

THE

## CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1880.

All communications for the Editor of "News of the Churches" should be addressed to the Managing Editor, Box 2648, P. O. Toronto.

Pastors and church members are particularly invited to forward items for "News of the Churches" column.

OUR grave and worthy Business Manager was about to insert a note in his department, but deeming it too valuable to run the chance of being overlooked there we give it prominence in this place. He says: "If correspondents will send 'news of the churches' to the Business Manager instead of the Managing Editor, they may reckon on one day's delay in reaching the Editor, and probably a week's delay in the publication of the news." We may add a line of sober fact to this. Two (at least) items that would otherwise have appeared last week, were, from the above cause, left over to this number.

## HOW TO GIVE.

IN all churches there are persons who give right handsomely to the cause of Christ. With them the devotion of a part of their substance to God is a matter of principle, and they gladly and ungrudgingly observe it. In their estimates, they not only calculate for food and clothing and taxes and recreations, but they also include the maintenance of the house of God and the furtherance of the Redeemer's kingdom. But there are others in the same churches whose offerings are absolutely beggarly in their character. The niggard's heart suggests the nature of the gift, and it is offered with the niggard's grudge. The cause of this parsimony is not always the same. In a few instances it is to be found in a disposition which loves to grasp and hold, but grieves to part with anything, even towards a worthy object. But in a majority of cases, perhaps, it arises from an ignorance of the legitimate needs of the house of God, and of plans for systematic benevolence. However, from whatever cause it may come, the fact is patent to all, that the treasury of the Lord's house— which ought to be full and which might be full—is sadly lacking, and all concerned in the service of the church have to suffer more or less inconvenience. The treasurer has to advance money to keep things straight. The pastor is condemned to shabby gentility, forced to appear like a gentleman while only receiving the pay of a second-class workman. The Sunday school is only half equipped. These and many such unpleasant things may be found in hundreds of churches. To remove them, recourse is had to socials and bazaars and such like for purposes of raising the needed to carry on the legitimate operations of the church. That any such niggardliness in connection with the Lord's work is absolutely wrong, and suicidal to the church's comfort, no one can deny. But how to remedy it, is the crucial question.

That any formal rules can be given for all cases, we do not think. For example, the general statement that persons should give a tenth of their receipts to the Lord is scarcely practicable. To a man receiving a dollar a day, the gift of the tenth has quite a different meaning than in the case of a man whose income is ten dollars a day. The one may not be able to stand it, while the other may. Perhaps the best way is to try to tone up men's consciences and affections, and from that healthier condition of mind let them donate to the cause of Christ. Lay before them the needs of the cause, and their duties and privileges, and then allow them to be their own judges concerning their gifts. For after all, we are strong believers in Gospel voluntarism. We remember that the "Lord loveth the cheerful giver."

It is a pity when any man who is interested in the advancement of the Saviour's kingdom sets himself to thinking how little he can give, consistent with respectability, instead of how much he should give to Him who died for him. There is too much of this giving in view of men, rather than in the sight of

God. The same eye which measured the gifts to the temple treasury years ago still sees our gifts, and the same mind makes its estimate of the value of what we give. It would transform many a parsimonious Christian into a liberal man, were he to remember that a Divine eye is watching all his donations. It is a pity too when we offer to God the crumbs from the table of our income. The coppers and pennies and quarter dollars which many cast into the church coffers are—when measured with their receipts—nothing more than the scraps and crumbs compared with the full dishes of the table. Would we give a visitor only what Lazarus got at the wealthy man's gate? And shall we give to the cause of the Divine Christ only remnants, only crumbs from our income? Or shall we not rather invite Him to share with us our best. When in the fulness of his heart, Araunah offered all he had for a sacrifice, David made a noble resolve when he said he would not offer to God that which had cost him nothing. He paid for the things Araunah offered him, and then gave them in sacrifice to the Lord. It is a principle worthy of adoption by all Christians, to give to the Lord what costs them something. If this were followed, the house of God would not know anything of penury or want.

It is a safe proposition that men are willing to pay for what they esteem valuable. The worldling is not unwilling to pay for the schemes on which his heart is set. And if Christian men and women shew anything like niggardliness in their support of Gospel institutions, they must not be surprised if others think that their appreciation of the Gospel is not very great. Men make sacrifices for a cause that will benefit themselves and those near to them. And if we believe the scheme of redemption to be invaluable to ourselves and our children, our faith will certainly appear in our gifts to spread the beneficial news.

## PAROUSIA A MONOGRAPH.

THE Greek word *parousia* is, in our present version of the English New Testament, translated *coming* in the following passages: Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4; etc. This paper proposes to state briefly what the word really imports. Etymologically, it means *being (ousia) alongside (para)*; to be present, at hand. And this is its prevailing meaning wherever found, outside the New Testament. In some cases it may be translated *present circumstances, substance, property*. In the New Testament it is opposed to *apousia*, absence (Ph. hp. ii. 12, where it is translated *absence*, as it is also in 2 Cor. x. 10). From this the idea of *arrival* is readily reached, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 17: "I am glad of the coming (literally *arrival*) of Stephanas." It is not easy to explain how the term *parousia* ever came to be used as synonymous of *advent*; nor can the word be rightly represented by *coming*, unless in the sense of *abiding*. Whatever view may be entertained regarding a second advent, one thing is plain, the word under consideration makes nothing for it. *En te parousia*, translated (1 Thess. v. 23) "unto the coming," may fairly be rendered "preserved blameless in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ," indeed the latter may be held as certainly the more correct rendering. Ewald says, "The *parousia* of Christ perfectly corresponds with the Shekinah of God in the Old Testament—the permanent dwelling of the King, where His people ever behold Him, and are ever shielded by Him. During the present imperfect state He is not so actually present as His people hope and long for, and even when the expression more immediately denotes the advent, it still *always* includes the idea of a permanent dwelling, from that coming onward."

## HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY.

FOURTH LAFR.

AN English nobleman once said of the Established Church of England that it was a Church with a Romish liturgy, Calvinistic Articles, and an Arminian clergy. How far that may be true to-day, or was true then, we venture not to say, but that within the pale of that Church there are strange bed-fellows

must be patent to all. Dean Stanley and Dr. Pusey have little theology in common, and the author of "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined," (Colenso), still retains his legal Bishopric of Natal. In the way of *comprehension* a church could scarcely further go. "It was remarked long ago by Jerome that before factions were introduced into religion by the promptings of the devil, the churches were governed by a Council of Elders, but as soon as each man began to consider those whom he had baptized to belong to himself and not to Christ, it was decided that one elected from among the elders should be placed over the rest, so that the care of the Church should devolve on him, and the seeds of schism be removed." This was the Episcopate established.

Had the Episcopacy proved itself the very thing we need, its Divine right would of necessity have been conceded, but its spirit has been that which dictated concerning the Waldenses "In their lives they are perfect, without reproach among men—all their errors consist in this, they deny the Church of Rome to be the Holy Mother Church, and will not obey her traditions;" therefore "Cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war."

John Wesley was driven out from the Episcopacy he fancied would have served; but he loved the Lord the better. The Reformed Episcopal Church had its origin in Episcopal interference with an undoubted Christian right to sit with others in remembrance of the common Master; and to-day, in Canada, though not of newspaper notoriety, it is known and felt behind the scenes how Episcopacy sits, like the Old Man of the Sea on Smead's shoulders, a crushing weight on every spontaneous effort to cultivate a fraternal spirit with the non-Episcopal churches. It may read as a terrible indictment, but historically it is true: spite of many noble exceptions, the Episcopate has ever been the steady opponent of every movement that has had for its object the raising of the people to real, manly, intelligent independence and strength; does any questioner challenge the proof?

Jerome's account of the origin of the Episcopate may be true, viz.: it arose as a bond of union among communities scattered; if true, it has not, fifteen centuries bearing testimony, proved itself equal to the task, though its opportunities have been ample. We dare not, therefore, look to it in any other light than a hindrance rather than an aid to Christian Unity, and whilst rejoicing in the earnestness and Christian life enjoyed within its pale, must say it does not commend itself, in its present form, as the Church of the future, when we shall have arrived at the unity of the faith, the full stature of manhood in Christ Jesus.

Two bodies now come under review, which by their elasticity, vigour, and manifest life, may fairly be considered as laying some claim having regard to the ideal of Christian Unity—Presbyterianism and Methodism—of which we shall speak together. Their politics, unlike the laws of the Medes and Persians, are changeable, at least in matters of detail, and can thus be properly adjusted to meet the requirements of the life within, the work without. Liberty without license, unity without rigidity, they each enjoy; a compact form, with comparatively little restraint. Pulpit interchange is common between them, and they are found through their representatives, often pleading a common cause upon a common platform. They have had each their history of divisions, we had almost said *ad infinitum*, they have each of late years manifested their power of union, and still, in that direction, their march is onward. There has been a Pan-Anglican gathering of *Bishops* which was simply a council of hierarchs; a Pan-Presbyterian Council has been held, another coming, where more truly the churches are represented; and a General Methodist Council or Conference, world-wide, has been at least talked over, if not inaugurated. That there is High Church exclusiveness both among the Pre-byterians and Methodists we know, but the popular element in both is too strong to permit of its ever overshadowing either body; and no denominations evince in all departments more determined church life, even sacrifice. Their missionary spirit and missionary effectiveness, the wide world bear witness thereto. Both cultivate freedom (with exceptions to be hereafter