

rewarded for his pains; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope, i. e., of what he hoped for in threshing—namely to realize a good return for his toil.' Is it not carrying out the spirit of the Aposth's argument to say that they who go through the processes of spiritual husbandry—who plough and plant, who sow and thresh, should be similarly rewarded. "Which thing is an allegory"—as Paul in another connexion brings out. The meaning being that the spiritual equally with the material or even anin al laborer deserved to be rewarded; that if the plodding ox, pursuing its rounds of work, has its want supplied, surely they who are not weary in well-doing should reap in this sense even now, as hereafter in the higher, in due season they shall reap if they faint not. If the ploughman and the thresher feel the cheerful influence of hope, surely the laborer in the Lord's vineyard should not be bereft of it.

Nothing is more fitted to check and chill than the thought of unrequited toil. 'We are saved by hope from that melancholy and moping into which they must relapse, on whom rests from those they seek to benefit, no smile of recognition, no mark of grateful appreciation, no token for good. "Cheer him." "Cheer him" broke the stillness of the awe-stricken crowd that surrounded a burning house as they gazed on the heroic fireman who climbed a dizzy height to rescue the perishing. The crowd cheered and the faltering hero got fresh courage to complete his deed of noble daring. Thus should a people cheer those who are seeking to save the lost, trying to "save them, with fear pulling them out of the fire." A kindly nod, a gentle word, a warm handshake, a hearty prayer, or the giving of those things that are needful for the body invigorate and stimulate, while reticence and reserve, coolness and coarseness whenever practised, disappoint and paralyze. Do what in you lies then to make "him that plougheth plough in hope and him that thresheth thresh in hope."

III. *Common Equity* supplied the Apostle with his third argument, verse 11. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" Is there not here more than a *quid pro quo*? Should we not give and take? Does not the principle of common honesty, of commutative justice underlie our present contention. We impart to you in the ministry of the Word, one class of bene-

fits. It is surely fair and reasonable—therefore that what we should look from you for another class of benefits in return. All the more that what we give is spiritual or pertaining to our immortal while what we get belongs but to our mortal part. Is not the soul infinitely superior to the body, the spiritual to the carnal? Ministers are guides to show you the path of life. Is it not the least thing we can expect therefore that when engaged in doing so, their temporal life should be cared for. When, but for such laborers many a one would have to say "no one careth for my soul," is it a great thing that the bodies of those who watch for souls and seek to win them, should be cared for? Is it equitable or just to receive so much from them, yet impart so little to them? When they are ready to impart unto them not the Gospel of God only, but even their own souls, it is a great thing that their temporal wants be supplied? "Let it not be thought (as the author of the *Anxious Inquirer* well puts it) that what is given to a minister is a charitable donation. It is the payment of a just debt. It is what Christ claims for his faithful servants; and which cannot be withheld without robbery. I spurn for myself and my brethren the degrading apprehension that we are supported by charity. We are not clerical pensioners upon mere bounty. Our appeal is to justice and if our claims are denied upon this ground we refuse to plead before any other tribunal and refer the matter to the great Assize."

IV. The Apostle finds a fourth argument for Ministerial Support in what had become *common usage*. It was no new thing that was demanded. This giving of their substance to the support of the Gospel ministry was not an improper or unheard of innovation. The Corinthians had conceded it freely in the case of other laborers. He had as good a right as any of them. Nay, in consideration of his services and sufferings in their behalf he could put in a stronger plea. He might apply the reasoning employed on another theme, with the Philippians, "If any other man hath whereof he might construct a legitimate claim on their liberality and love." "I more;" "if others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather?" Have not we a better claim considering what we have done and suffered for you? Yet he had not advanced that claim. He had the right to a full maintenance from them. "Nevertheless we have not used this