Course of Lectures read in the University of Dublin, by the late Francis Stoughton Sullivan, LL. D., Royal Pro­fessor of the Common Law in that University.” Lond. 1772, 4to. Dr Sullivan had obtained a fellowship at the early age of nineteen ; and, as his editor informs us, he “ was not less remarkable for his knowledge in history and chronology than for his skill in his profession as a barrister and civilian.” Towards the close of his life, he was engaged in preparing a History of Ireland ; but this task was reserved for Dr Leland, another distinguished fellow of Trinity Col­lege. The editor, whose name does not appear, has pre­fixed a preface of four pages, and has particularly extolled the author for his “ admirable vindication of the original freedom of our constitution, and his excellent commentary on *Mayna Charta”*

A pseudonymous work, of a very different denomination, has been ascribed to Dr Stuart. It bears the title of “ Ani­madversions on Mr Adam’s Latin and English Grammar ; being an Exhibition of its Defects, and an Illustration of the Danger of Introducing it into Schools. By John Richard Busby, Master of Arts.” Edinb. 1773, 8vo. This gram­mar, at its first appearance, was doomed to encounter a very fierce and general opposition. The other four mas­ters of the school to which the author belonged, presented to the town-council a remonstrance against it; and the use of it in that seminary was formally prohibited.@@1 Stuart’s zeal might be excited by his relationship to Ruddiman, whose elementary works, both excellent in their kind, had for half a century retained their place in the grammar schools. That the writer has detected and specified errors and omissions, it would not be safe to deny ; but the spirit as well as the style of his animadversions is such as no unprejudiced reader could approve. They conclude with the subsequent passage : “ These strictures will, it is thought, be sufficient to evince the entire frivolity of Mr Adam’s grammar, and the danger that must attend its adoption into our schools. To point out all the errors of his performance, would require several volumes ; and I am not ambitious of performing a task that would vie with any of the labours of Hercules. It is the peculiar infelicity of this grammarian, that he exhibits every defect which it is possible for an author to possess ; a sterile invention, an unhappy method, a cold and inauspicious manner, an in­accurate and nerveless expression, a perverted judgment, a defective understanding, a corrupted taste.—Education is -not a matter to be trifled with. The mistakes and mis­carriage of our most generous youth have too frequently their rise in the negligence with which they have been treated in schools, where they have been sent to be ini­tiated in the first principles of knowledge. It is also no groundless complaint, that the teacher often adds incapacity to neglect. And if this is, in general, a just representation of the matter, how must we pity, in particular, the pupils of Mr Adam ! To disadvantages common to other boys, they must join the cruel and insuperable one of studying a work that advances in an unvaried progress from blunder to blunder, and from absurdity to absurdity.” The merits and demerits of this grammar, which in spite of all opposition became very popular, were discussed in various articles of the Weekly Magazine. Here we find two Latin lucubra­tions on the subject, one of which was known to be the pro­duction of Stuart, and the other might perhaps be written by the same satirical pen. In the form of a description of a Roman funeral, he records the interment of Adam’s Latin Grammar; nor does he neglect to introduce the well-known Jamie Duff, an idiot whose supreme delight was to place himself, an unhired attendant, at the head of a funeral pro­cession : “ Imus ad hortos scholasticos, præeunte Jacobo Duff, solita sua gravitate, densissimo ac lætissimo puerorum agmine cincto.” The narrative closes with this monumen­tal inscription :

In hac urna jacet quod reliquum est

Libelli inauspicati,  
nunquam resurrecturi,  
invita et irata Minerva editi ;  
qui miserabiliter  
in tenera ætate raptus,  
triste præbet exemplum  
fragilitatis humanæ,  
nec non vanitatis auctorum,  
qui Musis non rite litantes  
longiorem expectant vitam.  
Siste viator ; et, si meliorem animæ partem  
velis esse superstitem,  
fatum meum tecum reputo.  
Festina lentius, et vale.@@\*

Dr Stuart now undertook the management of “ The Edinburgh Magazine and Review,” of which the first num­ber bears the date of November 1773. In the commercial part of this enterprise his partners were Alexander Kincaid, his majesty’s printer, William Creech, bookseller, William Smellie, printer, and William Kerr, surveyor of the post­office. The work was printed by Smellie, who was like­wise to manage the business details of the concern, to fur­nish the last half-sheet of every number, and to review such books as the editor and he should select. The profits were to lie distributed into six shares ; one of which was allotted to Kincaid and Creech conjunctly ; one each to Stuart, Smellie, and Kerr; and the remaining two to the editor and the printer, to be divided between them as they should mutually agree. Stuart was himself the principal writer. Various essays and reviews were furnished by Smellie. Lord Hailes, Dr Blacklock, Professor Richardson of Glas­gow, and Professor Barron of St Andrews, were among the number of the contributors. The name of Dr Moor ap­pears in the poetical department. An extraordinary lucu­bration, entitled “ A modest Defence of the Accomplish­ment of Blasphemy,” was written by the Rev. A. Gillies. The Rev. Mr Nimmo of Bothkennar wrote the Essay on the Antiquities of Stirlingshire, which he afterwards en­larged to the size of an octavo volume.@@3

A periodical work, supported by such contributors, might have run a long and prosperous career, if its success had not been marred by the editor’s want of temper and dis­cretion. At that period, the population of Edinburgh pro­bably did not amount to one third of its present number ; and the freedom of public discussion was circumscribed in at least an equal proportion. Dr Henry was one of those who had most reason to complain of injurious treatment. A single sermon of his was very unfavourably noticed by Smellie ; and on the second volume of his History of Great Britain two articles were written by Stuart, in a style of unmitigated sarcasm and contempt ; nor does it appear that there was any original ground of personal offence. In some fragments of his letters which have been published by D’Israeli, he speaks of this historian with a strange mix­ture of levity and virulence. Lord Monboddo did not ex­perience better treatment. On the second volume of his Origin and Progress of Language they inserted two, and on the third volume three articles, each of them more of­fensive than another. These articles were written by Stuart, Smellie, and Gillies, but the greater portion of them by the latter. The editor lent his aid in the review of the third

@@@, Henderson's Account of the Life and Character of Alexander Adam, LL. D. Rector of the High School of Edinburgh, p. 42. Edinb. 1810, 8vo.

@@@j Weekly Magazine, vol. xix. p 245. See likewise p. 53.

@@@’ Kerr's Memoirs of Smellie, vol. i. p. 401.