

THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

(NEW SERIES.)

VOL. V.]

TORONTO, FEBRUARY 15, 1886.

[No. 4

EDITORIAL JOTTINGS.

DEAR reader, do you pray? and when you pray do you remember what you prayed for? or do the desires fade from your heart, as the sounds melt away into silence? When you pray for revival do you work for it? When you pray for grace do you leave your heart open to receive it? Could you think of anything that would more surprise some people than to receive an answer to their prayers?

PRINCIPAL CAVEN, of Knox Presbyterian College, Toronto, has written an article on the revised version, whether it accomplishes all that can reasonably be expected from a revision at the present time. They that know the Principal will give much weight to his utterance. Conservative, cautious, candid, scholarly and exact novelty has little charm for him truth every charm. Of the New Testament version he says that "in textual revision everything has been done that could reasonably be expected—the results of the criticisms of the last hundred years are faithfully represented in the text which underlies the revision." In other words, the revised version of the N. T., so far as our present means of knowledge extend, more faithfully represents what the inspired penmen wrote than the older version. Of the translation, he writes "we should expect any competent judge to say that the work is well and thoroughly done."

Evidently the Principal does not deem the O. T. revision to be as thorough. The fact is, the materials are not available, but the general verdict is thus given regarding the whole: "No service rendered to the Bible since 1611 can be regarded as transcending in importance the work of revision now completed. The work is not perfect, but the revised version will certainly be placed at the head of all translations of the Scripture which have yet been made." We venture to add that Principal Caven herein

only voices the opinion of all who have competently studied the subject.

WE call special attention to the letter from Mr. Hague which appears in our correspondence column. As Mosheim writes, it is clear as noon day that the primitive churches were Congregational; but what of that, if life be wanting? As in the address we were permitted to give at the late Union, Mr. Hague urges in his way, as we in ours, that denominationally we must pre-eminently meet the spiritual needs of the day, or our candlestick will be removed.

"'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
"O life, not death for which we pant;
"More life, and fuller, that we want."

THE annual reports from churches have received suggestions more rather anxious reflections. Though Congregationalism is unsectarian, it must of necessity be denominational, having some truth or truths for which it is specially called to bear witness before the church and the world. We are a fraternity of churches, or ought to be, unless every tab must stand upon its own base, and our special function be to demonstrate the great fact of disintegration among the churches of God. Being a fraternity we have some interests in common; missions in the line of our own special testimony, the needy among us, our College, and our literature. Yet the interest taken in these departments of general life is for the most part very small. Churches seem satisfied with a collection of a few dollars and then rest from their labours. This state of things must change if we are vigorously to prosecute our work. The Woodstock church at one of its first meetings after organization resolved that it would faithfully remember the work of the denomination. That is the true spirit of brotherhood, not by constraint, but willingly, and only thus can our mission be accomplished.