

early days. Indeed, for some years previous to his death he may be said to have been living in the past. Not only had he no sympathy with those changes in ecclesiastic thought which characterize the present time, he could not away with them; he denounced them as "vagaries and innovations" that should not be tolerated, presaging the decay of morals, the downfall of true and undefiled religion, and the utter ruin of—what he maintained to be the only scriptural form of Christianity—Presbyterianism. With regard to his personal history, the idea suggested was one from which his mind intuitively recoiled. He was one of the most modest and unassuming of men, who never in his lifetime coveted the applause of his fellows, nor wished for posthumous praise. Moreover, he was a man of strong mind and yet stronger will, and it can be supposed that in a matter of this kind especially he was not easily influenced; but, as the sequel will shew, he yielded to entreaty, rather, doubtless, because of our importunity than from the conviction that compliance were either a virtue or a duty. And though the information eventually arrived at regarding himself is perhaps less full and explicit than we could have wished, it will be seen from the tenor of his own remarks that in this matter, at all events, he was the reverse of "textual." The slightest pretext seemed to him to be sufficient excuse for quite losing sight of himself, and diverging into a lengthened disquisition upon the Paraphrases, the Psalms of David, Dr. Chalmers, Edward Irving, "Harkness," the Union question, or the Organ question: anything, in short, except the particular subject which he had been requested to "stick to." The following extracts from a letter written in 1864, besides corroborating what has been said, are interesting as afford-