

any public treasury, but it would have to flow from the pockets of a thousand private individuals, and probably far more would be required than at present. Our organizations enable us not only to consecrate our efforts, but to do the work more cheaply. But when we say the Church rests on a substratum of cash, that without money her enterprises would be paralyzed and ruined, we are far from admitting that it rests on a material substratum. The money is the exponent of profound religious conviction. It is a vast sacrifice which the Church offers every year to her Founder. It is an annual triumph of Christianity to be able to extract so many millions from men and women who, but for her influence, would be as sordid as their neighbours, to redeem from the basest to the noblest uses a portion of the vast sum which is spent every year upon the gratification of low passions and frivolous propensities. That is, always presuming that the money has been given by the right people, in the right proportion, in the proper spirit, and that legitimate methods have been used to gather it in.

1. We reassert the principle so often forgotten—the Lord's work by the Lord's people. The Lord's offering from the Lord's people. Believers only can give to the cause of Christ with consistency, with entire satisfaction, with prayer that their gifts may be blessed. Most accursed is that Church, we all feel, which subsists upon money wrung by means of taxes or tithes from an adverse, perhaps an infidel, population. And not less accursed is the dissenting Church which depends upon the pompous patronage of a few rich men who give with a grudge and give with the intention of getting back their money's worth in reputation or influence. Such a state of matters may be pronounced impossible, but we have seen ugly symptoms of something very like it. We do not say that if a man who is not a professing Christian should bring his gift to the altar, it is to be rejected. "The money is not heretical," as the witty friar said to the American tourist when he told him he was a heretic. But woe to the Church which depends to any great extent upon selfish worldly men. Not less degrading is it when frequent appeals have to be made to a careless and mocking public, in the shape of soirees, popular lectures, entertainments, etc. We wonder what the apostles would have said if they had foreseen that the finances of Christian congregations would be supplemented in this way, that the warm tide of Christian benevolence, flowing in imperceptibly and without effort, was to be superseded by a general meanness which should leave holy things and holy men to the cold sneering charity of the world. More upon this part of our subject we dare not permit ourselves to speak. Let Christian societies take upon themselves no liabilities that they have not a reasonable prospect of meeting; and while that liability exists, let it be felt as a personal debt resting upon each individual of that society. Let us act with the *caution* implied in the first clause of the above sentence, and let us try to stimulate the *honourable* sentiment implied in the second, and we should soon hear less of the difficulties in Christian finance.

2. Good people should give in good measure. Probably there are very few in any congregation who have ever taken the trouble to make an inquiry into their affairs and to ascertain how much they ought to give to the house of God. Till this is done, how can a man say he is giving in good measure? He may be giving too much or too little. In either case he is doing wrong. It is right that every man should ascertain what proportion of the expenditure of the Church falls to his share. Divide the total sum wanted annually by our membership, and we believe the quotient would be a sum that most of our members could raise if they chose. Now, if to a large income raised in this way, as a voluntary tax, without entreaty, without compulsion, without deputations, we were to add all given over and above their due share by the rich and benevolent, what a glorious financial position we should occupy! Our Church might then pass on without fear to occupy new ground and win fresh laurels. Till that is done, our progress will be a scramble, not a general advance, and all our movements hampered by a discreditable meanness.

3. Let good people give in a good spirit: It is a melancholy fact that many of our churches must have a tea meeting once a year to raise the funds, not because it will do good, but because the members would not give a farthing *directly*. They must give in this vulgar ostentatious way. They must have a *quid pro quo* for their money in the shape of a newspaper report next morning, with the names of Mesdames A, B, C, and Misses D, E, F, duly recorded. It is said, moreover, that frequently the church is the loser to the extent of several pounds by this desire for notoriety. They would have had far more money in hand, if they had all simply laid down their contributions in solid cash upon the table. Now is not this a most degrading state of matters in a Church like ours? Would it not be far better for such a congregation simply to lessen its expenditure, reduce the salaries, if need be, than pander to such an unchristian spirit? We fear the whole system of Christian finance in this country tends to foster the vice of ostentation. Instead of Christian men being nervously anxious to conceal their charities, they are anxious to proclaim them to the world. In many churches the minister is soon made aware of the fact that So-and-so and So-and-so are the main supports of the congregation. What right has he to know this, if these men or their friends observed our Saviour's precept? Does not the system of eternally proclaiming to the world lists of contributors to our schemes stimulate this unhealthy state of matters? Then, what a fuss is made, often by ministers who ought to know better, if a rich man gives a large sum for some special purpose; what endless reference to the fact, what trumpeting about it in speeches and reports. Would it not be better if men would drop their gift into the treasury and let no one be the wiser of it? Is it not enough if God knows about it? The right spirit in which to give is that of humility. A man should feel that when he has given most, he has given no more than he ought to have done. We greatly fear that if all the unhealthy stimulants to Christian liberality now in vogue were withdrawn, a good many would withdraw their subscriptions. They would not give in the dark, even though the eye of God made it luminous. But what of that? A blessing would rest on what was given, and by-and-by Christian men would begin to find a positive luxury in secret benevolence. Certainly England at the present time would seem to be the last country in the world for making such an experiment. You cannot pass along a street in any town without seeing advertisements which prove that the Christian public no more realize their responsibility for their own debts than they do their responsibility for those of the Emperor of China. It is considered rather a chivalrous thing than otherwise to build a huge chapel and leave it with a huge debt to successive generations of half-starved ministers and grumbling and dwindling congregations. When we read of the tumultuous applause with which the treasurer's sheet is received at the large annual gatherings, we sometimes wish that some superhuman intelligence, some Asmodeus, could first discover and then narrate how each particular penny was gathered in. How small the bloated sum total would often appear in the eyes of those who look to the motive as well as to the sum given. And yet bad as things are, they are getting worse, we believe. Our Church must look to her hands and try to keep them clean. Let us abolish this parade of benevolence; let us have voluntary contributions in the strict sense of the words; let our people be made to understand that we can do without their money rather than give them an equivalent for it in the shape of teas and concerts. No doubt such a system would entail losses and sacrifices at first, but, we believe, it would result in an ultimate success. It would be a glorious thing to be pointed at as a Church whose members gave as a duty, gave as a privilege, gave without being asked. The best men in all the Churches feel that the present condition of things is intolerable and cannot last long. People who have to be periodically whipped up to give will soon be beyond the reach of such a process. They will go to their own place. We have had many worthless revivals in England of late years; where is the man

who will revive the dead sentiment of Christian honour in the hearts of thousands of professing Christians, and succeed in making them feel that the debts of the Church are their debts? *London Weekly Review.*

THE DISCOVERY OF AN ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT OF THE GOSPELS.

The general feeling of scholars in regard to manuscripts of ancient writers, is that almost all has been discovered that there is any hope of discovering. This feeling, however, has been happily disappointed in several cases. The recent find of a manuscript of Clemens Romanus and other early ecclesiastical writers in Constantinople, gave an agreeable surprise to students of Church history. In no department have such discoveries been more surprising and more valuable than those in connection with the New Testament. Tischendorf in his wanderings among libraries in all parts of the world, came upon many leaves of old New Testament manuscripts, and crowned his investigations by unearthing in the Sinaitic monastery the most complete manuscript of the New Testament in existence belonging to an early date. The issuing of a trustworthy edition of the "Codex Vaticanus" in our age may also be deemed a real discovery. In this way the two manuscripts which will be held in future as most valuable in determining the text of the New Testament, have become known to scholars only within the last twenty years.

We have now to record the discovery of another manuscript of a portion of the New Testament, written at a very early period. The merit of the discovery is due to two German scholars, Oscar V. Gebhardt and Adolf Harnach, whose edition of the Apostolic Fathers has deservedly received the warmest commendation. These scholars were enabled, through the munificence of the German Government and an endowment attached to Leipzig University, to make a journey in March of this year to Southern Italy and Sicily, in which places they resolved to search for manuscripts. Their attention was specially directed to notices of a monastery at Rossano, near the Gulf of Tarentum, in which important manuscripts were said once to have been. They could find no traces of the monastery, but they heard that there was a very old book preserved in the palace of the Archbishop of Rossano. Accordingly, they asked permission to see it, and to their great joy found that it was a very valuable manuscript of the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. They now issue an account of it in a volume just published—*Evangeliorum Codex Græcus Purpureus Rossanensis Litteris Argenteis sexto ut videtur sæculo scriptus picturisque ornatus, seine Entdeckung, sein wissenschaftlicher und künstlerischer Werth dargestellt von Oscar V. Gebhardt und Adolf Harnach.* (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient.)

The leaves of this manuscript are made of purple parchment, and the material used throughout in writing is silver, except in the first three lines of each gospel, where the letters are golden. There is only one other manuscript of this kind in existence, containing any portion of the New Testament, and it is in a mutilated condition, four of its leaves being in London, six in Rome, two in Vienna, and thirty-three have been more recently discovered in the Island of Patmos. The present volume, on the other hand, consists of one hundred and eighty-eight leaves, and contains the whole of the gospel of St. Matthew and the gospel of St. Mark down to the middle of the fourteenth verse of the sixteenth chapter. All the criteria used in judging of manuscripts indicate the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century as the date of this. The manuscript is written in uncial characters, with two columns in each page. There is no separation of words, no breathing, no accent, and only the slightest attempt at punctuation. There are capitals double the size of the uncials, the Ammonian sections are indicated, and the Eusebian canons must have been given, for it contains a portion of the letter of Eusebius to Carpianus; and there is good reason for conjecturing that this was followed by a table of the Eusebian canons. The letters bear the closest resemblance to those occurring in manuscripts of the fifth and sixth centuries,