

courage, as to be beyond all suspicion of fear. Gustavus Adolphus—he whose person was the mark of every imperial soldier—he who at the head of his cavalry, was found in the thickest of every fight, and who died covered with wounds in the moment of victory—utterly abolished it from his army, and gave an example of what might be done by a great king, a fearless man and a wise legislator, to put a stop even to a vice which assumed the name of virtue. Richelieu effected the same thing in France during his administration. In latter times, we have seen Frederick the Great, and the present stern and upright ruler of the mighty Republic of the United States, direct their efforts to the same great cause; and Colbert, at the period of which we are speaking—a man whom no personal fears could turn for one moment from any just and honorable object—now urged upon Louis XIV., a sovereign distinguished for his personal bravery and for his approbation of every species of courage, to treat with the utmost severity a crime which was a proof of any thing but a virtue which they both admired.”

Pennsylvania, in her proposed new constitution, has the following provision—“any person who shall, after the adoption of the amendments proposed by this convention to the constitution, fight a duel or send a challenge for that purpose, or be aider or abettor in fighting a duel, shall be deprived of the right of holding any office of honor or profit in this State, and shall be punished otherwise in such manner as is, or may be prescribed by law; but the executive may remit the said offence and all its disqualifications.”

In Yerger's Reports, vol. 1, p. 233, the following decision is found, and the opinion of the court was given by judge Catron, now of the Supreme Court of the United States. A lawyer had been stricken from the rolls of court, for the offence of accepting a challenge, which resulted in the death of his opponent; from which judgment, he appealed to the Supreme Court. “It is true, as a part of the history of our species, that many men of strong minds have equally strong passions, which are ill-controlled and subject such men to grosser errors than others with fewer mental advantages; these are the men of worth that fight duels, having no guide but blind and reckless passion when aroused, regardless of their own lives or those of others; hence their conduct furnishes the worst possible evidence upon which to ground a rule for the government of society. This class of duellists are not less wicked than others we will name, but their standing renders it more difficult to punish them.

Another set of men fight duels, (or more generally make a show towards it,) to gratify their vanity, by drawing upon themselves a little temporary notice, which their personal worth or good conduct cannot procure. These are always worthless coxcombs, equally destitute of bravery, virtue or sense, whose feeble nerves would be shattered and prostrated at the sight of an enemy in the field of battle, who are ridiculous in every situation where courage or conduct