

they have been violently held back. The land still waits unoccupied for the appointed inhabitants.—*February 12, 1840.*

---

### THE CROMWELL CONTROVERSY.

OUR readers must have remarked with some degree of amusement, the progress of the controversy still raging regarding an important clause in the Marble History of England, now in the course of being chiselled, at the national expense, in the new House of Commons. Every one agrees that, in order to impart to the record any degree of truth at all, it must contain a vast number of clauses that will do no honour to the marble, and that will be unable to receive honour from it. It will contain the Marian clause, in the form of a grim ugly female, smelling horribly of blood and fire; and the Henry VIII. clause, in the shape of a puffy-cheeked truculent bully, surrounded by a group of skeleton wives, some of them bearing their dissevered heads under their elbows; and the Charles II. and James VII. clauses; and a great many other disreputable clauses besides, some of them of more modern, some of them of more ancient date, on the insertion of which all are agreed. The entire dispute hinges on the singularly brilliant clause Oliver Cromwell, respecting the insertion of which there are, it would seem, many diverse opinions. Some assert that the clause Oliver should, like the clause William the Conqueror, or the clause Richard III., be introduced in full; others maintain, on the contrary, that it should not be introduced in full, nor introduced at all, and that there should be even no hiatus left to indicate its existence, but that the flat moody clause Charles I. should *run in* without break, as printers say, with the