I do not wish to be understood as laying down principles by which other are to be guided in this discussion. But it seems to me that this should not be discussed, as quæris ordinarily are in this hall, where terms of denunciation and anathematization are showered on one side, and venomous allegory and misapplied arguments and facts arelavished on the other. Before such an audience as this we need not hope for success by any such hackneyed expedients. In the first place we all must admit that the question is so equally balanced, and the opposite parties so nearly even together, that arguments and facts which in ordinary quæris would be regarded of little importance, are here to be received as conclusive evidence and remembered with the greatest care. And that I consider the question as at all far from limited by a narrow field of discussion, but it is this very delicacy of distinction that makes it more interesting.

Then how are we to determine on a plan of discussion? To discuss history as it were with a glance, and group together all those illustrious characters, who shine from its pages, and compare the man of action with those of thought; in order to decide this question, would require space far beyond our present limits. In fact—a difficulty presents itself even here, for in some illustrations—