

Tucholsky Wagner Zola Scott
Turgenev Wallage Fonatne Sydon Freud Schlegel
Twain Walther von der Vogelweide Fouqué Friedrich II. von Preußen
Weber Freiligrath Frey
Fechner Fichte Weiße Rose von Fallersleben Kant Ernst Richthofen Frommel
Engels Fielding Hölderlin Eichendorff Tacitus Dumas
Fehrs Faber Flaubert Eliasberg Eliot Zweig Ebner Eschenbach
Feuerbach Maximilian I. von Habsburg Fock Ewald Vergil
Goethe Elisabeth von Österreich London
Mendelssohn Balzac Shakespeare Rathenau Dostojewski Ganghofer
Trackl Stevenson Lichtenberg Doyle Gjellerup
Mommsen Thoma Tolstoi Lenz Hambruch Droste-Hülshoff
Dach Thoma von Arnim Hägele Hanrieder Hauptmann Humboldt
Karrillon Reuter Verne Rousseau Hagen Hauff Baudelaire Gautier
Garschin Defoe Hebbel Hegel Kussmaul Herder
Damaschke Descartes Schopenhauer George
Wolfram von Eschenbach Darwin Dickens Grimm Jerome Rilke Bebel Proust
Bronner Campe Horváth Aristoteles Voltaire Federer Herodot
Bismarck Vigny Gengenbach Barlach Heine Grillparzer Georgy
Storm Casanova Lessing Tersteegen Gilm Gryphius
Chamberlain Langbein Lafontaine Iffland Sokrates
Brentano Strachwitz Claudius Schiller Bellamy Schilling Kralik Gibbon Tschchow
Katharina II. von Rußland Gerstäcker Raabe Gleim Vulpius
Löns Hesse Hoffmann Gogol Morgenstern Goedicke
Luther Heym Hofmannsthal Klee Hölty Kleist
Roth Heyse Klopstock Puschkin Homer Mörike Musil
Luxemburg La Roche Horaz Kraus
Machiavelli Kierkegaard Kraft Kraus Moltke
Navarra Aurel Musset Lamprecht Kind Kirchhoff Hugo
Nestroy Marie de France Laotse Ipsen Liebknecht
Nietzsche Nansen Lassalle Gorki Klett Leibniz Ringelntz
von Ossietzky Marx vom Stein Lawrence Irving
May Petalozzi Platon Pückler Michelangelo Knigge Kock Kafka
Sachs Poe Liebermann Kock Korolenko
de Sade Praetorius Mistral Zetkin



The publishing house **tredition** has created the series **TREDITION CLASSICS**. It contains classical literature works from over two thousand years. Most of these titles have been out of print and off the bookstore shelves for decades.

The book series is intended to preserve the cultural legacy and to promote the timeless works of classical literature. As a reader of a **TREDITION CLASSICS** book, the reader supports the mission to save many of the amazing works of world literature from oblivion.

The symbol of **TREDITION CLASSICS** is Johannes Gutenberg (1400 – 1468), the inventor of movable type printing.

With the series, **tredition** intends to make thousands of international literature classics available in printed format again – worldwide.

All books are available at book retailers worldwide in paperback and in hardcover. For more information please visit: www.tredition.com



tredition was established in 2006 by Sandra Latusseck and Soenke Schulz. Based in Hamburg, Germany, **tredition** offers publishing solutions to authors and publishing houses, combined with worldwide distribution of printed and digital book content. **tredition** is uniquely positioned to enable authors and publishing houses to create books on their own terms and without conventional manufacturing risks.

For more information please visit: www.tredition.com

Early Reviews of English Poets

John Louis Haney

Imprint

This book is part of the TREDITION CLASSICS series.

Author: John Louis Haney

Cover design: toepferschumann, Berlin (Germany)

Publisher: tredition GmbH, Hamburg (Germany)

ISBN: 978-3-8491-5396-0

www.tredition.com

www.tredition.de

Copyright:

The content of this book is sourced from the public domain.

The intention of the TREDITION CLASSICS series is to make world literature in the public domain available in printed format. Literary enthusiasts and organizations worldwide have scanned and digitally edited the original texts. tredition has subsequently formatted and redesigned the content into a modern reading layout. Therefore, we cannot guarantee the exact reproduction of the original format of a particular historic edition. Please also note that no modifications have been made to the spelling, therefore it may differ from the orthography used today.

TO

MY FRIEND AND TEACHER

PROFESSOR FELIX E. SCHELLING

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PREFACE

"Among the amusing and instructive books that remain to be written, one of the most piquant would be a history of the criticism with which the most celebrated literary productions have been greeted on their first appearance before the world." It is quite possible that when Dr. William Matthews began his essay on *Curiosities of Criticism* with these words, he failed to grasp the full significance of that future undertaking. Mr. Churton Collins recently declared that "a very amusing and edifying record might be compiled partly out of a selection of the various verdicts passed contemporaneously by reviews on particular works, and partly out of comparisons of the subsequent fortunes of works with their fortunes while submitted to this censorship." Both critics recognize the fact that such a volume would be entertaining and instructive; but, from another point of view, it would also be a somewhat doleful book. Even a reader of meagre imagination and rude sensibilities could not peruse such a volume without picturing in his mind the anguish and the heart-ache which those bitter and often vicious attacks inflicted upon the unfortunate victims whose works were being assailed.

Authors (particularly sensitive poets) have been at all times the sport and plaything of the critics. Mrs. Oliphant, in her *Literary History of England*, said with much truth: "There are few things so amusing as to read a really 'slashing article'—except perhaps to write it. It is infinitely easier and gayer work than a well-weighed and serious criticism, and will always be more popular. The lively and brilliant examples of the art which dwell [Pg viii] in the mind of the reader are invariably of this class." Thus it happens that we remember the witty onslaughts of the reviewers, and often ignore the fact that certain witticisms drove Byron, for example, into a frenzy of anger that called forth the most vigorous satire of the century; and others so completely unnerved Shelley that he felt tempted to write no more; and still others were so unanimously hostile in tone that Coleridge thought the whole detested tribe of critics was in league against his literary success. There were, of course, such admirable personalities as Wordsworth's—for the most part indifferent to the strongest torrent of abuse; and clever craftsmen like Tennyson, who, although hurt, read the criticisms and profited by

them; but, on the other hand, there are still well-informed readers who believe that the *Quarterly Review* at least hastened the death of poor Keats.

It has been suggested that such a volume of the "choice crudities of criticism" as is here proposed would likewise fulfill the desirable purpose of avenging the author upon his ancient enemy, the critic, by showing how absurd the latter's utterances often are, and what a veritable farrago of folly those collected utterances can make. We may rest assured that however much hostile criticism may have pained an author, it has never inflicted a permanent injury upon a good book. If there appear to be works that have been thus more or less obscured, the fault will probably be found not in the critic but in the works themselves. According to this agreeable theory, which we would all fain believe, the triumph of the ignorant or malevolent critic cannot endure; sooner or later the author's merit will be recognized and he will come into his own.

The present volume does not attempt to fulfill the conditions suggested by Dr. Matthews and Mr. Collins. A history of contemporary criticism of famous authors would [Pg ix] be a more ambitious undertaking, necessitating an extensive apparatus of notes and references. It seeks merely to gather a number of interesting anomalies of criticism—reviews of famous poems and famous poets differing more or less from the modern consensus of opinion concerning those poems and their authors. Although most of the chosen reviews are unfavorable, several others have been selected to afford evidence of an early appreciation of certain poets. A few unexpectedly favorable notices, such as the *Monthly Review's* critique of Browning's *Sordello*, are printed because they appear to be unique. The chief criterion in selecting these reviews (apart from the effort to represent most of the periodicals and the principal poets between Gray and Browning) has been that of interest to the modern reader. In most cases, criticisms of a writer's earlier works were preferred as more likely to be spontaneous and uninfluenced by his growing literary reputation. Thus the volume does not attempt to trace the development of English critical methods, nor to supply a hand-book of representative English criticism; it offers merely a selection of bygone but readable reviews—what the critics thought, or, in some cases, pretended to think, of works of poets whom we have since

held in honorable esteem. The short notices and the well-known longer reviews are printed entire; but considerations of space and interest necessitated excisions in a few cases, all of which are, of course, properly indicated. The spelling and punctuation of the original texts have been carefully followed.

The history of English critical journals has not yet been adequately written. The following introduction offers a rapid survey of the subject, compiled principally from the sources indicated in the bibliographical list. I am indebted to Professor Felix E. Schelling of the University of Pennsylvania, and to Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson and [Pg x] Professor Albert H. Smyth of the Philadelphia Central High School for many suggestions that have been of value in writing the introduction. Dr. Edward Z. Davis examined at my request certain pamphlets in the British Museum that threw additional light upon the history of the early reviews. Dr. A.S.W. Rosenbach and Professor J.H. Moffatt read the proofs of the introduction and notes respectively, and suggested several noteworthy improvements.

J.L.H.

Central High School,
Philadelphia.

CONTENTS

Preface

Introduction

Bibliography

REVIEWS

Gray	Odes (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
Goldsmith	The Traveller (<i>Critical Review</i>)
Cowper	Poems, 1782 (<i>Critical Review</i>)
Burns	Poems, 1786 (<i>Edinburgh Magazine</i>)
	Poems, 1786 (<i>Critical Review</i>)
Wordsworth	Descriptive Sketches (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
	An Evening Walk (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
	Lyrical Ballads (<i>Critical Review</i>)
	Poems, 1807 (<i>Edinburgh Review</i>)
Coleridge	Christabel (<i>Edinburgh Review</i>)
Southey	Madoc (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
Lamb	Blank Verse (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
	Album Verses (<i>Literary Gazette</i>)
Landon	Gebir (<i>British Critic</i>)
	Gebir (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
Scott	Marmion (<i>Edinburgh Review</i>)
Byron	Hours of Idleness (<i>Edinburgh Review</i>)
	Childe Harold (<i>Christian Observer</i>)
Shelley	Alastor (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
	The Cenci (<i>London Magazine</i>)

	Adonais (<i>Literary Gazette</i>)
Keats	Endymion (<i>Quarterly Review</i>)
	Endymion (<i>Blackwood's Magazine</i>)
Tennyson	Timbuctoo (<i>Athenæum</i>)
	Poems, 1833 (<i>Quarterly Review</i>)
	The Princess (<i>Literary Gazette</i>)
Browning	Paracelsus (<i>Athenæum</i>)
	Sordello (<i>Monthly Review</i>)
	Men and Women (<i>Saturday Review</i>)
Notes	
Index	

INTRODUCTION

To the modern reader, with an abundance of periodicals of all sorts and upon all subjects at hand, it seems hardly possible that this wealth of ephemeral literature was virtually developed within the past two centuries. It offers such a rational means for the dissemination of the latest scientific and literary news that the mind undeceived by facts would naturally place the origin of the periodical near the invention of printing itself. Apart from certain sporadic manifestations of what is termed, by courtesy, periodical literature, the real beginning of that important department of letters was in the innumerable *Mercurii* that flourished in London after the outbreak of the Civil War. Although the *British Museum Catalogue* presents a long list of these curious messengers and news-carriers, the only one that could be of interest in the present connection is the *Mercurius Librarius; or a Catalogue of Books Printed and Published at London* [A] (1668-70), the contents of which simply fulfilled the promise of its title.

Literary journals in England were, however, not a native development, but were copied, like the fashions and artistic norms of that period, from the French. The famous and long-lived *Journal des Sçavans* was begun at Paris in 1665 by M. Denis de Sallo, who has been called, since the time of Voltaire, the "inventor" of literary journals. In 1684 Pierre Bayle began at Amsterdam the publication of *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, which continued under various hands until 1718. [Pg xiv] These French periodicals were the acknowledged inspiration for similar ventures in England, beginning in 1682 with the *Weekly Memorial for the Ingenious: or an Account of Books lately set forth in Several Languages, with some other Curious Novelties relating to Arts and Sciences*. The preface stated the intention of the publishers to notice foreign as well as domestic works, and to transcribe the "curious novelties" from the *Journal des Sçavans*. Fifty weekly numbers appeared (1682-83), consisting principally of translations of the best articles in the French journal.

A few years later (1686), the Genevan theologian, Jean Le Clerc, then a resident of London, established the *Universal Historical Bibliothèque; or, an Account of most of the Considerable Books printed in All Languages*, which was continued by various hands until 1693 in a

series of twenty-five quarto volumes. Contemporary with this review was a number of similar publications which had for the most part a brief existence. Among them was the *Athenian Mercury*, published on Tuesdays and Saturdays (1691-1696), the *History of Learning*, which appeared for a short time in 1691 and again in 1694; *Works of the Learned* (1691-92); the *Young Student's Library* (1692) and its continuation, the *Compleat Library* (1692-94); *Memoirs for the Ingenious* (1693); the *Universal Mercury* (1694) and *Miscellaneous Letters, etc.* (1694-96). Samuel Parkes includes among the reviews of this period Sir Thomas Pope Blount's remarkable *Censura Celebrium Authorum* (1690). That popular bibliographical dictionary of criticism (reprinted 1694, 1710 and 1718) is only remembered now for its omission of Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson and Milton from its list of "celebrated authors." Neither that volume nor the same author's *De Re Poetica* (1694) finds a proper place in a [Pg xv] list of periodicals. They should be grouped with such works as Phillips' *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675) and Langbaine's *Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (1691) among the more deliberate attempts at literary criticism.

Between 1692-94 appeared the *Gentleman's Journal; or, the Monthly Miscellany. Consisting of News, History, Philosophy, Poetry, Music, Translations, etc.* This noteworthy paper, edited by Peter Anthony Motteux while he was translating Rabelais, included among its contributors Aphra Behn, Oldmixon, Dennis, D'Urfey and others. In many ways it anticipated the plan of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1731), which has usually been accorded the honor of priority among English literary magazines. The *History of the Works of the Learned; or, an Impartial Account of Books lately printed in all Parts of Europe* was begun in 1699 and succumbed after the publication of its thirteenth volume (1711). Among its editors was George Ridpath, who was afterwards immortalized in Pope's *Dunciad*. The careers of the *Monthly Miscellany* (1707-09) and *Censura Temporum* (1709-10) were brief. About the same time an extensive series of periodicals was begun by a Huguenot refugee, Michael De la Roche, who fled to England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and became an Episcopalian. After several years of hack-work for the booksellers, he published (1710) the first numbers of his *Memoirs of Literature, containing a Weekly Account of the State of Learning at Home and Abroad*, which he continued until 1714 and for a few months in

1717. In the latter year he began at Amsterdam his *Bibliothèque Angloise* (1717-27), continued by his *Memoires Littéraires de la Grande Bretagne* (1720-1724) after the editorship of the former had been placed in other hands on account of his pronounced anti-Calvinistic views. At [Pg xvi] Amsterdam, Daniel Le Clerc, a brother of the Jean Le Clerc already mentioned, published his *Bibliothèque Choisée* (1703-14) and his *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* (1714-28). Both of these periodicals suggested numerous ideas to De la Roche, who returned to London and conducted the *New Memoirs of Literature* (1725-27). His last venture was a *Literary Journal, or a Continuation of the Memoirs of Literature*, which lasted about a year.

Contemporary with De la Roche, Samuel Jebb conducted *Bibliotheca Literaria* (1722-24), dealing with "inscriptions, medals, dissertations, etc." In 1728 Andrew Reid began the *Present State of the Republick of Letters*, which reached its eighteenth volume in 1736. It was then incorporated with the *Literary Magazine; or the History of the Works of the Learned* (1735-36) and the joint periodical was henceforth published as a *History of the Works of the Learned* until 1743. Other less extensive literary journals of the same period were Archibald Bower's *Historia Literaria* (1730-34); the *Bee; or, Universal Weekly Pamphlet* (1733-35), edited by Addison's cousin, Eustace Budgell; the *British Librarian, exhibiting a Compendious Review or Abstract of our most Scarce, Useful and Valuable Books, etc.*, published anonymously by the antiquarian William Oldys, from January to June, 1737, and much esteemed by modern bibliophiles as a pioneer and a curiosity of its kind; a *Literary Journal* (1744-49) published at Dublin; and, finally, the *Museum; or the Literary and Historical Register*. This interesting periodical printed essays, poems and reviews by such contributors as Spence, Horace Walpole, the brothers Warton, Akenside, Lowth and others. It was published fortnightly from March, 1746 to September, 1747, making three octavo volumes. [Pg xvii]

The periodicals enumerated thus far can hardly be regarded as literary in the modern acceptation of the term; they were, for the most part, ponderous, learned and scientific in character, and, with the exception of the *Gentleman's Journal* and Dodsley's *Museum*, rarely ventured into the domain of *belles-lettres*. An occasional erudite dissertation on classical poetry or on the French canons of taste

suggested a literary intent, but the bulk of the journals was supplied by articles on natural history, curious experiments, physiological treatises and historical essays. During the latter half of the eighteenth century theological and political writings, and accounts of travels in distant lands became the staple offering of the reviews.

A new era in the history of English periodicals was marked by the publication, on May 1, 1749, of the first number of the *Monthly Review*, destined to continue through ninety-six years of varying fortune and to reach its 249th volume. It bore the subtitle: *A Periodical Work giving an Account, with Proper Abstracts of, and Extracts from, the New Books, Pamphlets, etc., as they come out. By Several Hands.* The publisher was Ralph Griffiths, who continued to manage the review until his death in 1803. It seems remarkable that this periodical which set the norm for half a century should have appeared not only without preface or advertisement, but likewise without patronage or support of any kind. From the first it reviewed poetry, fiction and drama as well as the customary classes of applied literature, and thus appealed primarily to the public rather than, like most of its predecessors, to the learned. Its politics were Whig and its theology Non-conformist. Griffiths was not successful at first, but determined to achieve popularity by enlisting Ruffhead, Kippis, Langhorne and several other [Pg xviii] minor writers on his critical staff. In 1757 Oliver Goldsmith became one of those unfortunate hacks as a result of his well-known agreement with Griffiths to serve as an assistant-editor in exchange for his board, lodging and "an adequate salary." About a score of miscellaneous reviews from Goldsmith's pen—including critiques of Home's *Douglas*, Burke's *On the Sublime and the Beautiful*, Smollett's *History of England* and Gray's *Odes*—appeared in the *Monthly Review* during 1757-58. The contract with Griffiths was soon broken, probably on account of incompatibility of temper. Goldsmith declared that he had been over-worked and badly treated; but it is quite likely that his idleness and irregular habits contributed largely to the misunderstanding.

Meanwhile, a Tory rival and a champion of the Established Church had appeared on the field. A printer named Archibald Hamilton projected the *Critical Review: or, Annals of Literature. By a Society of Gentlemen*, which began to appear in February, 1756, under the editorship of Tobias Smollett and extended to a total of 144 vol-

umes when it ceased publication in 1817. Its articles were of a high order for the time and the new review soon became popular. The open rivalry between the reviews was fostered by an exchange of editorial compliments. Griffiths published a statement that the *Monthly* was not written by "physicians without practice, authors without learning, men without decency, gentlemen without manners, and critics without judgment." Smollett retorted that "the *Critical Review* is not written by a parcel of obscure hirelings, under the restraint of a bookseller and his wife, who presume to revise, alter and amend the articles occasionally. The principal writers in the *Critical Review* are unconnected with booksellers, unawed by old women, and independent of each other." Such [Pg xix] literary encounters did not fail to stimulate public interest in both reviews and to add materially to their circulation.

When the first volume of the *Critical Review* was complete, the "Society of Gentlemen" enriched it with an ornate, self-congratulatory Preface in which they said of themselves:

"However they may have erred in judgment, they have declared their thoughts without prejudice, fear, or affectation; and strove to forget the author's person, while his works fell under their consideration. They have treated simple dulness as the object of mirth or compassion, according to the nature of its appearance. Petulance and self-conceit they have corrected with more severe strictures; and though they have given no quarter to insolence, scurrility and sedition, they will venture to affirm, that no production of merit has been defrauded of its due share of applause. On the contrary, they have cherished with commendation, the very faintest bloom of genius, even when vapid and unformed, in hopes of its being warmed into flavour, and afterwards producing agreeable fruit by dint of proper care and culture; and never, without reluctance disapproved, even of a bad writer, who had the least title to indulgence. The judicious reader will perceive that their aim has been to exhibit a succinct plan of every performance; to point out the most striking beauties and glaring defects; to illustrate their remarks with proper quotations; and to convey these remarks in such a manner, as might best conduce to the entertainment of the public."

Moreover, these high ideals were entertained under the most unfavorable circumstances. By the time the second volume was complete, the editors took pleasure in announcing that in spite of "open assault and private assassination," "published reproach and printed letters of abuse, distributed like poisoned arrows in the dark," yea, in spite of the "breath of secret calumny" and the "loud blasts of obloquy," the *Critical Review* was more strongly entrenched than before.

There was more than mere rhodomontade in these [Pg xx] words. Not only did open rivalry exist between the two reviews, but they were both made the subject of violent attacks by authors whose productions had been condemned on their pages. John Brine (1755), John Shebbeare (1757), Horace Walpole (1759), William Kenrick (1759), James Grainger (1759) and Joseph Reed (1759) are the earliest of the many writers who issued pamphlets in reply to articles in the reviews. In 1759 Smollett was tried at the King's Bench for aspersions upon the character of Admiral Sir Charles Knowles published in the *Critical Review*. He was declared guilty, fined £100, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment. Yet in spite of such difficulties, the *Critical Review* continued to find favor among its readers. The articles written by its "Society of Gentlemen" were on the whole far more interesting in subject and treatment than the work of Griffiths' unfortunate hacks; but the *Monthly* was also prospering, as in 1761 a fourth share in that review was sold for more than £755.

In 1760 appeared a curious anonymous satire entitled *The Battle of the Reviews*, which presented, upon the model of Swift's spirited account of the contest between ancient and modern learning, a fantastic description of the open warfare between the two reviews. After a formal declaration of hostilities both sides marshal their forces for the struggle. The "noble patron" of the *Monthly* is but slightly disguised as the Right Honourable Rehoboam Gruffy, Esq. His associates Sir Imp Brazen, Mynheer Tanaquil Limmonad, Martin Problem, and others were probably recognized by contemporary readers. To oppose this array the *Critical* summons a force that contains only two names of distinction, Sampson MacJackson and Sawney MacSmallhead (*i.e.*, Smollett). The ensuing battle, which is described at great length, [Pg xxi] results in a victory for the *Critical*

Review, and the banishment of Squire Gruffy to the land of the Hot-tentots.

Dr. Johnson's well-known characterization of the two reviews was quite just. On the occasion of his memorable interview (1767) with George III, Johnson gave the King information concerning the *Journal des Savans* and said of the two English reviews that "the *Monthly Review* was done with most care; the *Critical* upon the best principles; adding that the authors of the *Monthly Review* were enemies to the Church." Some years later Johnson said of the reviews:

"I think them very impartial: I do not know an instance of partiality.... The *Monthly Reviewers* are not Deists; but they are Christians with as little Christianity as may be; and are for pulling down all establishments. The *Critical Reviewers* are for supporting the constitution both in church and state. The *Critical Reviewers*, I believe, often review without reading the books through; but lay hold of a topick and write chiefly from their own minds. The *Monthly Reviewers* are duller men and are glad to read the books through."

Goldsmith's successor on the *Monthly* staff was the notorious libeller and "superlative scoundrel," Dr. William Kenrick, who signalized his advent (November, 1759) by writing an outrageous attack upon Goldsmith's *Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe*. His utterances were so thoroughly unjustified that Griffiths, who had scant reason for praising poor Oliver, made an indirect apology for his unworthy minion by a favorable though brief review (June, 1762) of *The Citizen of the World*. During 1759 the *Critical Review* published a number of Goldsmith's articles which probably enabled the impecunious author to effect his removal from the garret in Salisbury Square to the famous lodgings in Green Arbour Court. After March, 1760, we find no record of his association with either review, al [Pg xxii] though he afterwards wrote for the *British Magazine* and others.

During the latter half of the century several reviews appeared and flourished for a time without serious damage to their well-established rivals. The *Literary Magazine; or Universal Review* (1756-58) is memorable for Johnson's coöperation and a half-dozen articles by Goldsmith. Boswell tells us that Johnson wrote for the magazine until the fifteenth number and "that he never gave better proofs of

the force, acuteness and vivacity of his mind, than in this miscellany, whether we consider his original essays, or his reviews of the works of others." The *London Review of English and Foreign Literature* (1775-80) was conducted by the infamous Kenrick and others who faithfully maintained the editor's well-recognized policy of vicious onslaught and personal abuse. Paul Henry Maty, an assistant-librarian of the British Museum, conducted for five years a *New Review* (1782-86), often called *Maty's Review*, and dealing principally with learned works. It apparently enjoyed some authority, but both Walpole and Gibbon spoke unfavorably of Maty's critical pretensions. *The English Review; or, an Abstract of English and Foreign Literature* (1783-96), extended to twenty-eight volumes modelled upon the plan of the older periodicals. In 1796 it was incorporated with the *Analytical Review* (1788) and survived under the latter title until 1799. The *Analytical Review* deprecated the self-sufficient attitude of contemporary criticism and advocated extensive quotations from the works under consideration so that readers might be able to judge for themselves. It likewise hinted at the tacit understanding then existing between certain authors, publishers and reviews for their mutual advantage, but which was arousing a growing feeling of distrust on the part of the public. The [Pg xxiii] *British Critic* (1793-1843) was edited by William Beloe and Robert Nares as the organ of the High Church Party. This "dull mass of orthodoxy" concerned itself extensively with literary reviews; but its articles were best known for their lack of interest and authority. The foibles of the *British Critic* were satirized in Bishop Copleston's *Advice to a Young Reviewer* (1807) with an appended mock critique of Milton's *L'Allegro*. In 1826 it was united with the *Quarterly Theological Review* and continued until 1843.

The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor (1799-1821) played a strenuous rôle in the troublous times of the Napoleonic wars. It continued the policy of the *Anti-Jacobin, or Weekly Examiner* (1797-98) conducted with such marked vigor by William Gifford, but it numbered among its contributors none of the brilliant men whose witty verses for the weekly paper are still read in the popular *Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin*. The *Review* was conducted by John Richards Green, better known as John Gifford. Its articles were at times sensational in character, viciously abusing