

Revised 15 June 1922
Reread 4 October 1924
Revised 12-17 October 1927
Revised 2-3 March 1934
Revised 30 January - 1 February 1943

30

31

1488-1544

American Review & Literary
Journal
1801-21

THE
AMERICAN REVIEW,
AND
LITERARY JOURNAL,
FOR THE YEAR 1801.

Mihi quidem nulli satis eruditi videntur, quibus nostra
ignota sunt. *CICERO de finibus.*

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK:

Printed by T. & J. Swords, and sold at their Book-stores,
No. 99 and 160 Pearl-street.

1801.

(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1488)

AMERICAN REVIEW AND LITERARY JOURNAL

1801-2

The American Review and Literary Journal began ~~its existence~~ with the number dated ~~for~~ January, February and March 1801 and was issued regularly ~~as a quarterly~~ until the end of 1802, totalling eight numbers.

X
According to the original blue paper wrappers and the conditions ~~as~~ given in the prospectus--which we shall quote presently--each number was issued in arrears; that is, the first, dated for January, February and March 1801, was issued on April first; the second dated for April, May and June was issued on July first, etc. For all numbers T. & J. Swords of New York were the publishers, and printers and

~~The periodical now under consideration~~ ^{it set forth} was published as a quarterly continuation of the Monthly Magazine and American Review but the change in the periods of issue and its ^{critical} character ~~made it necessary to drop~~ ^{removed} the first half of the old title. The addition of the Literary Journal was an artful concession ^{hold} to the old subscribers.

The prospectus ~~of the work~~ was set forth in a

"View|of|A Periodical Work,|entitled|The American Review|and
Literary Journal," ^{added} ~~as annexed~~ to the last number, December 1800,

~~of the third volume~~ ^{bound} of the Monthly Magazine and also ~~issued~~

^{its} in some copies of ~~the~~ first volume ~~of the work~~, between the preface and table of contents,

^{It} ~~The prospectus~~ presents ~~a very fair picture~~ of Brown's

^{American} opinions of the state of ~~the~~ authorship, criticism and literature

~~of the time~~ which is of value to the literary historian as well

as interesting to the student. It repeats his established opinion

of politics, mentions religion as one of the foundation-stones

of society and government, and outlines the several departments

~~to be supplied. It reads as follows:~~

¹
(1) **T**HE Editors of THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, and AMERICAN REVIEW, having been induced, by the reasons mentioned in the preface to the *third* volume of that work, to

1 The paragraphs are numbered in brackets for convenience of future reference. Any other numbering is Brown's.

change it from a *monthly* to a *quarterly* publication, and to make a consequent alteration of the title, they deem it a suitable occasion to renew their solicitations for the aid of subscriptions to

The American Review, and Literary Journal;

and to invite the contributions of all those who have leisure or inclination to promote such an undertaking.

- [2] The advantages of periodical publications like the present, are too well known, and have been too often discussed, to be again enumerated. All the reasons urged in favour of the numerous periodical works which appear in Great-Britain, have additional force when applied to similar productions in this country. At present, no other common repository is to be found, where the small and scattered portions of intellectual treasure may be collected and amassed; and which, if dispersed over an extensive country, are either lost, or disregarded as of little worth; but, when collected and thrown together into one coffer, may swell to a great and precious sum.

- [3] The people of the United States are, perhaps, more distinguished than those of Europe as a people of business; and by an universal attention to the active and lucrative pursuits of life. This habit has grown out of the necessities of their situation, while engaged in the settlement of a new country, in the means of self-preservation, in defending their possessions, in removing

the obstacles and embarrassments arising from their colonial condition, and in forming and establishing independent systems of government. When, now our population is increased, our national independence secured, and our governments established, and we are relieved from the necessities of colonists and emigrants, there is reason to expect more attention to polite literature and science.

- [4] Nothing seems better adapted to excite this attention, and to render the pursuits of knowledge more compatible with those of business, than those periodical publications which impart information in small portions; by which, men engaged in active occupations, may gradually acquire a degree of intellectual cultivation and improvement, without any infringement of the time allotted to their customary and necessary concerns.

- [5] Much has been said about the claims which the natives of America may urge to the praise of genius and learning. Some European critics hold our pretensions in contempt; and many among ourselves seem inclined to degrade our countrymen below the common level. Their judgment has been formed from very imperfect evidence, and very narrow views; though it must be admitted that we have not contributed our share to the great fund of knowledge and science which is continually receiving such vast accessions from every part of Europe.

- [6] Genius in composition, like genius in every other art, must be aided by culture, nourished by patronage, and supplied with leisure and materials. The genius of the poet, orator, and historian, cannot be exercised with vigour and effect, without suitable encouragement, any more than that of the artist and mechanic. Neither the one or the other is beyond the sphere of social affections, and domestic duties and wants; neither can be expected to produce works of ingenuity and labour without such a recompense as the natural ambition of man, and the necessities of his nature and situation demand.

- [7] No one is so absurd as to suppose that the natives of America are unfitted, by any radical defect of understanding, for vieing with the artisans of Europe, in all those useful and elegant fabrics which are daily purchased by us. Similar and suitable circumstances would show Americans equally qualified to excel in arts and literature, as the natives of the other continent.

1 Brown does not recall or else he chose to ignore that he had announced Dennie's Portfolio in the Monthly Magazine. It is undoubted that the prospectus was out before this one of Brown's.

But a people much engaged in the labours of agriculture, in a country rude and untouched by the hand of refinement, cannot, with any tolerable facility or success, carry on, at the same time, the operations of imagination, and indulge in the speculations of Raphael, Newton, or Pope.

[8] The causes, indeed, why the intellectual soil of America is so comparatively sterile, are obvious. We do not cultivate it, nor, while we can resort to foreign fields, from whence all our wants are so easily and readily supplied, and which have been cultivated for ages, do we find sufficient inducement to labour in our own. We are united by language, manners, and taste, by the bonds of peace and commercial intercourse, with an enlightened nation, the centre of whose arts and population may be considered as much *our* centre, as much the fountain whence *we* draw light and knowledge, through books, as that of the inhabitants of Wales and Cumberland. In relation to the British capital, as the centre of English literature, arts, and science, the situation of *New and Old-York* may be regarded as the same. It is only the gradual influence of time, that, by increasing our numbers, and furnishing a ready market for the works of domestic hands and heads, that will, at length, generate and continue a race of artists and authors purely indigenous, and who may vie with those of Europe.

[9] This period is, probably, at no great distance; and nothing seems better calculated to hasten so desirable an event, than periodical publications, in which every original contribution is received, and the hints and discoveries of observation and ingenuity are preserved; and which contain a critical examination of the books which our country happens to produce. It is from the want of this clear and comprehensive survey of our literary products that we are, in a great measure, to ascribe the censures of foreign critics, who are yet in ignorance of us and our affairs.

[10] In the short period of eighteen months, from the commencement of the *American Review*, above one hundred and fifty publications have been noticed, without comprehending those in medicine, and many others which were not offered at the time. Many of these, it is true, are of a nature fugitive and temporary, and of little worth; some are of real value; and a few, we may venture to predict, will acquire a lasting reputation.

[11] This part of the plan, so *new* in America, had many prejudices to encounter, and many obstacles to surmount. It was thought that American writers would not *bear* criticism; that, as this was a *young* country, its authors must be treated with peculiar indulgence, and be encouraged by praise, rather than intimidated by censure. This objection originates from a very imperfect and partial conception of the nature and end of criticism; and which experience has proved to be without foundation. It is applicable rather to the supposed incapacity of the critic, than to the business of criticism itself. If the critic have formed to himself an ideal standard of excellence of the most elevated kind, or is enslaved by the authority of any individual example, there is danger, lest the disappointment of unreasonable expectations should prompt him to pronounce a severe and inequitable judgment. But if possessed of liberality and candour, and a just view of the end of writing, as well as a sense of the imperfection of all human skill and capacity, he cannot fail to satisfy the public by the justice of his decision, and to benefit, if not please, the author himself by the exposition of the defects, as well as the merits of his performance.

[12] How far those who have executed the department of criticism are qualified for the undertaking, the public have it in their power to decide. Their purpose is not so much to exhibit

their own opinions, as the spirit and manner of the authors themselves. To boast of an exemption from prejudice, or bias of every kind, would evince their ignorance and presumption. Their prejudices; they would fain believe, are of a salutary kind, and favourable to the true interest and happiness of mankind. Though not indifferent in the great questions of politics, which are so often discussed, and which at present agitate the world, they hope to be above the influence of mere party-spirit, which engenders so many unworthy and selfish passions, and whose views are limited by personal, local, and temporary considerations.

[13] *Morality and religion*, the pillars which uphold the fabrics of society and government, they feel it their duty on this, as on every other occasion, to strengthen and support according to the best of their ability.

[14] As the AMERICAN REVIEW is intended to comprehend every native publication in every branch of literature and science, as well as American editions of European publications, this design cannot be fully accomplished without the attention of authors and publishers in transmitting, as early as possible, copies of their works to the publishers of the Review.

[15] The advantage of having their productions and publications thus made known throughout the United States, it is presumed will be a sufficient inducement for them to attend to this request. In the future numbers, this department will occupy the distinguished place due to its superior importance, and will receive the most liberal, candid, and sedulous attention.

[16]
[17] The LITERARY JOURNAL is designed to comprehend,
1. ORIGINAL ESSAYS on moral, literary, and scientific

subjects. So respectable a repository, as the one here offered, it is hoped, will induce persons of leisure and ability to make frequent contributions to this department. The Editor will be scrupulous in the selection of such pieces only as are distinguished for some originality, or excellence of sentiment and manner, or for the value of the opinions they contain, and which, while they may reflect credit on the writers, will add to the reputation and respectability of the work. But whether this department and the succeeding one will be filled or not with domestic materials, must depend on the nature and number of the contributions.

[18] 2. BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIRS and ANECDOTES of remarkable and eminent persons, particularly in America.— This ample field of the most useful branch of human knowledge, that of individual man, has hitherto been wholly neglected in America; though no country, in proportion to its population, has been more productive of those self-created characters, emerged by their own native energies from narrow and obscure conditions, to eminence and usefulness; characters, the steady and active tenor of whose lives afford the best and most instructive examples of genuine virtue, and useful

- 1 It will be seen by the preface to the second volume I that as suggested this department could not be supplied.
- 2 Brown was of course the editor. The word here is probably used as a courteous way of including his friends who contributed.
- 3 His experience with the disappointment of the subscribers to the Monthly Magazine in the matter of the political department promised but not fulfilled, seems to have lead Brown to insert this sentence, but in this case he likewise failed to supply the political half-yearly retrospect.

talents, exerted for the happiness of society. It is from the portraits of such men, that the youth of America should learn the road to true greatness; to distinguish the glory which surrounds the name of WASHINGTON, from the illusive meteors which excite wonder while they terrify and alarm, and disturb the repose and happiness of mankind.

[19]

It is hoped that those whose situation and knowledge enable them to contribute to this department, will not be backward in communicating the information they possess, be it little or great. A few incidents and facts from a variety of hands, may enable the future biographer to complete the portrait; and, if not thus preserved, are likely to be wholly lost, through forgetfulness, or the influence of time. Numerous public and private characters ought not to be suffered to pass into oblivion, or to be left to the imperfect and partial record of the general historian.

[20]

It would be particularly gratifying to the Editors, to be able, in the course of their publication, to give a list of all the authors who have appeared in America from the year 1770 to 1800, with a brief examination of the merits and contents of their several performances, so as to form a history of literature and knowledge in the United States. Should this intention

meet with attention from those who are best qualified to furnish the necessary information, and sufficient materials are collected for the purpose, this historical retrospect of letters and science shall constitute an appendix to each volume until it is completed.

[21]

3. INTELLIGENCE of every kind, in agriculture, natural history, mineralogy, arts, and miscellaneous literature; and every fact, hint, and discovery which can, in any degree, gratify liberal curiosity, promote useful knowledge, or contribute to rational amusement. This department will also comprehend early notices of all works and projects, and of intended publications, as well as accounts of new patents, granted for inventions and discoveries; and, to this, persons in every class and condition can communicate something which may be useful, or which deserves not to be forgotten.

[22]

At the end of every six months will be given a half-yearly retrospect of the political events and remarkable occurrences in America. This will be a general and connected narrative, without entering into political discussion, which may serve to place, in a clear and satisfactory view, the succession of events which, gleaned from Gazettes and diurnal publications, remain perplexed and confused, or are easily obliterated from the memory.

[23]

The AMERICAN REVIEW, and LITERARY JOURNAL, is intended to comprehend a survey of the state of literature, arts, and science in America; and, for the entire execution of their plan, the Editors rely not only on their own exertions and those of their friends, but of every person of observation, who feels any desire to encourage such an undertaking.

[24]

Although it is intended to consist wholly or chiefly of American products, resort will occasionally be had to those of Europe, for articles rare, curious, and valuable.

[25]

It will be published in four quarterly numbers, of one hundred and twenty pages each, making one volume, octavo, a year. The extreme cheapness of this publication, considering the enhanced price of the materials and labour bestowed on books, will render its purchase easy to every person. When compared with the sums periodically given for the numerous diurnal and weekly Gazettes, the annual sum will be regarded as trivial. Though the publication is but half as voluminous, the price is less than half of what has been paid for the Monthly Magazine, and American Review; and, to accommodate it to the wishes and ability of a numerous class of citizens, was an

- 1 Again Brown may have disappointed the subscribers by not supplying this department.
- 2 The Monthly Magazine was \$4.50 per year compared to this work at \$2.00.

additional reason of the preference of a quarterly to a monthly publication: and it is hoped that the original subscribers will continue their encouragement to the work under the form which it is about to assume.

CONDITIONS.

- [26] I. To be published quarterly, in numbers consisting of one hundred and twenty pages octavo each, at fifty cents a number—to be paid on delivery.
- II. It shall be printed on superfine paper, of an uniform size with the Monthly Magazine, and American Review, and on a new type. ¹
- III. The first number, for January, February, and March, will be delivered on the first day of April, 1801.
- IV. The last number of each volume will be accompanied with a neat title-page and complete index; and, if practicable, a list of the subscribers. ²
- [27] Subscriptions will be received, and numbers sold, by D. West, Boston; Hudson and Goodwin, Hartford; I. Beers and Co. New-Haven; C. R. and G. Webster, Albany; T. Dobson, J. Humphreys, and M. Carey, Philadelphia; J. Rice, Baltimore; W. Prichard, Richmond; T. Rainbow, Norfolk; Bailey, Waller and Bailey, Charleston; Seymour and Woolhopter, Savannah; and T. and J. Swords, New-York.
- [28] As the collection of small sums is difficult and expensive, those who reside at a distance from the above-mentioned towns, and wish to become subscribers, are requested to designate some persons in the said towns as their agents, to receive and pay for their copies.—Subscribers at a distance are requested to be punctual in remitting the sums due, as on that punctuality depends the success of the work.
- [29] All communications sent, *post-paid*, to T. & J. Swords, the publishers, No. 99 Pearl-street, New-York, will be seasonably acknowledged, and meet with due attention.
- [30] Those authors and publishers who do not forward their publications to the publishers, must not consider themselves as intentionally neglected if they are not noticed in the Review.
- New-York, January 1, 1801. ✱

The ~~prospectus~~ shows ~~that~~ Brown's original plan for the ~~magazine~~ was for a repository such as the Literary Magazine was to be or the Monthly Magazine had been. But it was a far cry from the prospectus to the first number of the publication. When that initial bow and prologue had been given the curtain rose and disclosed ~~quite~~ a

1 A type of smaller size was used in giving the extracts in volume two.

2 We have never seen a copy with the list of subscribers.

3 On the inside front wrapper of No. 1, Vol. I. I add the name of the periodical; II omits the uniform size clause; III is omitted and IV is the same. The date is simply January 1801.

different show. The original essays, the biographical memoirs and anecdotes and, ^{later,} the political half-yearly retrospect were not there and the general intelligence was merely the ghost of ^a the real thing.

Also-called "advertisement" found only on the blue wrappers of the fourth number ~~of the first volume~~¹ is a revision of ~~that~~^{the} prospectus. It begins with the paragraph numbered 14. "Is intended to comprehend" is revised to "is designed to comprise". 15 follows. "In the future numbers, this department will occupy" is revised to "it is meant that this department should occupy". "Will receive" has added "it (will receive)". 16 is altered in one word, designed becomes intended. In 17,² "and manner" becomes "excellence of manner". In 18,² "emerged" becomes "who have emerged"; "to distinguish" becomes "and to distinguish". 19 is used unchanged. In 20, 1800 is changed to 1801. 21 is used unchanged. 22 is omitted. In 23 "to comprehend" is revised to "to exhibit". 24 is used unchanged. Then follows the "conditions on which the

American Review is published" which follow those numbered as

- 1 Having seen but three out of eight numbers in wrappers this statement may need modification. The third number of volume one could not have had it dated January 1802.
- 2 Like the list of subscribers in 26 and the retrospect of 22 this paragraph should have been omitted for its promise had not been fulfilled.

paragraph 26 of which I begins "The American Review, and
Literary Journal" will be published", etc.; II omits the
uniform size detail; III is omitted; IV omits the detail of the
list of subscribers. 27 follows as another paragraph with J.
White of Boston and S. Bishop of Alexandria, added to the list.
E. Merrick is substituted for T. Rainbow of Norfolk and Charleston
has its state designation of South Carolina added. 28, 29 and 30
are used unchanged. The date is changed from "January 1, 1801"
to "January 1802".

As ~~can~~ be seen ~~in the first~~ ⁽¹⁾ paragraph ~~as numbered~~ and continued in other places those were the days when an author's vanity of seeing his work in print was the only pay an editor offered for contributions.

Especially ~~noteworthy~~ is Brown's hope to publish ~~in an appendix~~ a biographical account of all the authors of America from 1770 to 1800. That the material was not supplied ~~and the appendices never appeared~~ should be fully appreciated as a ~~great~~ loss by every literary student of to-day for it is only by the most laborious efforts ~~that~~ we ^{can} ~~are~~ recovering ~~ing~~ a part of the whole which was so easy of collection when Brown sounded the warning more than a hundred years ago. ~~Just~~ ^{Why} he dated the beginning the year before he was born is not known. Of course he should have gone back ~~at least~~ to 1700 ^{if not earlier.}

When the year's work ^{was} ~~had been~~ completed and the bound volumes ~~were~~ made up a preface was supplied as promised. It contains but little new to the readers of the prospectus and its revision the "advertisement" and for the most part repeats ^{them.} ~~these more impor-~~ ~~tant notices.~~ ~~For our purpose~~ We shall indicate how it differs from the prospectus.

Having numbered the ~~important~~ paragraphs of the prospectus the reader may ~~easily here~~ construct the preface ~~as a whole, if he~~ ~~prefers to read it,~~ by following the following directions.

(3)
The first paragraph is the same as ~~the third of the prospectus~~ except for the addition of that in the sentence "when, now, that our population...." The second paragraph is the same as ~~the fourth of the prospectus~~ (4) except at the opening which reads "nothing, it is thought, will tend more to excite..." instead of "nothing seems better adapted to excite..." Paragraphs three, four, five and six are identical with ~~five, six, seven~~ (5) ~~to (8)~~ ~~and eight of the prospectus~~. Paragraph seven substitutes "literary repositories" for "periodical publications" in the first sentence of ~~paragraph nine of the prospectus~~, (7) and also uses "want of a clear..." instead of "want of this clear..." Paragraph eight begins "The plan of a Review, so new..." instead of "This part of the plan, so new..." in ~~eleven of the prospectus~~. Otherwise it is the same. Paragraph nine is the same as ~~twelve of the~~ (12). ~~prospectus~~. Paragraph ten to the end, with the exception to be noted, is new, and reads as follows.

(11) | "It is not probable that any individual can be found, who, with the requisite ability and inclination, has leisure and perseverance enough, successfully to conduct a work of this kind. Depending, then, as it must do, on persons of various pursuits, and different political sentiments, drawn together by their common attachment to letters and a desire to promote the literature and science of their country, it is not surprising that occasional differences of opinion should appear in the course of their labours. Sincere as may be the endeavour of each, to speak on political topics with impartiality and justice, it is more than probable that what he may say, will partake of the predominant hue of his own particular creed. But whatever bias may at times appear, on the one side or the other, it is hoped nothing will be discerned that indicates the narrow and mean spirit of little minds, intent on petty distinctions rather than general principles, on names rather than things. They who look for the ordinary effusions of party-politics, must turn from the pages of this Review, to those numerous diurnal gazettes, which are the appropriate vehicles of invective and sarcasm, of anger and contempt, and in which the keen encounter of hostile pens is expected and enjoyed. Nothing, it is believed, will be found in this work which has any tendency to impair that fair form of government so wisely established, or to disturb those opinions which are essentially necessary to its just operation and lasting support."

(13)
Here ~~the thirteenth paragraph of the prospectus~~ is inserted with the change of we feel it our duty instead of they feel it their duty and as on instead of and on. The preface continues:

Mr. And we may offer this volume as a proof of the force of the sentiments here expressed.

In the View presented to the public, though no promise was given, yet it was confidently hoped that *original essays on moral, literary and scientific subjects; and biographical memoirs and anecdotes of remarkable and eminent persons, particularly in America*, would have formed a portion of this volume. We are free to acknowledge that any expectations which may have been excited of this part of our plan, which was thrown in provisionally, will be, at this time, disappointed. This deficiency may, perhaps, be regarded as, in some degree, compensated by the fulness of the Review. But on this subject, as on every other, we rely on the indulgence of the public, rather than on any supposed merits of our own. No part, however, of our original design will be lost sight of, though to fulfil it demands the aid of the intelligent and communicative in every part of the United States, whose contributions will always be thankfully received.

We have been cautious of making brilliant promises, aware how often they fail of performance. We trust that the public will not have less reason in future, than they have hitherto had, to be satisfied with our exertions.

New-York, January, 1802."

Promises in prospectuses ~~when read after the work is done~~ are very like those in political platforms. They express the hopes but rarely represent the accomplishment of the elected.

~~So Brown promises he will follow the original plan in all its details but it has already been suggested that~~ The political half-yearly retrospect which was forgotten or ignored was not the only department to be omitted. Despite his provision ~~against~~ ^{to} ~~the possibility of not~~ supply~~ing~~ the attractive departments of original essays and biographical memoirs, the actual failure of ~~them~~ undoubtedly disappointed many subscribers, just as the ~~Monthly Magazine had done.~~

Directed

Attention should now be ~~called~~ to Brown's state of mind ~~that~~

underlying both the prospectus and the preface. While he is

making ~~every~~ promise of, and has the ~~greatest~~ hope for, a magazine

of the class of the Monthly Magazine and the Literary Magazine,

the truth ~~of the case~~ is ~~that~~ when it came to be issued it was

of a specialized class. ~~On the face of it~~ *It* is quite different

from the Monthly Magazine both in name and material. Whereas the

one is ~~entitled~~ the Monthly Magazine and American Review the other

is the American Review and Literary Journal. Thus we have an

equation and if we take out the identical middle terms we should

expect the remaining ones to be equal. So far as the character

of the material is concerned this is true but *the analogy* ~~it~~ is not ~~of much~~

accurate

~~weight~~ when we ~~come to~~ compare the ~~respective~~ amounts of each

department of both magazines. The average number of pages given

up to reviewing is about one hundred and twelve and to the

literary journal material about fourteen, so that by far the greater

part is the American Review and the Literary Journal is so small

~~a part that~~ we are compelled to judge the ~~character of the~~ whole

as a review of a specialized class; namely, a review of reviews,

almost entirely, if not wholly, made up of reviews of book ~~publications~~.

1455

~~So far as we know if Brown had consistently kept to his original promises the work would have been better named as "The Quarterly Review and American Magazine."~~

As we shall see when this magazine in turn was to be metamorphosed, its review feature was its one predominant trait and any one subscribing because of the ~~hoped for~~ other dishes of the bill-of-fare would have nearly starved in the midst of unpalatable plenty.

The method of publication; that is the quarterly and arrears features, gave Brown about two and one half months to prepare ~~the material for~~ each number. This surely was an agreeable change in his literary engagements for ~~at~~ first he ~~was~~ ^{ed} contributing to a weekly, then was editor of a monthly and now he has a quarterly. In making the period quarterly he followed the same reasoning as the Edinburgh Review did. It gives ~~the~~ time for proper study ~~of the work so that~~ the reviews can be something more than mere notices. ~~It is true that in the future we shall find Brown reverting to a monthly but finally we shall find him extending the period further, even to semi-annually.~~

The mechanical details of the editor's work are not of importance

but they sometimes show the editor's own ideas so well ~~that~~ they are worthy of attention ~~especially~~ because of their contrast to these present days when ^{an} ~~the~~ editor's personality has ^{little} ~~no~~ influence ~~what-~~
~~ever~~ on the appearance of a periodical. For his quotation on the first volume title-page he snatched up from his beloved Cicero a passage to be found about fifty lines from the beginning of paragraph one of book one of De Finibus.

"Mihi quidem nulli satis eruditi videntur, quibus nostra ignota sunt."

For volume two he used lines 580 to 583 of Pope's Essay on Criticism

"With mean complaisance ne'er betray your trust,
 Nor be so civil as to prove unjust.
 Fear not the anger of the wise to raise;
 Those best can bear reproof, ¹ who merit praise."

^{That}
~~The Pope quotation~~ seems ~~to be~~ particularly appropriate in view of the difficulties the editor had to encounter with irritable authors who resented the notices they received.

~~As editor~~ Brown supplied most of the material for several departments ~~which constituted what was called~~ ^{of} the literary journal.

There were captions of intelligence, new patents, new publications and works preparing for the press, correspondence, errata and the
 1 The usual editions give the comma here, which Brown omitted.

index to remarkable passages. Notable in the mass, ~~of the material~~
~~supplied~~, which occupied only about an average of fourteen pages
~~of~~ ⁱⁿ each number, were the notices of works by his friends, his
 present and former publishers, many extracts from the Medical
Repository and several from the London Monthly Magazine, ¹ ~~which~~
~~he probably read at this time~~, accounts of the Presidency, the fire
 and the donations to Princeton, and the commencements of Columbia,
 Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton and Yale Colleges. Of particular
~~interest~~ and connection with Brown the magazine had announcements
 of both editions of Linn's Powers of Genius, Conrad's Select
 Novels, (in which Jane Talbot was number four,) Clara Howard, a
 case of spontaneous combustion of silk, also the destruction of an
 old lady's body in a manner remarkably resembling that in Zschokke's
Die Verklärungen and Dickens' Bleak House, which we have considered
 at length in our study of Wieland.

In two cases we find ~~that~~ Brown took his pen in hand and corrected
 in ink ^{two} ~~certain~~ typographical errors. First ² in the omission of
 "tions" of motions in volume one on page 445, and second, ³ in

- 1 The London Monthly Magazine Vol. II, p. 615, for July 20, 1801 had contained the following notice of Brown's work. "The Monthly Magazine and American Review of which three volumes had been published from the press of T. & J. Swords at New York, has, since April 1. 1801, been converted into a quarterly publication entitled "The American Review and Literary Journal."
- 2 The double form of "s" discovered by comparing three copies is Brownish.
- 3 The cancellation is drawn at the same angle but may not be Brown's.

volume two on page 120 in the errata the superfluous "1" in

"juridicial" was cancelled. Of the errata one item noticed ¹ ~~to of~~

~~assistance to~~ identify ^{is} early copies of volume two: *this means the*

was stopped the press for the change.

II When ~~in the case of~~ ^{making} the index he was not satisfied to merely amalgamate

the numbers' tables of contents. He added ~~to it~~ cross references /

~~But he even went further and added a second index, which he gave~~

~~a place at the end of the volume, and which was for the~~ ^{of} remarkable

passages with especial attention to medical book reviews. In this

particular he did his best to make the book readily helpful. In the

second volume, a smaller type was used for quotations and not so

much space ~~was~~ wasted on ~~the~~ headings

As editor Brown seems to have had no particular trouble in finding

material. Samuel Latham Mitchell helped with ~~the~~ literary intelli-

gence, and some ^{XX very likely} W.D., ^{possibly} Dunlap, contributed at least one article, ^{and}

John Blair Linn contributed some articles, probably theological, which the board revised against Brown's wishes.³

Who the other helpers are ~~can only be surmised but cannot be identi-~~
have not been

fied.

guide
With his experience ~~to help him~~ he appears to have wisely made

by it he
the magazine a quarterly for ~~just the reason of~~ *of haste and* avoiding trouble

assembling
in ~~supplying~~ the material. ~~Because he was not hurried in the doing~~

II ~~of it~~ He had no cause for complaint and expressed none either in

XX Vol. I, p. 126 on a sand-piper.

1 Page 459, 1.22 adopted for added indicates the earlier.

3 5 July 1802 letter to Linn

~~his private correspondence or in the suitable department of the
magazine~~

Though his eye was keen ~~enough~~ to detect ~~such~~ typographical errors ~~as we have already noticed~~ he allowed one to escape him in the case of the article entitled the patent for raising windows. The patent was not for raising them but holding them when raised.

He was careful to quote extracted passages unless they were obviously a part of a publisher's circular, but he was very careless in the matter of supplying promised continuations of articles.

The fact that there are so many slight traces of Brown's hand may be an editorial matter. Perhaps as editor he used his pen freely and added to almost every contribution.

As a rule his ~~formal~~ appearances before his readers as editor ~~are of the usual stamp and~~ call for no attention or comment. They are mostly notes of recommendation of new publications and promises of supplying reviews, ~~in the near future~~. Occasionally, however, he supplies ~~attractive or interesting comments and they become~~ notable.

In the first volume the following are the best and show the character of the whole.

~~1 Samuel G. Drake in his Catalogue dated May 1873, p. 4 says it was "an ably conducted work."~~

Of James Humphrey's publication, the Oriental Navigator Brown says:

" -The increasing commerce between the United States and the East-Indies called for the republication of this work. The variety and accuracy of the information it contains renders it an useful and necessary companion to every navigator and seaman, and it is well deserving the attention of the American merchant engaged in the commerce with the East. The great difference between the price of the American and London edition is an additional recommendation in favour of the former. It is very neatly and correctly printed."

Robinson's Reports of Cases calls forth this exposition of the importance of such publications.

" These Reports are a very valuable addition to the very few books which we have relative to the proceedings and decisions of the British Admiralty Court. They are peculiarly deserving the attention of the American lawyer whose inquiries are directed to this branch of law, since he must have hitherto been almost wholly ignorant, for want of reports, of the principles which have been decided in a court where the rights of so many of our own citizens are litigated. The inquisitive and intelligent merchant may, by the perusal of these volumes, add to his stock of information many important particulars relative to the conduct of trade and the laws of nations."

Brown never tired of recommending the "back-log books" of his day.

" -In the *Monthly Magazine and American Review* (vol. iii. p. 311) notice was taken of the Grammar of Mr. MURRAY. We can only repeat our opinion that it is the best work of the kind that has appeared in our language. The *Exercises and Key*, which are published in a separate volume, are valuable, and must greatly facilitate the acquisition of correctness and perspicuity in writing. The *Grammar* has passed through seven editions in England, and has received, as well as the other publications of Mr. MURRAY, the uniform approbation of literary characters and journalists. We do not hesitate warmly to recommend them to the instructors of youth in every part of the United States, as eminently conducive to pure morality and religion, and to the acquisition of a correct and elegant style. They deserve to take place of all other works of the same kind which are now used in our schools."

That Brown knew the subtle wiles of the press agent is attested

by this casual reference to the series in which his Jane Talbot was to appear.

"Messrs. CONRAD and Co. booksellers of Philadelphia, have published the three first volumes of their *Select Novels*. The work throughout is executed in a uniform and neat manner, ornamented with good engravings."

In this connection it is important to notice ~~that~~ there is no mention of the books' title here and in the announcement of Clara
¹
Howard there was likewise no comment.

Brown's appreciation of the work of the famous early American wood-engraver Anderson is thus expressed:

"GEORGE F. HOPKINS, of this city, has in the press, the *Seasons*, by JAMES THOMSON. It will appear in a duodecimo form, on a small demy wove paper, made for the purpose, and will be ornamented with four copper-plate engravings by ROBERTS, and four engravings on wood by ANDERSON. From specimens of the work which we have seen, we think ourselves justifiable in saying, that it will be executed in a style that will do credit to the artists employed, and reflect additional reputation on the press of Mr. HOPKINS."

This is repeated in another form later, ~~thus~~:

"G. and R. WAITE have in the press, *A General History of Quadrupeds*; the figures engraved on wood, after the manner of BEWICK, by A. ANDERSON, of this city. From the specimens already given, it promises to be little inferior to the English edition. The publishers are procuring drawings and descriptions of American animals never before described, which will have a place in the *addenda*. The artist engaged in this undertaking is a native of this city, and it is hoped the work will meet that encouragement it deserves."

A correspondence with Candidus we have treated at length in our

study of the Monthly Magazine but as showing the difficulties the editor had to surmount it needs something more than mention here.

In the Monthly Magazine we found Brown getting into difficulties with a person who wrote under the pseudonym of Candidus, and here, under the heading of correspondence, we find the editor administering the deserving rebuke. The whole reply of Brown deserves quotation.

"A NOTE has been received from *Candidus*, requesting insertion of his remarks on the review of Low's Poems, ¹ and is unable to promise. See Monthly Magazine and American Review, vol. iii. p. 179, 266, and 480. ²

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. ³

Candidus was not the only obstacle to the editor's peace of mind.

1 Vol. I, pp. 135-6. 2 Candidus vs. Reviewer.

3 The review of the second volume of Low's Poems. Vol. I had been reviewed in Vol. III, p. 56

4 Refusal of long article.

¹
 Dr. William Currie of Philadelphia strongly objected to the review²
 which had been given to the Letters on the Kine-Pox and a Variety
of other Medical Subjects by Dr. Benjamin Lynde Oliver of Salem and
 himself. The reviewer is here concealed under the abbreviated
 signature of "Rev." ~~just~~ as he was in the Monthly Magazine
 and while his remarks are worthy of quotation, the possibility
 that neither them or the review was ~~written~~ by Brown makes the
 mention of the incident and the recommendation of reading the
~~long~~ letter and the remarks all ~~that~~ we can properly give. ~~It is~~
~~possible that Noah Webster was Candidus. However, be that so or~~
~~not, and we are unable to prove it,~~ the old feud with Webster was
³
~~also~~ renewed here and although it is doubtful our consideration
~~of it~~ has been based on ^{the} a suspicion that Brown was ~~in his case~~
 the reviewer. The reviews of Webster's other works had been
 handled with an evident desire on the part of the reviewer not
 to give offence and when every thing seemed to be going smoothly
 the opening of the old wound dealt in the Monthly Magazine comes
 as rather a surprise. The evidence to indicate Brown to be the
 reviewer is suggestive but not conclusive.

1 See Scharf & Westcott History of Philadelphia, II, pp. 1601-2
 for an account of his life and work.

2 Vol. II, p. 77

3 Vol. II, pp. 379-80.

Here again the same situation confronts us as in the Monthly Magazine. It is suspected that Noah Webster was Candidus, and if ~~he were~~, the two controversies are to be tied together with those of that other periodical. Though the family denies it the "Monarch" has been considered as not a little cantankerous.

In the second volume the editor's literary notices were, ^{not} confined to ~~new books~~ ^{published.} ¹ In several cases the preparation of ~~them~~ by the author was announced.

It was popular to condemn Wordsworth for his ^{poetical} ~~theory of poetry~~ as presented in the preface to the Lyrical Ballads so that Brown was doing ^{no} ~~something~~ original when he wrote ~~the first part of the~~ ^{this} ~~notice of it.~~ ~~following, and he appears to have done it in an original manner.~~

^{slight} His praise is unusual and shows the soundness of his poetic

judgment especially ~~in a day~~ when it demanded unusual courage to ^{say anything favorable of} ~~champion~~ any member of the Lake school. Speaking of the Philadelphia edition of the Ballads he says:

" This edition contains a long, but ingenious and well written preface, by the author, in which he examines the properties of prose and verse, and which should be read by all who wish to enter into the spirit of these ballads. Mr. W. endeavours to maintain, that between poetry and prose there neither is nor can be any essential difference; that some of the most interesting parts of the best poems will be found to be strictly the language of prose when prose is

well written; and he incidentally remarks, that much confusion has been introduced into criticism by contra-distinguishing poetry and prose instead of poetry and science, for that the strict antithesis is prose and metre. He considers the music of verse, arising from a certain artificial arrangement of words, and coincidence of sounds, as the only quality necessary to form the contrast and antithesis of prose. To prove the truth of this theory by his own practice, the author excludes from his poetry all personifications of abstract ideas, as not making any regular or natural part of the language of men, and for the same reason he employs very little of what is called *poetic diction*, consisting of phrases and figures of speech, which, he observes, "from father to son have been regarded as the common inheritance of poets." This is indeed stripping poetry at once of half her plumage, and condemning her to skim along the vale, without daring to soar into the sublime regions of fancy. The laws prescribed by Mr. W. may suit a particular species of poetry like his own, but we apprehend that their authority will not be acknowledged by the lovers of poetry in general.

As the author has drawn his subjects from the incidents of common life, for the purpose of tracing in them without ostentation the primary laws of our nature, he has chosen a style imitative of the language of ordinary conversation in the middle classes of society. On this plan we think he has made some successful experiments. As the poems are almost entirely free from intricacy of thought or expression, they may be read by the simplest swain without difficulty. Some of them appear to us too humble both in style and sentiment to be generally interesting. Many of the pieces display a lively sensibility to the beauties of rural scenery; but they are particularly distinguished for the delicate and affecting manner of portraying the sensations of the mind, when agitated, as the author expresses it, by the great and simple affections of our nature;—of nature, however, as she appears in the walks of low and rustic life."

Of Mavor's account of celebrated Voyages Brown immediately grasped the essential excellence of the scheme, and said:

" The scheme appears judicious, since it must be admitted that most of the books of voyages and travels contain many things which can be of use only to those engaged in particular pursuits, many things unfit for the eyes of youth, and other things too trifling to be read or remembered. A succinct but comprehensive narrative, like the present, is best calculated for young persons, and for general use." ¹

Given a simple subject, presented with no particular merit, though worthy of encouragement Brown could still put it in its place. Thus:

"Isaac Collins & Son have published "Pastoral Lessons and Parental Conversations, intended as a Companion to Mrs. Barbauld's Hymns in Prose." This little volume is very handsomely printed, and deserves a place in the libraries of children. It is as well calculated to promote their religious and moral instruction, as to facilitate their progress in reading."

The following has an additional interest as showing Brown's style of comments in reviewing, which we should know thoroughly before we take up our study of the reviews. Several characteristics are here displayed.

"The Rev. William Jones, of Nayland, has long been distinguished in England as a divine and philosopher of the first eminence. His writings have been read with avidity; and, it is supposed, have had very considerable effect in correcting the prevailing errors of the times. With great strength and perspicuity of style he defends the primitive and orthodox faith of the Church against the numerous corruptions which have assailed it; and opposing with firm and enlightened zeal the infidel spirit of the age, he seeks to make philosophy illustrate and support the sacred writings."

The interest in the review department seems to have shown its first trace of decay in the last two numbers. There is a conspicuous absence of notes and smaller type is considered good enough for new publications.

The bibliographers have stated ~~that~~ this magazine was not only edited by Brown but almost wholly written by him. In regard to the editing they have been truthful but in the matter of the authorship of the material in the magazine they have been merely guessing. That their guessing is near the truth still does not make it other

1511
than guessing.

There is no means, save internal evidence, to indicate just what ~~Brown~~ ^{he} did write ^{for} in the magazine. To say ~~that~~ he wrote none of the reviews hardly seems to conform to the fact that there are ~~some~~ distinct traces of his hand. That he wrote some of them is ~~quite~~ ~~probable and the~~ more reasonable. There is also the possibility that he wrote them all; but if he did there would have been no necessity for the assistance of his friends, which he mentions in both the prospectus and preface. In referring to the reviewing of the Monthly Magazine in the prospectus he spoke of "those who have executed the department" in such a manner that one is forced to conclude ~~that~~ the same eight friends who formerly constituted the "critical bench" ^{accepted} ~~had~~ had a similar position on this magazine. At the same time we should remember ~~the significant fact that~~ none of the "eight" have ever claimed to have written any of the items and no one else ~~has~~ ever claimed any for them. ~~As already~~ ^{indeed} suggested ~~he~~ [^] he may have written parts of all of the reviews.

On the other hand internal evidence, on which we must entirely rely, is only of value when it is used with external evidence and when it consists of characteristic traits, reasonably inimitable by others.

~~In this work~~ There is not enough conclusive and convincing to
of any particular review.
indicate Brown to be the author. As we know, his diction is common
to many writers of his day and his method of construction though
apparently clear is not certain and is ~~not~~ ~~invariable~~. ~~Some~~ Sometimes
~~cases~~ he may be the reviewer who uses a great many extracts, in
others he may ~~be the one who uses~~ none at all. ~~Probably he is~~
~~often both~~. In fact, the method may vary as often as the subject,
~~differs~~.

What we call ^{his} ~~Brown's~~ method ^{should} ~~is not to~~ be too ^{readily} ~~faithfully~~ worshipped.
At best it is ~~really~~ a general one and the ^{probability} ~~fact~~ that ~~it is possible~~
anyone editing a similar periodical would naturally fall into its
use makes it wise to receive with caution ^{the} ~~any~~ statements we may have to
~~make about the method~~.

~~Thus~~ ^{So} far as we can decide with any ^{degree} ~~modesty~~ of certainty it
appears ~~that~~ he paid particular attention to ^{pet} ~~certain~~ details
connected with ~~any books under review~~. Diction usually impressed
him to the extent that if an author went very far afield for
exotics he was pretty sure to meet with Brown's condemnation.
The reputation of an author was usually thrown into the balance. If
the work was anonymous or pseudonymous and Brown knew who the
author was he was sure to tell it. If no account of the author's

life was supplied he would supply it. The work was usually placed

firmly where its relation to other works by the same author or

other authors could be known. If the book ^{was likely to benefit a} ~~had any possible reason~~

^{reader} ~~it~~ it was freely encouraged, especially as a final ^{halliative} ~~sweet morsel~~

for the author after the flaws had been thoroughly ^{exposed.} ~~sought.~~ His

recommendations were usually addressed to the lover of mankind

and seldom to the specialist. Extracts were ^{When used at all} ~~used freely~~ ^{so many} ~~in fact~~

^{far} ~~too much so~~ that they ~~often~~ appear to be a method of "padding;" at

^{we know had} the same time they are often those which ~~have~~ a particular interest

for Brown. The publishing and printing side is seldom neglected--if

the book was a creditable piece of manufacturing Brown never

tired of mentioning it. ~~In this respect~~ His ideas of good book-

making are based on ^{sound} ~~the real~~ standards; the standards that to-day

are the ^{guides} ~~touchstones~~ of the manufacturing departments of all the

best publishing ^{pro.} ~~houses~~. ^{When} ~~If~~ the work ^{was} ~~was~~ addressed to some society

the reviewer was usually interested to mention ^{the fact.} ~~that as well as to~~

~~review the~~ book or pamphlet. Certain "pet expressions" occur so

often ~~that~~ there is little hesitation to ^{accept} ~~refuse~~ the reviews

^{them, and to refuse those} ~~containing widely differing~~ language and phraseology. Thus

perspicuity of style stamps a review as Brown's, ^{very likely} ~~possibly~~ and

Other expressions found again and again are such as:

enter into a particular account or to lay some account;
attempt or exhibit a brief analysis;
author proceeds to consider;
bounds prescribed to our review;
conclude our account or brief account or our remarks;
discovers proofs;
we shall dismiss with remarking or observing;
proceed in or to the or enter into a minute or particular
or separate examination;
pass it over without any particular examination;
proceed to examine;
we shall exhibit (for show);
exhibited for showed;
extract affords a specimen;
generality of readers or our readers;
lay before our readers;
limits do not permit us;
nothing new in the book;
proceeds to relate or investigate or lay before our readers
or give a brief sketch;
selections as specimens or to show;
affords a happy or suitable specimen;
serve as a specimen;
presents a brief survey;
founded in or researches after or seeking truth--truth
like a philosopher's stone or an essential requisite in
history.

A study of the ideas and language used in announcing a continu-
 ation of a review ~~or in recognizing that another article on the~~
~~same book had appeared, shows some peculiarities; such as,~~ many
 similarly worded expressions ~~perhaps~~ given in a slightly different
 order, ^a and the careless absence of ~~the~~ ^a recognition of ~~the~~ former
 article ^{is} ~~a~~ characteristic; especially of the ^{review} Wieland, which we
 believe was Brown's. >

⁵⁰⁶
~~Thus we find that~~ three of the reviews ~~were~~ intended to be con-
 tinued, ^{were} two being so indicated by the usual bracketed line and one
^{had} by a longer statement of the intention in the final paragraph.

But no continuation was ever given of them. Whether we are to

assume them Brown's for that reason we know not. The fact is at

least cause for suspicion. Was the writer indifferent to the editor's lapse?

That leads to
Another study ~~which produces some results is~~ of the ^{editor's} apologies.

They are usually made because of the age of the book reviewed,

which we ^{shall} notice further in ^{many} ~~other~~ places; sometimes for the length

of the review; and occasionally ^a ~~the~~ refusal to make any apology

whatever is found. They ^{naturally} ~~obviously~~ would have their origin in ^{Brown's} ~~the~~ editorial office.

It seems ^{likely} ~~probable~~ that the reviews of the works of his immediate

circle of friends ^{were} ~~may have been~~ written by Brown ^{for} ~~and~~ in several

instances ^{there are} ~~we find~~ sentences which resemble ^{some} ~~ones~~ undoubtedly his.

However, ^{times} ~~in some cases~~ we ^{must} ~~shall be compelled to~~ refuse reviews

of this character.

Although most of the notes are signed "Rev." in no case is an

article signed by ^{name or} ~~any~~ initials. That ^{absolute anonymity} ~~was~~ undoubtedly due to Brown's

experience with reviews in the ^{the} ~~previous~~ ^{from the} form of the magazine.

There is a great deal to be considered before the reviewer

signs his name or initials and as a general rule it is far more

satisfactory to the readers and authors and ~~must be decidedly so~~

to the editor and the reviewers to hide the writer under anonymity.

ho 9 ~~Reviewing is usually not only peculiarly personal but~~ ⁱⁿ ~~from its~~
 very nature as a minor form ~~of a sort~~ ^{reviewing} of criticism ~~it~~ can only
 be of ~~real~~ value when it ^{is} ~~becomes~~ impersonal. As soon as a reviewer
 allows the reader ~~to have~~ even a momentary glimpse back of the mask
 the effect of his opinions is translated into ~~personal~~ bias, and
~~the value of the review is immediately diminished.~~ In the case
 of favorable reviews of merit the reviewer will not fail to claim
 their authorship at ^{a more} the proper time; ^{even} ~~sometimes~~ the unfavorable such
 as Jeffrey's famous one of Wordsworth may ^{later} be claimed ~~in the case~~
~~of~~ The unworthy ~~the~~ review is better alone dead or dead and for-
 gotten in the company of the work reviewed.

The moot point whether reviews should be signed or unsigned
 has more or less of a perennial interest for editors. ^{In} ~~As late~~
~~as~~ 1913 the Athenaeum opened its columns to a ^{very interesting} discussion of the
 matter. Such a veteran as A.J. Church ¹ who counts ^{ed} his reviews by
 the thousands believed ² in anonymity. J.P. Mahaffy an able reviewer
 of over fifty years experience ^{took} ~~takes~~ the same view. ^{George Saintsbury} ~~of the matter~~
~~practised it for thirty or forty years of~~ his life.
 Apparently the anonymous review is the result of ^{the} experience and
 wisdom ^{of} those who have ~~been~~ ^{given} the greatest amount of time
 and effort to the practise.

1 Memories of Men and Books London 1908.

2 Athenaeum 25 January 1913, p.101.

Such a decision is of course always complicated by the presence
 and the known identity
 of the editor ~~and~~ ^{he} the more satisfactory ~~a person~~ is in his editor-

ial capacity the more impersonal the reviews published under his

auspices will be and the more securely hidden will be the ⁱⁿ authorship.
 A critical periodical gains its respect and only holds its power by its

That Brown's practise in this matter follows what seems to

have shown itself to

be the best reflects great credit on him and his magazine.

uniform
 fairness
 and
 honesty.

Though the signing of the reviews would perhaps be more satisfactory

1517

to our present study the tactfulness ⁱⁿ ~~of the method of~~ conducting
~~such~~ a delicate affair ^{It's} undoubtedly makes amends. ~~Brown's~~ reviews
after all are only reviews and they very seldom approach the domain
of criticism.

One peculiar fact, which is liable to be overlooked, ~~if not called~~
~~attention to~~ is that these reviews are not only of books newly
published. Of course by far the greatest number are, ~~contemporaneous~~,
Of the total of two hundred and eight reviews eighty-eight ^{are} being
of books published in 1801 and seventy-one ~~of~~ those of 1802. As
one might expect the numbers do not diminish with the increase of
the age of the books. 1800 has twenty-five; but 1799 and 1799-1800
have three. Most others have one; but 1798 surprises us with seven
and 1794 with two. The publication of the magazine in arrears also
made possible the inclusion of one of as late as 1803¹. On the
whole it seems probable ~~that~~ Brown had had some of the reviews
on hand for the Monthly Magazine and he knew only too well ~~that~~
the late appearance ~~of a review~~ would not be noticed by his readers
and would be welcomed ~~any time~~ by the publisher or the author.

The reviews are, with some notable exceptions, of one general
class—they select a few unimportant errors and condone them

¹ Perhaps due to dating in advance books published during the last
few months of the year.

1518
and then they look for the excellences and the real use ~~of~~ or
need for the book and fearlessly defend it for them. In many ~~cases~~
~~of~~ unfavorable reviews there is no truckling to any party or
creed or publisher, even the publishers of the review itself—the
Swords¹--have almost as many of their books condemned as favored.
On the whole a high standard of morals is vigorously championed.

To any one giving ~~this magazine even~~ the most superficial exam-
ination the difficulty of identifying Brown's reviews will make
it apparent ~~that~~ the method which we ~~have used~~ in ~~studying~~ other
magazines ~~of Brown's~~, of classifying them under three heads is
inapplicable here. There are three possible classes; first, the
probable; second, the possible; and third, the uncertain; but each
~~class~~ merges so imperceptably into the other ~~that~~ the only guide
we can offer is to say that usually the most probable will be
treated ~~of~~ first and the uncertain will end the list. We may
even go further and state that certain kinds of reviews are quite
out of Brown's province and therefore we shall find it of advantage
to group all ~~of them~~ according to the subjects of which they treat.
We have considered all ~~the reviews~~ which have any definite evidence

¹ There are only eleven of the Swords' publications reviewed.
Five are either indifferent, only partially favorable or decidedly
unfavorable.

~~whatever~~ Such a method of arriving at some understanding of the contents of the magazine is necessary and though involving considerable space does not prove ~~on inspection~~ to be quite so tedious as one would expect, because ~~very~~ ^{are} often they ~~prove~~ ^{are} very instructive and interesting, throwing lights on Brown that otherwise we would not have.

The ~~review of~~ works relating, in general, to history ~~seem to~~ have the strongest traces of Brown's ~~hand~~ in their composition.

Minot's History of Massachusetts Baylis in what we explain as Brown's method, ~~both here and in our study of the Monthly Magazine~~. It has some of the ideas expressed similarly to ~~those in~~ the preface. It is one of the ~~reviews~~ of which as editor he was careful to indicate a trivial error. The attention called to the necessity for a good style parallels Brown's efforts in the same direction. ~~It is the first review of the work.~~

Chesterfield's History of Modern Europe 2 is in Brown's method, has a hit at the fictional side of the title and a reference to Hume and Robertson, one of Brown's own pairings.

Williams' Vermont 3 is in Brown's method and style, is very similar to several of the Monthly Magazine reviews; has an unusual interest in the Indian ~~such as Brown had~~ and has a careless Brownish slip in the estimate of the time necessary to absorb the Indian race, ~~into the white~~. It recalls the prospectus and expresses a hope, which certainly was Brown's, for a history of American literature. Sullivan's Maine 4 has Brown's style prominent as well as his method. Besides a personal explanation of the Indian's beardlessness it contains a quotable sentence on the hope of an author which is autobiographic of Brown, ~~and reads:~~

"We cannot but think that the ambition of being considered a correct and elegant writer is not only natural to an author, but laudable, and by no means inconsistent with the purpose of utility."

The Massachusetts Historical Collections, 5 if Brown's, would indicate that the Monthly Magazine review (III, p. 42) was also his. It has his language, comprises his interests and is in each detailed notice brief enough to almost be editor's work.

1 Vol. I, p. 1.

2 Vol. I, p. 108.

3 Vol. I, pp. 265, 390.

4 Vol. I, p. 291.

5 Vol. I, p. 304.

Snowden's American Revolution 1 has Brown's usual characteristics as we here know them. Austin's Oration 2 is two sentences, probably hastily supplied by the editor. Holmes' Cambridge 3 is more promising in its style and method but is probably by the same author as the Massachusetts Collections already noticed. It repeats Brown's ideas of an ideal history. Hall's Mississippi Territory 4 has some traces of his style and ideas and may be Brown's as well as Sibbald's Notes on Georgia 5 and Adams' Oration. 6

In general ~~all~~ these historical studies were the best sort of preparation for Brown's geography of 1809 and it is improbable ~~that~~ he would allow the opportunity to escape him.

The next group of ~~reviews~~ relates ^{obviously} ~~obviously~~ to Brown's known works and comprise ~~these on~~ geographies and gazetteers.

Scott's Universal Gazetteer 7 and Morse's Gazetteer 8 have the ideas and style of Brown. The former has parts which should be compared with Brown's geography prospectus of 1809 and his life-long interest in maps is explained on the ground of their being the "true vehicles of geographical knowledge." Carey's Atlas 9 is so short it probably was merely the work of a few strokes of the editor's pen. Morse's American Geography 10 adds to the details of Morse's Gazetteer 8 a characteristically Brownish closing which reads:

"After the general account we have given of this volume, which certainly contains a large mass of valuable and useful information concerning America, we shall reserve the consideration of the second part, and the further remarks we have to make on the execution of the whole work, to a future number of this review."

The social and political group comprises all that can be included under the broad significance of the title; such as secret societies, social reform, penology, philanthropy, politics and political biography.

1 Vol. II, p. 23.
4 Vol. II, p. 439.
7 Vol. I, p. 286.
10 Vol. II, p. 457.

2 Vol. II, p. 89.
5 Vol. II, p. 442.
8 Vol. II, p. 68.

3 Vol. II, p. 406.
6 Vol. II, p. 479.
9 Vol. II, p. 350.

The review of the Essay on Political Society has at its opening a touch of peculiar interest to Brown. Its delicate consideration and encouragement of the author, its hero-worship of Cicero, its condemnation of Godwin, its attention to the word "rhapsody," its characteristic promise at the end of the first instalment of a continuation of the article and the equally characteristic reference in the continuation 2 to the former article, its occasional Latinized diction, its method and especially its style are more than suggestive of its author. It seems that no one but Brown could have written it and the opening paragraph deserves quotation as an excellent example of Brown's style in works of this character and one which tends to approach the domain of real criticism.

" **N**OTHING is more agreeable to the human mind, impatient of doubt and distracted with error, than to repose on fixed principles and established laws, by which our present conduct may be regulated and the future condition of society be unfolded. It is not surprising, therefore, that political writers should attempt to exhibit politics as a science, and, as such, founded on determinate principles, which, in their operation, are productive of certain and definite consequences. The history of political institutions, however, is apt to awaken a suspicion, that truth and certainty, like the philosopher's stone, must for ever elude the most painful and elaborate researches; and that every new experiment, like the former, will end in disappointment. Yet as the labours of the alchemist have shed incidental light on medical and physical science, so hath the path of moral inquiry been illuminated by the efforts of the ethical philosopher. Nor can it be denied, that if the grand problem of political society and government is still unsolved, that many important and fundamental principles have been established, favourable to the improvement and happiness of mankind."

Priestley's Letters 3 if Brown's is an example of his tendency at this time to become a publicist. He shows a familiarity with the rights of an alien and is a champion of the right of free speech. Some of the ideas are Brown's; the severe criticism of the parts which discover faults in the American constitution may be his and the method may be one of the variations we have not been able to identify. It is another of the reviews of which as editor he was careful to indicate a trivial error. On the whole the testimony is doubtful of its being Brown's.

The comparison of the French and American Revolutions⁴ has his style and method but implies a knowledge of German which we are not certain, though it is probable, Brown had. The passage on Paine's writings suggests a comparison with another on the same author in Boudinot's Age of Revelation, to be noticed later, and probably not Brown's. As a review it is of a high type and will favorably compare with the best of critical reviews. The Reflections on the Consequences, etc.,⁵ is too short for more than a faint trace of Brown's style and is not decisive.

1 Vol. I, p. 17.

4 Vol. I, p. 55.

2 Vol. I, p. 146.

5 Vol. I, p. 86.

3 Vol. I, p. 48.

Wortman's Address 1 has Brown's style and method and contains a defence of Washington and an attention to diction both of which are Brownish. 4

The Crisis 2 and Cheetham's Dissertation 3 are short enough to be editor's work but have a certain tone of pleasantry which makes them improbable as his.

Two accounts of Washington 4 are considered under one article which has the Monthly Magazine method of opening and appears clearly to be editor's work. The opening and closing paragraphs are worthy of quotation and had we more space ~~to devote to this part of our subject~~, might be profitably compared to Brown's praise of Washington in the prologue to the Robbery.

The President's Addresses 5 is too short for decision but may be editor's work.

The two pamphlets on the District of Columbia Government 6 ~~when reviewed~~ shows none of Brown's traces except possibly his sarcasm.

The Proceedings of the Cincinnati 7 is short but is of Brown's stamp.

Justicius' Remarks 8 may be ^{his} Brown's and has a "slam" on the attempted humor of the work.

A Western Citizen's Examination 9 and Harris' Discourses 10 have no known trace of Brown, though the former may have his sarcasm and the latter his style.

Kirkland's Address 11 may be ^{his} Brown's as editor.

Eacker's Oration 12 has ^{his} Brown's style and his objection to political quarrelling and is short enough to be editor's work.

Palmer's Principles of Nature 13 may be ^{his} Brown's. It has his style, a passage which recalls the verse on the title-page of Wieland and is evidently written by the same author as the preceding review as well as by the reviewer of the books on chemistry here ascribed to Brown. If ~~it is~~ his it should be studied as ~~a presentation~~ ^{for} his religious belief.

Workman's Essays 14 betrays haste and is probably the editor's.

Dwight's Oration 15 is not technical and has Brown's style and a condemnation of Godwin's philosophy such as ~~is found~~ in Jane Talbot.

An Account of the State Prison 16 is probably Brown's being written in his style and having his interests selected for notice.

Payson's Proofs 17 may be ^{his} Brown's, having his style. The Rickett's Circus fire may be the hint of Davis' account of the Beefsteak club being broken up. The note is Brownish and the reference to New York friends ~~seems to fit~~ the editor. In this connection ~~it is~~ interesting to recall that Brown's mysterious men such as Colden and Carwin have been suggested as members of the Illuminati.

Woodward's District of Columbia 18 is short enough to be the editor's.

1 Vol. I, p. 89.

4 Vol. I, p. 199.

7 Vol. I, p. 246.

10 Vol. I, p. 348.

13 Vol. I, p. 448.

16 Vol. II, p. 19.

2 Vol. I, p. 95.

5 Vol. I, p. 209.

8 Vol. I, p. 247.

11 Vol. I, p. 352.

14 Vol. I, p. 483.

17 Vol. II, p. 57.

3 Vol. I, p. 96.

6 Vol. I, p. 240.

9 Vol. I, p. 248.

12 Vol. I, p. 362.

15 Vol. I, p. 493.

18 Vol. II, p. 67.

A

add to page 1522

^{His}
~~Brown's~~ opposition may have been caused by the pamphlet A Solemn
Address, New York 1800, signed Timoleon, against William Linn's
anti-Jeffersonian pamphlet Serious Considerations.

Cheetham's (Lysander's) Annals 1 is probably editor's work. It has ~~Brown's~~ slap at party politics and though unfavorable closes with encouragement. Brutus' Examination, 2 Leonidas' Reply, 3 the Examination 4 and Williams' Oration 5 all may be ~~the~~ editor's work. They have his style and indirectly the first two are defenses of Jefferson. The anonymous Examination 4 has a statement about the irksomeness of reviewing crudities which seems to have come ~~alone~~ from the editor. Dickinson's Writings 6 is in Brown's method and style especially at the closing. Adams' Address 7 is doubtfully Brown's. Webster's Miscellaneous Papers 8 is to be connected with the immediately preceding review on Barton's Dissertation. It has more echoing of Brown's acquaintance with international law and his opposition to party politics and is in his style and method. The Sham Patriot Unmasked, 9 Burr's Suppression 10 and Wood's Adams' History 10 are tied together, are in Brown's method and style and probably are editor's work. The last ~~one~~ has a superfluous note characteristic of Brown. Stillman's Discourse 11 may be Brown's as editor. Likewise Eckley's Discourse. 12

If we were only looking for the reviews most obviously by Brown probably ~~those of the prose fiction of the day~~ would meet with ready acceptance. It is hardly to be expected ~~that~~ he would turn over to any ~~of his~~ friends a work of prose fiction for he knew more about novels than any ~~one~~ of them. One of the seven reviews we have ~~already~~ considered as Brown's in our study of ~~the work it relates to~~ ¹³ Wieland; and we refer the reader to that part of our work and shall not further consider it here.

John Davis ~~we have seen~~ was an acquaintance of Brown's and, when his Farmer of New Jersey 14 came out it is ~~more~~ ^{quite} probable Brown noticed it himself rather than turn ^{it} over to ~~some one of the~~ "bench of eight." The shortness and character of it ~~are~~ ^{are} caused ^{for} ~~for~~ absence of details and ~~another~~ ^{an} indication ~~that~~ it probably

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 Vol. II, p. 88. | 2 Vol. II, p. 100. | 3 Vol. II, p. 101. |
| 4 Vol. II, p. 102. | 5 Vol. II, p. 103. | 6 Vol. II, p. 167. |
| 7 Vol. II, p. 173. | 8 Vol. II, p. 193. | 9 Vol. II, p. 212. |
| 10 Vol. II, p. 231. | 11 Vol. II, p. 347. | 12 Vol. II, p. 479. |
| 13 Vol. I, p. 333, Vol. II, p. 28. | 14 Vol. I, p. 83. | |

was editor's work. It is little more than a notice.. The brevity of the earlier notice of one of ~~John~~ Davis' works was not at all flattering or encouraging and now it appears it was due to ~~the~~ lack of merit. In the present ~~Davis~~ book, the Wanderings of William, we have an excellent example of Brown when compelled to condemn a work of reeking morals. The book ~~contains much that~~ disgusts ~~the reviewer~~ just as it would Brown. He knew, better than Davis ~~just~~ how far to go with ~~the~~ realism ~~in~~ of emotional scenes. As in the preceding review he does not allow the publisher to escape flaying. Of the fiction reviews worthy of being quoted ~~as examples of Brown's work~~ this is the one to stand at the head. ~~of them. It reads:~~

" **T**HE "Farmer of New-Jersey," to which this work is called a sequel, was noticed in the first number of our Review, page 83. In that production of Mr. Davis we discovered little worthy of praise; in the present one we find nothing but what is deserving of ridicule, reprehension, or contempt.

He sets out in his preface with sagaciously remarking, "that the reading of the present age is confined nearly to novels; that the shelves of our circulating libraries groan under the weight of excessive sensibility—"Female Frailty," "Love at

first Sight," and the "Children of the Abbey;" or they require the aid of the carpenter to support the burden of the "Cottage Moor," the "Man in the Moon," and the "Castles of Athlin and Dunbayne."

Having made this important discovery, and drawn this ingenious picture of modern libraries, Mr. D. profoundly remarks, that if the females of the present century be more enlightened than those of the last, they owe their accession of knowledge to novels. He then pathetically laments that the life of a human being "*should now be lost in brushing spiders from the ceiling, polishing the enamel of a tea-cup, and sympathizing in its fall from the shelf,*" when the world abounds with so many instructive novels.

The author then proceeds to show in what particulars his novel differs from those he has mentioned; and, after pointing out certain deficiencies of SMOLLET, FIELDING, ROUSSEAU, CUMBERLAND, &c. explains in what manner his book is an improvement on them all. "

Here as much of the outline of the story is given as Brown is able to stand and after an indecent scene he breaks off.

" But here we must positively stop.

This portion of the "Wanderings of William" must suffice for a specimen of Mr. D.'s talents at novel writing. We at first undertook to frame a short abridgment of the whole story, in order to save our readers the trouble and disgust which every person of delicacy must endure in perusing the original: but the nauseousness of the task overcame our benevolence. Those who are still disposed to believe that the genius of Mr. D. is capable of any thing refined, elevated or interesting, may satisfy their expectations by recurring to the book itself.

A greater number of unnatural incidents and improbable circumstances were, perhaps, never before jumbled together in one story. Not a single character presents itself, with which virtue, wit or refinement have any connection. His heroes and

heroines are nothing better than a group of adulterers, gamblers and prostitutes. In the character of his favourite sailor we do not perceive one manly or consistent trait; and yet, in his preface, he dares to boast, that he alone, of all other writers, has depicted in his hero the character of the mariner with "justness of colouring." It is scarcely characteristic of a legitimate and thorough-bred son of Neptune to write elegies, to quote Ovid and Virgil, to refer to Pliny and Cicero, and converse with chemists about azote and the decomposition of water.

In short, the Wanderings of William amount to nothing more than the adventures of a couple of vagabond seamen, who, with a pair of trulls picked up in a Spanish harbour, go roving from port to port, for no other ostensible purpose than to protract the scene of their debaucheries on ship-board, and their bacchanalian revels on shore. Such a narrative will, no doubt, be found suitable to the taste of the tenants of the fore-castle, and delightful to the imaginations of the frail sisters of the suburbs; but common sense and decency will revolt at it, and brand the publisher with an epithet harsher than *impudence*.

Moreland Valel is a short example of editor's work and nicely exhibits Brown's sarcasm.

Monima 2 appears to have been cut short, as if it were going to occupy too much space, ~~being shown of the required amount at the end.~~ The unfavorable comment is directed at just the details that had been singled out for attack in Brown's own prose fiction. One of the most surprising things about ~~the article~~ is the absence of comment on the yellow fever scenes inspired by Arthur Mervyn. Knapp's Letters of Shahcoolenzis in Brown's method. The ideas, the points selected for comment, and the style are Brown's.

The reader should have a general idea ~~of just~~ how much law

Brown knew; at least no one should be ^{ignorant of} ~~in doubt as to~~ the range of his legal training so far as it applies to the technical side.

~~of legal works.~~ Therefore when we come to ~~the~~ ten legal reviews

we should be able to form some decision as to ^{his} ~~Brown's~~ authorship of them.

Coleman's Cases 4 is excellent as an exposition of Brown's legal mind. It is a clear and illuminating display of the importance and use of such a work. The method and style are Brown's and so far as the technique ~~of the law~~ is concerned it might have been written by a man who had never studied law at all.

The encouragement for a future volume recalls the same

idea as expressed in the close of the review of Minot's History of Massachusetts.

Addison's Reports 1 has the same ideas suggested as were made part of a formal statement in the preceding review. It is generally possible and probable as Brown's, has the same avoidance of the technical and concludes with an excellent slap at party politics.

Jefferson's Manual 2 is shorter than we would wish but has signs of Brown's interests, style and method. It is an instance where no decision is warranted.

Cooper's Bankrupt Laws 3 has some of Brown's characteristics of language, is in his method and has an apology for not noticing some errors which alone could come from a layman and most probably was written by Brown.

Bushrod Washington's Cases 4 has Brown's ideas and style and like the review of Coleman's and Addison's is non-technical.

Dallas's 5 and Wallace's Cases 6 and Pothier's Treatise 7 are not too long for the editor's hand and are also non-technical. Dallas has his style and ideas. Wallace has his ideas. Pothier besides having the account of his study which must have had an appeal for Brown has his Brown's style and diction. The practise in translation recommended by the reviewer is that afterward followed by Brown in his Volney (1804).

than Taylor's Cases 8 has the same ideas somewhat differently expressed, ~~as we found~~ in Coleman's and appears to be by the same writer. The method is Brown's.

Sullivan's Land Titles 9 is in Brown's method and by the same author as Sullivan's Maine. It is another example in that it has some of the technical side of the law which may impress the uninitiated; however, all of it could be easily supplied by ~~having at hand~~ a copy of Blackstone.

Abbot's Treatise 10 and American Precedents of Declarations 10 are obviously editor's work.

There is ^{only} ~~but~~ one review on shorthand.

Rees' Stenography 11 is probably Brown's. The former personal interest in the subject and the present loss of interest would explain the brevity of the remarks. That Brown preferred Byrom is only too true of his own method, ~~which he has been in the habit of doing~~ The ~~review~~ is in Brown's style.

20 The reviews on poetry are all brief ^{they may} ~~enough to~~ be ascribed to

as Brown ~~on the ground that they are~~ editor's work.

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 Vol. I, p. 180. | 2 Vol. I, p. 200. | 3 Vol. I, p. 330. |
| 4 Vol. I, p. 413. | 5 Vol. II, p. 26. | 6 Vol. II, p. 72. |
| 7 Vol. II, p. 290. | 8 Vol. II, p. 332. | 9 Vol. II, p. 393. |
| 10 Vol. II, p. 489. | 11 Vol. I, p. 363. | 12 Vol. II, p. 464. |

Davis' Poems 1 opens the group with a defence of the Monthly Magazine thus:

"MOST of the poems contained in this collection have appeared in the gazettes of Charleston and of New-Hampshire, and are to be found, under the head of Poetry, in the second and third volumes of the 'Monthly Magazine and American Review,' published in this city.—As the author, in his advertisement to the public, has quoted a commendatory remark as taken from the American Review, it may be proper to suggest that no such remark is to be found in the critical department of that work."

12

Surely no one ~~except~~^{but} Brown had an interest in the repute of the ~~now~~-dead Monthly Magazine's critical opinion. That Brown could not find merit in Davis' verse which had been good enough for the padding of the Monthly Magazine is quite a commentary on Davis' voluble mention of Brown in his Travels. It is the third of the reviews ~~in~~^{of} which as editor he was careful to indicate two trivial errors.

Bloomfield's Farmer's Boy 3 is an excellent example of ~~his~~^{his} ~~Brown's~~ poetical reviews. It has all his ear-marks--style, method and ideas. It refers to Anderson and the Monthly Magazine praise of him and presents Brown's ideas of country life and peasantry. The two opening paragraphs are such an excellent example of Brown's development of prose that we ~~shall~~ quote them. With the exception of the final clause of paragraph two the rhythm would probably be considered as satisfactory even to ~~the greatest of modern scholars of English prose rhythm~~ Professor Saintsbury. of Edinburgh.

"A LOVE of the simple and tranquil enjoyments of rural life exists, with greater or less force, in every human heart. However immersed in the busy cares of the town, engaged in the pursuits of ambition, or enthralled by sensual pleasures,

there are few who do not, at some moments, sigh for the quiet and innocent scenes of the country. All who are not utterly depraved, or destitute of sensibility, must feel delight in contemplating the various pictures of natural objects, the occupations of virtuous industry, and the happiness of the unambitious peasant.

Still more pleasurable must be the sensations of the benevolent heart, in beholding the various exertions of humble and unassisted genius; in seeing modest and unassuming merit drawing to itself the attention and admiration of the world, and emerging from obscurity and depression to light and fame."

Brown gives Bloomfield considerable praise and the review approaches the realm of real criticism. Falconer's Shipwreck 4 is in Brown's style and though too short to impress it bears traces of his hand. Linn's Fowers of Genius, in the first 5 and second 6 editions, are undoubtedly Brown's having most of his characteristic details. So far as internal evidence can be accepted for a decision these instances want

1 Vol. I, p. 84.

2 Davis did this in the case of the First Settlers of Virginia quoting a passage from the Monthly Magazine--signed C.B. Brown--which we also have not been able to find.

3 Vol. I, p. 109.

4 Vol. I, p. 117.

5 Vol. I, p. 201.

6 Vol. II, p. 462.

nothing to stamp them as Brown's. The reference in the review of the first edition to the horrific writers who model their works on Mrs. Radcliffe and the passage which finds fault with the poet's preference of the Firth of Scotland to the Schuylkill and Hudson and Delaware as a scene for the love-lorn swain, are the most quotable instances of Brown's interest, ~~but our space forbids our extracting it.~~ The review of the second edition is particularly of interest in that ~~it directs attention to the fact that the suggested~~ for revisions formerly given had been followed. Peregrine Pastime's Pedagogiad 1 is ~~probably~~ editor's work.

Burns' Works 2 contains the only ~~appearance of a~~ statement of editorial policy relative to the plan of the review and its relation to domestic productions which ~~alone~~ could come from the editor. ~~It reads:~~

" We regret that the plan of our review, which obliges us to bestow our principal attention on domestic productions, will not permit us to extract these portions, as well as the judicious and well-written character of the poet and his works, given by his editor. "

Otherwise ~~the review~~ is not strongly characteristic save for ~~the~~ language and method. If this is Brown's it would make a good example of the ~~reviews of poetry~~ / group. Honeywood's Poems 3 is one of Brown's publishers publications. It has his method--his negative method--which calls attention to what is not in the book, ~~and~~ It has a ~~very~~ significant selection of the account of a visit to the Shakers; an experience ~~which we have seen~~ ^{known} Brown ~~having~~ just previous to this reviews' appearance. Barlow's Parnassian Shop 4 has some of Brown's style and method. The defence of Hayley is one of Brown's interests but otherwise the review is most doubtful. If it ~~be~~ Brown's it is a new display ~~of him~~ in a mood ~~to~~ which we do not know him ever to have ~~been subject~~ ^{had}. Paul Allen's Poems 5 has Brown's style and method though it is odd ~~that~~ he did not mention several personal interests in ~~Allen's~~ book. The remark on the author's youth and the encouragement at the end are peculiarly of interest in that one day Allen was to plan and write practically all of the official biography of the editor. A Poem on Universal Salvation 6 though religious in interest is given but two sentences of condemnation as poetry, and they probably were written by the editor. McKinnon's Poems 7 is in Brown's method. The singling out of the Hudson river poem and the acknowledged inability to judge the Mohawk one may be due to Brown's recent trip up the Hudson. So far as we know he never went up the Mohawk. Otherwise there is no decisive evidence.

There are four reviews in the group of ~~what we have entitled~~

1 Vol. I, p. 250.

2 Vol. I, p. 255.

3 Vol. I, p. 297.

4 Vol. I, p. 460.

5 Vol. II, p. 91.

6 Vol. II, p. 233.

7 Vol. II, p. 327.

shipping. The intimate relation Brown had with his relatives in the business qualified him to ~~intelligently~~ discuss general questions relating to ~~the business~~.

Clark's seaman's Desiderata 1 is a little too technical and ~~so far as we can judge~~ is out of his range, though he may have secured ~~the technical part~~ from his brothers. Barton's Dissertation 2 has his style and characteristic continuation and is a fine example of Brown's growing interest in public affairs. The reasoning on and the United States' championing ~~the cause of~~ neutrality and the rights and relations of belligerents has not been improved upon ~~by any of the documents in the European War~~. The need for an international court with power to enforce its decrees is here seen to be nothing new as a panacea. History repeats itself diplomatically as well as in other ways and no one knew or realized the importance of ~~the matter in~~ Barton's book better or had a keener relish for it than Brown. ~~did~~. Taken with the review next to appear in the magazine, the one on Webster's Miscellaneous Papers it is no wonder Brown was giving promise of being a great publicist. The first instalment of the Barton closes with a paragraph obviously by the editor. The second instalment closes with a characteristic paragraph like the closing of the Scott's Gazetteer review. 3 Abbot's Laws 4 is clearly the editor's work.

Two reviews we have grouped ~~ed~~ under printing.

They 5 are similar to other short examples and appear to be ~~probably~~ editor's work. The idea that the author presents more enthusiasm than judgment is a Brownism. The style is Brown's.

There are three
~~of the two~~ reviews on language, ~~one is doubtful~~.

Smith's Latin Grammar 6 appears too technical and shows too large a knowledge of the subject for Brown. Woodbridge's Key 7 and his Grammar 8 may be editor's work and are quite within his range and interest as well as like other short reviews which we suggest may be his. The former shows an intimate acquaintance with Johnson's dictionary such as we know Brown had.

1 Vol. I, p. 494.

2 Vol. II, pp. 183, 295.

3 Vol. I, p. 290.

4 Vol. II, p. 489.

5 Vol. II, pp. 350-1.

6 Vol. II, p. 224.

7 Vol. II, p. 226.

8 Vol. II, p. 355.

1

There is one notice of a book on logic and it is so short and general it cannot be by any other than Brown.

One review is on oratory, a branch of useful knowledge which Brown was ~~very much and very actively~~ interested in during his days, ~~of~~

adolescence¹

Best's Dissertation 2 has a ~~certain~~ sarcasm which we believe was Brown's, a knowledge of Greek, an antipathy toward philologists and a notice of pulpit eloquence which a layman might easily make. The style and method are Brown's.

Three reviews relate to books of travel. As a corollary of geography this group is of ~~peculiar~~ interest to Brown. His known works never neglect an opportunity to refer to ~~some of~~ the early travellers.

Mackenzie's Voyages 3 has his method and despite its length is not the technical work of a specialist. It is easily within Brown's grasp. The closing sentence is obviously the editor's.

The Tour in Holland 4 ^{is probably} ~~may be~~ editor's work. It is short, stilted and stereotyped in method and is under suspicion because of the book's having been before the public for twelve years. When such an interval has elapsed it is hardly warranted to give a review with a slight apology. Later, in the case of Barton's medical Collections, we shall find too elaborate an apology for the slight delay of one year. Here the apology reads:

"Although several years have elapsed since the first publication of this volume, yet, as there is a probability that to most of our readers it may be new, we shall make it the subject of a brief notice."

Moore's and Jones' Directory 5 are probably editor's work, though too short for certainty. ~~Carey's Atlas 5 included in the group of geographies and gazetteers is the same.~~

1 Vol. I, p. 246.

4 Vol. II, p. 204.

2 Vol. I, p. 87.

5 Vol. II, p. 350.

3 Vol. II, p. 121.

Whether Brown had any particular interest in agriculture is not certain though it seems ~~that~~ he did have. In several places we have found ~~hints that~~ he either hoped for a farm or had had some experience on one, ~~and~~ ~~It is of course~~ certain that more than one other member of the Brown family had.

The New York ^{his} Transactions 1 is in Brown's method and style and the subjects selected ~~for mention~~ are those of particular interest to him or their authors were ~~numbered among~~ his friends. The Rural Socrates 2 is nothing more than a quotation-padded piece of editor's work. It could be easily constructed by consulting the table of contents, and by snatching up hap-hazard selections. The method is Brown's. The style is characteristic but the ~~amount of~~ original matter is so small it is doubtful. Moore's Great Error of American Agriculture 3 and the Bahama Communications 4 are probably editor's work. The latter is also somewhat related to the shipping business and records the information of some Lieutenant-Colonel Brown.

Two reviews relate to ~~books on~~ naval subjects. ~~Though they may be included under the group of shipping it has been thought better to separate the more doubtful.~~

The Address to the People of the United States on the Policy of Maintaining a permanent Navy 5 is another instance of Brown's publicism. It is not technical, is in Brown's method and has enough of his style. ~~to consider it as his.~~ Aside from the old saw that history repeats itself the subject is of the greatest of interest to us ~~today just~~ as it was to Brown and his relatives more than ~~one~~ hundred years ago. Intimately related to the subject of the foregoing ~~book is the next one of the group,~~ Humphrey's Reports. 6 The review is not technical and it has all the usual traces of ~~being~~ Brown. (||)

Chemistry is so far as we know outside of Brown's range and it

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Vol. I, p. 402. | 2 Vol. I, p. 465. | 3 Vol. II, p. 227. |
| 4 Vol. II, p. 385. | 5 Vol. II, p. 206. | 6 Vol. II, p. 415. |

might be thought doubtful if he wrote ~~the~~ reviews of such books.

~~Perhaps~~ ^{however} an examination will show he may have been the author of ~~these as well as others more obviously within his range.~~

Lavoisier's Chemistry 1 is not at all technical, has a mention of book-making which recalls Brown's ~~noted~~ saying ~~to his brother~~ on the dullness of the business and a criticism of translations which Brown took care to follow in 1804. It is in ~~Brown's~~ style. The opening paragraph relating to the republication of foreign works is so general it must have come from the editor/~~hand~~ and deserves quotation.

"**R**EPUBLICATIONS of valuable European works in America have become frequent, and we are pleased with their appearance on several accounts. They indicate a taste for reading and study well becoming a free and intelligent people; and they evince a skill in manufacture, and an application of labour, highly agreeable to the patriotic mind. Indeed, from several specimens of American typography which have lately appeared, we judge that, in the manufacture of paper, correctness of execution in printing, preparation of leather for covers, and neatness of binding and decoration, distinguished excellence is already attained. In another respect, to us poor Reviewers, the American editions are preferable to the British: they are generally cheaper, and, in the present extravagant price of books, cost the reader oftentimes less than a third of the money demanded for a London edition of the same work."

Though indicated to be so this review was not continued, as if the author had lost ~~all~~ interest ~~in the book~~ after treating extensively the matter of translation, ~~which was probably Brown's greatest interest in it.~~ Chaptal's Elements of Chemistry 2 has Brown's style and repeats ~~in another way~~ the idea about the ~~high~~ price of books ~~as found~~ in the former notice. It may be editor's work.

Mitchell's Chemical Nomenclature 3 is a good example of what an editor can do with a technical subject. The whole review can be purloined from the book. There is no criticism and any ^{one} writer who had never read a page of chemistry could have written it. Hare's book on the Blow Pipe 4 is another review of the same character, ~~as that just considered.~~

Two reviews relate to ~~a subject further away from Brown's~~ ~~interests than chemistry; namely, to~~ finance.

The Thoughts on the Increasing Wealth of the United States 5 has none of Brown's ideas and only one of his literary characteristics, namely the ~~short~~ sentences. ~~The whole matter~~ is handled so simply ~~that~~ it appears to have come from someone with ~~only~~ the intellect of

1 Vol. I, p. 97. 2 Vol. I, p. 254. 3 Vol. II, p. 41.
4 Vol. II, p. 432. 5 Vol. I, p. 159.

a child.

Cooper on Bankruptcy 1 is in Brown's method and may be editor's work but is too doubtful.

By this time the decline has become ~~sufficient to be~~ noticeable and the ^{probability}~~certainty~~ becomes weaker and weaker, and ⁱⁿ the evidence ~~against stronger and stronger~~.

One review ~~may be classed as~~ ^{is} philosophical.

The Transactions 2 of the American Philosophical Society has his method and may be editor's work but is extremely doubtful; too much of it being technical medical science.

A certain group may be entitled educational.

Shepherd's Columbian Accountant 3 is short enough for editor's work. It also may be a variation of Brown's method. The slap at politicians and patriots is suggestive.

Hannah Foster's Boarding School 4 has the stamp of many ~~of the~~ reviews of the Monthly Magazine in that the author is not only condemned but the bookseller as well. It is ~~a the first case where the editor thinks it necessary to apologise for an 1801 review of a book which had been published three years before.~~ ^{old}.

Biglow's Child's Library 5 may be Brown's editorial work.

Edgeworth's Practical Education 5 closes with a remark continuing the review similar to ~~that of the~~ Essay on Political Society ~~noted above~~. It appears to be Brown's. Warren's Address 6 is not technical and may be ~~Brown's~~ ^{his}. Alden's Introduction 7 is too technical and ~~is~~ probably not Brown's. It recommends Wallace's arrangement of the English alphabet.

Webster's Useful Knowledge 8 may be editor's work but it is so full of ~~silly~~ platitudes and so lacking in critical comment we ~~cannot help but~~ doubt Brown's authorship, ~~of it~~.

Essays 9 ^{his} is probably not Brown's. So far as we know he ~~could not have been~~ a mathematical genius.

The group of ~~reviews of~~ the drama are probably as near to half and half as we could find. ~~The chances are about evenly balanced~~.

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Vol. I, p. 330. | 2 Vol. II, p. 253. | 3 Vol. I, p. 76. |
| 4 Vol. I, p. 85. | 5 Vol. I, p. 250. | 6 Vol. I, p. 492. |
| 7 Vol. II, p. 179. | 8 Vol. II, p. 334. | 9 Vol. II, p. 381. |

Winstanley's Hypocrite Unmasked 1 has Brown's style and diction. The opening paragraphs have Brown's idea of ~~proper encouragement to be given~~ to authors and the hit at punsters and wits recalls the puny whipsters of the Monthly Magazine. What ~~the reviewer~~ says about ~~the criticism of American productions~~ reechoes the ~~comment of the~~ preface and prospectus. It is possible Brown took the name of the hero of Clara Howard from ~~one of~~ ~~the~~ characters of this play. The critical ideas are such as he had forcibly brought to his attention by the ~~same~~ faults in his own works. It may be by Dunlap or some other ~~well-informed~~ dramatic man. Everett's Daranzel 2 is short enough to be editor's work and the poetic figure is so common it is not beyond Brown.

White's Orlando 3 is in Brown's style and contains a favorable comment on John Howard Payne's prologue. It is ~~clearly~~ by the same author as Winstanley's Hypocrite Unmasked.

Ingersoll's Edwy and Elgiva 4 appears to have more critical ability than we know Brown possessed but it has ~~a few of his~~ characteristics of language.

Carey's Reflections 5 is clearly not by Dunlap; it has Brown's ideas and style and also ~~stands for Brown's~~ his principles of the theatre, so ~~that~~ the internal evidence is strong. It contains a statement 6 that the writer had been in the habit of visiting theatres ever since youth which if true of Brown is ~~interesting if not~~ valuable information. Another statement 6 may be a reference to ~~the~~ destroyed tragedy by Brown as related by John Davis Bernard.

Dunlap's Abaelino 7 may be Brown's but is so short and general ~~that~~ it bears no clear traces, ~~of him~~. The closing paragraph appears to be editor's work.

There are four reviews on lexicography.

Two 8 are too highly technical for Brown though they may have his editor's addition of apologies at the closing and the second has a suspicious note on the word lengthy which recalls the trial of lengthy in the Monthly Magazine. 9 Of the second two the first 10 has Brown's style, is of his interest and is not too technical ~~to be within his~~ ~~grasp~~ for him. The second 11 ~~and last~~ by reason of its reference to Johnson may be editor's work.

1 Vol. I, p. 64.

4 Vol. I, p. 324.

7 Vol. III, p. 476.

10 Vol. I, p. 343.

2 Vol. I, p. 95.

5 Vol. II, p. 94.

8 Vol. I, pp. 210, 217.

11 Vol. II, p. 226.

3 Vol. I, p. 191.

6 Vol. II, p. 98.

9 Vol. III, p. 172.

1535

1 2

There are reviews on Botany and Health.

They may be editor's work though no proof is to be found other than ~~possibly~~ his interest.

One review relates to astronomy.

Woodward's The Sun 3 has a careless slip at the opening, is in Brown's style and deals with his interests. On page 445 ~~Brown~~^{he} supplied a typographical ~~error of~~ omission by writing in the missing "tions" of motions in line 6.

One book reviewed was on surveying.

The Art without Science 4 is ~~hardly anything~~^{no} more than editor's work.

One review relates to manufacturing.

Higgins' Observations 5 is not ~~clearly~~ suggestive of ~~Brown~~ but because of a few pet expressions may be his.

There was probably no ~~subject~~ of less interest to Brown technically and dogmatically than ~~the~~ group of theology. Yet his statement in the prospectus ~~about religion~~ may indicate ~~that~~ he had a greater interest ~~in this class of reviews~~ than we have hitherto known.

However, the subjects ~~here~~ are treated with too much of the attitude ~~of mind~~ of the initiated, and while they may be editor's work they are too much like ~~the similar reviews~~^{those} in the Monthly Magazine which we refused to believe to be Brown's. The possible exceptions

are as follows.

1 Vol. II, p. 317.
4 Vol. II, p. 232.

2 Vol. II, p. 351.
5 Vol. II, p. 307.

3 Vol. I, p. 430.

Beauties of the Bible 1 has some of ~~its details~~ within Brown's interest and ~~especially~~ maintains his belief of the literary excellence of Johnson. It probably is not ~~Brown's~~ his.

Alden's Sermon 2 has a closing which ~~suspiciously~~ recalls the prospectus and preface of the magazine and the hope for the services of the well-to-do of the first review. It may be editor's work.

Trumbull's 3 and Strong's 4 Century Sermon have nothing technical about them and the general criticism is in Brown's style. ~~Like the preceding item~~ They may be editor's work.

Abeel's Discourse 5 is probably editor's work. It is within Brown's range, is not ~~at all~~ technical and has his method and sentence structure.

Beck's Doctrine of Perpetual Bondage 6 is a strong statement of Brown's attitude ~~of mind~~ toward negro slavery. It is such an answer ~~to the pamphlet~~ as one would expect from ~~a man of intelligence and humanity~~ him and has his style and method.

Witherspoon's Works 7 ~~reviewed in four instalments~~ has Brown's language and interests and is evidently editor's work, ~~just as we shall later find the reviews of the Medical Repository to be.~~ The second instalment shows his characteristic expressions more than any of the others.

Trumbull's Dignity of Man 8 is not ~~at all~~ technically theological and might easily have been written by any layman. It has Brown's style and reflects his interest in that it commends the avoidance of "party violence and irritation."

Holmes' Sermon 9 is short enough to be editor's work but is doubtful.

In the case of Emmon's Discourse 10 there is an opening which undoubtedly was Brown's--possibly added ~~in the capacity of editor~~ to a contributed review. It ~~states the editor's position well and reads:~~

" **R**EWIEWERS, from the variety of matter which comes before them, are often placed in situations of difficulty and embarrassment. The community, for whose benefit they profess to labour, is generally divided into factions, irritated by the impressions of injuries mutually inflicted and suffered, and little inclined to listen to the suggestions of liberal and conciliating considerations. Political dissensions are eminently of this description. After a long series of collisions, political parties become so habitually and systematically hostile, that the one cannot perceive in the movements of the other any thing but mischief and sinister purposes. How far this is the necessary result of free government; it is not our present business to inquire. How far it might be moderated and diminished by a union of the exertions of the wise and virtuous in the respective parties, has never yet, perhaps, been put to a fair experiment.

1 Vol. I, p. 41.

2 Vol. I, p. 82.

3 Vol. I, p. 185.

4 Vol. I, p. 189.

5 Vol. I, p. 234.

6 Vol. I, p. 239.

7 Vol. I, pp. 324, 415, 427, Vol. II, p. 10

8 Vol. I, p. 340.

9 Vol. I, p. 361.

10 Vol. I, p. 484.

It would be foreign to our views and inclinations to launch ourselves upon the tempestuous ocean of politics! It is our object to cultivate elegant letters, sound learning, and useful science; and, by all the means in our power, to promote the interests of morality and religion. Happily, these topics may generally be discussed in this country without animosity or intemperance.

Convinced, as we are, that a great mass of wisdom, talents, honour, integrity and patriotism, belongs to each of the two political parties which now divide the United States, we wish, in our quality of Reviewers, to treat them both with deference, and to steer as exactly as possible between them.

To embrace the system of either would only serve to narrow the field of our usefulness, and to mingle with the pursuits of literature passions and feelings which ought for ever to be kept separate.

Many persons have supposed, that in a former number of our Review (p. 89) we deviated from our usual impartiality in surveying the political questions which agitate the community. Many others, it is probable, will imagine we equally depart from that impartiality in our consideration of the present article. We are also aware that the warm partizans of either side may accuse us of inconsistency; but while each of us reserves to himself, in the most explicit terms, that system of political faith, and that attachment to men and measures, which conviction had previously impressed on his mind, we think that every liberal and candid reader will be inclined to acquit us of the charge, and rather give us credit for attaining so near to the difficult point of impartial criticism. We shall, however, increase our exertions to maintain that strict neutrality in party politics which we think the cause of literature requires.

With this declaration, we proceed to the examination of the pamphlet before us.

White's Sermon 1 has some traces of Brown's style and a reference to the Monthly Magazine which hardly would come from any one except the editor, but is indecisive. Starr's Oration 2 is ~~a review~~ if it can so be called ^{only} of one sentence. It is hardly to be believed that anyone save the editor wrote it. Though headed by the pretentious capitals of "Article XVII" it surprises by its brevity and ~~it~~ makes food for thought, ~~as to the old ideas of reviews. However~~ Brown was not doing anything out of the ordinary in ~~that one sentence, other periodicals did the same.~~

Nott's Discourse 3 is short enough to be editor's work and is nothing beyond a layman. It has Brown's style.

Adams' View of Religions 4 is in Brown's style. It also contains a reference to the author's former mention of Miss Adams in the Monthly Magazine.

The Sword of the Lord, 5 Austin's Barley Cake 6 and Leland's Stroke at the Branch 7 are not technical and may very well be by the editor having his style and ~~being in the usual method.~~

Miller's Essay on Church Government 8 has Brown's style and ~~is in the usual method.~~ It presents a catholic view of the Presbyterian church. ~~In this connection~~ It should be remembered that at this time Brown was probably engaged to marry the daughter of a Presbyterian minister.

Muir's Power of Goodness 9 is short enough to be editor's work.

1 Vol. I, p. 488.

2 Vol. I, p. 491.

3 Vol. I, p. 492.

4 Vol. II, p. 38.

5 Vol. II, p. 49.

6 Vol. II, p. 52.

7 Vol. II, p. 56.

8 Vol. II, p. 89.

9 Vol. II, p. 90.

Welch's Century Sermon 1 recalls former criticism in the same department and uses the editorial "we" most prominently. While it has the characteristics of the others suggested as possibly Brown's it seems to be an exception. ~~in that editorial particular.~~ Boudinot's Age of Revelation 2 ~~review~~ has a great deal of the personal ~~tone~~ that would suggest the editor as the author. It contains an excellent handling of Paine's anti-Christian book, worthy of quotation, though it may not be Brown's, ~~it is too good to pass by.~~

"We have often felt much surprise that Mr. Paine's work against christianity should excite so much attention, and provoke so many answers, as it has done. The impression which it made, for a considerable time, certainly gave no very honourable idea of the learning and taste, to say nothing of the piety of the age. For it would be difficult to find a publication of equal claims, which displays so much false reasoning, wretched inconsistency, and gross misrepresentation; or which, amidst all the vanity and vaunting of the author, is less entitled to the character of originality with respect to matter. His whole merit consists in having presented the cavils and objections of others, less learnedly and less ingeniously than they; but in a more forcible, sprightly, and popular manner, than almost any writer. When his book first appeared, we considered it as destined only for an ephemeral existence; and accordingly it has been for some time gradually sinking into forgetfulness. All the zeal of the more ignorant classes of infidels has not been sufficient to support its influence; and the sensible, well-informed men, who belong to that denomination, view it merely as a popular instrument, which, though it has, for a time, promoted their cause, yet will not stand the test of serious examination."

Melmoth's Religious Life 3 has Brown's ideas of book-making and a wholesale condemnation of the ~~sort of~~ fiction he had published in 1801.

Hemphill's Discourse 4 has a closing paragraph obviously by the editor but is otherwise indecisive.

Letters on the Existence and Character of the Deity, etc., 5 is not technical, is in Brown's method and style and has his interests. It appears to be editor's work.

Wetmore's Extensive Charity 6 may be editor's work but seems to be too much lengthened by the extracts. ~~to be Brown's.~~

Miller's Sermon 7 has traces of Brown's style and may be editor's work though its tone is technical.

Davis' Sermon 8 is of two sentences general enough to be ~~merely~~ editor's work.

Marshall's Catechism 9 has Brown's style and ideas in the two final paragraphs. Otherwise it appears not to be his.

McLeod's Negro Slavery 10 had a peculiar interest for Brown besides containing a slap at Godwin's Political Justice. The method is the conventional one and the style is not clearly Brown's, so that it is probably not his.

Hotchkin's Doctrine of Election 11 and the Prayer Book for Families 12 are both short and may easily be editor's work.

- | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 Vol. II, p. 91. | 2 Vol. II, p. 143. | 3 Vol. II, p. 150. | 4 Vol. II, p. 178. |
| 5 Vol. II, p. 215. | 6 Vol. II, p. 220. | 7 Vol. II, p. 341. | 8 Vol. II, p. 347. |
| 9 Vol. II, p. 403. | 10 Vol. II, p. 450. | 11 Vol. II, p. 477. | 12 Vol. II, p. 478. |

The final group is ~~that of~~ medicine. If Brown was to be helped at all by the "eight" it would be in this department, ~~that the~~ mostly ~~help would come~~. Almost without exception these reviews are out of Brown's range of interest and information, and yet the fact that the second index paid particular attention to the ~~medical reviews~~ may indicate ~~that~~ he had ~~at this time~~ developed an unusual interest in the subject. ~~Some are non-technical and may be Brown's~~ ~~for the following reasons.~~

Hosack's Medical Education 1 has touches of his style, especially in the first three and the final paragraphs. The comparison to a lawyer's efforts and the slap at lexicographers are suggestive but the reference to the reviewer having been at college ~~seems to take~~ the review out of Brown's life.

The Medical Repository 2 reviews have in them nothing technical especially ~~in places~~ where opportunity offered. The method and style is always Brown's; one of the details seems to show the reviewer was not a medical man; the closing is Brown's usual ~~enthusiastic~~ encouragement; ~~just as he gave it in the Monthly Magazine~~, and one of the reviewer's particular interests was the yellow fever articles ~~of the magazine~~. The first review contains a tribute to Elihu Hubbard Smith which seems hardly could have come so strongly from any person except Brown and is worthy of quotation. ~~It reads:~~

"Our readers will forgive us if we pause a moment, before entering on the examination of the present work, to express our grief for the premature death of one of its founders, and to pay a tribute of respect to his memory. Few persons, we believe, have been more ready than the surviving colleagues of the late Dr. ELIHU H. SMITH, to express, with affectionate ardour, their high opinion of his enlightened zeal, in devising the plan of the present publication, and putting it into operation; the diligence of his exertions to support its character; and the great value of his labours as an Editor. Their candour has led them to acknowledge that to his confidence and activity the work is indebted for its existence. Indeed, we know of no man so well qualified for the conducting a work of literature and science in a country where so many ob-

stacles are to be encountered. His habits of order and regularity in the distribution of his occupations, and the employment of his time, and, above all, that spirit of perseverance, without which no great purpose can be accomplished, singularly fitted him for such an undertaking.

Few have acquired, so early in life, the high reputation he enjoyed, and very few, at any age, have been more generally regretted at their death. The native energy and activity of his mind, the extent of his learning, the warmth of his philanthropy, his indefatigable industry in the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge, and for the advancement of the interests of science, all conspired to render him useful in his profession, and in all the relations of social life; to excite high expectations of his future eminence and services; and to produce the liveliest sorrow for his premature removal."

This is followed by another reference 1 to his character when an article by him gives the editor the opportunity. It is short but particularly well put. ~~It reads:~~

"This paper discovers much of the ingenuity, learning, and comprehensiveness of mind, for which its accomplished author was so eminently distinguished."

Ramsay's Review 2 is only slightly technical, is in Brown's method and treats the book in the same manner as the Medical Repository was treated.

Rush's Lectures 3 is also non-technical.

Oliver's and Currie's Letters 4 contains a reference to the Medical Repository which would seem to have come from Brown's hand. It states the position of a reviewer as Brown would undoubtedly do.

Mace's Cause of Disease 5 may be editor's work. The group of yellow fever dissertations 6 are of interest to Brown but are too technical. The general opening appears to be editor's work and expresses his views well enough to be quoted.

"As publications of this kind are made not of choice, but from necessity, and as they are usually the productions of young men, the conductors of literary journals have generally thought it not proper to subject them to the ordeal of criticism, and have therefore omitted to take notice of them. Perhaps a middle course is preferable. While the impropriety of surveying them with the eye of a critic is obvious, yet the public ought to be informed of the existence of such publications."

Barton's Collections 7 appears to be the editor's and has his style and method. The opening apology which should be compared to that affixed to the Tour in Holland is certainly his. ~~It reads:~~

"Considering the importance of this article, we owe an apology to our readers for the long delay of bringing it before them. Publications of this kind are so rare and interesting in the United States, that we fully recognize the duty of seizing the earliest opportunity, as far as our influence extends, to direct towards them the attention of our countrymen."

In this case there is too much of it, while in the earlier case when it was warranted there was too little.

1 Vol. I, p. 280

2 Vol. I, p. 194.

3 Vol. I, p. 479.

4 Vol. II, p. 77.

5 Vol. II, p. 181.

6 Vol. II, p. 361.

7 Vol. II, p. 407.

1541
Quackenbos' Dissertation 1 is short enough to be editor's work ~~but also~~ is wholly in the editorial tone. One passage relating to the works which preclude criticism is worthy of quotation as expressing the idea of the editor, ~~and reads:~~

"a publication made not voluntarily, but as a prescribed task, ought not to be subjected to the severity of criticism."

That quotation should be compared with the opening to the yellow fever dissertations, ~~just noticed~~ ^{quoted above}. Walker's Dissertation 2 is short enough to be editor's work. It could easily have been dashed off after reading the announcement as issued by the Reviews publisher, the Swords, and has a closing sentence, suspiciously Brownish, ~~which reads:~~

"We are pleased to see in the medical graduates of our country so many evidences of industry and observation."

To sum up the ~~whole matter of the~~ reviews we are compelled to say ~~that~~ the difficulty of identification and the lack of convincing evidence is due to the fact that we have no definite standard by which to judge them. So far as our researches have gone there is no actually identified review by Brown. In the case of the reviews of the Monthly Magazine it was considered wise to place the reviews in the questionable class, for in that case where we had initials signed to the reviews, one of which, (C.B.) would in ordinary cases be acceptable as evidence, we were not sufficiently convinced. In this case we have a great many reviews of works by the same authors as in that other, and the friendly "bench of eight" who assisted Brown would have to be identified--which we are not able to do satisfactorily--before we could apply a process

of elimination to assist in identifying Brown's review work.

On the whole it seems to be ^{best} ~~the part of wisdom~~ to say ~~that~~ Brown may have used his editorial privilege to add to all the reviews contributed; that is probably as near to the actual identification of authorship of these reviews as anyone will ever come.

In this magazine Brown had no theory to ^{impose} ~~try~~ on the public. He stood for no party, no school; his object was the simple though difficult one of examining the new publications of a new republic. His models were those that have stood for a long time and probably will stand forever. He could be a severe, ^u ~~u~~ ⁿ ~~n~~ [^] ~~^~~ moved, or the gentlest of judges, his invariable intention was to encourage moderate talent so as to make sure ~~that~~ genius would survive. He did not believe in the Jeffrey This-will-not-do formula and no Keats would ever have been "killed" by his pen. How much of this sort of encouragement was his and how much was his friends', may never be accurately known.

The continued increase in the number of publishers who sent books for review would seem to indicate ~~that~~ the magazine, as it

1

went on, grew in favor. But there was ~~evidently~~ another side to

- 1 De. Mary, Voyage, etc., New Haven 1913, pp. xxxv and 182 used Brown's magazine when writing concerning the New York women as seen by him in 1794. Though it appears not to be Brown's the review of Ezra Sampson's Beauties of the Bible (Vol. I, p. 41) was used as a recommendation of the book when it was reprinted at Boston February 1804. On the back of the title-page ~~of that edition~~ these three paragraphs were quoted: "Mr. Sampson.... compilation", "We think.... contain" and "We are.... labours".

the matter. Not only was the old quarrel with Webster continued here but, as we have seen, another author entered the arena and measured swords with the reviewer. Beyond this the reason for the transformation of the magazine is not clear, but in face of it and of the fact that the next form of Brown's activity as editor retained and made most prominent ~~the character of~~ the less troublesome part of this magazine, it is ^{Likely} ~~probable~~ that Brown had had enough of the thankless task of ~~sitting in state as~~ literary censor and therefore made the metamorphosis, ~~just~~ as he had done before. ~~However, it was not a jump "from the frying pan into the fire."~~ ~~As it was in the case of the Monthly Magazine and American Review, and the American Review and Literary Journal.~~

As a part of Brown's ~~life~~ work these two volumes of the American Review and Literary Journal have been almost lost in the midst of the greater number of equally as large volumes of the other magazines with which he was connected. Several writers have even been ~~evidently~~ ignorant that he actually did edit them. With any opinion we may form ~~of our subject because~~ of them we must ~~not fail to~~ include the fact that two of his novels are also a part of this time of his life.

Aside from the interest and value the reviews may have because ~~history repeats itself and~~ we can read much of present-day importance in this hundred-year -old magazine, ^{they} ~~the work~~ mark an improvement in Brown's style. There is henceforth less of the staccato sentence and ~~throughout~~ more of a freedom of expression.