

in mail, with a marshal's truncheon in his hand. The legend affixed to the one was "Sir William Wallace, Protector of Scotland;" and that borne by the other, "Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of England:." and such was the interest attached to the prints and the notices, that the little books at length learned to open of themselves at the pages which exhibited the uncrowned warriors; for the one, with scarce a single exception, was the greatest and noblest of the Scotchmen, as the Bruce, though of a heroic nature, was less disinterestedly a patriot; and the other, with scarce a single exception, was, as far as we know, the greatest and noblest of the Englishmen; for, though the figure of Alfred looms large in the distance, the exaggerating mists of the past close thick around him, and we fail to ascertain his true proportions through the cloud. Here, we contend, in the child's books, and by the child, the grave question at issue, of statue or no statue, was fairly decided. The child's books found fitting space in their pages for the effigies of the two Protectors; and the child soon learned to give unwitting evidence that the effigies of none of the others had at least a better right to be there.

But Cromwell, it is urged, was not a *king*: he said *no*, though he might have said *yes*, when offered the crown; and his statue ought to be excluded on the strength of the monosyllable. We would be inclined to sustain the objection had it been proposed to erect Cromwell's statue, not in the British House of Commons, but in the Herald's Office. But history is a thing of veritable facts, not of heraldic quibbles. *King* is a simple word of four letters, and *Lord Protector* a compound word of thirteen; but, translated into their historic meaning, their import is exactly the same. They just mean, and no more, the supreme governor of the country. The only real difference between Cromwell and the Charleses on either side is, that he was a great and good supreme governor,