
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

all those incidental, and yet accurate, touches which an unconscious reference to the customs and incidents of an Oriental "judgment-seat," have added to this picture. Nor will time or space permit us to enter into such minuteness of analysis and illustration in dealing with other Psalms; though they may be equally suggestive, and even more appropriate to our general purpose. We can only glance at a few examples taken at random from the vast poetical storehouse of the Bible. These specimens will be selected with sole reference to the matter in hand. Our search is after the natural, physical basis of our spiritual language, and wherever that leads we will follow.

ARTICLE II.

ENGLISH ELOQUENCE AND DEBATE.

BY THE LATE GEORGE SHEPARD, D.D., PROFESSOR IN BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

I PROPOSE in this Lecture to speak of eloquence as it has appeared in connection with the English tongue. The Grecian and Roman eloquence is often treated, and greatly praised. The question presents itself, Is there not something in the records of our own language and race which, at least, approaches these renowned specimens of antiquity? I think we can show that there is. Something, at least, worthy our study, our admiration, and imitation.

I shall confine myself very much to the eloquence of debate, and shall, in the first place, attempt a very rapid sketch of eloquence in the English field, giving prominence to the conflicts and progress of debate on the parliamentary arena; giving also certain facts in the history of leading speakers, and deriving from the whole certain principles and lessons such as may be profitable to those who aspire to anything in the same line.

In glancing over the field of English eloquence, as I propose to do first, we find but little that is satisfactory in parlia-

mentary speaking only a century back of the present time; and at two centuries, all is exceedingly dim and uncertain. How fittingly and well the learned Coke was accustomed to speak, whom Bacon reproaches with speaking too much; how Selden talked in Parliament who talked so well at the table; how Elliott uttered the intensity of his conviction, or Phillips poured forth the boiling fervor of his passion; what the force and point Waller, so skilled in verse, gave to his prose when he pleaded for his own head; what the spirit and structure of Stafford's final words, when he stood before his inexorable judges; how Cromwell could wield the weapon of argument, who could cut his way to conclusions with the sword; we know, indeed, something, but only in general. We know enough, however, to satisfy us that these, and other men of their times, uttered themselves with great strength and effectiveness.

The first considerable cluster of eloquent men under the British constitution we find in the vicinity of 1640. There gathered here a great conflict and crisis. Men's liberties were touched, and their passions were stirred, and their energies profoundly roused and tasked. Pym and Hampden stood forth at this time as the great leaders, and the master spirits of debate. The eloquence of the period, doubtless, resembled its literature. The latter part of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth century, are justly regarded as the great creative period of English literature. The mind was then in its productive freshness; the field of thought and imagery all untouched before it. Men of wonderful powers came forward to occupy the field—gigantic men. They went to work somewhat rudely, indeed, but they delved deep, and brought up the gold and the silver and the iron in masses; and without stopping to polish, or even knowing how, they threw out the bare material with a boundless profusion. The language, too, was like the mind that spoke through it. It had just become settled into English, and had not been refined out of its majesty and strength. It was rough and massive; precisely the medium

wanted for great and original sentiments. As the writers, so the speakers, of this period were somewhat unfinished and coarse, often delivering themselves with great bluntness as well as power. Many there were who, in the phrase of one of them, "knew how to give a lick with the rough side of their tongue," and now and then it proved to be exceedingly rough.

Immediately subsequent to this period we find more accuracy, more refinement, but a sad decline in all the higher attributes of speech. All the writing and much of the speaking went for a season into a condition of tameness. The heavy and coarse things of more vigorous days were not endured. A fastidious delicacy prevailed. A nice precision was attempted. The even flow was loved. The cold substance was shaped and smoothed with the file. The time of Queen Anne, in which this abatement of manly vigor first took place, was distinguished, however, by the effective oratory of Lords Somers and Bolingbroke. The former, coming earlier upon the stage, the leading speaker and statesman of the period, was at once masculine and persuasive in the style and tone of his discourse.

We pass on now to the time of George the first and his great minister, Sir Robert Walpole, who extended his office and influence far into the subsequent reign. Around this minister we find the next remarkable cluster of great and eloquent men. The minister himself must have possessed no ordinary powers of debate in order to retain so long his power of place against the voices so terribly assailing him. Bolingbroke stood forth at this time in the solid strength of his maturity; in whom, according to Chesterfield's description, there met nearly all the qualities of a splendid and successful eloquence. So eager was the curiosity of Pitt to see some specimens of what was so admired and so potent in its time, that he is reported to have desired a speech of Bolingbroke, more than the recovery of all that has perished of ancient literature. William Pulteney was another leading mind in the opposing array — one of the great orators

of England. He had strong, inbred sense, and he was thoroughly disciplined — spoke with a classical finish, and with a large measure of the true ancient fire. He united beauty and force, wit and argument. The blade was polished, it was also keen; the weapon was pleasant to the sight, but often dreadful in its stroke. There were others in that array, but there is not time to speak of them individually. They were all lost in the strong blaze of a luminary, which suddenly rose upon the minister's declining age and influence. The voice of William Pitt was commanding and terrible in its first accents. The minister feared it the moment it broke upon his ear, and he said: "We must, at all events, muzzle that terrible Cornet of Horse." But the mouth of William Pitt was not made to be muzzled. There was a spirit within which would compel that mouth to speak so long as his head should stand upon his shoulders. Pitt is remarkable as, on the whole, England's greatest orator, and also as a connecting link between two great periods of English eloquence. Rising before the splendid galaxy we have just referred to passed away, he shone on till the appearance of that still more splendid galaxy which marked the close of the last century. In this last-named period we are brought to the true freedom and fire of debate; the skill at attack and retort, the wit, the sarcasm, the invective of minds heated by collision and struggling for victory. This, beyond all question, was the Augustan period. No eloquence before or since, in the English language, has equalled in all the masterly qualities, the eloquence which distinguished the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The leading speakers of this period were Chatham, Murray, Lord North, Burke, Barre, Fox, Pitt, Sheridan, Grattan, Erskine, Dundas, Dunning, Windham, and Wilberforce.

Lord Chatham's fire had nearly gone out; but there were some gleamings of his greatness, as he uttered his indignant sentiments upon the subject of the hostilities against the American colonies. He was, at this time of his life, imperious in his bearing, dealing more in authority than in argument.

By impassioned bursts, by overwhelming invectives, "by the terrors of his beak, and the lightning of his eye," he would make those who were far his superiors cower before him.

William Murray, then Lord Mansfield, was also in his decline at the opening of this distinguished period. He was great only in reply, as Chatham was great only in attack. His was the connected argument, given with some of the best graces of style and manner. He is represented as having all the Ciceronian accomplishments, — handsome in person, melodious in voice; in the phrase of Pope, "the silver-tongued Murray."

Lord North, who for many years stood the shock of that most formidable of all oppositions that have ever arisen in the British Parliament, possessed very considerable powers of debate. He showed great facility and command of language; being always clear in statement, often powerful in argument, but never rising to the impassioned. He is represented as a rather corpulent man, of imperturbable equanimity, of easy good nature, abounding in wit and humor. It is said that the thrusts of his mighty antagonists "seemed to sink into him like a cannon-ball into a wool-sack." He was favored with another shield in a constitutional somnolency, which would overtake him even on the Treasury bench; so that it would sometimes happen that while the opposition were stabbing, the minister would be snoring. The only man who could really succeed in stinging the minister was the waspish, sarcastic Colonel Barre. With a huge, rough voice, a savage countenance, one eye gone and the other going, he drove at his object with a directness and personality which it was sometimes hard to bear.

Burke spoke with rapidity and vehemence, with a strong Irish accent, and an undulating motion of the head, in splendid language, with apt classical allusions, with pathos, with humor sometimes, with caustic severity when provoked, with burning indignation; but not at the time with any marked effect, because he spoke so multifariously. He was oppressed and embarrassed by the profusion and variety

of his resources; he was enticed away from the point by the opening visions of his imagination. Hence his comparative failure in his place.

Charles James Fox has been called the greatest debater the world has ever see . He was always prepared, because he could speak without any preparation; at once mighty in argument and slovenly in arrangement; rude often in style, because too quick in the delivery of his thoughts for their proper clothing, so that they jostled, struggled, crowded, almost quarrelled, to get forth, while he rushed forward in his track of vehement reasoning and appeal, trampling down as he went all mere flowers of fancy.

Mr. Pitt, the illustrious rival of Fox, affords an example of altogether another sort. He kept more to the subject, and was sooner through, disposing of an attack in two hours which Fox stood three hours in making. In him the closeness of the argument, all to the point; the perfection of the style,-every word as it should be; the smooth, beautiful flow, harmonizing with the melody of a deep, sonorous voice, set off by a trained and dignified action, together, held the attention and produced a fine, sometimes powerful, effect.

Sheridan was the great declaimer of that arena. He was flowery, gorgeous, overwrought in many of his passages. Yet he could paint scenes; could work argument in passion, and give to his speech a dramatic turn and brilliancy; at one time amuse his hearers by strokes of humor, and then overwhelm them with the torrents of his heated, high-wrought declamation.

Grattan, another of the great orators of the time, was simple, though an Irishman; vituperative, antithetic, at times terribly effective. He sought point in every thing—in his thought and expression, in his argument, his ornament, and his passion. Point was at once his power and his blemish.

Erskine was pre-eminent particularly as an advocate. A peculiarly fascinating eye which held to itself every other eye; a singular lightness and grace of motion and action;

matter and argument precisely adapted to the minds and hearts before him, clothed in a diction of almost unequalled harmony and beauty; these formed a combination often well-nigh irresistible.

With Dundas, the main supporter of Pitt, from the same country, — Scotland, it was plain, sterling sense without embellishments of style; and with Dunning it was close, rapid argument, and little else; yet both were heard and felt in their place. Windham and Wilberforce were both prominent speakers in the latter part of the period in question; the one opposing the abolition of the slave-trade, the other the leading advocate of the measure; the former destroying his power by his violence and extravagance, the latter wonderfully aiding his by purity and goodness. This most remarkable period of British eloquence pretty much closed up with the eighteenth century; though Pitt and Fox, Windham and Wilberforce, and one or two others, lived a few years into the present.

There were great speakers in America at this period — John Adams, with his short, direct, business-like urgency; James Otis, fitly termed a flame of fire; at once intensely heated and severely logical; Patrick Henry, who uttered his plain, common-sense views in such tones of passion, and significance of manner, with a force throughout so rousing and astringent, that the nation was braced up by it to the desperate purpose of resistance, to the stern alternative, "liberty or death"; Fisher Ames, who, in 1796, on the subject of the British treaty, so moved and agitated the house, that objection was made to taking the vote under the excitement of such appeals.

We find three periods rather decisively marked in the history of British parliamentary debate. First, in Walpole and Bolingbroke's time, the eloquence of diplomacy, "partaking," as one remarks, "a good deal of a state-paper detail." Secondly, the great period, the eloquence of passion, the conflict of excited and gigantic talent, when great torrents were poured forth and were seen fiercely dashing

against each other. The third, that which we have witnessed since, the more sober period, the eloquence of argument and business. This last has been a dull period as compared with the preceding. But few speakers have appeared who, probably, could have succeeded highly on the great arena. Of these, we think, Canning and Brougham could have figured then. Canning reached after the Ciceronian roundness and elegance. He was a struggling, ambitious speaker, a speaker for rhetorical effect. It is said he would huddle up and hasten by the business part of his speech, and expand where there was room for show and passion and appeal. Brougham was the opposite, both in politics and taste. The latter took to the Grecian, as the former to the Roman models. Brougham steeped his mind in the great Grecian master, and caught his fire, but not a particle of his simplicity of structure and movement. He was a coarse, harsh, involved speaker; in frequent instances keeping the sense suspended through long and complex paragraphs; and in some of which, it is not known to have fallen even to this day. He was an uncivil speaker. If addressing an enemy, he knocked him down with a huge and knotted club of mingled argument and invective. If a friend, he seized him by the collar, and dragged him along in the way he chose to have him go.

It would be interesting to trace the leading speakers to the countries where they originated, and ascertain whence came the most and the greatest; and whether different sections have imparted any peculiar characteristics. Murray, Erskine, Dundas, came from Scotland; the two former taking their place in the first rank; none provincially marked, except Dundas, who to the last held on upon the broad Scotch accent.

Burke, Sheridan, Grattan, Barre, Plunkett, came from Ireland. The two first fall into the first rank. The Irish eloquence, as most know, has a very distinct character. It is impassioned and poetical, often extravagant, in the attempted loftiness of its conceptions, in the swell and pomp of its language, and the crowded and dazzling brilliancy of

its figures. The foundation of this school was unquestionably laid in the splendid and prolific genius of Burke. He went in this direction to the very outer limits of propriety, sometimes overstepping those limits. Curran, with his vigorous but often rioting imagination, went further than Burke. Charles Phillips exceeded Curran, and with some really good, gave some of the very worst specimens of this style and school.

Pulteney, Chatham, Fox, Pitt, Canning are distinctively English; and in the English line, I suppose, we are to look for the standard specimens. Here, probably, it should be acknowledged, is to be found, on the whole, the highest order of eloquence.

America, also, has furnished many illustrious names in this line. Otis, Henry, Rutledge, Ames, Adams, Pinckney, Wirt, Clay, Webster, Calhoun,—these are specimens. If the comparison had been made within the last twenty years, the American eloquence, I think, would not suffer much as placed by the side of the English. We should have felt safe in placing Webster against Brougham; Clay against Peel; Choate against Macaulay; Calhoun against O'Connel. Certainly a real encounter between those social and moral antipodes; Calhoun and O'Connel, would have been a sight worth witnessing,—the proud uncompromising conservative on the one hand; the unsparing denouncer and agitator on the other; both at home in hurling the hot and scathing bolts.

The American eloquence has unquestionably great strength and excellence. The leading fault chargeable upon it is that there is apt to be too much of it. Sometimes it seems as though it would never come to an end. There is some truth in the caricature which one of our own countrymen gives. He says, "We will take nothing for granted. We must commence at the very commencement. An ejectment for ten acres reproduces the whole discovery of America. A discussion about a tariff, or a turnpike, summons from their remotest caves the adverse blasts of windy rhetoric; and on those great Serbonian bogs, known in political geog-

raphy as "constitutional questions" our ambitious fluency begins with the general deluge and ends with its own." Wordiness, floweriness, magniloquence, great swelling structures with very little in them, have often been charged upon us as the leading peculiarity of our speakers. This allegation was made sometime since, in one of the prominent literary and political Reviews of the mother country. Were the charge made with just limitations and discriminations we might stand corrected. But, in fact, it is indiscriminately made. Even Daniel Webster comes in by name as one in the offence, — Daniel Webster who once remarked that he had been employed twenty years in casting off words; who as the result of this process became chaste and severe almost to excess. Yet he is called a wordy, flowery speaker. No man could say this, knowing whereof he affirmed. After this, in such matters, the critic may say what else he pleases; we care not what he says.

Whilst in the business of comparing, let us compare for a moment the merits of the ancient and the modern eloquence. Do we find the qualities of the ancient reproduced in the modern? Do we find as great, or greater qualities? It is admitted there is no exact reproduction of Demosthenes on the one hand, and of Cicero on the other; perhaps no one, in all respects and in all rhetorical powers, equal to the great Grecian master. We find, however, in no small measure, the Demosthenic rigor and intensity. Fox is Demosthenic. He has the fire, the rapidity, the running together of argument and declamation which characterize the Grecian. But he was not the Grecian. Burke is Ciceronian. He has something of the flow, the divergency, the diffuseness, the spreading amplitude of the Roman. But, though in many things he far exceeded him, he was not the Roman. In great thought, in permanent and noble sentiment, in extent and wealth of imagery, the Briton is far before the Roman. I believe there is more of the material that feeds the mind and stirs its energy, making it wiser and stronger, in Edmund Burke than in all the ancient orators put together. There

is more intense, at the same time close, silencing reasoning in some of the secondary efforts of Fox than appears in the most labored orations of Demosthenes himself. There is more melting pathos, more genuine, pungent wit, not useless but aiding the argument, and more convulsing humor in some of the speeches of Sheridan, as he delivered them, than can be found in the most skilfully picked specimens of Grecian oratory. There is incomparably more gigantic grappling and settling of great principles in the addresses of Webster than appears in the profoundest of the ancient advocates. For these qualities, the English eloquence is clearly pre-eminent. In its thought, its sentiment, its argument, its wit, and its pathos it surpasses the ancient. It abounds, more than the ancient, even in terrible invective; more, because eloquence in modern times has taken the form of debate, of which the ancients knew little or nothing. This fact has given a personal character to the speaking. The leading orators have all along been pitted against each other. Walpole and Pulteney, Chatham and Murray, Burke and North, Fox and Pitt, Grattan and Flood, Brougham and Canning, Webster and Calhoun. Hence it is that all the leading orators have been greatest in invective. The fire has been the hottest when it has been the fire of emulation or hate. The torrent has been the strongest and most majestic when embittered waters have been running. These master spirits, possessing the withering power in question, have ever been ready and eager to flash and thunder and rive the antagonist object in moments of excitement and conflict. This is a humiliating fact, that so many of the greatest passages in our eloquence are the malignant passages; that the mind has proved the strongest under the influence of feelings which it ought not to have entertained at all.

It is owing in part to the peculiar character of parliamentary assemblies and this terrible form and encounter of debate, which have been described, that so many who have distinguished themselves in other fields, as advocates and as writers, have failed on the floor of the senate. William

Murray, so eloquent at the bar, and sometimes in the house, quailed and held his peace before the look and tone of Chatham. Erskine could do but little in Parliament. He could do what he pleased with a jury; but in the house the sarcasm and the overshadowing reputation of Pitt kept him completely under. Jeffrey even, the great Northern critic and advocate, who spake through his Quarterly with an authority which almost sealed the destiny of authors, found that he had no authority and but little influence in the turbulent commons. He could hew men down with his pen, but in the storm of debate his tongue was a mere feather.

It would be interesting and profitable if, in looking over the field of English speakers, we could derive some principles to guide us in the training and developing of the orator. But little of this sort can be found, there having been no uniformity in this particular. Every man seems to have come forward in his own way; almost every one pretty much as it happened. We find that some of the distinguished speakers have been distinguished classics, — by no means all. Pulteney, Murray, Burke, Pitt, Fox, McIntosh, were; Walpole, Chatham, Windham, Sheridan, Erskine, Patrick Henry, were decidedly wanting in this respect. McIntosh took to the Roman models; Murray, Fox, Burke, to the Grecian. Fox, notwithstanding his reeking dissipation, surpassed almost all orators of his time in keeping up an intercourse with the ancient, particularly the Greek, models. Lord Chatham's reading, we are told, was very much in Bailey's Dictionary, the sermons of Barrow, and the poems of Spenser. Burke, it is said, made great use of the prose of Dryden, and especially the poetry of Milton, as suggesting the noblest images. Sheridan formed his taste and manner almost wholly by intimacy with the English poets and dramatists. Lord Erskine, too, dwelt almost excusively among English writers. Few men of his time were more familiar with Shakespeare than he; Milton he had nearly by heart; and from Burke, also, he could quote all but indefinitely.

Not many English orators seem to have followed very

sedulously Cicero's direction in the frequent use of the pen. It is, indeed, singular how very few of the powerful speakers have been powerful as writers. Chatham, Fox, Sheridan, the three pre-eminent orators, were not writers. On the other hand, nearly all the masterly writers have utterly failed, particularly as extemporaneous speakers. It may well be doubted whether that quality of mind which makes the words hard got, but the right ones when they come; that closeness, that stringency, that condensed structure, which gives the force and precision to the style,—whether that vivid, compact quality is not wholly irreconcilable with the easy fluency which gives a man power when he thinks upon his legs, and speaks what he thinks.

As to manner, in the line of great English speakers, it is obvious that it has received comparatively little attention. There are some who excelled in manner; but it came spontaneously to them. Lord Chatham, we know, cultivated manner most assiduously, if not excessively—speaking before a glass, often, with a view to perfect both his enunciation and his action; and he, doubtless, greatly surpassed all modern parliamentary men in the externals of oratory. It must be acknowledged that manner will achieve wonders, and few can altogether neglect it with impunity. Yet it is true that some have succeeded in being eloquent without the arts and accomplishments of manner. Of these it may be said, what quaint Thomas Fuller says of Hooker, that "he seems to have made good musick with his fiddle and stick alone, without any rosin; having neither pronunciation nor gesture to grace his matter." Indeed, men have been eloquent in a high degree, in spite of decided physical obstructions or defects—as Demosthenes, who was born a stammerer; as Cicero, who had a slender, squeaking utterance; as Fox, who had a clumsy, unwieldy frame; Curran, who went among his schoolmates by the name of "stuttering Jack Curran"; Dunning, whose person was ugly and mean in the extreme—short, thick, stumpy, his voice husky and often clogged; Lord North, who had a

tongue too large for his mouth; or as the duke of Lauderdale, who, from a defective conformation of the mouth that made him unable to hold in all its proper contents, was said "to bedew his hearers while he addressed them."

Almost all the great speakers have acquired their power in speaking by the practice of speaking. Most began their practice early in the debating clubs. The practice was then transferred to the bar, the senate, the popular assembly. Windham began a bad speaker, and became a good one simply by practice. Fox began clumsily, and rose to his astonishing power by persistent practice. He determined, on entering parliament, to speak every night; and he says that for five whole sessions he did speak every night but one, and regretted only that he did not speak on that night too. Sheridan commenced his career with an utter failure, and by practice stood up even with the first debaters of that unequalled period. Curran, one of the most brilliantly fluent in the whole line of orators, at first so disgracefully slumped in the outset of his speech that he had to leave the place, wearing the cognomen of "Orator Mum." To these Pitt is an exception. He broke forth upon the house at the early age of twenty-two with all the strength and maturity of a veteran orator. Beyond question, practice, persevering, obstinate practice; inflicting its words and wind and stammering and nonsense, as well as sense, upon others; practice whenever and wherever there is any decent chance to speak — in the caucus or the temperance gathering or the debating-club, will ultimately surmount all ordinary obstacles and inaptitudes, and lead to a reasonable readiness and ability.

And, let me say here, the power to reach and sway men by argument and appeal is an admirable power. And the attainment of it is within the reach of more than ever realize it; of many more, if they would only come to it resolved to have it; each, in the language of Richter, determined to make as much out of himself, in this particular, "as can possibly be made out of the stuff." And our history shows

that this path is open to those who have not had all the advantages of extensive and liberal culture. We have already named Patrick Henry, who, perhaps, stands at the head of American orators; yet he passed almost instantly from an uncouth, lubberly lounger to a very powerful speaker; apparently little more than an animal one day, thrilling and astounding men by the wonders of his eloquence the next. Henry Clay and Mr. Pinckney, two pre-eminently distinguished Southern orators, each without early advantages, were prepared and disciplined for their work by no liberal or university course. Roger Sherman went from the shoemaker's bench to be the Nestor of our congress. John Marshall, our greatest lawyer, whose eloquence, though chiefly that of thought and argument, was still so effective, had rather the soldier's than the scholar's education; his was the drilling of the camp, not of the college. There was discipline in all these men; and there may be, with God's blessing, in any man who shall strongly will it. It is indispensable that the mind be disciplined and prepared in some way for this work. We insist upon no particular way; only let there be attained the faculty of method and the fountain of feeling, a mind clear and strong joined with a living soul of fire. These together will make out the thing. Where these are, it will come out, and you cannot stop it. The soul of fire and the baptism of fire will impart and impel the tongues of fire; and these will fling forth mingled strains of reasoning and appeal, effective where they fall. Let the speaker's logic only now and then break into flame, so that the argument shall go out in a melted, glowing stream, sparkling as it is poured, and it will make, yea, will melt, its way to the auditor's heart. In this fervid condition of the speaker, if there be any power in him, it will come out in his speech. If nothing else, there will be force in what he says; and this is eloquence. Perhaps the best definition that has ever been given is this: "Eloquence is force." There are those, indeed, who do not like this definition; nor do they always like the thing, if it comes to them in this assailing and

entering shape. We hear it maintained and insisted on in many quarters that the smooth and nicely-finished, finely-balanced things, the brilliant corruscations of the imagination, the beautiful and blooming flowers of the fancy, the gorgeous and towering structures of language, language in shining heaps — these and such like — these, and nothing else, make out the true eloquence. They so make the people stare and admire and praise. It is so charming and so beautiful! If this be eloquence in its true form and spirit, then the dandies and the peacocks have it. The great masters of the past and present have it not. They never aimed at this mere finery. They struck for the achieving quality, the soul-bracing, the drastic element; for they wished and they meant to accomplish something — make those they spoke to believe, resolve, and do something.

You doubtless have often witnessed how the purpose of the speaker, the frame he is in, modifies everything that comes from him. We put ourselves before one man. He is in the light, entertaining mood, and we meet a beautiful exhibition; the person, manner, voice, style, all fine. There are admirable sketchings, great and vivid pictures drawn upon the wall; the sensibilities are stirred, and all love to feel, and it is a delightful entertainment. We go away, and soon forget all about it. It fades from our mind as the tinted bow fades from the eastern sky. We place ourselves before another man. He does not greatly excite our astonishment; but we find ourselves within the circle of his power. He moves us deeply, and we see definitely why we are moved. He implants within us some vital sentiments which we cannot dislodge, and sends us away thinking, feeling, resolving. We sleep, we wake, and the truth is within us, and the pressure is upon us, and we find no relief from the impulse which has visited us but in generous, decisive action. There is force here, not prettiness, not something which tickles the fancy or plays round the head; but something which touches and stretches and works the very muscles. Like the kingdom of God, it is not in word, but in power.

The evidence of its presence is not a sigh, nor a tear, nor a smile, but conviction, decision, achievement. This is eloquence, authenticated as such by the great performers who have gone before us. And who does not feel that it is an admirable power? And who does not sometimes wish he had it? Perhaps you may have it. But, remember, it will cost you something. Remember the discipline we have alluded to, and which all transcendent speakers in this line have had to come to. Let him whose heart pants for this distinction gird himself to the labor, the conflict, the persistent self-drill. Let him know what he professes to know, and see, as with an eagle's vision, what he undertakes to see. Let him study language till he shall understand its analogies and its nice shades and pregnant meanings; especially, till he can call out the sweet harmony, the picturesque force, and the Saxon stringency of his mother tongue. Let him in his reading dwell in a pure, bracing atmosphere; never, no, not for an hour, in a region of mingled mist and moonshine. Let him walk, rather, with the men, the former giants of our literature — get upon the mountains their shoulders make. In all the studies and problems he meets, let him meet them like a man; show the mastering mind — one that can grapple with difficulties and conquer obstructions and move straight through the most entangling intricacies, till he comes to brush them aside as though they were cobwebs. Thus let there be reached the two contrasted powers of comprehension and concentration, and also the power of a firmly-linked consecutiveness to be the sinew of his discourse. And then let him have a correct, wholesome taste and stored imagination, that he may clothe the process everywhere with comeliness, and now and then with lines and tints of beauty. And when he has gained these varied gifts, let him remember his responsibility to God and his generation; and use them in the advocacy of the true and the right, the pure and the good; expending them generously in the toils of philanthropy and the deeper solicitudes of religion, till this now burdened world shall come to the period of its redemption.