

loving heart desire than that which is thus furnished under the veil of apostolic suggestion, not to say command, for the consecration on every Lord's day, of a fit proportion of the blessings of the just mercifully concluded week?

Does its injunction to accomplish a given object, *restrict its operation to that object*?—Granting that it was the best mode of making timely provision for one purpose, in a day of few demands, is it not alike the dictate of piety, humility, and common sense, *in the absence of any other rule*, to adopt it for the varied demands of a more active age? Do not men prize a rule the more when applied to a case? Why is this case not as good as any possible one? If 2 Cor. viii. and ix. teach us anything, is it not that beneficence is a divinely appointed and satisfactory evidence of piety, the real, though faint, imitation of Christ? Is not the connection of 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, with this, that of the best means to this end? Does not the doctrine of the one passage commend the rule of the other? *Will any one object to the rule of measure*, "As God hath prospered?" *How can they, then, justly object to the rule of time*, "On the first day of the week?"

The only valid objection to the rule of time would be impracticability, which it is far easier to assume than to prove concerning our own cases more than those of apostolic Christians. The more frequent the dedication, where really impracticable weekly, the more satisfactory every way. Surely the Christian, anxious to fulfil his sacred trust, instead of rejecting, will rejoice to practise a plan so commended and enforced, so simple and effective. If the inspired apostle enjoined it on the churches of Galatia and Corinth, can we safely claim their privileges while refusing compliance with this command? Is this less binding on us than on them? If this is not obligatory, what is? *If the Epistles addressed to ancient Christians impose any obligation on us, why not this obligation? If they impose no obligation, where is our charter of grace and privilege?*

The incidental introduction of this method is no valid objection to it. The rules of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20); of recognition of Christian brotherhood (Acts x. 34, 35, 47, 48); of abstinence for conscience' sake (Acts xv. 23-29); and of Church discipline (Matt. xviii. 15-19); are deemed of permanent and universal obligation. Some of these (as Acts x. 34, 35, and xv. 23-29) arose out of cases requiring instant consideration. Who demands their repetition for our use? Who declares them null and void? Does it savour of docility to discard as obsolete this sacred rule? Why is liberty taken here, more than with other Christian institutes?

To treat this method as a merely isolated suggestion for a special object, is to overlook its real import; for, with the exception of the grand doctrines of justification by faith, the priesthood of Christ, and the final resurrection, there is no such expanded argument as this in all the Pauline Epistles. It extends through verses 1-7 of 1 Cor. xvi., and 2 Cor. viii. and ix. Following up the grand doctrine of the resurrection, as its true application—"Therefore my beloved brethren," &c. (1 Cor. xv. 58); "Now concerning the collection," &c. (xvi. 1-7); "Moreover, brethren," &c. (2 Cor. viii. ix.)—the three passages form the proper complement of the whole subject. Is it supposable that such an elaborate argument of principles and motives for the practice of weekly offerings would have been left on record, if this plan had been intended as only a temporary expedient, and not as a permanent institute, especially when the occasion for the expedient was just terminating?—Does the All-wise Spirit thus give his lessons too late for use? Is it not far more probable that He rather gave them at this period to commend and perpetuate the practice on the highest grounds for all future objects, now that this object was terminating?

It is a significant fact, that non-episcopal ministers generally use for authority, in celebrating the Lord's Supper, the terms of institution found in 1 Cor. xi. 23-26. Who ever questions this authority? Is it, then, candid, is it honest, to insist on the obligation of the mode of commemorating the Saviour's love to us, on this authority, but to discard that of practising our love to Him, enjoined in the same epistle?

The exercises of the early Christian Church are described in Acts ii. 42—"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." This verse is regarded as a comprehensive summary of Christian life and worship. The word rendered "fellowship" occurs twenty times in the New Testament, and is thus used—"To communicate" (1 Heb. xiii. 16), "distribution" (2 Cor. ix. 13), "contribution" (Rom. xv. 26), "communion" (1 Cor. x. 16), and "fellowship" Acts ii. 42). *Contribution to Christian objects was an element and evidence of fellowship in spiritual life. Is it not equally so in our own day?*

An objector required the treatment of this subject in the form of a problem. He afterwards declared it proven, as far as reasoning can decide a moral question. The premises are—A most momentous duty is discovered; that is, to honour God with our property.—The best mode of its fulfilment is, in one particular branch, enjoined in a day of limited action. This mode is found, where fairly tried, equally suitable to ever-increasing