

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 4.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXX.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD AS RELATED TO THE WORK OF REDEMPTION.

There are two great chains connecting man in his destiny with eternity and with God. One is the chain of God's providence; the other is the chain of Christ's redemption. It might at first appear difficult to decide which of these, considered in itself and apart from its relations to the other, affords matter of more profound and interesting inquiry.

How wonderful, for instance, is the chain of divine providence, as, taking its origin in the depth of the eternal purposes of God, and interweaving itself with all the details of human history, it forges its successive links in the midst of the rise and fall of empires, the growth and decay of civilisations, and the revolutions and dismemberments of states, presenting to us the finger of God in every event of history, from the falling of a sparrow to the overthrow of a kingdom or the extinction of a world.

How wonderful, on the other hand, is the chain of redemption, which takes its rise in the depth of the same unfathomable eternity, which we may trace backward link by link to the same deep counsels of the same unchanging Jehovah; and

VOL. XXI., NO. 4.—1.

intelligent and influential adherents; to discard it from the Syllabus is to withdraw with her own hand that which has been her principal prop with the vulgar and uninformed. Let her hug either horn of the dilemma, and the result must be to the weakening of her authority, and to the furtherance of the gospel of Christ.

Under these circumstances, how urgent is the call upon the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ to arise and gird herself afresh for the issues that are freshly springing upon her. The harvest-field was never so wide before. The grain was never more white for the sickle. Will the Church enter in and reap? This is the question of questions to-day.

---

ARTICLE II.

GIVING, AN ESSENTIAL PART OF TRUE PIETY.

Contributions to the cause of God is a subject on which the views and more especially the practice of the Church are still far below the truth. It is no new theme. It has been a matter of revelation and instruction, plain, full, and explicit, for many ages. Latterly it has been largely and ably discussed in our land. This discussion has done good. It has placed this claim on its true grounds; vindicated it from many wrong notions long and widely cherished; and assigned it its rightful position in religion. We think the conscience of the Church has been enlightened and quickened. A real advance has been made—measured not indeed by the greatly increased amount given, but by the improved tone pervading the appeals from our ministers and church courts, and by the spirit with which many of our people respond. Many, however, seem to be still in the dark, or at least unmoved by this increased light, and we all need to have our convictions strengthened. The practical side of this subject impinges upon a hard mass of covetousness which is al-

most impenetrable. "A continual dropping" seems necessary to wear away this rock, whose *strata* underlie even the Church of God, and crop out here and there in every section of its extended territory. It is the hope of aiding somewhat this slow but wholesome process that induces us to offer the following thoughts, not as original, but as partially reproducing what inspiration has taught on this subject and what Christian learning has explained. Real progress on this, as on every other topic of revealed truth and duty, consists not in going forward to novelties, but in going back to the "old paths"—in learning truly and correctly what God's ancient "law and testimony" teach.

With the Bible before us, it seems remarkable how the duty of giving has come to occupy in the minds of the Church a secondary, almost a secular position. The grand service which modern inquiry and discussion have rendered, and it cannot well be overestimated, consists in showing that giving to God's cause is not a mere incidental but an essential part of true religion—not the mere scaffolding, but a constituent part of the building; and that, while it has a secular aspect, and is often a mere act of the flesh, yet in its required motive and spirit it is an important element in the most spiritual piety. Paul repeatedly calls it *a grace*—by which he evidently places it side by side with faith, repentance, and love to God. Equally with these it is a divine gift—the fruit of a supernatural operation. The disposition and ability to perform this act aright is never natural nor acquired from any human source. It is a result of divine grace in the soul. Probably there does not exist a more conclusive proof of the reality and power of such a spiritual operation in the soul of man by which the strongest tendencies of the natural mind are reversed. Human nature, in some instances, does exhibit noble impulses and generous emotions; but Christian giving, in the religiousness of its motives, is as far above human nature as is the exercise of living, purifying, and saving faith. It is such giving alone that God requires or will accept. So that the same view which elevates this duty to such a high rank distinguishes it widely from much that bears its

name, but only a slight resemblance to its real character. When we learn the real nature of this grace, we have no difficulty in locating its exercise amongst the most sacred services of religion.

Practical religion, in its largest sense, exhibits itself under three leading forms of action, based on the several relations we bear to God. 1. Worship. 2. The discharge of a responsibility. 3. The response of love and gratitude for redeeming mercy. If giving to God's cause is embraced under either one of these forms, it is clearly both a legitimate and an essential part of practical religion. But it is embraced under each one of them, not only as allowing but as requiring it.

1. *Giving to God's cause is an act of divine worship.* The worship of God, in its essence, is the rendering to him the due homage of the heart—its reverence, adoration, love, gratitude, faith, submission. Evidently it must be sincere, supreme, and in accordance with the divine will. We can conceive of such homage apart from all forms, whether of word or act. But God's glory and our nature render outward and formal expression necessary; and such is as distinctly required as the inward feeling. Nor are the forms optional with us. Too much depends on the character of these forms, both as to their fitness to express and cultivate heartfelt devotion, and as to their appropriateness to God's nature, to justify the leaving of such a question to our choice. With all the restrictions which God has imposed, man has continually sought to degrade and corrupt his worship. But whatever may be the grounds upon which God has done it, it is perfectly clear that he has explicitly prescribed the forms in which he is to be worshipped. These include *praise*, by which, in sacred song and otherwise, his glorious attributes, word, and works, are celebrated; *confession of sin*, in acknowledgment of his authority over us as Ruler and Judge; *prayer*, by which we make known our wants to him and supplicate their supply; and also the *offering* to him of due parts of our material substance. These offerings are tributes to him as Creator, Proprietor, Preserver, and Benefactor. We thereby confess him as the author and owner of all we have,

our entire dependence on him, and our fealty to him as our Lord. The fitness of this is apparent to all. Subjects readily pay tribute to their kings, and conquered provinces are invariably required to make similar acknowledgments to their conquerors. This may to some appear derogatory to the spirituality and all-sufficiency of God. But God is to be worshipped by beings who have bodies and material possessions; and though "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," it is necessary that such a being as man should express his devout affections by voluntarily and submissively giving back to God a part of what he has received from his hands. There is indeed something wonderful in the fact that Jehovah, who is a spirit, who is invisible and intangible, who has no wants, and who cannot be benefited by our gifts whether small or great, should nevertheless require to be worshipped by the contribution of perishable and inferior forms of matter out of our little store. Yet it is nevertheless so, and a full explanation of it is found in his condescension to our weakness and meanness. He has simply adapted his worship to our constitution and condition. We doubt not this method of worship was required and practised before the fall—it may be in beautiful and fragrant offerings from the bowers of Eden. It was certainly embodied in the sacrifices which began immediately after the fall, formed a conspicuous part of the patriarchal worship, and was most extensively incorporated in the ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation. Very true they were instructive and typical of the great atonement, and that this was their chief signification and design. But they were no less gifts to God. They were brought from the flocks and herds of the people, were contributions from their property, and were given up to be slain and burnt or consumed by the priests, at God's express command. They all had their value to their original owners, and the giving them, however cheerfully done, involved more or less self-denial. Had they kept them from God, they could have used them on their tables or sold them for money. And yet the offering these sacrifices formed the most solemn and impressive parts of the holy worship of God, in which not only the offering priest, but the giver

of the victim, acted an important part, expressive of his devout affections. As he parted with his lamb or heifer, if a true worshipper, he exercised the grace of submission to God's requirements; and as he saw it consumed on the altar, with the ascending flame and smoke arose the ardent love, the humble reverence, and the self-consecrating devotion of his heart to him to whom he already owed everything, and who would in due time himself provide the great and efficacious sacrifice for sin. What could more truly deserve the name of worship than this? Could the swelling melody of song, could the most imposing forms of uttered prayer, could any combination of most solemn rites, convey to Jehovah a more fitting or ample expression of devout homage?

But God required of the Jews many other offerings, not of a strictly sacrificial character, and not liable to have their meaning as gifts lost sight of in view of their grand typical signification, such as thank-offerings, peace-offerings, the first-fruits of their increase of all kinds, and tithes. The amount or proportion of many of these gifts was fixed by divine appointment; of others, left to the liberality of the offerer. One fact applies to them all—they were gifts to God. They were all appropriated to the maintenance of divine worship. When properly given, they were as truly devotional tributes as were the sacrifices of slain beasts. They were the formal expression of love, gratitude, reverence, and submission to God. These offerings were brought to God's temple and to his priests, and mingled with the vocal praises and prayers which ascended to God in the holy place. Hence these gifts had all the essential features of divine worship. When, therefore, the primitive Christians, who were mostly converted Jews, were told by Paul to "do good and *communicate*, for with *such sacrifices* God is well pleased," and that the gifts sent to him, as God's servant, were a "*sacrifice* acceptable and well pleasing to God;" and when they were directed by him "to lay by in store on the first day of the week, (or the Lord's day,) as the Lord had prospered them" in view of a collection for God's saints, they would readily understand that, while the offerings under the new dispensation differed ma-

terially in form from those which the Mosaic law required, they nevertheless were still gifts to God, and were as truly a part of his holy worship. We doubt not that they made all their contributions with devout reverence, in the spirit of prayer and praise. It is to be deeply lamented that this duty has fallen, in the spirit and practice of the Church, so far below its true original position, that it is degraded by many to the level of a mere financial transaction, or of mere almsgiving, and that it is treated often with levity. If it be not of the nature of a gift to God, then it forms no part of worship, and ought to have no place in the sacred services of the sanctuary; but if it be of that nature, then we should cast in our contributions as with the solemnity and devoutness of prayer. It is the affectation of spirituality, if it be not the blindness or the hypocrisy of an intense covetousness that would exclude all handling or even mention of money from God's house as profane. God's command, a holy motive, a purpose to express supreme love, devotion, and gratitude to Jehovah, a desire to honor him with our substance, and to aid in spreading the glory of his name and the power of his gospel, are certainly enough to sanctify our temporal gifts when laid upon the altar. The real secret of this objection is an unwillingness to sacrifice the god of a base idolatry to a God who is only professedly worshipped.

It follows from the foregoing conclusions that it is at least eminently expedient and appropriate to incorporate this religious giving with the other parts of public worship. The recommendation of Paul to the Corinthians "to lay by in store, upon the first day of the week," while it does not specifically order a *collection* on that day, does direct the setting aside from other property *then* the proportion which God claims, and thus the virtual giving of it to his cause. It is thus made a proper part of the observance of the Sabbath; and as it is worship, the conclusion seems inevitable that the apostle meant to recommend, if not to enjoin, the including of this act in the regular services of the Lord's day. Certainly the practice is in every way appropriate and promotive of the faithful discharge of this great duty. We can best honor God with our substance while our

hearts are under the sacred influences of his day and house. While drawing near to him, in the attitude of devout contemplation of his person and character, under the teachings of his word, we are most deeply impressed by his claims and most apt to respond to them. While we praise him in song and in the adorations of the public prayer, we are certainly most likely to glorify him by the sacrifices which we may bring from our worldly store. While we enjoy communion with him, holy, and sweet, and endearing, and feed on his precious gospel, and repose our weary hearts on the rich promises of his grace, and draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation, surely we shall most freely and cheerfully and faithfully render a return of a part of our temporal possessions. And when are we so likely to give to God a proportion of what he has given us, as while beseeching him for blessings which our souls need and no other can give? If there be any virtue in the associations of time, place, and employment, especially of the mind and heart, there can be no comparison between the advantage of giving to God amidst the scenes of his worship and of giving at our places of daily toil or in our homes, surrounded by the influences of this world.

2. *Giving to God's cause is the discharge of a responsibility, which is a second form of practical religion.* It is all-important to put this matter on its true footing. While men regard religious giving as mere charity, and thus as appealing to a mere emotional sentiment, not only will they give far less than they ought, but their gifts will entirely fail of divine acceptance. Humanity, sympathy, generosity, are not religion, however included in it and promoted by it, and however excellent in themselves. Unless our charities to man are dictated by piety toward God, they are not approved by God even as charities. All true virtue lies in conformity with the divine will. But preëminently the gifts offered to God for his cause must spring from a sense of *duty*. We are to give because God requires it. It has already been shown how explicitly and how largely he required contributions from his ancient people for the maintenance of religion in the sacrifices and services of his worship.



The forms of worship are changed, but not the essentials. It still requires suitable sanctuaries, with their necessary appointments, and an order of men to conduct its services and impart instruction; and these must be provided and sustained by the gifts of the people. In addition to this, while the costly furniture and the expensive ritual of the temple are substituted by the simple sanctuaries and the unadorned rites of the Christian dispensation, God has devolved upon his people the grand undertaking of preaching the gospel to every creature, and of converting this whole earth into one glorious temple, to be filled with devout Christian worshippers, bringing their spiritual sacrifices from the four quarters of the world, and speaking and singing his praise in all the various dialects of the human tongue.

There can be no doubt in regard to the obligation which God has imposed. He certainly requires, "Honor the Lord with thy substance and the first fruits of all thine increase." "Whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." "Freely ye have received, freely give." "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is impossible to obey these commands without contributing of our money, according to our ability, to promote the cause and glory of God. But it is too late in the day to offer an argument to prove this position. And yet does the Church regard religious giving as an *imperative duty*? Look at the immense number of blanks in her statistics of benevolent contributions, and the vastly greater number of church-members, represented by these blanks, who give nothing to the cause of God in carrying forward his work! If it were known and felt that religious giving, being commanded by God, is just as binding as the duty of remembering the Sabbath day to keep it holy, and of honoring father and mother, and that withholding these required gifts is as *really* sinful as bearing false witness against our neighbor or taking God's name in vain, could these church-members continue to neglect this duty? It seems impossible. It is all important, then, that the conscience of the Church be thoroughly enlightened on this subject, that they be delivered from this sin. The Scriptures also plainly teach that what God has given to his servants is

not an absolute gift, but a literal *trust*. He gives worldly substance with the command, "Occupy till I come." He makes them stewards of his (their Lord's) money; and he calls upon them to use it in executing the expensive commission of discipling all nations. To keep back from these uses even a part of what God requires them to appropriate thus, is nothing less than a breach of trust—an embezzlement—a fraud; it is robbing God. There is no discretion given in this matter, except as to the mere circumstantials. We have no option as to whether we shall use God's money as he requires or as we wish. The responsibility is plain and fixed. We must discharge it faithfully or incur dreadful guilt. It will not do to confess failure and then content ourselves with including it in the mass of failures of which all are guilty. When a man deliberately and systematically refuses to respond to God's calls for a due proportion of his means, it is not a mere inadvertence or infirmity. It is persistence in a wrong. It is plain rebellion. When a man has money for ostentation and indulgence for the world for his family to waste, and for the gratification of self, and none or only a pittance for God, he may call himself a Christian, but he is an idolater. It is time that the delusion which has prevailed so long and so widely in the Church on this plain practical subject, were thoroughly exposed; and the truth, however trying and painful, distinctly understood and recognised.

But this responsibility is not discharged by bare giving. There must be giving according as God has prospered us. How much shall we give? is a question often asked as well by the cheerful as by the grudging giver—by the one to learn the real extent of his duty, and by the other to ascertain the *minimum* with which he can be released from an unwelcome claim. In both cases the demand seems to be for the answer of a definite sum or a definite proportion. And yet we are not authorised to give such an answer. No doubt the exact sum due from each one is fixed in the divine mind. But God does not in his word, nor by any other medium, communicate to each one what that sum is. Even the law of tithes was not such a revelation of duty. That law covered only a part of the contributions of the

people. They were also to make voluntary gifts, undetermined in amount, as expressions of gratitude. There was a broad margin for the exercise of pious affections. Many indications are given in the scriptural history to show that the Jews, as a general thing, were liberal in their religious gifts. And yet it is computed that, apart from these free-will offerings, the aggregate of their assessments amounted to one-fifth, at least, of their income. We mention these facts not by way of setting up a general rule, but to show what God has required when he has undertaken to lay an assessment. They certainly throw important light upon this practical question. Still we are not authorised to affirm that every man is bound to give one-fifth or even one-tenth. Some have adopted the rule of tithes, and thus settled the question for themselves; and yet we are not sure that they have in all cases settled it correctly. Baxter very justly says: "A tenth part of their entire income is too much for some and much too little for others; but for the most part it is, I think, as likely a proportion as it is fit for another to prescribe in particular." It is plain he does not mean a tenth after deducting personal and family expenses, but a tenth of our whole income. For he adds, "after such provision is deducted, it is far more than a tenth, if not all, that must be given."

The fact is, God has evidently given us a different rule under the Christian economy—a rule based upon general principles, appealing to the sentiments of the pious heart, and thus leaving the matter of amount and proportion to the convictions and promptings of each Christian, under the instructions of his word and the calls of benevolence and piety. This rule, indeed, is capable of being abused by multitudes wearing the Christian name, who, because they are left to their own judgment and feelings, content themselves with giving the smallest sums compatible with decency. But, on the other hand, it ennobles the gifts of the truly pious, gives them a higher value in the sight of God, and we doubt not also greater efficiency as means of usefulness. We should certainly regard, in our estimate of the real worth of religious gifts, the principle and motive infinitely more than the mere amount. The latter, however, it should be

remembered, all things considered, is a fair criterion of fidelity and benevolence.

This leads us to consider—

8. Giving as the *response of love and gratitude for redeeming mercy*. It was all this indeed to the pious Jew. He felt the claims of divine goodness, not only in the increase of his fields and flocks; not only in the great deliverance which made Israel a people, and the many subsequent deliverances which preserved them from extinction; but, above all, in the provision of redemption from sin through a promised Messiah. As he experienced a sense of pardon through the blood typified by his sacrifices, he freely gave himself and his all to God. But as the gospel was then but dimly revealed, as the Church was coextensive with the nation and identified with it, and as the peculiar arrangements of the ancient ritual required it, God gave to the Jews a fixed law of contributions. This, too, no doubt helped to prepare his Church for the freer method of the New Testament. He now lays no tax, but appeals to the hearts of his blood-bought people. He throws every interest of his spiritual kingdom, every enterprise connected with his glory, and every claim of a world perishing in sin, unreservedly upon their affections and convictions of obligation. If this plan fails, then all these interests fail, so far as they are connected with the employment of pecuniary means. If his people refuse to give, he will not compel them. He has provided no alternative. He will use no other expedients for supplying his ecclesiastical treasury. He has staked his whole cause on earth, so far as instrumentality goes, upon the love and gratitude of his redeemed people. The Lord loveth the cheerful giver; no other will he even tolerate.

This would seem to risk these precious interests upon a basis too uncertain. Human wisdom would have preferred a tax or perhaps an endowment. But God proceeded in this matter as he did with regard to the whole matter of personal holiness and good works. He saves his people by grace without works—before works—relying upon the fact that a salvation given without works as a consideration, is most sure to be followed by works

as the heartfelt expression of grateful love. He knew that hypocrites would turn this grace into licentiousness; but **this** was no argument with him against a plan which would glorify himself by ennobling the hearts and lives of his true beneficiaries.

But has the result justified this method? We believe it has; and yet we are constrained to admit and to lament that the Church has, as a body, failed to rise to the full height of **this** great argument. Why is this? It is easy to account for it on the same grounds which explain all instances of unfaithfulness and imperfections in Christians. But we are satisfied that there is a specific cause for this particular failure. The appeal for religious gifts is not put as distinctly and as strongly as it ought to be upon the divine claim for redeeming mercy. The claim is indeed recognised; but the connexion which our giving has with the cross of Jesus Christ seems to be remoter and feebler than that of any other of our religious habits. The view is too much confined to other aspects of this duty. We need to look at it more intently as the claim of redeeming love. We need to bring our offerings to Calvary and lay them down at Jesus' feet, in full view of his dying agonies, and with hearts full of the impressions of his amazing love—fresh with the recollections of our utter ruin by sin and overflowing with thankfulness to him who gave himself for us. Here is the place to learn our duty, to determine the question, "How much owest thou unto thy Lord?" and to bring our dull selfish hearts to the exercise of a true Christian gratitude. Let us regard Christ as the author and Christ as the ground and motive of all these appeals.

It is mortifying to see how this plain scriptural view of the subject seems to be ignored by thousands in the Church, who appear to regard the calls of religious benevolence as originating with the church officers or the church courts, or as coming only from man. If asked to give to Christ's poor, they either refuse or give an *alms*—not remembering Christ's words, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." If asked to contribute to spread the gospel, they complain of the unceasing calls of those who are taking the

only possible method of obeying the parting command of Christ, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature"—to obey which is just as obligatory on them as on the ministry or the courts of the Church, and in obeying which the very least they can do is to give their money. If asked to aid in the education of candidates for the ministry, they are ready to complain of such demands, as if these candidates were paupers burdening the Church, and not the gifts to the Church from the ascended Saviour, in answer to the prayer for laborers to be sent into the harvest. And so with regard to all calls. The prevalent feeling is that they are called upon by persons having no claim upon them, rather than by their divine Lord, through his constituted agencies in the Church. No sooner are such calls made from the pulpit or by a deacon in private, than such persons throw themselves into an attitude of self-defence, if not of actual hostility, as if an injustice or fraud or some imposition were attempted, and either *protect themselves* and their pockets by a bold refusal or a mere evasion, or else, if they give, cherish the feeling that they have incurred a loss or submitted to a wrong. To hear the replies given to such appeals one would suppose that the whole burden of sustaining and propagating the gospel devolved exclusively upon the church officers, courts, and committees, who have the direction of these enterprises; or rather that they were levying oppressive taxes upon the membership to furnish them a living; that the private members have no responsibility in the matter; that the *great commission* was not given to them; that they were never bought by the Saviour's blood, but are still *their own*, to live for themselves and their children; in a word, that they are a different party and interest from Christ and his Church; and hence that it is an unwarrantable as well as an offensive impertinence to require their coöperation in bearing these burdens, or rather in carrying forward these glorious and divine enterprises. No one will deny the wide prevalence of this feeling. Now, we charge that the ministry and deaconship have yielded too much and too long to this grossly erroneous and sinful feeling. We do not counsel severity, nor harshness, nor dictation. Like the Mas-

ter, they should leave the practical decision of every such matter to the consciences and hearts of the people. But they should use far more effort to correct their errors, enlighten their consciences, and enlarge their hearts—showing them how utterly wrong are their views, how unchristian is their spirit, how unfaithful and ungrateful is their practice. They should meet ignorance with light, selfishness with love—their own and the love of Christ—and unfaithfulness with unflinching zeal and constancy in pressing the solemn claims of duty. They must not shrink from contact with the repulsive and sometimes insulting selfishness of the unfaithful stewards of God's gifts. They must not let the claim go by default, or even meet it themselves, as is often done, on the ground that they would rather give beyond their means than ask some church-members for money. They must not come to the despairing conclusion that it is useless as well as unpleasant to press these claims further upon these unwilling hearts. All this is neglect of duty; it is shunning the cross. The Church must be trained, as children are trained, patiently, gently, by instruction, by precept, by example, by the presentation of Christian motives. It must be brought to believe that it is really "more blessed to give than to receive," so that they shall love to give, enjoy it, prefer to do it, and hence abound in the blessed privilege. Then will the modern Church become like the primitive—counting nothing they have as their own, and parting with their goods as every man may need, or as the Master may require, and yet eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people.

The neglect of these scriptural methods of cultivating the grace of giving has opened the door for those modes of inveigling the people into the discharge of the duty, by appeals to pride and emulation, and by various artifices suited only to deceive, by which the Church has often been disgraced and corrupted. The demand for money has been urgent; the people have not been prepared to give on right principles and with Christian motives. Hence the resort to these unlawful and injurious contrivances. They should be utterly abandoned. Mo-

tives of economy will require this, even if a sense of propriety does not, since all such expedients soon wear out. It is high time that the Church had left far behind her all the rudiments of the world and of the flesh, and under the lofty inspiration of true Christian sentiment, were acting a manly part in the great work to which her divine Master has called her.

Is it too early in the day to expect to see the wealth of the Church entirely consecrated to Christ? It does not seem strange to see men and women giving their energies of body and mind, their time, their acquirements, their influence, their opportunity to gain wealth, all to that Master's cause, in the work of the ministry, and in the more self-denying work of missions. Why should we not see thousands of private Christians, who have time, talent, and opportunity to make money, engage in *making money for Christ*, and thus furnishing what is so much needed in executing his parting command? Yea, why should not each Christian do this to the full extent of his ability? Is he not the Lord's? Was he not bought from as awful a hell, for as glorious a destiny, and by as precious blood, as were Martyn, Williams, Judson, or Paul? Why should he stop at a consecration less complete than theirs, or a love less ardent, or a gratitude less generous? Why should not every Christian look upon the cause of Christ as really and literally his own; and regard the great work of the Church not merely as bearing a remote and incidental relation to the great business of his life, but as constituting the supreme, all-comprehensive, all-controlling interest of his whole being, and therefore engage in it with the same zeal, earnestness, and cheerfulness, as now mark the efforts of a selfish and a worldly life? We believe this will become the general sentiment of God's people; and then will dawn the latter-day glory of the Church.