Mr. George Ellis to John Murray.

August 21st.

"I have now the satisfaction to send you the Spanish article complete. It will prove, I believe, a great deal longer than I expected; but it will, I trust, fully answer all your expectations, and, I feel confident, will eclipse the merit of any article which has ever yet appeared, or is likely to appear, in the rival Review. You will not suppose that I speak thus of that part of it which is my own; but of the general conclusion (for which you applied to me), and which, with the exception of the first paragraph in it, is by a master hand . . . How soon shall we come out? and what do you think generally of the other articles in this number?"

Mr. Gifford wrote:-

"In consequence of my importunity, Mr. Canning has exerted himself and produced the best article that ever yet appeared in any Review."

Mr. Murray, so far as can be ascertained from his statement to Constable,* thought the number a very bad one, while the Edinburgh Review was "the best they had yet published." "I told him," said Constable, "I presumed he was quizzing; he said not." Gifford, on the other hand, thought the number a very good one. There was an admirable article by Dr. Thomas Young on "Insanity," and another by the Rev. Dr. D'Oyley on "Paley," which Gifford thought was "his best." Mr. Scott was busily occupied with the second volume of the 'Minstrelsy,' as well as with the 'Lady of the Lake,' and therefore he contributed no article to the number.† The new

VOL. I.

 ^{&#}x27;Archibald Constable and his Literary Correspondents,' i. 145.

[†] Mr. Murray, in a letter to Mrs. Murray, then at Edinburgh, on a visit to Mrs. Elliot, said (July 28th, 1809), "I have been in a sad plight all day about my Review. We are going on very indifferently; and a letter from William Erskine to-day informs me that Mr. Scott does not intend, he believes, to write anything for the present Number. This is vexatious, and I have been up to Gifford to ask him to write to Mr. Scott urgently."