

had more of them; but, alas, we have not labourers enough to meet the demand.

Should not our more highly favoured congregations, where the sound of the gospel is heard every Sabbath, give this matter a little consideration. Under the present scarcity of men might not adjoining congregations give up their pastors for two or three Sabbaths and allow them to visit destitute vacancies and waste places, where the gospel is only preached at intervals?

### SYSTEMATIC GIVING: THE SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT.

REV. E. A. M'CURDY.

#### II.

The second point in reference to which the Committee on Systematic Beneficence sought information from Sessions, was respecting the principal difficulties in the way of the adoption of the Synod's recommendations by the congregations under their jurisdiction. The question which they proposed elicited numerous answers, all of which engaged the earnest attention of the Committee. Some of the difficulties suggested were adverted to in the report to Synod, but it was thought that others might be more effectively met, by means of communications through these columns. To the objection which some of the brethren urged that the Scripture argument in favour of Weekly Offering and Storing is not valid, I wish to direct attention in this article, leaving it for some of the rest of the members of the Committee to notice others.

In different hands the objection to which I have just adverted, assumes different aspects. Some contend that the precept, "On the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him," is not universally and perpetually binding for any purpose, while others freely admit its obligation, but only so far as provision for the poor is concerned.

It seems however to be admitted on all hands that the precept determined for the *Corinthians* the time and frequency of the appropriation of their substance for a specific

object, and that it also fixed for them both the mode and the measure of their contributions for that purpose. Now it seems evident that this precept could not have been intended solely for the Church at Corinth, because it had already been given to the churches in Galatia, "Now concerning the collection for the saints as I have given order in the churches of Galatia so do ye." Not only so, but as the apostle endeavours to stimulate the *Corinthians* to liberality by the example of the poor churches of Macedonia, may we not infer that he had given similar directions to them, especially since the apostle addresses the epistle in which it occurs, not only "to the Church of God which is at Corinth," but also "to all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." Besides, whether the Catholicity of this epistle be admitted or not, it is worthy of notice that no other measure or mode is prescribed anywhere else in the New Testament. Since then it is admitted on all hands that the measure is obligatory, since there is not probably a minister of the gospel anywhere who has not frequently urged his people to give "as God hath prospered them," why should any one doubt the universal and perpetual obligation of the command "to lay by him in store" any more than that of the precept which requires him to contribute according to his ability.

But let us cite a somewhat parallel case. In the same epistle in which the precept to which we are adverting occurs, the Apostle in giving directions respecting the preparation required for sitting down at the table of the Lord says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." Was not the Apostle evidently writing with a direct reference to the abuses which had crept into the church at Corinth? Yet who limits the obligation of the precept to the *Corinthian Christians*? Is not self-examination immediately before we take our place at the Communion table a duty enforced upon all Christians in all ages, though enjoined nowhere else in the same connection in the New Testament? "Upon the whole then," to quote the words of a distinguished