

obligation of Tithes, amongst other reasons, upon its being not simply Mosaic, but given as a law most probably to Adam, certainly to Noah, and from him pervading all nations, not as a self-devised but divinely imposed law; and hence proceeds concerning its undying character thus:

"The reason is a plain one. The commands of God to men continue in force until they have been repealed by Him. On the contrary, when a new dispensation (the Jewish), to answer peculiar circumstances, was instituted by Him, He made this original command part and parcel of its constitution; He gave it a leading position in it, down to the latest prophet (Mal. iii. 8.) He insisted on it as most obligatory on His people, while not one of the prophets ever spoke of it as a temporary institution; by the mouth of His Son He continued still to assert His full claim to the observance of it (Matt. xxiii. 23), and thus handed it over in all its force and all its freshness to the Christian dispensation. Not one link is wanting in the chain of evidence which brings this precept from the days of its primitive appointment down to our own; not a shadow of pretence exists for asserting, that if it had ever been imposed by God, He had withdrawn its obligation, or suffered it to become obsolete from want of observance."

That our author reasons most correctly and unanswerably we feel assured. What then must be the guilt of Protestant Christendom for its so general neglect of this solemn duty; whereby God is dishonoured and the souls of men left to perish? Are not the insane divisions and the notorious worldliness of modern Protestantism the consequence of God's controversy with us, He having greatly withdrawn His Holy Spirit, indignant at the grovelling ingratitude and base selfishness with which we have "robbed" him?

Again Mr. Constable, proceeding to consider tithes even on the ground of their being a Jewish Ordinance, combats in a very masterly manner the common error, that Christians are under no obligation to consider Old Testament teaching, or Mosaic law as binding upon them. He clearly shows, on the contrary, that whatever God has once instituted must ever remain in force, unless it were fulfilled in the person of Christ, or distinctly abrogated by Him. Thus he says:

"Now neither in the New Testament—where, in all probability, every departure from Jewish practice has been noticed—nor in any part of the writings of the Old, has it ever been hinted, that in Christian times men were to cease to

honour God with their substance as His servants of previous times had done. If such an intimation can be pointed out, we will at once confess ourselves mistaken; but since none such can be shown, it plainly shows that the obligations of Christians are continued in all their force.

"Again, it is allowed that, even while the civil and ceremonial laws of Judaism do not bind Christians, its moral law is still as binding as ever. Now the giving of a Tenth was certainly a part of the Jewish moral law, and therefore it is in force with Christians. That the giving of a tenth was a moral duty to the Jews is of easy proof. It had nothing typical or ceremonial about it. In all times, both previous and subsequent to Judaism, the giving of some portion of man's substance to God was esteemed a moral duty; and when God in the Jewish dispensation, if not before, named a TENTH as His expected portion, then the gift of a tenth to Him became of moral obligation. *Thenceforward it could not be altered, except by the same authority that imposed it.*

"Every reason exists now, and exists even in greater force, for the giving of a tenth, which existed in Jewish times. God is still the Sovereign Lord of all, and therefore to be honoured by His creatures in those gifts which He has bestowed upon them. Man is still the recipient of blessings, and bound to show in some sensible manner his gratitude and love. The interests of religion are to be upheld in a world, which would quickly, if left to itself, turn aside from, and forget, and oppose, the truth. The widow, the orphan, and the destitute, are still amongst us,—recommended to us by that same God who gave them in charge to His ancient people. In one important respect the need of a tenth is more felt in the Christian than in the Jewish Church. The latter was not missionary in its character—its calling was merely to uphold the faith among the chosen people; while that of the Christian is to bear the name of Christ to every dark land of heathenism."

Our essayist thus forcibly states the deeper obligation of Christians, as compared with Jews, to abound in thoughtful liberality:

"It is surely not to be thought of for a moment that the time of God's displaying most fully His love to man is to be seized upon by the latter as the time for *diminishing* the expression of His gratitude; or the acknowledgments of God's sovereignty are to be less manifest when He has made us and ours doubly His own. If the elder and less prejudicial system honored God with the tenth" (we repeat, it was nearer a fourth at least) "of their substance, can it be imagined that we, so much more favoured, are to be left behind them in our gratitude?"

Concerning the Christian evidence of the continued obligation of, at least the law of tithe, he further thus ably argues: