

TWELVE YEARS
OF THE
WESTMINSTER REVIEW
1824 - 1836

DEPOSITED BY THE FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

I x M

. 102 . 1927



ACC. NO. **UNACC.** DATE

Twelve Years of the Westminster Review.

1824-1836.

Thesis submitted for the degree of M.A.

Thomas Richard Davies.

April 30 1927.

Chapter One.

The Rise of the Great Political Reviews in England.

The opening of the nineteenth century marked a new era in periodical literature. It marked the beginning of the great reviews. The function of the review was to "discuss works of literature, art and science, to consider national policy and public events, to enlighten its readers upon these subjects and to award praise or censure to authors and statesmen. It did not publish original matter, but confined itself to commenting upon or criticising the works and doings of others".(1)

During the eighteenth century, most reviews were of very slight importance and were under the control or influence of the publishers, who used them to advertise their wares, for at that time book-selling and book-publishing were but parts of a single enterprise. The sole object of the spurious criticism in these reviews was to increase the prosperity of the publisher. The public was not long in becoming conscious of this fraud, and the reviews ceased to hold their sympathy or command their respect. The reviews soon lost all authority.

About the beginning of the nineteenth century, a group of young Whigs, conceived the notion of a review

to be entirely free from the influence of publishers, having a wider range and a more elevated line of thought, than any of its predecessors. These young men undertook the enterprise of founding such a review as somewhat of an adventure. The first number made a cautious appearance in the year 1802, under the name of the Edinburgh Review. To the astonishment of its founders, its success was immediate and lasting. It came at a time when people were clamoring for a solid, unbiased critical periodical. Almost at once the Edinburgh satisfied this great public need.

The Edinburgh Review was controlled by an editor who selected his contributors. It was designed to promulgate definite literary and political views, with which the ideas expressed by the contributors in their articles had to be in harmony. These contributors walked under a cloak of anonymity and it was not long before the editorial "we" of the review was regarded as a pet^Nifical authority. The opinions which it fostered were heeded with respect. At first it took no particular stand in regard to party politics. Its founders happened to be Whigs but some of its early contributors were Tories of the most rigid type, who supported

it without feeling any pangs of inconsistency.

The early years of the nineteenth century were years when almost every form of expression was impregnated with politics, when "ideas for social reform sprang from the ground of personal sentiment". (2) In such an age, it was impossible for such a review as the Edinburgh, which discussed this poetry of reform, together with national policy and public events, to remain aloof from party politics for any length of time.

As years passed the Edinburgh began more and more to emphasize a political platform. Since the majority of contributors were Whigs, this political platform tended to be a reflexion of Whiggism. Some of the Tory contributors regarded this tendency with alarm. They were gradually realizing that the Tories had slight chance of fair representation in its articles. Anything it reviewed which showed any inclination to favour the Tory field of "things as they are" received unfavorable comment. In the criticism of literature, as we shall see in chapter five, the primary consideration was, not to give the "Tory Dogs" the best of it. Walter Scott, one of the Tory contributors, apparently spoke to Jeffrey, the editor of the review, expressing the wish that the periodical should continue as a purely literary organ and that all political

considerations be laid aside. Jeffrey's remark in response that "the review, in short, has but two legs to stand on. Literature, no doubt, is one of them, but its right leg is politics"⁽³⁾, caused Scott to realise the futility of expecting impartial criticism. He and other Tory writers ceased to contribute.

The idea of the formation of a periodical to defend the Tory party was stimulated by the success of the Whig organ. Such a project had long been discussed by Stratford and George Canning, and Gifford. It was not, however, until 1809 that the first number was published, under the title of the Quarterly Review, by John Murray. Scott immediately became an enthusiastic supporter. For years he remained the greatest contributor and dominant figure. Many other Tories rallied round this new champion with enthusiasm. It was not long before the Quarterly became a worthy opponent to the already firmly-established Edinburgh Review. Unlike the Edinburgh, however, the Quarterly was founded with purely political aspirations. It made professions as a literary periodical, but these professions were a mere disguise to cover up its political tendencies. Its real object was to avert the dangers

threatened by the spread of the Whigs and the Edinburgh Review to church and state.

In a later chapter we shall discuss the rise of the Radical party, and the founding of the Westminster Review as the political and literary organ of that party.

These reviews, the Edinburgh, the Quarterly, and the Westminster, appeared quarterly. They were more elaborate than any of the reviews of the earlier century. They contained a great deal more material. The articles in them were, on the whole, much better written, some of them them having real literary value. Political discussion and literary criticism were the predominant features in these reviews. It was unfortunate, however, that the contributors wrote from a biased, partisan point of view. Most of the articles are weighty bludgeons striking cruel and bruising blows at each other. These reviews are heavy lumbering organs, as compared with the monthly miscellanies that were rapidly making their appearance, but they play a very important part in the political warfare of the nineteenth century.

Notes on Chapter One.

1...Cambridge History of English Literature.

.....Volume 12, page 141

2...Hazlitt on English Literature. By Jacob Zeitlin.

New York 1913.....Page xi.

3...A Survey of English Literature(1780-1880)

By Oliver Elton. In four volumes.

New York 1920.....Volume 1, page 387.

CHAPTER TWO.

The Origin and History of the Westminster Review.

When the Westminster Review began in 1824, there were three parties in England, the Whigs, the Tories, and the Radicals. The Tory and Whig parties had their beginning about the year 1675. It was felt that to one or other of these parties every one would attach himself, since they seemed to represent the two classes into which mankind is divided through temperament. A man must either believe in the principle of permanence and be a Tory, or follow the principle of progression and be a Whig. Such a sharp distinction, however, is not possible, as the temperament of man differs not only in kind, but also in degree. There are always individuals who cannot comfortably fit themselves into either category. This was particularly so among the Whigs. Certain individuals, who were adherents to the principle of progression, wished to carry this principle much farther than the rest of the party. Sometimes the differences which arose were so great that the followers of each extreme might quite reasonably be considered as separate parties. More accurately, they might be regarded as separate species of a genus. During the first years of the party system the representatives of the extreme species of the progressive genus were not very numerous. They were mainly isolated individuals carrying on private enterprise,

which was seldom constructive and represented little more than noisy tub-thumping.

It was not until the year 1819 that these Radicals, (1). as they came to be called, were recognized distinctively as a party of reform. For the first time they ceased to be a number of frenzied fanatics without sympathy for each other, and became an orderly group of intellectual giants finding a point of contact one with the other in the writings of Jeremy Bentham and through the powerful personality of James Mill. They were not only a group of thinkers who followed common principles but they had a clearly defined political and social program which was to exert tremendous influence in parliament and in the press, an influence which was to have far-reaching consequences. Bentham was the founder of this group in the sense that the sheer force of intellectual effort evident in all his work attracted a great many who accepted his method of reasoning, and as a consequence claimed relationship to him. The doctrine of "utility" which he early discovered in the works Joseph Priestley, and on which he fashioned all his writings, influenced a great many of the thinking young men who claimed him as their leader.

Thus these Radicals became known as "Utilitarian s." or "Benthamites," They received the original germ from the writings of Bentham, but it was the vigorous personality of James Mill which drew them together into an orderly body. The ascendancy of Mill's mind, the acuteness and depth of his intellectual character, exercised great influence over the people with whom he came in contact. Consequently there were gathered about him a great many of the brilliant young men of the time. His opinions gave colour to the group. This group then, received their point of view from Bentham, but were inspired by James Mill.

From the meeting of Bentham and James Mill in 1808, able recruits were added year by year, and this process of consolidation continued steadily until 1824. In that year we find a number of outstanding men connected with the group. It was a very small group but it had begun to wield an astounding influence in every phase of public life. This was due to the fact, that though they were a very small group, they were terribly sincere in all that they did. They had tremendous

zeal for knowledge and often met twice a week at 8.30 in the morning for reading and discussion. (2). Through these discussions the group was strengthened, not only in intellectual power, but also in number. John Stuart Mill was admitted to the group and with him many new recruits from the younger set including Chas. (3). and John Austin. (4). John Arthur Roebuck, (5). and Chas. Villiers, (6). As they increased in wisdom and in number, and as their energies were directed toward the single aim of reform, it was not long until they were recognized throughout the country as par excellence the party of reform.

The year 1824 found England nearing the close of the period of storm and stress in which she had been groping since the termination of the war and revolution in 1815. The aristocratic agricultural and ecclesiastical interests had the controlling power. They were a minority, distinctly out of touch with the feelings and needs of the great mass of the nation. The revolution and the war had widened the gap between the controlling class and the labouring class, by intensifying the misery of the latter.

The poorer classes seemed to feel that all the institutions and laws were organized for the advantage of the ruling minority. The Corn Laws seemed to benefit the landed gentry at the expense of the poor labourer. The Game Laws seemed to show that the limbs of poor men mattered nothing in comparison with the pleasure of the rich. (7). The penal code was hideous in its ferocity. The anomalies of parliamentary representations were looked on with disfavor by the masses. Even the late introduction of machinery was looked upon as something devised to draw the poor man lower in the depths of misery.

The Tories were in power and set themselves resolutely against reform of any kind. They had fallen into a stagnant reactionism.

The Whigs were divided and distracted. To the Radical party they seemed timid and bewildered, and although genuinely opposed to mere blind repression and working earnestly to better conditions, all that they did were looked upon as half measures of moderate reform.

The Radical party arose against this narrow legislation and against the political and social circumstances that rendered such legislations possible.

The Radical group was slowly entering the political arena in opposition to the two long-established parties. The Whigs and Tories were represented throughout the country by the two great reviews, the Edinburgh Review and the Quarterly Review, which served as excellent organs for the expression and diffusion of their respective opinions. At that time these periodicals had to play the part which our daily news papers play to-day. The small group of reformers soon realized that, if they wished to be a force of any consequence in the country, they too must have a periodical of some kind in which to champion their doctrines of reform. This had probably been spoken of at different times among the Radicals. To the majority such a project was beyond their ~~doctrines~~ highest hopes or expectations, as the production and maintain^{an}ce of a party journal was no small project.

According to John Stuart Mill (8) the plan was first conceived in a discussion between Bentham and James Mill a few years before 1823. It was not, however, until 1823 that Bentham supplied the money necessary for the founding of a party organ. James Mill was asked to take charge of the enterprise, but he was unable to

comply on account of the incompatibility of the post with his official work. Dr. John Bowring, a political pupil of Bentham and a man of great talents, was given charge. Arrangements were made with Longman's and Co., part-publishers of the Edinburgh Review, to publish the new periodical. About this time Henry Southern (9). conceived the project of a literary review, and had already begun organising. In the meantime the nascent radical review joined with this literary project and so the Westminster Review began under the joint editorship of Dr. John Bowring and Mr. Henry Southern, the one directing the political part and the other the literary.

Jeremy Bentham was very enthusiastic, as can be seen by reading a letter written before the publication of the first number of the review. (10). The organization of the review was complete. The prospectuses were sent out, and contracts with contributors had been made and some of the articles for the first number had already been written. In short, the success of the enterprise seemed well assured. Suddenly Longman, although he knew all that had been done already, in fact he had done a great deal himself in advertising, refused to publish it, fearing that its radical tendencies would injure

the character of his house. "It was however no more Radical than from the first he knew it to be. Be this as it may, no further would he go." (11). The optimism of the leaders was considerably curbed. They appealed to James Mill who was able to interest his own publisher, Baldwin with the successful result that in April 1824 the first number appeared.

The appointment of Bowring as editor was not regarded very favourably by the majority of the radicals. He was considered somewhat of a charlatan and one certainly not suitable for the task. J. S. Millsays, "My father had seen little of Bowring, but knew enough of him to have formed a strong opinion, that he was a man of an entirely different type from what my father considered suitable for conducting a political and philosophical Review." (12). A puzzling and probably puzzled Benthamite his appointment was looked upon with positive dissatisfaction by such stalwart utilitarians as the two Mill's. James Mill predicted failure under Bowring's management from the outset, (13). Although he contributed several articles, John Stuart Mill seems to think he contributed them chiefly on account of his friendship for Bentham, who

was backing the review, than from any willingness to support an enterprise controlled by such a being as Bowring. In spite of several unfavorable criticisms Bowring was a valuable asset to the new periodical.

He was a man of wonderful linguistic attainments. He controlled a business on his own account and travelled considerably for commercial purposes, visiting Spain, France, Holland, Russia, Sweden. In his travels he made the acquaintance of many distinguished men. His correspondence with many of these, produced capital hands for the Westminster Review from almost every country in Europe, not to speak of America and British India. (10). Under Bowring's leadership the Westminster Review was made to serve three or four purposes. Primarily it was designed to champion the platform of the Radical group which was rapidly increasing in influence, in the same manner in which the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews were the champions of the two larger parties. It was to broadcast the Benthamite method and to show the application of this method to the ultimate principles of the institutions, and to the current problems of the day.

Not only was it to champion the ideas of the reform group, but was also purposed during the first few years to pursue a direct and formal criticism of its contemporary periodicals, the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews especially the former. Another very important feature of the Westminster Review, and one in which it was unique, was the discussion of political situations, social conditions and literature of the continent. It was here that Bowring proved himself such an asset, for his travels, and talents as a linguist, had obtained for him a wide range of acquaintance among the intellectuals of Europe and also in the East. The literary side was not to be neglected for Henry Southern, a Cantab. who had already conducted the "Retrospective Review" for four years was to have charge of this.

Amid the pessimistic expectancy of the Mills and to the surprise of a great many people, the first number appeared in April 1824. The world of letters and politics was startled. It contained articles written with great ability. Mill's attack on the Edinburgh Review was the most vigorous attack upon the Whig party and did much to give the Westminster Review a position of importance in the political arena.

Containing an exposition of Bentham's theory of Education, an article on the United States, in which the democracy is held as an example of good government, a review of politics and literature in Russia, an attack on Moore's Fables by Bingham, a criticism of the Instrument of Exchange by Col. Thompson, and others on equally interesting subjects, the start of the organ of the Radical group was assuredly auspicious.

It was hailed with joy by radicals throughout the country for it was the first substantial literary evidence that there was a radical party. (14). The attacks which it made against the contemporary political organs seemed to draw the radical group together. The excellence of the first few numbers caused groups of radical reformers throughout the country to give their whole hearted support. The success of the enterprise surpassed the highest hopes of the most optimistic of its supporters. The group of philosophical radicals, who before its appearance were sceptical and indifferent, now embraced it with ecstasy. Such strict utilitarians as George Grote and Mrs. Grote,

2
Chas. Austen, John, Stuart Mill, became ardent supporters. Thus the Westminster Review became the true champion of utilitarian doctrine and its articles were the true expression of philosophical radicalism.

Its appearance excited no small flutter among the two aristocratic parties, the Tories and the Whigs. The Tories hailed it with fiendish delight in several ironical articles in Black woods⁽¹⁵⁾. They regarded its appearance as evidence of a schism in the Whig party. To some it meant the death of the Whig party . Some even predicted the downfall of the Edinburgh Review. Being at the opposite extreme to the Radicals, they took fiendish delight in repeating the criticism of the Westminster Review of the Whigs and of hailing the rise of the Radicals, as evidence of the fall of their opponents. They upheld the new review as superior to the Edinburgh, and as being controlled by men of outstanding genius. (16). This was a matter of expediency rather than any enthusiasm for the Westminster Review. They felt that by appearing to boost the radical organ they would do greater harm to their opponents the Whigs. One can only guess at the influence which ~~it caused~~ the appearance of the Westminster Review

had on the Whig party. That it caused a sensation in their ranks is probable, but there was no wide spread expression of this stir. An isolated letter, written by M'Gulloch seems to imply that they were watching with a great deal of interest. (17). However, they deemed it advisable to feign indifference and this they managed very well. The fluttering sensation among the objects of its attack would itself be sufficient to give the "Review" an ovation among the lower classes.

The Review was welcomed chiefly by the unopulent and democratic classes. The fluttering sensation which it caused among the aristocratic classes was a stimulus to its reception. The attack on the Whig and Tory parties was an innovation which particularly appealed to the masses. Another feature of the review to which it owed much for its early success was its excellent articles on European literature and politics. The contemporary reviews at the beginning had been extremely weak in this particular respect. The reason for this weakness was that few contributors were acquainted with the continental languages. (18). It was here that Bowring proved himself a valuable asset. His wide knowledge of the European languages and his travels in European countries were

a great help to him as editor. Not only was he able to write excellent articles himself, but his wide acquaintance and his wide correspondence drew to his review excellent contributors from almost every country in Europe. While the review is under Bowring's editorship, it contains articles on Russia, Greece, Italy, Spain, etc.

There was a great interest in European affairs at this time. There were many reasons for this. The late war and revolution on the continent, the controversy over Wellington's campaign in Spain, the recent insurrection in Greece, the sudden realization that Germany had a literature of her own and the growth of interest in this literature, the increasing number of refugees in England, the large number of books of travel which had recently been published, the increasing number of Englishmen who had begun to travel, exerted a strong influence on the minds of the English people which caused them to be interested in European affairs. Bowring and his foreign contributors were able to satisfy the demands caused by this new interest. As a consequence the Westminster Review was welcomed with enthusiasm and followed with care by a large group who would not support the other Reviews.

It had an extraordinarily large sale for a first number. It began with pretensions equal to those of the long-established party organs, the Edinburgh and the Quarterly Reviews and it excited much attention. It might have been more sensible to have begun on a smaller scale, for after the first few numbers, the sale was not sufficient to pay expenses, and money had to be continually drawn from the original amount set aside by Bentham for its maintenance. Meanwhile the harmonious enthusiasm between the editors and contributors did not continue for any length of time. This could hardly be expected. Radicals are usually people who cannot fit themselves into things as they are, so it would hardly be possible for them to fit in with one another. Dissonance of opinion arose within the group. The association between Bowring and the Mills, which had never been very amicable, became less so. Bowring's editorial operations were not taken with favour by the Mills and the group associated with them. "Hardly ever did a number come out without containing several things extremely offensive to us, either in point of opinion, of taste, or by mere want of ability". (19). Such stalwart radicals as Grote, Chas. and John Austen passed

unfavorable judgments and made complaints against the two editors. Bowring seems to have differed from this group in many points and made certain editorial alterations which were considered as disfigurements. He refused to publish articles which some felt should be published. Bentham remained friendly to Bowring and considered him as an excellent editor, so, in spite of the unfavorable attitude of some of the contributors, Bowring continued. Henry Southern had resigned so he had complete control.

The Review continued to cost more than was taken in, so gradually the fund set aside by Bentham was decreasing. In April 1828 it was nearly or quite exhausted. This was a period of crisis and some new arrangement of its affairs was necessary if it was to keep on. The Mills seem to have had private conferences, and had arranged a plan whereby Bowring could be displaced as editor without affront to him. They agreed to carry on the work with unpaid editors, sharing the editorship between them. Bowring meanwhile made arrangements with a certain Col. Thomas Perronet Thompson, who became proprietor of the Review, Bowring retaining the editorship. The Mills were thwarted in their plans, and together with a few close

friends, declined to contribute any longer.

The group connected with the Westminster Review had never been very large and the departure of such stalwart intellects as the Mills and their group was a great loss. The Review, however, appeared under its new proprietor, after a lapse of nine months, in January 1829. Thompson was a strict Benthamite, but cannot be reckoned as one of the "Philosophic Radicals", (this latter group was made up chiefly of the Mills and the group who declined to contribute to the Review.) He was a tremendous worker and during the seven years of his proprietorship of the Westminster Review, he was the greatest contributor.

The Westminster continued as a Benthamite organ. Bowring kept up connection with Bentham to the very end, so the tone of the Review remained much the same as before the division. It became closely connected with the politics of the day, making violent agitation for reform. Up till 1832 it was well supported by the common people whose cause they continued to champion.

England continued to be deeply agitated about this time. The Catholic Emancipation question filled the air.

The Westminster Review took the side of the Catholics, pointing out that it would be to the advantage of the country to make contented citizens of the Catholics.

(a). (20). The ascendancy of all religions is necessary to draw England out of the state of turmoil. It made a similar plea for the Jews. (b). It preached a doctrine of universal suffrage. (c). It took a definite stand against slavery in the West Indies. (d). It attempted to show the value of Free Trade and ridiculed the "monkey system" of "protection". It continued its onslaught against the Whigs and Tories. (f). It showed how, in the game of politics, the Tories invariably aimed in the opposite direction of the good of the people, while the Whigs aimed, but were uncertain where the good was, and so were not very effective. In short the Westminster Review continued, under its new management, with renewed vigor, to be the organ of the people. In every question of importance they aimed with unshrinking exposition at what they regarded to be in the best interests of the community.

So intent was the proprietor of the Review on making it the true representative of the common people,

that in the year 1830, she introduced a method of cheap republication. "By this method, an article on a subject of popular interest may be put into the hands of a multitude of readers, at an expense which can be an object of importance to few; and scarcely any friend to the principles of the work can be so situated, as to be unable occasionally to promote their extension, by the introduction of a pamphlet in a quarter which it would not otherwise have reached. To the labouring classes in particular, it is conceived that a substantial source of information, not unmingled with amusement, may in this manner be opened. The powerful, the represented classes, the "interests," can afford to pay for whatever flatters or supports them but the people, whom these combinations have made poor, must be furnished with cheap literature, if they are to be reached by literature at all". (21).

The sincerity and zeal expressed in the articles of the Westminster Review soon caused the term "Radical," once used as a term of low reproach, to have considerable influence in the eyes of the nation. One of the immediate results was the entrance of the Whigs to power in 1830. This was hailed as a step in advance." The English Revolution is begun, for what can be greater revolution

than to see a government that promises reform excepting always a government that executes. Meanwhile wise men wait, ordinary people hope, and fools expect. For all that we shall receive, may heaven make us thankful".(22).

Under the new government, it continued the campaign on behalf of the people. Europe was in a state of turmoil, Revolutions had broken out in many centres. The Westminster Reviewers felt that Reform or Revolution was the only solution for England, and they earnestly endeavoured to promote the former. (23). The Reform Bill of 1832 was passed. We are accustomed to give the Whigs the credit for this move on behalf of the common people. While a great deal of credit is due to the Whigs, some of the credit should be given to the group in charge of the Westminster Review, who educated the people to the desire for reform, and who themselves were the vanguard for the Whigs.

The Westminster Reviewers, however, were not entirely satisfied with the Reform Bill. They desired the abolition of the Corn Laws of 1815. They began a campaign for the vote by ballot and continued agitation, making demands for further reform. Up to 1832 they had been well supported by the common people. The introduction

of the method for republication in 1830 was a sign of its prosperity during this time. After 1832 the people of England were tired of reform. They felt they had gone far enough, their only desire now was to rest quietly after the storm and stress of the Reform Bill. The prosperity^{of the} Westminster Review began to decrease. Once more its number of subscribers was not sufficient to pay its expenses. Thompson, himself, paid from his own pocket to make up the deficit. (24).

Notwithstanding this decrease, the sincerity of Col. Thompson in the enterprise caused him to continue its support. To them the Reform Bill was only a beginning. Although the outlook was rather dim immediately after 1832, he probably felt that brighter days would follow. In the Reformed Parliament, elected at the close of 1832, the Whigs had a triumphant majority. These Whigs were, however, just as aristocratic as the earlier Tories, being dominated by a group of wealthy peers. They had won the support of the iron and cotton princes of Birmingham, Manchester and London, by posing as the liberal reforming element. The Tories followed Sir Robert Peel under the banner of Conservatism. Besides these Liberals and Conservatives there sat a score or more of Radicals for whom

neither parties were progressive enough. Thompson probably felt that, with such a representation in Parliament, the Radicals would occupy an important position in a short while, so he determined to keep his periodical alive. These hopes must have been blasted for the Radical group in parliament "did very little to promote any opinions, They had little enterprise, little activity". (25).

Bowring was appointed to a position of importance, Thompson himself was elected a member of Parliament. A bright future no longer continued to be held out before the Westminster Review. For these reasons and because of the continued deficit of the ~~united~~ enterprise, Thompson sold out in 1836 to Sir Wm. Molesworth, who united it with the London Review (26). under the name , The London and Westminster Review. This was placed under the editorship of John Stuart Mill. Thus the first twelve years of the Westminster Review came to a rather unprosperous close. That it did a great deal of good during this period cannot be doubted, but like Sampson of ~~the~~ old, it suffered the misfortune to be killed in the ruins which it demolished.

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO.

- 1...See."The English Radicals,'an Historical Sketch"by C.B.Roylance Kent."London 1899. Page 5.
- 2...Op.Cit.....Page 209
- 3...Chas.Austin,1799-1874.A lawyer by profession,who was also a brilliant and paradoxical exponent of the doctrines of Jeremy Bentham.He was a frequent contributor to the "Parliamentary History and Review", "Retrospective Review"and "Westminster Review."
- 4...John Austin.1790-1859.He was a celebrated jurist who became acquainted with the doctrine of 'Utilitarianism'and for awhile adhered to it.
- 5...John Arthur Roebuck.1801-1879.While a student at Inner Temple,he became interested in the group of 'Benthamites'.He was elected M.P.for Bath in the first Reformed Parliament.
- 6...Charles Pelham Villiers.1802-1898,He was a statesman of note ,who during his student days at Lincoln's Inn associated himself with the 'Benthamites'.
- 7...See."A Short History of the British Commonwealth" In two volumes.By Ramsay Muir. Liverpool.1922.Vol.2.Page 317.
- 8...See."Autobiographyof John Stuart Mill.

9...Henry Southern.1799 - 1853.He was the founder of the "Retrospective Review".In 1824 he was co-editor with John Bowring of the Westminster Review.

10."Works of Jeremy Bentham.Edited by John Bowring."

Edinburgh.1842.In twenty two parts....Part 20,page 540.

"Now as to the New Review ycept the Westminster Review,Quarterly,No.1 to come out the first of next year,1824.What think you of your old antediluvian having,in as great a degree as he could wish,at his disposal,a rival-a professed rival to the Edinburgh and Quarterly,-anorgan of the Radicals,as the Edinburgh is of the Whigs,and the Quarterly of the Tories?One half consecrated to politicsand morals³₄ the other half left to literary insignifancies.

Longman's house the joint proprietors.Longmans:

the greatest bookseller's house the world ever saw.

Prospectus according to their advice,short;printing and advertising,and publishing,they bear the expense

of;of the copies,they print of the prospectus 159,000'

Over and over again they have said it would and should find its way into every village in the United Kingdom,

not to speak of foreign parts. Bowring, editor of the

political part. A Cantab of the name of Southern, who has conducted a weekly or monthly publication with considerable reputation; for the flowery part. Of the political part, one constant sub-part will be the "Reviewers reviewed;" that is, and will be executed by Mill; he commences with the Edinburgh, as being the first established quarterly. Number to be printed, either 2000 or 3000; but in addition to these what think you of stereoty page? Yes, stereoty page there is to be; cost, it is said, no more than one third more, and in the event of success, this will be saved the expense the Edinburgh was at in several reprintings. The capital thing is² the circumstantial evidence thus affords of the growth of Radicalism; for with their experience and opportunities of observation, the Longmans would never have launched into any such expenses without good ground for assurance that Radicalism would either promote, or not prevent the accession of a proportionate number of customers. Bowring's correspondence has produced capital hands from almost every country in Europe, not to speak of America and British India."

- 11...Op.Cit.....Page 541.
- 12..."Autobiography"by John Stuart Mill.
 New York 1873.....Page 92.
- 13...See "The English Radicals,an Historical Sketch"
 By C.B.Roylance Kent. London 1899.....Page 220.
- 14..."Works of Jeremy BenthamEdited by John Bowring"
 Edinburch 1842.....Part 20 Page 540.
- 15..."Blackwood's Magazine" Vol.15.
 &Letters of Timothy Tickler Esq."Nos.14.and15.
- 16...Op.Cit.....Page 146.
 "This is a work of no small talent.Had the same
 talent come forth on any other ~~shape~~ side it must
 have done something:but coming forward in this
 shape,and on this side,it must indeed do much."
- 17..."Selection from the correspondence of the late
 Macvey Napier Esq.Edited by his son Macvey Napier"
 London 1879.....Page 40.
 "A new Number of the Westminster has been published,
 and it contains the sequel of the attack of the
 Edibburgh,and a more contemptible and pettifogging
 one never was published."
- 18...See."Memoirs of a Literary Veteran"by R.P.Gillies.
 London 1851.....Volume 1.Page 236

19... "Autobiography" John Stuart Mill.
New York.....Page 97.

20a.. "Westminster Review".....Vol.10, page 1.
b..Op.Cit.....Vol.13, page 188
c..Op.Cit.....Vol.10, page 1.
d..Op.Cit..... Vol.11, page 275
e..Op.Cit.....Vol.12, page 138
f..Op.Cit.....Vol.14, page 440

21... "Exercises, Political and Others" by Lieut. Colonel
T. Perronet Thompson. In Six Volumes. London 1842.
"Programme to the Westminster Review for April -- 1830"
Vol.1, page 246.

22...Op.Cit.....
"Programme to the Westminster Review for January 1831"
Vol.1, page 327.

23...Op.Cit.....
"Programme to the Westminster Review for October 1831."
Vol.1, page 461.

24... "James Mill's Biography" by Alexander Bain.
London 1882.....Page 312.

25... "Autobiography" John Stuart Mill.
New York 1873.....Page 195.

26...In 1834 the London Review was established by Sir William Molesworth, with John Stuart MILL as editor. The object of this project was that the new review should represent the doctrines of Philosophic Radicalism. It was intended to take the place which the Mills had considered the Westminster Review was not filling. In a letter written in 1855, John Stuart explains the founding of this later periodical.

"Early in 1834 some of those who had been writers in the original Westminster, and had not been connected with it under Colonel Perronet Thompson's proprietorship, had been forming projects for a new and better Radical Review: which projects appeared to have come to nothing, when Molesworth of his own motion (and quite unexpectedly on my part) offered to me to be the editor, or would at least take the control and direction of it with an editor to work under me. Accordingly the London Review was established on the latter plan: Molesworth himself wrote in it some very able articles, but it is not true that he was his own editor. After four numbers had been published, Molesworth bought the Westminster Review from Colonel Thompson, and united it with the London, under the title of the London and Westminster Review".

"Letters of John Stuart Mill" edited by Hugh Elliot

In Two Volumes..... Vol.1, page 186.

Chapter Three.

The Attitude of the Westminster Review toward its Political Contemporaries.

Let us now turn to the consideration of the Westminster Review in its attitude towards its great contemporaries, the Edinburgh, the Quarterly and Blackwoods. All three were political organs, the first defending the Whig point of view while the remaining two represented the Tories. The primary purpose of the Westminster was to defend the few Radicals who were rapidly making themselves felt in the politics of the day. From the very beginning then, it assumed a certain attitude coinciding with the ideals of the Radical party. This attitude was, as would be expected, inimical to the two larger parties and especially to the periodicals representing those parties. The Radical organ was not satisfied with merely preaching the doctrine of radical reform, but they also felt that their cause would be strengthened if they had ~~their own~~ a certain department in which to criticise their opponents. This seems to have been a favorite portion of the scheme, from its very conception during the conversation between Mill

and Bentham.(1). Bentham was extremely enthusiastic about this particular portion of his periodical, and he mentions it as one of the features of the new review in a letter written just before the appearance of the first number. (2). This out spoken attitude towards its contemporaries made the Westminster unique among the three weightier political periodicals. (Blackwoods was of a lighter nature.) The Edinburgh Review was not in the habit of reviewing reviews. (3).The Quarterly Review used different tactics, trying to draw the fire of their opponents by an ironical touch here and there and an occasional reductio ad absurdum rather than by any open attack.(4).

James Mill was in charge of this department during the first year of the Westminster, either writing himself or directing his son John to write several formidable attacks on the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews. Attacks on particular articles in these reviews were written by close friends of the Mills during this time. The department, with its vigorous polemical writing, was one of the reasons for the early success of the venture. It caused considerable stir in the world of letters and

and politics. After the year 1825 Mill ceased to take interest in this special department, and for the few years till 1829 it remained practically silent, only one single article appearing which must be considered as under the subpart of "Reviewers reviewed." It is a review of an article which appeared in the Quarterly Review on Greek Courts of Justice.

In 1829 the review appeared under the new management of Col. Thompson, who wished to continue the review, as nearly as possible, in the tone in which it first set out. The particular department for reviewing reviews is reopened with an article written by Col. Thompson himself, criticising Macaulay's Review of James Mill's collection of Essays on Government and Jurisprudence, etc. This was the article which kindled the famous controversy between the Westminster Review and Macaulay, which we shall deal with in due time. When this controversy subsided the special department ceased to exist.

The attacks which ^{were} made through the special department of "Reviewers reviewed", during its short period of existence, were directed chiefly against the Edinburgh Review. This can be explained by the fact that the feeling between the Radicals and the Whigs was high at this time.

The Whigs, upholding the principle of progression were looked upon as a party with liberal views, fighting for the rights of the people, whereas, according to the Radicals, they were following half-way principles of moderate reform, simply to increase their chances of obtaining the controlling power. For these pretensions they were severely handled in the columns of the Westminster Review as we shall see. The Quarterly Review came in for its share of criticism, but they were considered as a necessary evil beyond salvation; and were permitted to remain comparatively undisturbed. No particular attack was made against Blackwoods due probably to the fact that this periodical differed somewhat in nature from the other two, being more concerned with light and humorous or purely literary articles.

The Westminster Review pursued a definite line of attack against the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews. If we wish to understand why it took a special attitude toward each review, we ~~must~~ must understand the attitude which the Radicals entertained toward the particular parties which these reviews represented. James Mill, in his article in the first number of the review gives us a clear idea of the radical point of view. England was ruled by a comparatively small number possessing political power. The owners of the great landed estates have the principal

influence in sending the representatives to the House of Commons. Consequently these members are held in check by these landowners, who are the real rulers of the country. These landed gentry, the true aristocracy, are aided by the Church and the Law. The representatives in the House of Commons are merely servants to these landed families (not two hundred in all) and their two "props" are the Church and the Law. This aristocracy is divided into two classes. All that part of the aristocracy that think themselves better off under the King's present advisers, place their weight in support of the ministry. Those who are dissatisfied, lend their influence to the opposition whose chief aim is to dispose of the present ministry and to set themselves up in their stead. The former follow the principle of permanence, while the latter are followers of the principle of progression. One of the most powerful means of attaining the end of the ~~support~~ in opposition (viz to dispose the ministry) is to deprive it of support in the House of Commons, which can be done by operating on the lower classes and by courting the favour of the powerful body. Thus the opposition are obliged to speak so as to gain favour from both bodies. Consequently they are perpetually trimming between the two interests.

Periodical literature must aim at the applause of the moment. To win this applause it cannot censure the errors of the people but it must pander to their sickly tastes. It must flatter the prejudices of those who are most powerful, if it wishes to survive. The Edinburgh and the Quarterly have both pandered to the tastes of the aristocracy. They had to oppose progress because they had to patronize the opinions in vogue among the powerful classes. Instead of following an educational policy and leading the way, they have, of necessity, followed the irrational whims of the small but powerful group. On this they depended for success. The Edinburgh became the political organ of the principle of progression and addressed itself to the opposition party of the aristocracy. The Quarterly supported the ministerial group. Each catered to the landed interest but followed separate principles and so made use of different tactics. It is these tactics that the Westminster Review, in the subpart of its political section, attacks. In their attack it was necessary to take a particular line towards each review.

(a) Its Attack on the Edinburgh.

The Edinburgh review, being the official organ of the opposition, had to use the tactics adopted by that party in striving to discredit the ministry.

They had to augment the favour of their party with the aristocratical class and ^{at} the same time, they had to court the favour of the lower classes. When these two classes differed in principle they had to show a great deal of tact. In striving to win the favour of the people and not offend the powerful classes, they engaged in a perpetual "see-sawing" between the two interests. It is here that James Mill makes his scathing attack on the Whig organ. He shows the inconsistency of the periodical and points out its perpetual compromising between the two interests. He quotes selections from articles in the Edinburgh illustrating how that review writes alternately on both sides of many of the questions which touch the power or interest of the governing classes. He shows that at times the Whig reviewers even make contradictions in the same article, for the sole purpose of pretending to serve two masters.

This was the opening attack of the Westminster Review. "So formidable an attack on the Whig party and policy had never before been made; nor had so great a blow ever been struck in this country for Radicalism" (5).

This article was immediately followed up in the second number of the review by a similar article by John Stuart Mill. The author here points out by further citations that the review has since persevered and does

still persevere in the self same course of compromise and contradication. He attempts to prove that the Edinburgh, though the literary organ of the party of progress, is really the enemy to progress since it continually panders to natural prejudices, severely criticising all that, in foreign countries, differs from the English institutions. He criticises the moral defectiveness of the Edinburgh, its sacrifice of truth to convenience, its continual attempts to varnish over inconsistencies, its frequent creation of false impressions by omission of part of the truth or by outspoken falsehood.

This particular subsection for reviewing reviews continued its warfare. After the general attack had been made, the campaign is carried on by skirmishes on certain articles which had appeared in the Edinburgh. The first victim is M' Culloch's article on Primogeniture, (6). which is severely handled by Austin in the Westminster Review. (7). Austin guided his argument on the Benthamite method, holding M' Culloch's statements up to the light of "utility" showing that, as an institution must be praised or blamed as it tends to increase or diminish the sum of happiness, M' Culloch's theory of Primogeniture must be disregarded, as it aids the distinct division of society into rich and poor, thus making some happy but a great number miserable. Another successful skirmish into the camps

Of the Edinburgh Review is made by an article in the Westminster Review(8). on the relations of the Whig periodical to Parliamentary Reform. Following the Radical attitude towards the parties summarized above the writer points out the need of reform. He then tries to convince the reader that the Edinburgh continues to "See-saw", evading the main issue and diverting the public with more frivolous and misleading topics.

This seems to have been the main criticism of the Edinburgh Review by the Radical group, through their newly established periodical. How these attacks affected the Edinburgh Review we can only guess. That they caused a great stir is almost certain. (9).

After July 1825 this warfare on the Edinburgh Review came to a close until it broke out with renewed vigor in 1829, when the Westminster began under the management of Col. Thompson.

James Mill's Essays on Government, a terse statement of the radical creed of the time as based upon Benthamite principles were reprinted in 1828. In the March issue of the Edinburgh Review for 1829, Macaulay, contributed an article which professed to be a review of this collection, but in reality it was a violent attack on the whole system of Utilitarian logic and politics,

and on the group who followed this system. He was a young man in the first flush of his great reputation who, being a Whig, was pretty much convinced that "all but Whigs were fools". (10). In this early enthusiasm, he undertakes the formidable enterprise of a passage of arms against the champions of the Utilitarian philosophy in retaliation for the earlier attacks on the Whigs. It is a severe attack, in which he gave expression ^{to} his youthful prejudices. He ridicules the "persons who, having read little or nothing, are delighted to be rescued from the sense of their own inferiority by some teacher who assures them that the studies which they have neglected are of no value, puts five or six phrases into their mouths, lends them an odd number of the Westminster Review, and in a month transforms them into philosophers." (11). Macaulay continues by ridiculing the a priori method of Mill's reasoning, putting forward his own inductive method.

This article stimulated controversy. In the July number of the Westminster, 1829 Col. Thompson takes up the cudgels in defense of Mill and proceeds to review Macaulay's article. Thompson's article (12). was so well written and seemed to put forward the Benthamite point of view so clearly, that Macaulay thought it was written by Bentham himself. Thompson in this article shows how the half way measures put forward by Macaulay, are characteristic of all Whigs, and if carried out, would inevitably lead to a reign of terror.

Macaulay seems to be caught so he wisely leaves the offensive and takes up his position on defense. "Our object," he says "was to prove, not that monarchy and aristocracy are good, but that Mr. Mill had not proved them to be bad; not that democracy is bad, but that Mr. Mill had not proved it to be good." (13).

The controversy continued between the Edinburgh Review and the Westminster until January 1830, when Thompson makes a final retort. The whole controversy caused quite a stir and attracted a great deal of attention. Some of the Whigs considered that Macaulay was too rash and carried it too far. (14). One cannot help but feel that he was not true to himself. "He ought by all his intellectual sympathies to be a Utilitarian. Yet he abuses Utilitarianism with the utmost contempt, and has no alternative theory to suggest." (15). He was a young man at the time and his rashness is excusable. When he grew older and saner he caused the articles to be suppressed so that they were not republished during his life time.

Leslie Stephen sums up the attitude towards the Whigs very well. (The reviewers reviewed column, though directed against the reviews was indirectly aimed at the political parties.) "The Whigs were aristocrats as much as the Tories. They were simply the "out's" who hoped to be the "in's". They trimmed their sails to catch the public opinion, but were careful not to let it

drift into the true popular currents. They had no desire to limit the power which they hoped one day to possess. They would attack abuses- the slave-trade or the penal laws- to gain credit for liberality and enlightenment, when the abuses were such as could be removed without injuring the power of the aristocracy. They could use "vague generalities" about liberty and so forth, but only to evade definite applications. When any measure was proposed which really threatened the power of the privileged classes, they could bring out a contradictory set of fine phrases about Jacobinism and democracy. Their whole argument was a shuffle and they themselves mere selfish trimmers." (16).

(b). Its Attack on the Quarterly.

We must retrace our steps in order to see how the Quarterly Review fared in the hands of the Westminster Review.

The Quarterly Review cannot be said to represent the Tories through its different administrations. Rather it stood for certain principles which a particularly conservative group of the Tory party kept continually before them. Consequently it was an ultra-conservative periodical. It represented the views of a group that possessed the controlling power, so it was under no necessity to court the favour of the lower classes. Its

one main political object was to keep England safe for the aristocracy. (17). Representing as it did the aristocratic agricultural and ecclesiastical interests and standing for the patriotic interests of the kingdom, it wished to conserve existing institutions. It had a two fold domestic policy, first, to do all it could in favour of the landed aristocracy which it directly represented, and secondly, to curb by stern measures of repression every movement which seemed to aim at change. It set its face resolutely against reform and it did all in its power to check the desires and demands for reform in English politics and society.

The greatest stimulant to these desires for reform in England, at this time, was provided by the stories of travel which spoke of the liberty enjoyed by the citizens of other countries, especially of America and France. In order to counteract this stimulant, the Quarterly, pursued a regular campaign in the vilification of America and France, heaping calumny whenever the institutions differed from those in England. The Westminster Review noticed this particular occupation of the Quarterly, and in its first number in the subpart of "Reviewers reviewed" there is a review of the Quarterly's review of Faux's Memorable Days in America. The author

of the article points out how the Quarterly's review is "nearly filled with extracts from Faux containing the details of individual instances of ferocity, violence, knavery, boasting and vulgarity, disappointment, failure, despondency, bad soils, bad climates, bad food, discomfort, dirt and barbarism- all on the debtor of the account, without hinting at the existence of a single item on the creditor side". (18) "The reviewer attacks the Quarterly for giving a false impression by omitting certain ideas expressed in the book of which it claims to be a review.

In the fourth number of the Westminster James Mill makes his attack (19). on the Quarterly as he had already done on the Edinburgh. His main criticism is that the Tory reviewers watch the earliest symptoms of any tendency in the public mind towards the improvement in any shape, in order to fall upon it with determined hostility. Possessing authority, they do not have to beg or persuade but rather they have it in their power to strike or demand. By the use of this authority, however, they became the remorseless enemies of mankind. Their main weapons are assumption and abuse, which Mill terms the "logic of power". By frequent citations Mill shows, how they use this logic of power in endeavouring

to connect any ideas of reform with the opinions of men already odious, in contradicting, in suppressing evidence, in begging the question, in calling names and flinging dirt. In regard to conditions in England the Quarterly Reviewers are the well-fed advocates of things as they are. When speaking of the French, the people of modern times who are most distinguished for their efforts to throw off the yoke of aristocracy, everything is done to make them appear excessively hateful. They treat Americans similar to the French. Whoever speaks against the Americans receives implicit credit, but whoever says anything in their favour is to be told that he is a liar, a knave or a fool or as many names as one can think of the Quarterly, not being careful of its purity of mouth.

After this main attack the guerilla force of the Westminster Review continues to harass the articles of the Quarterly review. They fall upon separate articles and point out the misrepresentation, of some particular phase of the main attack made by James Mill. John Stuart Mill is the first to follow up his fathers violent criticism. In the fifth number of the Westminster he reviews an article which appeared in the Quarterly on the Essay on Political Economy in the Supplement to the Encyclopedia Brittanica.

He elaborates on a phase of his fathers attack as he had previously done in reviewing the Edinburgh. His particular criticism is, that the Quarterly had once condemned Adam Smith but now that the public mind has got beyond him it now counts his alliance. He emphasises the fact that the Quarterly acts as a drag on progress.

The Westminster in its fifth, 24 (20)^(a) seventh^(b) and thirteenth^(c) numbers attacks the attitude which the Quarterly had taken towards the ancient Greeks. ~~in a series of articles.~~ In this series, the Westminster reviewer points out^{that} the Greeks are the especial object of hostility and misrepresentation. So extremely active was the Quarterly in its warfare on reform, that it attempts to misrepresent history in order to excite the minds of its readers to hate any qualities in other nations, and even in the ancients, which showed the least tendency to uphold institutions which were hostile to the aristocracy of England.

The Republican form of government, and the freedom of discussion in ancient Athens, are the chief causes for the hostility towards the Greeks in the Quarterly. These are unpardonable sins to the Tory review and obscure all the glories of ancient Greece. "The citizen of a republic whether he inhabit Attica or the United States in a miscreant and placed out of the pale of social intercourse by the reviewer". (21). He misrepresents

by exaggeration. He asserts that the degraded state of the female character in Athens was due to the popular form of government and such will always be the case under such government. The Westminster shows by many quotations, that the Quarterly reviewers, whenever they find a remnant of history suitable to their present purpose, -viz to preserve the authority for aristocracy, - hoist it and carry it about with triumphant acclamation as the banner and standard of the party. On the other hand, when any work does not exactly tally with their preconceived notions, they rush in all the impetuous ardour of ignorance, to overthrow its authenticity.

According to the Westminster Reviewer, the whole purpose of the Quarterly review seems to be to decry all institutions that differ in any way from those in England, especially those which tend to preach liberty or reform. This they do by misrepresentation, using intractable compounds, using words vaguely and continually citing comic poets (22). as serious authorities, ~~and~~ ~~in all things.~~

In Jan. 1827, the Westminster reviewer shows in his review of an article on Greek Courts of Justice in the Quarterly, that "the temptation to compare the Greek courts with the French National Assembly was too powerful for the Reviewer's love of truth, however great, to resist. The candid critic thought with some

sagacity, if he could show that the one body resembled the other in any respect whatever, his readers would be kind enough to infer immediately, that they were perfectly alike in all things". (23).

We see then that the Edinburgh was criticised for its vacillation between two opposing interests, while the Quarterly was attacked because it misrepresented the truth for its own ends. The subpart of "Reviewers reviewed" thus threw down an open defiance to their opponents. Except in the case of Macaulay, no one had the courage, or else they considered it inadvisable, to make any violent retort. After the Westminster had given expression to the feelings of the Radical group towards the opposing reviews in the articles which we have dealt with, the subpart died a natural death. After 1830 no more formal or direct criticisms were made. The times were too filled with events of importance and the energy of the Westminster reviewers could be better spent in the consideration of these events which were leading to the reform bill of 1832.

Notes on Chapter Three.

- 1... "Autobiography"by John Stuart Mill.
New York 1873.....Page 92
- 2... "Works of Jeremy Bentham" Edited by John Bowring.
In twenty parts. Edinburgh 1842.....Part 20, page 540.
"Of the Political part, one constant sub-part will
be the 'Reviewers reviewed', that is, and will be ex-
ecuted by Mill; he commences with the Edinburgh, as
being the first established Quarterly."
- 3... See "Edinburgh Review" Volume 49.....Page 273
- 4... See "Tory Criticism in the Quarterly Review". By
Walter Graham. New York 1921.....Page 8.
- 5... "Autobiography"by John Stuart Mill.
New York 1873.....Page 94.
- 6... "Edinburgh Review"No. 80 Article 4.
- 7... "Westminster Review"Volume 2, page 503.
- 8... "Westminster Review"Volume 4, page 194.
- 9... "James Mill, a Biography" by Alexander Bain.
London 1882.....Page 276.

"I cannot tell exactly how it affected Jeffrey and
his contributors: but no one had the courage to reply

or to retaliate in any form, until Macaulay took up the cudgels in 1829 against the author's articles on Government".

Op.Cit.....Page 291.

Letter from James Mill to M'Culloch in August 1825.

"Bye-the-bye, I suppose (indeed I hear) your Edinburgh Review people are in great wrath on the subject of the Parliamentary Reform article."

Also see note 17 of chapter 2.

10...Dictionary of National Biography"....Volume 34, page 411.

11..."Edinburgh Review".....Volume 49, page 160.

12..."Westminster Review".....Volume 11, page 254.

13..."Edinburgh Review".....Volume 49, page 275.

14..."Selections from the Correspondence of the late Macvey Napier Esq." Edited by his son Macvey Napier. London 1879.

Letter from Napier to J.R.M'Culloch on October 28, 1829. "Do not blame me for inserting another blow at the Utilitarians. I have softened its severity". ~~xxx~~

15..."Hours in a Library".....By Leslie Stephen.

- 16... "The English Utilitarians".....by Leslie Stephen.
Duckworth and Co.1900.In Three Volumes.
Volume 2.....Page 98.
- 17...See "Tory Criticism in the Quarterly Review" by
Walter Graham.New York 1921.....Page 16.
- 18... "Westminster Review".....Volume 1,page 251.
- 19...Op.Cit.....Volume 2,page 463.
- 20.(a).Op.Cit.....Volume 3,page 233.
(b).Op.Cit.....Volume 4,page 233.
(c).Op.Cit.....Volume 7,page 227.
- 21.....Op.Cit.....Volume 3,page 235.
- 22.....Op.Cit.....Volume 3,page 233.
- 23.....Op.Cit.....Volume 7,page 227.

CHAPTER 4.

The Relation of the Westminster Review to the Political and Social Events of the Period.

The direct attack of its contemporaries, dealt with in the last chapter led the Westminster reviewers into the heat of political controversy. We must now consider how they fared. The twelve years 1824-1836 mark the changing of the old order giving place to new. The aristocracy, which dictated a policy for the interests of their own small group, was slowly giving place to an aristocracy whose object was to serve the state. The old parties were breaking up on account of the constant pressure from the increasingly unenfranchised body. The lately introduced steam railway system, the penny-postage, and the many inventions of the industrial revolution, ushered in a new type of society. This new society was demanding that the non-representative parliament be adapted to the new conditions. Reform was the key-note of the period. In the demand for reform, the small group of Bentham's disciples were the loudest. It was to aid this demand that the Westminster was formed. Unlike the beginning of the Edinburgh Review, this periodical began purely as a political venture. Unlike the Quarterly, it did not cloak its political tendencies under the guise of a literary review. It was avowedly and openly a party organ. This was made plain in the first number, by the attitude which was taken towards the Whigs

and Tories.(1)

We have seen how the Westminster held the Edinburgh and the Quarterly Reviews, its literary opponents, up to violent criticism. It did not, however, occupy itself solely in making severe attacks on its opponents. There were certain institutions, towards which it had special aversion. It upheld the principle of, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," as the standard of conduct for the individual, the nation and the human race. This principle of "utility" is the standard, in the light of which, it regarded all human actions and institutions. In this maxim it professed to see the solution for all the political and social evils of the time. With this principle as its centre, the range of the Westminster stretched in every direction of human endeavor. It dealt with conditions in almost every corner of the globe. Its political and social contacts were innumerable. In this broad program of destruction and reconstructing on a new basis, the basis of the standard of "utility", it slowly built up for itself an enviable political and social character. That it played an important part can be seen by a consideration of its relation to a few of the vital matters which stirred England during the twelve years with which we are dealing.

The first task of the Westminster was to uphold the interests of the large and rapidly-growing labouring class,

which at this time was oppressed by toil, goaded by misery, deluded by the designing, tempted by sensuality and debased by the law itself, whose imperfections seduced to vice and impelled to crime.(2). It felt that something ought to be done to lessen these pitiable conditions among the labouring class, as it was not in the best interests of the nation to have one of its classes in such wretched circumstances. Applying the principle of utility, "The true interest of each is the happiness of all". The security of no class can be permanently attained at the prejudice of any other. A narrow, and partial policy necessarily issues in the injury of the order for which it was framed. All philosophy is finally found defective, which is not so enlarged as to include the happiness of the aggregate". (3). It agitated for the provision of institutions of the most liberal and popular character for the political instruction of the people. It agitated for a reduction of taxes, especially the taxes levied through the Corn Laws, and the toll levied on sugar by the slave-owners of the West Indies. It felt that the abolition or reduction of these taxes was the logical solution for the evils of the labouring classes. (4). Any thing short of this would not make the people contented, and a discontented labouring class would eventually cause the state to tremble, and the basis of society would crumble beneath

the superincumbent mass.

The Westminster Review regarded the Reform Bill of 1832 as but a step forward. The repeal of the Corn Laws and the Abolition of Slavery were considered ^{the} as logical successive steps. Any other move on the part of the party in power was looked upon as but an attempt to avoid the main issues. Even the Factory Act of 1833, which fixed legal limits for the working hours of children, was looked upon as the stalking horse to cover and protect the Corn Laws and West Indian slavery. (5). The Westminster considered that these laws, placed restrictions and burthens on commerce and ~~the~~ caused much of the misery among the labourers. It felt that it should be the business of any sane government to stop the cause of the misery, instead of trying to alleviate it by their microscopic benevolence. It felt that "the direct and visible object of the inventor ^{and mover} of the Factory Bill was to run his bill against Parliamentary Reform, Slave Emancipation, and the removal of the Corn Laws". (6). This act, it felt, struck at none of the evils which affected the poor. It reduced the hours of the labour of the ill paid poor, thus making them poorer.⁽⁷⁾ Only after the abolition of the Corn Laws and toll on sugar should the government take the Factory Question in hand. Let it

give the country the measure of its talent by the judgment and despatch with which it applies the remedy. (8).

The Westminster was dissatisfied with the half-way measures taken by the Whigs. (9). It considered that they were doing a great deal of minor reforming but were neglecting the really important issues. "The people of England want not now the pettinesses, the half doings of these men: they demand first, the charter of their liberties. the grand principles in which good government must rest. to be conceded in some great measures. All the details will follow as the early fruit of such concessions." (10).

We have not the space to deal with such subjects as, Trial by Jury, the Coercion Bill, Blogging and others of equal importance. We have chosen, however, to deal with the Westminster's agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws and the abolition of slavery, because they were looked upon as of primary importance and are definitely mentioned as causes of the misery among the labouring classes." (11).

The Corn Laws.

The demand for the repeal of the Corn Laws in the Westminster illustrates its attitude toward the landed interest. With the rise of the commercial class in England after the industrial revolution, many statesmen felt that the future of England lay in commerce rather

than in agriculture. (12). The Tories naturally supported the landed interests and any thing that would be advantageous to that group. Many of the Whig gentlemen did likewise. The Corn Laws were highly advantageous to these aristocrats. An ever increasing group, however, among the middle and working classes were crying for their repeal. The Westminster Review, representing these lower classes, strengthened this cry for repeal, by bringing the subject of the Corn Laws to light and denouncing them with loudness and perseverance.

The Corn Laws had already been denounced in a series of thoroughly sifting articles in the Edinburgh, but that periodical seemed to have suddenly dispaired of doing any good. The Westminster, however, felt that by continuing to pound and thunder it might triumph over the prejudices and overawe those whom it could not hope to convince. (13).

The Westminster defined the Corn Laws as "the prohibition of foreign trade by act of parliament, for the benefit of the owners of land, who by means of the imperfect state of the representation, have contrived to acquire a majority of votes in the House of Commons." (14). In another article it is pointed out that the Corn Laws are injurious to all the rest of the community

and beneficial to the land-lord alone. Applying the principle that a narrow and partial policy necessarily ensues in the injury of the order for which it was formed, it immediately attacked the priveleged few. It favoured a removal of all duties and would be satisfied with nothing short of Free Trade. It realized that England was a trading nation and that commerce was the great source of her wealth. If she wished to retain her position the Westminster reviewers felt that Free Trade was the only alternative. "How can we expect to export without importing?" they asked. "How truly, then do we misunderstand our own interest, if we attempt to sell our commodities to foreigners and yet refuse to take theirs in return?"

(15). The effect of the Corn Laws was to make corn dear: (16). since this was the sole purpose for which they existed. The increase in the price of grain caused an increase in rents. The landlord then received the greatest benefit from these laws. The Westminster, seeking to apply the principle of "utility", asked the question. Are rich landlords more conducive to the happiness of the community than cheap corn? (17). It answered its own question in favour of cheap corn.

Besides proving that cheap corn is more conducive to general happiness than rich landlords, the Westminster Review considered that the Corn Laws caused a portion of the labour and capital of the country to

be diverted out of a more into a less advantageous employment. They forced into cultivation inferior soils making the cost of production of home corn higher. They caused a waste of labour in forcing into cultivation barren soils, to produce ^{corn which might be bought with the produce} of less labour by being purchased with manufactures. They also lessened the power of accumulation, by diminishing the productiveness of capital, and the motives to an accumulation, by lowering profits. The country is thus made poorer by the laws. When a country is made poorer the first people to suffer are the labouring classes. The Westminster felt that if the conditions of the working classes are to be alleviated, these laws must be repealed and nothing short of their repeal would be accepted.

Colonel Thompson, the proprietor of the Review, was the author of the famous "Catechism of the Corn Laws," which pointed out the fallacies of the laws proving that their operation caused the misery of the agricultural labourers as well as of the manufacturers. In its campaign against the corn laws the Westminster aided the Anti-Corn-Law-League in its undertaking the education of each section of English society, in town or village, up to a point of uniting all in a common enthusiasm for a proposition in economics.

The Whigs were but half-hearted Free-traders and were jealous of the League as a rival and ashamed of it as an ally. (18). The Tories denounced it as the "most dangerous combination of recent times." (19). The Westminster Review, however, remained firm in its support of the repeal of the Corn Laws and continued to uphold the League. Colonel Thompson was himself the leader of the agitation. In 1834 it was anticipating immediate victory. "The public intelligence is rapidly advancing". (20). "The principle point for study now, is to ascertain how the assured fall of the landed tyranny, may be made to bring down with it the greatest quantity of other abuse." (21). At a banquet of the Anti-Corn-Law-League in 1838. Dr. Bowring made the following statement "Gentlemen I hope the time is coming when the warrior will not be looked to as the defender of England, but the peace maker. The happy state of things will come, in which we shall look on the victories of commerce, and the victories of peace, as far more glorious than any that have been gathered in fields where blood has been poured out like water." (22). At the same meeting at which Dr. Bowring made these statements, the health of Colonel Thompson was proposed because his writings in favour of Repeal had done so much to procure an amendment

of the representative system, and who, in addition to the instruction so well given in his "Corn Law Catechism" was then engaged in exposing every new land-~~land~~ fallacy. The toast was received with loud applause. (23).

Abolition of Slavery.

About 1827 the price of sugar imported from the West Indies was about ten per cent more than it could be got for in the East Indies or other places; and then ten per cent above this found its way into the West Indian's pocket. The Westminster Review, which condemned the Corn Laws for enriching the land owners and ~~and~~ impoverishing the mass, also condemned the system which was making the West Indian rich at the expense of the people of England. It pointed out that slavery was more expensive than free labour. For this reason and on the ground of humanity, it preached a doctrine of abolition.

In the second number it gives the question of slavery an important place. This article laid the blame for the persistence of slavery to no particular body. It recommended that the parliament of England ought itself to undertake whatever it deemed advisable toward the amelioration of the negroes. (24). It condemned, however, the plan of immediate extinction, without compensation to the slave owners, feeling that fresh injustices

might be committed. (25). Moderation seemed to be the keynote of this article. It propounded a plan whereby all slave owners be forced to give up their rights for an equitable compensation from the House of Commons, This compensation to be assessed by impartial persons, so that neither party would have the power of dictating its own terms.

It is rather surprising to see the Westminster preaching in this tone. When this article was written, the reviewer seemed to be hopeful of the moves which Canning was making towards ^{the} amelioration of the condition of the slaves. Before it was printed, however, he seemed to feel that Canning was evading the question so a postscript was added which implied "We hope and trust most sincerely, that they at least will be consistent that they will consent to no delay, and that they will never cease to agitate the question, until effectual measures are taken to bring about that which is really for the interest of all parties".(26).

The next article to appear on the question was in October 1829. (27). The tone of this article is entirely different from that of the former. It condemned the people of Great Britain who, giving themselves airs by reason of their freedom, paid a poll tax for the

support of slavery and slave owners in the West Indies. Its solution of the difficulty also changed. It now proposed that all extra duties in favour of West Indian sugar should be removed by a prospective act to take effect in six months after date. (28). It proceeded to condemn the government which taxed the people to support slavery abroad and expended part of the plunder to support the iniquity at home, feeling that a root-and-branch reformation was necessary. "If governments do not like root-and -branch reformations, they should cut off the gratuitous iniquities which induce the danger, and not give food to the cry for radical reform".(29).

In 1832 the Westminster Review became even more emphatic in its denunciation. (30). It laid aside any thought of palliative measures feeling that the evil admitted of no remedy but immediate, entire abolition, unqualified by compensation. If the evil was to be extinguished, no compromise of principle would do it; its extinction must be unqualified, complete in all its parts. The question of compensation was entirely rejected. It showed that, there being no enactment creating or defending the state of slavery, the slave owners could not prove them as their property. Moreover the protecting duties, prices needlessly enhanced, ^{AND} an endless list of military and naval and judicial expenditure, have drained the

people of England and enriched the West Indian slave owners. No compensation was necessary for being

no longer allowed to exact uncompensated labour since they have already received so many privileges.

In Jan. 1833 the Grey Ministry passed a Bill to abolish slavery. It was put through Parliament with all the vigour and eloquence of Edward Stanley, the Colonial Minister. Twenty millions sterling were paid in compensation to the slave owners by a nation which, though eager for retrenchment, was willing to pay the price of justice and freedom.

In July of that year there appeared in the Westminster an article entitled. "Sugar without slavery." (31). In it the Whigs are severely condemned for the Bill which had just been passed. It was pointed out how the West Indies were nothing more than prison islands where any army and navy and a civil establishment was necessary to prevent rebellion, at a cost equal to the entire prime cost of the commodities manufactured. "It is in support of this system, and to curry favour with their enemies by dispensing to them the plunder of the honest part of the community, that the Whigs have just thrown away twenty millions of the public money." (32). In January 1835 a similar attack is made. (33).

Minor Reforms.

Besides these two major issues the common people were defended in many minor issues by the group of Utilitarians in their official organ. They held all customs up to the severe light of "utility" and upheld or condemned, as they provoked or prevented the greatest aggregate of happiness. They made their voice heard on almost every question of importance in the first dozen years of its existence. War, Taxation, Poor Laws, Penal Code, Position of the Peer Peers, Law, Emigration, Education, Commerce, Conditions in Africa, America, Belgium, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Russia, and Spain all received notice of some sort in the different articles of the Westminster.

In everything they were seeking reform and they were invariably extremists in opinion. It is interesting here to note the attitude with which they regarded religion. They felt that religion should never be mixed up with political discussion. (34). To them, Christianity was the true faith, but they were unwilling to condemn anyone who did not follow that faith. They sympathised with and even approved of such great atheists as Tom Paine and agnostics such as Tindal. They recognised that these

men did a great deal of good in causing Christians to search their hearts. If it had not been for these men they declared the great defenders of Christianity such as Leland and Watson would never have written their valuable works.

While they are hearty defenders of Christianity, they do not consider it necessary to condemn those who differ from them. They condemned only those who sought to crush the opposition of opinion by vindictive persecution. They felt that equal justice ought to be rendered to believer and unbeliever and that privation of civil rights and the endurance of legal penalties ought not to be added to the misfortunes of infidelity. (35). Tolerance was the keynote of the Westminster in regard to religion.

Besides tolerance, the Westminster Reviewers demanded sincerity. They condemned all hypocrisy in religion from that in royal proclamations down to tabernacle tracts. They had no place for cant. "We say nothing of privileged characters and places, nor of the religious meetings at town halls and taverns, though there some commit the offence who have no claim to benefit of clergy, as when the statesman comes fresh from the imposition of some demoralizing tax to subscribe

for the spread of Christian precepts of purity; or a dissipated lordling lends his titled name to grace the religion of universal brotherhood; or the lawyer forms his testimony to the work of truth; or the soldier leans on the hilt of, perhaps a mercenary sword, to support him through the praises of the gospel of peace. What is worse than even this is, that we all cant, at all times and in all places." (36).

The Westminster Reviewers condemned hypocrisy and cant in every form. It was because of their own terrible sincerity in all things, the Westminster Reviewers though a very small group, were able to set in motion a force which made itself felt for many decades. Their religion is well summed up in one of the articles. "We know that the measure which is most conducive to the happiness of mankind is most grateful to a benevolent Providence. This is enough for us." That they practiced this religion is beyond doubt when we realize what strong upholders they were of the principle of utility and what strong defenders they were of the cause of the common people of England. For this they built up for themselves the important political and social character which they well deserve.

Notes on Chapter Four.

- 1...Westminster Review.....Volume 1,page 206-268.
- 2...Op Cit.....Volume 18,page 385.
- 3...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 380.
- 4...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 396.
- 5...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 404.
- 6...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 397.
- 7...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 400.
- 8...Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 404.
- 9...Op.Cit.....Volume 21,page 52.
- 10..Op.Cit.....Volume 21,page 53.
- 11.Op.Cit.....Volume 18,page 396.
- 12..British History in the Nineteenth Century.
By G.M.TREVELYAN.New York.1922.....Page 204.
- 13..Westminster Review.....Volume 3,page 395.
- 14..Op.Cit.....Volume 11,page 2.
- 15..Op.Cita.....Volume 3,page 417.
- 16..Op.Cit.....Volume 3,page 396.
- 17..Op.Cit.....Volume 3,page 397.
- 18..British Historyin the Nineteenth Century.
By G.M.Trevelyan.New York.1922.....Page 270.

19..Tory Criticism in the Quarterly Review.

By Walter Graham.New York.1921.....Page 11.

20..Westminster Review.....Volume 20,page 520.

21..Op.Cit.....Volume 20,page 520.

22..History of the Anti-Corn-Law-League.

By Archibald Prentice.London.1853.....Page 69.

23..Op.Cit.....Page 70.

24..Westminster ReviewVolume 1,page 343.

25..Op.Cit.....Volume 1,page362.

26..Op.Cit.....Volume 1,page 370.

27..Op.Cit.....Volume 11,page 275.

28..Op.Cit.....Volume 11,page 281.

29..Op.Cit.....Volume 11,page 284.

30..Op.Cit.....Volume 16,page 529.

31..Op.Cit.....Volume 19,page 247.

32..Op.CIT.....Volume 19,page 262.

33..Op.CIT.....Volume 22,page 120.

34..OP.Cit.....Volume 1,page 368.

35..OP.Cit.....Volume 2,page 27.

36.Op.Cit.....Volume 1,page 14-15.

CHAPTER FIVE.

The Westminster and its Attitude towards Literature.

In this chapter we shall attempt to trace the literary tendencies of the Westminster Review. In chapter one we have already noted the rise of the great political reviews, the Edinburgh, the Quarterly and the Westminster, representing respectively, the Whigs, the Tories, and the Radicals. The founding of these organs, with their system of anonymous reviewing by a group of outstanding writers under the supervision of an editor, ushered in a new day in literary criticism. Men wanted to know about books and to find them discussed, but most of them would not peruse a lengthy treatise, while they would readily read a short essay. These new reviews formed a means of access to a great deal of valuable reviewing and criticism, which was highly acceptable to the general public. During the nineteenth century nearly every critical essay of importance reached the public through this medium of periodical literature.

But as we glance through the early numbers of the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, one cannot help but be surprised at the estimation of the reviewers of the contemporary authors. The authors, whom we consider to be men of genius, were given a most hostile reception. These

reviewers seem to have been singularly blind to their genius. We can almost set up the rule that the degree of a poet's reputation varies inversely as he is hailed by the reviewers.

With the appearance of the Quarterly Review in the field in 1809, the Edinburgh, which was already moderately partisan, became violent in its emphasis on Whig principles. The Quarterly was not long before it became equally, if not more biased, in upholding the policy of the Tories. When each of these reviews acted as the champion of a partial political view, it is natural for us to expect that, in an age when almost every form of literature was an expression of a political partisanship, it would be impossible for them to be impartial in their literary criticism. We are not surprised then, when, in literature, anything contains in it any notion of change from "things as they are", it was attacked without pity in the Quarterly Review. We know somewhat of the fate of Keats and Shelley in this review. These men are severely handled "chiefly because they were friends of Leigh Hunt, Liberal whu was editor of a newspaper which had displeased George the Fourth." (2)

The literary character of the matter under examination was only of minor importance to these reviewers.

A much more important quality of the matter was its tendency to teach a lesson. Like Dr. Johnson, of the earlier century, the reviewers tended to act as moral teachers and to ~~show~~, the matter was judged according to the standard of morality and decency. In the Edinburgh Review of April 1803, there appeared a review of Madame de Stael's Delpine. The reviewer's verdict is that the book is evil, because it ~~is~~ "calculated to shed a mild lustre over adultery". This article concludes characteristically—"What a wretched qualification of this censure to add, that the badness of the principles are alone corrected by the badness of the style, and.... she would have been very guilty if she had not been very dull".⁽³⁾ With such a standard[†] the early reviews did much to put a check on licentiousness of writing, but such a standard, added to the political bias of these reviews would tend to deform any frank attempts at true literary criticism.

Nevertheless, the contributors to these reviews, with minds deformed by political prejudice, and coloured by their standard of didacticism, uttered their criticism with dictatorial assurance. They were dogmatic, orthodox pulpit-pounders, making vigorous judgments and delivering them like so many hammer-blows. Their criticisms were certainly not infallible, but they were delivered with a

certain tone of infallibility. These criticisms were made up of long excerpts, synopses, long discussions suggested by the books examined, a moral point of view and a summary of judgments without profound analysis. Under the veil of anonymity, these judgments were delivered with the authority of a pope.

This authority, however, was soon challenged. There was a new awaking to the realisation of a new spirit in criticism. Literary men began to realize that the function of criticism in a review, was not so much to dictate to the reader a particular opinion, but rather to stir his mind on the subject with which they dealt, and to provoke discussion and interest. "The protest against the methods of the dictatorial quarterlies found expression in the two brilliant monthly periodicals, Blackwood's and the London magazine founded respectively in 1817 and 1820". (4)

A few years after the formation of these monthly magazines, in 1824 the Westminster Review made its appearance. As we have already noted, it was fashioned after the style of the two great party organs, the Edinburgh and the Quarterly Reviews. Like its predecessors, the Westminster Review discussed national policy and public events, works of science and literature. Primarily, as we have

seen, it was founded to defend the radical party in politics, and to diffuse Benthamite principles among the reading public. According to the first article of the first number it also hoped to free literary criticism from the trammels of party. It professed to feel that the spirit and manner in which the leading reviews had been conducted, were susceptible of improvement. (5). It ~~blame=d~~ blamed its predecessors for the cant and the affected levity that entered into literature at that time. It censured the heartlessness of the contemporary reviewers and the levity of criticism which had withered many a sensitive mind which gave promise of bright excellence. It claimed to be par excellence the voice of the people from whom they had no separate enterests. It claimed that its criticisms would not be based on party prejudice.

Notwithstanding these remarks made in the first article of the first number and in spite of John Stuart Mill's defense of the Westminster Reviews attitude towards poetry in his autobiography, ⁽⁶⁾ the Westminster Review, especially in its early days, had very little sympathy for literature. Especially in its early numbers it stands further off in this respect than any of its precursors. Though it included criticisms of poetry

and fiction, it began with a certain contempt for poets and poetry in general. In the letter in which Bentham tells of the founding of the new review, he speaks rather slightly of the department dealing with "the flowery part." The Westminster began with aims that were in no sense aesthetic. Its early numbers are written with little sense of author craft, with the coldness of repressed enthusiasm. In their desire to be recognized as par excellence a group of extremely rational beings, they wrote with "mathematical plainness," doggedly and verbally repeating their points, ruthlessly stripping and defining their terms.

The early numbers of the Westminster express nothing but contempt for poetry and find little place for it in the life of a rational being. The following extracts will illustrate this narrowness.

"Unfortunately, the exclusive culture of the faculty of imagination has but too strong a tendency to impair the powers of judgment; and how much so ever poets may wish to instruct as well as amuse, it rarely happens that they accomplish this double purpose."(?)

"They are mere creatures of sentimental sympathy and antipathy; their heart tells them this and their

heart tells them that; their love and hatred; their approbation and disapprobation, are measured by no intelligible standard." (8). "Mr. Moore is a poet, and therefore is not a reasoner. Provided he encourages institutions and feelings likely to operate beneficially upon the condition of the people at large, we ought to be contented with his performance." (9).

In the early years, the standard by which the Westminster judged poetry was that of didacticism. To it a poem was good only if it taught a lesson. The poetry of the post Revolution period in France was praised because their poets wrote as if they were conscious that the reader expects something more valuable from them than mere amusement. " Though many of them are highly gifted with the beauties of style, they never seem desirous of showing off their own eloquence' they seem to write because they have something to say, and not because they desire to say something." John Stuart Mill in the Westminster condemns Shakespeare because his plays contained no particular moral tendency. Scott is considered as agreeable but not useful in making moral conditions any better. Voltane is placed high above these English writers because, according to the Westminster Reviewer "With Voltane, even in his lighter

pieces, to make the reader wiser and better is the consideration to which all others subordinate." (10). Moore's

"Epicurean" is severely reviewed because the poet ignored the didactic standard. "Even if the work had merits of any kind, poetical, descriptive, narrative, or dramatic, much higher than any which it, in our judgment possess, they would scarcely reconcile us to the total absence of any moral purpose in a work of so much pretension." (11).

The standard by which the Westminster judged a literary work was its didacticism. The work, however, had to be didactic in a very special sense. Cowper's literary works were considered as a "chef d 'oeuvre' of didactic poetry" yet they do not receive the approval of the radical reviewers. A true poem according to the Westminster Review, must seek to edify and improve mankind in virtuous conduct, but the rule of conduct must be shown to produce happiness, happiness on the largest possible scale. (12). Because Cowper did not measure conduct on such a scale he is unfavorably reviewed. The principle of "Utility" then is not only their standard in political and social relations but it is also their standard for literary criticism. The Westminster Review begins with the idea that the artist and the thinker are incompatible.

"There are few great poets who have been good reasoners." (13)

The artists imagination and originality make it impossible for him to have the fine sense of loyalty to facts,

necessary for the thinker. It is evident however that

the Westminster soon becomes broader in its outlook.

Before the Westminster had been in existence for a year

an entirely new attitude towards literature pervades

its columns. Dealing with Lord Byron and his

departure to fight for the liberty of Greece, it says.

"The imagination of Lord Byron, however, was the subject

and servant of his reason in this instance he did not

act, and perhaps never did, under the influence of the

delusions of a wild enthusiasm, by which poets, very

erroneously as regards great poets, are supposed to be

generally led." (14). Here the great artist and the

thinker are considered as compatible. We cannot say

by this single quotation, that a sudden light fell on

the reviewers causing them to become appreciative of

poetry. It is, however, at least a faint glimmer which,

is evidence of a gradual enlightenment in artistic

appreciation. This process, however, was slow. For a long

time their old contempt for poetry comes to the surface.

In the fourth number Austin says, "So ridiculous a whim

might possibly find its way into the airy head of a poet but would never disturb the calculations of a discreet farming man." (15). Similarly in the fifth number."

In the quantity of serious matter to which our attention is necessarily devoted, we can spare no more time or space for these lighter topics." These "lighter topics" were poetry and music.

This slighting treatment of elegant literature was kept up until 1829, when Macaulay wrote the severe castigation of the Utilitarians with which we have already dealt. In this article Macaulay projects some of his criticism at the attitude in which the Westminster regarded elegant literature. To him this contempt of fine art was the contempt of ignorance.(16). He continues his criticism of the Westminster reviewers. "It is one of the principle tenets of the Utilitarians, that sentiment and eloquence serve only to impede the pursuit of truth. They therefore affect a quakerly plainness, or rather a cynical negligence and impurity of style. The strongest arguments, when clothed in brilliant language, seem to them so much wordly nonsense. In the meantime they surrender their understandings, with a facility found

in no other party, to the meanest and most abject sophisms, provided those sophisms come before them disguised with the externals of demonstration. They do not seem to know that logic has its illusions as well as rhetoric, that a fallacy may lurk in a syllogism as well as in a metaphor."

(17). This severe criticism at the hands of Macaulay brought the Utilitarians to their senses. It was a criticism which they well deserve and Macaulay was a master in administering such criticism.

As a result of Macaulay's article there appeared in the Westminster for January 1830 an article on the poetical works of Coleridge which ~~should~~ showed that it had at last broadened itself in acquiring an appreciation for poetry. This article began with a reference to Macaulay's criticism. "There is a set of dunces in the world who having, as they think, compassed the comprehension of one idea, cannot by any means expand their minds to its combination with a second idea, and who therefore sturdily deny that anybody else can. These people are the people who, having had woeful experience that Utilitarians are somewhat logical, hold as downright her^esy or flat blasphemy, the notion that possibly the gods have made them poetical also. And truly their own poetry is as

destitute of logic, as their logic is of poetry. But that is no rule for the world; nature having made many minds by a much ampler measure. May, so far from there ~~be~~ being any natural incongruity between the reasoning and imaginative faculties, as dunces have always been delighted to believe, it may rather be affirmed that they have a mutual affinity, and rarely attain their full development but when they exist in union. Produce who can the name of any first rate poet who was not a sound reasoner." (18). "No, it is not among great poets that we look for men who cannot handle the foils of logical fence, well enough to disarm in a truce the dullest dog that ever tumbled over the dry bones of Aristotle." (19). "The higher degrees of the ratioc^onative and imaginative powers are usually found together." (20)

The ideas expressed in these quotations are vastly different from those in the earlier numbers of the Westminster Review. The Review has reached the stage where poetry and elegant literature are considered as a necessity. It even goes on to point out how Bentham himself has something of the poet in him. "A philosopher must always have something of poetry in him, and a poet of philosophy, for in the nature of things, which is

the source of both, they are inextricably interwoven; there is no dissociating the true and the ~~best~~ beautiful and however exclusively the mind may be devoted to the pursuit of the one, its perceptions must be quickened to the ~~appre~~ apprehension of the other, by finding it in constant contact therewith." (21).

In its enlightenment and its lately acquired appreciation of poetry, the Westminster hails Coleridge as a Utilitarian for he has in himself both the thinker and the artist; he writes as a thinker under the controlling and dictating power of truth and nature, and as an artist he writes under the inspiration of his own profound convictions and emotions, combining the two in his wonderful poetry.

The Westminster reaches this stage in its appreciation of "elegant literature" just at the time of the great stir in England before the reform Bill. For the next six years it is completely occupied in the arduous task of agitating for reform and practically no space is given to the consideration of poetry.

Notes on Chapter Five.

- 1.....For the discussion of the articles on early foreign literature, see section in the appendix on that subject.
- 2.....Hazlitt on English Literature. By Jacob Zeitlin.
New York....1913.....Page xxvi
- 3.....Edinburgh Review.....Volume 2, page 177.
- 4.....Hazlitt on English Literature. By Jacob Zeitlin.
New York....1913.....Page xxxvii
- 5.....Westminster Review.....Volume 1, page 16.
- 6.....Autobiography.....By John Stuart Mill.
New York 1873.....Page 112.
- 7.....Westminster Review.....Volume 1, page 18.
- 8.....Op.Cit.....Volume 1, page 19.
- 9.....Op.Cit.....Volume 1, page 21.
- 10....Op.Cit.....Volume 1, page 536.
- 11....Op.Cit.....Volume 8, page 384.

12....Westminster Review.....Volume 2,page 49.

13....Op.Cit.....Volume 1,page 19.

14....Op.Cit.....Volume 2,page 226.

15....Op.Cit.....Volume 2.

Article on Primogeniture.

16....Edinburgh Review.....Volume XLIX page 160.

17....Op.Cit.....Volume XLIX page 161.

18....Westminster Review.....Volume 12,page 1.

19....Op.Cit.....Volume 12,page 2.

20....Op.Cit.....Volume 12,page 2.

21....Op.Cit.....Volume 12,page 3.

These pages are the result of an attempt to trace the early history and influence of one of the great English reviews. As we have seen, the early numbers of this review were largely given over to a discussion of political and social events and were very often far removed from a discussion of literature or art. In these pages, however, we have the ^{EARLY} history of the Westminster Review which was later to number among its contributors such notable literary personages as George Eliot, Herbert Spencer and Leslie Stephen.

APPENDIX.

The following is a list of the contributors to the Westminster Review whose articles have been identified.
Bingham.

Title of article(1)	Westminster Review	Authority(2)
"Moore's Fables for the Holy Alliance"	Volume 1, page 18. January 1824.	1. Page 112.
"Vocal Music"	Volume 1, page 120. January 1824	6. Vol. 4. Page 158.

John Bowring.(3)

"Greece and Russia"	Volume 1, page 453. April 1824	7. Vol. 15. Page 562.
"Tennyson's Poems"	Volume 14, page 211. January 1831.	14. Page 34.
"Frisian Literature"	Volume 12, page 186 January 1830	5. Vol. 6. Page 76.

(G. Barnett Smith)

Cameron.

"The British Code of Duel"	Volume 4, page 20. July 1825.	2. Page 293.
----------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority
<u>Thomas Carlyle.</u>		
"The Nibelungen Lied"	Volume 15, page 1	5.Vol.9.
	July 1831.	Page 126.
		(Leslie Stephen)
<u>Albany Fonblanque.</u>		
"Moore's Life of Sheridan"	Volume 4, page 371.	8.Page 15.
	October 1825.	
<u>Ugo Foscolo.</u>		
"Wiffen's Tasso"	Volume 6, page 404.	4.Vol.1.
	October 1826.	Page 227.
"Memoirs of Casanova"	Volume 7, page 400.	4.Vol.2
	April 1827.	Page 165.
<u>William J.Fox.</u>		
"Men and Things in 1823"	Volume 1, page 1.	5.Vol.20.
	January 1824.	Page 137.
<u>George Grote.</u>		
"Institutions of Ancient Greece"	Volume 5, page 286.	1.Page 96.
	April 1826	5.Vol.23.
		Page 286.
		(G.Croom Robertson)

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority
<u>John Austin.</u>		
Disposition of Property	Volume 2, page 503.	1. Page 96.
by Will--Primogeniture"	October 1824.	
<u>James Mill.</u>		
"Edinburgh Review"	Volume 1, page 206.	2. Page 265.
	January 1824	1. Page 92.
"Quarterly Review"	Volume 2, page 463	2. Page 277.
	October 1824	1. Page 96.
"Southey's Book of the Church, &c."	Volume 3, page 167	2. Page 285
	January 1825	1. Page 96.
"Ecclesiastical Es- tablishments"	Volume 5, page 504.	2. Page 295.
	April 1826.	
"Formation of Opin- ions"	Volume 6, page 1.	2. Page 304.
	July 1826	
"State of the Nation"	Volume 6, page 249.	2. page 308.
	October 1826.	
"The Ballot"(4)	Volume 13, page 1.	2. Page 349
	July 1830.	

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>John Stuart Mill.</u>		
"Edinburgh Review"	Volume 1, page 505. April 1824.	3. Page 31.
"Religious Persecutions"	Volume 2, page 1. July 1824.	3. Page 31.
"War Expenditure"	Volume 2, page 27. July 1824.	3. Page 31.
"Brodie's History of the British Empire"	Volume 2, page 346 October 1824.	3. Page 31.
"Quarterly Review. Pol- itical Economy"	Volume 3, page 213. January 1825.	3. Page 31.
"Law of Libel and Liberty of Press"	Volume 3, page 285. April 1825.	1. Page 97.
"The Game Laws"	Volume 5, page 1. January 1826.	1. Page 97.
"French Revolution"	Volume 5, page 385. April 1826.	3. Page 31.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority
<u>John Stuart Mill.</u> (continued)		
"Modern French Historical Works--Age of Chivalry"	Volume 6, page 62. July 1826.	3. Page 31.
"Corn Laws"	Volume 6, page 373 October 1826.	3. Page 31.
"Godwin's History of the Commonwealth of England"(5)	Volume 8, page 328. October 1827.	3. Page 32.
"Whatley's Elements of Logic"	Volume 9, page 127. January 1828.	3. Page 32.
"French Revolution-- Scott's Life of Napoleon"	Volume 9, page 251. April 1828	3. Page 32. and 1. Page 131.

Joint production of John Stuart Mill and Ellis.

"M'Culloch's Discourse on Political Economy"	Volume 4, page 88 July 1825.	2. Page 292.
--	---------------------------------	--------------

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Francis Place.</u>		
"Egypt"	Volume 6, page 158 July 1826.	9. Page 87.
"History of Parliament"	Volume 8, page 253. October 1827.	9. Page 87.
<u>Jeremy Bentham.</u>		
"Bentham on Humphrey's Property Code"	Volume 6, page 446 October 1826	10 Part 6. Page 387.
<u>"John Arthur Roebuck.</u>		
"Affairs of Canada"	Volume 23, page 269. October 1835.	13. Page 70.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u>		
"On the Instrument of Exchange"	Volume 1, page 171. January 1824.	11. Vol. 3, page 295 5. Vol. 56. Page 225 (H. J. Robinson)
"Arabs and Persians"	Volume 5, page 202. January 1826.	11. Vol. 3. Page 344

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"Corn Laws"	Volume 11,page 1 July 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 87.
"Quipos,or Peruvian Knot Records"	Volume 11,page 229 July 1829.	11.Vol.1. 1. Page 96.
" 'Greatest Happiness' Principle"	Volume 11,page 254. July 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 121.
"Slavery in the West Indies"	Volume 11,page 275. October 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 136.
"Essays on the Pursuit of Truth,&c."	Volume 11,page 278 October 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 152.
"Change ^{OF} in the Min- istry in France"	Volume 11,page 494. October 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 165.
"Edinburgh Review and the 'Greatest Happiness' Principle"	Volume 11,page 527. October 1829.	11.Vol.1 Page 180.
"Notice on the Subject of Free Trade"	Volume 11,page 540. October 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 190.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
------------------	--------------------	------------

Thomas Perronet Thompson.(continued)

"Catholic Question"	Volume 10,page 1.	11.Vol.1
---------------------	-------------------	----------

January 1829	Page 1.
--------------	---------

"Béranger's Songs"	Volume 10,page 198.	11.Vol.1.
--------------------	---------------------	-----------

January 1829	Page 36.
--------------	----------

"Absenteeism"	Volume 10,page 857.	11.Vol.1.
---------------	---------------------	-----------

January 1829.	Page 52.
---------------	----------

"System of Fagging"	Volume 10,page 244.	11.Vol.1.
---------------------	---------------------	-----------

January 1829	Page 58.
--------------	----------

"Religious Disabil-	Volume 13,page 188.	11.Vol.1.
---------------------	---------------------	-----------

ities"	July 1830.	Page 269
--------	------------	----------

"Distress of the	Volume 13,page 218.	11.Vol.1.
------------------	---------------------	-----------

Country"	July 1830.	Page 278.
----------	------------	-----------

"Great Britain &	Volume 13,page 240.	11.Vol.1.
------------------	---------------------	-----------

France"	July 1830.	Page 287.
---------	------------	-----------

"Geometry without	Volume 13,page 503	11.Vol.1.
-------------------	--------------------	-----------

Axioms"	October 1830.	Page 306.
---------	---------------	-----------

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"Revolution of 1830"	Volume 13,page 509. October 1830.	11.Vol.1. Page 313.
"Defensive Force"	Volume 14,page 1. January 1831.	11,Vol.1. Page 328.
"East-India Trade"	Volume 14,page 93. January 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 344.
"Machine Breaking"	Volume 14,page 191. January 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 353.
"European Revolution"	Volume 14,page 245. January 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 373.
"Banking"	Volume 10,page 360. April 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 63.
"Disabilities of the Jews"	Volume 10,page 435. April 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 70.
"Poor Humphrey's Cal- endar"	Volume 10,page 480. April 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 79.

Title of article Westminster Review Authority.

Thomas Perronet Thompson.(continued)

"Forty-Shilling Free- holders"	Volume 10,page524. April 1829.	11.Vol.1. Page 82.
"Free Trade"	Volume 12,page 138. January 1830.	11.Vol.1. Page 191.
"Radical Reform"	Volume 12,page 222. January 1830.	11.Vol.1 Page 219.
"Edinburgh Review & the'Greatest Happiness Principle'"	Volume 12,page 246. January 1830.	11.Vol.1. Page 229.
"Taxes on Literature, The'Six Acts'"	Volume 12,page 416. April 1830.	11.Vol.1. Page 247.
"Le Representant des Peoples"	Volume 12,page518. April 1830.	11.Vol.1. Page 261.
"Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society"	Volume 14,page 261. April 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 381.
"Parliamentary Reform"	Volume 14,page 440. April 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 413.

Title of article Westminster Review. Authority.

Thomas Perronet Thompson.(continued)

"Poland and France"	Volume 14,page 507. April 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 429.
"Annals & Antiquities of Rajast'han"	Volume 15,page 143. July 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 437.
"Military System of Napoleon"	Volume 15,page 225. July 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 440.
"Belgium & the Holy Alliance"	Volume 15,page 267. July 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 453.
"Quarterly Journal of Education"	Volume 15,page 495. October 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 462.
"Appeal to the French Nation"	Volume 15,page 522. October 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 473.
"Prospects from Tory Reaction"	Volume 15,page 527. October 1831.	11.Vol.1. Page 478.
"Archbishop of Dublin on Political Economy"	Volume 16,page 1. January 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 1.
"Adjustment of the Peers"	Volume 16,page 121. January 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 23.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.(continued)</u>		
"Saint Simonianism,&c."	Volume 16,page 279. April 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 34.
"Improvement of the Con- dition of the Clergy"	Volume 16,page 394. April 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 75.
"Silk & Glove Trades"	Volume 16,page 425. April 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 95.
"Enharmonic of the Anc- ients"	Volume 16,page 429. April 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 99.
"French Commerce"	Volume 16,page 534. April 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 159.
"Dr.Chalmers on Pol- ical Economy"	Volume 17,page 1. July 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 167.
"Renewal of Bank Charter"	Volume 17,page 193. July 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 200.
"Supplement to the Art. onSilk & Glove Trades"	Volume 17,page 241. July 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 218.
"Prospects of Reform"	Volume 17,page 248. July 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 225.

Title of article.	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"M'Culloch's Edition of the 'Wealth of Nations'"	Volume 17,page 267. October 1832	11.Vol.2. Page 238,
"Gardiner's Music of Nature"	Volume 17,page 345. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 282.
"Second Supplement to Art- icle on 'Silk & Glove Trade'"	Volume 17,page 380. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 303.
"Wainewright's Vindicat- ion of Paley, Fort Risban"	Volume 17,page 413. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 306.
"Supplement to 'Renewal of Bank Charter'"	Volume 17,page 421. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 314.
"Viscount Milton's Address on the Corn Laws."	Volume 17,page 510. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 316;
"The Fall of the Con- stitution"	Volume 17,page 514. October 1832.	11.Vol.2. Page 320.
"Report of Secret Committee on Bank Charter."	Vol.18,page 76. January 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 329.
"Harmonics of the Violin"	Volume 18,page 155. January 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 337.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"Bishop of Bath & Wells on a General Commutation of Tithes"	Volume 18,page 162. January 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 345.
"Col.Torren's Letters on Commercial Policy"	Volume 18,page 168. January 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 351.
"Third Supplement to Art- icle on Silk & Glove Trades"	Volume 18,page 228. Jan.1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 358.
"Policy,Justice,& Con- sequences of the Dutch War"	Volume 18,page 249. Jan.1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 368.
"Equitable Adjustment"	Volume 18,page 263. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 374.
"Booth's Free Trade,as it affects the People"	Volume 18,page 366. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 392.
"Effects of Abolition & Commutation of Tithes"	Volume 18,page 375. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 401.
"Fourth Supplement to Art- icle on Silk & Glove Trades"	Volume 18,page 404. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 406.
"Colonel Torren's Additional Letters on Commercial Policy"	Vol.18,Page 421. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 409.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"Musical Periodicals. Harmonicon--Guilianiad"	Volume 18,page 471. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 414.
"Ireland"	Volume 18,page 500. April 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 417.
"Property Tax"	Volume 19,page 1. July 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 433.
"Whewell's First Principles of Mechanics"	Volume 19,page 146. July 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 441.
"Nathan on the History and Theory of Music"	Volume 19,page 242. July 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 459.
"A Free Trader's Defence of the Mercantile System"	Volume 19,page 269. October 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 466.
"London University Magazine;Note on Austin's Jurisprudence"	Volume 19,page 329. October 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 479.
"Otto on the Violin"	Volume 19,page 442. October 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 482.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.(continued)</u>		
"The Question of Absenteeism Reducible to the Principles of Free Trade"	Volume 19,page 516. October 1833.	11.Vol.2. Page 486.
"Dr.Chalmers Bridgewater Treatise"	Volume 20,page 1. January 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 2.
"Jew's Harps,&c."	Volume 20,page 74. January 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 22.
"Importance of Belgian Independence"	Volume 20,page 125. January 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 36.
"Economy of Paying Twice Over"	Volume 20,page 238. January 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 43.
"The Suffering Rich"	Volume 20,page 265. April 1834.	11.VOL.3. Page 70.
"Royal Society and M. Legendre"	Volume 20,page 424. April 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 79.
"Subjunctive Mood"	Volume 20,page 465. April 1834.	11,Vol.3. Page 89.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"Impressment and Flogging"	Volume 20,page 489. April 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 93.
"Quarterly Review,Globe, &c.in Support of Corn Monopoly."	Volume 20,page 514, April 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 100.
"Bentham's Deontology"	Volume 21,page 1. July 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 108.
"Pamphlet in Modern Greek and French on Out-post Cavalry"	Vol.21,page 204. July 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 126.
"Do.cn Telegraphers,Horse and Foot,for Field Ser- vice"	Vol.21,page 211. July 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 134.
"First Report of Messrs. Villiers and Bowring"	Volume 21,page 257. July 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 137
"Cab and Omnibus Nuis- ance"	Volume 21,page 395. October 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 148.
"Bordwine's New System of Fortification"	Volume 21,page 480. October 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 153.

Title of article	Westminster Review	Authority.
<u>Thomas Perronet Thompson.</u> (continued)		
"John Hopkin's on Political Economy"	Volume 22,page 1. January 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 159.
"Enharmonic Organ"	Volume 22,page 56. January 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 165.
"Contre-Enquete.Par 1' Homme aux Quarante Ecus"	Volume 22,page 226. January 1835.	11.Vol.3. page 177.
"Lady Morgan's Princess"	Volume 22,page 281. April 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 216.
"Jacquemont's Letters from India"	Volume 22,page 304. April 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 239.
"Table-Talk with S.T. Coleridge"	Volume 22,page 531. April 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page248.
"Mrs.Loudon's Philanthropic Economy"	Volume 23,page 1. July 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 254.
"Woolhouse's Essay on Musical Interval's &c."	Volume 23,page 100. July 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 290.

Title of article Westminster Review Authority.

Thomas Perronet Thompson inserted a few pages within the following articles.

"Clapperton's Travels"	Volume 11,page 69. July 1829.	11.Vol.3. Page 466.
"Military Law"	Volume 16,page 414. April 1832.	11.Vol.3. Page 463.
"Sugar without Slavery"	Volume 19,page 247. July 1833.	11.Vol.3. Page 464.
"Prospects of the Col- oured Races"	Volume 20,page 168. January 1834.	11.Vol.3. Page 406.
"Present Postures of Affairs"	Volume 22,page 259. January 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 430.
"Banin's Canvassing"	Volume 22,page 472. April 1835.	11.Vol.3. Page 447.
"Stuart's Three Years in North America"(6)	Volume 18,page 317. April 1833.	11.Vol.3. Page 416.

KEY TO THE APPENDIX.

- 1.....Autobiography. John Stuart Mill.
 New York.1873.
- 2.....James Mill.A Biography Alexander Bain.
 London.1882.
- 3.....John Stuart Mill.A Criticism with Personal
 Recollections. Alexander Bain.
 New York.1882.
- 4.....Opere. Ugo Foscolo.
 Florence,Le Monnier.1923.
- 5.....Dictionary of National Biography.
- 6.....Memoirs,Journal and Correspondence of Thomas
 Moore.In Eight Volumes.Edited by Lord John
 Russel.M.P. London.1853.
- 7.....Blackwood's Magazine.
- 8.....The Life and Labours of Albany Fonblanque.
 by Edward Barrington de Fonblanque.
 London.1874.

9.....Life of Francis Place. by Graham Wallas.

London.1918.

10.....The Works of Jeremy Bentham, collected under
the Superintendence of John Bowring. In Twenty
Parts. Edinburgh.1842.

11.....Exercises, -Political and Others. by Lieut.
Colonel T. Perronet Thompson. In Six Volumes.
London.1842.

12.....Fraser's Magazine.

13.....Life and Letters of John Arthur Roebuck. by
Robert Baden Leader. London.1897.

14.....Tennyson- A Modern Portrait by Hugh I'Anson
Fausset. New York.1923.

Articles in the Westminster Review on Popular Poetry.

During the twelve years with which we are dealing, there appeared in many numbers of the Westminster Review, articles dealing with the popular poetry of different countries. These were probably written by, or under the direct superintendence of John Bowring, the editor, who was particularly interested in poetry of this sort. Early in his career, he conceived the scheme of writing a history and giving translated specimens of the popular poetry of, not only the Western World, but the Eastern as well. With the help of some of the eminent scholars of many countries, he translated and published collections of these poems. In the Westminster, during the first few years of its existence, there appeared regularly, articles on these subjects. That Bowring wrote most of them is more than probable. He was enthusiastic about this scheme just about the time that he was made editor of the Westminster Review. It would be strange, indeed, if there were not some reflexion in the review of the extensive he had conceived. The following are the articles with the date of their appearance.

- "Politics and Literature
of Russia" Volume 1, page 80.
January 1824.
- "Greece and its Popular
Poetry" Volume 2, page 149.
July 1824.
- "Basni, J. A. Krilov. Fables
de M. Kriloff" Volume 4, page 176.
July 1825.
- "Narodne Srpske Pjesme Pop-
ular Songs, collected and
published by Vuk Stephanovitch
Karatzich, etc." Volume 6, page 23.
July 1826.
- "Runes of Finland" Volume 7, page 317.
April 1827.
- "Living Poets of Holland" Volume 10, page 36.
January 1829.
- "Illyrian Poems Feudal Scenes" Volume 10, page 71.
January 1829.
- "Hungarian Tales" Volume 10, page 101.
January 1829

- "Handbuch der Ungrischen Poesie, Volume 11, page 29.
etc. s. e. Manuel of Hungarian Poetry" July 1829.
- "Frisian Literature" Volume 12, page 186.
January 1830.
- "Ancient Bohemian Ballads" Volume 12, page 304.
April 1830.

N.B.

For Bowring's interest in poetry of this kind see the article on Bowring in the Dictionary of National Biography, by ~~George~~ G. Barnett Smith. (Dictionary of National Biography Volume 6, Page 79.)

Notes on the Appendix.

- Q.
1. The titles of the articles given in this column are the same as those used on the headings of the pages of the Westminster Review.
 2. This column represents the authorities which the writer has used to prove the identification of the authorship of the articles. The initial figure is explained by a key at the end of the appendix.
 3. A further list of Bowring's probable contributions to the Westminster will be given later.
 4. Fraser's Magazine for March 1831, page 193, seems to be under the impression that this article was written by Bentham.
 5. Alexander Bain, whom I give as the authority, is uncertain about the authorship of this article. It is only probable that Mill wrote it. For this reason I have included it in Mill's list.
 6. Thomas Perronet Thompson wrote the last twelve pages of this article, as they are included in the edition of his works collected by himself. They

are in "Exercises ,Political and Otherwise" Volume 3,
page 416.The reference to the date of the appearance
of the article in the Westminster REview,given in this
collection is wrong.This article appeared ,not in April
1830,but in April 1833.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- John Stuart Mill.....Autobiography.
New York.1873.
- Alexander Bain.....James Mill,A Biography.
London.1882.
- T.Perronet Thompson.....Exercises,Political and Others.
London 1842. In Six Volumes.
- C.B.Roylance Kent.....The English Radicals.
London 1899.
- Walter Graham.....The Beginnings of English Literary
Periodicals. New York 1926.
- Walter Graham.....Tory Criticism in the Quarterly
Review. New York. 1921.
- G.M.Trevelyan.....British History in the Nineteenth
Century. New York 1922.
- Jeremy Bentham.....Works edited by John Bowring,
in twenty two parts. Edinburgh 1842.
- Mrs.Grote.....Personal Life of George Grote.

Henry Mills Alden.....Magazine Writing and the New
Literature.New York 1908.

Alexander Bain.....John Stuart Mill,a Criticism.
New York 1882.

Hugh Elliot.....Letters of John Stuart Mill.
In two volumes.London 1910.

Oliver Elton.....A Survey of English Literature.
In four volumes.New York 1920.

Hugh I'Anson Fausset.....Tennyson-A Modern Portrait.
New York 1923.

Edward Barrington de Fonblanque.....The Life and Labours
of Albany Fonblanque.....
London 1874.

R.P.Gillies.....Memoirs of a Literary Veteran.
London 1851.

Carlton J.H.Hayes.....A Political and Social History of
Modern Europe..In two volumes.
New York 1924.

- Robert Baden Powell.....Life and Labours of John
Arthur Roebuck.London 1897.
- Ramsay Muir.....A Short History of the British
Commonwealth.In two volumes.
Liverpool 1922.
- Macvey Napier.....Selections from the Correspon-
dence of Macvey Napier Esq.
London 1879.
- Archibald Prentice.....History of the Anti-Corn-Law-
League.London 1853.
- Lord John Russell.....Memoirs, Journal and Correspon-
dence of Thomas Moore.In eight
volumes.London 1853.
- George Saintsbury.....A History of Nineteenth Liter-
ature.London 1896.
- Gilbert Slater.....The Making of Modern Europe.
New Revised Edition.Boston 1924.
- Leslie Stephen.....The English Utilitarians.In
three volumes.Duckworth and Co.1900.

Hugh Walker.....The Literature of the Victorian
Era.Cambridge 1910.

Graham Wallas.....Life of Francis Place.
London 1918.

Jacob Zeitlin.....Hazlitt on English Literature.
New York.1913.

PERIODICALS.

Westminster Review.....Volumes 1-25.

Edinburgh Review.....Volumes 47-51.

Quarterly Review.....Number 66

Blackwood's Magazine.....Volume 15.

Fraser's Magazine.....March 1831.

