

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE MARKET FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WHEAT.—We have been favoured by Mr. Hewitt, of Noarlunga, with the following letter addressed to him by the Rev. R. W. Newland, of Encounter Bay, while the reverend gentleman was at the Cape on his way to England. Mr. Hewitt kindly permits its publication; and we are sure that on such excellent authority as Mr. Newlands, the facts stated in this communication will be regarded as most interesting and important to the agricultural interests of the colony:—
 “Cape of Good Hope, March 22nd, 1845—
 My dear Sir—I have this day seen one of the most extensive millers of this place, and made enquiries respecting the price of wheat, &c., and write you the result. They would now most gladly purchase any quantity of prime wheat at eight shillings the bushel. The season has this year been very dry, and the growing crops not so good as usual. The miller says that at the cheapest times good wheat is worth, and will readily sell in almost any quantity at not less than six shillings a bushel. They are quite on the look out for South Australian wheat, expecting it will suit this market better than what they obtain from any other place; they say they have no sample of it at present. We have on board a quantity shipped by Paxton, of Adelaide, which he purchased at Frew's sale; it is a fair sample, but not clean. They have seen a sample, and would gladly give 8s. per bushel cash, but being shipped for London, of course it must go there. Here are no port charges whatever. The gentleman says, that of course any sample of wheat will sell, but they are particularly looking out for good samples, as they have an especial demand for very fine flour, and certainly it is most beautiful, being dressed through No. 73 wire machine. I thought that this information might be of service to you. This appears to me to be a market which will suit us well, and will take all we can supply from South Australia. How the question has got abroad in South Australia that the Cape would not answer, I know not. We arrived here in ten weeks exactly, and expect to sail again tomorrow. Our vessel is very heavily loaded, and sails very slowly. We are well. I shall not write to any one else about wheat, but you are at liberty to make any use of this you think proper. They are thinking seriously of despatching a vessel to Adelaide on purpose to fetch wheat. Kind regards to all.—Yours truly, R. W. NEWLAND.”—*South Australian Gazette*.

SWAN RIVER.

His Excellency the Governor's despatches upon the subject of his recall had been received at the Colonial Office, and Lord Stanley had intimated his acceptance to the Governor's resignation. We believe we may state positively that his Excellency has no official communication whatever upon this subject, but his speedy recall is nevertheless certain, and judging from the usual practice of the Colonial Office, it is likely that his successor will be immediately appointed. Allowing three months for the new Governor to make his preparations, he may be expected to sail in the month of June, and his arrival may thus be looked for, at latest, by early in October next, up to which time, at all events, Mr. Hutt will remain to administer the go-

vernment of the colony. With regard to Mr. Hutt's successor, nothing whatever is known; indeed the knowledge of his resignation appears to have been confined to Lord Stanley, and one or two of his confidants.—*Swan River Paper*.

LITERARY REGISTER.

THE HOME-BOUND SHIP.

Morn brightened into rich and cloudless day,
 And beauty, resting full on earth and heaven,
 Seemed as just breathed from the Creator's love.
 The gallant vessel lay, with look of pride,
 As conscious that the hour, at last, was come
 For her glad journey back to England, bearing
 The home sick homeward; that sad farewell looks,
 From many a jut and point along the shore,
 Would follow, seeking on her poop, for faces
 To vanish soon for ever. Hark, eight bells!
 And see her "meteor flag," for the last time,
 Rise in the sunlight of this Southern Land
 Which, too, bears England's union, floating o'er
 The spot where landed first our countrymen.
 Now, friends and kindred! take your last farewell,
 Press close your beating hearts; nor let false shame
 Lock up the tears that flow, to fertilise
 The heart which has true love enough for tears.
 Now the boat waits for them who go; and ye,
 Dwellers in Sydney, who lose friends to-day,
 May hold them by the hand no minute longer;
 Now, come, and watch their bark go out to sea!
 With loud and cheery song, the seamen lift
 Her anchor, 'neath the pilot's watchful eye;
 Already her loose sails, in white festoons,
 Are stirred by the fresh, favorable breeze,
 Which breaks in glittering fragments the small waves
 Against her trimly-painted sides: and eyes
 Are watching for her earliest gentle start
 Upon her long, long journey. "Of she goes!"
 The iron keeper has forsook his hold,
 And cometh home, with the crew's heightened song,
 From his long post of safety in the sea.

Behold yon group upon the tide-left reef
 Under the Fort which bears Macquarie's name,
 And burlesques England's power, and shames her pride:
 Yon group, with farewell signals waving white
 To passenger who answers, with the same
 White symbol of quick, recognising love.
 As down the harbour glides the noble ship,
 With canvas set, and colours flying gaily,
 Those snowy handkerchiefs are waving still,
 And still are answered from her starboard quarter,
 Till round dark Bradley's wooded head she's lost.
 "A pleasant passage to her!" in the words
 Of every sailor, bidding an old friend,
 When outward bound, farewell—"A pleasant passage
 To her;" and may she reach a happy land!

H. PARKES.

BIOGRAPHY.

COPERNICUS.

NICOLAUS COPERNICUS was born at Thorn, in Prussia, a town on the Vistula, near the place where it crosses the Polish frontier. His family was not noble; but his uncle, Lucas Watzelrode, was bishop of Warmia (episcopus Warmiensis), whence it is frequently stated that Copernicus afterwards settled at a town of that name; whereas the cathedral was situated at Frauenburg, a town on the coast, near the mouth of the Vistula, and, as to social position, about fifty miles both from Königsberg and Danzig. Copernicus was educated first at home, and then at the University of Cracow, where he became doctor of medicine. He paid more than usual attention to mathematics, and afterwards to perspective and painting. After the completion of his studies at Cracow, Copernicus went to Italy, and stayed some time at Bologna, under the instruction of Dominico Maria. His turn for unusual speculation began to appear in his having at this time the notion that the altitude of the pole was not always the same at the same place. He was certainly at Bologna in 1497, and by the year 1500 he had settled himself at Rome, as appears by astronomical observations which he is recorded as having made.

At Rome he gave public instructions, and in some official capacity (magno applausu factus mathematicum professor); he is said, while thus engaged, to have established a reputation hardly less than that of Regiomontanus. In a few years, but the date is not precisely stated, he returned to his native country, where (having taken orders, we suppose, in Italy) his uncle gave him a canonry in his diocesan church of Frauenburg. There, after some contests in defence of his rights, not very intelligibly described, he passed the rest of his days in a three-fold occupation—his ecclesiastical duties, his gratuitous medical practice among the poor, and astronomical researches. He went very little into the world; he considered all conversation as fruitless, except that of a serious and learned cast; so that he formed no intimacies except with grave and learned men, among whom are particularly recorded Gysius, bishop of Culm, and his pupil and follower, the celebrated Rheticus. A large mass of his epistles is said by Gassendi to have fallen into the hands of Broscius, professor at Cracow, but none have been published. He was all this time engaged as well in actual observation as in speculation. His instrumental means, however, were not superior to those of Ptolemy; and he perfectly well knew the necessity of improvement in this department. "If (said he to Rheticus) I could determine the true places of the heavenly bodies within ten seconds of a degree, I should not glory less in this than in the rule which Pythagoras has left us."

Copernicus was struck by the complexity of the Ptolemaic system, and searched all ancient authors to find one of a more simple character. The earth stationary in the centre of the universe, the planets moving round it carried on enormous crystalline spheres (for though many might use this as mere hypothesis, the refutation of Tycho Brahe from the nature of the orbits of comets shows that he considered the material spheres as one of the opinions of his day), and finally the enormous sphere of the fixed stars, carried round once in every twenty-four hours, struck him with a feeling that such a system could not be that of nature. He found in Martianus Capella and others, proofs that an opinion had formerly prevailed to some extent that Mercury and Venus, at least, moved round the sun; that the Pythagoreans held the rotation of the earth; and that Philolaus had even imagined the earth to have an orbit round the sun. It is very doubtful to what point these several opinions were carried, or on what grounds they were supported: it is sufficient for our purpose here that Copernicus found such doctrines attributed to the sects and persons above mentioned, and took them into consideration, with a view to see how far phenomena could be made to follow from them with more simplicity than in the system of Ptolemy. At what time he finally adopted his own system is not very clear; his work was completely written in 1520, and from that time he did nothing except to add and alter. And since Copernicus says, in his epistle to Paul III., that he had been very long pressed by his friends to publish, the above date is not improbable. In the mean while his opinion was circulated even among the vulgar; and he was satirized on the stage at Elburg. His reasons had convinced Reinhold, Rheticus, Gysius, and others; and upon

the representations made to him, Cardinal Schonberg was desirous of having the work printed, and wrote to Copernicus to that effect from Rome in 1536. But though backed by a Cardinal, a bishop, and two of the most learned astronomers of the age, Copernicus was well aware of the odium which an attempt to disturb established opinions would excite; and it was not, it seems, till about 1541, that a tardy consent was extorted from him. The work was accordingly delivered to Gysius, and by him to Rheticus, who, thinking that it would be best printed at Nuremberg, entrusted it to Andrew Osiander, who superintended the printing, and wrote the remarkable preface, which is generally attributed to Copernicus himself. This is explicitly stated by Gasendi, and the reason assigned is the obvious one that Osiander (besides thinking it necessary to print the cardinal's request) was afraid of shocking public opinion, and thought it best to represent the scope of the work, not as actually affirming the motion of the earth, but as using such an hypothesis for the more simple and ready calculation of the heavenly motions.

He says, "It is not necessary that hypotheses should be true or even probable; it is sufficient that they lead to results of calculation which agree with observations." He points out the admitted defects, and admitted unlikelihood, of several points of the Ptolemaic system; requires that the new hypothesis should be admitted on the same footing as the ancient ones, and ends thus—"Neither let any one, so far as hypotheses are concerned, expect anything certain from astronomy, since that science can afford nothing of the kind; lest, in case he should adopt for truth things feigned for another purpose, he should leave this study more foolish than he came."

With such safeguards, headed by the urgent request of a cardinal, and dedicated, probably by permission, to the pope, the work was ushered into the world, of which it was the ultimate destiny to help largely in overthrowing submission to authority in matters of science, whether to the doctrines of the Greeks or to the reputed interpretation of the sacred writings. The title-page is as follows:—

NICOLAI COPERNICI TORINENSIS

DE REVOLUTIONIBUS ORBIUM
CÆLESTIUM LIBRI VI.

Habes in hoc opere iam recens nato & ædito, studiosè lector, Motus stellarum, tam fixarum quàm erraticarum, cum ex ueteribus tum etiam ex recentibus obseruationibus restitutos: & nouis insuper ac admirabilibus hypothësis ornatos. Habes etiam tabulas expeditissimas, ex quibus eosdem ad quoduis tempus quàm facillimè calculare poteris. Igitur eme, lege, fruere.

Norimbergæ apud. Ioh. Petreium.

Anno M. D. XLIII.

The taste of what we should now call the puff in the title-page is doubtless that of Osiander, to whom it is due that the great work of Copernicus contains an expression of recommendation to buy it in the title-page, being the only instance of the kind we know. The second edition, edited by Rheticus, was published at Basle, 1566, and is little es-

teemed; the third, edited by Muler, was printed at Amsterdam in 1617, and again in 1640, with notes: it is the most correct of the three. This same Muler, in his *Tabulæ Frisicæ*, Alcaaar, 1611, has reduced the hypotheses of Copernicus to the form of tables.

We now come to the description of the Copernican system. It is customary to call all existing notions on the system of the world, Copernican. This matters little, considered as a mere method of expression; but it becomes of consequence when, by means of it, a degree of lustre is thrown on the speculations of Copernicus, which, properly considered, they do not need, and, critically examined, they will not bear. We are accustomed to see Copernicus represented as a man so far in advance of his age, that in the main points of his system nothing has been added and nothing subtracted. The plates in our elementary works show, under the heading of "the Copernican system," planets, satellites, and comets, all with orbits such as the latest discoveries have assigned. We shall, therefore, exhibit the "Copernican system" as far as we can in the words of its author, and at greater length than would have been necessary had no misconception prevailed. The work "*De Revolutionibus*" consists of an introductory dedication to Paul III., and six books. In the former Copernicus distinctly informs us that, being discontented with the complexity of the prevailing systems, he closely examined all the writings of the ancients, to see if he could find anything better. He found the testimony of Cicero and Plutarch, as to the opinions of Nicetas, Pythagoras, and Philolaus. He thereupon claims for himself the same license, adverts to his hypothesis as purely fictitious, and says, "Quamvis absurda opinio videbatur, tamen quia sciebam aliis ante me concessam libertatem, ut quoslibet fingerent, circulos ad demonstrandum phenomena astrorum. Existimavi mihi quoque facile permitti, ut experirem, an posito terræ aliquo motu firmiores demonstrationes quàm illorum essent, inueniri in revolutione orbium cœlestium possent." With regard to the word demonstration, it must be particularly remembered that at this period the term, as applied to astronomy, always meant a showing how the thing would happen if the supposition were true, not a proof of the supposition itself.

The first book contains the propositions—1. That the universe is spherical; which is proved by old reasons, such as that a sphere is the "most perfect figure," &c. 2. That the earth is spherical; for which he gives the same reasons as are now given. 3. That the earth and sea make one globe. 4. That the motions of all the heavenly bodies must be either uniform and circular, or compounded of uniform and circular motions. Nothing but circular motion, he asserts, could reproduce phenomena periodically; and he maintains that a simple body must move circularly. 5. He examines the questions whether the earth can have an axial and an orbital motion, and satisfactorily shows that, supposing the distance of the fixed stars to be immense, there is no astronomical reason to the contrary. 6. He gives what he imagines to be a proof that the sphere of the fixed stars is immensely distant. It must be observed that he has no notion of a universe of stars unequally dis-

tributed throughout space. 7 and 8. He examines and argues against the reasons of the ancients for placing the earth in the centre of the universe, by considerations which are as purely imaginary as those against which he was contending. He says that circular motion must be that of a whole, rectilinear motion that of a part separated from its whole; and from this assumption he deduces the falling of a body to the earth. That rectilinear and circular motion can exist together is, according to him, a thing of the same kind as the notion of a horse existing with that of an animal. He is throughout possessed by the opinion that there must be a *centrum mundi*, or fixed point in the middle of the universe, which, however, he considers to be the sun, not the earth. It is needless to say that the *centrum mundi* forms no part of the Newtonian system. 9. He contends for the possibility of the earth having several motions. 10. He establishes the order of the planets, remarks that it is impossible to explain the motion of Mercury and Venus upon the supposition of the earth being their centre, and observes that the motion of the other planets round the sun is perfectly possible, consistently with that of the earth, if the radii of their orbits be made large enough. He draws a diagram of the system in the manner now usual, and concludes with the following words, which must be considered as the first announcement of the system:—"Proinde non pudet nos fateri hoc totum, quod luna præcingit, ac centrum terræ per orbem illum magnum inter cæteras errantes stellas annuâ revolutione circa solem transire, et circa ipsum esse centrum mundi: quo etiam sole immobili permanente, quicquid de motu solis apparet, hoc potius in mobilitate terræ verificari, &c." It must be observed that he lays down a sphere for the fixed stars so distinctly, that his commentator Muler finds it necessary to remind the reader that he does not name the spheres of the planets. But we shall presently see that he could not divest himself of the idea that the primitive motions of the planets were such as would be caused by their being fixed in immense crystal spheres which revolve round the sun.

Before proceeding further it will help us here to observe, that Copernicus does not in the smallest degree attempt to answer the mechanical objections to the earth's motion, which were urged with success against his system till the time of Galileo. The laws of motion, as then explained, and as admitted by Copernicus himself, were altogether insufficient to explain why, if the earth moved, a stone should fall directly under the point from which it is dropped. No explanation of such difficulties is given by Copernicus, nor can we find that they are even alluded to as an element of the question. If the mechanics of Copernicus had been true, the system of Copernicus would have been physically impossible. Now this is an essential element in the character of a discovery, which is materially altered if that which is advanced as true be advanced on false grounds. It is true that fire burns, and it is true that two and two make four; but it is false that two and two make four because fire burns. We give no credit to the Pythagorians, if it be true, as asserted, that they placed the sun in the centre of the planets because they thought fire the most excellent of all things. We may consider the omission of Copernicus in two different lights,

The first is that he saw the mechanical difficulties, but was so struck by the simplicity of his astronomical system that he thought it more probable than the mechanics of his day, and suspected that future researches would produce laws of motion which should allow of the possibility of his system; and thinking thus, he judged it more wise not to enter upon the mechanical question, so as thereby to shock two sets of received opinions at once. This would do honour to his sagacity; but unfortunately, the single sentence above alluded to, the equestrian simile, prevents us from supposing that if he considered the subject mechanically at all, he was other than satisfied with his own conclusion, 'Cum ergo motus circularis sit universorum, partium vero etiam rectus, dicere possumus manere cum recto circularem, sicut cum *ægro animal*.' The word in italics must be a misprint for *equo*, as remarked by Muler. The latter distinctly points out that this is meant to explain the difficulty of a falling stone, and adds, 'Sententiæ hujus veritas dependet ex hypothesi Copernicana;' that is, the truth of the proof depends upon that of the thing proved. He should have said (and possibly did mean), that upon the truth of this sentence the Copernican hypothesis depends, so far as it was proved by Copernicus himself. Our readers now must begin to have an idea how great an injustice has been done to those who found better reasons for the co-existence of rectilinear and circular motion, by the attachment of the name of Copernicus to the present cosmical system.

The second method by which we may suppose Copernicus to have reconciled difficulties, is the actual assertion made both by himself and Osiander, that the hypothesis of terrestrial motion was nothing *but* an hypothesis, valuable only so far as it explained phenomena, and not considered with reference to absolute truth or falsehood.

We now come to the brightest jewel in the crown of Copernicus, the method of which he explained for the first time and with brilliant success, (so far as *demonstration* went, as before described,) the variation of the seasons, the precession of the equinoxes (book i. cap. 2, book iii., and book vi. cap. 35), and the stations and retrogradations of the planets. The latter point is fully made out, and in the manner now adopted, so far as the *qualities* of the phenomena are concerned: we shall presently see the method of rectifying the *quantities*. With regard to the variation of the seasons, Copernicus explains it rightly, from the continual parallelism of the earth's axis. But he cannot obtain this parallelism from his mechanics. He imagines that if the globe of the earth move round the sun, and also round its own axis, the axis of rotation must always preserve the same inclination to the line joining the centre of the earth and sun: just as when a ball fastened by a string is made to spin, and a conical motion is simultaneously given to the string and ball. It is most evident that he got this idea from the solid crystal spheres. If the earth's axis were fixed in an immense sphere, with which it turned round the sun, and if in the first instance the axis produced would pass through the axis of the sphere, the complete phenomenon of Copernicus would be produced. The earth's axis would then describe a cone yearly. To produce parallelism, Copernicus imagines what we

may call an anticonical motion, namely, that the earth's axis is itself endued with such motion, independent of its motion in the sphere, as would, did it act alone, carry the axis round the same cone in a year, but the contrary way. The effect of the two motions is to destroy each other, and the axis remains parallel in all its positions. Then, by supposing the anticonical motion to be a little greater than the direct conical motion, by 50" in a year, he produces the phenomenon of the procession of the equinoxes. If we consider that even Newton himself, in tracing the effect of the forces which cause the procession, is thought to have misconceived his own laws of motion, it is not at this part of the mechanics of Copernicus that we need express surprise: and this explanation of the cause of the seasons and of the procession, together with that of the stations, &c. of the planets, must always place him among cosmical discoverers of the first order of sagacity.

All that we have hitherto described will explain the mean motions of the solar system, and the mean motions only. To account for all irregularities, Copernicus (hampered with the motion that all motions must be compounded of circular ones) is obliged to introduce a system of epicycles entirely resembling that of Ptolemy. It will surprise many readers to hear that the greater part of the work of Copernicus is taken up with his description of this most essential branch of the real 'Copernican system.' But it must be added that the Copernican epicycles are more successful than the Ptolemaic. The latter are utterly insufficient as a means of *demonstrating* the changes of distance of the planets and earth. The former, founded upon a basis which brought this point not very far from the truth at the outset, made a much nearer approximation to a correct representation of the inequalities. But as the epicyclic system is not now connected with the name of Copernicus, we need pursue this subject no further, satisfied that what we have done will have a tendency to put the reputation of that sagacious investigator in its proper place, and that not mean, though lower than the one usually assigned to it.

While Copernicus was in daily expectation of receiving a complete copy of his work from Rheticus, he was seized with hemorrhage, followed by paralysis. The book actually arrived May 23, 1543, and, as Gysius wrote to Rheticus, Copernicus saw it, and touched it, but was too near his end to do more. He died in a few hours after, and was buried in the cathedral to which he belonged.

CONSISTENCY.

From the "Great Gun."

LATELY a paragraph appeared in the daily papers giving a detailed account of the solemn inhumation of the remains of the lamented and gifted composer, Carl Maria Von Weber, which took place at Dresden with great funeral pomp. Nearly twenty years have passed since Weber paid a visit to this country, and received, to a certain extent, the encouragement due to his talents; that is to say, although everybody went to hear his opera of "Der Freischutz," the composer did not receive one farthing either from the proprietor of the English Opera House (where it was produced in England), nor

from the lessees of Drury Lane or Covent Garden.

The musical career of Weber had been one of continued disappointment. His works were nearly unappreciated; their beauties were condemned as faults. The marvellous harmonies, which the world has since reluctantly acknowledged as the masterpieces of a mighty genius, were at first looked upon as combinations of discords, and his wilder and more unstudied efforts as the ravings of an over-wrought brain.

But the world has repented of its injustice; it has decreed that the name of Weber, hitherto cherished by the few who have listened to "Oberon," to the overture of "The Ruler of the Spirits," to Euryanthe," setting apart his most extraordinary though perhaps not finest work, "Der Freischutz," shall be loved and revered by thousands.

His countrymen have celebrated his triumphs by a festival—ceremonies in which the musicians of Dresden, and even some from Berlin and Munich, have hastened to join, and accompany his mortal remains from their resting-place at Magdeburgh (they had reposed quietly in a vault in London for a considerable time), to the tomb prepared for their reception in the City of Dresden. By following the mournfully-decorated barge containing them down the Elbe by torch-light, by bending over his grave in the mockery of "effective sorrow," they imagine they have more than atoned for the entire neglect of the living genius, and have cast a halo round the dead.

It is a positive and undeniable fact that Weber never received, in his own country, the slightest remuneration for "Der Freischutz." A bankrupt manager swallowed up his rightful emoluments. And when the score was first brought over to England with a view to its production at one of our national theatres, it was pronounced by the musical director (an artist of the highest talent) not only to be totally unfitted for our stage, but ineffective in itself.

A manager of more enterprise tried the opera as an experiment at a summer theatre, and he announced it as "a new musical performance of an extraordinary character," and that "the eccentric vehicle for music and scenic effect was a literal translation from the highly-celebrated German opera, &c., &c., of Carl Maria Von Weber."

It was received with great success.

We have alluded before in *The Great Gun* to the salaries of principal performers. For a certain period both Braham and Miss Stephens performed in the English Opera House version of "Der Freischutz." Let us look how matters stood:—

Mr. Braham's salary, per night.....	£21
Miss Stephens'.....	20
Carl Maria Von Weber, (the) inventor and creator,).....	0

Weber fared better with his "Oberon," which was performed at Covent Garden with far less effect, in consequence of the utter meagreness of the *libretto*, for he received one thousand pounds, a sum inadequate to the merits of the work, but beyond what his modesty either hoped or expected.

The encouragement which Weber had never received in his own country came too late to do more than cast a momentary brightness over his fortunes in England.

He had followed in the weary and almost heartbroken track of his predecessors, Mozart and Beethoven. He died!

It is left for future writers, when his works, by the diffusion of musical knowledge, shall have been far better appreciated, to observe that, twenty years after the death of Weber, the musicians and authorities of Dresden (in sad imitation of one of the favourite manias of the Parisians) removed his remains to their city, as if the soul that breathed throughout his harmonies was sleeping still within the perished clay they had thus disturbed.

THE MIRROR HELD UP TO NATURE.

From Chambers' Journal.

To hold the Mirror up to nature, was Shakspeare's idea of what the stage ought to be; and its friends sometimes assume that such is its actual function. We suspect it neither is, nor could well be such a Mirror. To take a strong case at first, where in the world we would ask, do people eat singing, fall asleep singing, quarrel singing, fight singing—in short do everything singing? Is there any place where courts of law are conducted to music, where the prisoner pathetically sings his exculpation, and where the judge gravely condemns him to death to the tune of (what should be) "Tyburn Tree?" If there be such a land of melody, it is certainly among the terra incognita.—As far as our own land is concerned, it is not too much to say, that, if we were not familiarised to such doings, nothing assuredly could appear more absurd. But leaving such ultra musical pieces out of the question, and coming to those performances in which players act as far like the people of the known world, as to talk without flats and sharps (though perhaps in *blank verse*) do we find the matter very much mended? Were there ever any real human beings like those obstinate, gouty, old stage-admirals, who have always nephews and nieces whom they call "young dogs" and "young sluts," and whom they regularly persist in attempting to marry to some displeasing person up to the very last scene of the last act, when they as uniformly change their mind all at once, without the shadow of a reason, and place the hand of a nephew or niece in that of the individual he or she likes, saying, with a most affecting and benedictory snuffle, "Here, you young dog, like her," or, as it may be, "Here, sir, you may take the young gipseey." There is an old monster of this order in almost every drama now acted, and we tolerate him from the mere farce of habit, as if he were like something in actual life—which he certainly is not. In reality, however, the whole round of modern stage characters are scarcely one whit less unnatural. Every theatre has its "Old man obstinate" (the aforesaid admiral) performer; its "Old man virtuous," its "Young man puppyish," and its "Young man tragic," with its knowing valet and rustic simpleton. The theatrical ladies are arranged in a similar way, each company having its "Elderly tragic lady," and its "Old woman comic," its "Young lady serious," and its "Young lady chambermaidish." These personages appear without variation, or shadow of change in every piece. Each new dramatist gives them the word of command like a dancing master, and they assume new positions, as in a reel; but

the parties are the same, ever the same. If they were like anything in real life, one might even get over this sameness—however, they are not. If, for example, the Young man puppyish, who wears spurs, and exclaims "adorable Julia!" so affectingly, were really to cane a servant as he regularly does his stage valet, what would be the consequence? Assuredly the servant would knock him down in an instant, or summon him to the police office. So also with other things. The life of the stage is a bounded and purely conventional life, unlike the life of nature, which is infinite in variety. Dramatists write always within the conventional range of the stage. They prepare a part for the Old Man Obstinate, a part for the Old Man Virtuous, &c., who have representatives in every company; and they never dream of looking into nature herself for novel and striking characters. How then can it with any truth be said that the stage is a mirror held up to nature? As much are the dresses of the Lord Mayor's Show a fair sample of the European costume of the nineteenth century.

A New Invention.—The Queen's Ink.—We received a few days ago, from the inventor a worthy baronet, whose chemical and agricultural knowledge have already conferred great distinction upon his name, and benefit on his country—a specimen of a new invention in the manufacture of ink, which bids fair, in a short time, to supersede entirely the dirty fluid that has hitherto been used for writing. The new ink, which is called the Queen's Ink, from the fact that Her Majesty has expressed her pleasure at the invention, and condescended to make use of it in preference to the old black ink, is colourless as water, and perfectly innocuous, and if spilled upon paper not prepared to receive it, makes no blot or mark. It does not stain linen, or woollen, or wood, or the fingers, or any substance whatever with which it may come in contact, except silver, (from which it may be removed without trouble), and flows with perfect freedom and fluency from the pen, leaving behind it a writing which is distinctly black or blue, according as the paper is prepared for either colour. The great advantages of this harmless and beautiful fluid, over the poisonous and dirty concoction now in universal use, are too obvious to be insisted upon; and we have no doubt, that ere a very long period has elapsed, it will be the only fluid used for writing. To those who write in carpeted rooms, or upon tables covered with any material that ordinary ink will stain or spoil—to those who love cleanliness—to students in their libraries—to ladies in their drawing rooms—and to schools, where ink is so profusely scattered over the walls and floor, this new ink must be invaluable.—*Glasgow Argus.* [Having also been favoured by the never-wearied-in-well-doing inventor of these articles with a packet of his papers and very singular ink, we are enabled to add our testimony to that of our highly respectable northern contemporary of their evident value and importance. It is a very pretty thing of itself to see the same fluid imprinting a block colour on one sort of paper, and a blue on another; and when one notices that this is done by means of a perfectly colourless, and in every way innocuous, fluid, it excites mingled feeling of

pleasure and surprise. Those who handle pens may now hope to do so without having their fingers, furniture, clothes, in short everything about them, dyed with an ugly fast-sticking colour; while, on the other paper especially designed for the reception of the new ink, it takes such a hold as no power of the chemist can obliterate, except by absolutely destroying both. It is needless to say how important it is for professional men and others in business to be made aware of this; and the fact is incontrovertibly established. Altogether, among the arts so abundantly practised in this country, this invention must stand conspicuous as a singular application of science to daily use, for we imagine the Queen's Ink and Paper will soon be in daily and hourly use in all parts of the kingdom.—*Economist.*

Ladies' Logic.—There is as much difference between logic proper and ladies' logic as there is between a polka-pelisse and a macintosh. For, supposing—as ladies, we believe, generally suppose—all logic to be stuff, logic proper is one kind of stuff, and ladies' logic another kind of stuff. The essence of logic proper is the syllogism, which consists of three parts—the major, the minor, and the conclusion. Now, in ladies' logic, all majors are out of the question but Majors in the army; and no attention is paid to minors, unless they are likely to come into property. The major and minor terms of a syllogism are called premises. The premises of ladies' logic are such as Mr. George Robins talks of. Logical premises ought to contain the conclusion; but ladies' premises contain little but trinkets and needlework. The following will serve as an example of a syllogism, according to the rules of logic proper; that is to say, of proper logic:—*Major.*—"Every man who lives beyond his means is a fool." *Minor.*—"I should be a man who lived beyond his means, if I kept a carriage and pair." *Conclusion.*—"Therefore, if I kept a carriage and pair, I should be a fool." The syllogism, in ladies' logic, is much simpler; as thus:—*Minor.*—"Mrs. Dashington's husband keeps a carriage." *Conclusion.*—"Therefore, my husband ought to keep a carriage." In this instance, we see that the first term, or major, is dispensed with; so that, in fact, the major is a minor consideration. This is a very convenient sort of logic: because the only correct major, in the above instance, would be as follows:—"Whatever Mrs. Dashington's husband does mine ought to do." Now, this is a major that many husbands would object to. As it is, they can only question the conclusion. As:—"Why ought I to keep a carriage because Mrs. Dashington's husband does?" To which the (lady's) logical answer is, "Why? why, of course." "Well, but," says the husband, "I don't see that." "Then," replies the wife, "you must be blind." There's nothing so sharp as woman's wit. She decidedly has him there. There is another kind of syllogism in ladies' logic, which consists but of one proposition. For example: "I don't like your friend Mr. Wilkins at all, William." "Why not, my dear?" "Because he is so disagreeable." That is to say, "Because I don't like him." The following are examples of syllogisms, according to the most approved rules of ladies' logic:—"Intemperance is horrible, therefore it is dreadful." "Swearing is ungentlemanlike, therefore it is