

THE

SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NEW SERIES.

APRIL, 1856.

VOL. I...No. 1.

ART. I.—THEORY OF THE BEAUTIFUL.

Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste. By ARCHIBALD ALISON, LL.D., B.F.R.S., &c. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1811.

IN the Edinburgh Review for May, 1811, Lord Jeffrey said of the work at the head of this article, "We look upon this as, on the whole, the best and most pleasing work which has yet been produced on the subjects of taste and beauty. Less ornate and adventurous than Price or Knight, the author, we think, has gone deeper into his subject than any of those writers; at the same time that he has been more copious (perhaps too copious) in his examples and illustrations, and more constantly awake (perhaps to an excess here also) to those feelings of enthusiastic delight which the contemplation of such subjects is apt to excite in the minds best qualified to discuss them." It is because the work of Alison still, in our opinion, holds the place assigned to it by the Edinburgh critic, that we now make it the starting point in an inquiry into the theory of the beautiful in the material world, which we propose in this article.

The theory of the beautiful often resolves itself, in the course of discussion, into the theory of taste; they being only different views of the same question. We shall, therefore, begin the inquiry by an investigation into the theory of taste, as the polemical aspects of the question make this the most convenient mode of examining it.

So difficult has it always been to fix upon any certain standard of taste, that there is a long-established proverb denying there is any standard. All tastes are supposed by it to be equally justified in reason; or, rather, the proverb supposes, that taste is a matter with which reason has nothing to do. "There is no disputing about tastes," is the great canon of popular opinion by which the most disputatious is silenced.

But philosophy does not yield to popular opinion, neither is it content to acquiesce in what has a mere semblance of truth. It

ART. IX.—MEMOIR OF DR. HENRY.

Eulogy on the late Honourable John Caldwell Calhoun, delivered at Columbia, South Carolina, on Thursday, May 16, 1850.
By ROBERT HENRY, D. D., Professor of Greek Literature in the South Carolina College. Published at the request of the Committee of Citizens. Columbia, S. C.: Printed by I. C. Morgan. 1850. Pp. 59.

THIS was the last public effort of Dr. Henry, though the interval which elapsed betwixt its delivery and his death was too long to justify us in speaking of it as “the last voice of the swan, chanting its own monody”—*illa tanquam cycnea fuit divini hominis vox et oratio*. Yet we contemplate it with the same melancholy interest with which the friends of Crassus went into the senate-house, and gazed upon the spot where the orator closed his splendid career. When the eulogy was first published, we admired it as a just and beautiful tribute to the character and services of its illustrious subject; we cherish it now, as reflecting on every page the lineaments and features of its gifted author. It is an accurate transcript of Dr. Henry’s mind; so exact that those who are familiar with his habits of thought, will see, in peculiar turns of expression which occasionally occur, and in the general air of the whole composition, the person of the author so vividly depicted as to produce the illusion of an actual conversation, a momentary belief that they are not reading a production of his pen, but listening to a discourse from his lips. We do not allude to such general qualities as severity of taste and richness of classical allusion; these are not personal characteristics; they are the ornaments, but not the essence of thought. There was a compactness in Dr. Henry’s mode of thinking, a tendency to consolidate the results of his reflection in brief and pregnant maxims, which always seemed to us the most striking feature of his mind. It was exactly the quality which gives a charm to the histories of Thucydides and Tacitus. He had caught their spirit from a long, patient, delighted study of their works; and while he abhorred all vague and barren generalities, which cheat the shallow with the show of wisdom without the substance, he freely expressed himself in sententious aphorisms, which, weighty as they were brief, commended themselves to every man’s judgment. He seized at once upon the principle which pervaded the details of a subject, and the conciseness with which he announced it, was but a reflection of the energy with which he conceived it. The eulogy before us abounds in illustrations of the quality in question. The biography, even in its most minute and trifling details, is enlivened by the spirit of philosophy. There is no set effort to be profound; no attempt at

abstruse reflection. All is natural and easy; and yet he who should be tempted to pronounce it superficial on account of its simplicity, or commonplace on account of the apparent obviousness of its thoughts, should be reminded that, as it is the highest accomplishment of art to conceal art, so it is the highest proof of genius to conceal the traces of labour in its production. In moral subjects, the true is always natural, and when properly presented, will always seem obvious. Pascal's reflections are none the less rich and none the less profound, because they occasion in us surprise that we had not thought of them before. As a general rule, what costs the reader labour, costs the writer none; and what costs the writer labour, costs the reader none. Ease and grace, like the inspiration of true eloquence, "come to us after we have wrestled all night." They are nature, but nature richly and laboriously improved.

Our design, however, in placing the eulogy on Mr. Calhoun at the head of our article, is not to make it the subject of our criticism; the judgment of the public has long ago forestalled us; but to make it the occasion of presenting a brief memoir of the life and character of Dr. Henry himself. He is justly entitled to this tribute at our hands. He was not only the most eminent scholar in this State; he was one of the earliest and ablest contributors to this Review. His articles, together with those of Elliott, and Legare, and Nott, gave it, when first established, the exalted position which was then universally conceded to it, as a literary journal. He had promised to become a contributor again, and, at the time of his death, was engaged in preparing an article on a very interesting point in the history of Greek philosophy. In addition to these public considerations, we shall not deny that a private motive has not been without its effect. Dr. Henry was our revered instructor, and to him more than to any other man, living or dead, we are indebted for the direction of our own studies, and for whatsoever culture—"quod sentio quam sit exiguum"—our mind has received. Twenty-six years ago, we entered his lecture-room, a raw, inexperienced, but ardent pupil. He was then in the vigour of his days. We shall never forget the impression which his profound learning, his lofty bearing, and his intense enthusiasm produced on our minds. We saw, what we had never seen before, a *ripe scholar*. The effect was electric; we felt the power of a new life; and from that day to this, amid all the vicissitudes of his and our own history, we have never ceased to regard him with filial love and reverential gratitude.

Dr. Henry was born in the city of Charleston, on the 6th December, 1792. His father, Peter Henry, a native of Banffshire, in Scotland, was the son and only child of a respectable farmer. He manifested an early inclination to the church, and probably received, for that purpose, a liberal education; but, through the

intervention of the Duchess of Gordon, his attention was turned into the channel of business. After the death of his parents, he emigrated from Scotland to the West Indies, where he became a very successful merchant. He was born on the 23d of July, 1752.

Dr. Henry's mother, whose maiden name was Anne Adelaide Schwiers, was the daughter and youngest child of a merchant of great piety and worth in the city of Bremen. Her brother, Rev. Conrad Schwiers, D. D., was minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, Austin Friars, London, and author of a grammar of the Dutch language. He seems to have been a man of learning, and his social position may be inferred from the circumstance that his son married the niece of the Governor of Demarara, and was subsequently appointed regent of the place, with the title of Honourable. Anne Adelaide, the mother of Dr. Henry, was born in Bremen, on the 5th of June, 1757. She removed, at an early age, with some of her relatives to the West Indies; there she married Mr. Angel, of the island of St. Croix. He died in little more than a year after their marriage, leaving her a widow, with an infant son, the late Mr. Justus Angel, of John's Island, near Charleston. In an excursion, which it was supposed would not occupy more than a few hours, she was blown off at sea, and after weeks of hardship and exposure, landed finally at Kingston, Jamaica. There she became acquainted with Mr. Henry, and married him. They resided in Jamaica a few years, then removed to the Bay of Honduras, and at length, settled in Charleston, S. C., in May 1792. Having selected this city as his home, he returned to the West Indies to adjust his business, and to collect the debts which were still due to him there. He had settled his affairs to his satisfaction, and was on his return to Charleston, with a large amount of money, when he was captured by a French privateer, robbed of all that he had collected, and so barbarously treated, that he died of the effects of the cruelty, in Savannah, Georgia, on the 2nd September, 1794. His son Robert was thus consigned to the sole care of his mother; and he could not have been left in wiser or safer hands. With the remnants of her husband's fortune that she was able to put together in Charleston, she opened a dry goods store, from the earnings of which she succeeded in supporting herself and educating her children, without drawing upon the aid or the sympathy of others. She was, in many respects, a remarkable woman. Familiar with the languages of western Europe, conversant with affairs, of sound and vigorous understanding, she was fully competent to direct and superintend the training of her son, and to her, under God, he owes all that he afterwards became. He always cherished her memory with the profoundest veneration. He was accustomed, particularly, to commend her solid sense and her enlightened piety; and her letters show that she happily combined tenderness with firmness in her treatment of her children,

and ardour of zeal with exemption from asperity or bigotry in her relations to God. Amid all the trying vicissitudes of her history, her faith was unshaken and her serenity unbroken.

She was deterred by no narrow consideration of economy from seeking the best masters for her son, assigning as a reason—and it is a proof of her great good sense—that poor teaching, however cheap, is always costly; and good teaching, however costly, is always cheap; that the best, in other words, is always the cheapest. As soon, therefore, as Robert had mastered the alphabet, she put him under the care of Rev. Dr. Buist, who had recently come to Charleston, with a high reputation, from the University of Edinburgh, having been commended to the Scotch or First Presbyterian congregation in the most flattering terms, by Drs. Robertson and Blair. With Dr. Buist he began the Latin, as we have heard from himself, at six years of age. His Ainsworth's School Dictionary has his name written in it, in his mother's hand, under date of August 28th, 1800, so that he had begun to construe and translate, before he had completed his eighth year.

As it had been the purpose of his father to educate him in England, his mother took him there in May, 1803, and put him under the charge of a Mr. Johnston, with whom he appears to have remained only a few months. He was thence transferred to the school of James Lindsay, D. D., Grove Hall, Oldford Bow, near London. With Dr. Lindsay, in addition to the Latin and Greek classics, he studied the French language, as appears from a record made in his copy of *Gil Blas*, in September, 1804. He continued under the care of Dr. Lindsay until 1808, when, at the solicitation of his mother, he relinquished the prospects of academic life, and took a situation in the counting-house of Mr. Hernandus Vos, a merchant of London, who carried on an extensive trade with the Dutch colonies of Demerara, Berbice, and Surinam. Here it was that the exigencies of his employment forced upon him the acquisition of the Dutch language; and with the help of his uncle's grammar, and the constant use of the language in the business of the house, he acquired such skill in it that he spoke and wrote it with fluency and ease. Here also he must have made his first attainments in the German. His introduction to Mr. Vos was through a merchant of Bremen, for whom he always retained a strong affection, and whose brother subsequently married his only sister. It is certain that, in 1809, he corresponded occasionally with his mother in the German language. It is probable that he remained in the counting-room only about a year, when he resumed his academic studies with reference to preparation for the ministry of the gospel. In 1811 he entered the University of Edinburgh, and graduated Master of Arts, June 15th, 1814. We find among his papers memoranda of his having

attended, in 1813, the classes of Prof. Brunton in Hebrew, Dr. Ritchie in Divinity, Dr. Brown (the celebrated Thomas Brown, the successor of Dugald Stewart) in Moral Philosophy, and Dr. Meiklejohn in Church History. In April, 1814, he completed his course at the Divinity Hall; and we now have before us his examination exercises, which were sermons on John xvii. 15, for Church History, and critical dissertations on Romans v. 6, ix. 2, 3, for the Divinity Hall. We have no memoranda of his studies in 1811 and 1812, except that, in a letter to his mother, dated August, 1812, he complains of the undue importance assigned to the mathematics in Edinburgh. His own tastes led him to languages and philosophy, and he regrets that the time which he was anxious to give to Hebrew and Arabic, he was compelled to share with the exact sciences, in order to maintain a respectable position. We sympathize with him in his troubles, and, though we would not banish the mathematics from our schools and colleges, nor under-rate their importance as useful sciences, we cannot withhold the opinion, that, as a discipline of the mind, they are comparatively worthless. We agree cordially with Sir William Hamilton in the estimate which he has put upon them, and, until his arguments shall have been answered, we shall regard the question as settled. Among the manuscripts of Dr. Henry are two articles, addressed to the editor of the Classical Journal, and dated July, 1813, which indicate his interest in the critical study of the Greek. One is an exposition of a passage in the Iliad, and the other an exposition of two passages in the New Testament. Both indicate a sound judgment and ripe scholarship. His interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 10 is particularly ingenious, and, we are inclined to think, entirely original.

Young Henry left the University with rare accomplishments. He was well skilled in the ancient and modern languages, and thoroughly imbued, under the enthusiastic teachings of Brown, with the love of philosophy. That he made a strong impression upon those who were competent to judge of merit, may be inferred from the following anecdote. While in Edinburgh, probably at the close of his university course, he had the pleasure of meeting Sir William Hamilton, then a young man, with the honours of Oxford blooming fresh upon him, at the house of a friend. Their interview was brief; they parted, and never met again; and yet, more than forty years afterwards, Sir William Hamilton retained as vivid a recollection of the scene as if it had recently occurred. He narrated the circumstance to a young gentleman from the South Carolina College, two years ago, and inquired with affectionate interest into the subsequent history of the young Carolinian.

Having received his degree, Dr. Henry returned to London, and spent some time, how long we cannot say, with his friends there. The war between England and the United States prevent-

ing his return to his own country, he turned his mercantile attainments to a good account, by accepting an agency which yielded him an adequate support without drawing largely upon his time, and which gave him the opportunity of spending the year 1815 upon the continent of Europe. His letters show, that, in selecting the ministry of the gospel as his calling, he had been impressed with the deepest conviction of its importance. He had not chosen it as a trade, but as an awful department of most solemn and responsible labour, in which he might benefit the souls of others and save his own. He unbosomed himself freely to his mother, and often expressed his regret that he had not access to the society of experienced Christians, that he might have a deeper and more practical knowledge of the things of God. It was during this year that he passed through a painful trial of his faith, which his friends apprehended might eventuate in the renunciation of his profession. At some seasons in their history, all earnest minds have been tortured with the agony of doubt. Intense conviction is rooted in the storms of spiritual conflict. He alone believes deeply who has doubted deeply; and he alone can estimate the preciousness of an assured faith, who has experienced the anguish of its birth. This was illustrated in the case of Dr. Henry. Devoted to truth, and incapable of anything like insincerity or deceit, he could not profess what he did not feel to be true. Doubts were excited in his mind in relation to the doctrines of predestination and the Trinity; he was beset with scruples; and, though he had completed the usual routine of theological study, and had been licensed to preach according to the forms of the Scottish Church, yet, when these doubts took possession of his mind, he determined to renounce theology, unless his difficulties should be obviated by a full persuasion of the doctrines of his church. Happily for himself, his perplexity was not of long continuance. His sense of the evil and demerit of sin, and of the necessity of a real and proper satisfaction in order to the pardon of the sinner, soon sealed upon his heart a practical conviction which no difficulties of the speculative understanding should be allowed to set aside. The atonement of Christ he never could forego, and he has often declared to us, that the government of God would, in his judgment, be altogether unworthy of the Divine Being, if He should receive a transgressor into favour without it. He was the first to call our attention to the passage inserted in the first edition of Smith's Theory of the Moral Sentiments, and omitted in the later ones, and referred to it as a proof of the unhappy ascendancy which Hume had acquired over the mind of Smith. How his doubts became resolved upon the doctrine of predestination, we do not know; but we have repeatedly heard him express his cordial agreement with Augustine in his doctrine of grace.

Early in 1816, he returned to Charleston. The first record of

his preaching is "May-19th, Sunday morning, preached in the first Presbyterian Church." In the following June he was invited to supply the French Protestant Church, where he preached alternately in French and English, until he was elected to the College. On the 25th May, 1817, he was ordained, according to Presbyterian forms, by the old Presbytery of Charleston, which not long afterwards became extinct. We have heard it said that the ordination of Mr. Henry was its last official act.

On the 19th March, 1818, he was married to Elizabeth Henrietta Connors, daughter of Charles Connors, Esq., of Clarendon, South Carolina, who was a native of St. Stephen's parish. This amiable and accomplished lady, a pattern of meek and unobtrusive virtue, now survives him, together with six children, the fruits of their union. In December, 1818, he was chosen to the professorship of Moral Philosophy and Logic in the South Carolina College; and as the circumstances of his election were highly creditable to him, and are not generally known, our readers will excuse us for reciting them. His name was suggested by Hon. Mitchell King to Mr. Pringle, the President of the Senate, and, ex officio, a member of the Board. Mr. King also transmitted to Mr. Pringle two essays of Dr. Henry on subjects connected with the department for which he was a candidate. When the board met, Dr. Henry was put in nomination by Mr. Pringle, and his claims earnestly espoused by Judge Cheves. Dr. Maxcy, the president of the college, and a man, deservedly, of commanding influence with the board, had his heart set upon the election of another candidate. Dr. Henry's essays were submitted to the board, and Dr. Maxcy requested the favour of being allowed to take them home and read them at his leisure. His request was complied with, and upon the reassembling of the board, he pronounced a high encomium upon the essays in question, and not only withdrew his opposition, but gave his cordial support to Dr. Henry, who was unanimously elected. It is a pity that such an ordeal were not now exacted of a man's fitness for a professor's chair, before he is called to fill it. In every other profession there is usually demanded a trial of skill before a candidate is entitled to its privileges; and the universities, as anciently constituted, attached great importance to academic disputations. But merit, in these days and in this country, is ascertained upon easier terms; and learning and intellectual ability are not the items which enter most largely into it. We are now content to accept a teacher, if he has capacity to learn, and gives a reasonable promise of being able to keep ahead of his class.

The sphere of labour into which Dr. Henry was now introduced was, in all respects, congenial with the tastes and cherished habits of his life. Philosophy was his favourite pursuit. He loved the classics, and was critically conversant with the choicest monu-

ments of antiquity. But philology with him was only the handmaid of a higher truth; and he never felt himself so perfectly at home, as when conversing with Socrates in the streets, Plato in the gardens of the Academy, Aristotle in the Lyceum, or "the budge doctors of the Stoic fur," in their chosen walks. Man was the theme on which he concentrated the powers of his mind—man in all his relations and in all the aspects of his being. He accordingly entered upon the duties of his chair with ardour and enthusiasm, and the consequence was that new life was infused into a department of inquiry which had, previously, somewhat languished. His residence at Edinburgh, his partialities for the Scottish philosophy, and his fondness for Locke, it might have been presumed, would have led him to underrate the importance of the scholastic logic. This, happily, was not the case. The respective provinces of syllogism and induction were clearly perceived by him, and while he united most cordially in the homage which was generally and justly paid to Bacon, he detracted nothing from the equal merits and the equal glory of Aristotle. He was the first man to give to logic its proper place in the South Carolina College. He was the first of those who undertook to teach it there, that really understood it. He had imbibed none of the prejudices which had so largely infected other disciples of the new organon; and in his zeal for mood and figure, and his earnest evolutions of the importance and significance of forms, which ignorance pronounced barren and indolence dry, one was tempted to think that ancient Oxford had removed to Columbia, or that Marck Duncan was revived in one of his countrymen. Logic, henceforward, became a prominent study in the State; and this circumstance will explain the general tendencies of mind which the statesmen and scholars of the commonwealth have confessedly exhibited.

The only literary labour with which, during the first years of his professorship, Dr. Henry favoured the public, was an eulogy, delivered at the request of the faculty of the college, on Dr. Edward D. Smith, who had been professor of chemistry and mineralogy there, and whose character had won for him golden opinions from his colleagues, the students, and the people at large. His death was universally lamented as a public calamity. The tribute paid to him was worthy alike of the author and the subject. It was delivered December 12th, 1819, but not published until 1822.

The 4th May, 1820, he experienced a severe affliction in the loss of his mother, who died after a painful and lingering illness, which she bore with Christian patience and resignation to the will of God. She had lived to see her labours and anxieties crowned with success, in the circumstances of her children. They had been her jewels; for them she had lived, and toiled, and prayed; and it is a noble incentive to exertion, that her work had not been in

vain. Her eldest son, Mr. Justus Angel, the fruit of her first marriage, was adorning the social position which, of all others, is most esteemed in this State, by the accomplishments of mind which his education in England had given him. Her son Robert was precisely in the station which her own heart would most ardently have coveted for him; and her only daughter, who still survives, was all that she could wish a daughter to be. She looked upon the heritage which God had given her, and could sincerely rejoice that she was able to bequeath a noble legacy to the country and the world. His promise had not failed; He had been a husband to the widow, and a father to the fatherless; and she was permitted to close her eyes with every earthly desire fulfilled, and with the confident hope of a richer joy in heaven. She had attained a good old age, wanting only a month of being exactly sixty-three years old; and we cannot but feel that the prayer of Simeon was appropriate to her case, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace."

The following December, Dr. Henry delivered an eulogy, at the request of the faculty, on Dr. Maxcy, the late president of the college. His appointment to discharge such duties, is a proof of the estimate in which he was held by his colleagues; and the ability with which he performed them sufficiently vindicates their perspicacity and confidence. An eulogy on Maxcy was a very delicate undertaking; it was hardly possible to come up to the measure of public expectation. That extraordinary man, whose memory is still fresh in the hearts of his pupils, and whose influence still lingers in the college, in the general type which he impressed upon its discipline, seems to have been born for the government and direction of the young. Distinguished by dignity of character, elevation of sentiment, and a communicative sympathy, he infused his own spirit, by the gentle inspiration of his matchless eloquence, into the minds of his pupils. He at once awed and attracted. An atmosphere of moral power surrounded him, and none could approach him without feeling its influence, and paying an involuntary homage to virtue. "His presence," says an admiring pupil, in a production which we do not hesitate to signalize as one of the most exquisite gems in the casket of our literature, "quelled every disorder. The most riotous offender shrunk from the reproof of that pale brow and intellectual eye. The reverence that attended him stilled the progress of disaffection; and to him belonged the rare power—exercised in the face of wondering Europe by Lamartine—of quelling by persuasion the spirit of revolt." He justly looked upon the formation of character, by inducing the conscious exercise of principle, as the main end of college government; the measure of its success is the extent to which the subjects of it are led to think, and, by their own determinations, to govern themselves; and the secret of its power is the

charm of eloquence, example, and advice, by which they are led to develope and apply the law contained in the structure of their own souls. To teach men, in other words, to be a law unto themselves, is the scope of wise and judicious discipline. This principle Dr. Maxcy kept steadily in view; he made the college a school of character, and the man within the breast his most effective police. Through all the changes of its history, the college has retained the impression which he gave it; and to this more than to any other cause, is due the lofty sentiment of honour which has always pervaded it. That there are evils which the predominance of this mode of government fails to repress, cannot be denied; and because they are obvious and palpable, some have thought it advisable to substitute a system of military rigour, in which the facility of detection and the certainty of punishment shall be the principal restraints from disorder. The change, we think, would be injurious. There would not be the same culture of principle, the same manly self-reliance, the self-respect and dignity which are the natural result of the maxims of Maxcy; and the loss of these qualities would be dearly purchased by an exemption from a class of disorders which, after all, are rather mischievous than wicked—the offspring of levity and thoughtless frivolity rather than of malice.

The eulogy was published in 1822, and is one of Dr. Henry's most finished productions. In comparing it with the beautiful sketch of Mr. Petigru, we were struck with the difference between a pupil and a colleague in their estimate of Dr. Maxcy's genius, and the predominant tendencies of his mind. One makes him æsthetic, the other metaphysical. Mr. Petigru affirms that he "was deeply imbued with classical learning," while Dr. Henry asserts: "I could never discover that he possessed a keen relish for the classical authors of antiquity; and for philological pursuits, strictly so called, I know that he entertained no very great reverence." Upon all other points, the two accounts are in harmony, and perhaps even here the discrepancy is more in appearance than reality. Dr. Henry paid one other tribute to the memory of Dr. Maxcy—the inscription upon the monument, erected to this illustrious man by the Clariosophic Society, came from his pen. There needs no other record of his accomplished scholarship; and it is an interesting circumstance that the same monument consecrates the memories of the two men who have exerted the greatest influence upon the history and fortunes of the college, and that in the respective aspects of their usefulness. Dr. Maxcy shaped its government, and Dr. Henry its studies; and it is precisely the discipline of the one and the learning of the other that are perpetuated.

After the death of Dr. Maxcy, metaphysics were taught by Dr. Henry as a labour of love, or by a private arrangement with the

Board of Trustees, until 1824, when they were formally transferred to his chair, and logic, belles lettres, and criticism erected into a new and independent department, which was first filled by Henry Junius Nott, Esq., at that time a conspicuous member of the bar.

The publications of Dr. Henry from 1822 to 1832, were purely occasional. They were, 1. Two sermons on the Connection between Faith and Practice, and on the Co-operation of Reason with Grace; these appeared November, 1822. 2. A Thanksgiving Sermon, preached February 5th, 1823, and published at the request of the students. The subject was, Religion productive of National Prosperity. 3. A Discourse on Duelling, occasioned by the deaths of Edward P. Simons and Archy Mason; preached December 7th, 1823, and published at the request of the House of Representatives. 4. A Discourse on the Beneficial Results consequent on the Progress of Liberal Opinions in Politics, delivered in the College Chapel, July 4th, 1824, and published in 1827. 5. Contributions to the Southern Review, from 1828 to 1832, of articles on Niebuhr's Roman History, the Romances of the Baron La Motte Fouque, Goethe's *Willhelm Meister*, and Waterhouse's *Junius*. During this period, however, his labours in the college were prodigious, and his application to study so intense, that the bell for morning prayers not unfrequently found him in his library, unconscious that a night had elapsed, and that he had not closed his eyes in sleep. He prepared, as a part of his appointed duties, in addition to the lectures he had been accustomed to deliver on moral philosophy, a full course on metaphysics, the new branch which had been assigned him. His instructions in political philosophy embraced, in connection with the topics of the text book, a masterly analysis and exposition of the constitution of the United States, which still exists in manuscript, and occasional discussions of the points usually embraced in political economy. He was fresh from Edinburgh, where the work of Smith and the labours of Stewart had given extraordinary popularity to this department of speculation, and he was the first to introduce the subject in collegiate instruction in this country. Beside these, he gave, at irregular hours, the attendance of the students being voluntary, a very complete view of the evidences of Christianity, and interesting sketches of the history of philosophy. His lectures upon these subjects were extempore, and only a few notes, which he used as memoranda, are found among his papers. His vindication of Christianity was not without effect. Many a young man who came in doubt went away convinced. One case deserves to be recorded, though we cannot mention the name of the individual. A youth from another State came to the college, attracted by Dr. Cooper's fame, and his guardian's sympathy with Dr. Cooper's opinions. His mind was full of prejudice against religion. He

was drawn by curiosity to Dr. Henry's apologetic lectures, and the result was that he left college a confirmed believer, and subsequently became a preacher of the gospel. To these disinterested services, must be added his kindness and courtesy, as well as his zeal for the interests of the college, in relieving the aged Professor of Languages of the instruction of the upper classes in Greek. In the midst of this ceaseless toil, he redeemed time for general literature, and if his means had been commensurate with his aims, he would have left a work which would have linked his name in immortal union with the name of a scholar whose genius was only equalled by his learning. Soon after the appearance of Niebuhr's work on Roman history, he determined to translate it into English, if satisfactory arrangements could be made for publishing the translation. He began the work, and had proceeded nearly through the first volume, when he abandoned the enterprise, because no publisher could be found who would assume the risk.

In 1833, Dr. Cooper, who had succeeded Dr. Maxcy, resigned the presidency of the college. His religious opinions had rendered him so offensive to the religious people of the State, that it became clearly impossible for the college to answer the ends of its establishment, if he continued at the head of it. He was a man of eminent abilities, and of extensive and varied attainments. The benevolence of his nature, the frankness of his temper, and the natural simplicity of his manners, joined to his wide spread fame as a man of science, and a sufferer in the cause of liberty, gave, in his person, the fairest opportunity to liberal opinions to illustrate their boasted power of good. The result, according to the popular verdict, was a miserable failure. Public sentiment demanded a change. Religion and education had always been regarded as inseparable allies; and it was no longer to be tolerated that the South Carolina College should present them in the attitude of unnatural hostility. All parties united in doing justice to the integrity and talents of Dr. Cooper; it was not a personal opposition to the man, but to the religious sentiments of which he had become the representative. He yielded to the popular demand, and withdrew from public observation to the quiet walks of literary labour. Dr. Henry was appointed temporarily to fill his place, and during the year (1834) in which he discharged the duties of the presidency, in addition to the labours of his own department, he drew up and delivered a course of lectures on political economy, a branch which Dr. Cooper had taught for some years previously. The friends of Dr. Henry took it for granted that he would be chosen as the permanent successor of Dr. Cooper. To use a phrase of his own, "he was in the line of succession." Dr. Cooper had been elected over him by only a single vote, though at that time Dr. Henry was a very young man, and had been very

recently connected with the college. The board of trustees would, no doubt, have tendered the office to him with the utmost cheerfulness, had it not been that public sentiment involved Dr. Henry in the same condemnation with his illustrious colleague. They had been associated so long and amicably together, that a common odium attached to them both, and it was felt to be unsafe, in the new organization, to give the slightest ground for suspicion as to the religious character which the institution was thenceforth to bear. Not long before the meeting of the board, Dr. Henry published a sermon designed to vindicate his name from the unjust imputations of indifference or skepticism which had been cast upon him. The sermon was entitled, *The Mysteries of Religion worthy the Assent of the Human Understanding*. But prejudices, which had long been accumulating, were not to be subdued at once. The board took what seemed to be the safe side, and elected another president. They were, unwilling, however, to lose him from the college, and consequently retained him in his professorship, while they sufficiently indicated their own conviction of his piety and merits by granting him the degree of doctor of divinity. Indignant at what he felt to be the injustice that was done him, he withdrew from the college to a small farm which he owned in the neighbourhood of Columbia, where he lived in great retirement for nearly two years, with the exception of two visits to the west, made for the purpose of seeking better lands.

There never was a more unfounded charge than that Dr. Henry sympathized with the opinions of Dr. Cooper. On every important point of morals, philosophy, and religion, they were the poles apart. Dr. Cooper was an avowed materialist; Dr. Henry's tendencies were all to idealism. Dr. Cooper looked upon utility as the criterion of right; Dr. Henry looked upon right as the criterion of utility. Moral rules, according to Dr. Cooper, were flexible and variable; according to Dr. Henry, eternal and immutable. Dr. Cooper was first a Socinian, and afterwards a Deist, in religion; Dr. Henry a thoroughgoing advocate of the Nicene creed, and of an external, authoritative standard of faith. Dr. Cooper was mortally opposed to an order of clergy; Dr. Henry regarded it as indispensable to the public good. We speak what we know. There was but one subject on which they thoroughly agreed, and that was politics. They were both the ardent friends of liberty, and the zealous advocates of the liberal opinions which political economy had demonstrated to be the true interest of States. But, unfortunately for himself, Dr. Henry had never proclaimed his opposition to the doctrines of his friend. They lived on such good terms as gentlemen and as officers of the college, that the people could not understand the spirit of toleration which enabled them to walk together without being agreed. From our own experience and observation, while a student in the

college, we are satisfied that the influence of Dr. Henry, within the legitimate sphere of his duties, was efficiently exerted in counteracting the tendencies of Dr. Cooper's doctrines. He never let slip an opportunity of vindicating religion, and the records of the Christian faith. We ourselves are particularly indebted to him for the able and satisfactory reply which he gave to us in private, to Dr. Cooper's celebrated assault on the Pentateuch.

Dr. Henry passed his life in comparative obscurity until December, 1839, when he was induced, by the urgent solicitations of his friends, to accept the invitation of the board, and return to the college as Professor of Metaphysics, Logic, and Belles Lettres. None of his old associates were there. Cooper, and Nott, and Park, and Wallace, were dead. He came among strangers, except that the distinguished chaplain of the college was an old pupil. But his learning commanded respect, and in 1841, when President Barnwell was compelled to retire from the institution, on account of his health, Dr. Henry was chosen by his colleagues chairman of the faculty, and held that trust until December, 1842, when he was unanimously elected president of the college. It was during these years that he changed his ecclesiastical relations. He had always been an advocate of the doctrine that regular succession from the apostolic period was a mark of the true church. This may have been the key to his episcopacy. Be that, however, as it may, he was ordained a deacon of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Right Reverend Bishop Gadsden, on the 10th March, 1841, and a presbyter or priest by the same bishop, on the 25th September, 1842.

Soon after his return to the college, the extraordinary compliment was paid to him, of being elected by the two societies to deliver their annual oration. It is the only case, we believe, in which a professor has been chosen to this office. The address was delivered on the 8th of December, 1840, and published at the request of the societies. The subject was, *The Cultivation of the Fine Arts favourable to the Perfection of Private Character and the Development of Public Prosperity*. In December, 1845, his relations to the college, for reasons which it would be altogether indelicate to discuss, either in the way of censure or approval, were changed. From that time till the period of his death, he gave instructions in Greek, without being required to participate in the government and discipline of the institution. He was released from an intolerable burden of care and anxiety, and his days, no doubt, protracted by the comparative quiet which he was permitted to enjoy. His academic labours were occasionally diversified by other occupations. He preached two sermons, one on the Greatness of God, November 24th, 1847, the other on the Goodness of God, June 30th, 1848, at the Pinckney Lecture, in

Charleston, which were published according to the provisions of the foundation.

In 1848 or 1849, he was proposed, by some of his friends, for the episcopate of Mississippi. When consulted on the subject, he replied that it was an office which should neither be sought nor shunned; that, if he were elected, he should consider it a call of Providence to a more extended sphere of usefulness; if not, he had learned that man's happiness consisted in entire conformity to the will of God. He was, therefore, neither chagrined nor disappointed when the result of the election was announced to him.

An address on eloquence, delivered before the Clariosophic Society of the College, at the dedication of their new hall, February 10th, 1849, the eulogy on Mr. Calhoun, and a letter on co-operation, which appeared in the South Carolinian, February 10th, 1851, complete the list of his publications.

For several years before his death, his friends had noticed, with apprehension and anxiety, that his strength was failing; his step had lost its elasticity, and his gait its freedom; he himself was persuaded that he was approaching his end; but it came, after all, unexpectedly. He was congratulating himself, only a few days before his last illness, that his health was firmer, and his physical feelings more natural than they had been for years. In a long excursion which we made with him, and in which we discussed some of the principal doctrines of modern philosophy, he alluded to his reviving energies, and expressed the hope that his previous feebleness had been a penalty, which, at length, was satisfied, for his early habits of imprudent study. Alas! all was delusive! On Monday, the 3rd of February, he took to his bed; on Wednesday, the 5th, he lay a corpse. His malady seized him while engaged in prayer. He had retired to his library, and, according to his custom, was invoking the blessing of God upon his studies, when he received an intimation that his studies were over. As the last act of his health was prayer, his friends may cherish the hope, that the first act of his ransomed spirit was praise. He was sixty-three years and two months old, the day he died. His first connection with the college was for sixteen years precisely; his second, for sixteen years and a little more than a month; so that he had been upwards of thirty-two years engaged in the office of instruction.

Dr. Henry, in person, was of middle stature, with a well proportioned and compactly built frame, and an air of commanding dignity. His head was large, and his brain well developed; his features were regular and handsome; his countenance noble and frank, and his whole face beamed with intelligence. He bore in his aspect the marks of his pedigree. His expansive forehead, his clear complexion, and his light hair proclaimed a German origin, while the dogged resolution which was compressed in his lips and

reflected from his eye betrayed the blood of the Cameronian and Covenanter. He inherited from both races the peculiarities of his mind, the fervid genius of the Scot and the patient industry of the German, united in a common zeal for the pursuits of philology and philosophy. His natural temper was irascible, but self-government was the study of his life. In his domestic relations he was a model of tenderness and affection. The most conspicuous feature of his character was his scrupulous regard to truth. He abhorred every appearance of prevarication and deceit, and no one could look upon his face without being impressed with his manly and noble ingenuousness. He could conceive of no circumstance under which a lie was admissible. The conventional evasion by which a visitor is turned from the door, under the plea of "not at home," he contemplated only with disgust. It is obviously an artifice of cowardice, to purchase an exemption from a disagreeable intrusion, without the risk or responsibility of offence. As to the pretext that it deceives no one, it may be confidently said that, if it does not deceive, it perplexes. The man is left in doubt; he knows not whether you are really from home, or only wish to be undisturbed by his company, and the effect is, that he must act upon the supposition of your absence, whether you were absent or not. He must *presume* the statement to be literally true, whatever reasons he may have for suspecting it to be false. The very design of the equivocation is to create this presumption, in order to avoid the imputation of rudeness. In morals, says Jeremy Taylor, our first thoughts are generally our best; and we suspect that no one ever employed this expedient for the first time without a violent shock to his moral sensibilities, and a forfeiture of something of his own self-respect.

We cannot conclude this memoir without adverting briefly to Dr. Henry's philosophical opinions. He had been, as we have seen, a pupil of Dr. Brown, and always retained an exalted estimate of Brown's metaphysical abilities. The general system of his master he cordially adopted. Reid's doctrine of an immediate perception of external objects he rejected, not by virtue of the principle that the relation of knowledge implies an analogy of existence, but because he was persuaded that the only facts given in consciousness were the successive changes in the states of our own being. The uniformity of these changes we were compelled to attribute to some permanent cause, but except as the unknown cause of known phenomena—an explanation which our constitution constrained us to receive as the only consistent explanation of a series of regular effects—he contended that we knew nothing of the existence or properties of matter. He was thus what Sir William Hamilton calls a cosmothetic idealist, or hypothetical realist. What Sir William Hamilton calls "the fact of consciousness in perception," he positively denied. The only difference betwixt these

views and those of Berkley, was the admission of a mysterious something as the cause of intellectual phenomena, independent of mind. The affinity betwixt the systems is obvious at a glance, and, next to Dr. Brown, the philosopher whom Dr. Henry most prized was the Bishop of Cloyne. We have often heard him say, that if he were compelled to adopt one side of the alternative, he would find it far easier to maintain the non-existence of matter than the non-existence of mind. Thought we know directly and immediately, while matter is known to us only in its relations to thought. In his academic teachings, he was accustomed to begin with Locke, as being the point of departure of most of the modern schools. He took the aspect of Locke's theory, though fully sensible of its imperfect development in the hands of its master, which led to idealism, and he was saved from the consequences which Berkley fairly deduced, only by an appeal to a primitive belief, which guaranteed a transcendent reality beyond the sphere of consciousness. The authority of our primary beliefs he accordingly concurred with the whole Scottish school in receiving, but he was not partial to the phraseology by which Reid expressed them, nor satisfied with the reduction he had made of them. Though an accomplished German scholar, and well versed in German literature, he had no taste for the German philosophers. His estimate of Kant was precisely that of Dugald Stewart, and as to Kant's successors, we do not believe that Dr. Henry could ever be induced to read a line of their writings.

In morals, though he excogitated a system of his own, and developed it with great ingenuity, the leading hints were suggested by his favourite authors, Berkley and Brown. Assuming as a postulate, that society was the natural state of man, and the well-being of society the end of law, he deduced his moral rules from the a priori consideration of its nature, and the conditions indispensable to its conservatism and security. They were, consequently, the products of the understanding, and not the dictates of an original and special faculty. In the development of his scheme, he subjected social relations to an analysis from which he inferred the necessity of three great laws, into which, he supposed, all our moral duties might be finally resolved—truth, justice, benevolence. Conscience he regarded as belonging exclusively to the emotional part of our nature, and as having no other office than to operate as a sanction in reference to the rules which the understanding had elicited. It was in no sense a law; it was simply a motive to enforce the law. Hence, he contended, that to speak of an enlightened conscience was absurd; the light was not in it, but in the understanding; it was nothing but the feeling of approbation or disapprobation, consequent upon the contemplation of our conduct as in conformity or otherwise with the rule whose authority we acknowledged. The feeling of approbation, prospectively

considered, was a sense of obligation; retrospectively considered, conviction of merit or ill desert—self-approbation or remorse. Moral truth, being the product of the understanding, from the contemplation of fixed and permanent relations, was itself immutable. The truth was *necessary*, if society were given, and no man could depart from it, upon any considerations whatever, without making himself an outlaw. Our duties to God he resolved, in the same way, into the personal relation we sustain to him. There was a species of society betwixt us. Communion was the highest form of religion, and communion was society intensified.

Such is a brief outline of the doctrine to which the students of the South Carolina College were inured for more than twenty years.

The death of Dr. Henry we regard as a great calamity to the college, not so much because it is deprived of his teachings, as deprived of his presence. The spectacle of a man of erudition is itself a stimulus to exertion. It operates powerfully on the young. They see what industry and application can accomplish, and have an example of successful effort. Besides this, they are led to perceive in what genuine scholarship consists. The distinction is kept before them between learning and pedantry—real merit and factitious pretension. Dr. Henry was on all hands confessed to be a man of extraordinary attainments. He walked the campus among able and learned professors, and all conspired to do him reverence; and, as he unfolded his stores before his pupils, the dullest were, for a moment, inspired with a gleam of literary ardour. We sincerely trust that his mantle may fall on worthy shoulders. It will take an Elisha to supply the place of Elijah.