

original. If his reflections be not so broad and philosophical, he leads you closer up to life. Interwoven with his narrative are numerous details, calculated to place the reader in near relation to his story and its personage.

America boasts of her biblical critics and theologians. Moses Stewart of Andover, is the best known representative of the one class, and possibly Barnes of Philadelphia, of the other. Pretending to no more acquaintance with this department than falls to the lot of those who occasionally read the newspapers, and attend to what is happening around them, we state it as our impression that there is nothing of surpassing eminence in this way. From all that we have heard, it is our belief, that one might travel from one end of the Union to the other, without getting an idea in theology that was at once new and true. That stagnation that has come over theology in the rest of the world is perceptible in America. In the most erudite of its cities, the person that is pointed to as the most efficient preacher, is one who teaches a wild system of pantheism. The nature of the American character marks the people as ill adapted for that sort of mental exercise which we have been in the habit of terming eloquence. A conformation that is precise, minute, and wanting in passion, may have an eloquence perhaps of its own sort, but it will not be like that diction of long periods, and much iteration that flowed from the lips of Burke, Erskine, Curran, Chalmers, O'Connell and Kossuth. We are quite prepared to learn that our ideas of eloquence in time past, have been depraved, and that there is need of a reformation, which would introduce a style in which the feelings were less addressed, and in which the reasoning was closer. We do not know that we should dissent from such a verdict; what we allege in the meantime is, that there appear to be causes incident to the character of the people that ought to prevent them from excelling in that bounding high-flown impassioned mode of speech, that has procured distinction for men in other countries. Webster and Everett are named as the finest examples which the States supply. We have read or glanced over some of the occasional orations of the former, but they did not convey to us a high idea of his powers. In the few cases that we refer to, the speech wanted what to our mind is an essential ingredient—a bold leading thought. To stand by the monument at Bunker's Hill and in the presence of the matter-of-fact audience that might be expected to assemble there, to assume the Demosthenic port, and attempt strains similar to those that were addressed to the shades of heroes who fell at Leuctra and Marathon, seems an inauspicious mode of soaring into sublimity.

When memory roams over the works of those departed notorieties, that the world has consented to consider eloquent, it comes at passages that are peculiar in their structure. The peculiarity consists in this, a central idea recondite enough to be called original; transparent enough to be seen and appreciated as soon as it was held up to the view. This thought hovering between the profound and the perspicuous, introduced by a preamble, proved, commented on,