

## SPEECH ON FUSION WITH THE UNITED SYNOD.<sup>1</sup>

---

THE argument, Mr. Moderator, before the recent adjournment, was directed to the constitutionality of the proposed act of union, and to the propriety of connecting it with any declaration of principles other than the Confession. One main point remained, the discussion of which has been sundered from the others, I fear awkwardly, by the arrival of the hour of adjournment. It has been strongly asserted that, if it were prudent to accompany this act with any declaration of principles, this one prepared by your committee would be inadmissible, because faulty in itself. To this point I will now advert.

Much has been said of the *ambiguity* of the committee's propositions. Has not the attempt been made to verify this charge by those who make it, by their over-readiness to profess that *they* misunderstand it? Upon this easy way of supporting the charge, no document on earth could escape the reproach of being ambiguous. For what one has not been *misrepresented* by some captious persons? The question is, not whether an adverse ingenuity can *profess* some misunderstanding of the committee's meaning, but whether our words can be fairly *convicted* of being liable to it. Let the same just rule be extended to these propositions which the Confession, Chap. I., Sec. IX., asserts for the interpretation of the Scriptures, and we shall have no fear of their being misunderstood.

Much has also been said about the presumption of the attempt to construct on these points "a new creed," which was "virtually to supersede the Confession; and the supposed haste and rashness with which the attempt is said to have been made, is set in contrast with the laborious years spent by the Westminster Assembly. Now, in reply to this, there are two things to be

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper forms only the concluding part of Dr. Dabney's speech, but includes all that related to the doctrinal statements adopted by the committees of conference on the question of a union with the United Synod. The first part was not reported, though it would have been gratifying had the whole been preserved as a permanent record of the argument.

said. How do these objectors know how much of labor, time, correction and study were devoted by the committee to the preparation of these few paragraphs, which only profess to touch four points of doctrine? Next, they repudiate the purpose of making a "new creed," or any thing which was "virtually to supersede the Confession." They declare that their purpose was only to put forth a few statements to evince the cordial agreement of those who were supposed to have differed on these points. And for this modest, humble, specific, temporary purpose, I will still assert these sentences may answer, not perhaps absolutely well, but sufficiently well; nor will I lie under the charge of presumption in attempting to draw up a few such statements, the doing of which is obviously within the reach of any respectable Presbyterian minister, with due care, guided, as he would be, not only by the Scriptures, but by the Confession, and by a recent and exhaustive discussion of these points between New and Old School, which, after lasting thirty years, has ceased for want of new matter. Is it not time such a subject should be understood by all well-informed men?

Now, Mr. Moderator, I might fairly avail myself of the course pursued by the opponents of this report, to claim an *a priori* conclusion in its favor. After numerous and most confident objections and criticisms, outside the house and in print, they have not attempted on this floor, save in one brief form, to substantiate a single one of them in debate. There has been a silence and avoidance of this whole branch of the discussion. I might claim this as my prosecutors' *nolle prosequi*, as their tacit surrender of their charges, and thus demand of the Assembly a verdict in our favor. But I desire to press no technical advantage. Moreover, a memorial has been read *as a part of the argument* in this discussion from the respected Presbytery of South Carolina, which raises three points against our paper. As the other side have seen fit to bring them in this form into the house, I shall avail myself of the right to reply to them, giving thereby evidence of our readiness and ability to defend the whole.

1. The memorial objects to the words that this union is intended to "remove the dishonor done to religion by former separations." And the charge is here implied, elsewhere broadly stated, that we ask the Assembly, in adopting this language, to

repudiate and condemn, in a body, the glorious reforms and principles of 1837. Mr. Moderator, when Martin Van Buren, in his inaugural, closed by saying he should "endeavor to walk in the steps of his illustrious predecessors," his enemies—of whom he had even more than he deserved, bad as he was—by chopping off the "s" made him say, "his illustrious predecessor," and they then charged him with a disgusting sycophancy, in those words, to Andrew Jackson, to whose popularity he owed his election. This innocent phrase in the report of your committee has met with the same fate. The "s" has been dropped, and the phrase "former separation," which we never used, has been forced to mean the reform of 1837 itself, and our happy release from the corrupt elements of the Northern Church. Restore this phrase as we used it, and it becomes manifest that the reference is to all those causeless and mischievous divisions *in the South*, divisions of hearts, of churches, of schools, as of my native congregation, that of the sainted Wharey, of the College Church, the Richmond Church, the Union Seminary, and a multitude of other churches. Did not these dishonor religion? Did not the Old School Synods in the South declare that these separations here were not demanded by any vital difference of principle, and tenderly invite our New School brethren in the South to refrain from them as unnecessary? Was not some of the blame of them found on both sides? But, let this last question be answered as it may, I assert that, meeting our New School brethren for the purpose you sent us to them, a generous language of concession was the proper one to use. We met, not to apportion the several measures of guilt upon the culprits, and to avenge it, but to reconcile, to heal, to place that old guilt and its bitter consequences in the road to a happy oblivion. Men who meet for such a purpose, if they are sincere, will think it much more appropriate to assume a generous share of the blame of former divisions, than enviously to seek to seal it upon former opponents, whom they now profess to forgive.

But in fine, these words have illustrious precedents. They are borrowed almost verbatim from the act of union, 1758, between the Synods of New York and Philadelphia. Similar words were used again and again touching the very separations of 1837 by our greatest Old School fathers, and even by that Assembly itself. And that this Assembly, by adopting this act

of union with these words included, will not repudiate the reforms and principles of 1837, receives its crowning demonstration from this fact, that *the United Synod are here requested to join us upon emphatic assertion of every one of the principles which were then contended for, and which we now regard as of living value.*

2. The memorial which has been made a part of the argument against us, says that our statements touching the doctrine of "original sin" "savors of New School theology," because we "reject the error of those who assert that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty;" and because we say that the "fall has not destroyed in man any capacity of understanding or conscience" necessary to responsibility or to serving God. If we may conceive the meaning of these objections according to the abundant illustrations which have been given in the periodicals of that quarter of the church, their force lies against the words "powers" and "capacities," where we imply that fallen man still has some powers of some kind for the performance of duty, and then more definitely say that he retains those rational and moral capacities—so far as man unfallen had them, and so far as they are essential to free-agency and responsibility—which the fall greatly impaired, but did not destroy. The *gravamen* of the objection, then, is, that this language is, at least, incautious, in that it seems to teach that man's "inability" is not total, and that it revives the ill-expressed distinction between "natural" and "moral" "ability."

Now, is not this objection sufficiently met by the other sentences of the paragraph, which, in language borrowed from the Confession, and in other equivalent language also, assert again and again that man's "inability" *is* entire? But it is charged that the report is then convicted of inconsistency, because the word "power" and the word "ability" are equivalents; and thus some "ability" is granted in one sentence, while it is denied in another. Mr. Moderator, I emphatically deny that the two terms, in the well established usage of theology, have ever been equivalents. The persistent misrepresentation of the committee is founded only on a careless inattention. In the language of Calvinistic theology, the word *inability* has ever had a most sharply defined and specific meaning, as expressive of the lack only of one peculiar kind of power; thus, Hodge, *Outlines*, Chap.

XVIII., Ques. 13: "Ability consists in the power of the agent to change his own subjective state, to make himself prefer what he does not prefer, and to act in a given case in opposition to the coëxistent desires and preferences of the agent's own heart." The Confession of Faith, when utterly denying *ability* to fallen man, defines it as "*ability of will.*" But "*power*" has always, with even more uniformity, been used in the theology and dialectics in the widest and most general sense. Thus, Locke, Book II., Chap. XXI.: Power is "that which is able to *make* or to *receive any change,*" So wide and universal is the term, it has ever since the days of Aristotle been held to embrace "*passive power*"—a phrase which Reid even declared to be self-contradictory. By the established usage of dialectics, then, the word "power" is so broad as to include even *mere susceptibilities.*

When, therefore, Pelagians and Arminians charged, and weak, incautious Calvinists admitted, that our doctrine of inability denied to man *all power of any kind*—a phrase very common in controversy thirty years ago—both were in error. Your committee, therefore, have done well in repudiating the ignorant and unfortunate and false admission. When they thus tacitly claim for man some "*powers*" of some kind for the performance of duty, they do not contradict themselves or the Confession where they say man has no "*ability.*" A given *species* may be absent, and yet some of the *genus* present. Some one has indeed been so heedless as to assert that the committee are in explicit, verbal opposition to the Confession, and to claim the latter as saying in express words that the sinner has "no power" to truly serve God. Mr. Moderator, this is simply untrue; it is a sheer mistake. There is no such proposition within the lids of the book. The Westminster divines were too accurate as dialecticians to say so. They say of man that he is "unable," that he is wholly "disabled," that he is "made opposite unto," that he has "no ability of will." They never say he "has no power of any kind" for serving God. The sentence under discussion was taken by your committee from Dr. Baxter, as has been already explained. The reply was made, that then Dr. Baxter too was incautious. No, Mr. Moderator, it is his critics who are incautious. Dr. Baxter, one of the ablest of all theologians in America, knew what he was about. His language was chosen in exact ac-

cordance with the established usage of theological nomenclature.

Why, then, did he, why did we, introduce this sentence? The answer is obvious to those who are familiar with the New and Old School controversy. The former party revived the charge, as old as Pelagianism, that our doctrine of *total inability* contravened the rational and moral intuitions of man; because where there is absolutely no power for duty, there can be no responsibility. Do not gentlemen remember how uniformly this was the staple of heretical cavils? How they embarrassed weak minds with it? How it was the uniform lever with which they endeavored to turn the Calvinistic theology into an absolute monstrosity? Why, sir, *was* not this cavil the *staple* of every one of the four propositions which the leaders of that party demanded of us to insert into the doctrinal teachings of the Assembly of 1837? Now, we believe that if we and the United Synod are at one in belief, we have come to understand each other about this old "bone of contention." The task the committee had to do, then, was to express that agreement in terms sufficiently perspicuous to make it appear whether there was substantial *harmony*, and at the same time *soundness*. The phrase proposed by Edwards, "Man has no moral 'ability,' but has sufficient 'natural ability,'" was often used for this intent by orthodox men and in an orthodox sense. This has been fully admitted on the other side; and I will venture the assertion, that there is not a particle of real difference between the committee and a single gentleman on this floor as to *that sense* in which sound Calvinists were accustomed to use that bungling phrase. Yet the phrase has been generally disused by Calvinists as ambiguous and inaccurate. *Therefore the committee carefully avoided it.*

Now, the complete answer to the cavil, that the sinner's total inability would destroy his responsibility, is in the proper explanation of what inability is. And here, I repeat, I am persuaded there is not a particle of real difference between any gentlemen on this floor. All intelligent Calvinists understand very well that it consists, *not in the extinction* of any of the powers which constituted man the creature he was before Adam's fall, and which make up his essence as a religious being, but in the *thorough moral perversion* of them all. The soul's

essence is not destroyed by the fall; if it were, in any part, man's responsibility would be to that extent modified. But all his faculties and susceptibilities now have a decisive and uniform, a native and universal, a perpetual and total moral perversion, by reason of the utter revolt of his will from God and holiness to self-will and sin; such that it is impossible for him, in his own free will, to choose spiritual good for its own sake. His inability is "inability of will." This is the doctrine of Calvinists; and if it be pushed farther than this, so as to deny to man as fallen any of those natural powers, either active or passive, which constituted him a proper subject of religious responsibility, the effect is only disastrous. Man's reason is outraged, and the guilty conscience is furnished with a mischievous pretext for denying the voluntariness of its sin, and excusing its unbelief. This truth your committee have attempted briefly to express, and they are still persuaded they have done so with sufficient correctness, and in terms justified by good usage.

But it is objected that when the committee say, man still has all his rational and moral "capacities," impaired indeed, but not destroyed, by the fall, the word "capacities" is objectionable; and the illustration which this point of your memorialists has received in the public prints is, that the word is unauthorized by good usage, and is dangerous as suggesting the semi-Pelagian idea that man has not only the same powers which made up his essence before his fall, but the same *measures of power* in them all. It is asked, Why did not this committee satisfy itself with the word "faculties?"

I will show why. Man's essence is constituted—to borrow the old nomenclature—not only of active, but of passive powers. The word *faculties* corresponds only to the former; but the natural *susceptibilities* are as truly of man's essence, and some at least of them are necessary to his constitution as a religious being. Now, no one would think of calling the susceptibility of sympathy, of love, of the ludicrous, of the beautiful, a *faculty*. Yet without these, would not man cease to be man? To say that man still has the *faculties* which Adam had, impaired indeed, but not destroyed, does not, then, express the whole truth. The whole truth is, that he still has the *faculties and susceptibilities* "on which free agency and responsibility depend." The word "capacities" has been used by the best modern writers to

express just this double idea, in strict conformity with its etymology. Sir Wm. Hamilton, while proposing to limit the word to the sense of *susceptibilities*, acknowledges that he has no authority for doing so earlier than Leibnitz. Says Hodge in his *Outlines*, Chap. XIV., Ques. 1: "The soul of man is not an organized whole consisting of several parts, and therefore what we call its several faculties are rather the capacity of the agent for discharging successively or concurrently the several functions involved." Says Hill, p. 404: "This account of the corruption of human nature does not imply that man has lost the *natural capacity of knowing God*," etc. And again: "In every situation he appears *capable* of the sentiment of religion."

#### THE ATONEMENT.

3. The third point objected to is our brief statement of the doctrine of the atonement. And this has been assailed most vehemently of all. Say your memorialists, "We understand the report as representing Christ to be the substitute of all mankind alike." . . . "Thus, according to the Confession, the decree of election would seem to have, in the order of thought, preceded in the divine mind the redemption wrought out by the Saviour. But the report appears to us to teach, according to the New School view of the subject, that first, the redemption was decreed for all men alike, and then God elected some of these as the redeemed ones to be saved."

The illustration of these criticisms is, we believe, best to be found in the periodicals which have sustained them. In showing how unfounded they are, I would premise by saying that there is among Calvinists, among ourselves, a slight difference in the arrangement of some details concerning the atonement and its application; yet both classes have always recognized each other as holding the essentials of the doctrine of particular redemption. Thus your memorialists adjust those details in such an order as to represent a sequence of thought in the divine mind itself in forming the decree, and in this sequence place the predestination of the elect first, and the purpose to send Christ to redeem them second. Others, as Amyraut, with whom possibly a few of our brethren still hold, suppose such a sequence only in an inverted order: first, the purpose to send Christ to die for man, and then out of the race to sovereignly elect some, to whom this

universal provision should be applied in effectual calling. Now to us it is perfectly clear that the Confession commits itself to neither of these schemes, for the reason that, whatever be their correctness or incorrectness, they contain refinements which go beyond the word of God. I have been taught to think, along with Dr. Baxter, upon this subject of a sequence between the parts of the divine decree, that the human reason can go no farther than this: its infirmity constrains it to think of that vast plan in parts, which in the infinite mind of God has no parts, but is one, eternal, single, all-embracing purpose. So, in our minds, the apprehension of one part must follow after that of another part. But with God it *cannot be so*; for that which is one and eternal must be absolutely cotemporaneous. If, then, we impute our sequences to God, we plunge into error. The most we can comprehend is that God, in entertaining from eternity one part of this cotemporaneous purpose, has regard to a state of facts as to that part destined by him to result from his same purpose as to other parts of his moral government. I presume to go no farther. And this view I am pleased to find sanctioned by the powerful support of Principal Hill, when he says: "Hence it may be observed how idly they are employed who presume to settle the order of the divine decree, and how insignificant are the controversies upon this subject which in the days of our fathers divided those who were agreed as to the general principles of Calvinism."

Now we suppose that the Westminster divines were guided by precisely the same wise view in passing over in silence, as they certainly do, the question between supra and infra-lapsarians. And I regard the slight difference between your memorialists and the Westminster divines in precisely the same light. In stating that common basis of Calvinism, touching this doctrine of the atonement, upon which we should invite our brethren of the United Synod to meet us, was it proper to demand of them the admission of refined details, not agreed on among ourselves, not demanded by the Scriptures, nor by the Confession? To do so would have been preposterous and positively unjust. The aim of your committee, then, was to state, after the example of the Confession, those features of the doctrine which distinguish Calvinists hereupon from Arminians and the New England school, and to introduce sentences which should clearly and be-

yond a peradventure cut up by the root all the notions which reduce the atonement to a didactic display, a moral drama, an exemplary incident, or a governmental expedient. Hence, we either say, or expressly imply, that Christ was our substitute; that his sufferings were truly vicarious; that they were properly penal; that they were a true satisfaction to justice; that they were necessary to make pardon possible, consistently with the perfections of God. Is not this right?

But it is objected that the report suggests error concerning the application and extent of the atonement. On this subject there are two aspects which Calvinists have always distinguished. One regards the *nature* of the atonement; the other its *design*; and we all hold that, in its intrinsic nature, the atonement is infinite. This is the consequence of the infinite dignity of the Mediatorial Person. Its value is, intrinsically, as sufficient for the sins of all men as of one. Its limitation to the elect is not to be sought, then, in its nature, but in its design; and this design, as to its actual application to them, is nothing else than *the decree*. It is not something else, different and separate, but the decree itself. Now the section of our report under remark, in its first sentences, speaks of the *nature* of the atonement, and in its last of its application. In its first sentences it uses general terms, "man's guilt," "our sins," etc., for it is speaking only of the *nature* of Christ's atoning work, which has no limits. And in speaking thus, I claim that the report does but imitate the Scriptures—"God so loved *the world*," etc.; "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the *sins of the world*," etc.—and the Confession itself. Why, then, should it be charged with error for using the same sort of language which the Bible itself does in this connection? But when the report proceeds to speak of the application of redemption, it declares, as I assert, in exact accordance with the spirit of our standards, that God applies it to all the elect, and to no others; and that this application is itself through the purchase of Jesus Christ. We do not invent a statement to establish a supra-lapsarian order of sequence between the purpose to save the elect and to send Christ to die; but neither does the Confession. It merely declares that redemption is applied through this work of Christ precisely to those to whom it was God's eternal purpose to apply it; and that is, his elect. The report speaks the same thing.

Moreover, the committee used the word *redemption*, as they believe, in strict accordance with Calvinistic usage, in a sense distinct from the word *atonement*. Redemption means, not only a provision of a vicarious penalty to satisfy for guilt, but in addition all the gracious gifts, of active obedience to be imputed, of effectual calling, of sanctification, and of glorification, which make up a completed salvation. All this is designed, purchased, and bestowed for the elect in and through Christ. And in this view they may quote, among many Calvinistic authorities, this of old Willison, *Catechism*, Ques.: "How doth Christ *redeem* his people from their bondage?" Ans. "Partly by price, or purchase; partly by power, or conquest."

In a word, the committee intended to express summarily that sound, but not ultra, view of the atonement held by Calvinists, and expressed in the ancient *formula*, "Christ died sufficiently for the race, efficaciously for the elect."

But the member from New Orleans, Dr. Palmer, insists that the report is, to say the least, "not happily worded," in that its phraseology leaves a loop-hole for the lubricity of the new theology. Well, Mr. Moderator, I presume that the committee would at any time have partly assented to this judgment; for you will bear us witness that our estimate of our labors has been modest. We did not claim that our phraseology was absolutely the best, but only that *it would do*. We admitted that language is an instrument so flexible that an indefinite improvement may be made in the verbal dress of any thoughts by continued care and criticism. But, sir, the course of this discussion inclines me to place a more self-applauding estimate upon our humble labors; and I must profess that I think our doctrinal statements are rather happily worded on this point. I have been convinced of this by the very objections of the critics.

One of these was that the phrase, Christ bore his sufferings "*as* the penalty" of guilt, was loose and incorrect, because it suggested, by the little word *as*, not only a substitution of one person for another—Christ for the sinner—but of one penalty for another; whereas, it was urged, we should have taught that Christ suffered the identical penalty due the sinner. Thus, they complained, the deceitful errorist was enabled to cheat us honest folk by talking about a penal satisfaction for sin, when, after all, he only meant a loose sort of *quasi* satisfaction. Now I have

been made very happy to find that our much abused little "as" expresses so much truth and so accurately. For the substitution, not only of one person for another, but of one penalty for another, in the atoning transaction called by theologians satisfaction, *is the very thing asserted* by the standard authors. It is obvious that if one person is substituted for another, then the penalty substituted cannot be identical with that in the room of which it came, in the sense of a *numerical identity*, however absolutely conformed it might be in a generic identity. And this distinction the acute Whately points out, in the introduction to his *Logic*, if I remember aright, in connection with this very subject. But farther, these divines all assert most emphatically, that in a case of penal satisfaction there is not an absolute generic identity between the penalty due and the penalty substituted. Turretin, Hill, Dr. John H. Rice, I find saying, with entire unanimity, that *satisfaction* is where *something else, not exactly* the debt due, but a moral equivalent, is accepted as sufficient by the injured party. According to those acute critics, the *Southern Presbyterian* and *Southern Presbyterian Review*, little "as" suggested this idea. But this, say these great masters, is just the idea of Christ's satisfaction. Is not this rather happy?

Again: we had defended ourselves against the complaint by pleading that the phrase, bore these sufferings "as the penalty" of guilt, was so natural, so common, and so fairly understood in the orthodox sense. Now all this is substantiated by the fact that the member from New Orleans, even in the midst of a passage objecting to it, could not help using the very phrase. In the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, p. 298, he complains that our "slippery opponents," while pretending to use many words that sound orthodox, will not say that "the sufferings of Christ were inflicted *as* the penalty threatened to the transgressor," etc. This, then, is what he would have them say, in order to be indisputably orthodox. But this is just what our committee asks them to say.

On the other hand, the *Southern Presbyterian* says this is not enough; nor that they shall say Christ's sufferings were vicarious, or that they were substitutionary, or that they were a satisfaction for guilt, because they may say all these in a loose sense. No; he will not be entirely pleased unless they say in express words, without the "as," that Christ "*bore the penalty*" of guilt.

Well, we thought that this was lifting the standard pretty high, when we remembered that good old Dr. Alexander was accustomed to say, that he who admitted the atonement to be *vicarious*, was substantially sound on that point. But we looked a few lines downward, and perceived that our report, in the article on justification, also used those very words, and said expressly, without the "as," that Christ "bore the penalty" of guilt. Thus, our paper has been so happy as to satisfy both these most lynx-eyed sentinels of orthodoxy exactly, even in demands which are, in appearance, contradictory. The difference between themselves *they* must settle.

Once more, I am led to believe that our effort to make a brief statement of the substance of this doctrine is rather happy, by noting a remarkable conformity between its structure and the Canons of the great Synod of Dort, on the atonement, and the article in which the National French Synod at Alençon caused Amyraut and Testard to recant their rash speculations, and the Heidelberg *Catechism*, and indeed the standards of the Reformers generally. The Heidelberg *Catechism*, the symbol of the German Reformed Church, which our own Assembly embraced as the very pink of orthodoxy, uses language which goes farther than our report. So that, while we have stated the doctrine in accordance with the belief of the purest Reformed churches, we have been even more guarded than some of them. Thus, Ques. 37: "What dost thou believe when thou sayest, 'He suffered?'" (in the creed). Ans. "That he bore in his body and soul the wrath of God against *the sin of the universal human race*, during the whole period of his life which he passed in the earth, but especially in its end; so that by his passion, as the sole propitiatory sacrifice, he might deliver our body and soul from eternal damnation, and purchase for us the grace of God, righteousness and eternal life."

Mr. Moderator, I have now nearly said what I proposed to say, and shall stop. But I cannot sit down without an apology to this Assembly for my tediousness, and thanks for the patience and unmerited attention with which my protracted remarks have been received. If the manner of them has seemed to any too blunt or dogmatic, I beg them to believe that this is but an appearance, and that I am profoundly actuated by a sentiment of

reverence for this venerable body as a whole, and of affectionate respect for the rights and feelings of each member in it.

Nor can I reconcile it to my feelings to omit a reference to the kindness and courtesy expressed for me individually, in this discussion, by those who differ from me, notwithstanding that they are, some of them, zealously opposed to the conclusions I advocate. Especially I would notice the undeservedly flattering references of the gentleman from New Orleans. He has been pleased, after expressing a far more favorable estimate of my powers than I am entitled to, to add an earnest wish that they may not be wasted on mere polemics. I can most heartily say, amen! for I have no conscious fondness for that work. And if this kind wish means, as it seems to imply, a reference to the polemics which have recently been waged over this question in the periodicals, and intimates that they have been, in the estimation of that gentleman, *rather a poor affair*, it is not for me to dissent from his judgment. He has kindly declared his desire that the return of peace may speedily restore me to the great work of training the young ministers of our church for heralding redemption. This also is my prayer, for it is a blessed work. But there is another which is still nobler, and that is the work of preaching the gospel itself. I feel, therefore, that I am uttering for Dr. Palmer even a more ample and generous wish than he has expressed towards me, and one which I am persuaded is dearest to his heart, when I now pray that God may speedily restore peace to all our bleeding country, that the queen city of the South, which is his home, may soon be cleansed from the polluting steps of the invader, that our brother may soon reassemble that noble congregation which was wont to hang with such delight upon his teachings, and during long and prosperous years may minister to that great city the glorious gospel of the Saviour, until the fame of his genius, his sanctified eloquence, and his usefulness, is borne on the white wings of her imperial commerce to the ends of the earth. Meantime it will be my happiness to return to the quiet shades of Union Seminary, and gathering there, amidst the ragged fields of poor old battle-scared Virginia, a few of her maimed young soldiers with one arm or one leg, to teach them, in my plain way, to preach Christ.