impropriety of the situation

in which Harriet and Arden are placed; the two sisters left helpless by Loveden and the grotto difficult of access: all are general details ~~which may be~~ found in more than one of Brown's works.

Among the ~~mass of~~ instances there are many which relate the work in some unknown way to Jessica; in fact the story may belong to the same class, may have been composed at the same time and certainly saw ~~the light of~~ publication at the same time. Brudenel's advice to his sister Anna, who loved Arden, is similar to that given by Jessica's brother Harry in regard to Colden. Brudenel's suspicion of Arden is also paralleled by Harry's of Colden. Anna Brudenel, in reserve and domesticity the same sort of a character, is in ~~the details of~~ her situation ~~surely~~ another Jessica; for, like that loveable little woman, she had lost a lover on a sea voyage, she had had two sisters, who ~~had~~ died similarly, her father was dead and she lived with and supported her mother. Perhaps according to the rumor Arden was a former Jesuit spy ~~just~~ as Colden in Jessica may have been. As ~~we have~~ suggested in our study of Adini, Henry Colden, and Medway (1797) there probably is some ¹ ~~unknown~~ relation of the Trials of Arden to Jessica and possibly to Jane Talbot.

¹ Harriet is used as a name in Henry Colden and Medway.

Parallels to other of Brown's works may be found. ~~in the following details.~~ The manuscript of Arden ~~buried~~ in the bottom of a trunk recalls the chest in the Man at Home and others. Arden defended himself at the bar and forgave his persecutors as Wieland did. Though the story is complete in itself there is an opening left ~~at the end~~ for an account of Arden's early life ~~and experiences~~ just as there was in Wieland for the Memoirs of Carwin. Harriet had an estate on the bank of the Hudson ~~somewhat~~ as Constantia did in Ormond. Like Dudley's plans for Craig in Ormond Finch had established in business his former employee Arden.

~~One of~~ Brown's characteristics—the neglect of ~~certain~~ details—has more than the usual number of appearances in this work. ~~The~~ will of Harriet's was an essential of the trial and should have been used as evidence. ^{Her} ~~Harriet's~~ marriage with Arden is concealed too long in fact there is too much heaping of details on the same character, Harriet, in order to explain ~~all~~ the various motives and actions of several of the characters. Mayo's former crime committed on Harriet is one of these unnecessary complications. In one instance an important detail is ~~not~~ introduced ~~until~~ too late; namely, the burning of the papers of Arden. Arden went to see

Finch on the day after Harriet's disappearance, but after Wingate and Finch had considered Arden's intention to leave the latter's service, a messenger arrived and told of the disappearance of Harriet. Of course she had really disappeared the day before. The old man lives fifteen miles from New York and later Arden lives only nine. Arden comes first from Europe, and later from London. The judge in the trial is later ~~multiplied~~ into the judges. The three sisters of Harriet are absolutely ignored as possible complications of the development: but then there are already too many corresponding characters.

The character drawing of Harriet is made ineffectual ~~just~~ as in the case of Mary Selwyn. By loading so many details on her and connecting her with so many of the characters Brown has defeated his object. She arouses less and less sympathy because she is more and more shown to be anything but beautiful and innocent.

On the other hand the character of Arden is never once departed from. He is a twin brother of Colden the mysterious boarder who came to live at Jessica's home. He has a fear of some foreigner ~~just~~ as Carwin feared Ludloe, but here the religious side is suggested as an explanation of his actions. Given as gossip is the following:

1 Cf. Ellendale in Henry Colden. At first fifteen miles and later nine from Philadelphia.

1271

"Vague rumors flew abroad, but were merely rumors. Great discoveries were likewise pretended to be made respecting him. It was said that Arden was a Jesuit in disguise; that he had been a spy in London, for the Catholic powers, during the late war; that he had fled to America, and changed his name, under apprehension of being punished."

Arden is perhaps not only the Colden of Jessica; but the Colden of Jane Talbot, the man who was absorbed in the Godwinian philosophy, perhaps the member of the Order of the Illuminati which was said at one time to be allied with the Jesuits. Besides being perhaps both of Brown's Coldens he was possibly also Carwin, the man who lived in constant terror of the persecution of the epopt of the great secret society. And finally Arden has some relation to Brown's namesake Charles Brockden, who may, for all we know, have been one of the Illuminati at the time of the attempted restoration of Charles the First.

In the single detail of speaking of Mayo's enthusiasm for hunting and fishing as the murder of the scaly and feathered tribes we have a touch of Brown's autobiography; for that expresses exactly what he thought of the practise. Had he lived in our day he would perhaps have belonged to the blessed clan of the camera hunters.

A faint trace of the gradually-declining supernatural is to be found in the almost miraculous disappearance of Arden in the

house when pursued by the mob of lynchers.

With such a catalogue of details there is little wanting to ~~stand out as finger posts~~ point ~~(//)~~ to the author. All ~~through~~ the ~~part that narrates~~ the trial there is a familiarity with the law that the ~~ordinary~~ writers of ~~this kind~~ of fiction of Brown's day did not have. The omission of the terrible scene that must have taken place between Harriet and the criminal Mayo is one of Brown's negative virtues. There probably was not another of his contemporary novelists who would have ~~so properly~~ omitted that ~~dramatic and sensational~~ element. Thus, in keeping with his character, Brown preferred to resist ~~the temptation of~~ using the possibilities of a powerful ratiocinative story of ~~the murder of Harriet~~ which has since been shown by Poe in his Mystery of Marie Roget.

To sum ~~all the points~~ up we might say these ~~convicting~~ pointing fingers are like the details of circumstantial evidence in ^a ~~the~~ murder trial. If they do not all point at one individual, and that individual ^{indicate} Brown, they, at least that no one but Brown could have written the Trials of Arden; so that ~~of course~~ there is only one reasonable conclusion to be drawn.

Being one of our newest attributions to Brown, the Trials of Arden of course ~~has~~ never been reprinted. ~~as his~~ However its

value has been appreciated, as it should be, and it was anonymously published by no less than ^{four} ~~three~~ publishers, ^{Broderick and Ritter,} Solomon King ~~of New~~ York ^{and} ^{all} W. Borradaile of New York and Freeman Scott ¹ of Philadelphia. ^{Broderick and Ritter's} King's edition is apparently the earliest;

and it is followed textually

by the others. It considerably abridged the story as found in the Monthly Magazine. The alterations were made to take the story out of the class of first person narratives and to place it in the realm of the "true story". Therefore an omission at the beginning was made; for the first nine paragraphs of the original appearance in the Monthly Magazine were an essential part of Brown's method of constructing ^{on} a ~~raison d'être~~ by recalling a story similar ~~to the one about to be told~~ by picturing the scene of the narrator and the listener, just as he did by the "advertisement" to Wieland, by the

1 Scott was a grocer and paper dealer in 1825 and 1829 and in the thirties he was an alderman.

letter to Rosenberg of Ormond, by the introduction to Clara Howard and by the opening paragraphs to Arthur Mervyn and Edgar Huntly. Thus the earlier "my friend" is replaced by its equivalent "Brudenel" and "this city" becomes "New York". Any paragraphs which showed ~~that the~~ ^{it} ~~story~~ was originally in the ~~form~~ of dialogue were omitted. Any words or sentences which disclosed ~~that the~~ ^{it} ~~story~~ was being told to any one but the reader were altered. The details of Arden's past are so suggested by Brown ~~that~~ they would have disclosed the secret: therefore they and the last seven paragraphs are struck out.

Illustration of front. In supplying the frontispiece engraving, which appears to be unknown as an early Prud'homme, he gave us one of the few illustrations of scenes from Brown's works. The selection of the scene from the fifth paragraph is excellent and has an unusual interest ^{because it} ~~as~~ represents ^{it} a country scene on the west side of Manhattan Island. In the left distance is the Hudson with a sloop near the Palisades. The copy found is fully hand-colored ^{as} in ~~Kings'~~ ^{Bonradaille's} edition, being only partially so.

~~When we consider these details~~ ^{It seems as if} ~~there is not the least doubt~~
~~that King in his publication~~ ^{Broderick and Ritter were} determined to pass off as a true
 murder story what was purely a work of Brown's imagination. What
 they ¹ ~~did in his self-appointed editorial capacity~~ was well done.
~~As made into~~ ~~by King,~~ ~~by Borradaile~~
 and ~~Scott~~ ^{best} the better part of Brown's novelette ^{was} retained though
 the editorial work on it was after all merely a change of method,
 a matter of literary architectonic and not by any means an improve-
 ment. ~~on the one chosen by Brown, though it undoubtedly served~~
~~the purpose of the publishers of cheap children's books of the~~
 twenties.

The Trials of Arden should be included in any collection

¹ ~~Brown's~~ Italics were set in lower-case, a questionable improve-
 ment and not necessary. ~~for his purpose.~~

1273

of Brown's miscellaneous pieces.

^{it}
(Related to his life and work ~~this story~~ is merely ~~an~~ undistinguish-
ed ~~one~~ among many but for its relation to Jessica alone it should
be read.

¹
In the first volume ~~of the~~ Monthly Magazine there is a fragment
entitled the Punishment of Ridicule. With the exception of the
omission of two dashes and commas, it is wholly extracted from the
Series of Original Letters ² ~~of~~ the Weekly Magazine and in our study
of that periodical we considered ~~the work~~ ^{it} at some length and have
proved ~~it to be~~ Brown's. Here ~~however~~ as a separate story under
^a ~~its~~ new title it will stand critical attention but it ^{is not} ~~can hardly~~
^{need it.}
~~be considered so important as to deserve further mention.~~

In the second class of contributions there are several articles
signed B and one signed C.B., which have some traits to mark them
~~as being by Brown's~~ ² ~~The~~ Other evidence that can be found is not
convincing and because of the ~~very~~ nature of most of them, being
more or less of a stereotyped form of review that might be
successfully imitated by others, it is necessary to include them
in the second class of the more or less doubtful though quite
probable. In considering each case when there is any internal

¹ Vol. I, pp. 257-259. ² Vol. II, pp. 104-5.
~~It is reprinted in~~ The Rural Visitor Burlington, N.J., Vol. II,
1821, pp. 207-9 edited by David Allinson.

evidence of value it will be noticed, but in ^{most} ~~the majority~~ of ^{them} ~~cases~~ a ~~general~~ statement of the character of the review will be all ^{we can give.} ~~that deserves mention.~~ In the case ~~of~~ a story or sketch we ^{shall} ~~are warranted~~ in extending ~~it~~ our remarks.

The nearest we have of these initialled reviews is the one signed C.B., which is better than B. but because of the number of possible writers who may have had as much right as Brown to these initials, they are not so convincing as C.B.B. would be.

¹
The review of the New Views of the Origin of the Tribes and Nations of America by Benjamin Smith Barton is the one signed C.B., and from his letter dated 16 March 1803 to Samuel Miller may be considered as the work of our author. It appears in the number for May 1799 immediately following Brown's Roman story Thessalonica.

The opening shows traces of his Biblical discussions ⁱⁿ remarkably good taste. The subject is peculiarly of interest to Brown not alone from its obvious connection with his use of the Indians in Edgar Huntly of this same time but from the strongest interests of his life, his love for geography and its

1 Vol. I. p. 117.

allied subjects. It is much more than a mere padded notice, ~~of~~
~~the book~~, its criticism being of the kind practised in after
 years by such men as Jeffrey, though it is much shorter. Unlike
 many others ~~instances~~ it does not contain ~~any~~ quotations, ~~from the~~
~~book~~. As an example of ~~what~~ Brown, ~~could do~~, it is far superior to
 the usual notices published in those days and were space unlimited
 it should be quoted in full. It is one of ^{his} ~~the~~ best favorable
 reviews, ~~which can be ascribed to Brown.~~

~~Whether written by Brown or not it has~~ an added interest for
 us in the fact that it must have ^{begun} ~~opened~~ ^{it did} if not completed his ac-
 quaintance with Barton. In 1803 we shall find evidence that
 Brown was on very intimate terms with him.

The best of the items signed B. is the note to the plays of
¹
 Kotzebue already noticed in our remarks on Brown's notes as
 editor.

²
 The review of Caldwell's Eulogium on Dr. Samuel Cooper, is signed
 B., and if ~~it really is~~ by Brown it may be cited as another excell-
 ent example of ^{his} ~~Brown as a reviewer~~. It is such ^{skillful} ~~deft~~ handling ^{ing} ~~of~~
~~the editorial rapier~~ that it cannot be
 ignored or slighted; in fact we have found it worthy of

1275'

quotation in its entirety and if we were using long quotations
~~of the kind~~ it would be given as a valuable guide for future
ascriptions of similar works.

The Portrait of An Emigrant,¹ extracted from a letter is signed
B. It bears considerable internal evidence, ~~of being~~ Brown ||
~~In general~~ the diction, sentence formation and mechanical construc-
tion ~~of the story~~ are his. The situation of Mrs.K---, though in
the city, is similar to that of Jessica in that she was a good deal
of a recluse. In Clara Howard there is a Mrs.Kahn of whom this
Mrs.K--- may be the prototype.² Philip Stanley goes to her apart-
ment. She is said to be noted for freedom of discourse and when
Stanley states his case her garrulousness is hardly excelled by
and is of the same kind as that of Mrs. K---. In Ormond the
people who formerly inhabited the house next to Mrs.Melbourne's
were English, here they were the M'Culeys; in the former case
they were driven out by the pestilence, in the latter they left
in 1793 which amounts to the same thing. In the Man at Home
and Ormond we have other French families, especially a Frenchman,
wife and daughter and in several of Brown's works we have frequent
references to French refugees from St.Domingo. The Frenchman here
1 Vol.I, pp.162-164. 2 Clara Howard, Letter XVII.

is employed in the counting-house of a French merchant, just as are several of Brown's characters. The wife is one of his favorites

~~ladies~~ often found with a musical instrument in her hands and is

an actress in Lailson's pantomimes. Like Clelia Neville in Stephen

Calvert ^{the lady} ~~she reads and~~ stays in doors, ^{know} ~~We have seen how~~ Brown and ^{and reads.}

Dunlap went to Lailson's circus on 2 May 1797. Here a negro brings

the dinner, in Ormond the French people next door had black ser-

vants. If we slightly change a few insignificant details ~~in~~

~~parts of this story~~ and bring them together we have the same

situation as we have in Ormond when Constantia heard the music and

discovered Martinette. The name given ^{tan & by} ~~late~~ to the French family

is de Lisle ^{which} ~~and~~ we shall find ~~is~~ used extensively in its shortened

form as Lisle in Ormond and mentioned once in Clara Howard. It is

a Brown family name. Like the Dudleys in Ormond the de Lisles

shut up their lower rooms and live in the upper part of the house.

Finally, there is the drawing of the moral and the philosophizing

which we have found ~~to be~~ characteristically Brownish.

In ~~the fact of~~ these resemblances which amount to more than

~~mere~~ coincidences it seems not only probable ~~that~~ Brown wrote

this Portrait but also ~~that~~ he found in it hints for ~~the~~ details

afterward developed in Ormond. As in the Cooke story in his letters of the 'nineties Brown made a curiosity concerning the affairs of neighbors the pretext for a narrative.

As ~~a story~~ illustrative of the title, the work does not conform. It had better have been named "Domestic Felicity". Structurally it is characteristically Brown ~~and that implies only a near approach to what it might be in more masterly hands~~. The visits of the young girl show Brown's appreciation of simple turns of English in the mouths of foreigners.

The original communication ¹ On the Inequalities of Solar Light is signed B. Other than the initial there is nothing to stamp it as Brown's. It is an instance of what he may have been able to do with logical discussion ~~when focussing attention~~ on a scientific subject, and ~~if it is his it is important to be considered by those who have~~ hitherto looked on him as only a dreamer with no adaptability or inclination toward the realities of life. That the ideas here expressed agreed with Herschel is probably due to the author's study of him for evidently he did no original research on the subject. It is true ~~that~~ Brown read extensively in
1 Vol. I, p. 81.

scientific lines,so ~~that~~ this item may be his.

Proud's History of Pennsylvania was reviewed and the article¹
signed B. It seems hardly probable ~~that~~ Brown had any idea of the
modern practise of the specialist in reviewing,and it is quite
possible ~~that~~ the editor's life-long affection for his old
schoolmaster may have lead him to review the book. ^{Some} ~~The severity~~
~~of the~~ censure Brown owed to his conscience but the evident striving
to find compensatory virtues seems to show the same desire ~~that~~
we have already noticed in Brown as ~~an~~ editor;namely,to encourage
~~honest~~ effort in any line of intellectual pursuit. As an honest,
useful and industrious compiler Proud is given all praise,as a
historian he is denied genuineness.

In the same volume Robertson's History of America is reviewed²
by B. As a review this is one of the best we have considered. There
is a poise of judgment throughout it that stamps its author as
far removed from the hack-writer of book notices. Though briefer
it takes on the character of the thorough reviewer of to-day,
but unfortunately we cannot find any ~~corroborative~~ evidence to
prove it Brown's. It is acknowledged to be by the same author as
the review of Trumbull's Connecticut and if we accept one we
1 Vol.I,pp.216-17. 2 P.130.

1279
must take the other ~~with it~~.

Southey's Joan of Arc ~~as issued in~~¹ Boston 1798 is reviewed by B. With the exception of the ~~rather~~^t lengthy introduction which runs the gamut of the epics of the ~~ancient~~^{ed} Greeks and Romans ~~the review~~^{it} is thorough and just, though ~~not~~^{less} carefully constructed. It's author displays a penetrating knowledge of character study that we have come to believe Brown lacked so ~~that~~ the initial B. becomes quite doubtful and we have nothing to corroborate ~~the initial~~^{it} as meaning it was Brown's ~~review~~.

²
The article on the Philadelphia Water Works is signed B. and dated June 1799. We have Dunlap for ~~the~~ authority that Brown took a trip into Connecticut at this date but whether he went a roundabout way and visited Philadelphia before returning to New York we do not know. In this article, which on its face presents a dry subject which would ordinarily have only a short mention ~~given to it~~ in the newspapers of the day we find the author allowing his imagination to run riot in a ~~veritable~~ rhapsody. But when he has pictured in glowing colors all the advantages, sanitary and artistic and commercial, he ~~flashes out with the blow that~~ drives the nail home by an extended reference to the yellow fever and the possi-
(notice of second edition)
1 Vol. I, p. 225 and p. 238. 2 Vol. I, p. 181.

bilities that pure water in abundance may wash away the pestilence.

With a few details such as these we have all that concerns the authorship and the article and at best consider it doubtfully Brown's.

These cases of initial signing are somewhat near reasonable acceptance especially so when we have one signed C.B. That is about as near as one could come without being absolutely certain. However the next item is not so sure and the force of argument dwindles in those following until it reaches the thin-ice of the third class.

The Remarks on the Monthly Magazine¹ has some of the earmarks of Brown and the signature of A.Z. may be here Brown's as well as it was in the Weekly Magazine but there is no doubt of the editor's remarks² appended to this A.Z. communication. Because it contains not only an excellent answer to A.Z. but also expresses Brown's views of the departments of the magazine it is of sufficient value and ^{at the same time} sufficiently brief to be quoted. It reads::

*[The Editor is ever ready to listen to the remarks of his friends and correspondents, and to profit by their advice in his exertions to please and benefit those who honour]

his work with a perusal. His scheme, as first announced, is very comprehensive, adapted as well to the moralist as the philosopher, critic, physician, and divine. Literature and science have a strong connection with morality: and, although the Editor is not less sensible than A. Z. of the superior importance of those performances which have immediate relation to the latter, he cannot but think that a plan which comprehends other branches of knowledge, will be approved by the majority of readers. His design is, to render his work as *extensively useful* as possible; to furnish a respectable *vehicle* for all those who have leisure and inclination to write, to convey their thoughts to the public. The department of *morals* is not *limited*; and it depends on the number and zeal of his correspondents whether it shall contain more or less. They may be assured that they will find ample space for their accommodation. The department of *criticism* is, in the opinion of many friends, in whose judgment the Editor justly places strong reliance, not the least important or interesting. It is certainly an object of liberal curiosity to those who attend to the character of their country, to ascertain the *quantity* and *quality* of the literary products of America; how much, and what is produced in every branch of literature and science, whether the same be great or small, valuable or worthless. That this end may be best accomplished by a review, without encroaching on the higher department of morals, cannot be denied. Whether the Review is well or ill conducted, the public must decide.] "

2

The Household, a fragment, unsigned belongs to the class of works of Jessica and has sufficient details to warrant ascribing it to Brown. The opening shows us the familiar Brown construction; the telling of the story as a reply to the request of a nameless friend. Throughout the diction and sentence formation are Brown's. The yellow fever of 1795 and 1798, the subsistence by the needle, the

1 He evidently had forgotten the omission of the political department.

2 Vol. III, pp. 81-7.

first person narrative, the duplication of recommendation of people, the indiscriminate difference in the name of a character are other familiar details. Taking in Mrs. Knowles and making her his laundress recalls the first position the Man at Home gave to his landlady. The adoption of Lucy Franks¹ likewise recalls Lucy adopted by Constantia in Ormond. Elgar's revolutionary activity and coming to America resemble the facts of Charles Brockden's life. Another detail that smacks of the autobiographic is Mrs. Elgar who is not only a Brown family name but is described as "not one whom I should seek for a companion. She has little curiosity, and few ideas in common with me". A person of no "curiosity" was of no consequence to Brown. The family of the Knowles was first mentioned to the narrator by Stanton. In Brown's letter dated 16 May 1792 there is mention of Edward Stanton with whom Brown imagines himself to be on terms of intimacy and with whom he is accustomed to dispute with vehemence and obstinacy. The same letter also gives us an imaginary picture of a man happily situated a deal like here represented. In this connection it should be said that in this resemblance possibly we have a detail which shows Brown wrote all the fragmentary works of the class of Jessica in 1792. The two sisters

1 Cf. A Portrait, Vol. III, p. 325.

who are housed and employed as servants to assist the housekeeper Mrs. Elgar are first named Hannah and Jane; a little later Jane becomes Jenny. We have found a Hannah to be the servant of Jessica and a Jenny the servant of Jessica's brother. A Jenny is also the servant of Clelia Neville in Stephen Calvert. The situation of Lucy Franks, when her mother is bargaining for the sale of her honor is a phase of life which Brown also treated in Arthur Mervyn and Stephen Calvert. The name of Mrs. Wemyss recalls Walter Wemyss in the Man at Home though the two characters have no resemblance. Here again, as in the Portrait of An Emigrant, the details so closely resemble other works of Brown that we are within probability in ascribing this fragment to him.

Given as a fragment, the work bars extended criticism, but if we are to consider it as the beginning of a longer work, and also to include Brown's practise of not revising, we cannot fail to notice the story is crowded with characters of a similar condition and circumstance of life and the latter half of it, undoubtedly the most important, is too slightly developed.

As a fragment of a larger work the story is interesting for other reasons than the material it contains. It shows again that Brown did not turn from the romance to the novel without writing some works

which mingle both these classes of prose fiction.

A Portrait on page 325 of volume three bears resemblances to Brown's work. Lucy Wells resembles Lucy Franks in character and position. She also recalls Lucy the servant taken in by the Dudleys in Ormond. Probably the work was a rejected extract from the Household, a fragment; for it could be easily and appropriately inserted in place of four paragraphs as given in this same volume.

In volume three there is a piece entitled On a Taste for the Picturesque. It is signed Looker-on and it bears a striking relation to one of Brown's letters--the unforgettable one which contains the verse about the "sweet little thing". It appears again in Brown's Literary Magazine and in a letter dated 4 July 1804 Brown says he supplied all of the original material of the number in which it appeared only excepting the Valverdi item. Of course "supplied" does not necessarily mean that he wrote it, but in this case we have additional evidence in his letter and in a detail which on first sight appears meagre. In the appearance here paragraph four starts

1 Pp.85-6.

2 Pp.11-13.

3 Vol.II, p.163 et seq.

"A lady Clara, with whom you and I are well acquainted." In the latter appearance the name Clara is omitted. Clara was one of the young ladies to whom Brown addressed two poems which have come down to us. Another detail is the reference to Salvator Rosa who was a favorite of Brown's. So that it is a probability that he wrote the article. The ideas as well as the diction were Brown's. As a companion piece to the letter of the "sweet little thing" we have two sides of the propensity of people to have pet expressions--in the former the humorous which Brown is always said to know nothing about, in the latter the serious which anyone can discover. The opening paragraph gives a picture of the author looking on one of the natural beauties of New York. It reads:

"A gentleman, a friend of mine, who sometimes favors me with a visit, lately found me at a window that overlooks New-York-Bay and its Islands. This scene, just then, was extremely beautiful, and its beauties were heightened by a long-protracted echo occasioned by the evening gun, fired from the ramparts of the fort on the Island. My guest took his seat....."

The piece is given as original in both appearances in Brown's magazines; the gentleman was possibly John Davis; in it there is a summer house like Clara Wieland's vine-covered affair; a romantic dwelling in the country as in Ormond; a reference to Ann Radcliffe's

Travels which we know Brown had read; and praise of the grandeur of the Blue ridge which had been presented in Edgar Huntly. Many details suggest it may be related to the Dialogues on Music and Painting of 1802.

The ascription of the Taste for the Picturesque, which has just been made carries with it another article signed with the same pseudonym¹--Looker-on. It may be found in the same volume as the other article and is entitled Thoughts on American Newspapers. We have earlier in this chapter considered a short editorial comment on Washington Newspapers but in view of the present pseudonymous contribution on the same subject it is necessary again to call attention to the editor's opinion of the newspapers. The fact which seems to appear salient to him is that "every puny whipster is enabled to sit in judgment on the talents and adroitness of our governors."

First it should be noticed that the scrib on the Washington newspapers; in other words, the political side of the subject appeared in the same volume some pages after these Thoughts. And the scrib is undoubtedly by Brown while this article is to be proved. At the same time the attention given to

¹ Vol. III, pp. 259-264.

detailing the objections to mercantile advertising, the estimation in octavos of the annual amount of the newspapers which is of no lasting value, and the possibilities of the newspapers as a vehicle of ethics, seem to be in keeping with Brown's belief. Thus we find one article expresses in general the same belief as the other.

It seems that one who could use such a piercing expression as the "puny whipster" would hardly fail to use it in this article, at least if the same person wrote both articles--but this is an indifferent detail. The one irresistible blow to the ascription of this article to Brown can be found in the defense with which it closes. Lack of proof of this appearance of a Looker-on as his, it must be remembered, casts doubt on the authorship of the other article by a Looker-on which has been considered previously.

In the four Dialogues of the Living there are a few traces of Brown's hand; but the evidence is slight and it should be accepted with caution. We shall consider each of the four appearances of the article.

¹
I, is between William and Robert on lotteries. Robert is an author who has not thought much on the morals of lotteries and is
1 Vol. I, pp. 19-21.

1289
the propelling force for William's discussion and final moralizing.

We may consider him as representing Brown.

¹
II, is between Edward and William on the Monthly Magazine. It is introduced to the editor by a fictitious letter, signed Philomuthos, which we translate as a "lover of conversation" which Brown was. Here William is poring over a book, in Dialogue I. Robert had just come from a bookstore. Edward expresses Brown's views and William again gives the opposing point of view. In fact in this case Edward's side is so strongly that of the editor that we have almost enough testimony to conclude the article to be Brown's.

²
III, is between Tom and Harry on the study of German; in which Harry expresses Brown's opinions, especially so in "Of all trades, Book-making is, in our own country, the most wretched... I meditate nothing but intellectual pleasure and improvement." which should be compared to his letter to his brother James. A remarkable coincidence is that this No. III is in the April 1800 number of the magazine and the letter is dated April 1800. The method and the use of the study of German as here advanced by Harry recalls that used by Brown in studying French.

³
IV, is between Tom and Harry on politics. Here we have Brown's
1 Vol. II, pp. 96-99. 2 Vol. II, pp. 284-287. 3 Vol. II, pp. 402-404.

usual method of construction. The usual "I" is summoned up to introduce the dialogue between the same named characters as we had in III where they were not in need of any presiding officer. In view of the fact that Brown had originally intended the magazine to have a political department but had omitted it, this venture in what might be called the political arena seems unusual. But when one has read the dialogue the reason seems clear. It is the glaring absurdity and foolishness of the situation of the two political disputants which stands out as Brown's belief. Of course as Brown always endeavored, we here have both sides of the political turmoil of the day, and the author draws no conclusions but merely points to the picture as if to say "Here's what political discussion comes to."

1

Taken as a whole these dialogues have too many earmarks of Brown to make it unwise to include them in the possible contributions.

2

Another dialogue entitled The Breakfast may be Brown's but is too short for certainty. It is between Edwin and Alfred and concerns the taking in and feeding of a ragged hungry urchin. Their mother

Mrs. T. is dragged in at the end to preach^a the sermon and draw the

1 One of the most peculiar is that there are five dialogues—one of which is not connected with the others. In the case of the Rhapsodist (1789) we found Brown using as signatures four of the five initials of his name. Perhaps both cases would indicate that Brown had a lack of attention to details of consistent construction.

moral, and in both these particulars the method is characteristically Brown's. Some experience at Smith's may have suggested it.

The article on the Death of General Washington¹ is elaborately displayed just as any editor would direct on a like occasion. The long extract, the simple narration of the funeral pageant, the closing eulogy, seem to be an editor's fitting announcement of the calamity. Followed shortly by Brown's monody the piece seems to be from Brown's hand.

The article on the Population of the United States in volume two² signed T. is interesting in connection with a similar one in the Weekly Magazine which was signed C.B.B. In this case the only part Brown could have written was the introductory paragraphs and they deserve no further attention.

In volume one³ there is a piece called On Apparitions signed F.R. the only appearance of the initials in all of Brown's magazines. In it there are some traces of Brown, and though they are slight and not decisive they are worthy of attention. The method is the most characteristic. It is the usual one followed by Brown of introducing the story and then putting it in the hands of an "I"

1 Vol. I, pp. 475-477.

2 Pp. 13-16.

3 P. 3.

the narrator. That the apparently supernatural is explained, and that it is a hoax, is quite in keeping with Brown's interest and method of treatment of the theme. The idea that it might produce unfortunate results recalls the moral of Wieland. As we shall see in another place the resemblance of the trick to those in Schiller's Ghost Seer recalls the possibility that Brown had read and been influenced by that work in one of its early translations published in America. The clergyman Mr. S---, the skeptic, bears a striking resemblance to the Mr. S--- who was an exhorter of Waldegrave¹ in his skepticism in Edgar Huntly. The diction, the argumentative narrative, and the sentences are characteristically Brownish.

In volume one² there is a piece entitled Gossiping a dialogue signed N. In it the Mrs. B. may be for Brown and Mrs. L. for Linn. The sisters dependant on B.; the yellow fever; the cousin-marriage; the residence on the North River; the garrulousness like that of Mrs. K. in the Portrait of An Emigrant; Calthorpe who leaves town to escape bankruptcy; the woman with the cold like Clelia Neville; the woman who sits in the window and watches all passers-by; and the style are the strongest details to link it with Brown, and they

are enough to warrant the ascription of it to him.

¹
An Instance of Longevity is signed Z. It is "from the Journal of a Traveller" and dated "Paris, April, 1792." When we recall the imaginary Journal of a Traveller which Brown mentions in his letters of the 'nineties, the date of the letters being April and May 1792 from the Pays de Vaud, which Brown also used, it seems as if we here had another selection from his manuscripts. The subject is one of interest to him, the sentence formation, the diction, the reflections started by the sight of the very old man, the bearding of him at the gossipy shopkeeper's, his Colden-like mysteriousness of character; the character of the narrator and the moral tag at the end; are all Brownish. The initial Z is the detail difficult to explain. Besides its appearance

²
 here it is quite common to the Weekly Magazine and the Literary Magazine; in one case the article so signed was extracted from the Farmer's Weekly Museum; in another signed to a poem which could hardly be Brown's; in another signed to what bears every evidence of being an actual account of the environs of Naples which we know Brown never visited. However this appearance here may have no connection with any others.

1 Vol. I, p. 165.

2 Weekly Magazine, Vol. I, p. 379; Vol. II, p. 61; Vol. IV, pp. 5, 65, 161; Monthly Magazine, Vol. I, pp. 165, 221; Literary Magazine, Vol. IV, p. 60; Vol. V, pp. 200, 415

The subject of longevity leads us to ~~here call attention to~~
 a Case of Long Life in Gaspard Courtrai, to ¹ ---- ----. Philadelphia,
 April 1800, unsigned. The method ~~here adopted~~ is Brown's usual
 one of a letter in which the opening ^{gives} ~~explains~~ the cause for the
 narration. The diction and sentences are Brown's. The description
 of the valley in which Courtrai lived recalls ~~that of~~ Edgar Huntly.
 The letter tells the story of ^{the} a man who lived for 167 years and
 then was imprisoned on a charge of witchcraft and committed suicide.
 It is peculiarly appropriate ~~as a story~~ for Brown because it dis-
 cusses ~~at length~~ the possible experiences ^{in long} of a life of that
 length and has several suggestions of ~~a nature~~ that could not
^{had an} ~~help but~~ appeal to him. The elixir of life is one ~~of them~~ and ~~if~~
~~this was written by Brown~~ it is a very good explanation ~~of the~~
~~reason~~ why he did not treat ^{the} such a subject. The ~~application of~~
~~the fancy of the author~~ ^{Courtrai} to this case of Gaspard shows the very
~~character that such a theme would have to have in a novel~~. After
^a ~~the~~ hero has achieved the elixir the interest of Brown would wane
 and to carry the work further would be as difficult for him as
 Hawthorne afterward found it. The development to be of moral
 interest seemed impossible---it could only take on the character
 1 Vol. III, pp. 247-256.

of a novel of adventure, with no ^{no} reasonable climax and ending, save
 the ^{exhaustion} end of the writer's patience. The name of Gaspard we have seen
 used in Stephen Calvert as ~~Gaspard Calvert~~, but of course similarity
 of names is but a detail in the evidence. The structure is in its
 repetitions peculiarly faulty like ^{several} ~~most~~ of Brown's short stories; it
 has the ~~usual~~ moral tag at the end; the love of the principal character
 for solitude and books; his possible writing of his memoirs and his
 recollection of William Penn's history are all Brownish. At the end
 the story is suggested as ~~appropriate~~ to be sent to the narrator's

friend who is a physician ~~the same~~ as several of Brown's friends were.

¶ In the biographical study of the year 1799 when it was delivered
 We have given attention to the prologue to the Robbery which was

~~undoubtedly~~ Brown's but for want of sufficient proof that its companion
 piece is also his we have found it necessary to place our consideration

of the Epilogue to the Robbery ^{here} in the somewhat questionable class. It
^{appears} ¹ is found in volume one immediately following the prologue, and reads

~~as follows:~~

2

Epilogue to the Robbery.

A ROBBERY!--five hundred pounds reward!

Look to your watches--o'er your stores keep guard!

1 P. 480.

2 At the second performance, which was undoubtedly the last, Mrs.
 Melmoth spoke ~~this~~ epilogue. The text used is that of the Monthly
 Magazine. ~~No copy has been found in the newspapers of the day or
 dramatic collections since then.~~

I've lost my pocket-handkerchief!--'tis gone!
 'Twas worth two shillings--though it cost but one.
 The hue and cry is up--seize, seize the wretch!
 And give him up to gibbets and Jack Ketch.

But let the licens'd robber freely roam
 And prowl abroad, or lurk for prey at home.
 Let heroes seize the mighty nabob's store,
 Or enter Switzerland and rob the poor.
 On Altdorf's hills, or India's fertile plain,
 Alike the object, thirst for power or gain.
 In either hemisphere the like pretense
 Has serv'd to cheat mankind of common sense--
 "We only conquer for their proper good,
 "To make them happy we must shed their blood."
 Thus the fell Spaniard sought Columbia's shore,
 And, impious, bore the cross through fields of gore.
 Thus every hero who the world has vex'd
 Makes human happiness his stale pretext;
 Is it to civilize?--or preach the word?
 The first great argument is still--the sword.
 "We must have power--you must submit--must pay--
 "We know what's right--you perish or obey."
 But human happiness was never found
 Where grinding swords inflict the deadly wound;
 Where hate and vengeance fill the troubled breast,
 And man is only seen oppressing and oppress'd.
 It springs from justice--from the love of good,
 This must be taught in love--not wrote in blood.

Now to the more familiar robber turn,
 O could I make his face with blushes burn!
 He, who for prey, still prowls from door to door,
 And thrives, by making poverty more poor:
 Hold, hold the portrait up, that each may see,
 And shrinking cry, "That figure's meant for me!"
 But no, I start and tremble at the task,
 What force Herculean would the labor ask!
 A conscience pure--discernment clear and keen--
 A voice and air which speaks the soul serene;
 My will is stifled by my conscious fears,
 My conscious wish to steal--your smiles and tears--
 For robbing is the soul of my vocation,
 My mighty strife to steal--no--gain your approbation."

The failure to use the heavy dash to separate it from the pro-
 logue and also to give it a heading in capitals, as all other
 verses are given, ~~in this magazine~~, would seem to indicate ~~that~~
 it should be ~~in some way~~ connected with the prologue. Of course
 the epilogue and prologue of a play are somewhat related so ~~that~~

it is possible they would be given as a pair whether by the same

author or not. However doubtful ~~it may be~~, it is ~~worthy of noting~~ especially

^{there are} ~~in view of~~ some ^{traces of} Brown ^{it} ~~hand in the composition~~. ^{Apparently} It seems

~~to have alone~~ ^{only} appeared in the Monthly Magazine, not even being

given in the newspapers of the day, ~~another suspicious circumstance~~.

The verse is the couplet like ~~that in~~ the prologue and ^{other} recalls

of Brown's early verse. The opening recalls the verses For the Grocer's

Window of 1787. "The mighty nabob's store" recalls the nabob and

his fortune of Arthur Mervyn. The shift of ~~the~~ ideas to Switzer-

land is quite in the line of Brown's worship of the Pays de Vaud.

"But human happiness was never found where grinding swords inflict

the deadly wound", "A conscience pure--discernment clear and keen--|

a voice and air which speaks the soul serene" and "gain your

approbation" are all Brownish, but beyond these details and the

circumstances of publication ~~as noticed~~ there are no further

traces, ~~of Brown to be found~~. ~~So it is~~ Somewhat doubtful ^{it is} ~~that he~~

he wrote ^{it.} ~~this epilogue~~ but still possible.

The newspapers of the day ^{while} in speaking of the prologue do not

mention the authorship of the epilogue at all, and it seems more

than a mere probability that the same hand called in by Dunlap

to supply a prologue would ~~be used to~~ furnish the epilogue. At the same time ^{perhaps} ~~it is possible~~ Dunlap himself wrote it, but not because of ^{its} ~~the humorous strokes~~. The man who was capable of the verses For the Grocer's Window, those on "Loo" and the "Sweet little thing" could easily have risen to the comical elements of this epilogue.

²
On Cards signed Almeria has a Brown opening; recalls what ^{he} ~~Brown~~ had written ~~in letters~~ about "Loo" and card playing; is ill-maintained as a woman's contribution; all that it contains being possible of Brown himself and has the same style and language as Alcuin.

³
The Evils of Reserve in Marriage is characteristically Brownish. It has his diction; has the usual moral tag; and is given according to one of his methods as a letter to Mary; but convincing evidence is wanting. It is signed N. That it is fiction seems to be clear from a letter in answer to be found in volume three. ⁴

We now come to the very doubtful third class of contributions.
~~to this magazine.~~

⁵
The Remarks on a Passage in Virgil signed X would seem to have

~~1 If he did it is among the few instances of his work which he did not take pains to tell us was his.~~

2 Vol. I, p. 188. 3 Vol. II, p. 409. 4 P. 15. 5 Vol. II, pp. 243-247.

in the opening paragraph hints that Brown wrote it. ~~Perhaps It~~

may be his, but there is too much doubt and too little evidence to

^{decide}
~~prove it one way or the other. At the same time, it should be~~

~~mentioned, and it should be noted that~~ ⁴ anyone inclined to accept it

will ^{must} ~~have to~~ accept also or disprove in all twenty articles

¹ signed X. In every case the subject is ~~one in which~~ ⁴ Brown was

interested, ¹ but in some ~~cases~~ the opinions are not ~~distinctively~~

his, ~~in one they are distinctively not his, and in all cases they~~

are ~~either~~ indicated as communications or ~~as~~ "For" the magazine.

Only one has ~~a few points of~~ internal evidence, ~~namely~~ ¹ in the first

~~case~~ ^{of} in the Literary Magazine volume three--On New Year's Day.

which will be considered when we ~~come to~~ study that periodical.

²
On Early Attachments has a comparison of two female characters,

Matilda and Felicia, which is of Brown's ¹ interest, and somewhat

similar to certain contrasts in the Weekly Magazine, but except

for style there is no other evidence, ~~to warrant ascribing it to~~

him.

³
On Almanacs signed R. has Brown's diction, a Brownish opening

and is partly a dialogue but has nothing more to stamp it ~~as~~ his.

1 Monthly Magazine, Vol. I, p. 247; Vol. II, pp. 243, 251; Vol. III, p. 321;
Literary Magazine, Vol. I, p. 329; Vol. II, p. 531; Vol. III, pp. 22, 194,
208, 281, 466; Vol. IV, pp. 114, 207, 276, 323, 431; Vol. V, pp. 36, 292,
332, 468; Vol. VI, pp. 26, 451.

2 Vol. II, p. 321.

3 Vol. I, p. 85.

Many of the articles appearing in this magazine appeared in others

with which Brown, was connected and In some instances we have been

able to offer evidence to show a probability that they were written

by him. When such is the case ~~with any of the following list~~ we shall

call attention to it ^{in the} ~~by a~~ notes.

~~Double appearance, though suspicious under the circumstances of alteration or revision, especially if it is confined to unimportant details, is not conclusive but merely suggestive; however for the purpose of attracting attention to them we list them.~~

<u>Vegetable Manure</u>	selection, Vol. I, p. 146.	= 1 Vol. II, p. 75.
<u>Garlick taste in milk</u>	" " " " 146	= 2 W.M., Vol. I, p. 162.
<u>General description of Peru</u>	" " " " 308	= 3 L.M., Vol. II, p. 110.
<u>Honest Man, a portrait</u>	original 4 " " " 405	= 5 L.M., Vol. VI, p. 459.
<u>Remarks on Russian Empire</u>	" 6 " II, " 99	= 7 L.M., Vol. VI, p. 445.
<u>Foresight of Spiders</u>	" " " " 324	= 8 L.M., Vol. VI, p. 438.
<u>Life of Burger</u>	selection 9 " " " 384	= L.M., Vol. VIII, p. 28.
<u>On Writing Pens</u>	" 9 " " " 468	= 10 W.M., Vol. I, p. 149.
<u>On a Taste for the Picturesque</u>	original, Vol. III, p. 11	= L.M., Vol. II, p. 163
<u>Anglo-German, a dialogue,</u>	" 12 " " " 327	= 13 L.M., Vol. VI, p. 427.
<u>A Miser's Prayer</u>	" 14 " " " 412	= 15 L.M., Vol. II, p. 175.
<u>Prevailing Ignorance of Geography</u>	" " " " 410	= L.M., Vol. VI, p. 467.
<u>Remarks on Shorthand</u>	" " " " 92	= 16 L.M., Vol. VI, p. 421.
<u>Rumford's Essays.</u>	" 17 " I " 1321	= 19 W.M., Vol. II, p. 6. 18

(W.M.=Weekly Magazine. L.M.=Literary Magazine.)

In ^{the} our study of the Weekly Magazine we showed ~~that~~ Brown was

probably the author of the extended review of Rumford's Essays.

1 With a few suspicious unimportant corrections. 2 Cf. Weekly Magazine, Vol. II, p. 102. 3 With considerable variation and title, General Idea of Peru. 4 Signed H.L. and ascribed by us to Brown in our study of the Literary Magazine. 5 Signed W., and with a few suspicious unimportant corrections. 6 Signed H.X. 7 Signed R. 8 Signed W. 9 Certainly not Brown's. 10 Opening was modified and six sentences omitted by Brown. 11 Signed Looker-on and ascribed to Brown elsewhere. 12 Introduced by L.M. 13 Given a new title, Dialect in Phila and signed A. 14 Signed C. 15 Given a new title, A Worldling's Prayer, and shorn of its first three paragraphs. 16 Signed L. Attributed to Brown by us (1793). 17 Second instalment signed O. 18 And continued. 19 Some signed Philo, not proven Brown's in our study of the magazine.

The second instalment in the Monthly Magazine ~~appearance of the~~
~~review~~ is signed O. and it is possible ¹ that the parallel between
Hume, Robertson and Gibbon and the review of Grimké ² On Wills, simi-
larly signed, may be ~~by Brown~~ ¹ ~~It is important to mention this~~
~~and we should not ignore the equally pertinent fact that~~ ¹ the O.
initial makes fourteen appearances in three volumes of the
Literary Magazine most of which we shall suggest as ~~probably~~
Brown's.

Among the pseudonymous contributions there are ~~a great many~~
with signatures that do not again appear in any of Brown's
magazines. That they may be a device of the editor's ~~for deceiving~~
~~the reader~~ is quite probable. In some ^{instances} ~~cases~~ they have been not
~~entirely~~ satisfactorily ascribed to other writers by the usual
reference books on pseudonymous literature. Of course they still
are doubtful and we may not be entirely warranted in calling
attention to some esoteric connection with Brown of such names
as Amy Armstrong, Peter Puffendorf, Egeria, Almeria, Monendus and S.B.
~~We should also mention that~~ ¹ Possibly others were masks for Brown.
It seems strange that so many single initials appear throughout

1 Vol. I, p. 90.

2 Vol. I, p. 127.

these Brown's¹ magazines; ~~that~~ of the alphabet only B.G.I.K. and U. happen to be omitted. When we find ~~that the~~ articles from Brown's friends were usually signed by their names, or ~~as~~ in the case of reviews were unsigned it seems as if he had simply adopted the device of attaching^a any letter of the alphabet at random. At least, the point is uncommon and suspicious.

The mere mention of several pieces will serve the purpose of directing attention to them. It is possible, though wanting of convincing proof, that Brown wrote them.

The verses To Stella in volume one ² will have recall their frequent occurrence in the Literary Magazine, the signature of Alwin resembles Selwyn and Alcuin, and the date conforms to Brown being in New York at that time of pestilence. ~~The verse~~ ^{it is} is Brown's usual couplet form. Possibly ^{he} ~~Brown~~ wrote the reviews³ of the translations of Kotzebue and the Word-chase Finished which has ^{his} ~~the~~ diction and verse form, of ~~Brown's~~. Whether ^{he} ~~Brown~~ wrote the Remarks on Godwin's St. Leon⁵ is doubtful. The initials R.P.⁶ may be for Robert Proud, but there is doubt whether he would abandon the usual Quaker forms of address and whether he would read any work of the ^{kind.} ~~character.~~ With this

should go the note Bethlem Gabor⁷ which may be Brown's. A Retort

¹ After volume one. ² P. 79. ³ Vol. II, p. 225 and Vol. III, p. 453.
⁴ Vol. II, p. 319. ⁵ Vol. II, p. 404. ⁶ Vol. II, p. 453.
⁶ Cf. Eulogy on Richardson, Vol. III, p. 163.

^{1 can}
Merchandise may be the result of ~~an~~ experience in the store of
his brothers'. ² On Conversation, the ³ Family of Lines and the
⁴ Remarks on Short Hand Writing, the Differences between Felicity
and Happiness signed X, ⁵ the Differences between Prejudice and
⁶ Prepossession, the Differences between Shade and Shadow signed
⁷ L., the Trial and Condemnation of Lengthy ⁸ and the Men worth
⁹ Fifty Dollars: all bear slight traces of Brown and may be selec-
tions from his journal or manuscripts.

¹⁰
The three poems, signed Calista and unidentified by the usual
authorities, may be included here as possibly Brown's. In our
biographical study of the year 1794 we ^{gave} ~~found~~ a long poem To Calista which has
sufficient internal evidence to warrant its ascription to Brown.

^{Writing}
~~if he wrote~~ that ~~one~~ it is not improbable ~~that~~ the name as a
pseudonym was used by him. The three poems are the only instances

- | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 Vol. I, p. 171. | 2 Vol. III, p. 87. | 3 Vol. III, p. 88. |
| 4 Vol. III, p. 92. | 5 Vol. III, p. 13. | 6 Vol. III, p. 96.. |
| 7 Vol. III, p. 243. | 8 Vol. III, p. 172. | 9 Vol. III, p. 401. |
| 10 Vol. III, pp. 239 (September 1800) and 400 (November 1800). | | |

of the use of the pseudonym in all his periodicals. In no way can they be ~~considered~~ answers to the longer one which was not published until 1808 in the third volume of the American Register. Perhaps eight years was thought sufficient ^{to escape} ~~for the defects of~~ the memories of his readers.

The most suspicious circumstance concerned with the ~~whole~~ three is ~~that~~ no notice was given them in the editor's notes to correspondents. If the first was so ungratefully neglected the editor could hardly have expected to receive the others from any correspondent.

The first is ~~entitled~~ The Seasons written from New York. During the year 1794 when it is probable these verses were written Brown was several times in that city. The metre is ^{his} ~~Brown's~~ iambic pentameter, not in the familiar couplet but riming in alternate lines arranged in groups of four like the verses To Miss D---- P-----, the postscript to the 13 May 1792 letter, To Laura Offended, Helena's and Constantia's songs in Ormond and L'Amoroso. Its inspiration To Calista only differed in being unrhymed. The ideas expressed if ^{his} ~~Brown's~~ are new in that they are joyful. The

diction is like his. On the whole this one ~~poem~~ is indecisive and alone would not warrant more than mention.

The second, To the Leheigh, reminds us of the verses In Praise of Schuylkill of 1788 except that here we have the variation in the same iambic pentameter of alternate lines rhymed. The ideas are like Brown's, the diction is his and the poem is dated at Bethlehem 21 May 1794 when we ~~know Brown~~^{he} may have been there, having made an ~~earlier~~^{other} visit ~~to the place in~~ the previous autumn. If we accept as his the varying allegiance to streams which is not beyond ~~the rights of~~ poetic license we may find nothing to hinder us from ascribing these lines to ~~Brown~~^{him}.

The third, On Domestic Happiness, follows immediately the second, though ~~it is~~ not dated or located. The ideas are ~~Brown's~~^{his}, the metre is the same as the others, the diction is his, and the state of mind is his. Of the three it has the strongest indications of being ~~by our author~~^{his}.

Now that we have seen that about one hundred and twenty articles or instalments of articles or contributions must be at least considered in our search after possible ascriptions to Brown in the Monthly Magazine it is necessary to state that only two other writers have given ~~the world~~ any details connected with ~~any part of~~ this task.

1

Fricke in Brown's Leben und Werke suggests as ~~possibly~~ Brown's ~~the following six~~ items:

<u>On the State of American Literature</u>	2 Vol. I, p. 15, signed M.
<u>Parallel between Hume, Robertson and Gibbon</u>	Vol. I, p. 90, signed O.
<u>Schiller</u>	3 Vol. I, p. 153, unsigned.
<u>Thoughts on Style</u>	Vol. I, p. 167, signed Crito.
<u>Character of Mary Godwin</u>	Vol. I, p. 330, signed L.M. 4
<u>Eulogy on Richardson</u>	Vol. III, p. 163, signed R.P. 5

1 Hamburg 1911.

2 This may have been supplied by Candidus who had furnished the article on American Literature in Vol. I, p. 338.

3 Given as a selection.

4 This is too near ~~to being for~~ Latham Mitchill to be accepted by us.

5 Cf. Remarks on Godwin's St. Leon, Vol. II, p. 404.

He does not go ^{into} an extended proof of any of them, and in the ^{instances} ~~cases~~ of Crito and R.P. does not consider other articles so signed.

Van Doren in the ¹ Nation lists what constitute fourteen instalments or articles. He notices ~~the~~ undoubted items such as the Edgar Huntly fragment, Thessalonica, Stephen Calvert and the Friendship letter from Jessica. He suggests as Brown's the Original Letters-- and their place in Jessica-- the Lesson on Concealment or Mary Selwyn but ~~is unable to prove and~~ does not believe the Trials of Arden to be his. ~~In the cases where he gets on the right track he is not interested to go on to the terminal.~~

~~It was~~ ^{turn.} about April 1800. ~~that~~ the magazine and all of Brown's literary work took ~~on~~ an unfavorable ~~aspect~~. In his letter to James Brown he speaks of the dullness of the booktrade.

"Bookmaking, as you observe, is the dullest of all trades, and the utmost that any American can look for, in his native country, is to be reimbursed his unavoidable expenses."

This and the ~~personal~~ letter to Beers soliciting his and his friends' subscriptions indicate ~~that~~ the magazine was not ~~very~~ prosperous, and evidently the editor called into consultation the remnant of the eight "men in the highest degree respectable for literature and influence" who had persuaded him to ~~be the pilot of,~~ and launched ~~him on~~ the undertaking. The result was to be seen in 1 N.Y., 14 Jan., 1915.

the preface to the third volume. It speaks for itself and contains all the facts essential to our present purpose. We quote it in full, and shall merely notice a few details in notes.

"THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, AND AMERICAN REVIEW, was undertaken with a foresight of the many difficulties which might embarrass and impede its progress for a time; but, feeling some confidence in the general excellence of their plan, and relying on the aid of friends, and others well disposed to promote the literature of their country, the Editors were not intimidated by the gloomy prospect of the disastrous wreck of former adventurers, or discouraged by the predictions of a similar fate, from renewing the experiment, and again trying the strength and durability of public favour and patronage towards literary projects. Its appearance, too, at a time when no similar publication was known to exist in the United States, was justly deemed a circumstance peculiarly favourable to success.

With no very high expectations, and with no extraordinary efforts to obtain patronage, which has been chiefly voluntary and unsolicited, it cannot be supposed that any disappointment should be felt, if the success of the undertaking has not been hitherto equal to their wishes.—The Editors have, indeed, experienced the most flattering species of encouragement, in the approbation bestowed by those whose judgment is a sufficient sanction in favour of any production relative to literature or science. Gratified in being instrumental in the establishment of a work, which, from the nature and value of its materials, and the respectability of the contributors, might add something to the literary reputation of their country, and tend, in some degree, to refute the censures of foreigners, on the apathy and disregard apparently shown by Americans to literature and science; they indulged little expectation of any remuneration for their labours, but as a remote and dubious consequence of the prosperity of the enterprise.

In a scheme, experimental and tentative, depending on the precarious aid of casual auxiliaries, as well as the more certain support of associates and allies, and liable to the fluctuations of circumstance and opinion, it was allowable, on principles of prudence and justice, in any stage of its progress, however disagreeable to them, to relinquish the

- 1 We have seen that this is merely courtesy. He was the editor and there were no others.
- 2 The newspapers were supplying the demand.
- 3 We have seen Brown's expectations extended to his dreaming of a possible \$2,700 in one year. So far as we have any evidence such a success seemed only remotely dubious.

undertaking wholly; or to make such alterations as might, in the opinion of others, and from their own observation, be more conducive to its ultimate success, and to the advantage of the public.

The thin population of the United States renders it impossible to procure sufficient support from any one city; and the dispersed situation of readers, the embarrassments attending the diffusion of copies over a wide extent of country, and the obstacles to a prompt collection of the small sums which so cheap a publication demanded, are, it is presumed, satisfactory reasons for altering and contracting the publication, so as to diminish, if not wholly avoid, those inconveniences.—Their own experience, as well as the observation of respectable friends, has led to a belief, that a work, chiefly, or wholly, devoted to literature and science, would, in the present condition of the United States, appear more advantageously at less frequent intervals; and that, either as it may regard the Editors, or the Public, a quarter-yearly publication is preferable to one appearing at shorter periods.—The completion of the *third* volume of the present work, and the commencement of another year, and a new century, render this a fit time for introducing such a change.

Had obstacles occurred formidable enough to have produced a total dereliction of the scheme, little consolation could be derived from imputing the failure of success, nor would such an imputation be just, to the ignorance and cupidity of the people. Americans, in this respect, are no way different from the people of other countries, but are influenced by similar motives; and, swayed by the force of circumstances, are more concerned about what relates to their immediate interests or wants, than in examining or estimating the value of the productions of genius, taste, and learning.

Though some temporary inconvenience may probably be felt by the Editors, from the change of their plan, they cannot but flatter themselves that its necessity and propriety will be apparent to those who have subscribed to the work; and that their patronage and aid will be extended to "*The American Review and Literary Journal*," a view of which is annexed to the present number.

New-York, January 1, 1801.

3

This preface ~~being~~ written after the ~~proposed~~ change had been definitely ^{decided} ~~settled~~ states the case ~~to his readers~~ in absolute forgetfulness of his original plans, ~~and hopes~~. Two facts seem

- 1 The proposed change would only make the numbers sell for 12 1/2 cents more.
- 2 This "View" must either have been on the original wrapper, which we have not seen, or given as an extra signature. We assume ~~that~~ the one in the first volume of the new publication is an exact reprint.
- 3 It is evident ~~that~~ Brown and his friends tried to retain the title, but, changing from a monthly to a quarterly had to be contented with the latter half of it.

to stand out clearly, the magazine did not make money for the editor and probably not for the publisher and a month's issue took up too much of the time which Brown would otherwise give entirely to fiction. Exactly what was the cause of dissatisfaction is not clear. According to one source it appears the magazine was making too many enemies by its honest though not politic reviews; but this seems hardly conformable to the fact that that part was precisely the part which survived. According to another critic the claim was made that though it had excluded politics it had a decided leaning toward Jefferson; and even such a thing as its omission of marriages and deaths was suggested as against it. There may have been too many minds directed to the undertaking. Probably the real cause was a combination of these with other unknown reasons. However ~~it is to be noted that~~ the magazine was not given up, it did not really become defunct, as many have stated. The editor saw there was dissatisfaction and that some change was necessary, so he waved his magician's wand and metamorphosed it.

Brown deserves a great deal of credit for this magazine. Like all ventures of his, he entered on it with enthusiasm and his conduct of it was always earnest if not always excellent. The material supplied is readable to-day and in so far as it is educational

it seems ~~that~~ the present day reader is equally as ignorant ^{of} the subjects he treated as were those to whom he catered. Though probably not Brown's own it is probably true as stated ¹ that the magazine was the first to introduce Schiller to the American public. The range of subjects was wide, perhaps too much so. In trying to please a great many differing interests he succeeded in pleasing no particular one, so ~~that~~ there was no enthusiasm and without compass or chart the pilot steered all over a boundless sea, only being watchful to avoid rocks on the shoals of politics.

It seems ~~quite~~ probable ~~that~~ Brown got his idea of the periodical from the Weekly Magazine but when a publication of this character contains astronomy, biology, agriculture, travels, inventions, history, biography, chemistry, the drama and literature, and for good measure adds various original stories and verses it is getting out of its field, and trespasses so much on that of the newspaper ~~that~~ it might just as well be issued as such. Joseph Dennie had done this at Walpole, New Hampshire, in the Farmer's Weekly Museum with considerable success and in the state of the country at the time it is probable that had Brown followed his example he would have likewise succeeded. But like all voyages on the

¹ Goodnight:
¹ German Literature in American Magazines prior to 1846. University of Wisconsin, Bulletin No. 188., p. 29.

boundless sea the sensible pilot soon saw the necessity for a
port in view, and when Brown began self-criticism he invariably
accomplished something. Thus the sudden activity in the pilot's
quarters resulted in putting the ship into a course toward the
American Review.