

and have not given up their claims. They are only kept quiet because they have not the power to enforce them. The same principles have been set forth boldly and boastfully in our day by the leading organs of Rome on both sides of the Atlantic. They have been often declared by the *Univers*, the leading organ of the Jesuits in France; by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the organ of the Jesuits at Rome; by the *New York Freeman's Journal*, the organ of the Papacy in the Atlantic States; and by the *Shepherd of the Valley*, the organ of the Papacy in the Western States, etc. We are told in the coolest manner by these journals, that constitutional liberty and Catholic liberty cannot agree, and that the one or the other must be a chimera, the two not being able to subsist at the same time in the same country. This is the decided opinion of the leading spirits of Rome (*Butwark* Edinburgh). Yea the very idea of granting religious liberty to Protestantism is scoffed at as an absurdity by these organs as opposed to the whole system and privileges of the Papacy. Now, as the practical result of such teaching, Rome, according to Dr. Edgar, of Belfast, in his "Variations of Popery," has slaughtered sixty-eight millions of the faithful servants of Christ, who would not worship the beast, or bow down to his image; so that for more than 1,000 years, the true followers of Christ, who took God's Word as their rule and guide, are represented as a woman who fled into the wilderness from the efforts of the great dragon to destroy her. And we are told that the earth, that is the civil power, "helped the woman," and so it has been since the Reformation, when the Papacy received its deadly wound (Rev. xii.). But even since the Reformation, France lost about 3,000,000 of her best subjects by the persecutions of Rome, about 200,000 being put to death, and the rest driven out of the country. Thus, in the providence of God, France, that was the leading nation of Europe, has become a second-rate nation, inferior to both Protestant Germany and England. Just so long as she had the power, the Church of Rome continued to imprison and persecute Protestants in Italy, Spain and Austria, even in our day.

(To be concluded.)

THE CHURCH VS. THE CONGREGATION

REVISED BOOK, PAGE 6.

MR. EDITOR,—The terms church and congregation are not synonymous, but differ in meaning and use. The word congregation, which is derived from Latin *congrego* (i.e., *con*, together and *greg*, a flock), means an assemblage of persons met together for worship, or any business proper to them. In its Christian use it means an assembly of persons met together for the worship of God. But such an assemblage is not necessarily a church. The word church, which is from the Greek (*κυριακον*) *kuriacon*, means the Lord's, i.e., the Lord's House. The familiar form of the Greek word is found in our Scotch word *kirk*, i.e., church. The judicious R. Hooker says: "The word church thus signifies no other thing than the Lord's house." We do indeed call the building in which Christians meet to worship God the church. We say, e.g., of the buildings in which the members of Knox, St. Andrew's, etc., Churches meet for worship, it is Knox, St. Andrew's, etc., Church. But we do so in the same figurative way in which we speak of a cup, when we mean that which it contains. Uniformly in Scripture and in Christian speech, we mean by the Church the Christian society, which composes God's household on earth. It may include one or many such societies. The meaning of the Greek word (*ἐκκλησία*; *ecclesia*, translated church in the New Testament, means that society of men called out and separated by God to holy living, mutual help, etc., to His worship and service. This is the society composing His spiritual family or household.

The terms church and congregation differ in this, that the former implies an organization, or an organized society, which the latter does not. We may have a congregation where we have no church; but we cannot have a church without a congregation. Every minister who has done pioneer work has often addressed congregations which were not churches, which had no church organization; but no one has addressed a church without having a congregation. The congregation is the popular assembly of the Church. We think a clearer distinction should

be made between these terms in the "Revised Book," than is done.

Under the caption, the congregation or particular church, from page six, we have such phrases as these: "A congregation is formed by Presbytery," "The Session of every congregation," "Presbytery resolves to form a congregation," "The members of a congregation entitled to Church privileges," "The property of the congregation is held by trustees appointed by the congregation," etc. We also find such phrases as "The members of a congregation who are entitled to all Church privileges," "Members of the Church are under the care and subject to the authority of the Session," "Members of the Church not in full communion," "Fellowship of the congregation," "Fellowship of the Church."

In these cases, the term *congregation* seems to be used synonymously with *church*. We object to this use of it, though sanctioned by the old Book and long usage; and we insist the term should be used only when we speak of the popular assembly of the Church, and not when we mean the society of believers, or organized Church. We object to its use on these grounds and for these reasons, viz. First, because it tends to foster and countenance congregational, rather than Presbyterian authority and rule in the Church. As Presbyterians, making high claims for our system of Church government, we should not strengthen views subversive of that system. The chief difference between congregational and Presbyterian Church government lies in this, that the former regards each congregation as complete in itself and independent of every other; while the latter regards each Church as completely, but not independent of all others. In fact each Church is part of a larger body, i.e., the Presbytery, and this of one still larger, i.e., the Synod, and it again of a yet larger, the General Assembly, or Ecumenical Council. The prominence given to the term congregation in our "Revision" tends to strengthen that practical congregationalism, which, we venture to believe, is hurtfully manifest in the workings of many particular Churches. Frequently the will of a self-operating few in a congregation is wrought into the many in such way that the peaceful Session and non-combatant Presbytery are often practically coerced into conformity in its unrighteous demands. Thus a fraction of a congregation often incepts the most serious undertakings or the most momentous changes, by the practice of those arts of the demagogue, which sway the people and so precipitate results, regardless of honour, fairness and the rights of others. The movers usually have the same object in view, and use the same means as the lowest politicians to secure notice, advancement and power. We should spare no pains to eradicate all germs or tendencies in this direction from our constitution and polity, and set up a type of Presbyterianism strong, just and beneficent to all.

This brings me to my second objection, which is that such use of the term congregation is contrary to the analogy of the teachings of the New Testament. The apostles formed churches in Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, etc., but we never read that they formed congregations in any of these places. We also read that they ordained elders in every church; but never that they ordained elders in every congregation. We further read of the elders of the churches of Jerusalem, Ephesus, etc., but never of the elders of the congregations of these places. In fact the phraseology of the "Revision" and of the New Testament Scriptures are at variance. The one holds up the congregation, the other the church. We hold with the latter *versus* the former. In the third place we object to the use of the term congregation, because the permanent officers, which Christ left in the Church, and which He designed for the edification of particular churches, were not instituted in particular congregations, but in churches. Pastors and teachers, elders and deacons, were given to the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, the seven churches of Asia Minor, etc., but they are never named as ministers, pastors or officers of the congregations of these places.

In the fourth place, because the term congregation is not used in the New Testament Scriptures, whence we derive the constitution and laws of the Christian Church; while the term church occurs more than a hundred times. Except in a single case—Acts xvii. 37—it is the translation of the word (*ἐκκλησία*) *ecclesia*, which uniformly means the society of believers, whether in a single family, congregation, city or country, or in many. The only instance in which the word congregation occurs in the Authorized Version of the New Testament is Acts xiii. 43, where it refers not to a Christian assembly at all, but to a disorderly mob in the synagogue of Antioch. I am indeed aware that the word is of very frequent occurrence in the earlier books of the old Testament, and that in the *Septuagint* Version it is translated by the word (*ἐκκλησία*) *ecclesia*, which, as we have just seen, is the one translated church in the New. It should, however, have weight with those who regard this fact as a reason for still retaining the word in current use in our polity that the Old

Testament revisers, in the revision of 1881, have in every case in which the phrase "tabernacle of the congregation" occurred, substituted the phrase "tent of meeting;" "because," say they, "the tabernacle of the congregation conveys an entirely wrong sense." This reduces greatly the number of occurrences of the word in the New Revision of the Old Testament.

In view of all these considerations we would eject the word congregation from the formula of our Church polity, and substitute for it the more scriptural and Presbyterian one, church. Thus the misleading and incorrect should always yield to that which is exact and certain.

PARITY.

AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS' FUND.

MR. EDITOR,—The American Presbyterian Church has succeeded in carrying out their resolution and even going beyond it, of raising \$1,000,000 for their Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund. Our Church may be stimulated by this success to make an effort in the same direction. The general impression which prevails throughout the Church, that many of the annuitants on the fund are able and willing to work, will be a serious obstacle in the way of those who have the management of the fund, till something is done to remove such impression. There is an annuitant on the list who, before the Union, filled the highest office in the branch of the Church to which he belonged, and is reputed to be one of the ablest preachers in the Church. The season before he was placed on the retired list he was employed to supply a group of mission stations. While engaged in this work he was in the habit of holding three services and driving thirty-five miles in a day, but he was about sixty-five years of age—aged though not infirm. And it would have been as useless to put him on the probationers' list and trot him out before the vacant congregations for inspection as it would be to exhibit an old cart-horse at a fair in the ring among the two-year-old colts. Only two ways were open. Either to turn him out to dig or beg or starve, or to pension him off. The latter was adopted.

A neighbouring minister threatened to use his influence with the congregations to keep them from paying into the fund, while it was applied in that way. Of course this was wrong, but the congregations hold the purse strings, and unless they are satisfied with the administration of the fund they will not pay into it. Another minister, aged but not infirm, who had just resigned an important charge in a town, told me that he intended to preach as a candidate for an important charge in a town, worth \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year. Failing in this he would apply to be pensioned off. A large proportion of the annuitants are men of this stamp. They are able and willing to work, but under our system they cannot find employment. The Methodists and Episcopalians have no trouble of this kind. Under their systems every minister who is able to work is employed, and as soon as he is unable he is pensioned off.

"Knoxonian" discussed lately the cause of ministers proving failures in the Presbyterian Church. Our brethren of the above named Churches have next to no failures among their ministers, and it is because they find employment for them. The reason why we have failures is because we do not find employment for them. The most efficient ministers are often the most unsuccessful in finding employment, and the least efficient are frequently the most successful in getting good places. Our students are, as a rule, successful as workers, and it is because their work is found them.

What is wanted is a comprehensive system by which employment would be found for all the ministers unable to work, and pension off only those who are unable, and transfer all whose usefulness in their present fields is gone, to new fields. Much money and many good, efficient workmen might be saved to the Church by such a scheme. Many of our aged ministers who are rusting in enforced idleness might be sent to mission fields accompanied by students. Youth could be benefited by the experience of age. The aged could be assisted by the vigour of youth. This plan works well in the Methodist Church. Why should we be above borrowing a leaf from their book?

All that is wanted is to become thoroughly Presbyterian, for Presbyteries to resume the powers originally vested in them, and see that all the congregations within their bounds are supplied, and all the ministers employed, controlling both ministers and congregations, instead of trusting to haphazard according to the present practice.

If this system, which is already adopted to some extent on the mission fields, was made general, and judiciously carried out, there would be much less difficulty in raising money for the Schemes of the Church. Many refuse to contribute for the colleges, because they see men of age and experience who are able and willing to work out of employment. Others refuse to contribute to the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund because they see ministers who are able to work pensioners on the fund. The adoption of the above suggestion would remove those and other obstacles which stand in the way of collecting money for the Schemes of the Church.

AMOR JUSTITIE.