

starting with a provisional approximate solution (that of Delaunay being accepted for the purpose), and substituting the expressions for the moon's coordinates in the fundamental differential equations of the moon's motion as disturbed by the sun. If the theory were perfect, the two sides of each equation would come out equal. As they do not come out exactly equal, Sir George puts the problem in the form: What corrections must be applied to the expressions for the coordinates that the two sides may be made equal? He then shows how these corrections may be found by solving a system of equations.

The several methods which we have described have for their immediate object the determination of the motion of the moon round the earth under the influence of the combined attractions of the earth and sun. In other words, the question is that of solving the celebrated "problem of three-bodies" in the special case when one of the bodies, the sun, has a much greater mass than the other two, and is at a much greater distance from them than they are from each other. All methods lead to a solution of the same general form which we shall now describe. Let us put g the moon's mean anomaly; g' the mean anomaly of the sun (or earth); ω the angular distance of the lunar perigee from the moon's node on the ecliptic; ω' the angular distance of the sun's perigee from the moon's node on the ecliptic. When no account is taken of the action of the sun the angles g and g' increase uniformly with time, representing in fact the uniform motion of the moon round the earth and of the earth round the sun, while ω and ω' remain constant. When account is taken of the action of the sun all four of the angles change with a uniform progressive motion. In consequence, the mean orbit of the moon round the earth becomes a moving ellipse whose major axis makes a revolution round the earth in about nine years, and the line of whose nodes makes a revolution in about eighteen and a half years. All the other elements of this ellipse—namely, its major axis, its eccentricity, and its inclination to the ecliptic—remain absolutely constant however long the motion may continue, unless some other disturbing force than that of the sun comes into play. But in the actual motion of the moon there are periodic deviations from this ellipse, which may be represented by an infinite trigonometric series, each term of which is of the form

$$c (\sin \text{ or } \cos) (ig + i'g' + j\omega + j'\omega'),$$

in which the quantities c are absolutely constant coefficients, and i, i', j, j' are integers which may take all combinations of values—positive, negative, or zero. The circular function is, a sine in the expression for longitude or latitude, a cosine in the expression for the parallax. Also, j and j' must be both even or both odd in the expressions for longitude and parallax, but the one even and the other odd in the case of the latitude. For example, if we suppose j, j' , and i all zero, we shall have terms of the form

$$c_1 \sin g' + c_2 \sin 2g' + c_3 \sin 3g' + \&c.$$

To write other terms, suppose $i=1$, then we have terms of the form

$$c_1 \sin (g-g') + c_2 \sin (g+g') + c_3 \sin (g+2g') + \&c.$$

Taking the case when $j=2$ and $j'=-2$, we shall have terms of the form

$$m_1 \sin (g-g'+2\omega-2\omega') + m_2 \sin (g-2g'+2\omega-2\omega') + \&c.$$

As the indices i, i', j, j' become larger, the coefficients $c, c', m, m', \&c.$, become smaller; but the number of terms included in the theories of Hansen and Delaunay amount to several hundreds. In the analytical theories, like that of Delaunay, each of the coefficients $c, c', m, m', \&c.$, is a complicated infinite series, but in the numerical theories it is a constant number. And the principal problem of the modern theory of three bodies is to find the appropriate coefficient for each of these hundreds of terms.

Action of the Planets on the Moon.—For nearly two centuries it has been known from observations that the mean motion of the moon round the earth is not absolutely constant, as it ought to be were there no disturbing body but the sun. The general fact that the motion has been accelerated since the time of Ptolemy was first pointed out by Halley, and the amount of the acceleration was found by Dunthorne. After vain efforts by the greatest mathematicians of the last century to find a physical cause for the acceleration, Laplace was successful in tracing it to the secular diminution of the eccentricity of the earth's orbit, produced by the action of the planets. He computed its amount to be $10''$ per century—that is, if the place of the moon were calculated forward on its mean motion at the beginning of any century, it would at the end of the century be $10''$ in advance of its computed place. This theoretical result of Laplace agreed so closely with the acceleration found by Lalande from the records of ancient and medieval eclipses that it was not questioned for nearly a century. In 1852 Mr John C. Adams showed that Laplace had failed to take account of a series of terms, the effect of which was to reduce

the acceleration to $6''$ or less. The result was inconsistent with the accounts of ancient eclipses of the sun, and a cause for the discrepancy had to be sought for. A probable cause was pointed out, first by Ferrel, and afterwards by Delaunay. The former, in papers published in *Gould's Astronomical Journal*, and in the *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, showed that the action of the moon on the tidal waves of the ocean would have the effect of increasing the time of the earth's axial rotation or the length of the day, which is necessarily taken as the unit of time. Since, as the days became longer, the moon would move farther in one day, though its absolute motion should remain unchanged, and hence an apparent acceleration would be the result. That this cause really acts there can be no doubt. But the data for determining its exact amount are discrepant. If we take only such data as are purely astronomical—namely, the eclipses recorded by Ptolemy between 720 B.C. and 150 A.D., and those observed by the Arabians between 800 and 1000 A.D.—the apparent excess of the observed acceleration to be accounted for by the tidal retardation amounts to only $2''$ per century, and may be even less. But this small acceleration is entirely incompatible with conclusions drawn from certain supposed accounts of total eclipses of the sun, notably the eclipse associated with the name of Thales. This is the famous eclipse supposed to be alluded to by Herodotus when he describes a battle as stopped by a sudden advent of darkness, which had been predicted by Thales. If the true value of the coefficient resulting from the combined effect of tidal retardation of the earth and secular acceleration of the moon is less than $10''$, then not only could the path of totality not have passed over the field of battle but the greatest eclipse could not have occurred till after sunset. In fact, to represent this and other supposed eclipses of the sun, the acceleration must be increased to about $12''$, which is near the value found by Hansen from theory, and adopted in his tables of the moon. But his theoretical computation is undoubtedly incorrect, because in computing in what manner the eccentricity of the earth's orbit enters into the moon's motion he took account only of the first approximation, as Laplace had done. The following is a summary of the present state of the question:—

The theoretical value of the acceleration, assuming the day to be constant, is, according to Delaunay	$6''\cdot176$
Hansen's value, in his <i>Tables de la Lune</i> , is	$12''\cdot18$
Hansen's revised but still theoretically erroneous result is	$12''\cdot56$
The value which best represents the supposed eclipses (1) of Thales, (2) at Larissa, (3) at Stikkelstad, is about	$11''\cdot7$
The result from purely astronomical observations is	$8''\cdot3$
The result from Arabian and modern observations alone is about	$7''\cdot0$

Inequalities of Long Period.—Combined with the question of the secular acceleration is another which is still entirely unsettled—namely, that of inequalities of long period in the mean motion of the moon round the earth. Laplace first showed that modern observations of the moon indicated that its mean motion was really less during the second half of the 18th century than during the first half, and hence inferred the existence of an inequality having a period of more than a century. All efforts to find a satisfactory explanation were, however, so unavailing that Poisson, in 1835, disputed the reality of the inequality. But Airy, from his discussion of the Greenwich observations between 1750 and 1830, conclusively proved its existence. About the same time Hansen announced that he had found from theory two terms of long period arising from the action of Venus which fully corresponded to the inequalities indicated by the observations. These terms, as employed in his *Tables de la Lune*, are

$$15''\cdot34 \sin (-g-16g'+18g''+33''\cdot36') \\ + 21''\cdot47 \sin (8g''-18g'+4''\cdot44'),$$

in which $g, g',$ and g'' represent the mean anomalies of the moon, the earth, and Venus respectively. During the first few years after the publication of Hansen's tables they represented observations so well that their entire correctness was generally taken for granted. But doubt soon began to be thrown upon the inequalities of long period just mentioned. Indeed, Hansen himself admitted that the second and larger term was partly empirical, being taken so as to satisfy observations between 1750 and 1850. Delaunay re-computed both terms, and found for the first term a result substantially identical with that of Hansen. But he found for the second or empirical one a coefficient of only $0''\cdot27$, which would be quite insensible. With this smaller coefficient the observations from 1750 could not be satisfied, so that, so far as observations could go in deciding a purely mathematical question, the evidence was in favour of Hansen's result. But on comparing Hansen's tables with observations between 1650 and 1750 it was found that the supposed agreement with observation was entirely illusory. Moreover, since 1865 the moon has been steadily falling behind the tabular place. These inequalities of long period have not yet been satisfactorily explained. The most plausible supposition is that they are due to the action of one or more of the larger planets. But the problem of the action of the planets on the moon

is the most difficult and intricate of celestial mechanics, and no satisfactory general method of attacking it has yet been found. The sources of difficulty are two in number. First, the disturbing action of the planets is modified by that of the sun in such a way that the ordinary equations of disturbed elliptic motion are no longer rigorous, and hence new and more complicated ones must be constructed. And, secondly, the combination of the four bodies—moon, earth, sun, and planet—leads to terms so numerous and intricate that it has hardly been found possible to isolate them. The question has, indeed, been raised whether the rotation of the earth on its axis, and hence the unit of time, may not be subject to slow and irregular changes of a nature to produce apparent corresponding changes in the motion of the moon. But it has recently been found, from a discussion of the observed transits of Mercury since 1677, that, although such inequalities may exist, they cannot have the magnitude necessary to account for the observed changes of long period in the moon's motion.

The following is a summary of the present state of the various branches of the lunar theory. (1) The numerical solution of the problem of the sun's action on the moon may be regarded as quite satisfactory, at least when Hansen's results shall have been verified by an independent method. (2) The analytic theory needs to be perfected by finding some remedy for the slow convergence of the series by which it is expressed, but its general form may be regarded as quite satisfactory. (3) Except in one or two special cases, the action of the planets on the moon, when treated with the necessary rigour, is so intricate that no approach to a satisfactory solution has yet been attained. When this desideratum is reached, the mathematical theory will be complete. (4) The general discussion of ancient and modern observations with a view to finding what real or apparent inequalities of long period in the mean motion may exist is still to be finished. With it the astronomical theory will be complete. (S. N.)

MOORCROFT, WILLIAM (c. 1770-1825), traveller in Asia, was born in Lancashire, about 1770. He was educated as a surgeon in Liverpool, but on completing his course he resolved to devote himself to veterinary surgery, and, after studying the subject in France, began its practice in London. In 1795 he published a pamphlet of directions for the medical treatment of horses; with special reference to India, and in 1800 a *Cursory Account of the Methods of Shoeing Horses*. Having been offered by the East India Company the inspectorship of their Bengal stud, Moorcroft left England for India in 1808. Under his care the stud rapidly improved; in order to perfect the breed, he resolved to undertake a journey into Central Asia to obtain a stock of Turcoman horses. In company with Captain William Hearsay, and encumbered with a stock of merchandise for the purpose of establishing trade relations between India and Central Asia, Moorcroft left Josimath, well within the mountains, on 26th May 1812. Proceeding along the valley of the Dauli, they reached the summit of the frontier pass of Niti on 1st July. Descending by the towns of Daba and Ghortope, Moorcroft struck the main upper branch of the Indus near its source, and on 5th August arrived at the sacred lake of Manasarowara. Returning by Bhutan, he was detained some time by the Gürkhas, and reached Calcutta in November. This journey only served to whet Moorcroft's appetite for more extensive travel, for which he prepared the way by sending out a young Hindustani, who succeeded in making very extensive explorations. In company with this young man and George Trebeck, Moorcroft set out on his second journey in October 1819. His enterprise was looked upon rather coldly by the directors, who merely allowed him his pay for a time, all the expenses being borne by Moorcroft himself. By way of Almorá and Srinagar, Lahore was reached on 6th May 1820. On 14th August the source of the Biyah (Hyphasis) was discovered, and subsequently that of the Chenáb. Leh, the capital of Ladák, was reached on 24th September, and here several months were spent in exploring the surrounding country. A commercial treaty was concluded with the Government of Ladák, by which the whole of Central Asia was virtually opened to British trade. Kashmir was reached on 3d November 1822, and by the Pír Panjál mountains Jalálábád on 4th June 1824, Cabul on 20th June, and by

Khulm, Kunduz, and Balkh Moorcroft arrived at Bokhara on 25th February 1825. Everywhere he bought horses for the company, and endeavoured to establish trade relations. At Andkho in Cabul Moorcroft was seized with fever, of which he died on 27th August 1825, Trebeck surviving him only a few days. It was not till several years afterwards that his papers were obtained by the Asiatic Society, and published under the editorship of Horace Hayman Wilson in 1841 under the title of *Travels in the Himalayan Provinces of Hindustan and the Punjab, in Ladakh and Kashmir, in Peshawar, Kabul, Kunduz, and Bokhara, from 1819 to 1825*. Though published so long after the traveller's death, the narrative was a valuable contribution to a knowledge of Central Asia, and still remains a classic. In vol. xii. of *Asiatic Researches* will be found an account by Moorcroft of his first journey, and in the *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. i., a paper on the Purik sheep.

MOORE, EDWARD (1712-1757), minor poet, dramatist, and miscellaneous writer, was the son of a dissenting minister of Abingdon, where he was born in 1712. He was the author of the thrilling domestic tragedy of *The Gamester*, originally produced in 1753 with Garrick in the leading character, and still in the repertory of acting plays. It is perhaps the strongest lesson against gambling ever preached from stage or pulpit. The literary merit of the play is not great, but it is powerfully constructed and full of impressive incident, and the career of Beverley the gambler (a character modelled on Fielding's Captain Booth) affords great scope for the actor. Moore also wrote two comedies. As a poet he produced clever imitations of Gay and Gray, and with the assistance of Lyttelton, Chesterfield, and Horace Walpole conducted *The World* (1753-57) during the great decade of the revival of periodical essay-writing. *The World* followed Johnson's *Rambler*, and was followed by *The Idler*; it had as rivals *The Adventurer* and *The Connoisseur*. Moore died at London in 1757.

MOORE, DR JOHN (1730-1802), born at Stirling in 1730, was one of the most prominent writers of travels and novels in the latter part of the 18th century. His novel *Zeluco* (published in 1789) produced a powerful impression at the time, and indirectly, through the poetry of Byron, has left an abiding mark on literature. The novel would in these days be called a psychological novel; it is a close analysis of the motives of a headstrong, passionate, thoroughly selfish and unprincipled profligate. It is full of incident, and the analysis is never prolonged into tedious reflexions, nor suffered to intercept the progress of the story, while the main plot is diversified with many interesting episodes. The character took a great hold of Byron's imagination, and probably influenced his life in some of its many moods, as well as his poetry. It is not too much to say that the common opinion that Byron intended *Childe Harold* as a reflexion of himself cannot be cleared of its large mixture of falsehood without a study of Moore's *Zeluco*. Byron said that he intended the Childe to be "a poetical Zeluco," and the most striking features of the portrait were undoubtedly taken from that character. At the same time it is obvious to everybody acquainted with Moore's novel and Byron's life that the moody and impressionable poet often adopted the character of Zeluco, fancied himself and felt himself to be a Zeluco, although he was at heart a very different man. Moore's other works have a less marked individuality, but his sketches of society and manners in France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and England furnish valuable materials for the social historian. Like his countrymen Burnett and Boswell, he was a sagacious, penetrating, and in the main unprejudiced observer, with something of a natural historian's interest in the human species; and he had exceptional opportunities of observation.

He was a doctor by profession, and the son of a Stirlingshire clergyman. After taking his medical degree at Glasgow, he served with the army in Flanders, then was attached to the household of the English ambassador at Paris, then practised for five years in Glasgow, next travelled on the Continent for five years with a young nobleman, settled for some years as a physician in London, accompanied Lord Lauderdale to Paris in 1792 and witnessed some of the principal scenes of the Revolution. All classes thus came under his observation, while his profession preserved him in an unusual degree from flippant bias. His works attest great shrewdness and sagacity of judgment, and show no small skill in literary presentation. He died at London in 1802.

MOORE, SIR JOHN (1761-1809), the only English general who has gained lasting fame by the conduct of a retreat, was the son of Dr Moore (the subject of the preceding notice), and was born at Glasgow on 13th November 1761. It was his appointment as tutor to the young duke of Hamilton which procured for John Moore educational advantages by which he profited so much as to be called in after life the most cultivated officer in the army. It was then the fashion for young noblemen to travel from court to court, and Moore accompanied his father and the duke to all the chief capitals in Europe, until he was suddenly ordered in 1777 to join the 51st regiment, in which he had been appointed an ensign. He learned his drill at Minorca, and in 1779 was appointed lieutenant and paymaster in a new regiment recently raised by the duke of Hamilton, with which he served in America till the peace of 1783. In 1784 Moore, though but twenty-three years of age, was returned by the duke of Hamilton as member of parliament for the united boroughs of Selkirk, Peebles, and Linlithgow. In parliament he does not seem to have opened his mouth, though he always voted with the Government; but he made some useful friends, notably the duke of York and Pitt. In 1788 he was promoted to a majority in the 51st regiment, and in 1790 he became lieutenant-colonel and resigned his seat in parliament. He soon got his regiment in fine order, and in 1792 sailed with it for the Mediterranean. He was too late to assist at Toulon, but was engaged throughout the operations in Corsica, and especially distinguished himself at the taking of Calvi. After the expulsion of the French, Moore became very intimate with Paoli and many of the leading Corsican patriots, which intimacy was so obnoxious to Sir Gilbert Elliot, the viceroy, that Moore was ordered to leave the island in forty-eight hours. Sir Gilbert's hasty conduct by no means met with approval in London, and Moore was gazetted brigadier-general, and ordered to proceed with his brigade to the West Indies. In April 1796 he reached Barbados, and at once became the right hand of Sir Ralph Abercromby, the commander-in-chief. The first enterprise was the reconquest of the island of St Lucia, which was completely occupied by an agent of Victor Hugues with a mixed force of Caribs, negroes, and Frenchmen. The key of the island was a fortified and almost impregnable height called the Morne Fortuné, which was at last stormed, though with great loss, by the valour of brigadier-generals Moore and Hope, who were to be comrades on a yet more memorable field. After this success, Sir Ralph left the island, and appointed Moore governor and commander-in-chief. A difficult post he found his government, owing to the swarms of Caribs and negroes in the woods; but just as he was on the point of triumphing he fell ill of yellow fever, and was ordered home. In 1798 he was well and again eager to be on active service, and he accompanied his friend Abercromby over to Ireland, where he received the command of the Bandon district. In the Irish rebellion of 1798 he distinguished himself by his activity in saving

Wexford from destruction after the battle of Vinegar Hill. His services were in universal request, and Abercromby insisted upon his serving with him in the expedition to the Helder in 1799, where he did creditably all that was creditably done in that ill-managed expedition. On his return from Holland he was made colonel of the 52d regiment, and in 1800 accompanied Abercromby to the Mediterranean as major-general.

Throughout the Egyptian expedition he commanded the reserve, and especially distinguished himself at the battle of Alexandria, when he was wounded in three places, and behaved with such distinction that he was recognized universally as the greatest English general, now that Abercromby was gone. The short interval of the peace of Amiens did not injure Moore's prospects, and in 1803 he was appointed commandant of the camp at Shorncliffe. Here he proved his greatness as an organizer, for it was at this time that he organized those light regiments which were to form the reserve in his own campaign and the light division in the Peninsular War. While at Shorncliffe he renewed his intimacy with Pitt, who was then residing at Walmer Castle, and who on his return to office made Moore a knight of the Bath, and consulted him on every military project. Fox, when he succeeded to office, showed the same appreciation of Moore, and in May 1806 appointed him second-in-command to his brother, General Fox, who was ordered with a strong force to Sicily to supersede Sir John Stuart. Moore won but little credit at this time, for there was none to gain, but employed his time, according to Napier, in falling in love with Miss Fox, to whom, however, he never proposed, fearing to be accepted for his position and not for himself. In 1807 he was able to escape from the intrigues of the Sicilian court, and was ordered to Portugal, which he reached too late to make any defence of Lisbon, already in the possession of the French. He then went home, and had four months' rest, the last he ever had. In May 1808 he was ordered with a force of 11,000 men to Sweden to assist the king against the united forces of France and Russia. The mad conduct of the Swedish king, however, who even went so far as to declare Sir John Moore under arrest when he refused to acquiesce in his plans, ruined any chance of successful co-operation, and the English general made his escape and returned to England. He was at once ordered to proceed with his division to Portugal, where Sir Arthur Wellesley had already landed; but the appointment of Dalrymple and Burrard to the chief commands was even more of a slight on Moore as a general of European experience than on Wellesley, whose laurels had hitherto been won in India. He regarded himself as personally insulted by the ministers, and especially by Lord Castlereagh, but deemed it his duty to go where he was ordered. He met his reward; for when, after the excitement caused by the Convention of Cintra, Dalrymple and Burrard went home, he was left in command of the largest English army since the commencement of the war. Wellesley had appreciated him, and in an interesting letter (published in the *Wellington Despatches*) had expressed his desire to use his own great political influence to reconcile him to the ministers and the ministers to him.

Now began the glorious three months on which Moore's reputation as a soldier and a statesman must rest. The Spaniards, flushed with their former success at Baylen, regarded Napoleon, who had in person crossed the Pyrenees, as another Dupont, and loudly summoned Moore to a share in their coming victories. Moore knew better what was the value of Napoleon's genius, but he had been commanded to assist the Spaniards, and therefore gave the order to advance. His army marched in four distinct divisions, and on 13th November 1808 he concentrated at Sala-

manca, where he waited to see what would happen. He heard that a subsidiary force under Sir David Baird had arrived at Corunna, and ordered it up to join him. At Salamanca he remained a whole month watching the triumphant successes of Napoleon and his lieutenants, and learning how little Spanish reports or Spanish valour were to be relied on. Though irritated by the menaces and abuse of Frere, the English minister to the junta, he waited till the 13th December, hearing daily of Spanish defeats, and then he determined to draw off upon his own small force the weight of Napoleon's power, and thus give Andalusia the winter in which to organize an army and prepare for another Baylen. With this intention he advanced through Toro and Mayorga, where Baird joined him, to Sahagun. He judged rightly that Napoleon would never advance into Andalusia and leave the English behind him, but that he would turn all his power against them. Having once drawn Napoleon's attention to himself, he began his famous retreat and fell back quickly, fighting every day and invariably with success. He now could test the military spirit he had taught at Shorncliffe, for the reserve under Sir Edward Paget consisted entirely of his own light regiments. To detail each step of the retreat and every skirmish would be but to rewrite Napier; suffice it to say that, with great loss of life and material, Moore reached Corunna on 12th January 1809. But the fleet to take the army home was not there; and the English would have to fight Soult, whose army was even more weakened and demoralized than Moore's, before they could embark. It was on 16th January that Moore fought his last battle; he fell early in the day, and knew at once that his wound was mortal. His last hours were cheered with the knowledge of victory, but were spent in recommending his old friends, such as Graham and Colborne, to the notice of the Government. Sir H. Hardinge's description of these hours is in its way inimitable, and in it must be studied how a modern Bayard should die in battle, every thought being for others, none for himself.

It may be possible in the face of his heroic death to exaggerate Moore's actual military services, but his influence on the British army cannot be overrated. The true military spirit of discipline and of valour, both in officers and men, had become nearly extinct during the American war. Abercromby, who looked back to the traditions of Minden, was the first to attempt to revive it, and his work was carried on by Moore. The formation of the light regiments at Shorncliffe was the answer to the new French tactics, and it was left to Wellington to show the success of the experiment. Moore's powers as a statesman are shown in his despatches written at Salamanca, and he had the truest gift of a great man, that of judging men. It may be noticed that, while Wellington perpetually grumbled at the bad qualities of his officers and formed no school, Moore's name is associated with the career of all who made their mark. Among generals, Hope, Graham, Sir E. Paget, Hill, and Craufurd, all felt and submitted to his ascendancy, and of younger officers it was ever the proud boast of the Napiers, Colborne, the Beckwiths, and Barnard that they were the pupils of Moore, not of Wellington. Nay more, he inspired an historian. The description of Moore's retreat in Napier is perhaps the finest piece of military history in the English language, not only because the author was present, but because his heart was with the leader of that retreat; and, if Napier felt towards Wellington as the soldiers of the tenth legion felt towards Cæsar, he felt towards Moore the personal love and devotion of a cavalier towards Montrose.

The great authority for Moore's life is the *Life of Sir John Moore*, by his brother, J. C. Moore (1835); see also *Narrative of the Campaign of Sir John Moore in Spain*, by his brother, J. C. Moore (4to, with plans, 1809); *Napier, Peninsular War*, Bk. iv., and his *Life of Sir Charles Napier*. For views adverse to Moore's retreat, see Charnilly, *Narrative* (1810), and Sir Bartle Frere, *Life of the Rt. Hon. J. H. Frere* (published in vol. I. of his works). Consult also Wilson, *Campaign in Egypt*, for Moore's services there, and the *Life of Gilbert Elliot, First Lord Minto*, for the squabble in Corsica. (H. M. S.)

MOORE, THOMAS (1779-1852), born at Dublin on 28th May 1779, fairly shares with Lord Byron the honour of being the most popular poet of his generation. Whatever may be thought now of the intrinsic qualities of his verse, this much cannot be denied. The most trustworthy of all measures of popularity is the price put upon a writer's work

in the publishing market, and when Moore's friend Perry, in negotiating the sale of the unwritten *Lalla Rookh*, claimed for the poet the highest price that had up to that time been paid for a poem the publisher at once assented. Moore was then in the heyday of his reputation, but twenty years later publishers were still willing to risk their thousands on his promise to produce. Much of Moore's success was due to his personal charm. This at least gave him the start on his road to popularity. There is not a more extraordinary incident in the history of our literature than the instantaneousness with which the son of a humble Dublin grocer just out of his teens, on his first visit to London, captivated the fashionable world and established himself in the course of a few months as one of its prime favourites. The youth crossed St George's Channel in 1799 to keep terms at the Middle Temple, carrying with him a translation of the *Odes of Anacreon*, which he wished to publish by subscription. In a very short time he had enrolled half the fashionable world among his subscribers, and had obtained the permission of the prince of Wales to dedicate the work to him. The mere power of writing graceful and fluent amatory verses would not alone have enabled the poet to work this miracle. Moore's social gifts were of the most engaging kind. He charmed all whom he met, and charmed them, though he was not a trained musician, with nothing more than with his singing of his own songs. The piano, and not the harp, was his instrument, but he came nearer than anybody else in modern times to Bishop Percy's romantic conception of the minstrel. To find a parallel to him we must go back to the palmy days of Provençal song, to such *troubadours* and *jongleurs* as Arnaut Daniel and Perdigon, whose varied powers of entertainment made them welcome guests wherever they went. It was not merely the fashionable world that the young adventurer captivated; the landlady of his lodgings in London, a countrywoman of his own, offered to place at his disposal all the money of which she had the command.

The fragment of autobiography in which Moore draws a softly-coloured picture of his early life in Dublin lets us into the secret of the seeming miracle of his social conquest. Externals apart, the spirit of his social surroundings in Little Aungier Street had much in common with the society to which he was introduced in London. He was born in the proscribed sect of Catholics, whose exclusion from the society of the Castle produced a closer union among their various ranks, and thus, from the first, Moore was no stranger to the more refined gaieties of social intercourse. It was, upon the whole, a gay life in Catholic society, though the conspiracy of the United Irishmen was being quietly formed beneath the surface. Amateur theatricals was one of their favourite diversions, and gifts of reciting and singing were not likely to die for want of applause. Moore's schoolmaster was a leader in these entertainments, a writer of prologues and epilogues and incidental songs; and at a very early age Master Thomas Moore was one of his show-boys, ardently encouraged in all his exercises by a very affectionate mother at home. Before he left school he had acquired fame in his own circle as a song-writer, and had published, in the *Anthologia Hibernica*, verses "to Zelia on her charging the author with writing too much on love." This was in 1793. In that year the prohibition against Catholics entering Trinity College was removed, and next year Moore took advantage of the new freedom. As one of the first Catholic entrants, he had an exceptional stimulus to work, and there industriously acquired that classical scholarship with which he won the hearts of such learned Whigs as Lansdowne and Holland, while he charmed fashionable ladies with the grace of his songs. Young Moore's social atmosphere was, of course, strongly charged with patriotism and hatred of the excesses of