deserve to find many readers. They are greatly superior to the average of what is called religious literature.

The *Canadian Almanac*, sent us by Messrs Cobb, Clark & Co., of Toronto, is badly printed on poor paper, but contains a great deal of useful information.

We have to thank Mr. Mackeson for two excellent books of reference, *Low's Handbook to the Charities of London* (Low & Co.), and the *Guide to the Churches of London* (Metzler & Co.). Both are creditable to the editor; but the latter at least should be bound in cloth. Nothing is less adapted for reference than a thick octavo pamphlet in a paper cover.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

Theology.

Breviary Offices, from Lauds to Compline, 12mo. 3/6 cl.
Broadus's Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, 5th edit. 6/
Cheerful Words, Sermons, edited by W. Hyslop, cr. 8vo. 5/ cl.
Christianity in Great Britain, 12mo. 2/6 cl.
How's Daily Family Prayers for Churchmen, 5th edit. 1/6 cl.
Jelf's (G. E.) Our Treasure of Light, 12mo. 1/6 cl. lp.
Our Sunday Book for Holy Thought, &c., edited by E. Bohn, 2 vols. imp. 8vo. 35/
Palmer's Three Wet Sundays with the Book of Joshua, 1/6 cl.
Rouse's (Rev. N.) Humanity of Christ, cr. 8vo. 4/ cl.
Supernatural Religion, 2 vols. 8vo. 24/ cl.
Talmage's (Rev. T. de W.) Burning Words, with Portrait, 3/6
Thiselton's (Rev. A. C.) Church and Home Lessons from the Book of Hosea, cr. 8vo 5/ cl.
Whedon's (D D.) Popular Commentary upon New Testament, Vol. 1, Gospels, cr. 8vo 5/ cl.

Philosophy.

Kant's Critical Philosophy, by J. P. Mahaffy, Vol. 1, Pt. 3, 3/

Law.

Franklyn's (H. B.) Outlines of Military Law, 3/6 cl. swd.

Poetry.

O'Shaughnessy's (A.) Music and Moonlight, cr. 8vo. 7/6 cl.

Music.

Fifteen Soprano and Mezzo-Soprano Songs, as Sung by Nilsson, &c, 4to. 1/ swd.
Westropp's Gems of Sacred Songs, 4to. 1/ swd.

History.

Chesney's (Col. C. C.) Waterloo Lectures, 3rd edit. 8vo. 10/6
Hosack's (J.) Mary Queen of Scots, and her Accusers, 2nd edit. Vol. 2, 8vo. 16/6 cl.
Hudson's (E. H.) Life and Times of Louisa, Queen of Prussia, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 21/ cl.
Jones's (C. A.) Life of S. Frances de Chantal, cr. 8vo. 5/ cl.
Poore (Rev. J. L.), Memoir, by J. Corbin, cr. 8vo. 7/6 cl.

Philology.

Kennedy's (B. H.) Studia Sophoclea, Part 1, 8vo. 5/ cl.

Science.

British Pharmacopœia, with Additions for 1874, cr. 8vo 6/ cl.
Meade's Manual for Students, 4th edit., Practical Medicine, by A. Silver, fcap. 12/6 cl.
North's (O.) Practical Assayer, cr. 8vo. 7/6 cl.
Pavy's (F. W.) Treatise on Food and Dietetics, 8vo. 16/ cl.
Salmon's (J.) Analytic Geometry of Three Dimensions, 3rd edit. 8vo. 14/ cl.
Smith's Manual for Medical Officers of Health, 2nd edit. 8/6
Squire's (P.) Pharmacopœia of Twenty-Two of the London Hospitals, 3rd edit. 12mo. 6/ cl.

General Literature.

Aguilar's (G.) Mother's Recompense, 23rd edit. cr. 8vo. 6/ cl.
Ballantyne's (R. M.) Tales of Adventure by Flood, Field, and Mountain, 12mo. 3/6 cl.
Bosanquet's (C. B. P.) Handy Book for Visitors of the Poor in London, 12mo. 2/ cl. lp.
Carlier's (A. G.) Legend of the Hone-Fos, and other Tales, 2/6
Carlyle's Works, People's Edit., 'Wilhelm Meister,' Vol. 3, 2/
Church of England Temperance Chronicle, Vol. 1, fol. 1/6 swd.
Collins's National Ready-Reckoner, 12mo. 3/6 cl.
Debrett's Illustrated House of Commons, 1874, cr. 8vo. 6/6 cl.
Dickens's Works, Illustrated Library Edition, 'Nicholas Nickleby,' Vol. 2, 8vo. 10/ cl.
Ellis's (Mrs) Mothers of Great Men, new edit. cr. 8vo. 6/ cl.
Evans's Tables of Discount and Profit, 20th edit. imp. 4to. 21/
Fawcett's (H.) Manual of Political Economy, 4th edit. 12/ cl
Gouffé's (J.) Royal Pastry and Confectionery Book, roy. 8vo. 36/
Guerini's (Prof. G.) Fireside Entertainments, 8vo. 10/6 cl.
Havegal's (F. R.) Under the Surface, 12mo. 5/ cl.
Heath's (J. D.) Complete Croquet Player, 12mo. 1/ bds.
Herings's (J.) Through the Mist, 3 vols. cr. 8vo. 31/6
Lytton's (Lord) My Novel, Vol. 1, Knebworth Edition, 3/6 cl.
May's (K. E.) Life at Hartwell, 12mo. 2/6 cl.
Oliphant's (L.) Piccadilly, 5th edit. 12mo. 2/6 bds.
Oliver Wyndham, 3rd edit. 12mo. 3/6 cl.
Palmer's (E.) Stories Told in a Fisherman's Cottage, 12mo. 2/ cl.
Pennell's Puck on Pegasus, new edit. cr. 8vo. 5/ cl.
Prince Florestan de Monaco, La Chute du, Racontée par Lui-même, 8vo. 5/ cl.
Rose, Robin, and Little May, 12mo. 1/6 cl.
Rossetti's (C. G.) Annus Domini, 16mo. 3/6 cl. lp.
Story of Elsie Marcel, 12mo 2/6 cl.
Temple Bar, Vol 40. 8vo. 5/6 cl.
Todd's (Rev. J.) The Daughter at School, new edit. post 8vo. 3/6 cl.
Trollope's (A.) Eustace Diamonds, new edit. cr. 8vo. 2/6 bds.
Trollope's (A.) Lady Anna, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 21/ cl.
Tweedie's Home, a Book for the Family, new edit. post 8vo. 3/6
Woodward's (T. W.) Treatise on Nature of Man, cr 8vo. 7/6 cl.

'ETRUSCAN RESEARCHES.'

Cambridge, March, 1874.

Having read through Mr. Isaac Taylor's 'Etruscan Researches,' which are at present attracting some attention, I may be allowed to make the following remarks. It is not my intention to write anything like a review of the work. I do not feel myself competent for such a task, from the difficulty of the subject and the number of languages with which the book deals. All that I want to say is, that Mr. Taylor has fallen, over and over again, into the strange mistake of citing as *Turkish* (Turanian) words which are really either *Arabic* (Semitic) or *Persian* (Indo-European). Every Orientalist knows that the Turkish of Constantinople is a composite language, like Hindustānī, and that it has adopted a host of Arabic and Persian vocables of all kinds. Hence those who are not familiar with these other tongues must use Turkish vocabularies for philological purposes with great caution. How far Mr. Taylor's arguments are affected by this pervading error, it is easy to see. A very little care would have kept him clear of it, as in one or two cases he has had an inkling of the truth.

Let me give some examples. Page 99, "the Turkic *ghoul*" is in reality the Arabic *ghūl*, an evil spirit often mentioned in ante-islamic poetry. Page 102, "the substantive *fena* (*vana*)," meaning 'destruction,' 'annihilation,' 'death,' is the common Arabic word *fanā*. On the same page Mr. Taylor remarks that "the suffix *d* or *t* in Turkish commonly denotes abstract nouns, as in *melekyut* 'sovereignty,' from *melek* a 'king,' *munidat* 'a proclaiming,' from *munadi* a 'herald,' *nejdet* 'courage,' *nedamet* 'repentance.'" It so happens that the termination *d* or *t* is not so used in Turkish, and that the words cited in evidence are all pure Arabic: *malakūt*, *malik*; *munādāt*, *munādī*; *najdat*, *nadāmat*. Page 108, "Closely related to the Tungusic *han* we have," says Mr. Taylor, "the Turkish words *jan* 'soul,' *jinn* a 'spirit,' and *jen-aze* a 'corpse.'" And again, "we find a close approximation to the Etruscan and Finnic forms in the Turkish word *khayal*, a 'spectre' or 'ghost.'" Unluckily, *jān* is a Persian word, whilst *jinn* (a collective, 'spirits') is Arabic. The latter has nothing whatever to do with the equally Arabic word *jināza* or *janāza*, 'a bier or corpse,' which comes from the radical *janaza*, in Ethiopic *ganaza*, 'to wrap in a shroud.' *Khayāl* is also a well-known Arabic word. Page 113, "the Turkish *nissti*, 'annihilation,' or *ezhdiha*, a 'dragon,' may perhaps furnish an appropriate meaning," namely for the word NUSTHIEEI or NUSTHIEH. *Nīstī* is a Persian word, denoting 'non-existence,' from *nīst* 'is not,' compounded of the negative *na* and *ast* or *hast* ('est,' 'is'). As for *azhdahā*, I supposed that every philologist knew this modern Persian representative of the old Bactrian *azhi dahāka*, 'the biting snake.' Page 119, "The word *lasa* would therefore become *jaza*, and the Turkish dictionary gives the word *jeza*, with the signification of 'judgment' or 'retribution.'" This is the Arabic *jazā*, 'requital, recompense, retribution, reward or punishment.' On p.125, Mr. Taylor explains *Lemures* to mean 'maternal ancestors,' because "the Turkish word *li-umm* means 'on the mother's side,' 'maternal.'" Most unhappily *li-umm* is Arabic, *li* being in that language a preposition, meaning 'to,' 'belonging to,' and *umm* the common word for 'mother,' in Hebrew *ēm*, Syriac *emmā*. Page 128, "the Turkish *sihhat*, 'health,'" is again Arabic, *ṣiḥḥat*; and the same is the case with "the Turkish *mal*, 'fortune,'" p. 130, which is the Arabic *māl*, a secondary formation from *mā li*, 'what (belongs) to.' Mr. Taylor explains *Camillus* to mean 'bearer,' p. 151, and identifies it with the name of the animal, the *camel*. He adds, that "in the Albanian language, which preserves so many Etruscan words" (?), "we have the precise word χαμαλ, a 'carrier,' a 'porter.' This leads us to the Turkish *hammal*, a 'porter,' a 'carrier,'" &c. Unfortunately *ḥammāl* is an Arabic word, which the Turks borrowed from the Arabs, and the Albanians in their turn from the Turks. As for *camel*, it is the Greek and Latin form of the Hebrew and Phœnician *gamal*, the origin of which I cannot here trace. Page 160 affords one of the worst examples of Mr. Taylor's ignorance of Arabic and Turkish. "In seventeen of the Tatar dialects belonging to the Turkic family the word *bar-mach* denotes a 'finger,' and in Turkish *mikh-lab* means the 'clawed foot' of a bird or animal." *Parmaḳ* is really the Turkish for 'finger,' but *mikhlab* is an Arabic noun of instrument, formed, according to a definite rule, from the verb *khalaba*, 'he cut and rent.' At p. 193, Mr. Taylor is strongly tempted to identify the words NAPER, RAS, and TENE, with "the Turkish numeral adjuncts, *nefer*, *ras*, and *dane*, meaning respectively 'souls,' 'head,' and 'corn,' which are used in the numeration of men, of animals, and of things"; but he cannot set Kasembeg's authority at defiance. In fact, *nafar* and *rās* (or rather *ra's*) are Arabic words, signifying 'persons (from three to ten in number),' and 'head'; whilst *dāna* is Persian for 'a grain.' Page 204, *ajil* and *ejel* are old Arabic words, *ājil* and *ajal*, and cannot possibly have anything to do with Turkic or Mongolic words meaning 'a year.' The same may be said of *nessl*, 'progeny, race, posterity,' p. 216, more correctly *nasl*, which occurs in the Kor'ān. Page 235, the "Turkish *sag-ird*" is in reality a Persian word, *shāgird*. Page 260, "'strength,' 'force,' is *kuvvet* in Osmanli," says Mr. Taylor. Very true; but this is merely the Turkish way of pronouncing the Arabic *ḳūwat*, from *ḳawiya*, 'to be strong.' At p. 290 Mr. Taylor commits a strange mistake in imagining *kal-eb*, 'a mould,' to be a Turkish word. *Ḳālab* or *ḳālib* is the Arabic adaptation of the Greek καλάπους or καλόπους, 'a shoemaker's last,' in general 'a form (forma, Span. horma de zapatero), shape, mould.' Page 295, "the Turkish *zanu*, 'knee,'" is in reality Persian, and is identical with γόνυ and *genu*. Page 301, "the Turkish *jessed*, a 'body,'" is again an Arabic word, *jasad*. Page 304, "In Turkish," says Mr. Taylor, "*takdim* is a 'presentation,' *tak-dimmet* is to 'present,' *tok-met* to 'pour out,' and *tak-disset* to 'consecrate.'" Of these words, *tok-met* represents, I suppose, Redhouse's "dùkmek"; the other three are Arabic. *Taḳdīm* and *taḳdimat* are verbal nouns, formed, according to fixed rule, from one of the conjugations of the radical *ḳadima*; and *taḳdīs* and *taḳdisat* are the same forms of the radical *ḳadusa*. Both are well-known Hebrew roots. *Quid plura?*

Wm. Wright.

Trieste, March, 1874.

Perhaps you will allow me a few words concerning Mr. Taylor's 'Etruscan Researches' (London, Macmillan, 1874), as a preliminary to further notice.

The Mongol theory is so valuable, that I can only hope it will be taken up by M. Vámbéry, the highest living authority; and the remarks upon the great tomb-building races, though not new, have much of truth in them. Unhappily, Mr. Taylor has confounded in the simplest way Turkish with Sanskrit and Arabic, Persian, Hindi, and goodness knows how many other languages. By borrowing from some score of Mongol dialects, he has invented a highly composite tongue, which painfully reminds us of "the voice of Israel from Mount Sinai." And he has by no means made the best of the Turkish forms; for instance, the terminal vowels of the past tense, which still survive in Usmanli speech.

The carelessness of the comments is stupendous. Upon the cover, and at p. 367, we find the well-known Trojan horse, and on the right hand the open door. Upon the latter which acts as framework, we read clearly and distinctly HAINS, *i. e.* Hellenes. Will it be believed that Mr. Taylor (p. 368) assures us that it "bears the unmistakable label HUINS"; that "the word (Hlins) has hitherto been dismissed by the commentators as an unintelligible equivalent of ΔΑΝΑΟΙ," and that he indulges us with a whole page about the Huns. Even if the word were written HVINS, it would still read "Hellenes," for the L in Etruscan has many forms, of which one is V, with the left leg slightly shortened.

Yet the substratum of fact appears to me clear. Etruscan antiquities occupied much of my time in 1852, and I hope soon to apply the Mongol theory to the now well-known cemetery at Bologna.

Meanwhile, I would invite Mr. Hyde Clarke to attack the "Caucasic solution" of the Etruscan problem, which Mr. Taylor, though he afterwards "eliminates" it, considers (p. 355) not impossible.

RICHARD F. BURTON.

SHAKSPEARE'S 'EDWARD THE THIRD.'

Maidenhead, March, 1874.

ONE hundred and fourteen years ago Capel printed, in his small volume of 'Prolusions,' the historical play of 'Edward the Third,' announcing it as a work by Shakspeare. Such it undoubtedly is; but when Malone published his 'Supplement' in 1780 he omitted it, thereby discountenancing the notion that it, or any part of it, had proceeded from the pen of our great dramatist. In what follows I am about to state some of the grounds for my entire conviction that Capel was right, and that the play ought to have been included, not only in the Folio of 1623, but in every edition of Shakspeare's productions from that day to the present.

I have taken considerable pains with the subject, and, in my opinion, it is worthy of all the labours of the best of our Shakspearean scholars, whether on this or on the other side of the Atlantic. I shall be as brief as possible, and I hope to avoid mistakes; but it is not pleasant, when walking, to know that there is somebody close behind anxious to trip up one's heels. Let us all humbly strive to attain the same end; and no man ought to feel more humble than even the ablest commentator on Shakspeare. What a fly is he on the wheel!

'Edward the Third' was first printed in 1596, a year earlier than any known play by Shakspeare, and it was reprinted for the same bookseller (Cuthbert Burby, or perhaps *Burbadge*) in 1599; in the interval came out Shakspeare's 'Richard the Second,' 'Richard the Third,' 'Romeo and Juliet,' (all three in 1597), 'Love's Labour's Lost' and 'The First Part of Henry the Fourth' in 1598. All the rest appeared in 1600 or afterwards. The second impression of 'Edward the Third' bears date in 1599, when, as far as we are aware, no drama by Shakspeare was originally issued; it was anonymous in both instances, and so were Shakspeare's 'Richard the Second' and 'Richard the Third' in their first editions of 1597. The same reason for the non-appearance of the author's name might apply in 1596 as in 1597; and it was not until 1598 that Shakspeare's name was prefixed to 'Richard the Second' and 'Richard the Third.' The causes why dramatic authorship was at that date avowed or unavowed are but very imperfectly, if at all, understood.

In attributing 'Edward the Third' to Shakspeare, I rely confidently not more upon particular passages and expressions, than upon the whole spirit and character of the performance. Capel did not assign a single reason, whether general or special, admitting at the same time that there was no external evidence upon the point. I rely upon internal evidence only; and I defy anybody at all acquainted with the style and language of our great dramatist to read 'Edward the Third' from end to end without arriving at the decision that it must have been the work of Shakspeare, and of no other poet. I shall not make extracts to establish this general proposition, but content myself with a few quotations, which, as I contend, lead by a different road to the very gate of truth.

Let it be borne in mind always that no printed play by Shakspeare is so old by a year as 'Edward the Third.' In act ii. sc. 1 we read as follows: the Countess of Salisbury is persuading the King to relinquish his suit to her to be faithless to her husband's bed, and she asks,

> Will your sacred self
> Commit high treason 'gainst the King of heaven,
> To stamp his image in forbidden metal?

In 'Measure for Measure,' act ii. sc. 4, Angelo tells Isabella that he will not, as a judge,

> remit
> Their saucy sweetness that do coin heaven's image
> In stamps that are forbid.

Everybody must remember the dispute among commentators as to the words in 'Hamlet,' act ii. sc. 2, "a good kissing carrion," Warburton contending that they should be "a *god* kissing carrion"; and he was right, though opposed to all the old copies, where we read "For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a good kissing carrion," &c.

In 'Edward the Third' we find the following lines given to Warwick:—

> The freshest summer's day doth soonest taint
> The loathed carrion that it seems to kiss.

Again, in 'The Merchant of Venice,' act iv. sc. 1, we have this passage:—

> And earthly power doth then show likest God's,
> When mercy seasons justice.

'Edward the Third' contains the subsequent couplet:—

> And kings approach the nearest unto God
> In giving life and safety unto men.

Deloney published his novel of 'Jack of Newbery' in the same year as 'Edward the Third,' and there we find even a still closer copy: "Herein do men come nearest unto God in shewing mercy and compassion."

Everybody is so well acquainted with the famous character of Prince Henry given by the Archbishop in 'Henry the Fifth' that I need not quote it; but I ask any reader to compare with it the subsequent impassioned lines on the Countess of Salisbury, put into the mouth of Edward, and to say if they could proceed from any pen but that of Shakspeare.

> When she would talk of peace, methinks her tongue
> Commanded war to prison; when of war,
> It waken'd Cæsar from his Roman grave
> To hear war beautified by her discourse.
> Wisdom is foolishness but in her tongue;
> Beauty a slander but in her fair face:
> There is no summer but in her cheerful looks,
> No frosty winter but in her disdain.

Who could have written this and a great deal more in this play but Shakspeare? I might quote the whole quarto, for *it is all his.*

It contains also allusions to contemporaneous works. Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander' was not printed (as far as is now known) until 1598, but many manuscript copies of so famous a production were in circulation before 1596, and, in reference to the story, the succeeding lines are put into the mouth of Edward the Third, speaking of the object of his passion:—

> Fairer thou art by far than Hero was;
> Beardless Leander not so strong as I:
> He swom an easy current for his love;
> But I will through a Hellespont of blood
> Arrive at Sestos where my Hero is.

Hellespont is absurdly misprinted *Helly spout* in both the old copies of 'Edward the Third,' for I have collated them throughout. But this is not the only reference to a popular poem, though nobody (least of all, perhaps, Capel) has hitherto understood it, or the high interest attached to it.

Shakspeare's 'Lucrece' had been printed in 1594, two years before 'Edward the Third' came from the press. The Countess of Salisbury has thrown herself at the King's feet, and is threatening to stab herself rather than submit to his lawless passion; Edward, overcome by her virtue and courage, and resolving to conquer his hopeless folly, thus exclaims, alluding clearly to Shakspeare's own 'Lucrece,' then in the height of its popularity:—

> Arise, true English lady; whom our isle
> May better boast of, than e'er Roman might
> Of her, whose ransack'd treasury hath task'd
> The vain endeavour of so many pens.

Surely this allusion is evident enough, and immediately connects Shakspeare with the admirable play under consideration. After what I have said, I need not dwell upon particular passages of poetry; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting a few lines where Edward instructs his secretary-poet thus to address in verse the lady upon whom the King dotes:—

> Out with the moon-line! I will none of it,
> And let me have her liken'd to the sun:
> Say, she hath thrice more splendour than the sun:
> That her perfection emulates the sun,
> That she breeds sweets as plenteous as the sun;
> That she doth thaw cold winter like the sun,
> That she doth cheer fresh summer like the sun,
> That she doth dazzle gazers like the sun:
> And in this application of the sun,
> Bid her be free and general as the sun,
> Who smiles upon the basest weed that grows
> As lovingly as on the fragrant rose.

The three last acts of the drama are devoted to the wars in France, and to the victories of Cressy and Poictiers, all conducted with true Shakspearean energy and vigour, and concluding with the delivery of the burgesses of Calais from their halters by the intercession of the Queen. Nothing can be finer in its way, but the play must have taken long in the representation. This portion of the subject is, of course, from Holinshed, while the love-scenes of the first two acts are from 'The Palace of Pleasure,' a book so often used by Shakspeare.

It seems wonderful that so little attention has ever been paid to this noble historical drama; for I cannot call to mind any allusion to it either in ancient or more modern times. It ought to have preceded 'Richard the Second' in the folios, and in every other edition of Shakspeare. It is no doubtful play. If instead of such paltry work as picking holes in old coats, the New Shakspere Society would reprint this grand historical drama, they would confer a lasting benefit upon our early theatrical literature, and nobody would be more thankful than J. PAYNE COLLIER.

P.S. Some years ago a proposal was made to me to collect and correct all the old plays attributed on any authority to Shakspeare, but even then I found my failing energies and industry unequal to the task: I, however, collated several, including the two impressions of 'Edward the Third' in 1596 and 1599, both in the library of the Duke of Devonshire; and besides the few I have here pointed out, that single drama contains many other parallels and illustrations of quite as much importance. Let the New Shakspere Society set boldly to work, and reprint *all* those imputed plays.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH.

IN the review, in your number for March 14, of the Correspondence of Lord Ellenborough, published by me, two charges are brought against his memory. One is, that he concocted an "artful scheme" to evade responsibility in his orders to Generals Nott and Pollock as to the campaign of 1842. This view has, I know, already been started by vehement partisans of Sir George Pollock, and writers closely connected with Lord Ellenborough's opponents in the old Board of Directors. If true, it would entirely deprive him of that claim to be considered a high-minded and honourable statesman, which the reviewer himself seems to allow him. And what does this injurious interpretation rest upon? It is clear that, as his letters show, he regarded a march on Cabul from the first as a hazardous enterprise. Another disaster like that of the Khyber and our Empire was, in his opinion, lost. But when, by that energy for which your reviewer gives him credit, he had remedied many deficiencies in the condition of the armies as to supplies and means of transport, when partial successes had raised their spirit, he did not feel justified in absolutely forbidding, against the opinion or without the support of the opinion of the Generals, an advance, which, if successful, would produce such valuable results. To one thing only he was always opposed, any concession to the views of a section of "politicals" which might entangle us in permanent engagements as to Afghan affairs. This may have been right or wrong, but does it justify an assumption of "disingenuousness and shrinking from responsibility," which you admit to have been "alien from his character."

The second charge, of "believing he could teach war-worn Generals their art," especially referring, it seems, to the China operations, seems to me to confute the former. Were Nott and Pollock so different from Gough in capacity that it was "disingenuous" to leave any discretion to the two former, and impertinence to interfere with the latter? But with reference to China, Lord Ellenborough possessed special information, derived from one of the very few Englishmen then familiar with the waters of the Yang-tse Kiang. My father, the late Lord Colchester, had surveyed