instructions, as a literal compliance with them might have ’ been unfavourable to the sale of the property.

1. His earliest publication was a pamphlet entitled The Petition of an Englishman, 1765. It consisted principally of apologies for the private conduct and immoral writings of Wilkes.

2. He also published a Sermon while he continued in the church, that is, before the year 1773 ; but it attracted little notice.

3. A Letter to Mr Dunning, 1778. The rudiments of his grammatical system, arising out of remarks on the par­ticles employed by the attorney-general in his indictment, and by the judges in his sentence. It was afterwards in­corporated into the Diversions of Purley.

4. Facts, 1780 ; consisting of remarks on the admini­stration of Lord North ; with some additions relating to fin­ance, by Dr Price.

5. A Letter on Parliamentary Reform, 1782; addressed to Mr Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton.

6. E*πεα* ∏*τεgοεντα*, or Diversions of Purley, 1786, 8vo. Ed. 2, 4to. Part i. 1798. Part ii. 1802. This is his great and celebrated work ; rich indeed in etymology and in wit, but meagre in definition and in metaphysics.

7. A Letter to the Prince of Wales, 1787 ; relating to his supposed marriage with a Catholic.

8. Two Pair of Portraits, 1788, 8vo. The two Pitts con­trasted, in opposite columns, with the two Foxes, in colours by no means favourable to the latter.

9. Many of his Letters have been printed in Stephens’s Life of Tooke.

It is from the last-mentioned publication that this histo­rical sketch of Mr Tooke’s life has principally been extract­ed. It now becomes necessary to add some remarks on his literary and moral qualifications ; and in both these points of view the subject has been treated in so masterly a man­ner by the author of an article in the Quarterly Review, who is supposed to be a near relation of Tooke’s most in­timate friend, the late Colonel Bosville, that it would be presumption in any man to go over the same ground, with­out adopting very nearly the eloquent and energetic ex­pressions which that noble and learned person has em­ployed.

“ Mr Tooke,” says the accomplished reviewer of the Me­moirs of his Life (Q. R. vol. vii. p. 325), “was possessed of considerable learning, as indeed his writings sufficiently show. To other more casual acquirements, he united a very extensive acquaintance with the Gothic dialects, of which he has so copiously and so judiciously availed him­self in his etymological researches.” But it must be re­marked, that a person more intimately acquainted with the “ Gothic dialects” as living languages, will easily discover that his knowledge of them was in truth but superficial, or that he was indebted for it more to grammars and diction­aries, than to any extensive study of the authors who had written in those languages, or to any habit of speaking them ; and such a person will easily find a variety of in­stances, in which a very different etymon to that which he has assigned, will naturally suggest itself as the true origin of the word in question.

(P. 320.) “ Though Mr Tooke’s philosophical works are the results of no common talent and industry, yet they are neither written in a truly philosophical spirit, nor do they display traces of a mind which, even if it had been wholly dedicated to the study of metaphysics, would have much enlarged the bounds of our knowledge in that nice and in­tricate branch of science. His object seems to have been rather to retard than to advance the progress of philoso­phy, by recalling us from those sound conclusions as to the nature and operations of the human mind, which are built upon observation and experience, to vague speculations, drawn from the imperfect analogy existing between the moral and the physical world. There can be no doubt that the proposition which he has succeeded in establishing is highly interesting and important; and that in the illustra­tion of it he has shown great learning, ingenuity, and re­search. But tl>en, on the other hand, he has so monstrous­ly exaggerated its importance, and so widely mistaken its tendency, and has attempted to raise so vast a superstruc­ture upon such a narrow, slippery, and inadequate founda­tion, that we are quite lost in amazement when we recol­lect how completely the sagacity which guided him so well in the investigation of his principal fact, appears to desert him when he comes to apply that fact to the purposes of a theory. The distance between what he has proved and what he wishes us to believe that he has proved, is enor­mous. What he has proved is, that all words, even those that are expressive of the nicest operations of our minds, were originally borrowed from the objects of external per­ception ; a circumstance highly curious in the history of language, consequently in the history of the human mind itself, and the complete demonstration of which, of course, reflects great credit upon its author. What he thinks he has proved is, that this etymological history of words is our true guide, both as to the *present* import of the words them­selves, and as to the nature of those things which they are intended to signify ; a proposition so monstrous that he has nowhere ventured to enunciate it in its general form, but has rather left it to be collected from the tenor of his re­marks upon particular instances. In truth, the inferences at which Mr Tooke arrived, far from being warranted by his facts, are directly the contrary of those to which he ought naturally to have been led by the result of his own studies, when they were most successful. In tracing up­wards, through all the mazes of etymology, the origin of words, he ought to have seen more clearly, if possible, than any body else, that their *real present* sense is not to be sought for in their primitive signification, or in the elements of which they were originally composed, but that, on the contrary, their *actual import,* with which alone in reasoning we have to do, hardly ever corresponds with their etymo­logical meaning, although the one always bears to the other a certain resemblance, more or less accurate, according to the greater or less effect of time and accident. One could without difficulty understand how a person, unaccustomed to such considerations, and misled by a few instances par­tially chosen, should adopt a theory like that which Mr Tooke was desirous to establish ; but how a philosopher, minutely acquainted with the whole subject, and proceed­ing upon a most copious induction of particulars, should not have perceived that, in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred, such a doctrine would lead to absolute absurdity, is, to us at least, inconceivable.”

The reviewer then follows Mr Dugald Stewart in some very just criticisms, which this distinguished philosopher had already made on several of Mr Tooke’s examples, fully prov­ing the complete fallacy of the system which so completely confounds the definition of a term with its etymology. Mr Tooke has indeed the merit of having demonstrated pretty clearly that all the parts of speech, including those which grammarians had often considered as expletives and un­meaning particles, may be resolved more or less completely into nouns and verbs ; but, on the one hand, it has been ob­served, that the very same doctrine may be clearly traced back to the works of Aristotle ; and, on the other, it may be asserted with equal truth, if we wish to carry the theory to its utmost extent, that language consists only of nouns and *one verb ;* since all verbs may in fact be resolved into par­ticiples or adjectives, compounded with auxiliary verbs, as well as those which exhibit this complication in their ex­terior form.

“ In the ordinary intercourse of life, Mr Tooke was kind, friendly, and hospitable.” (P. 325.) We doubt whether