

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Tholuck's View of the Right Way of Preaching.**

ALTHOUGH it is true that of late the churches are here and there somewhat better filled than formerly, especially where zealous preachers proclaim the Word, yet in many places we find them more and more deserted. The services of Sunday afternoon, and of the week day have been given up for want of hearers. Of entire classes, such as public officers, military and professional men, there is often seen only a single individual, like some relic of antiquity in the old cathedrals.

In numerous cities and villages, church attendance is almost wholly confined to the middle and lower classes. And even among these, many think it sufficient if they do not forbid the attendance of their wives and children. Unless there is a change, it will soon be the case in some sections of the country, that in our places of worship we shall find, as indeed on Sunday afternoons we now frequently do, only women and children, as was the case during the second century in the temples of Rome.

* This article is a translation, by an accomplished American lady, of *Counsels to the modern German Preacher*, being Dr. Tholuck's Preface to his second series of Sermons.

ART. V.—*The Trial Period in History.*

MAN was made in the image of his Maker,—a conscious, rational, and immortal being. This constitutes the vast difference between him and all the lower ranks of creation. With an upright will, he was yet capable of deflection, else he could not have fallen. He possessed affections that twined around the true and good, which, nevertheless, might turn and clasp the evil and the false; otherwise how could he be capable of trial. In this freedom lies the superiority of mind and conscience over matter and animal instinct.

This difference explains, too, the mastery of man over nature, and the progress of the race in science, civilization, and moral refinement. It also accounts for its mastery over him, when, falling into moral debasement, he is governed by appetite and passion, instead of reason.

“Two things overwhelm me,” said Kant,—“the star-sown deep of space, and right and wrong.” Of the two, the latter is far more sublime and appalling. The stars have no power of deflection from their normal course. The high capability of this in man is just that moral endowment in which the likeness to his Maker consists, and without which, improvement or deterioration would be impossible. In this primal fact of the divine likeness in man, lies the key to human history and a clew to human destiny.

This fearful possibility of wrong comes first into actual history, in what may be called *The Trial Period*.

But there meets us here the preliminary question of man's physical and intellectual status at the starting point. Three theories have found more or less acceptance.

First, a literal infancy, capable, by time and growth, of bodily and mental development and maturity.

Second, a physical maturity, but intellectual and moral savagism.

Third, a mental and moral, as well as physical completeness, in a fulness of faculties which nature and the divine tui-

tion brought into immediate use in the acquisition of knowledge, and the felicities of obedience and love.

Which, now, is the true theory? Not that of infantile weakness. For Eve, who could not have grown from infancy in the brief slumber of the man during which she was made, appeared in blooming womanhood, when, on waking, he welcomed her as his wife. So Adam, it would seem, was not created a babe, that by years and growth obtained maturity, but in the capability of acquiring knowledge, and with a full responsibility for rightly using it. All other parents being born, were once babes. But these first parents were not born and were never babes. Things that grow, reach perfection gradually. Those which are created, start normally in it, and may advance or retrograde. This seems to be a creative law. According to the testimony of geology, every species, however low, comes into being at the point of its own ideal as a species.

The theory of barbarism as the historic starting point, elaborated by Condorcet and espoused by Bunsen and others, is not supported either by facts or analogies. For although a cannibal savageism is the lowest stage of society, this is certainly no more an intimation that the human race commenced at that point, than the inebriation of a few adults is, that all men are born intoxicated. Cannibalism shows how low humanity has fallen, not its state at the commencement.

All barbarisms perpetuate and intensify themselves by a law as fixed as that of gravitation. They all are traceable, historically, as a degeneracy from something higher and better. No savageism, by its own force, ever emerges to civilization. Niebuhr affirms that there is not in all history a single instance of such emergence. Hence no essential advances are indigenous, but all come to it from without. These general facts perfectly harmonize with the sacred record, and help to settle this question of status at the commencement of history.

Swedenborg adopts a theory from the old Hindoo philosophy which combines the two—infancy and barbarism. He represents man as making his entrance into the world from an egg, incubated by the Supreme, on the branch of a tree. In due time the parturient branch rested its burden on a leafy couch.

When the term of gestation was completed, the infant broke through its bars into the waiting world. From this vegetable maternity he passed slowly through childhood and youth to a mute manhood. For several generations he and his descendants had only a vegetable respiration. Their only language was the inaudible movements of the lips with the gesticulations of the face and fingers, and their only hearing through the mouth and by the Eustachian tube.

But the vegetable kingdom, according to the best lights of science, holds no maternal relation to the animal, nor filial to the mineral. God, as Creator, is, indeed, man's Father; but nature is not his mother. And the birth of one kingdom or species from another is contradicted equally by the sacred record and the natural sciences.

From all the diverse theories of spontaneous generation, of transmutation, natural selection and development, the historical and scientific thought turns away more and more unsatisfied and dissatisfied, to the simple announcements of the divine Word: "So God created man in his own image." He starts thence, not as a philosopher, but with natural intuitions far better than inventions or mere tuitions. He possesses a rich mental and moral furniture, adequate both to the acquisition and the use of knowledge.

It is an extravagance to say with South, that "an Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam," though in some respects the Adam was better than the Aristotle. For it is not mere conjecture that the first type of humanity, the starting-point of history, was neither barbarism nor infancy, but the beginning of a high moral and religious civilization.

What is civilization if its elements are not found in this period? Here, at the very first, by admission of the philologists, is language sufficient in its social and zoologic use, for both science and society. Here is the marriage relation, in the purest and most sacred monogamy—a relation which barbarism always corrupts and which modern civilization does not entirely restore, or even preserve in its primitive purity. Here, in the care of the garden, is horticulture, with its hygienic and refining influence; and here is monotheism in its simple grandeur,—the central educating power of all that

is noble and true, of which polytheism, and pantheism, and fetichism are barbaric perversions. And here, too, is the Sabbath of rest,—a heart-worship of the Supreme by souls erect in good and in God's image, as yet unmarred.

Man's first great movement harmonizes with this view. It shows him to be a rational being and a subject of definite law. In the keeping and culture of the garden of which he was the sole human proprietor, there was the largest liberty of enjoyment. These first occupants of the fertile and blooming earth were full of loyalty to their sovereign and happiness in each other. But their loyalty was untried.

"This one, this easy charge of all the trees
In Paradise that bear delicious fruit,
So various, not to taste that only Tree
Of Knowledge, planted by the Tree of Life;—
So near grows death to life."

Perhaps it is God's ordinance that no finite virtue can be entirely firm and trustworthy till it has passed the ordeal of temptation. Certainly it cannot be heroic till it has fought with evil and conquered. The subjects of moral government cannot become conscious of their full loyal power till they have complied with prohibitory as well as requiratory law. Neither can they attain the highest development of their upright faculties and the greatest nobleness of character, but by shunning error and evil as well as by aspirations after the good and the true. Hence every wise ruler finds it necessary to include the disciplinary force of the prohibition of wrong with the requisition of right.

These fundamental principles were operative in Paradisiacal history, and give trial as the characteristic of this first movement. All the trees of the garden were permitted to its occupants except one. The fruit of that was forbidden, and under penalty: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The object of this discipline and of all wise prohibitory law, is the preservation of loyalty to truth and good, and the reinforcement of virtue by a more distinct consciousness of its worth. The positive command is the formulated moral principle. It is another of the uses of this prohibition, to illustrate

the liberty of will in finite agents, without which freedom they could not be the subjects of moral government.

“Many there be,” says Milton, “that complain of Divine Providence for suffering Adam to transgress. Foolish tongues! When God gave him reason, he gave him freedom to choose, for reason is but choosing; he had been else a mere artificial Adam.”

Here are some of the great principles of government, the seeds of history. And the simplicity, the apparent insignificance even of the form of the trial, instead of a stumbling-block, is a beautiful instance of that wisdom by which the weightiest results are often reached through means, to human reason, most inadequate and unfit. That this law was so simple, concise, and so perfectly intelligible, and that the consequences of disobedience were so explicitly stated, is a signal proof of Divine wisdom. Where great interests are staked on obedience, it is incompetency or despotism that leaves confusion or unnecessary complexity in legal enactments. This first statute is admirable in every quality of legislation.

Here, now, is the race introduced upon the world's great movements, in a dual unity; with their Maker for their Teacher, and the heavens and the earth for their illustrated text-books.

For a time they abide in obedience and felicity. But a dark scene soon opens. A new and disturbing agent makes his appearance. The third chapter of Genesis records a conversation between the new-made woman and a tempter in the form of the serpent. It indicates a rationality as real and palpable on the one side as the other,—inexperienced guilelessness assailed by malignant cunning and craftiness.

The term serpent, from *serpo*, to creep, very inadequately conveys the content of the Hebrew word, שֶׁפָּן. The former expresses only brute being, and the latter an investigating and shrewdly reasoning creature. The rational rules in the whole scene, and is the sole tempting force. A bold impeachment of the infinite Lawgiver, on the injustice and unreasonableness of his prohibitory enactment, opens the great trial.

The woman is taken very adroitly in the absence of her

more reasoning husband. A natural curiosity puts her on a venture.

“Let us divide our labors; thou where choice
Leads thee, or where most needs.

While I
In yonder spring of roses, intermixed
With myrtle, find what to redress till noon.”

In her conscious innocence, she feels more than equal to any temptation that might fall in her way :—

“Let us not, then, suspect our happy state,
Left so imperfect by the Maker wise,
As not secure to single or combined.”

But the tempter came. First she listens, then wavers. Can it be sin to know? Next, she wishes to be wiser, then, disbelieving, puts forth her hand to the forbidden tree.

The admission, at this point, of a third factor in history—a distinct, personal agent—is objected to by about all sceptical schools. The narrative is divided by some into fact and fiction, and by others, resolved into pure fancy. Others allegorize and find a moral with its machinery,—some great facts dressed in fable.

But what are the facts and what the fancies? On this, the objectors are not agreed. One party understands by the narrative, the lapse of man into some sort of evil; and another party his advancement in freedom up to true manhood. The prohibition, the garden, the trees, and a personal tempter are poetic drapery. What is the value of this criticism?

As the discoveries in natural science vindicate the historic character of the creative period in Genesis, so also do the principles of historical science discredit, with equal explicitness, the idea of allegoric machinery and poetic fancy in respect to the temptation and fall in this trial period.

The actual presence of sin and of death in the world, and hence their commencement somewhere, is one of the most patent events in history. And these two facts are clearly traceable to this first human pair. As sin, in its nature, is a transgression of order and law, it must have had its beginning in the infraction of command. This infraction supposes in man an antecedent condition of loyalty and of trial. It sup-

poses also a prohibitory law and circumstances of temptation, in harmony with this trial. And just this concurrence of particulars is found in the record in minute detail.

There is the garden, its geographic boundaries, its rivers, and its mineral treasures,—all historic verities. There are the many trees that are permitted, and among them, the tree of life, the sacramental symbol of primitive obedience and communion. There stands the forbidden tree, whose fruit, to the eaters, made it the tree of knowledge,—of good, sorrowfully, from a sense of its loss; and of evil, by its bitter experience. What more natural than this grouping of elements, and what more harmonious?

If this is not all veritable history, who shall tell where the history ends and the fiction begins? The garden,—who knows that it was not a real, but only a poetic, garden? And the trees,—what proof that they were only fancy and not real trees? The tempted,—was she not a veritable body-and-soul woman? Why, then, was not her tempter a veritable, personal instigator to evil?

Besides, tried by the highest literary and scientific tests, this providential record is accredited as an historical and not a poetic document. The writer has every appearance of a plain narrator of fundamental facts. No such writer mingles, confusedly, fiction with facts. If the serpent be resolved into an impersonal, mythical tempter, by the same rule, the tempted will fall into an impersonal, mythical woman. By the same logic, we must construe the prohibition and her disobedience into allegory. Then why not construe the creation of the race, the origin of moral government, and the Great Ruler himself,—all into allegory? For allegory, as well as history, demands of those who write it, harmony and self-consistency. This narrative must be one or the other; it cannot be both.

Upon these general principles, the inspired record vindicates itself in respect to the trial and fall of man, as thoroughly historic, both in its drift and detail. It is a simple and continuous narrative. It has not a single element of poetry, or sign of allegory or mythology. It is consistent with itself throughout, and with all subsequent history. And

it accounts for the origin of moral evil and death, to which, otherwise, we have no historical or ethieal clew.

Other important events make it evident that here comes into the movements of the world a third class of actors. The prince of these is called, in the Hebrew, Satan, and in the Greek, Diabolus, both expressing the same idea of tempter, adversary, a liar-in-wait. And because of his first appearance in human history in the guise of the serpent, John, the revelator, designates him as "the great dragon, that old serpent, the devil, and Satan." Christ, referring to his diabolical agency in the temptation, calls him "a murderer from the beginning, a liar, and the father of it."

In the later history, when the woman, which is the church, fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent, the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after her. "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus." Here, the ineradicable antagonism, which appears so early in history between these two representative personages, is seen to continue with unabated force in its later stages.

But what are the qualities of this new element which comes into history, as disclosed in the events immediately following? Crest-fallen shame, in the place of open-faced innocence; a patchwork of fig-leaves instead of the robes of heavenly purity; gloomy fear of him who, before, was the object of their reverent and joyous love. Then came black falsehood,—a schism of the soul from truth, assigning nakedness instead of guilt as a reason for this fear. The man meanly excuses himself by inculpating his wife, and wickedly reflecting on his Maker. She palliates her case by casting the blame on the serpent, the mover of all these schisms and seditions.

On the next page of the record the dark drama opens into what is still more tragic. The new element is not a mere atom, without links or length, but has continuity as a positive force in human nature. The schism between these first parents and their Maker, and also between themselves, extends to their children. Here lies the second born, a martyr, and there stands the eldest born, his murderer,—speedy harvest of that

first sad seed sowing. In the fratricidal son re-appears, and in bolder characters, the same scene of crimination, falsehood, and impugning of God's justice. How complete the separation of man from his fellow, in this separation from God, his Maker.

. But in this trial period, another character appears, whose influence also sweeps through the whole historic course. In the curse pronounced upon the serpent-tempter, God says to him,—“ I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

In this pre-announced hostility of these two parties, is given the cause and the programme of the conflicts of the ages. The introduction of a new representative personage—the seed of the woman, makes more clear and certain the personality of the serpent-tempter, who is confronted by him.

But who is this seed of the woman, thus introduced as the moral and historical opponent of the great tempter and deceiver?

Recall here the primal condition of man, in perfect harmony with himself and his Maker, as the key to the temptation and the fall. Then this degeneracy places itself in our hand as a clew to the regeneracy which follows. Notice also, that both these personages—the seed of the woman and the serpent-tempter—are presented under the law of pedigree. The lineage of the tempter is ethical only, an affinity of evil. Those are his children who do his works. The genealogy of the seed of the woman is both physical and moral. It commences with her who fell from her primeval loyalty and drew her husband along with her. It introduces the idea of a suffering, but finally conquering Messiah, an idea, which, like a thread of light, prophecy and history make more and more visible as the plan of Providence unfolds.

Here, then, among these trees of Paradise, opens the great drama of providence and history. The chief *dramatis personæ*, as now introduced, are the seed of the woman and the serpent-tempter. Two competing kingdoms take their rise here. Two antagonistic forces,—truth and error, freedom and oppression, order and anarchy, meet here, of which these per-

sonages are the respective leaders. Thus through the revolving ages, these two rival powers have been struggling for the mastery.

Now one seems to bear down every thing of truth and good. Then it is checked, and the other makes advances. To a spectator of this first deflection, coming so near the starting point, it might seem that all was lost. But a little star glimmers in the darkness,—a foretold seed of the woman, whose recuperative power is so far felt in the family of the first offenders, that religious worship is restored. One son, at least, and probably the parents, turn back to faith in God and loyalty to his government. The lost life of love is thus made to reflow in the veins of humanity and to vitalize again the course of history.

But what has Providence to do in this dramatic action? where is the sovereignty? where the plan? And to what do these dark beginnings tend? It will help us in seeking an answer to these questions, to glance at the factors which have now been brought into the historic arena. These are God, man, and the devil, or evil angels.

The construction of history will be theistic or pantheistic, colorless or Christian, according to the view taken of these three agents. On theistic principles, they are perfectly distinct, yet all act in the harmony of a divine plan, and according to the idea of a problem and progress in history.

The atheistic view entirely excludes the Supreme, and shuts out the possibility of a plan and rational history.

The pantheistic resolution of these factors into an eternally expanding and contracting substance, confuses every thing, and makes progress, except in a mere treadmill-movement, impossible. The effect and the cause are one. Being and non-being, something and nothing, are identical. Listen to one of these wise men out of the east.

“Mathematics,” says Oken, “is based on nothing. The eternal is the nothing of nature. Animals are men who never imagine, and men are the whole of mathematics. Theology is arithmetic personified. God is a rotary globe and there is no other form for him. The liver is the soul in a state of sleep; the brain is the soul active and awake. Circumspec-

tion and forethought appear to be the thoughts of bivalve mollusca and snails. Gazing upon a snail, one believes that he finds the prophesying goddess sitting upon a tripod; what majesty is in a creeping snail! what reflection! what earnestness! what timidity and yet what confidence!"

Such is the acme of the pantheistic philosophy, the sublimation of rarefied modern theologic science. It has its starting point in the infinite as the nothing of nature, and its goal in the anthropologic wisdom and majesty of a snail.

How simple and intelligible in comparison with this confusion, is the course of providence in history. And how welcome the relief which it brings from the inanities and platitudes of these heathenish speculations!

Of the three factors which appear in history, God as the divine, is supreme, the cause of all other causes and of all things. His agency is a perfect unit, and its characteristics, wisdom, justice, and love. He acts in and through his intelligent creatures, and yet they act with as much freedom as if they were the sole agents. All things transpire according to his providential plan, and also in harmony with the creature's liberty and accountability.

Moral evil came into the world not unforeseen or unprovided for. It came neither by God's direct agency, nor because he had not power to prevent it if wisdom and benevolence had dictated. Every possible plan was open before the sovereign ruler,—that in which good is universal, that, in which evil is universal, and that in which they mingle. He chose the last, and this is the actual course of history. We may not be able to see all the reasons for such a choice. But that does not invalidate the wisdom of it, or the benevolence of the plan. The evil comes in against prohibition and against right, else it would not be evil. It comes in by providential toleration, else it would not come at all.

If God could not have kept sin out of history, and if its absence were necessary to the best administration, he is not infinite, not adequate to the best system of moral government. But since its existence is a palpable fact, and it is one of the great forces, and the problem of history turns so much on its treatment, its permission points to some object that will in

the end vindicate the providential course as wise, and make history a complete theodicy.

The human factor is created and dependent, and falls into the rank of secondary causes. Ethically, it is either antagonistic to the sovereign factor, concurrent with it, or partly both. Since the lapse of man, the concurrence with the divine is the result of a recuperative providence, through the seed of the woman.

Only so far as the human will is brought into agreement with the divine, can the two agencies have a free and harmonious movement. And as this agreement is not absolute in the life of the best, while on earth, the human factor is here partly concurrent, and partly discordant—the discords in the history of good men vanishing more and more until they finally disappear in a complete and eternal harmony. Hence, the phenomenon of imperfection, of degrees in moral excellence, the triumph of good over evil in some, and that of evil over good in others.

Underneath all the forms of human agency, as opposed to fate, lies man's freedom. Of fatalism history knows nothing, for fate and providence are moral contradictions.

But what is freedom? Hegel defines it pantheistically, as self-sustained existence. It is its own object of attainment, its own law of development, and is under an absolute necessity of unfoldment. Hence, only the infinite and absolute is free. But since all is God, by this philosophy, all, in some stage, are free.

Historical, responsible freedom consists in the completeness of personality—the power of choosing and of refusing, as radical forms of moral conduct. This will-power is the indispensable condition of moral agency, the distinguishing feature of personality. The exercise of it constitutes the entire human part in history. All personal action must be free in order to be personal. This freedom is a primal part of God's image in man.

Hence, though man is a creature, he is, in a limited sense, a creator also. He originates his own thoughts, makes his own history, his character, and, to a certain extent, his destiny. Yet these human creations and this human history are subor-

dinate to the divine plan, and make a part of it. They are determined by providence, yet are perfectly free, and free because made to be so. To this freedom, which some call an illusion, consciousness bears the fullest testimony.

But there are some limiting impossibilities connected with this freedom of the human factor. It cannot detach itself from dependence on the Supreme Factor. It cannot withdraw itself from providential control, or subservience to the solving problems of history. It is limited by the finiteness of the human faculties. It can side with the good or the evil, but not with both at the same time. Nor can it stand neutral. The first deflectors from the primeval rectitude were free in their transgressions, and were moved to it by natural causes and influences. But when they had taken the step, and turned the historic course downward, a supernatural agency became necessary to turn it back again. Degeneracies come by the influence of natural laws and forces. But regeneracies spring from a power that is supernatural, that touches the will with a divine magnetism, that draws it back again to truth and good, in the fulness of its force and freedom.

Of the angels, the third class of factors, a part are loyal and a part disloyal. In respect to their origin, we have little or no definite information. But our knowledge of their existence is very clear, from what we know of their agency.

These angels had a beginning anterior to the creation of man; but how far anterior, we have no means of determining. Of those fallen from primitive holiness, one—the arch-traitor, by guile and falsehood, drew the progenitors of the human race from a regular development to a schismatic and degenerate one.

It is in connection with these apostate spirits that the problem of moral evil first meets us. Why was it permitted? Who was the first tempter? Or did the first sin come without temptation? What motive to evil could prevail over the tendency to good, where all was good? How could wills, erect in truth and right, and with the strength of original constitution, bend downward to error and wrong? These are metaphysical, rather than historical questions. Yet the providence which is in all human history, is also in this,

which is pre-human. The evil that starts here cannot be detached from that providence which rules everywhere. It makes a dark scene of the unfolding plan. It projects itself into the human course almost at the starting-point, and runs its tragic race through all the generations of mankind.

We cannot, with some, resolve this evil into only "the shady side of good," or a "vanishing negative," the mere "dust of progress." It is an appalling positive, and thus far, it is the dominant phase of history. The problem of suffering is easily solved by the presence of sin. But whence and why came this sin? From the moral freedom of the creature and that infinite permissive wisdom and benevolence which the true idea of theism involves, a wisdom and benevolence which the works of creation everywhere proclaim, and of which the written revelation is still more full and expressive.

The influence of the evil angels or spirits upon the destiny of man is most evident and positive. It has changed the whole course of history. To accomplish his purposes, the prince of these powers of the air darkens the understanding, perverts the judgment, debases the will, and sows the seeds of discontent and strife. He is not mortal, like men, nor eternal, like God: possessing superhuman power, he is not omnipotent; moving with spirit-speed, he is not omniscient. His power is limited by a threefold barrier; the finiteness of his own nature, the connection of cause and effect, and God's perfect control. Beyond any one of these he cannot take a single step.

Twisten portrays with a graphic pen, the characteristics of this peculiar personage:

"He possesses an understanding which misapprehends exactly that which is most worthy to be known, without which nothing can be understood in its true relations; a mind darkened, however deep it may penetrate, and however wide it may reach. Torn away from the centre of life, and never finding it in himself, he is necessarily unblest. Continually driven to the exterior world, from a sense of inward emptiness, yet with it, as with himself, in eternal contradiction; forever fleeing from God, yet never able to escape him; constantly laboring to frustrate his designs, yet always conscious of being obliged, in the end, to promote them. Instead of hope, a perpetual wavering between doubt and despair; instead of love, a powerless hatred against God, against his fellow-beings, and against himself."

Here are the three great factors of the providential course.—God, man, and the angels—with their characteristics and relations. One is purely wise and good; another is a mixture of good and evil; and a portion of the third is purely evil. The divine is always the dominant; the satanic ever the resistant. The human is partly with the one and partly with the other, with a providential movement, slow but sure, back from the starting-point of evil, through the coming conqueror, toward the triumph of the true, the beautiful, and the good.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, convened in the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, on Thursday, May 19th, at 11 A. M.

Being the first General Assembly of the re-united church its proceedings were regarded with extraordinary interest, not only on account of the magnitude, the new composition, and circumstances of the body, but on account of the many grave and delicate questions of readjustment and reconstruction to be decided by it.

According to the plan of re-union, as adopted, both Moderators of the bodies now united presided jointly, until the election of a new Moderator was effected—the Rev. Dr. Fowler preaching the sermon, and the Rev. Dr. Jacobus performing all other duties of the office. Dr. Fowler preached from Eph. iv. 4: “There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling.”

Among the many pertinent suggestions of this discourse, in regard to the best means of promoting the unity, purity, growth, and efficiency of the united church, we note one, which we trust will not be forgotten. He said:—

“*The great doctrines of grace are committed to our stewardship.* It devolves on us to keep and dispense them. Our Baptist brethren, who profess them, are occupied with the mode and subjects of baptism, and our Congregational brethren