

XXXIV.—*A Biographical Notice of the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. & LL.D.*

By the Very Reverend E. B. RAMSAY, M.A., F.R.S.E.

(Read 4th March 1849.)

MR PRESIDENT,—It has been a practice from the foundation of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, to commemorate its deceased distinguished members by memoirs or biographical notices, read at the ordinary meetings of the Society. Some of these have been printed in the Transactions; and our published volumes are enriched by papers of DUGALD STEWART, PROFESSOR PLAYFAIR, SIR JOHN MACNEIL, and DR TRAILL, on the characters and writings of ADAM SMITH, DR HUTTON, PROFESSOR ROBISON, SIR CHARLES BELL, and DR HOPE. A biographical notice is now due to the memory of a distinguished countryman, late Vice-President of the Royal Society; and the following remarks will, in attempting that object, make a deviation from those more severe discussions with which the time of the Society is usually occupied, in connection either with pure mathematics, natural philosophy, or natural history.

I consider it scarcely becoming for the reader of a paper to occupy the time of the Society, by details or explanations which are merely personal. I would, however, ask permission to state, that I did not enter upon this office till I knew that it had been declined by one far better qualified for its performance; one who, if named, would, I am confident, be recognised as the individual of our body best calculated to do justice to the subject.

I feel assured, however, that, from those whom I have the honour to address, I shall receive every sympathy and indulgence in the few observations which I propose to offer in attempting to delineate those literary characteristics—those efforts of practical benevolence—by which the subject of this brief notice was distinguished during the many years which, as a public man, he came before his contemporaries.

THOMAS CHALMERS was born at Anstruther, 17th March 1780, and at its parochial school received his early education. He studied at the University of St Andrews the usual course of eight years, from 1791 to 1799. He received licence from the Presbytery of St Andrews, 31st July 1799. During the sessions 1799-1800, 1800-1801, he studied at Edinburgh under Professors ROBISON, STEWART, and HOPE. He commenced his clerical life as assistant at Cavers, December 1801—was instituted to the Parish of Kilmany, Fife, 12th May 1803—removed to Glasgow, 1815—to St Andrews, as Professor of Moral Philosophy, 1823. He came to Edinburgh as Professor of Divinity, 1828, and filled that chair till the Disruption in 1843. In February 1834 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, Edinburgh—in 1835 a Vice-President. In January 1834, he was elected a corresponding member of the Institute of France, before which distinguished body he read, in 1838, a paper, in

English, on the distinction between legal charity for the relief of indigence, and legal charity for the relief of disease. At the annual commemoration of Oxford, 1st July 1835, he received the honorary degree of LL.D. In that ancient and Episcopal seat of learning this degree was conferred upon the Presbyterian Professor amidst enthusiastic acclamations, without one dissenting voice. His death took place, 31st May 1847, at the age of 67: He was buried, 4th June 1847.

Of a life so long extended, and embracing so many subjects of active exertion, it is evident such a paper as the present can include only a very abridged and limited notice. It is not intended to embrace those points which belong to mere personal and private biography, or to details of questions on which there existed special and peculiar relation to his own religious communion. There is, I believe, in preparation a full Life of Dr CHALMERS, which will include a publication of his private memoirs, of his correspondence, and other personal biographical expositions. We have now to consider Dr CHALMERS as he came before the world, as he occupied a distinguished place in the observation of mankind; for his reputation was not merely Scottish, or merely British,—it was European. In this view, then, I think we may at once, for the sake of preserving something like method and order in our remarks, consider his public character under three heads:

1. As an Author.
2. As a Political Economist.
3. As a Speaker.

First, One thing strikes us at first approaching the subject of Dr CHALMERS' writings, and that is, the great *industry* which must have marked his literary labours. When we look at the array of volumes published during his lifetime; when we consider the manuscripts which he left behind; and, in addition to all this, take into account that these volumes were not written in the retired cloisters of a college, or the quiet of a country parsonage, but that he wrote in the bustle of numerous engagements, of meetings to be attended, of lectures and examinations for his classes, of correspondence to be maintained, and perhaps, above all, amidst lavish encroachments made upon his time by strangers; we must be struck with his economy of time, and with the *perseverance* of his mental efforts. How many might say of him, as the Younger PLINY wrote of his uncle, the Elder PLINY, "Erat incredibile studium summa vigilantia. Itaque soleo ridere, cum me quidam studiosum vocant; qui si comparer illi sum desidiosissimus."* Dr CHALMERS was far from being, in the classical or scholastic sense of the term, a *learned* man, or a great scholar. His early education, his habits, and pursuits through life, prevented it.† But it is a pleasing

* Plin. Epist. iii. 5.

† In his Lectures on the Romans, he makes no reference to an exegetical or critical view of the passages, though in that Epistle there is a great temptation to do so. He takes the statements of the Apostle in their broadest and most general acceptance. His mind did not *rest* on the niceties of philological distinctions.

view of his character to find how much he admired and respected learning in others. He never undervalued an attainment because he did not possess it himself. He impressed his students with the value and importance of learning in Theology, and revered what he called the "massive erudition" of divines of the English Church. In describing the peculiarities of his mental constitution, we are at once led to the conclusion of a remarkable predominance of one, and that is an extraordinary abundance of the *imaginative* faculty,—the power of illustrating his ideas, and of setting forth his subjects of discussion with never-ending variety of imagery, comparison, and analogy. In some of his works it seems as if he could not tear himself away from the pleasure of reproducing some great truth, which he enforces under all the different garbs and attitudes with which he can invest it. There is no question that this is a very effective and important method of handling subjects, when the particular bent of the author's genius enables him to pursue it effectually, and is specially adapted for leaving a clear, distinct, and vivid impression upon the mind. In the case of Dr CHALMERS, attachment to science, and early pursuits in astronomy, chemistry, and other branches of physical science, gave him a great advantage in furnishing types for analogy and illustration. These he used on some occasions with happy effect. Indeed, he never lost his interest in the exact sciences; and, had the circumstances of life been favourable to their pursuit, would, no doubt, have been distinguished in the branches of mathematical pursuits. His mind was always alive to scientific subjects. In 1838, when introduced to the present Bishop of Nova Scotia, he heard, with much interest, the Bishop's description of the Bay of Fundy (which is in his diocese), and the enormous roll of tide coming in with a front 70 feet in height; next day Dr CHALMERS wrote a letter to the Bishop, proposing the experiment of having a delicate pendulum placed on the shore, and to watch the effect of the mass of water upon it, as they came into the bay, similar to Dr MASKELYNE'S celebrated experiment at Schehalion, to test the effect of gravity, but, with the advantage over Dr MASKELYNE, that the waters would form a homogeneous mass of matter, and the result be more striking, from marking the effect of the mass *approaching* the pendulum.* When I said, therefore, that, in Dr CHALMERS, the faculty of imagination was an abounding and prominent endowment, I was far from meaning that this implied a poverty of the reasoning faculties, or defect in other mental qualities. On the contrary, he had a mind remarkably adapted for the apprehension of great principles, of broad and profound truths. He delighted to grasp primary and fundamental elements. He expatiated, with the fullest enjoyment, on reasonings of such authors as Bishop BUTLER, BACON, NEWTON. His admiration of BUTLER was intense: as an expounder of great elementary truths, he placed him in the first and highest class

* This experiment, I find, had been suggested by Professor ROBISON, in his *Elements of Mechanical Philosophy*, § 474.

of human intellects. In the dedication of his Bridgewater Treatise to the BISHOP of LONDON, he thus expressed his admiration: "I have derived greater aid from the views and reasonings of Bishop BUTLER, than I have been able to find besides in the whole range of our existent authorship." On one occasion, when some person present was animadverting upon the wealth of the Church of England, and gave, as an example of its over-abundance, the revenues of the See of Durham, the Doctor exclaimed, with characteristic eagerness, "Sir, if all that has been received for the Bishopric of Durham since the foundation of the See, were set down as payment for BUTLER'S Analogy, I should esteem it a cheap purchase." We are not to consider his admiration of BUTLER'S works as proceeding from the sameness or resemblance of their mode of reasoning, but rather from the difference. BUTLER excogitated masses of profound thought, and left them nearly as raw material, costly indeed, but not elaborated for use, except for the purpose of furnishing him with examples of *analogy* between natural and revealed theology. CHALMERS found, in this storehouse, abundant substance for practical application to the business and improvement of life. He polished and carved, and adjusted the stone which he had dug from the quarry. And thus, both as an able quarryman, and as an accomplished dresser, he has erected graceful, durable, and useful edifices for mankind. His method of exhibiting truths, in so many and in such attractive positions, has deeply impressed the minds of thousands, not only of those who were amongst his stated hearers as pupils, but amongst readers of his works generally. Although Dr CHALMERS' mode of treating his subjects was such as I have described, and though his usual mode of handling was to exhibit *one* great and leading topic, illustrated and enforced with all the profusion and imagery of a rich fancy and a powerful imagination, we should, at the same time, observe that the method is frequently applied with great ability, and with great effect in bringing forward *two ideas* where one is required to check or modify an exclusive attention to the other. Thus, for instance, in his Sermons, though he dwells upon the doctrine of the corruption of human nature, and the utter insufficiency of all mere natural efforts to merit the Divine favour, and to claim a reward at God's hand, he runs, as it were, parallel with this great truth another truth, equally important and equally authoritative, viz., that virtue in itself is beautiful, that the generous affections and good feelings must not be undervalued or depreciated, but are, in fact, desirable and estimable in their own place and their own character, and require only the right *motives* to render them acceptable. I know no writer who has more successfully elaborated this important subject. He has shewn the harmony and consistency of the two doctrines. He has upheld and vindicated the dignity and the loveliness of virtue. He has cut away all ground of merit and of human desert before God. In the same manner, as a predestinarian, he has ably and powerfully (in some instances sternly) put forward the proofs of God's prescience and omnipotence over all his works; but, in conjunction with that great truth, he has upheld, with unflinching fidelity, the necessity of human exertion,

and he has illustrated the agency of man's own endeavours as fully and as freely as if he had been the champion of a free will entire and uncontrolled. Thus it is always in his writings. He is urging and reiterating, with all the fervency of an ardent eloquence, a great and important principle, or he is running the parallel between *two* essential truths. He is sustaining, singly and conjunctly, the position of two considerations, both of which are to be of supreme authority. The action of both is requisite for man's moral and spiritual wellbeing; at times they may, in theory, appear to be incompatible, but in action are never inconsistent. He is not, therefore, a writer of subdivisions or details. He is copious, but copious in illustrating great propositions. He offers, in this respect, a remarkable contrast to a great writer, Dr ISAAC BARROW, whose strength is in *division*. Of him it was said, that he "*exhausted his subject.*" CHALMERS also exhausted his subject. But then one exhausted the practical application and minute enforcement of a truth, in all its results and consequences; the other exhausted the various forms and illustrations by which that truth itself could be enforced upon the human mind. There is nothing of the analytical method in his treatment of a subject. It is almost purely *deductive*. He sets out with a great principle, and shews, in a thousand shapes, its application and appropriation. One remark, however, we would make on this subject. Although the handling is so copious and diffusive, it is seldom deficient in strength and pungency. It would frequently be difficult to abbreviate without injury; and we find expressions constantly occurring of great force and point. It was said of Dr CHALMERS by ROBERT HALL, after hearing him preach, that his sermon went on hinges, not on wheels. Images are sometimes dangerous coadjutors. A discourse on wheels may run off the course; but a discourse on hinges must, at any rate, retain the speaker in his place, and make him exhibit the various forms and phases of his subject, by turning it in every direction to his audience.

The style of Dr CHALMERS' writing partakes of the character of his mind. It is copious and overflowing; cumbrous, perhaps, at times, for the more minute detail of a subject; but the phraseology (though occasionally somewhat eccentric) is often powerful and beautiful in the highest degree. It is impossible to illustrate these peculiarities without examples. I shall only select a few. Thus, to express the quick passage of time: "Time, with its mighty strides, will soon reach a future generation, and leave the present in death and in forgetfulness behind it." To express that the world occupies our thoughts: "Its cares and its interests are plying us every hour with their urgency." A man of shallow views in religion is a "man whose threadbare orthodoxy is made up of meagre and unfruitful positions." The external marks of piety: "A beauty of holiness, which effloresces on the countenance, and the manner, and the outward path." To say that the repentance of a sinner interests the angels, is thus worded: "His repentance would, at this moment, send forth a wave of delighted sensibility throughout the mighty throng of their innumerable legions." Persons who take

their opinions from a *partial* adoption of Scripture truth, are persons who, “retiring within the entrenchment of a few verses of the Bible, will defy all the truth and all the thunder of its warning denunciations.”

His style, with all its peculiarities, was HIS OWN. It may be called mannerism; but it is the mannerism of a powerful mind striving to express its own conceptions without regard to rules of rhetoric or the discipline of schools. It is the mannerism of genius,—one leading characteristic of which is to invest known truths and ordinary objects with new and untiring interest, and with constantly-fresh attraction; and, on this ground, it is characteristic and becoming, because it is his own; and, accordingly, these peculiarities of style pervaded his ordinary conversation and his familiar letters, just as much as they marked his more elaborate compositions; and in the ordinary intercourse of life, expressions constantly recurred to remind one of his writings. In fact, his language is merely the vehicle or medium of expressing and communicating his ideas; and we may almost say *he could not help it*. There is a danger with him (as there is with all imaginative writers) of his style being considered imaginative *only*. To many minds declamation is irksome and wearisome in the highest degree,—to them it conceals rather than develops the mental power which lies below the surface; and, not unfrequently, practical wisdom and sound argument are not duly estimated, simply *because* there is a play of imagination around them,—the lustre and richness of the setting obscures the pearls. Such authors are not unfrequently a snare to their admirers. Mannerism in authors may be easily caught by those who have no inspiration of their genius. Hence, of all writers and speakers Dr CHALMERS was one most dangerous for imitators (and amongst young and injudicious students he had imitators). What was natural to him was constraint or affectation in them. In fact, they became copyists more than imitators. Their taking his style and manner becomes a literary larceny, rather than an honourable and fair obligation. It is miserable to see men borrowing fine clothes which they know not how to wear,—affecting a glow of eloquence to cover a vapid and commonplace conception of their subject.

Secondly, As affecting the happiness of mankind, and as bearing upon their best and highest interests for time and for eternity, Dr CHALMERS was, during the whole of his public career, much occupied with the theories of Political Economy. In all ages of the world, how much of the misery of mankind may be traced to the errors and mistakes of erroneous legislation. Bad laws on excise,—on poor management,—on taxation,—on police or criminal jurisprudence, proceeding from false views of political economy, have been the most fruitful sources of crime, of misery, and degradation. The energetic and benevolent spirit of CHALMERS saw and felt the connection between a well-*doing* and a well-*living* population. He felt how much, under the Divine blessing, might be done by rulers and statesmen

to make or mar human happiness, and he took a very prominent position amongst the Christian economists of the day. Into the general question of political economy as a theory, whether of population, free trade, balance of trade, capital, taxes or tithes, I do not pretend to enter. On these points Dr CHALMERS wrote with much power and acuteness. His views on most points generally coincided with ADAM SMITH, MALTHUS, TOOKE, and authors of that school. But in one department of political economy, he took that position which has added lustre to his name, and which exhibits him to the world as the true Christian philanthropist, and the best friend of human nature. Speculations on theory and doctrine in political economy were not sufficient for one who constantly sought to do good to those who most needed the help and guidance of their fellow-Christians. We have to consider CHALMERS, then, as a practical economist; as one who, not satisfied to reason and to speculate in his study upon the best methods of improving the conditions of mankind, went forth into the cottages, the hovels, and crowded habitations of the poor, to improve their temporal, moral, and religious condition. The agencies on which he depended for improving mankind were the school, the Bible, the visitor, the pastor. Hence the titles of his works and articles on this subject, indicate what were the objects and purposes he had in view: for instance, we have "The Civic and Christian Economy of Great Towns;" "The Christian and Economic Polity of a Nation;" "Sabbath Schools;" "Bearing of Christian Economy upon Pauperism," &c. In his "Civic and Christian Economy of Large Towns," he lays down some of the most valuable and practical principles of useful charity. It is a dreary and heart-sickening prospect which the Christian philanthropist encounters when he enters upon the charity of great cities; and not only did Dr CHALMERS zealously promote amendment in that field of our erring, and destitute, and suffering countrymen, by suggesting sound principles of management, but he threw his whole energy, his persuasive eloquence, and his personal superintendence into the work.*

In 1815 he had been called to take the pastoral charge of a parish in Glasgow, a city where he knew there would be abundant opportunities for verifying his opinions and employing his resources. He commenced the publication of *The Civic and Christian Economy*, as a small periodical, and took the lead in directing the attention of the nation to the absolute necessity of extending, in our city population, means of education, of pastoral superintendence, and spiritual instruction, *similar* to what prevailed through the country parishes

* It is pleasing to remember how the last mortal days of such a man were engaged with plans of instruction for the benefit of this very class. He had for some time been entirely taken up with a School and Church, in the worst locality of the Old Town of Edinburgh. The man of high speculation became a teacher of ragged children. The Professor of Theology descended from his chair to impress the first rudiments of Christian truth upon the rude minds of a congregation the most ignorant and most neglected.

of Scotland. However ample and effective had been the supply of these elements of human improvement in the agricultural parishes and districts, the commercial and manufacturing population had quite outgrown them, and the work required to be recommenced, and taken in hand in good earnest. He was, therefore, a strenuous and constant advocate for carrying out the system of TERRITORIAL SUBDIVISION. There was a vitally important principle in the accomplishing this great end, and one which Dr CHALMERS established with great ability: it was the principle of providing for the work being *effectually* done, in the particular portions or districts chosen—not only the taking in hand the worst localities, but in every one of these laying a sufficient foundation or substratum of good, so far as you go. I think this principle was first taken up by Dr CHALMERS. It is of immense importance, and I know was adopted from Dr CHALMERS by the BISHOP of LONDON, in consequence of consultation with him regarding the plans for providing churches, schools, and parsonages, for the recently-formed masses of the destitute population of the great metropolis. The experiment was tried in Bethnal Green, where ten new parishes were formed, dividing the population into sections manageable by a pastor, and curate, and school. For want of attending to this principle, a grant of a million of money for church-building in England had been rendered comparatively ineffective. Churches and schools were set down here and there; lost in the mass of surrounding poverty and destitution, their influence was little felt,—in some cases almost unnoticed.*

I have now to notice, in connection with the political economy of Dr CHALMERS, an important incident of his life. And I must allude to an achievement which exercised the greatest influence upon his own views of the parochial system and management of the poor, and which excited astonishment, admiration, and scepticism amongst his contemporaries. I refer to the remarkable effects produced by management of the poor in St John's Parish, Glasgow, under his direction and superintendence. I will endeavour to make a plain and distinct statement of the FACTS, as established by the evidence of the parties concerned in the operation.

It is well known how exceedingly Dr CHALMERS was opposed to the support of the poor by a *compulsory assessment*; that is to say, the *ordinary* wants and the *ordinary* support of the poor. He approved of assessments for disease and casualties, for supporting infirmaries, dispensaries, and lunatic asylums, also for extraordinary emergencies of famine, pestilence, or catastrophe; but general poor-

* This principle of territorial subdivision, for which Dr CHALMERS, as a Christian philanthropist, so long contended, is at last acknowledged as the essential preparation for bringing spiritual instruction to bear upon the worst portions of our crowded and demoralised population. Lord ASHLEY, the enlightened friend of the poor, has, with the full approbation of the Premier, moved for a commission to inquire into the best method of dividing all parishes in England which contain a population of 10,000 or upwards.

laws he utterly condemned. He had termed the system a "legalised enormity." He had ascribed to the action of those laws in England all the evils under which the country suffered from pauperism. He considered them to be the bane of Christian charity, and the curse of all connected with them. It remained, then, to test by experience, when he had a proper field, an *opposite* system; and this he was determined to do in Glasgow. When, in the year 1815, he took charge of the Tron Church Parish in Glasgow, the system of management for the poor throughout the city was somewhat peculiar. The whole funds raised for the poor, whether in the shape of assessments or collections at the church-doors, were under the administration of two bodies, one called the General Session, consisting of the elders and clergy of all the parishes, and the other called the Town-Hospital, which had pensioners within its walls, and *out-pensioners* residing in the city. The whole expense of poor support had been on the increase. In 1803 it amounted to about £4000; in 1818, to about £11,000; in 1820, to £13,000. His determination was, from the first, to manage his district *without* assessment. In this wild and extravagant scheme, as it was considered, he was opposed by the General Session, by the Magistrates, by the Town-Hospital, and by the Presbytery. Indeed, the Presbytery had carried up a case against him to the General Assembly; accordingly, he was glad to be transferred to St John's Parish, which took place in 1819, and where the same obstacles and impediments to his experiment did not exist. The population was 10,000; the people, with very few exceptions, of the poorest class of manufacturers. According to the due proportion of population and pauperism, the expenditure for St John's had been about one-tenth of the expenditure for all Glasgow, or upwards of £1400 annually. His first step was to release the General Session and the Town-Hospital from all obligation to support the St John's poor, and he undertook, with his own church-door collection, to meet their wants. This collection averaged £400 a-year. With £400 a-year, therefore, he began the work. Now, of this sum, £225 were already pledged for regular cases permanently settled upon parochial relief, so that, from this collection fund of £400, £175 only remained as a *surplus* to meet and to provide for *new* cases of pauperism. But, besides the £400—the result of day collections at the church-door—there was another and an evening collection made by a very poor congregation, chiefly in halfpence, which amounted to about £80 a-year. Out of *this* £80 he resolved to provide for new cases of paupers coming upon the parish, and to leave the £400 collection to take care of the old paupers. He had previously made a minute district subdivision of the parish, and secured the assistance of zealous and intelligent deacons as visitors, one for each district. What, then, was the *result* of the system, and the degree of success with which it was accompanied? The £80 covered the whole expense of the *new* pauperism, which did not require more than £66, 6s. The £400 were, in the mean time, increasing in the hands of the kirk-session by old paupers dropping off, and by the surplus

of £175 not being required. This command of money in the hands of the kirk-session Dr CHALMERS considered to be a snare and a danger; accordingly, as he expressed it with considerable *naïveté*, he sought to provide “a safe and salutary absorbent” to take off this plethora of pecuniary oppression, and this he did by expending it all in the permanent endowment of a school. Thus the system worked, and the only disturbing force seems to have been the occasional indiscreet and injudicious introduction of charitable contributions *from without*: And certainly here is a marvellous result,—the poor of a parish absolutely managed with a success varying *inversely* as the pecuniary resources at the command of the managers. But neither the principal mover of this scheme, nor his colleagues in the work, seemed to consider it a mystery or a miracle; their solution of the problem was; *1st*, that former applicants who were conscious that they did not require or deserve support withdrew, and the idea of legal right ceasing, no cases but those of absolute necessity were left; but, *2d*, and chiefly, that the sympathies of the poor themselves were thus called forth, and no one allowed his neighbour to starve so long as he could spare a morsel, and when he knew that neighbour was deprived of other resources on which he could depend. The poor, in short, helped each other through their difficulties when no one else would. The artificial channels of charity being closed, a more copious and more permanent supply flowed through the natural channels of relationship and vicinage. Such was the theory; the results were indisputable. The world was still sceptical, and two solutions were offered to account for the success of a scheme which would support poor people without poor-laws. It was said, in the first place, that the system was so hard upon the people that the poor were driven out of St John’s parish, and took refuge in other parishes, where more money was expended. It was said, in the second place, that the success was the consequence of Dr CHALMERS’ personal influence and powers. That what he accomplished in St John’s, another man *could not* accomplish in St Luke’s; and that, with the man, the scheme would die out. To both of these objections an answer was ready. To the first objection it was declared, that the balance of migratory pauper population was fully in favour of St John’s; and, to come to greater exactness, it was stated that a correct account was kept of poor *leaving* St John’s, and poor *coming in* to St John’s: the result was the *imports exceeded the exports* by fourteen souls. The exchange, in fact, was *against* them, and this they considered a conclusive answer to the charge of harsh treatment of paupers. To the second objection it was replied, that the system worked for many years *after* Dr CHALMERS’ departure from Glasgow, and succeeded also in other manufacturing parishes of Scotland where it was tried—the Gorbals of Glasgow and Langholm being cited as favourable examples. How it was that, in the face of an experiment apparently so successful, detailed by himself in evidence before a parliamentary Committee, a more stringent enactment of poor-laws for Scotland should have been made, and the system be adopted for

Ireland ; or how, in the public mind, it did not produce a stronger feeling *against* compulsory charity in general, I am not competent to decide. The facts are indisputable, and were, during the whole of Dr CHALMERS' lifetime, after he left Glasgow, referred to in corroboration of the correctness of his theory, and as a standing proof that charity, if left to itself, *would* supply means for the maintenance of the poor, and a maintenance of a more suitable and effective nature than could be done by a compulsory assessment. In all his treatises on Management of the Poor, he alludes with unshaken confidence to the great Glasgow experiment.

The complete and detailed account of the experiment will be found in four articles, forming the general Appendix on Pauperism, in the sixteenth volume of his collected Works, including his own evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on the subject of a poor-law for Ireland. Great prejudice existed (in England especially) against the whole system, as harsh, and severe, and cruel, and numerous objections were urged against the possibility of success. One objection brought by the writers of articles on Poor-laws in the Quarterly Review, against the plan of withholding an assessment for supporting the poor, and throwing them on the natural or voluntary principle of charity, was an unjust one, and indicated a misapprehension of the whole system upon which that method was grounded. It was said that the principles advocated by Dr CHALMERS were an encouragement to vagrancy and mendicity. Therefore, according to this view, it was merely a question whether we were to have parish *paupers* or highway and street *beggars*. But the writers of those articles did not consider that on no point was Dr CHALMERS' views of pauperism more decided than on the *discouragement* of relief to common vagrants and beggars. The principles on which the Glasgow experiment was accomplished, when carried through, would have entirely put down common beggars ; and Dr CHALMERS drew an ingenious and novel argument *against* promiscuous charity from the example of our Lord, as recorded in the four Gospels. He healed all diseases and sickness in those who came to him ; but only on two occasions did he supply by miracle the multitudes with *food*. These were occasions of urgency ; and when he found that they came to him idly and *on account* of food, he firmly withheld it.

But, Sir, I would now turn to another subject connected with the great question of a nation's civic economy—and that is the Endowment of its Church and Universities. On these points Dr CHALMERS has written with remarkable force and much enthusiasm. And he has propounded the compulsory endowment theory for ecclesiastical and educational objects as vigorously as he has disclaimed it for sustaining the poor. His essay "On Ecclesiastical and Academical Endowments" has been described in the Quarterly Review (vol. xliv., p. 527) "as one of the most vigorous and eloquent defences of such endowments that ever proceeded from the press—a treatise which would alone have been sufficient to immortalize its author." This is high praise from such a quarter : But I think it is

deserved, and fully deserved. There is great power of argument, felicitous illustration, and a glowing enthusiasm of admiration, for the theological literature, and the erudition, and the learning, and the eminent men produced by the ecclesiastical and academical endowments of England. In reference to the Church of England he writes:—"There are many who look with an evil eye to the endowments of the English Church, and to the indolence of her dignitaries. But to that Church the theological literature of our nation stands indebted for her best acquisitions; and we hold it a refreshing spectacle, at any time that meagre Socinianism pours forth a new supply of flippancies and errors, when we behold, as we have often done, an armed champion come forth in full equipment, from some high and lettered retreat of that noble hierarchy; nor can we grudge her the wealth of her endowments, when we think how well, under her venerable auspices, the battles of orthodoxy have been fought,—that in this holy warfare they are *her* sons and *her* scholars who are ever foremost in the field—ready at all times to face the threatening mischief, and by the weight of their erudition to overturn it."

In the same work, "On the Use and Abuse of Literary and Ecclesiastical Endowments," he thus writes of Oxford and Cambridge:

"We cannot conclude this passing notice of the Universities of England, without the mention of how much they are ennobled by those great master-spirits, those men of might and of high achievement,—the Newtons, and the Miltons, and the Drydens, and the Barrows, and the Addisons, and the Butlers, and the Clarkes, and the Stillingfleets, and the Ushers, and the Foxes, and the Pitts, and Johnsons, who, within their attic retreats, received that first awakening, which afterwards expanded into the aspirations and the triumphs of loftiest genius. This is the true heraldry of colleges. Their family honour is built on the prowess of sons, not on the greatness of ancestors; and we will venture to say, that there are no seminaries in Europe on which there sits a greater weight of accumulated glory, than that which has been reflected, both on Oxford and Cambridge, by that long and bright train of descendants who have sprung from them. It is impossible to make even the bare perusal of their names without the feeling, that there has been summoned before the eye of the mind the panorama of all that has upheld the lustre, whether of England's philosophy, or of England's patriotism, for centuries together. We have often thought what a meagre and stunted literature we should have had without them; and what, but for the two Universities, would have been the present state of science or theology in England! These rich seminaries have been the direct and the powerful organs for the elaboration of both; and both would rapidly decline, as if languishing under the want of their needful aliment, were the endowments of colleges swept away. It were a truly Gothic spoliation; and the rule of that political economy which could seize upon their revenues, would be, in effect, as hostile to the cause of sound and elevated learn-

ing in Britain, as would be the rule of that popular violence which could make havoc of their architecture, and savagely exult over the ruin of their libraries and halls.”

Now, throughout the whole of this Essay on Endowments, and in the lectures which he delivered with so much success in London before Princes of the Blood Royal, Peers, Bishops, Ministers of State—the highest and the most intelligent of the land—it will be observed that he constantly advocated compulsory enactment or permanent endowment for support of the objects on which he lectured. He maintains this opinion chiefly on the ground, that individuals are not in all cases the best judges of their own interests, and will not always voluntarily employ their means in that way which is most conducive to their own benefit and that of society. In religion the supply must not be delayed till the demand come forth to claim it. The demand is, in fact, to be created, for there is no natural appetency for religious instruction; and so, as he himself declares, “the great argument for *literary* endowments is founded on the want or weakness of the natural appetency for *literature*.” Now the difficulty which most people have in following Dr CHALMERS’ views on pauperism, arises out of this very argument of his own in defence of academical and ecclesiastical endowments. For may it not be urged, if the principle of provision by compulsory payment be so clear and applicable to the case of sustaining ecclesiastical and academical institutions, why is it not equally applicable to provision for maintaining the poor? The natural appetency for *charity* is frequently quite as dull and torpid as natural appetency for religious or literary instruction. As a high and moral obligation, should it not therefore also be compulsory equally with the others? But the poor do assist each other in their poverty. But then, again, it may be asked, why should the support of the poor be *confined* to the poor? They see their brethren suffer, and charity is forced upon them. The more wealthy neighbours live at a distance. If human distress were forced upon *their* notice, *they* too would help. But they do not witness suffering at their doors, and so they forget it. But ought they to be allowed to forget it? Whatever force there may be in these or similar arguments, one thing is clear, the Glasgow experiment did not practically convince the Legislature that they might now abandon all compulsory assessment for the poor, and throw themselves upon the natural charity of mankind for better attaining, *without* compulsion, the same object. This, however, be it remembered, is no real argument either against the truth of the statement or the soundness of the theory. The highest exercise of Christian charity is undoubtedly the voluntary; indeed, giving to the poor except voluntarily, is not charity at all. The principle may be pure and right, but human nature is not perhaps yet fitted to receive it, or capable of acting upon it. A time may come when the world will discern and receive it, when the outpourings of Christian love to the brethren will so promptly and so amply supply all the wants of the poor, that assessments will

be unheard of. Men will do that on principle which now they must do by legal enactment. Such a state of things would follow the universal prevalence of Christian charity in men's hearts, and is not therefore to be considered a mere chimera. Should this triumph of principle and of love ever be achieved amongst mankind, what will be said and thought in *those* days of the mind that, amidst scepticism and ridicule, had resolutely maintained the principle, nay, which had in its own sphere of action practically worked out its successful application?

Thirdly, And now, Sir, we have to consider Dr CHALMERS as an orator. He was distinguished as a preacher, as a speaker at public meetings, and as a member of ecclesiastical courts. We attribute to him in all these positions, especially in the pulpit, the quality of a high and a peculiar *eloquence*, and we have the utmost confidence in the correctness of this estimate; for if CHALMERS were not eloquent, where, we may ask, is eloquence to be found? Judge by the effects upon men's minds, and say, is not that eloquence which captivates and enchains the hearers? Is not that eloquence which delights all classes of mankind, all ages, all situations of life? Is not that eloquence which ensures an interest and admiration unbroken, and which to the last attend every appearance of the speaker in public? Nor was this attraction the result of art, or the merely artificial embellishments of oratory. It was not in graceful and studied action. It was not in musical and practised intonation. It was not in the purity and beauty of the accent. All these were plain, homely, to some hearers quite unusual; and yet how extraordinary were the effects of his eloquence! Such effects, then, being the result, not of artificial embellishments or natural grace of manner, tones of voice or skilful action, are attributable to the power and energy of the preacher's own spirit, to the vivid pictures which he brought before his hearers, the fervid oratory with which he took captive the heart and understanding. One important element of his success as a preacher, I think, was the impression of earnest truth and sincere conviction existing in his own mind. As to the mode of arguing and the style of composition, the remarks already made upon Dr CHALMERS as an author, apply to him as a preacher. Indeed, all his writings seem as if composed for *spoken* communication, and the method is favourable to producing one vivid and powerful effect upon the mind. No one indeed, who has not *heard* Dr CHALMERS in his day of vigour, can form a correct idea of his power as a pulpit orator. It is now thirty years since his *Astronomical Sermons* were delivered, and though I suppose no discourses ever produced a greater effect, the nature of that effect must be little known to the younger members of the present generation. The fame of a preacher mainly depends (like the fame of an actor or singer) upon traditionary description. In many cases, the perusal of written discourses gives little notion of the effect in delivery; in some cases, as of WHITFIELD, Dean KIRWAN, and other eminent preachers, who, in their day, produced marvellous sensations, they give *no*

notion at all; the effect must have arisen entirely from the *manner*. And when we consider how much pleasure the printed Sermons of Dr CHALMERS now afford to the intelligent reader, we may easily imagine the delight with which they must have been heard, coming with all their novelty and fervour, fresh from the preacher's lips. To enter into any description or analysis of compositions so well known as these published Sermons, would be here quite out of place. I may perhaps refer to one or two passages as specimens, and favourable illustrations of his own peculiar manner. In his sermon "On Cruelty to Animals" (preached in consequence of an endowment), he has occasion to shew that suffering is often inflicted on the inferior creatures by man, not for the purpose of torment, but that it follows whilst he is occupied with other considerations and excitements; and as an example, to illustrate the absence of any cruel *purpose* for the mere infliction of pain, he described in glowing colours the excitement and the interest of an English hunting-field, and he terms it "this favourite pastime of joyous old England, on which there sits a somewhat ancestral dignity and glory." And he described the "assembled jockeyship of half a province," the assemblage "of gallant knight-hood and hearty yeomen," and he spake of "the autumnal clearness of the sky," and "the high-breathed coursers," and "the echoing horn"—"the glee and ferocity of the chace,"—"the deafening clamour of the hounds," and "the dying agonies of the fox," in such a strain of animation, that Lord ELCHO's huntsman, who was present, declared that he had difficulty in restraining himself from getting up and giving a *vue-holla*.

Of a far different character was the scene he drew in the conclusion of a sermon preached for the benefit of a Society in aid of Orphan Children of Clergymen. He described the sons and daughters of a Scottish pastor obliged, at their father's death, to leave the peacefulness of their father's dwelling, and appealed to his hearers for their assistance in behalf of those who were so friendless and so dependent. "With quietness on all the hills, and with every field glowing in the pride and luxury of vegetation, when summer was throwing its rich garment over this goodly scene of magnificence and glory, they think, in the bitterness of their souls, that this is the last summer which they shall ever witness smiling on that scene which all the ties of habit and affection have endeared to them; and when this thought, melancholy as it is, is lost and overborne in the far darker melancholy of a father torn from their embrace, and a helpless family left to find their way unprotected and alone, through the lowering futurity of this earthly pilgrimage." I heard that sermon, and the tears of the *father* and the preacher, fell like rain-drops on the manuscript.

In his Sermon on the Death of Dr THOMSON, describing in a *picturesque* point of view, the proximity of tenderness and power, of gentleness and strength, in the same human character, he added this happy illustration: "This is often exemplified in those alpine wilds, where beauty may at times be seen embosomed in

the lap of grandeur, as when, at the base of a lofty precipice, some spot of verdure or peaceful cottage home seems to smile in more intense loveliness, because of the towering strength and magnificence which are behind it."

In a very striking Sermon on the "Paternal Character of God," when drawing "the picture of moral and pleasing qualities of mind and affections, *apart* from the love of God, or from the influence of divine grace upon the soul," he adds this beautiful illustration: "There is beauty in the blush of a rose, and there is beauty of a higher character in the blush that mantles the cheek of modesty, and yet there may be just as little of loyalty to God in the living as in the inanimate object."

Of his speaking at public meetings, I had fewer opportunities of judging than I have had of his pulpit discourses. On some of those occasions, he produced great impression. But, perhaps, the most distinguished of such appearances was on occasion of a public meeting held in Edinburgh, in the year 1829, on the subject of a bill then pending in Parliament, commonly called the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Dr CHALMERS, in opposition to the views of the generality of those with whom he usually acted in public affairs, civil and ecclesiastical, was in favour of that emancipation, and of the admission of Roman Catholics, Peers and Commoners, into the two Houses of Parliament. The effects of that speech have been described as something very remarkable. An excitement and enthusiasm pervaded the large and closely-crowded assemblage, seldom witnessed in modern times. I heard our most distinguished Scottish critic, who was present on the occasion, give it as his deliberate opinion, that never had eloquence produced a greater effect upon a popular assembly, and that he could not believe more had ever been done by the oratory of DEMOSTHENES, CICERO, BURKE, or SHERIDAN. And this was a case simply of eloquence. For the speech delivered was not remarkable either as to argument or literary composition. It was reported in the newspapers at the time, but has not been deemed worthy of being included in his collected Works. I shall refer to one incident only connected with his speaking in the General Assembly, —and the result was the more remarkable as the reply must have been unpremeditated. He had spoken very strongly against the principle of a clergyman holding the two offices of Professor and Pastor. It was alleged against him that such opinions were, at any rate, inconsistent in him, inasmuch as he had himself been an aspirant for the Chair of Mathematics, and justified the union of professional and pastoral duty. His answer to the charge was striking,—"I feel obliged," he said, "I feel obliged to the Reverend Gentleman for reviving my pamphlet, and for bringing me forward to make my public renunciation of what is there written. I now confess myself to have indeed been guilty of a heinous crime, and I now stand a repentant culprit before the bar of this Venerable Assembly." After stating that he had then certainly maintained that a devoted and exclusive attention

to the study of mathematics was not dissonant to the proper habit of a clergyman, he thus concluded:—

“Alas! Sir, so I thought in my ignorance and pride. I have now no reserve in saying that the sentiment was wrong, and that, in the utterance of it, I penned what was most outrageously wrong. Strangely blinded that I was! What, Sir, is the object of mathematical science? Magnitude, and the proportions of magnitude. But then, Sir, I had forgotten *two magnitudes*, I thought not of the littleness of Time,—I recklessly thought not of the greatness of Eternity.”

An important class of productions and of labours come under this head, and occupy a place somewhat intermediate between the pulpit and the public meeting. I refer to his *Lectures on Moral Philosophy,—on Evidences,—and on Theology*. These lectures were all composed and written with great care; but he introduced, parenthetically, further explanations and illustrations extempore. The remarks made, on his manner of discussion in the pulpit, apply also to his manner of discussion in the Chair. The same fulness of illustration, the same energetic and irresistible enforcement of some leading and fundamental truth,—the same fervour, and the same sincerity. These did not fail to secure the attention, and to engage the affections, of his class. Many persons, not intended for the ministry, attended these lectures; and we have reason to believe that his discussions on Evidences, on BUTLER'S Analogy, and on Natural Theology, have, in this generation, exercised considerable influence upon the supposed sceptical tendencies of the northern mind. I will only adduce one passage in illustration of his lecture style. In his *Lectures on Natural Theology*, he draws an argument in favour of an unquestionable act of GOD in creation, from the geological appearances of the world. The commencement of the present economy, after the destruction of the previous economy, is a convincing argument against the *eternity* of creation. The whole reasoning is ably and ingeniously conducted, and, at the same time, clothed in language of a high and imaginative eloquence. He thus asks, How could the present world, after former destruction, be produced otherwise than by a new and palpable act of creation? “Is there ought in the rude and boisterous play of a great physical catastrophe that can germinate those exquisite structures, which, in our yet undisturbed economy, have been transmitted in pacific succession to the present day? What is there in the rush and turbulence, and mighty clamour of such great elements of ocean, heaved from its old resting-place, and lifting its billows above the Alps and the Andes of a former continent? What is there in this to charm into being the embryos of an infant family, wherewith to stock and to people a now desolate world? We see, in the sweeping energy and uproar of this elemental war, enough to account for the disappearance of all the *old* generations, but nothing that might cradle any *new* generations into existence, so as to have effloresced on ocean's deserted bed, the life and the loveliness which are now before our eyes. At no juncture, we apprehend, in the history of the world, is the interposition of Deity more

manifest than at this; nor can we better account for so goodly a creation, emerging again into new forms of animation and beauty from the wreck of the old one, than that the SPIRIT of GOD moved on the face of the chaos; and that nature, turned by the last catastrophe into a wilderness, was again repopled at the utterance of His word."

We naturally feel an interest about the appearance and address, the personal habits and peculiarities, of those who have been distinguished in their day and generation. Such peculiarities, in the subject of this biographical notice, must have been familiar to many now present. For upwards of twenty years I enjoyed the privilege of friendly intercourse; and it is a pleasing, though melancholy office of memory to recall those traits which rendered his society so interesting, and so delightful. I think I can safely say I never left his company without having some sentiments or expressions in my mind which I felt were worthy to be remembered. There was a mixture of guileless simplicity and acuteness, of playful humour and vigorous conversation, of urbanity and earnestness, which cannot be forgotten. His face was at times radiant with benevolence and kindly feeling. Like many powerful and striking countenances, the expression was chiefly in the mouth. The eye was dull, and often inanimate,—this, in combination with the massive brow, rendered the play of the lower part of the face the more striking;—on those occasions especially, when, after being silent and apparently abstracted, he would burst forth into some strain of admiration, or some strong expression of his opinion regarding the topic of conversation, or not unfrequently some humorous or ludicrous combination of thought. His habits were social—he was hospitable, and enjoyed the hospitality of his friends. Though, in his whole demeanour, utterly inartificial, he was eminently courteous and pleasing in his address. Though as plain and unpretending in his manners as possible, no man had a more acute perception of refinement of manners in others. I recollect his *enthusiastic admiration* of the polished and refined manners of an English dignitary of high birth and station, in whose company we had been.

In his ordinary conversation, there was constantly occurring some appropriate and striking expression. In fact he never expressed himself exactly like other people, and yet without any straining or affectation of effect. No man could have been more conscientiously and sincerely attached to his own Church, both from argument and from those numerous national associations and social feelings which are sometimes more binding even than convictions of reason. He was yet quite free from intolerance and bigotry, and illiberal prejudice. He admired and loved what was great and amiable in those from whom he differed, and differed in many important principles. Thus, as appears from passages I have quoted, he spoke with enthusiasm of the learning and the position of the Church of England. He gloried in the grandeur of her Gothic architecture, as much as any of her own

children could do. On one occasion I recollect his describing, with much interest, a Sunday he passed at Winchester, when a guest of the Bishop, and dilating on the services and "staff of the Cathedral," as he called them; the question was put, evidently expecting an unfavourable reply, "But, Doctor, what did you think of the *chanting*?" His immediate answer was, "Very grand, Sir!" He could discern what was good, and exercise kindness and forbearance towards those from whom he differed far more widely than he did from the Church of England. Thus, when told of a purpose on the part of Roman Catholics to establish in the old town a system of visiting the poor by Sisters of Charity, similar to the visiting in Paris and other continental cities, he exclaimed he was glad to hear it, as it might induce a similar plan of visits from Protestant Sisters of Charity. In his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons respecting his management of St John's, Glasgow, the question was put, "Did you meet with any contradiction on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy of Glasgow?" He replied, "Not in the least; for the clergyman was a party in the negotiation. He attended our meetings, and there was mutual understanding between the clergyman and the members of the committee." (This mutual understanding was, that there should be no attempts on either side at proselytizing, but simply to give education with reading of Scripture. There was this compromise made regarding schools with Roman Catholic children: The Roman Catholic clergyman consented to the use of the Bible as a school-book, according to the authorised version; the Protestants consenting to have Roman Catholic teachers). He had before said to the Committee that he attended at a Roman Catholic school from the delight he had in witnessing the display of native talent among the young Irish, and that he was received with welcome and respect by the Roman Catholic master, who asked him to address the children. Having done so freely, and according to his views, the master thanked him most cordially—and then he added, "This convinced me that a vast deal might be done by kindness, and by discreet and friendly personal intercourse with the Roman Catholics. I may also observe that, whereas it has been alleged that, under the superintendence of a Roman Catholic teacher, there might be a danger of only certain passages of Scripture being read to the exclusion of others, so far as my observation extended, he read quite indiscriminately and impartially over Scripture."

Dr CHALMERS going to the Roman Catholic schools to witness "display of native talent amongst the young Irish," reminds me of a trait in his character not generally perhaps understood, but which was on occasions very marked; I mean his turn for humour and keen sense of the ridiculous. At times he could not control his merriment at ludicrous and grotesque combinations; and I can easily imagine his exquisite enjoyment of answers from the half-naked little Irish urchins. Their odd mixture of acuteness and self-possession, with random confusion of ideas, would be to him irresistibly comic. He had an instinctive sense of the

ludicrous combination of circumstances, and narrated them with great effect. One of the most amusing scenes I remember, was his own description of what happened at Manchester when he had consented to preach a sermon for some public object at a large chapel in that town. He had not been thinking about the matter after he had given his consent to preach ; but his eye was attracted by seeing his own name in a printed paper, like an immense play-bill, posted on the walls all about the town. This was a *programme* of the ceremonial for the day. There were to be prayers, anthems, choruses from Handel's Oratorios, and a sermon by the celebrated Dr CHALMERS of Edinburgh ! Excessively annoyed at all this display he refused to take any part, or to preach on the occasion. The directors expostulated, and represented what would be the effects of his withdrawal, and the disappointment of the public. The matter was compromised, and Dr CHALMERS was to sit in the vestry till the proper time for him to come out and preach his sermon. But his troubles then only began, for, unfortunately, an anthem, with full instrumental accompaniments, was appointed to follow the sermon. The orchestra being placed immediately behind the pulpit, and more occupied with anticipations of their own performance than with anything else, the musicians annoyed and disturbed the preacher through the whole sermon by their preparations and preliminaries for the grand chorus, " actually," as the Doctor exclaimed, " tuning their very trombones close at my ear before I had finished."

One other feature of mental constitution, and one only I will refer to ; and it is an important one, as having its influence not only upon the imagery and ornament of his literary compositions, but, in some instances, upon the general current of his opinion and speculations, and that is his deep admiration of the beautiful in the *material* universe. This admiration was intense, it amounted to a passion, and he evidently had exquisite enjoyment in the contemplation of Nature's works, or rather, I should say, of the goodness and wisdom of the Creator, whether displayed in the wildness or loveliness of natural scenery, the delicate tints and texture of a flower, or the magnificence of the starry heavens. Hence, although no artist himself, he had the greatest interest and enjoyment in the society and conversation of artists. He delighted to hear their remarks on subjects of taste in connection with scenery ; on the tints of the landscape, the sky, the ocean, the forms and varieties of clouds, the appearances most suitable for picturesque representation, and the practical rules observed in transferring to the canvas imitations of what is in nature. Hence in his moral reasoning we find all his references, in the way of analogy or illustration, to the beauties and appearances of the natural world, expressed with so much freshness and feeling of reality. He always seems to be impressed with the conviction that, though a fallen world, the fall has chiefly affected the moral and spiritual nature of man himself ; that, though the ground was cursed for man's transgression, and so lost the power of supporting the species without toil and labour ; yet that, in the *material* world around us,

there remains an impress of primeval beauty,—that there are forms unscathed by the penalties of the primeval curse, and flowers as delicate and fair as those that bloomed in paradise. These sentiments of intense admiration for an external and material world, exercised, I think, considerable influence in modelling his views, and shaping his arguments for *Natural Theology*. He ever delighted in tracing the lineaments of God's moral character in the mirror of the material world, as reflecting his attributes, and as displaying the nature of his handiwork. He deprecated the notion of any essential connection between materialism and sin; and as the abode of man in innocence was a *terrestrial* one, so he believed that in glory there would be provided a new heaven and a new earth, with visible magnificence and material splendour, to be a fitting habitation, and to furnish fitting occupations and enjoyments, for the new and glorified bodies of the redeemed.

I have now, I think, touched upon all those points of character, and all those public acts and deeds, of which I have been capable of forming a judgment, and which have occurred to me as strictly coming within the province of such a paper as the present. In these remarks I have endeavoured to look upon Dr CHALMERS, not as a private friend, but as a public character. I have sought to give a fair transcript of the man as he appeared before us, with no undue partiality arising from those personal feelings of regard and admiration which I am proud to acknowledge. I am certain that those who knew him best esteemed him most. His character bore investigation; and, I think, whatever opinion, in a literary or critical point of view, the world may form of the posthumous volumes, on Scripture Reading, which have been laid before them, it must be allowed that they furnish unequivocal indications of a mind constantly and habitually occupied with sacred things,—of private thoughts and of retired meditations, ever conversant with God and with His holy word.

And now, Sir, to conclude. It will hardly be supposed that I should expect unanimity of opinion in all those questions by which the name of our late distinguished Vice-President has been brought before the notice of his contemporaries. On every subject, indeed, where there are not positive moral precepts or mathematical demonstration, the different tastes and habits of mankind will lead to a difference in their judgments. Different styles of writing, for instance, are congenial with different mental constitutions. The eloquence which affects and even overpowers one man, has little charm or influence over the mind and feelings of another. The early associations of individuals,—the various points of view from which they contemplate the actions of public men, almost inevitably lead to differences in their decisions. In great questions of national or ecclesiastical policy, the conduct utterly condemned by one party, will often be extravagantly lauded by another. It was impossible for any one to take so prominent a position in that

recent movement of our country,—the Disruption of a National Church, with all its accompanying excitements,—its breaking up of old associations,—its contending opinions and hasty sayings,—without running counter to the opinions of many early admirers, without partially, at least, alienating himself from former friends, and separating himself from former coadjutors. On such points it were vain to expect a concurrent judgment on all he has done and said. But of this I feel assured, that none who have had favourable opportunities of personal acquaintance with his character and disposition,—that none who have deeply entered upon a study of his writings, so as fully to appreciate the lofty and benevolent spirit of their sentiments and tendencies, will hesitate to admit that he was both a good and a great man,—that he was imbued with the spirit of Christian philanthropy,—that he had a fervent mind, keen sensibility, and indomitable energy. His highest praise, but, at the same time, his *just* eulogium is, that his fervency of spirit, his sensibility, and his energy, were all exercised and called forth in the one great and magnificent cause,—promoting the glory of God and the welfare of Mankind. In all his meditations, and in all his labours, he had ever distinctly before his eyes the advancement of his fellow-creatures, in their best and truest relations to this world and the world to come.

His greatest delight was to contrive plans and schemes for raising degraded human nature in the scale of moral being,—the favourite object of his contemplation was human nature attaining the highest perfection of which it is capable; and, as that perfection was manifested in saintly individuals, in characters of great acquirement adorned with the graces of Christian piety. His greatest sorrow was to contemplate masses of mankind hopelessly bound to vice and misery by chains of passion, ignorance, and prejudice. As no one more firmly believed in the power of Christianity to regenerate a fallen race,—as faith and experience both conspired to assure him that the only effectual deliverance for the sinful and the degraded was to be wrought by Christian education, and by the active agency of Christian instruction penetrating into the haunts of vice and the abodes of misery;—these acquisitions he strove to gain for all his beloved countrymen; for these he laboured, and for these he was willing to spend and be spent. From the fields of earthly toil and trial he has been removed, and he has entered into his rest. The great business of Christian benevolence, and the contest with ignorance and crime, are left in other hands. But *his* memory will not die, nor his good example in these things be forgotten. His countrymen will do his memory justice. Of the thousands who were assembled to witness the funeral procession which conveyed his earthly remains to the tomb, all felt conviction on that day that a Great Man had fallen in Israel,—that a Scotchman had gone to the grave, of whom Scotland might be proud,—a Scotchman who had earned a name in his country's annals, and a place in his country's literature, which will not pass away.