

veyed all the provinces and towns that belonged to him, or of which he had been governor, and subdued them by force, or by the weight of the royal authority. He also removed Conti and Longueville from their governments.— At his return to Paris, he derided the friends of Condé, to whom he had promised that prince's liberty, and the Co-adjutor, whom he had promised to raise to the dignity of a Cardinal: Thinking himself superior to every storm, he threatened the malecontents with imprisonment; he despised the hatred and clamours of the public.

However, the friends of the prince of Condé were not asleep. In spite of the Argus's, they found means to keep up a punctual correspondence with him; they made various attempts to release him; they raised troops, in particular the dukes of Bouillon and Rochefoucault, and the viscount de Turenne. The princess of Condé engaged the province of Guienne to declare in his favour; she made war in order to force the court to release him; at length the partisans of the prince signed a treaty with the Spaniards to labour in concert for his enlargement. But all these efforts would perhaps have been ineffectual, if other more powerful resources had not been employed.

In that gallant and warlike age, every thing was managed by the passions and intrigues of five or six women, who possessed the confidence of the leaders of the state, and of the various parties. The princess of Mantua, wife to one of the sons of the Elector Palatine, K. of Bohemia, was the soul of the counsels in the party of the Princes. She united all the talents which the art of negotiation requires, and all the probity necessary to deserve an entire confidence. She undertook and she accomplished the reconciliation of the D. of Orleans, the Co-adjutor, & the mal-contents with the friends of the Prince, and united their efforts against the Cardinal. The parliament, on the other side, loudly demanded the release of the prisoners. All the orders of the state united in soliciting it, insomuch that the Queen was prevailed on to give her consent.

At this news, Mazarin, amazed, confounded, betrayed by the Dutchess of Chevreuse, attacked on all sides, abandoned by almost all those on whom he had most depended, abandoned also himself; he made his escape for the fourth time disguised like a trooper, and arrived at the gates of Richelieu, where a body of horse waited for him,

The parliament, informed by the Queen of the Cardinal's flight, thundered forth an arret, by which he was enjoined to leave the kingdom, with his family and foreign servants, in the space of fifteen days, under the penalty of being exposed to a criminal prosecution. The Queen desired to follow him with the King; but the nobles and the burghers invested the *Palais Royal*, and prevented the execution of this project, which would have kindled a civil war.

Mazarin perceiving therefore that it was impossible for the Queen to join him, determined to go himself to restore the princes their liberty, and to get the start of the deputies who were coming to acquaint them with it. On his arrival at Havre, he informed the Princes that they were free; he intreated Condé's friendship; he was so abject as to prostrate himself at the feet of him whom he had so basely oppressed. Condé gave him a polite reception, he spoke to him in a free and cheerful tone; but, tired with the mean submissions which the Cardinal lavished upon him, he left him without making him any promise, and set out on his return to Paris, which he entered as it were in triumph, amidst the acclamations of all the orders of the monarchy, and the demonstrations of a most sincere and general joy.

(To be continued.)

Red-Lyon Square, June 13, 1768.

S I R,

SINCE Magazines are commonly supplied with matter from the works of authors, as well as from extemporaneous productions of ingenious men, great care should be taken to give the public the most faithful extracts and accounts of what you fill such collections with. I am sorry to find, that, on the contrary, my account of the Rhinoceros is misrepresented, and my name mentioned with a seeming disrespect, in your Magazine of last month, in the following words:

“ Dr Parsons, in the 41st Vol. of the Philosophical Transactions, *thinks* he has made a new discovery about the double horn of the Rhinoceros, and cleared up a difficulty insuperable to four eminent critics, Bochart, Mattaire, Mead, and Douglas; not to mention that for a Rhinoceros to *tojs up two bulls or bears at once* would be much more extraordinary than that he should have two horns.

I can-

"I cannot help taking notice of a passage in Pausanias which seems to prove Rhinoceroses with double horns are no such uncommon animals."

In this sentence your correspondent would insinuate that I had pretended to discover what every body knew, that there are double horns upon the noses of Rhinoceroses.

Now, since I cannot have the pleasure of a little conversation with him upon this subject, having signed his paper with initial letters only, I must take this method in pointing out his illiberality and want of candour; and much neglect on your part, in suffering so crude a piece to be printed, without a strict examination of the author whose work he makes use of; for, I assert, no reader will ever conceive what he means by the words "*toft up two bulls or bears at once*," nor by the names he mentions of the critics: because he has shamefully neglected to make a fair extract of the part that relates to these matters.

However, Sir, I will inform you what my purpose was, and do expect you will, from your regard to truth, publish this justification in your Magazine for this month, June, or I must publish it another way.

When I had finished my natural history of the Rhinoceros, which was printed in the Transactions of the Royal Society, (Vol. XLII.) I took occasion to end that memoir with a vindication of Martial, in his Epigram upon the Rhinoceros, whose reading was mutilated by Bochart, Mattaire, Mead, and Douglas; and they were led into it, because they did not know there was a species of that animal in the world with a double horn upon the nose; nor was it ever noticed by any of our natural historians till my account was published.

Again, it was foolish to make a parade of the quotation from Pausanias, as well as a most unfair proceeding; which, he says, "he could not help taking notice of, to shew that Rhinoceroses with double horns were no such uncommon animals." Indeed, they are so common, that all those which inhabit Africa have the double horn, whilst those of Asia have only a single one; and it is no wonder he could not help taking notice of it, because he found that very quotation in my account presented to the Society in 1743, which I brought, with several other authorities,

to prove that the African species of Rhinoceroses, only, was shewn at Rome; and that Martial's own reading was right; so that, in fact, I had the honour of making two discoveries at the same time: first, of informing the natural historians, that double horns were proper to those of Africa, for every body was well acquainted with those with the single horn, by seeing several from Asia brought by India captains from time to time; and, secondly, in doing justice to Martial, which could not be done without shewing the world that such a species of that animal existed.----And indeed it was a strange omission not to mention my having, in Vol. LVI. of the Transactions, declared Dr Mead's generous retraction of his criticism, as soon as he saw a double horn brought from Angola; in which place your correspondent found the four names of the critics.

From these considerations, Sir, you see how little instruction your correspondent's paper conveys to the reader, how uncandid his omission of principal matters, and what an absurd representation he has given of the design of,

Sir, Your humble Servant,

JAMES PARSONS:

[\* \* \* *The Editors of this Magazine cannot be expected to examine critically all the passages referred to in the contributions of their friends; they readily give preference to those pieces that are apparently written with a view to explain the obscurities or correct the errors of antient writers; and they as readily admit of justifications, where justifications are necessary: they do not, however, think themselves answerable for the misrepresentations of their correspondents, but answerable only for the strictest impartiality.*]

Mr. URBAN,

THE opposition of the colonies to the new method of taxation will probably bring the subject of *virtual Representation* again before the public. As I have never yet seen this kind of representation precisely stated, give me leave to communicate to the public, thro' the channel of your Magazine, my Idea of it, in which you will find no essential difference between *virtual* and *actual* representation in England; but a very striking distinction between these, and no representation at all of America.

My