

THE
GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE :

LONDON GAZETTE
GENERAL EVENING
M. Post-M. Herald
Morning Chronic.
Times-M. Advert.
P. Ledger & Oracle
Brit. Press—Day
St. James's Chron.
Sun—Even. Mail
Star—Traveller
Pilot—Statesman
Packet-Lond. Chr.
Albion—C. Chron.
Courier—Globe
Eng. Chron.—Inq.
Cour d'Angleterre
Cour. de Londres
15 other Weekly P.
17 Sunday Papers
Hue & Cry Police
Lit. Adv. monthly
Bath 3—Bristol 5
Berwick—Boston
Birmingham 4
Blackb. Brighton
Bury St. Edmund's
Camb.—Chath.
Carl. 2—Chester 2
Chelms. Cambria.



JANUARY, 1815.
CONTAINING

Cornw.—Coven 4
Cumb. 2—Doncas. 1
Derb.—Dorches
Durham—Essex
Exeter 2, Glouc. 2
Halifax—Hants 2
Hereford, Hull 3
Ipswich 1, Kent 4
Lancast.—Leices. 2
Leeds 2, Liverp. 6
Maidst. Manch. 4
Newc. 3.—Notts. 2
Northampton
Norfolk, Norwich
N. Wales Oxford 2
Portsea—Pottery
Preston—Plym. 2
Reading—Salib.
Salop—Sheffield 2
Sherborne, Sussex
Shrewsbury
Staff.—Stamf. 2
Taunton—Tyne
Wakef.—Warw.
Worc. 2—York 3
IRELAND 37
SCOTLAND 24
Sunday Advertiser
Jersey 2, Guern. 2.

Meteorol. Diaries for Dec. 1814, & Jan. 1815. 2, 94

Miscellaneous Correspondence, &c.
Epitaphs by Langborne, H. More, & Somerville. 3
Epitaph on Mrs. Grove, by her Husband 4
The Bust of Shakspeare at Stratford *ibid.*
History of Somersetshire.—Domesday Book 6
Bishop in the West Indies.—Dr. Franklin 7
Family of Greatrakes.—Mrs. Eliz. Carter 8
Description of Herefield and its Owners 9
Advice to the Students, &c. of Craniology 11
Strictures on Hume and Laplace on Miracles 12
Alfieri.—Miller's Gardener's Dictionary 16
England's Parnassus.—Stourminster Marshal 17
On the Rectification of the Hyperbola 18
Milton.—Family of Powell of Sandford 22
The Blue Mountains in New Holland explored 25
FRAGMENTS OF LITERATURE, No. VIII. 27
Antiquity of the University of Cambridge 29
Dr. Priestley—Opinions of Ignatius 32
Remarks on "Banks's Extinct Baronage" *ibid.*
Epigrammatum J. Owen, Cambro-Britann. &c. 33
Robert May's Art and Mystery of Cookery 34
State of Case between Messrs. Britton & Storer 35
Repair of Allhallows Church, Tower-street. 36
ARCHITECTURAL INNOVATION, No. CC. 37
LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.—Index Indicativus 40

Articles of New Publications, viz.
Croft's Verses to Duchess of Angoulême 41
—— Reflections soumises à Congrès, &c. 43
Mason's Statistical Account of Ireland 44
Lavoisier's Complete Genealogical, &c. Atlas 47
L'Angleterre au Commencement du 19^{Siècle} 48
Dr. Clarke's Travels, concluded 50
Elton's Specimens of the Classic Poets 52
Rivington's Annual Register for 1805 55
Bp. Law's Charge to the Clergy of Chester. 57
Storer's Antiquities of Cathedral Churches . 59
REVIEW OF NEW MUSICAL PUBLICATIONS. 60
SELECT POETRY for January 1815 62—64
Historical Chronicks.
Extension of the Most hon. Order of the Bath 65
Abstract of principal Foreign Occurrences . 69
Country News, 75.—Domestic Occurrences 78
Gazette, &c. Promotions.—Ecol. Preferments 79
Births and Marriages of eminent Persons... 80
Sketch of the Character of Mrs. Roberts 81
Memoir of Mr. Thomas Mullett 83
—— of Mr. John Taillay 85
—— of the Rev. William Jesse 87
Obituary, with Anec. of remarkable Persons 88
Bill of Mortality—Prices of Markets, &c. 95
Canal, &c. Shares—Prices of Stocks 96

Embellished with beautiful Perspective Views of HAREFIELD PLACE, Middlesex;
and of STOURMINSTER-MARSHAL CHURCH, Dorset.

By SYLVANUS URBAN, GENT.

Printed by NICHOLS, SON, and BENTLEY, at Cicero's Head, Red Lion Passage, Fleet-str. London;
where all Letters to the Editor are desired to be addressed, POST-PAID.

METEOROLOGICAL DIARY 1887 AT EXETER.

| Dec. | Bar. | Ther. | Hy. | at 8 A. M. | Bar. | Ther. | Hy. | at 3 P. M. | Bar. | Ther. | Hy. | at 10 P. M. |
|------|-------|-------|-----|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|--------------------------|
| 1 | 29.31 | 38½ | 6½ | M Very fine, frosty..... | 29.61 | 42½ | 2½ | do. Do..... | 29.66 | 38½ | 5½ | do. Do. |
| 2 | 29.67 | 35 | 6½ | M Very fine, frosty..... | 29.67 | 34 | 3 | do. Fine, sharp frost..... | 29.67 | 32 | 5 | do. Do. |
| 3 | 29.69 | 35 | 7 | M Fog & sharp frost; at 1 clear. | 29.69 | 42 | 4 | do. Frost..... | 29.56 | 42 | 4 | do. Sm. rain, wind, fog. |
| S 4 | 29.37 | 42 | 8½ | M Moderate and fine..... | 29.37 | 45½ | 2 | do. Fine; after 7 rain..... | 29.27 | 40½ | 7 | do. Fair. |
| 5 | 29.37 | 44 | 8½ | M Fine..... | 29.56 | 44 | 5½ | do. Do. frosty..... | 29.72 | 38½ | 6½ | do. Do. |
| 6 | 29.94 | 30 | 7 | M Very fine, sharp frost..... | 29.96 | 39 | 5 | do. Do. do..... | 29.96 | 34 | 6 | do. Frost. |
| 7 | 29.97 | 45 | 10 | M Gloomy and overcast..... | 29.65 | 50½ | 19 | do. Some little rain..... | 29.65 | 47 | 12 | do. F. & C. |
| 8 | 29.56 | 49 | 12 | M Lowering and gloomy, rain. | 29.34 | 50 | 14 | do. Do..... | 29.30 | 42½ | 16 | do. Do. and wind. |
| 9 | 29.28 | 52 | 15 | M Fine, with clouds and windy. | 29.34 | 46 | 14 | do. Small rain from 1 to 4; fair | 29.50 | 40 | 13½ | do. F. & C.; rain. |
| 10 | 29.52 | 40½ | 14 | M Thick haze and rain..... | 29.26 | 55 | 16 | do. Fair and windy..... | 29.30 | 54 | 16½ | do. F. & C. windy. |
| S 11 | 29.32 | 56 | 17 | M Fine with clouds, fresh gale. | 29.50 | 56½ | 17½ | do. F. & C.; small showers... | 29.54 | 56 | 18 | do. F. & C. wind & rain. |
| 12 | 29.55 | 55 | 18 | M Blowing hard, haze & rain. | 29.56 | 57½ | 18 | do. Fair, but blowing strong... | 29.37 | 55 | 19 | do. Wind and rain. |
| 13 | 29.36 | 55½ | 19½ | M Wind and rain; at 12 fair. | 29.46 | 49 | 16½ | do. Fine..... [wet haze. | 29.55 | 46 | 16 | do. Do.; fair, but hazy. |
| 14 | 29.63 | 49 | 16 | M Hazy with wind and rain... | 29.57 | 53 | 18 | do. Fair, but lowering; wind and | 29.52 | 54½ | 18 | do. Do. fair, high wind. |
| 15 | 29.52 | 54 | 18 | M Fair, but lowering and windy. | 29.60 | 54 | 17 | do. Do.; at 6 wet haze & wind. | 29.61 | 53 | 18 | do. Do. with rain. |
| 16 | 29.33 | 52 | 19 | M Rain & windy; after 11 fair. | 29.57 | 49½ | 13 | do. Fair, but hazy, & high wind. | 29.83 | 46 | 12 | do. Do. |
| 17 | 29.83 | 50 | 13½ | M Fair & windy; after 10 rain. | 29.70 | 56 | 17 | do. Small rain & high wind.... | 29.70 | 55½ | 16 | do. Fair, and Do. |
| S 18 | 29.75 | 56 | 16 | M Fair but lowering & windy. | 29.75 | 55 | 16 | do. Lowering, but fair & windy. | 29.67 | 54 | 15 | do. Fair & moderate. |
| 19 | 29.66 | 52 | 15½ | M Cloudy, wind N. shower at 2. | 29.70 | 46 | 14 | do. Do. fine..... | 29.87 | 41 | 13 | do. Fine. |
| 20 | 30.01 | 36 | 15 | M Sharp frost..... | 30.01 | 44 | 15 | do. Fine, frosty..... | 29.96 | 35 | 15 | do. Do. |
| 21 | 29.76 | 39 | 15 | M Small rain; fair; rain..... | 29.57 | 42 | 15 | do. Fair, blowing strong..... | 29.50 | 40 | 16 | do. Fair, high wind. |
| 22 | 29.43 | 39 | 14 | M Gloomy; after 10 small rain. | 29.55 | 41½ | 16 | do. Rain and wind..... | 29.17 | 44 | 17 | do. Do. |
| 23 | 29.38 | 36 | 16 | M Frosty..... | 29.49 | 36 | 17 | do. Frost..... | 29.34 | 30 | 17 | do. Sharp frost. |
| 24 | 29.43 | 32 | 16 | M Gloomy; frost, and clearer. | 29.40 | 32 | 16 | do. Do..... | 29.40 | 31½ | 17 | do. Do. |
| S 25 | 29.43 | 29½ | 15½ | M Hard frost, dark and gloomy. | 29.43 | 29½ | 17½ | do. Do..... | 29.46 | 29 | 18 | do. Frost, snow, clear. |
| 26 | 29.46 | 30½ | 16½ | M Frost, snow on the ground... | 29.46 | 32 | 17 | do. Cloudy, frost..... | 29.46 | 29 | 17½ | do. Thaw, small rain. |
| 27 | 29.14 | 35 | 18 | M F. & C. snow all dissolved. | 28.85 | 47 | 19 | do. Rain and wind; after 6 fair. | 28.70 | 37 | 19 | do. Fine. |
| 28 | 28.85 | 38 | 19 | M F. & C..... | 29.16 | 35 | 19 | do. Gloomy, with sharp frost... | 29.41 | 35 | 19 | do. Frost. |
| 29 | 29.55 | 35 | 19 | M Foggy, with small rain..... | 29.55 | 43 | 20 | do. Foggy and gloomy..... | 29.65 | 44 | 19 | do. Foggy. |
| 30 | 29.66 | 49 | 20½ | M Lowering, with small rain... | 29.57 | 53 | 21 | do. Do.; at 5 a shower, then fair. | 29.67 | 45 | 25 | do. Fine. |
| 31 | 29.86 | 43 | 25 | M Fine..... | 29.95 | 46½ | 20 | do. Some drops; fine..... | 30.02 | 42 | 22 | do. Fine. |

THE GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE,

For JANUARY, 1815.

Mr. URBAN, *Jan. 10.*
PRESUMING the monumental inscriptions inserted in the two last Magazines have not proved unacceptable to some classes of readers; I must claim indulgence for the insertion of a few others, which, perhaps, are not less simple, correct, and elegant, than those communicated in my two former letters. As the subjects of them are far removed from the reach of human applause, the affectionate tribute of surviving friends can add nothing to their happiness; but these perishing records may awaken reflection in the minds of the thoughtless, and evince to all the excellence and consolation of a life devoted to religious duty and practical Christianity. Yours, &c. J. C.

I. In Folkstone, Church, Kent.

To the Memory of William Langhorne, A. M. Curate of Folkstone, who died in February 1772, at the age of fifty-one.*

In life belov'd, in death for ever dear,
 O friend, O brother, take this parting
 tear! [sigh,
 If Life has left me aught that asks a
 'Tis but like thee to live, like thee to die.

JOHN LANGHORNE.

Of Langhorne's life, be this memorial
 given, [was heaven;
 Whose race was virtue, and whose goal
 Not through the selfish, drear unfriendly
 road [trod;
 Which ancient moralists and sophists
 But in an active sphere of Christian love,
 He mov'd himself, and will'd mankind
 to move.

Enthusiast's confidence, or sceptic's fear,
 Affected not his equable career;
 With evangelic eloquence he warm'd,
 With reason won us, and with meekness
 charm'd;
 Shew'd in his life, his converse, and his
 prayer, [care.

The friend's attachment, and the pastor's
 Oft would he, in the mines of ancient
 lore,
 Historic truth and moral truth explore;

* He published "Job, a Poem," a "Paraphrase of Isaiah," and, with his brother, the "Lives of Plutarch."

Yet was his aim to dissipate the night
 Of Pagan's doubts by Revelation's light;
 The Christian's steady plan to recom-
 mend,

Just in its source, and happy in its end.
 Thus to his flock, whom here he left be-
 hind, [mankind,
 Thus to his neighbours, who were all
 He gave example to pursue with zeal
 His Saviour's steps to everlasting weal:
 And in the moment of expiring breath,
 To give a test of endless joy in death.

II. In St. Mary's Redcliffe, Bristol.

On Mrs. Fortune Little, wife of Mr. John Little, died June 26, 1777, aged 57.

O could this verse her bright example
 spread, [dead;
 And teach the living while it prais'd the
 Theu, Reader, should it speak her hope
 divine, [thine:
 Not to record her faith, but strengthen
 Then should her every virtue stand con-
 fess'd,

Till every virtue kindled in thy breast:
 But if thou slight the monitory strain,
 And she has liv'd, at least to thee, in
 vain,

Yet let her death an awful lesson give,
 The dying Christian speaks to all that
 live.

Enough for her, that here her ashes rest,
 Th' God's own plaudit shall her worth
 attest. HANNAH MORE.

III. In the Church-yard of Amwell, in Hertfordshire.

In cottages and lonely cells
 True Piety neglected dwells;
 Till call'd to Heav'n, its native seat,
 Where the good man alone is great;
 'Tis then this humble dust shall rise,
 And view its Judge with cheerful eyes;
 While guilty sinners sink afraid,
 And call the mountains to their aid.

WILLIAM SOMERVILLE.

Mr. URBAN, *Jan. 11.*

THE name of "Anna Seward" is erroneously mentioned in vol. LXXXIV. ii. p. 515, as the author of the epitaph on Mrs. Grove. I read the epitaph many years ago in the South transept of the Cathedral at Lichfield, and mentioning it at Dr.

Falconer's,

Falconer's, where I dined, said, "I supposed it was by Miss Seward, the Poetess of the place:"—"No, indeed it is not," was the answer. "It was written by her husband Dr. Grove himself; and, what is better, she deserved every word of it." Upon this, I re-visited the monument, and transcribed the epitaph. I knew Mr. Grove personally at Oxford, when he was there superintending the education of his son. He had much of the gentleman in his appearance, a handsome, intelligent, prepossessing countenance, and was reckoned a very sensible man. He had been educated at Oriel College; M. A. there 1765, and had the honorary degree of D. C. L. in 1781. He used to live, not at Lichfield, but I think at or near Coventry; and perhaps gave up his seat there to his son on his marriage, and then came and resided in the Close at Lichfield. May I add, that I have some reason to believe that Dr. Grove has occasionally corresponded with Mr. Urban?

Whether the other two epitaphs are rightly given to Hannah More and Mrs. Carter, I do not know. Dr. Stonhouse, who wrote many religious tracts, a pious good man, perhaps a little tinctured with methodism, was likely enough to be the author of an epitaph for his wife. But I do not know the fact. One would suppose from these copies, that the names, "Anna Seward," "Hannah More," and "Elizabeth Carter," are inscribed on the respective monuments: and if so, my memory must have imposed upon me in my Lichfield anecdote; but I verily believe that I am right.

Yours, &c.

R. C.

Mr. URBAN, *Lichfield, Jan. 12.*

I TRUST you will feel anxious to take an early opportunity of correcting an error of the Correspondent who has attributed, I know not upon what ground, the much-admired epitaph to the memory of Lucy Grove, in Lichfield Cathedral, to the pen of Miss Seward, when in fact it was written by her husband, William Grove, Esq. D. C. L. as is well known to many persons here, as well as to

Yours, &c. ANTI-PLAGIARY.

Mr. URBAN, *Jan. 13.*

THE publick have been so long imposed upon by the numerous paintings of Shakspeare, all equally

original, that it is time his monumental bust in Stratford Church, the earliest authenticated likeness of our Bard, should recover its deserved estimation.

In your Magazine for June 1759, p. 257, it was properly observed by the Rev. Joseph Greene, at that time master of our free-school, and whose contributions occasionally found a place in your early numbers, that the *doubt* whether the Stratford bust preserved any resemblance of the Bard did not take date before the erection of his cenotaph in Westminster Abbey; the admirers of which upheld the opinion that the country figure differed as much from the likeness of the Poet, as it did from the face in the Abbey; and so far endeavoured to depreciate its merit. From that period our Stratford bust has sunk into comparative neglect; and for these probable reasons—that ever since Scheemaker executed the Abbey bust from Zoust's painting, which must have been a copy, as his earliest known picture in England was done, according to Malone, in 1657; and since Roubilliac is said to have made the statue of our Poet from the Chandos picture for Garrick, from the latter of which the Jubilee Statue presented by that imitable Roscius to our Town was said to be copied, the publick have formed in their own imagination, and accustomed themselves to a likeness of Shakspeare very different from what it probably ought to be. In this they have been too long assisted by the engravings of Simon, of Vertue, Houbraken, and Earlom; from one or other of which most of the subsequent prints have been copied: they have been familiarized to a *frenchified* head of the "sweet Swan of Avon" by the incalculable number of busts, medals, and seals; and by Malone, in his zealous yet ineffectual endeavours to establish the Chandos canvas, they have been taught to look with a supercilious indifference upon the "pertness in the countenance of the Stratford bust totally differing from that placid composure and thoughtful gravity so perceptible in his original [Chandos] portrait, and his best prints. The statuary (he continues) probably had the assistance of some picture, and failed only from want of skill to copy it."

Thus

Thus powerfully will prejudice and prepossession operate. That the Stratford bust has, however, been unmeritedly neglected, is most unequivocally affirmed. The tradition of the town is, that it was copied from a cast after Nature, a practice sufficiently prevalent in that age to support oral communication. "But we have still," says Mr. Britton in his Essay prefixed to Whittingham's edition, "a better criterion, and a more forcible argument in its behalf; one that *flashes conviction* to the eye of the intelligent artist and anatomist. This is the truth of the drawing, with the accuracy of muscular forms, and shape of the skull, which distinguishes the bust now referred to, and which are evidences of a skilful sculptor." That it was erected within seven years from the Poet's death is certain, being mentioned by Leonard Digges in his verses accompanying the first folio edition of Shakspeare's dramatic works, printed in 1623; and though I cannot altogether agree with the late Mr. Greene, in his before-mentioned letter, that if we compare the earliest engraving which was made of the Bard (that of Droeshout in the first folio) with the face on the Stratford Monument, there will be found as great a resemblance as perhaps can well be between a statue and a picture, except that the hair is described rather shorter and straighter on the latter than on the former; nor coincide with Mr. Malone, who could not, on comparing them, trace any resemblance whatever; yet I think there may be found a considerable similitude of our monumental bust to this print, for the correctness of which we have his friend Jonson's testimony; and the "surlly Ben" would surely not have unnecessarily complimented the artist, nor ventured to affirm what, had it been untrue, numbers then living could and probably would have denied. The sculptors of that period seem to have excelled the engravers in their respective arts; and the Stratford bust, which in the disposition of the head indicates some acquaintance with Grecian models, is a much superior specimen of the labour of the chisel, than Droeshout's engraving is of that of the burin.

The intention of these tedious observations, Mr. Urban, is to introduce the mention of a new era in the his-

tory of our Stratford bust. In November 1813, I gave Mr. Britton a cast which I had made of this *face*, and from which was copied the woodcut prefixed to his "Essay." By that gentleman the original was duly appreciated; and in consequence Mr. George Bullock, of Tenderden-street, Hanover-square, visited Stratford in December last, with such sentiments as animate the connoisseur, and made the first complete cast of the whole bust. Let it, therefore, be hoped that an excellent engraving, upon a large scale, by the first artist in England, will be speedily given to the public; for though it has been several times copied with the monument itself (in Dugdale's Warwickshire; in Pope and Sewell's 8vo edition, 1728, by Fourdrinier; in Ireland's Avon; Boydell's Illustrations; and in my own History of this Town) yet most of them are incorrectly and all of them unsatisfactorily engraved. To multiply the casts from Mr. Bullock's first, and consequently valuable mould, will be now impossible; for after that which he has in London, and one which I possess (the latter only half way down the body of the bust) were made, the original mould was broken up, and thrown into the Avon.

The Stratford bust is carved out of a solid block of stone (perhaps either Portland or Bath), but on no part of it could be discovered any name or date. By comparing the style and the quality of the material with other contemporary works (between 1616 and 1623) a probable guess may be made which of the few eminent artists of James's reign might have executed it. The general glare of light beaming on all sides through the Gothic windows which surround the monument, is certainly disadvantageous to the appearance of the features of this face; but when a single or more contracted light is properly thrown upon it, then the loftiness and beauty of the forehead, the handsome shape of the nose, the remarkable form of the mustachios and beard, and the very peculiar sweetness of expression in the mouth, are particularly striking. At first sight there appears an extravagant length in the upper lip, which, if viewed in profile, shews in truer proportion. After all, it appears somewhat long; and Lavater, upon whatever principles he determined, and whatever

whatever regard his physiognomical observations deserve, has, I believe, mentioned that the modern busts of Shakspeare do not represent a man of genius, from the invariable shortness of his upper lip.

In the description of a bust neither possessing a characteristic *pertness of countenance*, nor deficient in *skilfulness of execution*, a bust seen to the least advantage in its present situation, so long disregarded, except by the very few, who, having had the constant opportunity, have been in the almost daily habit of contemplating and admiring it; and at last likely to gain its due value in the opinion of the illustrious Bard's intelligent countrymen, when its merits are more fully known than hitherto they have been; it may be at present improper further to intrude upon your pages, which may be better occupied, if not by a subject more interesting to those who boast of being born in a country which produced the greatest dramatic genius in the world, yet by compositions less erratic than the "bald disjointed chat" of

Yours, &c. R. B. WHEELER.
Old Town, Stratford-upon-Avon.

Mr. URBAN, *Jan. 7.*

AS your pages have always afforded a ready admission to any observations relative to the general Topography of this favoured Isle, and as County History in particular seems at present to hold a deservedly high rank in the public estimation; I venture to address you in behalf of a spot, of which but a very unsatisfactory and imperfect account has hitherto been given. The county of Somerset, sir, has laboured under the misfortune of having had an Historian, who, for the most part, has been diffuse, where a less detailed account would have been desirable, and too often brief, where a more ample account would have been acceptable to his readers. His pen was not calculated for the office which it assumed; and, were it necessary, numerous instances might be adduced, in which proffered information was too hastily canvassed, and documents of an interesting nature too cursorily investigated. That the opinion of the residents of the county is not in this respect at variance with that of the publick at large, those certain criterions of merit, the cata-

logue of the bookseller, and the hammer of the auctioneer, afford a sufficient proof, whenever the History of Somerset is enrolled in the pages of the one, or subjected to the vibration of the other. The very limited patronage, which the venerable and well-qualified Historian of the neighbouring County of Dorset has experienced, would appear to afford in a pecuniary point of view an unfavourable prospect of encouragement to such an undertaking; but, sir, when the extent of our County, its infinitely more abundant population, and the perpetual change of property, to which that population necessarily gives rise, are taken into consideration, the adventurer, I am confident, would not feel that he was about to launch into an uncertain and precarious speculation. From my own personal knowledge, I can affirm that Proposals for a New History of Somerset would meet with general attention; and in the hope that these remarks will be considered as conveying a stimulus to the exertions of the living, rather than a reflection on the labours of the dead, I subscribe myself,
URBANI AMICUS.

Mr. URBAN, *Jan. 7.*

IN the margin of the Domesday Survey of Devonshire an abbreviation occurs, which, as I believe, is not to be found in any other part of that Record. It stands thus,

par

in small characters, and appears first at folio 105, and again at folios 105 b. 108 b. 110, 111, 112, 112 b. 113, 114 b. 115, and 116.

I am at a loss for its meaning, and shall thank any of your Correspondents who will assist me in attaining it.

Mr. Kelham (in Domesday Book Illustrated) does not attempt its explanation, but says merely, "This abbreviation occurs in the margin of Domesday, p. 105, in six places successively, and once in p. 110; but what the signification of it is, or to what it refers, is left to the reader to determine."

Yours, &c. R. R.

Mr. URBAN, *Middle Temple, Jan. 9.*

THE very learned Mr. Bawdwen, in his Translation of Domesday Book for Dorsetshire, communicated
to

to the Editor of the Fourth Volume of the excellent History of that County, has fallen into a slight hallucination, by rendering *ipsa Ecclesia* "the Church itself." It should rather be "the same Church;" namely, the Church just before mentioned.—Collinson, in his "Somersetshire," has committed the same mistake.—That *Ipsa* signifies "the same," is evident from Ainsworth. And accordingly, in the Translation of Domesday for Leicestershire, the indefatigable Historian of that County renders *ipsa Abbatia*, "the same Abbey," p. vi.; *ipse H.* "the same Henry," p. xii.; *ipse R.* "the same King," &c. &c.

Yours, &c. CARADOC.

MR. URBAN, Jan. 18.

IN the Times of Saturday last, Jan. 14, I read a letter signed "Laicus," on the state of the Church in our Western Colonies. With the sentiments of the writer I perfectly agree; and as a Church establishment in the East was formed in the last year, celebrated for many memorable events, and that one not among the least, I do think that a resident Bishop should be sent out by the Prince Regent for the Ecclesiastical Government of the Colonies. It was at first, perhaps, well ordered, that they should be placed under the care of the Bishop of London; but it could not be supposed that they were always to continue so, when that Prelate has so large a Diocese at home. Besides, the inhabitants of the Colonies must be, as things are, without evidently, as the writer expresses, some useful Episcopal rites! Probably some of your friends know a reason why a Bishop should not be sent to reside in Jamaica. Yours, &c. AMICUS.

DR. FRANKLIN'S LAST THOUGHTS ON RELIGION.

THAT the name of Benjamin Franklin cannot fail of occupying a conspicuous place in future histories of the eighteenth century, will, I have no doubt, be readily admitted; also, that of his distinguished mental endowments, as well as the extent of his scientific attainments, there can be but one opinion. Still, as there is reason to believe that his sentiments on the great concern of Religion varied at different periods of his long life, an authentic exhibition of his last

thoughts on that most important subject, will, I am persuaded, be acceptable to many admirers of the useful portion of his multifarious objects of research, and seems to be a tribute of justice due to his memory. This consideration induces me to indulge a hope, that the insertion of the following anecdote in a Miscellany so generally esteemed and that has so extensive a circulation as the Gentleman's Magazine, may not be deemed an improper occupation of a part of one of its valuable pages. It is extracted from "Travels in some parts of North America, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806. By Robert Sutcliff, late of Sheffield," one of the Society of Friends (called Quakers), 12mo. printed at York, 1811*. The Editor informs us that the narrative was penned without the remotest thought of publication, but from the well-known character of the writer, its strict veracity does not admit of a doubt. He was a respectable merchant in Sheffield, and his extensive dealings with transatlantic connections led him to make two voyages to North America. Several years elapsed, after his return from the latter in 1806, before he consented to permit the manuscript containing the observations he had committed to writing, to go to the press, from whence its contents had issued but a short time, when it pleased Providence to remove him from this state of existence.

A FRIEND TO ACCURACY.

Page 225. "*Philadelphia, 3rd month* 31, 1806. In conversation this evening with Samuel Bryant, a son of the Judge of that name, he mentioned that Doctor Franklin was an intimate friend of his father's, and that, in consequence, there was a frequent intercourse between the two families. Amongst a number of anecdotes relating to the Doctor, he recited one respecting his religious opinions, which appeared to me worth preserving. It is as follows: At the time the Doctor was upon his death bed, he was visited by a young man who had a great respect for his judgment in all things; and having entertained doubts in his own mind as to the truth of the Scriptures, he thought that this awful

* See vol. LXXXIII. Part II. p. 416, for some anecdotes of the late lamented General Moreau, extracted from the same publication.

period afforded a suitable opportunity of consulting the Doctor on this important subject. Accordingly he introduced it in a solemn, weighty, manner, inquiring of the Doctor what were his sentiments as to the truth of the Scriptures. On the question being put, although he was in a very weak state, and near his close, he replied, "Young man! my advice to you is, that you cultivate an acquaintance with, and a firm belief in the Holy Scriptures: this is your certain interest."

MR. URBAN,

Jan. 18.

THE attention of the publick being a good deal turned to William Greatrakes, I send some particulars relative to his family, drawn up from papers in my possession. "Allen Greatrakes, of Clashdermot, in the Barony of Imokilly, and county of Cork, Gentleman," (so styled in a lease dated March 9, 1755, granted to him by Richard Supple, Esq.* of the lands of Monelahan, co. Cork,) had three sons and a daughter, Elizabeth Greatrakes, wife of . . . Courtenay, of Lismore, co. Waterford, and now living at an advanced age. The sons were Osborne Greatrakes, *William* Greatrakes, Edmond Greatrakes, mentioned in the above lease, but supposed to have died young, as no farther account of him occurs. Allen Greatrakes, the father, devised the lands of Clashdermot and Monelahan to his sons Osborne and *William*, of which they made a division, Osborne taking Monelahan, and *William* Clashdermot.

Osborne Greatrakes, the eldest son, resided at the town of Youghall, co. Cork; he is described in the Papers sometimes as "Osborne Greatrakes, *Merchant*," at others, as "Osborne Greatrakes, *Mariner*." By his wife, who was named Mary, he left four daughters and coheirresses, viz. 1. Frances, wife of Anthony Sampis, Esq. 2. Mary; 3. Catherine; 4. Sarah. This Osborne Greatrakes mortgaged his leasehold lands of Monelahan and premises in Youghal to Richard Hutcheson, Esq. by whom the Mortgage was assigned to Colonel Richard Tinson, M. P. for the borough of Baltimore, whose descendant the Right

* Richard Supple, Esq. of Ahadoe, co. Cork, (the lessor of Allan Greatrakes,) was father of Sir Richard Brooke, Bart. of Northamptonshire.

Hon. William Lord Riversdale obtained a decree of Court for the sale of the mortgaged premises. They were accordingly sold to Mr. Adderley Willcocks; and in the deed of conveyance the before-mentioned William Baron Riversdale, Mary Greatrakes (widow of Osborne Greatrakes), Anthony Sampis, Esq. and Frances Sampis (otherwise Greatrakes) his wife, and Mary, Catherine, and Sarah Greatrakes, daughters and coheirresses of the late Osborne Greatrakes, are stated to be consenting parties.

William Greatrakes, of Clashdermot, the younger son (the supposed Junius) is styled usually in these Papers, "William Greatrakes, of the city of Cork, Esq." He appears to have had a property (I believe under a lease) in the barony of Duballow, co. Cork, which he conveyed to Thomas Chatterton, Gent. of the city of Cork, viz. "all that and those the lands of Knockanerobart, Nancy's Farm, Keel, and Milleen, situate in the parish of Cullen, barony of Duballow, and county of Cork, containing 328 plantation acres, and also the lands of Knockigillane, in the same barony."

Of Mr. William Greatrakes's claims to the authorship of Junius's Letters, I do not feel myself entitled to give any opinion.

Yours, &c.

G. H. W.

MR. URBAN,

Jan. 19.

IN vol. LXXXIV. Part ii. p. 264, I are some lines "Ad Elisam Popi horto lauros carpentem," also a translation of them, both sent by a Correspondent, signed Oxoniensis. I need not tell you, Mr. Urban, that the Eliza so celebrated, was the late learned and excellent Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, the translator of Epictetus. But, on turning to the Memoirs of that lady, by her Nephew the Rev. Montagu Pennington, p. 25 of the quarto edition, I was induced to refer back to the year 1738, of your valuable Miscellany, and there found not only the original Latin verses, p. 372, but three several translations, or rather imitations of them. Also a Latin answer to the Epigram, and a translation of the same, both I believe from the pen of the learned and modest object of the first well-merited compliment.

Yours, &c. A CONSTANT READER.

Mr.

Mr. URBAN, Jan. 2.
HAREFIELD-PLACE (a view of which forms the *Frontispiece to our present Volume*) is so ably described by Mr. Lysons, in his "Middlesex Parishes," that I beg you to insert his own words :

"In the survey of Domesday, the name of this parish is written Herefelle; in other antient records, Herfeld, Herefelde, and Herfield. Harefield in the Saxon is literally the 'hare field.'

"The parish of Harefield lies in the hundred of Elthorne, and forms the North-west angle of the county of Middlesex, being bounded on the North by Rickmansworth in Hertfordshire; on the West by the river Colne, which separates it from Denham in Buckinghamshire; on the South by Hillingdon; and on the East by Ickenham and Rislip. The village is pleasantly situated on rising ground, three miles from Uxbridge, and eighteen from London.

"The manor of Harefield is thus described in the survey of Domesday:—Richard, son of Gilbert the Earl (of Briou,) holds Herefelle, which is taxed at five hides. The land is five carucates. Two hides are in demesne, on which there are two ploughs. The villans have three ploughs. The priest has one virgate; there are five villans, who hold a virgate each; seven bordars, who have five acres each, and one bordar, who has three acres; there are three cottars, and three slaves, two mills yielding 15s. rent, four fisheries yielding 1000 eels, meadow equal to one carneate, pasture for the cattle of the manor, and pannage for 1200 hogs. The total annual value is 12*l.*; it was only 2*l.* when entered upon by the present owner; in King Edward (the Confessor's) time (being then the property of the Countess Goda,) it was 14*l.*—Richard, son of Gilbert Earl of Briou, was sometime called Richard Fitz Gilbert, sometime Richard de Tonbridge, and sometime Richard de Clare: from him it seems to have descended to Alice, daughter of Geoffrey, and grand-daughter of Baldwin de Clare.

"By a *quo warranto*, bearing date 1284, it appears, that Roger de Bacheworth was then lord of the manor of Harefield, and that he and his ancestors had enjoyed it, with all its rights and privileges, from time immemorial, paying a small quit-rent to the Honour of Clare. Sir Richard de Bacheworth, in the year 1315, granted this manor to Simon de Swanland, who married the elder daughter and co-heir of his brother Roger. This Sir Richard afterwards took upon him

GENT. MAG. January, 1815.

the habit of the Knights Hospitallers; and his wife Margaret, who had dower assigned her in Harefield, took the veil. William, son of Sir Simon de Swanland, had three sons, two of whom died in their infancy, and the third left no issue. Joanna, the only daughter, married John Newdegate, who was afterward knighted, and served in the wars in France under Edward III. In the year 1525, John Newdegate, esq. the eighth in lineal descent from Sir John, who married Joanna Swanland, exchanged the manor of Harefield, with Sir Edmund Anderson, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, for the manor of Arbury in Warwickshire, which has ever since been the principal seat of the family. Sir Edmund Anderson, in 1601, sold Harefield to Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal; his wife, Alice Countess Dowager of Derby, and Lady Anne, Lady Frances, and Lady Elizabeth Stanley, her daughters. The Lord Keeper died in 1617, being then Viscount Brackley; the Countess of Derby, in 1637. Lady Anne Stanley, the eldest daughter, married Grey Lord Chandos; and after his death, Mervin Earl of Castlehaven. She survived her mother only ten years; and on her death, George Lord Chandos (her eldest son by her first husband) inherited the manor of Harefield, pursuant to the deed of 1601. Lord Chandos died in February 1655, having bequeathed it by will to his wife Jane. In the month of October following, Lady Chandos married Sir William Sedley, bart. Sir William died in 1656; and in 1657 his widow took a third husband, George Pitt, esq. of Stratfield Say, in the county of Southampton. Having vested all her estates, by a deed bearing date 1673, in Mr. Pitt and his heirs, he, in conjunction with his trustees, in the month of February 1675, (his lady being still living) conveyed by bargain and sale the manors of Harefield and Morehall to Sir Richard Newdegate, bart. Serjeant at Law, younger son of Sir John Newdegate, and grandson of John Newdegate, esq. who had exchanged them with Sir Edmund Anderson. Having been thus restored to the Newdegate family again, they have continued in it ever since, and are now [1800] the property of Sir Roger Newdegate, bart. who is the thirteenth in descent from Sir John Newdegate first mentioned. It is remarkable that this manor (with the exception of a temporary alienation) has descended by intermarriages, and a regular succession (in the families of Bacheworth, Swanland, and Newdegate,) from the year 1284, when, by the verdict of a Jury, it appeared that

that Roger de Bacheworth, and his ancestors, had then held it from time immemorial. It is the only instance in which I have traced such remote possession in the county of Middlesex.

"Harefield Place, situated near the Church, [of both of which a good view is given in Mr. Lysons's Work,] was the antient Mansion-house of the Lords of the Manor, and for many years a seat of the Newdegate family. After the alienation before mentioned, it became the successive residence of Lord Chief Justice Anderson, and the Lord Keeper Egerton. The Countess Dowager of Derby, wife of the Lord Keeper, (and with him joint purchaser of the manor,) continued to reside here during her second widowhood. Here she was honoured with a visit from Queen Elizabeth, whom she received with all the pomp and pageantry of those days*. Sir Roger Newdigate was once possessed of an account in MS. of this visit, with a collection of the complimentary speeches with which, as was customary upon those occasions, she was addressed. The MS. is unfortunately lost; but Sir Roger Newdigate recollects, that she was first welcomed at a farm-house, now called Dew's farm, by several allegorical persons, who attended her to a long avenue of elms leading to the house, which obtained from this circumstance the name of *The Queen's Walk*. Four trees of this avenue still remain, and the greater part were standing not many years ago. It was at Harefield Place also that Milton's Arcades was performed by the Countess of Derby's grandchildren. That great Poet, during the time he lived at Horton with his father, (viz. from 1632 to 1637,) was, it is probable, a frequent visitor at Harefield. After the death of the Countess of Derby, Harefield Place was inhabited by George Lord Chandos, her grandson. This Nobleman, during the civil war, attached himself to the royal cause, and behaved with great gallantry at the battle of Newbury, having three horses shot under him. When the republican party had

* The Queen was twice at Harefield. In 1601 she visited Sir Edward Anderson there; and in 1602 Sir Thomas Egerton. See the *Queen's Progresses*, vol. II. 1601, 1602, pp. 20, 21; and Vol. III. Preface, p. xviii. EDIT.

† Not long before the death of Sir Roger Newdigate, this curious MS. (which had for many years been missing) was found in a volume of "*Strype's Annals*;" and a transcript of it was made (see LXXVI. 1074; LXXVII. 633.) But both the original and the copy were soon after again mislaid; and neither of them has since been found. EDIT.

established themselves in power, he was obliged to pay a heavy composition for his estates. He then retired to Harefield, where he spent the remainder of his days in great privacy. Dr. John Conant, a celebrated preacher and divine, resided with him as his domestic Chaplain; and, during his residence there, preached a voluntary lecture on a week-day to a numerous congregation at Uxbridge. Harefield Place was burnt down about the year 1660. Tradition says, that the fire was occasioned by the carelessness of the witty Sir Charles Sedley, who was amusing himself by reading in bed. It is probable that he was on a visit to his sister-in-law Lady Chandos. The foundations of the old mansion may be traced at a little distance above the site of the present house, which was formed by uniting the two lodges with an intermediate building. This was done by Sir Richard Newdegate, the second Baronet, whose widow resided in it several years, it being her jointure house: it was for some years also the residence of Sir Roger Newdigate, the present Baronet [1800], who, in 1743, was unanimously chosen Knight of the shire of Middlesex. In 1760, having fixed his residence in Warwickshire, he sold Harefield Place (retaining the manor and his other estates in this parish) to John Truesdale, esq. In 1780 it was purchased of Mr. Truesdale's executors by the late William Baynes, esq. whose son, Sir Christopher Baynes, bart. is the present proprietor and occupier.

"Evelyn, in his *Sylva*, mentions a silver fir, which having been planted at Harefield Place in 1603 at two years growth, had, in 1679, attained the height of 81 feet, and measured 13 feet girth."

The Church, dedicated to the Virgin Mary, is a Gothic structure of flint and stone, consisting of a chancel, nave, and two aisles; at the west end is a low square tower embattled. It contains a very handsome monument to Alice Countess of Derby, engraved in Mr. Lysons's work; several monuments of the Newdegate family (one of which, to the memory of Mary Lady Newdegate, is also there engraved; monuments in memory of the Ashbys, Bishop Pritchett, &c. &c. all of which are fully described by Mr. Lysons; to whose valuable Work I refer your Readers. B. N.

‡ Sir Roger Newdigate died in his 87th year, at his seat at Arbury, co. Warwick, Nov. 23; and was buried at Harefield Dec. 5, 1806. See an account of him in vol. LXXVI. pp. 1173, 1174; and a full biographical Memoir of him, by his friend Mr. Archdeacon Churton, in vol. LXXVII. pp. 683, 705.

Mr. URBAN, Jan. 2.

AS Physiognomy is now laughed out of countenance, and Craniology has taken it into his head to supply her place, I cannot forbear to address a few lines to you upon that event; though I must confess, I do it with fear and trembling, lest I should expose myself, by attempting that for which my head was not originally formed.

If your head, Mr. Urban, has the same defective organization, which I rather suspect, and you have not yet attended the Lectures in Rathbone Place, you will probably be unable to comprehend the nature of my alarm: I will therefore explain it.

The learned Lecturer (for so I am compelled to style him by the etiquette of literary intercourse) declares that no person can understand his Lectures, unless he has the organ of Craniology in perfection.

If I could admit this dictum in its full force, I should not have presumed to offer any opinion upon the subject; but I rather suspect it to be a little stroke of art, which has amply answered the intended purpose.

This age, it is well known, pretends to a more general diffusion of knowledge than any which has preceded it, insomuch that ignorance upon any subject whatsoever is now considered as disgraceful. To avoid the imputation, therefore, of an imperfection in the headpiece, and of that want of knowledge which has been denounced as the necessary consequence, men, women, and children, crowd the Lecture Room; for that want of the organ of Craniology which incapacitates them from understanding what is there delivered, does not preclude their entrance, provided they have previously paid their subscription.

This plan of operating upon the feelings of pride, in order to fill the Lecture Room, brings to my recollection a similar attempt, to excite the benevolence of a congregation, which was equally successful. A Methodist Preacher, after expatiating on the excellence of the charity which he was then recommending, declared it to be of a nature so superior to all others, that no person could refuse to put money into the plate, unless he were actually in debt. The effect of this upon his auditors may easily be conceived. No one was willing that

his neighbours should suspect that he was in debt, and consequently every one subscribed.

These oratorical kinds of swindling are not, as I believe, yet provided against by any existing Statute.

The Lecturer labours hard to free his system from the imputation of Materialism; but he does it in such a manner as evidently proves, that either he does not understand the force of his own argument, or that, having craniologically examined the heads of his subscribers, he is convinced they will not detect him. He reasons thus—My system is not Materialism, because man, being a free agent, has power to correct those evil propensities to which the formation of his skull naturally determines him.

Here the Lecturer wisely keeps back one half of the argument; and for this plain reason, that the whole would at once reduce his boasted discovery to the baseless fabric of a vision. For if man, by his free agency, can correct the evil organs, he unquestionably has equal power to pervert the good ones; and in either of these cases the craniologist cannot by any examination of the skull, which will necessarily remain unchanged in its form, learn whether the good or evil propensities are unaltered, or still retain their pristine tendency; and consequently, as the Lawyers express it, he will take nothing by the examination.

That his Lectures are well attended, does not in the least surprize me, who perfectly recollect what numbers flocked, in former days, to another learned Lecturer, in order to be instructed in the Science of Animal Magnetism.

If I were worthy to offer advice to the present learned Lecturer, I would recommend the skull of that profound Physician to his consideration; and I have no doubt but that the examination will somewhat startle the Professor of Craniology.

I have myself, Mr. Urban, some little judgment in heads; but, being a native of the Highlands, and gifted with second sight, I do not require to handle men's skulls in order to judge of their character; and, consequently, I can, without ever having seen the aforesaid Doctor, tell the Professor some things which will occur in his examination of the skull.

He

He will find the organ of *Calocagathy** outwardly so perfect, that, without looking any further, he will at once pronounce the Doctor to have been incapable of giving his pupils nonse, se as an equivalent for their money.

But, if he extend his inquiry, he will discover that the organ of *Covetiveness* is of a capacity equal to that of *Calocagathy*; and the real history of the Doctor's life will inform him, that he, being a free agent, perverted the good tendency of the latter, and yielded to the evil tendency of the former, until he persuaded himself that he might honestly take money for instructions in an art which never had existence.

The Lecturer must be aware that it is by no means uncommon for men thus to deceive themselves.

The above is humbly submitted to the Professor's consideration, upon the supposition that the profound Lecturer upon Animal Magnetism is actually dead. If that be not the case, I must apprise him as a Foreigner, that it is not quite safe in this country, to handle living skulls in order to prove dishonesty, excepting perhaps in Westminster Hall, the Old Bailey, and other Lecture Rooms of the same kind.

This, however, need not prevent the Professor from paying due attention to his own skull, and especially to those organs which I have particularly pointed out; and I am clearly of opinion, that a candid examination of them will give him an idea of the state of those organs very different from that which he at present entertains.

I remain, Mr. Urban, with the highest consideration for the learned Lecturer, your very humble Servant,

PERICRANIUM.

Strictures on an Article in the last Number of the Edinburgh Review.

"Conformably to the principles contained in Mr. Hume's 'Essay on Miracles,' and also to those in the Essay now before us, if we would form some general rules for comparing the evidence derived from our experience of the course of Nature with the evidence of

testimony, we may consider Physical Phenomena as divided into two classes: the one comprehending all those of which the course is known from experience to be perfectly uniform; and the other comprehending those of which the course, though no doubt regulated by general laws, is not perfectly conformable to any law with which we are acquainted: So that the most general rule which we are enabled to give, admits of many exceptions.

"The violation of the order of events among the Phenomena of the former class—the suspension of gravity, for example; the deviation of any of the Stars from their places, or their courses in the Heavens, &c. &c.—these are facts, of which the improbability is so strong, that no testimony can prevail against it; and it will always be more wonderful that the violation of such order should have taken place, than that any number of witnesses should be deceived themselves, or should be disposed to deceive others."

From the Edinburgh Review for Sept. 1814, pp. 328—9.

MR. URBAN,

CONSIDERING the "Essai Philosophique sur les Probabilités" of M. L. Comte Laplace, as by no means likely to obtain a general circulation in this country, and the *once* much vaunted reasoning of Mr. Hume in his *Essay on Miracles*, as already sufficiently confuted; I certainly should not have deemed it necessary to notice the sceptical opinions of either of those Writers, on the momentous subject referred to in the preceding extract, were there not perceptible, throughout the whole critique of the Edinburgh Reviewer on the former work, a more than tacit approbation of the Deistical doctrines therein maintained. It is true, indeed, that the Reviewer, when speaking of Mr. Hume's *Essay on Miracles*, has been pleased to qualify the high eulogium pronounced upon its Author, "for his deep thought and enlarged views," by piously admonishing us "not to stretch the principles contained in it so far, as to interfere with the truths of Religion." But how we are to avail ourselves of this friendly caution; or by what kind of mental ingenuity we can possibly contrive to admit at the same time, both the soundness of Mr. Hume's philosophy, and the divine pretensions of the Gospel; I have,

for

* I translate for your Country Readers, *Calocagathy* is *Honesty*. Now-a-days terms of Art are not looked at unless they be derived from the Greek.

for my own part, still to learn; it being, I conceive, to all reflecting minds indisputably clear, that as far as the credibility of Revealed Religion is made to rest on the evidence of miracles, so far is it in reality the avowed and exclusive aim, as well as the obvious and necessary tendency of Mr. Hume's Essay, totally to subvert the very ground-work of the Christian faith.

Viewing the subject in this light, it will be, I trust, permitted me to plead its supreme importance, as a sufficient excuse for the unusual length, both of the preceding Extract, and of the ensuing Strictures.

I shall begin with noticing a general position of the Reviewer; to the truth of which, every unbiassed mind will, I doubt not, readily subscribe: viz. "That there is not a particle of water, or of air, of which the condition is not defined by rules as certain, as that of the Sun or the Planets." (page 326.) But, having once acknowledged the philosophical justness of this doctrine, are we, by necessary implication, in reason bound to yield an equally unqualified assent to the following immediate deduction from it? "So that nothing but information sufficiently extensive, and a calculus sufficiently powerful, is wanting, to reduce all things to certainty, and, from the condition of the world at any one instant, to deduce its condition at the next." Before we can reasonably allow ourselves to concur in opinion with the Reviewer respecting the legitimacy of such an inference as this, we must needs be thoroughly persuaded, that the very same rules, which of necessity define the present and regulate the future condition of every material substance connected with this earth, define and regulate with equal certainty both the present and the future condition of every spiritual substance so connected. Since, if there really exist, both in Heaven and on Earth, Beings in native dignity, infinitely superior to any portion of the inanimate creation, whose appropriate function and continual employment it is, to exercise over every part of the material world, provident and irresistible dominion; what can possibly be more evident, than that, through the practical controul and agency of these superior Beings, that perfect uniformity

in the order of physical phenomena, which might otherwise have been with certainty anticipated, will now be liable to frequent and almost perpetual interruption.

And should it even be asserted, that neither man, nor any other intelligent creature, is actually invested with the power of varying or influencing, in any degree whatever, the wonted course of natural phenomena; yet will no one, most assuredly, but the avowed Atheist or Fatalist, pretend for a moment seriously to question the physical power and rightful authority of the Supreme Being, either to alter, to suspend, or to supersede entirely (whenever he shall be pleased to do so), the pre-established order of all sublunary events, and the wonted operation of all secondary causes.

If, however, we feel ourselves thus constrained to own, that it is at all times, and in all circumstances, alike possible and easy for the Divine Being to vary or annul the general laws of material nature (such, for example, as that of gravity); who among us will have the presumption to affirm, that it is not, both in all real and all imaginable cases, equally possible and easy for that Being to give mankind indisputable evidence of such extraordinary interposition by means of *indirect communication*? And if none among us, retaining a sober mind, will dare avow so impious a thought, what is there (we may further reasonably ask) in the nature of *human testimony*, which renders it in the least improper to be made, by Divine appointment, the *ordinary and most effectual medium of such communication*?

Will it suffice to answer (conformably with the leading principle of Mr. Hume's deistical philosophy) that the most decisive test of truth is men's experience? that a miracle is confessedly an event entirely contrary to such experience; whilst the deceitfulness and fallibility of human testimony are but too indisputably proved by every man's daily observation; and consequently that to believe, in any given instance, an asserted miracle, merely in deference to human testimony, is (truly speaking) to reject the stronger evidence, and admit the weaker?

What real force there is in this (formerly) much boasted argument, will

will be, I conceive, best shewn by a brief enumeration of all the several meanings which can be consistently annexed to the term *experience*, as used in the preceding passage.

Now these (it is sufficiently obvious to every competent understanding) are no more than the three following. We must needs understand by the term *experience*, as used above, either universal, individual, or general experience.

To say, however, that in no case can we ever consistently or reasonably admit the truth of any assertion, or the reality of any fact, which is contradicted by the universal experience of mankind, is (in the judgment of every reflecting mind) in no degree to prove, but only gratuitously to assume, the utter incredibility of miracles; it being to every such mind abundantly manifest, that in the firm belief of any asserted miracles, there is necessarily implied a positive denial that miracles are contradicted by the universal experience of mankind.

Passing on, therefore, to the consideration of the second meaning above ascribed to the term *experience* (that is, understanding that expression as denoting solely, what has been sensibly witnessed and observed by the individual whose judgment is to decide on the truth or falsehood of any asserted or recorded miracles) it is obvious for me to remark, that if men's *personal experience* (thus defined) be indeed to them in all cases, and on all subjects, the incomparably surest, and almost the only test of truth; then must we of necessity acknowledge, that as on this principle of reasoning we can none of us at present consistently admit, as well authenticated, any of the numerous miracles related in the Old Testament or in the New; so, on the very same ground of argument, must we equally maintain, that with respect to the periodical conversion of water into ice in many regions of the earth, all the untravelled natives of the warmer climates are in reason bound to remain for ever equally incredulous with the memorable King of Siam, alluded to by Locke. A mode of reasoning directly leading to, and fully warranting, an inference thus palpably absurd, must, doubtless, be regarded by every sober mind, as neither meriting, nor requiring formal confutation.

And should the advocates of Mr. Hume's philosophy, for the purpose of obviating this glaring inconsistency, be disposed to allege upon the subject, that, by the experience so much insisted on in the *Essay on Miracles*, as affording men in all cases the infinitely best criterion of truth and falsehood, we are by no means to understand, in any instance, the limited experience of the individual whose judgment is to pronounce on any specific question, but the more enlarged experience and observation of *mankind in general*: To this our ready answer is, by none of us can it, in the natural course of things, ever possibly be ascertained what is, or what is not, in any given instance, the actual result of men's general experience and observation, unless it be permitted us (after due discrimination exercised) to repose full confidence in the *fidelity of human testimony*. Withhold the aid of this grand medium of general information to mankind, or assert its total insufficiency when considered as the test of truth, and source of rational conviction; and the practical demonstrations of a Newton, it is abundantly manifest, will, in most instances, immediately dwindle into the fanciful hypotheses of a Descartes.

For with regard even to the principle of gravity itself (through the constant and all-pervading influence of which we are now so firmly and so rationally persuaded that the admirable order of all this solar system has been so long preserved): who is there among us, retaining a sound judgment, that will pretend to build solely on the narrow basis of his own partial experience and observation, a well-founded confidence in its universal agency?

Without an entire reliance on the general accuracy of what has been written and related on this head by others, no individual of mankind (it is self-evident) could ever possibly attain to a full and rational conviction of this truth. If, however, the fidelity of human testimony must be thus presumed, before we can pretend to make the least proficiency whatever in the science of natural philosophy, or arrive at any general conclusions with regard even to the most obvious physical phenomena; why is the correctness of such testimony to be thus impeached, and its authority thus denied,

denied, in all discussions and inquiries that concern the doctrines of Revealed Religion? If, without the aid of human testimony, we can none of us be rationally assured, that there is actually prescribed by Divine Power and Wisdom any one specific law to all material bodies, does it in any degree accord with reason to believe, that, however apparently irresistible its evidence, such evidence is, notwithstanding justly to be esteemed by us altogether incompetent to prove as much even as the very slightest deviation from that law? Or, in other words, is that instrument or medium which we must of necessity acknowledge to be of all others incomparably the most effective and infallible in ascertaining and establishing the general rule, with any semblance of consistency to be considered as of no validity whatever in ascertaining and establishing the occasional exception?

It is for the admirers of Mr. Hume's Deistical Philosophy to reconcile this apparent contradiction.

Yours, &c. OXONIENSIS.

MR. URBAN, Jan. 4.

THE following Letter was lately sent to a person in an eminent situation. If you should deem it worthy of a place in your Magazine, it may perhaps answer the same purposes for which it was addressed to him, with those whose sensibility and literary endowments are any way on a par with his. I must leave it to his and their taste and judgment to determine, with what reservations the praises I have given to my favourite Author may be assented to. Sure I am, that to press his works on the attention of the Publick, is doing service to the cause of genius, good sense, and good morals.

To ———

SIR,—I have a double motive for intruding this Address upon you. One is, the desire of giving to a man of your worth and eminence, an object of attention which may have still more important effects than the gratification that I think it cannot fail to afford; the other, that of adding to the celebrity of an Author, whose works, I believe, are not so well known and valued in this country as they deserve. With these views, and the presumption that you are yet unac-

quainted with the Tragedies of Count Vittorio Alfieri*, I beg very earnestly to recommend them to your perusal; in the firm persuasion that you will find the high encomium bestowed on them in the dedication of a Selection of them published in 3 Vols. at Edinburgh, in 1806, by the Editor Montucci, not more than equal to their merit. Indeed that merit appears to me to comprehend all that is required to make Dramatic writing estimable in the highest degree. You will find, I am persuaded, the excitement of those "fine sensations" (painful though they are) which I was lately told that you had (very justly) attributed to Theatrical Representation, at a moment when you was most strongly impressed with its effects, carried to the highest pitch in these Tragedies, which interest, elevate, and I may say fill the mind, more than any I ever read before. Formed as they are on the model of the Greek Tragedies (which Alfieri seems to have studied to the full extent required by Horace) and carried beyond their simplicity in the embellishments of language, the arrangement of the plots, &c. but, stopping short of the exuberance of many of the modern plays, they never "overstep the modesty of nature," and never was that modesty made more dignified and interesting; nor ever was any language more happily made the vehicle of thought and expression, than the beautiful and truly classical one in which they are written, and to which they have given a lustre beyond perhaps what it ever had before. That language indeed in common use is now superseded by the easy and lively garrulity of one which may, after all, realize the motto of an eloquent little pamphlet, written 20 or more years ago, by M. de Rivarol, "sur l'universalité de la langue Française." "Tu regere *Eloquio* populos, *O Galle*, memento." Possibly, however, its influence may only tend in future to counteract the more powerful causes of discord among the Nations of Europe, especially if it is favourable to discussion, by opposing one kind of preponderance to another, and by varying the modes and instruments of human contention. But who shall

* See a review of "Memoirs of Alfieri, by Himself," in vol. LXXX. i. 458.

penetrate into futurity, or trace from their sources to their results, unless in some faint and general outlines, vague (or at least imperfect) comparisons, and uncertain speculations, the events that determine the fate of nations?

“Prudens futuri temporis exitum

Caliginosa nocte premit Deus.”

To whose wisdom and power, as the “Alpha and Omega” of Existence and of Agency, we must leave what all our varied and most laboured inquiries are impotent to solve: confining ourselves more properly, in the limited sphere of human agency, to what most nearly concerns us, the fulfilment of our responsibility, whether in a public or private capacity. So shall we rear to ourselves, as far as human imperfection will allow, that “*murus athenicus*,” whose materials must consist of our thoughts, words, and actions: and so shall we still further—But to return from this digression, which I think cannot well be called impertinent, as all things are more or less connected with the object of it, in proportion perhaps to their different degrees of importance, or of our disposition to refer them to it—to return, I say, to Alfieri and his Plays, of which his *Antigone* is the one which most interested and affected me. It deserves, I think, in a much higher degree, the encomium that Pere Brunoy (in his *Theatre des Grecs*) gives to the same Play of Sophocles, “*Dans une piéce où il s'agit simplement d'une dispute sur une Sepulture, tout ce que la Pitié a de plus tendre, eclate au souverain degré.*” This, I think, you will find more fully verified in Alfieri's Tragedy, in which the gradual rise of interest is unequalled, except it is in the *Oedipus* of Sophocles; the deep interest, and the impressive and awful simplicity of which are perhaps unrivalled. In Alfieri's Plays, however, the calls for our admiration and sympathy are nearly as varied and multiplied as the subjects of them. They are, in short, what Dramatic Pieces ought to be, the finest and most interesting moral lessons: and their merit can only be done entire justice to, by the most attentive perusal in the closet, and the most perfect subsequent representation on the stage. The first we have in our power; the second is difficult (to say the least) to

meet with anywhere. Not to trespass further on your time and patience, by dwelling on a subject on which praise can hardly be exhausted, and having no motive for this Address to you but those first mentioned, being personally unknown to you, and, from my situation and habits of life, likely to remain so; I will contrast the retired obscurity of that life with the conspicuous and useful activity of yours, by signing myself, with all due respect and regard,

Yours, &c.

OTIROS.

Mr. URBAN,

Jan. 7.

MILLER'S *Gardener's Dictionary*, when completed in folio, and sanctioned by public favour, was followed, at no great distance of time, by an abridgement, from the Author himself, in three handsome volumes octavo. How many editions of this might be printed, I am not fully informed. The Edition in my eye is dated 1753. The first Edition of the folio appeared in 1731: but I fancy it had seen more Editions before the Abridgement was made.

I am one of those who, not finding it convenient to go to the expence of the great Edition, completed in 1807 by Professor Martyn, have anxiously wished to see a good and judicious Abridgement of the work as it now stands. It could not perhaps be expected that the Professor, who had gone through the Herculean labour of republishing the folio, would choose to employ himself immediately in the task of abridging. But many competent persons might be found, and the work might as yet have the advantage of revision at least by the eye of the very worthy and learned Professor. I am persuaded that the number is not small of those who would be heartily glad of such a publication. The number could not fail to be considerable, in the present flourishing state of Botany and Horticulture.

It may be that such a work is actually preparing; if so, it will be gratifying to those engaged in it, to know that the work is so much desired. If it has not been thought of, I hope that this suggestion, thus made public by the wide circulation of Mr. Urban's Magazine, may lead some spirited publisher to undertake it in a judicious manner.

STOURMINSTER-MARSHAL CHURCH, DORSET.

Gen. Mag., Jan., 1815. Pl. II. p. 17.



AS ENGLAND'S PARNASSUS is now republishing in the *HELICONIA*, I will communicate through you, Mr. Urban, a small index which I made for my own use, of the Poets quoted in the Work. The Editors of *Heliconia* (particularly Mr. Park, whom I rejoice to call my friend,) are heartily welcome to reprint it in that work, if they should have any wish to do so. I believe it is accurate.

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| A. (R.) the Editor, | Lodge, D. |
| suppose Robt. Al- | M. of M. (Mirror of |
| lot. | Magistrates.) |
| Achelly, Thos. | Markham, J. |
| Bastard, Thos. | Marlowe, Chr. |
| C. (H.) qu. Consta- | Thos. |
| ble? | W. |
| Chapman, G. | Mareton, J. |
| Churehyard, Thos. | Middleton, Ch. |
| Constable, Henry, | O. E. of, (probably |
| printed at length. | Earl of Oxford.) |
| Daniel, Sam. | Oxford. E. of, (dis- |
| Davies, J. | tinctly named.) |
| Dekkar, Thos. | Nash, T. |
| Drayton, Mich. | Peele, Geo. |
| Fairfax, Edm. | Roydon, Matth. |
| Fitzgriffen, Ch. | S. T. B. (qu. who?) |
| Fitz Jeffery, and | Sackville, M. |
| — Geffrey, proba- | Shakespeare, (N. B. |
| bly the same. | always so spelt.) |
| Gilpin, E. printed | Sidney, Sir Ph. |
| also Guilpin. | Spencer, E. (so spelt) |
| Greene, Robt. | Storer, Thos. |
| Harrington, Sir J. | Surrey, E. of. |
| Higgins, J. | Sylvester, Jos. (often |
| Hudson, Thos. | Sylvister.) |
| I. probably <i>Incerti</i> . | Turberville, G. |
| Ignoto. | W. (T.) probably |
| Johnson, B. (so | Watson. |
| spelt) | Warner, W. |
| K. of K. (qu. who?) | Watson, Thos. (at |
| K. of S. (qu. King of | length.) |
| Scots?) | Weever, J. |
| Kyd, Thos. | Wiat, Sir Thos. |

These notices, Mr. Urban, are much at your service; or any thing else within the power of,

Yours, &c.

A. N. S.

Mr. URBAN, Jan. 5.

THE parish of Stourminster Marshal, co. Dorset, is a very large one, situated on the southern banks of the river Stour, four miles West from Wimbourne Minster. It takes its name from the Church, or *minster*, on the Stour; and its additional name, from its lords the Pembrokes, earls *Marshal* of England. It is also called *East Stourminster*, from its

GENT. MAG. January, 1815.

situation with regard to Stourminster Newton in the same County.

In Domesday book, Sturminster was held by Roger de Belmont. It consisted of 25 carucates, worth when he received it 66*l.*, now 55*l.* In the reign of King Edward (the Confessor) it was held by Archbishop Sigaud.

Roger Belmont was related by marriage to the Conqueror. He married the heiress of the Earl of Mellent, by whom he had that earldom. Robert his son was made Earl of Leicester by Henry I. The family did not possess this vill very long, for, 15 Henry III. it came to the Marshals earls of Pembroke. It subsequently passed by marriage to William Ferrers, earl of Derby.

The manor of Stourminster Marshal afterwards underwent such a variety of divisions and alterations as can scarcely be traced. See pp. 27 to 38, of vol. III. of the new Edition of Hutchins's "History of Dorsetshire."

The Church of Stourminster (See Plate II.) stands in the East part of the parish, near the river Stour. It is a considerable structure, consisting of a very large chancel, a body, a North aisle, and an embattled tower, in which are four bells and a clock. The body rests on three round arches on square pillars; the arch between it and the chancel is pointed, on round pillars. The body is covered with lead, the rest tiled. The South porch was rebuilt in 1803.

This Church is a peculiar jurisdiction granted to the hospital of St. Giles, at Pont Adomar, near the mouth of the Seine, in Normandy, no doubt, by one of the Popes; and by Henry VI. in 1441, to Eton College, who present to the vicarage, and constitute the vicar their official.

The learned Dr. Thomas Ashton was vicar of this place from 1749 to 1753. See a life of him in vol. III. of Mr. Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary, compiled from the "Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century," and other authentic sources. The present vicar is the Rev. George Heath, D. D.

A view of Corfe Mullen Chapel, in this parish, was lately communicated to your Magazine, by your excellent Correspondent, Mr. Hamper*.

* See vol. LXXX, p. 201.

By the Return to Parliament in 1811, the parish of Stourminster Marshal contained 116 houses, occupied by 130 families (110 of which were chiefly employed in agriculture, and 19 in trade, &c.) consisting of 278 males and 310 females; total 588.

Yours, &c.

B. N.

Mr. URBAN,

Jan. 6.

YOUR Mathematical Readers (and doubtless you have such) will infallibly be pleased with the following discussion of two different methods suggested for the *Rectification of the Hyperbola*. The one proposes to effect it by means of two Ellipses; the other shews that it may be better done by an appropriate Theorem. The former is *Mr. Woodhouse*, then Tutor at Caius College, Cambridge; the latter, *Mr. Hellins*, Vicar of Potters-Pury in Northamptonshire. The discussion refers to two Papers, published at different times in the *Philosophical Transactions*; that of *Mr. Woodhouse*, at Art. X. p. 219, in the Volume for 1804; that of *Mr. Hellins*, at Art. VI. p. 110, in the Volume for 1811. It was written originally for a respectable Journal, but by accident deferred, and finally prevented from appearing there. But considering it as a question interesting and important to Mathematicians, I am induced to forward it to you.

R.

N. B.—It is written by a very eminent Mathematician and Professor.

PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS FOR THE YEAR 1811. PART I.

Art. VI. *On the Rectification of the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses, proving that Method to be circuitous, and such as requires much more Calculation than is requisite by an appropriate Theorem; in which Process a new Theorem for the Rectification of that Curve is discovered.*

To which are added, some Observations on the Rectification of the Hyperbola: among which the great Advantage of descending Series over ascending Series, in many cases, is clearly shown, and several Methods are given for computing the constant Quantity by which those Series differ from each other. By the Rev. John Hellins, B. D. F. R. S. and Vicar of Potters-Pury, in Northamptonshire. Being an Appendix to his former Paper on the Rectification of the Hyperbola, inserted in the Philosophical Transactions for the year 1809. Communicated by Nevil Maskelyne, D. D. F. R. S. Astronomer.

The Rectification of the Ellipsis, and of the Hyperbola, are problems of the same class; and, by a judicious application of appropriate theorems, may be solved with equal facility. Yet, since the discovery that the latter of these problems might be solved by means of the former, that method of solving it has been considered as the best by several eminent mathematicians. The Rectification of the Ellipsis is the main subject of Art. X. in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1804; in which Paper *Mr. Woodhouse*, the writer of it, has applied the Rectification of the Ellipsis to the Rectification of the Hyperbola, and to the solution of a problem in *Physical Astronomy*.

It must be evident to every intelligent Reader, and appears also from *Mr. Woodhouse's* own references, that the greater part of the matter contained in his Paper was taken from other books, and no small part of it from French books, some of which were by no means easy to be procured, especially in time of War.

So scarce were the foreign books required, that two years elapsed before they could be procured. In that interval, however, and even to the present time, I have not heard of any correction which this Paper has received from its Author. But several of its errors have been pointed out in different periodical publications; and a few of them are noticed by the second writer, *Mr. Hellins*. A few brief remarks on Art. X. of the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1804 shall therefore suffice, with respect to that part of the subject.

The differential notation of *Leibnitz*, which is used throughout this Paper, instead of the fluxional notation of *Newton*, displays such a partiality for foreigners, and so much disrespect to the great inventor of Fluxions, as could not be expected from any Englishman, and particularly from a Member of the University of Cambridge. The new notation also of the co-efficients of a binomial quantity raised to a given power, proposed by *Mr. Woodhouse* (p. 227) to be used "for the sake of conciseness," is rather surprizing; since the *Newtonian* method of denoting such co-efficients by the letters A, B, C, &c. is both more simple and more concise.

The

The writer also falls into blemishes of style, which might easily have been avoided. Such, for instance, as the following phrases, borrowed from the French: "The whole integral." "Integral from $x=0$ to $x=1$." "Integral" (of a quantity) "between $z=0$ and $z=1$." This is not the mathematical language of England; and it is a pity if the Author, in studying French mathematicians, has forgotten his English Masters.

Of his Algebraic processes, some are very obscure, and some are erroneous; so that to a person not otherwise acquainted with the subjects, they could hardly be intelligible. The following processes and results may be noted as erroneous. The process in p. 231, and the series derived from it in p. 232; also the process in p. 233, and that in p. 260, and the theorem derived from it in p. 261, for rectifying the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses. The form of the fluent which Mr. W. assumes in p. 276, shews such a want of skill in series as is very inconsistent with the high tone in which he speaks on the subject.

Mr. Woodhouse is erroneous also when he speaks (p. 236 and 237) of *Fagnani's* Theorem as necessary in the investigation of *Euler's* Series (given in p. 235) for computing a quadrantal arch of an excentric Ellipsis. Had Mr. W. been acquainted with a Paper on Series, written by the Rev. *J. Hellins*, and published by the *Royal Society* in their Transactions for 1798, he might have perceived that *Fagnani's* Theorem is not at all necessary in that investigation.

Mr. W. is erroneous again when he speaks of *M. La Grange* (which he does more than once) as the discoverer of a substitution, by which the fluxions of Elliptic and Hyperbolic arches are transformed into others of which the fluents are attainable in swiftly converging series.

This misrepresentation (as Mr. W. acknowledges in p. 273) is on the authority of *M. La Croix*; who in the 2d Volume of his *Traité du Calcul Différentiel et du Calcul Intégral*, art. 422, speaks of the aforesaid substitution as the device of *M. La Grange*; and in the table of contents refers to the *Memoires de l'Acad. des Sciences de Turin* for the year 1785, for the origin of it. Yet the fact is,

that a similar substitution was used, and a like result obtained, by our countryman, Mr. *John Landen*, at least ten years before *M. La Grange's* Paper appeared, as may be seen in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1775. And the same device may be found in his *Mathematical Memoires*, vol. I. p. 32. Nay, *M. La Grange* himself, in the very Paper in the *Turin Memoires* to which *M. La Croix* refers, acknowledges that he had seen *Landen's* Paper on the Ellipsis and Hyperbola (in which the substitution is used) by the mention which he there makes of that Paper! It is no great commendation of a tutor in an English University, to be better acquainted with French books than with those that are valuable in English; and still less can he be excused, if, through carelessness, or partiality, he gives to one Author that praise which is due to another.

The grossly erroneous assertion in p. 273, respecting series of the swiftest convergency for computing the values of A and B. (which the Author affirms to be when the index $i=1$) is borrowed, with the exception of the peremptory mode of expression, from *M. La Grange's Nullius in verba*, the judicious motto of the *Royal Society* of London, might have warned the Author against this fault.

Notwithstanding these faults of the Paper (No. X. for 1804), and others which may be found in it, still it is not without its value, as a *synopsis* of the ingenious devices of several eminent mathematicians of this Island, and of more on the Continent, for rectifying the Ellipsis, and by that means solving a difficult problem in Physical Astronomy. It is valuable also for showing that several methods of computation, very different in Algebraic characters, are founded on the same principle, and are in fact the same. It is impossible therefore not to regret that the Author did not draw it up in a manner more conducive to his own credit.

A brief account of Art. VI. of the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1811, will conclude the present discussion.

This Paper, as its title indicates, consists of two principal parts; the Demonstration, and the Observations.

The Rectification of the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses, is an invention of the late *Mr. John Landen*, F.B.S. which was first published in
the

the Philosophical Transactions for the year 1775, and afterwards in Vol. I. of his *Mathematical Memoirs*, in 1780.

In the beginning of this Paper, Mr. Hellins speaks of this method as a display of great ingenuity, and observes that it has "justly obtained the notice, and called forth the praises of eminent mathematicians both in this Island and on the Continent." He next adverts to Landen's representation of himself, as the first who solved the *Problem of computing the difference between the length of the infinite arch of an Hyperbola and its asymptote*, (a problem of great importance in the rectification of that curve,) although it had been solved before both by *M^r Laurin* and *Simpson*, in their Treatises of Fluxions; but caudily, and, as we believe, justly, attributes this misrepresentation of fact to the failure of *Landen's* memory, who was old, and much encumbered with other business. He then proceeds to demonstrate, *That the Rectification of the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses* (the mode recommended in the former Paper) *is circuitous, and such as requires much more Calculation than is requisite by an appropriate Theorem*. This proposition is fairly and fully proved. Indeed, no one who deserves the name of a Mathematician, can cast his eye on the new Theorem given in Art. 9 of this Paper, and withhold his assent from the proposition.

Among the observations which make up the second part of this Paper, the first is: that, when the convergency of the ascending series (which is a new series given in Art. 11 of this Paper) ceases to be swift, then a good rate of convergency will take place in some of the descending series to be found in his former paper on the Rectification of the Hyperbola, published by the *Royal Society* in their Transactions for 1802. This naturally introduces the consideration of the constant difference which subsists between the ascending and the descending series given in that Paper. It is a curious fact, that this constant difference is no other than the difference between the length of the infinite arch of the Hyperbola and its asymptote, as is easily perceived by what is done from p. 460 to p.

465 of the volume last mentioned, where also methods are given for computing it. But as methods of computing this difference have been proposed by *M^r Laurin*, *Simpson*, and *Landen*, he gives a brief statement of their methods, and compares them with such of his own as he has offered to the publick. The first comparison is of a series in Art. 808 of *M^r Laurin's* Fluxions, with another in Art. 435 of *Simpson's* Fluxions, and with a third given in the former part of this Paper, by which it appears that each of these series has, in this case, the same rate of convergency, and the three may be said to coincide. The next comparison is of *Landen's* method of computing the said difference by means of two Elliptic arches, with the series before mentioned; which affords a striking instance of the inutility of rectifying the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses. The third comparison is of a series derived from *Landen's* Theorem in his second Memoir, Art. 5, (for *Landen* cannot be said to have finished his work,) with those of *M^r Laurin* and *Simpson*, before mentioned; by which it appears, that when the transverse axis of an Hyperbola is much greater than the conjugate axis, the series thus obtained converges much faster than the old series: and consequently that *Landen* had some reason for setting a value on that Theorem. It appears also, by this comparison, that, when the transverse axis of the Hyperbola is less than the conjugate, *Landen's* method of computing the difference in question is not wanted, since the old series (which is simpler in its form than that which is derived from his Theorem,) converges swiftly enough to answer the purpose. He then proceeds to show, that, by a combination of *Landen's* Theorem with the new one given in the former part of this Paper, a series of more rapid convergency is obtained for computing the aforesaid difference; the geometrical progression which has place in it, decreasing somewhat swifter than the powers of the fraction $\frac{1}{10}$, even in the most disadvantageous case, viz. when the ratio of the axes of the Hyperbola is as 1000 to 756, or as 4 to 3 nearly: so that twelve terms of this series (its convergency being quickened by numeral co-efficients,) will

be sufficient for all common uses. Having obtained this series, he gives (in Art. 24,) a new and very convenient formula, for computing the difference before mentioned.

Mr. Hellins next (in Art. 25) adverts to p. 466 and 467 of the Philosophical Transactions for 1802, and shows that the difference between the ascending series and the descending series, there inserted, is the very expression which Mr. Landen obtained, by a very different method, in Art. 5 of his second Memoir, and on which he set a considerable value. This difference, as was before observed, (and is proved in this Article,) is the difference between the infinite arch of the Hyperbola and its asymptote; which difference he denotes by the letter d , the character by which we also, for the sake of brevity, shall denote that difference in the remaining part of our account of this Paper. It clearly appears, by the process in Art. 25 of this Paper, that, when the same geometrical progression obtains both in the ascending and in the descending series, the latter will be most eligible for arithmetical computation, on account of the absence of a column of quantities in that series which enters into the other. So that the formula for computing the value of d , by the descending series, will be more convenient in practice, than the formula for computing it by the ascending series. The first of these formulas (which may be called Landen's Theorem) is given in Art. 25, the second is given in Art. 27 of this Paper. In Art. 28, Mr. H. refers again to his Paper in the Philosophical Transactions for 1798, for a method of transforming the series given in Art. 25, for computing the value of d , into others which converge twice as fast: And, in the next Article, he transforms one of his own descending series for the rectification of the Hyperbola (inserted in the Philosophical Transactions for 1802,) into a pair of series for computing the value of d , each converging by the powers of the fraction $\frac{1}{2a}$; where a , which denotes the transverse semi-axis, is supposed to be much greater than 1, which denotes the conjugate semi-axis; so that this series will converge very swiftly. In Art. 30, the last mentioned pair of swiftly converging series is transformed into another

pair of a simpler form, but having the same rate of convergency; the operations being similar to those which he had described in his former papers inserted in the Philosophical Transactions for 1798 and 1800.

Art. 31 and 32 contain the investigation of the law which the co-efficients of the new pair of series observe *ad infinitum*; which law is discovered by a fluxionary process, for which we must refer our mathematical readers to the Paper itself, as it cannot be abridged, nor will the nature of our plan admit of its insertion here. Mr. H. then says, with great truth, "Thus, by the common application of *Sir Isaac Newton's doctrine of Fluxions* and infinite series, without any assistance from, or regard to, Landen's Theorem, we have obtained a pair of series for computing the value of d , which converge by the powers of $\frac{1}{2a}$, and of which we can find as many terms as we please. And by a similar process, may *Euler's series* for computing the quadrantal arch of an Ellipsis be obtained without any use of *Fagnani's Theorem*, or the *tentative methods*, and *strange artifices* as Mr. Woodhouse calls them, which appear in *Euler's Paper*."

In Art. 34, that ratio of the axes of an Hyperbola is pointed out, which serves as a limit of the use of the single series, and of the pair of series, before spoken of, for computing the value of d . And in the next Article, the pair of series is accommodated to the Hyperbola of which the semi-axes are 1 and b .

Mr. Hellins had shown in Art. 24, that, even in the most disadvantageous case, the value of d might be computed by a series converging somewhat swifter than the powers of $\frac{1}{3}$; he remarks in Art. 36, that series of much swifter convergency may be obtained for that purpose, by means of a transformation of the fluxion of the arch of the Hyperbola; but that such transformations were foreign from his present design.

By the examples which are given in the remaining pages of this Paper, the great advantage of descending series over ascending series, in the rectification of the Hyperbola, is very obvious; and Mr. H. concludes his Paper with this just remark: "In these examples the use and advantage

vantage of descending series appear: more examples of their utility might be given: and it might easily be shown, that there are cases in which such series have the advantage, even when the ascending series have a good rate of convergency. I trust, however, that enough has been done in this Paper, to satisfy all candid and competent judges of the matter, that *the rectification of the Hyperbola by means of two Ellipses is more curious than useful*; that the advantage of computing by descending series, is, in many cases, very great; and that such series will often answer the end of a transformation without the trouble of making it."

THE importance of the subjects of the two mathematical articles here noticed, will be acknowledged by all scientific men, and will justify the attention here bestowed upon them.

With respect to the two Authors, the distinction is very obvious. The one borrows largely from books; the other takes from his own store; the one delights in Gallicisms, and is often obscure; the other is plain and perspicuous.

More might be said respecting the different tempers of the writers, but nothing that would not be self-evident to every reader of the two Papers.

MR. URBAN, *Inner Temple.*

THE life of our great Poet Milton has occupied the attention of many able pens. Every minute occurrence of his memorable career, which industry, joined to the spirit of modern inquiry, could at this distance of time recover, has been laid before the publick, and points out the high estimation in which his memory is now held. Indeed no genuine admirer of the Poet will regard any circumstance connected with the family of Milton, or which serves to throw light on the transactions of those times, as trivial. Much curious information, and many valuable notices, collected by the late Mr. Thomas Warton, are prefixed to his edition of Milton's Juvenile Poems.

It is owing to the commendable zeal and assiduity of a late writer of his life, the Rev. H. J. Todd, that even an additional harvest has been gleaned to adorn what the Author modestly terms an "unadorned narration;" and from his acknowledged talents

and integrity, the writer is convinced he would not *intentionally* have inserted any thing that would not have borne the test of the strictest investigation. In *one* instance, however, this is not the case: and truth being the sole object in view, more especially that the character of Milton may not be liable to a charge of inconsistency, the writer of this may easily be pardoned for attempting to clear up a point relative to the Poet's first marriage into the family of Powell, in which, according to Mr. Todd's account, there is most certainly a considerable inaccuracy.

The first Life of Milton was written by Phillips, his sister's son, who may reasonably be supposed to know the circumstances connected with his uncle's first marriage. His words are: "About Whitsuntide (A. D. 1643) or a little after, he (Milton) took a journey into the country, nobody about him certainly knowing the reason:—after about a month's stay, home he returned a married man that went out a bachelor; his wife being Mary, the eldest daughter of Mr. Richard Powell, then a Justice of the Peace, of *Forrest-hill*, near Shotover in Oxfordshire." (Phillips's Life of Milton, p. 22.)

Mr. Todd (on the authority of the late Mr. T. B. Richards) asserts, that "Milton married a daughter of Justice Powell of *Sandford*, in the vicinity of Oxford, and lived at a house at *Forrest-hill*, about three miles from *Sandford*." (Todd's Life of Milton, p. 25, 2d edition.)

The late Mr. Richards had certainly great opportunities of making inquiries concerning the family into which Milton married, having resided many years in the early part of his life, at *Bensington*, within ten miles of Oxford. But, if indeed he ever did make inquiries, he has in this instance been most strangely mistaken; having confounded the family of Richard Powell, Justice of the Peace, of *Forrest-hill*, with an antient *Roman Catholic* family, the *Powells of Sandford*.

To prove this point satisfactorily, it will be necessary to pursue the following plan:

1. Give a genealogical sketch of the *Powells of Sandford*.
2. State the result of an accurate examination of the parish register at *Sandford*.

3. Collect the incidental notices scattered through the works of those eminent Antiquaries Hearne and Anthony Wood, relating to this family.

The first part proposed, the writer is the better enabled to accomplish, being possessed of a curious Pedigree of the family, commencing with Maurice Ap Howel of Guernan, co. Cardigan, to the death of the late John Powell, esq. of Sandford, A. D. 1730, without issue male.

1. The manor of Sandford belonged in ancient times to Sir Thomas de Saundford, who, in the reign of King Stephen, or thereabouts, gave it to the Knights Templars. At the suppression of religious houses, it was granted by King Henry VIII. to Edward [Edmund] Powell. (Tanner's Not. Mon. ed. 1744, p. 414.)

Arms: Arg. a lion ramp. Sab. debruised by a fess engrailed Gules.

1. Edmond P. (to whom the manor was granted) settled at Sandford 33 Henry VIII. A. D. 1542.

2. Edmond P. his son ob. 1592, seipuit. ap. Sandford. He left two sons, 1. Edmond, his successor; 2. Sir William P. of Tutbury and Rolleston Park, co. Stafford. ob. s. p. 1656.

3. Edmond P. married two wives, 1. Frances, daughter of — Gifford, of Chillington, co. Stafford, by whom he had three daughters, who died young and unmarried. Secondly, Cicely, daughter of Richard Fogge, of Dane-court, co. Kent, by whom he had two sons: 1. *Edmond*, born 1604, his successor; and 2. William: also six daughters. 1. Thomazine, born 1603, married Richard Spicer, of London, Doctor of Physick. 2. Philippa. 3. Anne, born 1607, married Richard Betham. 4. Mary, died young. 5. Mary, born 1609. 6. Cecilia, born 1611, buried at Sandford 1641. This Edmond P. dying in 1632, was succeeded by his eldest son.

4. Edmond P. born 1604, who married Winifred, daughter of John Throgmorton, of Coughton, co. Warr.; by whom he had four sons: 1. Edmond, died unmarried, v. p. 2. John, born 1632, who succeeded his father. 3. Francis, buried at Sandford, 1690. 4. Ambrose: — also three daughters. 1. Agnes, married to William Gould of Dunscombe, co. Devon. 2. Winifred, married to John White. 3. Mary, died unmarr. 1703.

5. John P. eldest surviving son,

born 1632, succeeded his father; married Catharine, daughter of William Petre, of Stamford Rivers, co. Essex, and died 1678. He had two sons: 1. Edmond, who married Anne, sister to Rowland fourth Lord Dormer, and died v. p. without issue. 2. John, who succeeded his father.

6. John P. married Anne, daughter of Thomas Wyndham, and dying Aug. 1730, without issue male, was succeeded in his estates by his two daughters and coheiresses. 1. Winifred, born 1705, married to Sir Francis Curzon, of Waterbury, co. Oxon. bart. whom she survived, and died 1764, s. p. 2. Catharine, born 1709, married in 1732 to Henry Roper, 10th Lord Teynham, and died 1765.

From this short, though comprehensive extract, comprising the names of every individual of the Powell family from the above-mentioned pedigree, it appears then, that from 1542, when the manor of Sandford was granted to Edmond P. till 1730, during a space of nearly 200 years, there never was any one of this family named Richard. That at the time Milton is said to have married (in 1643) Mary, the eldest daughter of Mr. Richard P. of Forrest-hill, Edmond Powell born 1604, fourth in descent from the original grantee, both in name and possession, was Lord of the Manor of Sandford; that he was then 39 years of age; and of his daughters, the third, named Mary, died unmarried in 1703.

Besides, the family were rigid Roman Catholics, and connected by marriage with several ancient families of that persuasion; as Gifford of Chillington, Napier of Halywell, co. Oxon. Dormer, Petre, Throgmorton, &c. as set forth in the Pedigree. That they continued in this profession is evident. The two daughters and coheiresses of the last John Powell married into two of the most ancient Roman Catholic families in England, Curzon* and Roper, although they have both since that time conformed to the Establishment. While Milton was a rigid Presbyterian, whose principles must have ill accorded with

* Henry Curzon, esq. of Waterbury, Colonel of the Oxford Volunteers, was a Candidate to represent the city of Oxford, in Parliament at the last general Election.

those of a Roman Catholic family; and when he was inveighing against Prelacy and Papal tyranny, it is quite absurd to suppose that he would become so closely allied to such an one; if he had, doubtless his enemies would not have failed to have published this circumstance to the world.

II. Parish Register of Sandford.

This Register, which has been kept with a very commendable neatness, has been most carefully examined. Milton, according to Phillips, was married in Oxfordshire; and it is reasonable to suppose, some notice might have been traced from this source. The entries of the Powell family commence in the middle of the 16th century, very shortly after they became seated at Sandford, and are brought down to the death of the last possessor, viz. "John P. esq. Lord of the Manor of Sandford, was buried Aug. 15, 1730;" and although these entries are numerous, yet no such marriage is noticed.

III. Incidental Notices from the writings of Anthony Wood and Hearne.

At Sandford "there is nothing extraordinary to be seen in the Church, besides some monuments of the Powells, Lords of the Manor here. The chief of these monuments is one in the South wall of Chancel*." (Leland's Itin. vol. 11. p. 119.)

Antient Crosses: Trees in orchards were often planted in the shape of them. "There was formerly such an orchard at the great Ivy-house at Sandford, near Oxford; the present trees in it are much later, though there is now (1724) in it a very old holly tree, the oldest, I think, I ever saw, round which there was formerly a bench, where, in summer time, the present Mr. Powell's great grandfather used to entertain his friends." (Hearne's Rob. of Glou. p. 638.)

Nunnery of Littlemore, near Sandford: "I refer to Leland's Itinerary, for what I have said about the nunnery of Littlemore or Sandford; but I shall observe in this place, that the Minshery, Minchery, or Minchion Ree, belongs to the Powells of Sandford, being purchased by an ancestor of theirs in the third year of King Edward VI. of Sir John Williams (afterwards Lord Williams) of Thame. *Ex cod. MS. penes antecessimum virum Joannem Powell de Sandford, a nigerum.*" (Hist. Glaston. pref. p. 16.)

A. D. 1661. June 29, "A. W. was at Sandford, near Oxon, in the house of John Powell, gent. which was a house and preceptory sometime belonging to the Knights Templars. He took a note of some arms in a bay window in a low room there." (Ant. à Wood's Diary.)

These celebrated Antiquaries passed their lives at Oxford, within three miles of Sandford, and most surely have been acquainted with the circumstance of Milton being connected with this family, and knowing it, would not have failed to have alluded to it. Hearne, indeed, appears to have lived on very friendly terms with the last possessor of the estate, whom he terms *vir antecessimus*. Wood made large collections relating to Oxfordshire families, now in the Ashmolean Museum, from which some extracts respecting this family, about the time of Milton's first marriage, are printed in Guillim's Heraldry (edit. 1724, p. 273); yet not the most distant hint occurs of any such marriage.

From what has been written we may fairly conclude, that the antient family of Powell of Sandford was in no way connected with the family into which Milton married, as related by Mr. Todd, in his Life of the Poet. Of what family Mr. Richard Powell, Jus-

* Erected to the memory of Sir William Powell of Tutbury and Rolleston Park, co. Stafford, second son of Edmond, and grandson of Edmond P. to whom the manor was originally granted in 1542. He died Dec. 15, 1656, æt. 23. Hearne has printed the inscription, by which it appears that he left his estates to the Powells of Sandford, in whose possession they continued till the death of the last John Powell in 1730, when, on a division between his two daughters and coheirs, Rolleston Park was assigned to Catharine, his youngest daughter, married to Henry Roper, Lord Teynham. The present Lord T. grandson of the said Catharine P. is now the owner of them.

TUTBURY. In this parish, about a mile South of the town, is Rolleston Park. Sir Simon Degge says, "at Rolleston Park, a mile South of Tutbury, is the seat of [John] Powell, that was [great nephew] to Sir William P. Knight, and courtier in the time of King James; of whose son, as I take it, he purchased this Park, and made the Lodge his seat." (Shaw's History of Staffordshire, vol. 1. p. 58. MS. addit. to Edeswick.)

tice of the Peace, of Forrest-hill, was, the writer is unable to say. The former appears to have maintained a considerable degree of splendour during two centuries, and to have been connected with several noble families, the latter was not *perhaps* of any note or standing in the county.

Yours, &c. C. TORRENS.

Narrative of an Expedition to explore the Territory beyond the Blue Mountains; by an Officer of the 101st Reg.

THE Territory beyond the Blue Mountains has long been an object of considerable anxiety & conjecture; not only among the inhabitants of New Holland itself, but even among the learned men of almost every civilized Country in the World—an anxiety not springing from idle curiosity, but deriving its origin from that laudable thirst of knowledge, to which may be attributed almost every great and useful discovery, of which the modern world so justly boasts. The investigation of this hitherto unknown Country presents an object in all respects worthy the speculation and research of the Philosopher and the Merchant. With this impression, a party of spirited individuals, residing at Sydney-Town, having obtained the sanction of the Governor, undertook to pass the mountain-boundary which had so often baffled the labours of previous Adventurers; and the result of this last effort of perseverance has not only justified the undertaking, but realized the calculations of those who have accomplished the extraordinary task.

On the 9th of April 1814, the party, consisting of 27 persons, (of whom 19 were workmen, the rest being Gentlemen well acquainted with Geology, Botany, &c.) set out from Sydney; and having by the 13th reached the celebrated Cataract (which supplies the River emptying itself into Shark's Bay), where all prior attempts had ceased, they immediately commenced active operations. The Cataract issues from a large circular opening in the immense ridge of rocks composing the front line of the Blue Mountains, the terrific barrier which runs from one end of the Country to the other, preserving almost the whole way the regular perpendicular height of about three hundred

feet. The aperture through which this awful Cataract falls in one column to its basin, is about 120 feet from the ground, being rather more than 30 feet less than the celebrated Falls of Niagara. The first idea which suggested itself to the Travellers, was to explore a passage through the fissure from whence the Cataract issued; but, on more accurate observation, it was ascertained that the column of water completely filled the whole diameter of the opening; so that no alternative remained but to scale the awful wall of rocks.

After innumerable attempts, they at length adopted a plan used many years since in repairing the great Tower of the Monastery at Raucoux in Westphalia—by making a hole in the rock at about two feet from the ground, and driving the end of a strong stake into the opening, and so continuing to make fresh holes (each two feet above the former, not in a straight, but in a slanting direction of ascent), and to introduce as many stakes, they were enabled to construct a firm flight of steps, connected by coarse basket-work, about the texture of common hurdles, the materials being furnished in abundance from the neighbouring woods. This was a task requiring of necessity much labour and considerable time, so that it was not until the 27th the workmen attained an elevation parallel with the upper part of the opening through which the Cataract rushed; they were, however, most agreeably surprized to find that here the rock ended, the immense continuation of the precipice consisting of a kind of bituminous Coblon earth, firm, but very yielding to the spade. By the following day was hollowed out a space sufficient for the workmen to move at will with their wheelbarrows, &c. and the noble undertaking was now determined on of excavating a flight of steps to the summit! Within about thirty feet of the top, the labourers discovered the petrified skeleton of an unknown animal, the head and body resembling those of a bear, with a tail similar to that of a crocodile, only not so long. It is a remarkable fact, that when about 140 feet from the ground, the thermometer (Fahrenheit) fell to 37, and continued so till the party had ascended within fifty feet of the surface, when