

ary operations are straitened by a lack of funds. There is now an urgent need for \$50,000—a pitiful sum when one considers it—a sum which episcopal “deputations,” if they were really serviceable agents, ought to be able to raise without the slightest difficulty in a Church like ours.

It is not only in the raising of money that episcopal deputations fail. Even when they are most successful, they are not successful for the whole missionary field, but for their own special and peculiar fields. Bishops would be more than men, if, in advocating their cause, they did not feel their own part of it to be greater than the whole; and the consequence is that while some jurisdictions are fostered to an extent which pauperizes them by removing the necessity of self-help, others are left without their just and necessary share in the benefactions of the Church. To their credit be it said, many of our missionary bishops refuse to leave the Word of God either to serve tables or to beg for them, so that the system as a system is a failure; and bishops of that sort must expect to receive comparatively slight attention, so that its practical operation is unequal. No bishop ought to be forced into any such service. Our bishops are gentlemen, and it impairs their official and personal dignity to devote themselves too largely to the work of begging for their jurisdictions. When they leave their proper work to spend month after month at the East, no one will pretend that any great amount of spiritual power attends, or ever has attended, their ministrations. Their discourses are apt to lack savor. They are pretty sure to repent themselves. Their good stories fall flat when they are told too often. When they make their appearance, men instinctively button up their breeches pocket. Even in their own jurisdictions they are honored less for the abundance of their spiritual gifts than for their success in raising money. “Our Bishop,” said an enthusiastic layman in the far West, “mayn’t be much of a preacher, but I tell you he’s a good ‘un to get money!” The good man had not the slightest sense of irony in making this remark; but when a bishop is chiefly honored for getting money, is there not some reason to fear that he devotes more time to furnishing tables than to the ministry of the Word?

We have no plan or scheme of our own for increasing the contributions of the Church to the support of missions; but one thing is certain: *the Church will flourish most and best in all its work when every member of the same shall faithfully serve in the vocation and ministry whereunto he has been appointed.* To ask and virtually to constrain our missionary bishops to leave the Word of God and furnish tables is to ask and constrain them to abandon their vocation and forsake their proper ministry. The Church took much credit to itself for sending out seven missionary bishops a few months ago; if some of those men, so sent, have to leave their work to raise money for themselves and others, that noble act of faith and hope was less noble than it seemed to be.

Whatever plan may be necessary to recruit the missionary treasury, by all means let the missionary bishops have a chance to mind the business for which, and not for the work of “deputations,” the Church has appointed them. As a system, episcopal “deputations” are a failure. Unsystematically worked, they produce egregious inequalities in the distribution of the benefactions of the Church, with a pauperizing superabundance in one field and a lack of fair support in others.

In what we have said in the present article, we are not representing any peculiar view of our own. We know it to be silently shared, and sometimes quite emphatically, though privately, expressed, by some of the most earnest bishops, pastors and laymen of the Church.

EARLY BIBLES OF AMERICA.

In a work by Rev. J. Wright, D.D., (London Gray and Bird, 1893), some very interesting editions of the Bible are described. They were printed during the existence of the British-American colonies while under the rule of England, and a few that appeared after the same colonies became independent under the name of the United States. The author also gives an account of the *Editio Prima Americana* of the Greek Testament, printed at Worcester, Massachusetts, by Isaiah Thomas in 1800. The Greek text is that of Mill, with a few alterations from the Elzevir text of 1678. The first Bible printed in America was the work of the famous Indian Apostle, John Eliot, whose object was “to relieve the minds of the Indian races from their spiritual darkness.” He was a graduate of Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1623, and a remarkably able-linguist, learning the Indian language from a native who had been taken prisoner. In 1663 he published his translation of the Old and New Testament into the Indian language. The Lord’s prayer begins as follows in this most unpronounceable of languages: *Nooshun Resukgut, qutlianatamunach koowewonk.* The governing spirit of this gifted and devoted clergyman may be gathered from the words he wrote in his Indian grammar, “Prayers and pains, through Jesus Christ, will do anything,” words which remind one of the confidence which inspired St. Paul who felt that through Christ he was enabled to do all things. The first German edition of the whole Bible published in America, was in 1805, by Youngman, for the benefit of the German settlers in America. It followed that of Luther. The first English Bible printed in America was in 1782, printed and published by Mr. R. Aitken, a Scotchman. The first Douay version in America was published at Philadelphia in 1790. The first translation of the Septuagint was made in 1808, by Charles Thompson, and published at Philadelphia. There is also given an account of “curious versions” of the Bible, which are by no means remarkable for simplicity and terseness of expression. We quote the following specimen from the new and corrected version of the New Testament, edited by Rev. R. Dickinson, and published at Boston, in 1833, St. John iii. 3. “Except a man be reproduced, he cannot realise the reign of God. 4. Nicodemus says to him, how can a man be produced, when he is matured? Can he again pass into a state of embryo and be produced?” Acts i. 18. “And (Judas) falling prostrate, a violent and internal spasm ensued, and all his viscera were emitted,” xxvi. 24. “Festus declared with a loud voice, Paul, you are insane! Multiplied research drives you to distraction.” So late as 1852 Mr. Hezekiah Woodruff, who desired to render the words of Scripture according to the language of our day, published a portion of the New Testament, of which the following specimen may be given, St. Matthew iii. 4. “His food was small animals and vegetable honey.” Happy are they who hunger and thirst for correctness. It is certainly curious to read of one Bible published at Hartford in 1837, wherein is found such a blunder as “the Scripture is given. . . . for destruction in righteousness,” and another edition printed by the American Bible Society, where we find, Mark v. 3: “Who had his dwellings among the lambs,” in place of “tombs.”—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

The way to be saved is to believe that Jesus Christ is able to save you and then trust Him to do it, by being obedient to His voice in all things.

The man who picks his own cross never gets the right one.

THE DIVINE PLAN OF CHURCH FINANCE.

A Paper read at the Missionary Conference held at Yarmouth, N.S., by

REV. JOHN LOCKWARD, RECTOR OF THE PARISH OF PORT MEDWAY, N.S.

It is my accepted duty—a duty well mixed with pleasure—to read to you a short paper on “The Divine Plan of Church Finance.” It might seem strange and harsh to some minds to find that under the express wording of my subject I am to set God before you in the character of a Financier, which among men is not always a worthy character. But certainly it cannot be any more derogatory to the Godhead to be thus described in particular than to be generally known as Providence. And if this title of Providence be a true description of God, then, surely, we might even from this reasonably infer that as He has so bountifully provided for all things in His natural kingdom, so He must have made similar and suitable provision for the various needs and necessities of His Spiritual kingdom.

Now, if we will take from this thought a not unreasonable presumption that God has made some special and suitable provision for the needs of His Church; and remember, too, that all His revelations have been gradual and of a progressive and perfecting character, we shall not find ourselves mistaken when we end our enquiry.

We are not confined to “the Bible and the Bible only” in making this enquiry, but of course we turn to it first; and having made the fullest use of its sacred pages, we will trust that a sufficient time will remain in which very briefly to refer to the other source of enquiry for our further conviction.

The first incident to which I would refer in the Sacred Record is that of the offerings of Cain and Abel. We read that “the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering, but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect,” Gen. iv. 4, 5. As God could not act arbitrarily or unjustly or unreasonably, there must have been some good and sufficient reason for the great difference noted out to the worship of the two brothers. We are told that the sacrifices differed in character, for the one “brought of the fruit of the ground” and the other “brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof,” Gen. iv. 3, 4. But while there is this difference, we might also well remember that there was an exact similar relationship between each offerer and his respective offering. Each brought of the labour of his hands “an offering unto the Lord.” Cain, being “a tiller of the ground, brought of the fruits of the ground;” and Abel, being “a keeper of sheep, brought of the firstlings of his flock.” So far both acted alike. Why, then, was the one accepted and the other rejected? Certainly there was a reason. Was it because of the character of their respective offerings? Was Abel’s sacrifice accepted because it was “of the firstlings of his flock;” and was Cain’s sacrifice not accepted, but rejected, because it was “of the fruits of the ground?” Some think this was the reason, and if so then we must infer that God had made some revelation, unrecorded for us, touching the character of the offerings to be made to Him in worship. But there is another theory on this matter which is by some considered to be fully supported by the Septuagint version of Gen. iv. 7. This theory is that Cain offered a small and mean offering, while Abel made a full and large offering. The Septuagint version of the passage is thus translated: “If thou hast offered aright, but hast not divided aright, hast thou not sinned?” And St. Paul’s reference to the offering of Abel in Heb. xi. 4, seems to bear out this view. Both the Authorized Version