

dedication, the consecration ! Now, there is dedication, there is consecration, both in Baptism and in the Lord's Supper. But is not the idea of God's covenant with us through his Son, or with his Son for us, and the primary design of sacraments as signifying our participation in the blessings of that covenant, too much in the background of our conceptions ? If we are to judge from the feelings with regard to the Lord's Supper with which many approach the sacred table, or which lead many to eschew approaching it at all, it is this bond, this pledge or engagement on man's side, that constitutes the essence of the whole matter. Might it not be kept more prominent in the teachings on this subject, that the Lord's Supper is the memorial of a covenant fulfilled, and a seal or pledge of the interest which every believer has in all its stipulated grace ?—that it signifies our receiving from God rather than our giving ? Our engaging, doubtless, too ; “our engaging to be the Lord's.” Yes ; but see the caution of the learned and pious compilers of our formularies in bringing this into their definition as a second idea, certainly not the first. They do not place it in the foreground ; something else is there. And in the order of men's thoughts, how important that this engagement or vow of ours keep its proper place ! Not the less sure thus, but only the more sure, to be an ingenuous consecration in purpose, and an effective one in act and fulfilment. For, thus, with what an inviting aspect would sacraments be clothed, instead of a repulsive and discouraging aspect ! Never will the soul bow in so deep and yet so joyful prostration at the shrine of duty, or set the seal so cordially to its vow of fealty to its heavenly Lord, as when this act of homage is associated with faith's recognition of the promise on God's own part, or when it looks first on the rich provisions of covenant grace, and is emboldened to appropriate these ; and *that* under circumstances so powerfully appealing to the heart's best affections, or over the memorials of an event which supplies the most constraining motives to love and obey.

One other point—while a few moments remain to us—would we advert to. We advocate a full Gospel. May not the Gospel be mutilated by doctrines being in effect ignored in the pulpit, though not denied ? Preachers, who yet claim to be reckoned evangelical—supposing themselves in this indeed to be only true to the design of a free Gospel—give little or no place in their teaching to the doctrine of sovereign grace. It is admitted that our Saviour preached eternal electing love, and that the Apostles embrace this in the Gospel testimony ; but it appears to be judged inexpedient to follow these precedents. The word must scarcely be let fall from our lips ; it is injurious to make any but the rarest reference to such a subject. It is of Paul's hard things which a wise teacher will put in shade. To any who are thus minded I should like to suggest the question : May not your philosophy, as well as your theology, be at fault ? Are we the judges as to what effect any part of the testimony of God committed to us may exert on the human mind ? He who revealed this truth surely best knows what is adapted to stir the soul to its depth, and stimulate its activities. And if neither Christ nor His Apostles concealed this part of the Gospel of grace, are we not taking too great a responsibility in standing between God and the souls of his creatures, withholding a part of his counsel which may be seen by the Divine Wisdom to be, in the hands of the Spirit, a power for good ? Such teachers say it is a discouraging doctrine. It naturally rouses such prejudices, and provokes such questionings, that our message from a God of love can only be hindered by it. But what if your supposed kindness to the Gospel hearer be cruelty ? May not