

the idea of *saving*. All through the Book of Judges the Judge first judges, condemns, reproves, moves to repentance, then saves. Connect with this those beautiful words in the *Te Deum*, "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge; we therefore pray Thee help Thy servants." Because our Judge, help us. Another point: Distinguish between judging *actions* and judging *character*. The former is very easy; the latter, most difficult—I might say, beyond man's power, altogether. For instance, I see one stealing; I am certain the act is quite wrong; but what degree of guilt it implies in the person stealing depends upon matters of education, natural disposition, particular temptation—circumstances making a complicated question, quite beyond any man's knowledge to solve. Now, at the Day of Judgment character will be judged; it will be finally decided what the man is, and, resulting from that, what his place must necessarily be. This shows how unmeaning is the objection sometimes made, that God cannot justly punish a few short acts of life by Hell, or reward them by Heaven. Of course not. A soul will not be sent to Hell only because a thousand years before it did some wrong deeds, or sent to Heaven because it did some good ones; but it will be sent away from God, because it is evil; brought to His Presence, because it is holy and good. True, we must remember that a soul becomes what it is by what it *does*; so, in this sense, deeds are judged. Single acts repeated form habits; continued habits form character. Here in this world much is done; the "deeds done in the body" give the direction, the set, so to speak, to the soul; then, after death, the formation of the character, by repeated acts and habits, continues, until, at last, all is done, and it stands before the Throne that it may be judged and sent to "its own place." Look at the 25th Chapter of St. Matthew. There are there two parables about the Judgment, and a description of it. It is well worth noticing the gradation in the sentences. The unready virgins are shut out from the feast; the slothful servant loses his one talent, and is cast into outer darkness, where are weeping and gnashing of teeth; to those who did no works of charity it is said, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." So you can compare for yourselves the rewards in the three cases. Sentences are not all alike, nor are rewards. Death, Judgment, Hell, Heaven, these are called the four last things. In the thought of these things—of what infinite importance our life here becomes; how must we watch against sin; how, through God's care, try and form good habits, avoid bad ones, or, if they have been formed, strive to break them—let the thought of the Judgment ever be before you, restraining and encouraging you.

[We regret having been obliged, owing to want of space, to cut up No. 6 of Mr. Hodgson's interesting and valuable articles. We shall print the whole of No. 7 in our next.—Eds.]

#### SOMETHING OF THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BIBLE.

No. I.—(Continued.)

Compiled by the Curate of Yarmouth.

Still another copy there is, not only of the Books of Moses, but of the whole of the Old Testament. It is commonly known as the *Septuagint*, and sometimes is called the Alexandrine Version. Concerning this last name there is no doubt the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek, for the use of the great numbers of Jews who were living in Egypt, at Alexandria, the then Capital of that country, B. C. 186. Concerning the name "*Septuagint*" there were various opinions which long prevailed, but which the searching power of modern criticism has destroyed. The balance of scholarship now leans to the explanation that the name was given because the Translation received the approbation of the Jewish Sanhedrim, or Great Council of 72. But even here we must notice that the Jews themselves explain the name by telling us that 72 persons were employed in the translation. This copy of the older Scriptures gains at once, in our eyes, an interest which would not otherwise belong to it, when we are reminded that this was the version in common use among the Jews at the time of our Lord; that He read and studied this translation; I do not say exclusively, for His reading in the Synagogue was from the Hebrew Scriptures; that He and His Apostles in their quotations in the present New Testament, to the number of at least 271, referred to and quoted from the Septuagint. And this enables us at once to explain how it is that there is a slight verbal difference in some of the texts quoted in the new from those texts as found in our version of the Old Testament. Our translation is made from the Hebrew, while the quotations are made from the Greek of the Septuagint.

It will be, however, not only gratifying to, but may tend to allay the anxieties of sensitive minds, who have, perhaps, sometimes allowed a doubt to arise concerning the purity of the *text* of Scripture, to know that the Jews, who were of course its earliest guardians, were exceedingly careful to maintain its *accuracy*, that each copy was transcribed with the utmost caution; that so closely were the comparisons made that their Rabbis could tell not only how many words were in the Sacred Canon, but also how many letters, and even the number of times the little letter "*yod*," occurred—which was the smallest letter in the Hebrew alpha-

bet, being not much more than a good-sized dot. The words of our Lord are therefore very emphatic when He says, (St. Matt. v. 18,) "Verily I say unto you, till Heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."

Some have sneered at the Jews for this excessive care of the letter of the Scripture, while their lives were a contradiction of both its letter and spirit. True, their national degeneracy was great, but "to their own Master they stand or fall;" we should rather be thankful that they were thus scrupulous with those very prophecies which were to prove the claims of the Messiah, our Saviour, to be true. And we will admit that it was no unimportant matter, this exceeding care of letters, when we know that in the Hebrew alphabet there are, at least, 3 (three) pairs of letters which a touch of the pen might so change as to alter the one into the other of the pair. They are *Beth* and *Caph*, *Daleth* and *Resh*, *He* and *Cheth*.

A saying was common among the Rabbis that "he who should change one of these into the other, would destroy the world;" and before you condemn too strongly the exaggeration of this figurative expression, let us look at one or two examples.

I quote from the instances given by the Rabbis themselves: "Should any person in the words of Deut. vi. 4—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is (*achad*) ONE Lord"—change the *daleth* into a *resh*, he would ruin the world—since the words would then mean "The Lord our God is a *strange*, or a *false* God." The change of a simple letter would make the words "Thou shalt worship no other God" (Exod. xxxiv. 14) to read "Thou shalt not worship the *only* God." "Neither shall ye profane my holy name" (Ps. cl. 6) becomes by a spot of ink less than the size of a pin's head—"Neither shall ye *praise* my holy name." 1 Sam. ii. 2—"There is none holy as the Lord" becomes by an exceedingly slight difference in a single letter—"There is no holiness in the Lord."

I repeat then we may indeed thank God for the exceeding care, even though it was merely ceremonial, which the Rabbis bestowed upon the text of Scripture. In the Temple at Jerusalem, so says tradition, at least, three absolutely correct rolls of the Law were kept for final authority and appeal, one of which copies was said to have been made by Ezra; and Josephus makes it a boast that the only treasure he saved out of the burning ruins of Jerusalem was one of these precious rolls (Life p. 75.) I remember to have seen it somewhere stated, though I am just now unable to verify my quotation, that these rolls containing the books which form what we now call the Old Testament were kept in a crypt or chest in the Temple; while those other books inserted in our Bibles between the Old and New Testaments were not preserved so carefully—were not, in fact, admitted into this crypt, and hence came to be called *apocryphal* (*apo krupton*.) But this derivation of the word I leave to the more curious or better informed, which you will. The reference is, of course, to Deut. xxxi. 26, &c.

The word is rather to be derived from the Greek word for *secret* or *hidden*, (occurring in the New Testament in St. Mark iv. 22, St. Luke viii. 17, and Col. ii. 3,) and expresses, therefore, the uncertainty and concealed nature of the origin of these books. Such of them as were known to the Jews of a few centuries before our Lord, were certainly by them not admitted into the Sacred Canon; and modern scholarship and research have enabled us to assert with equal certainty that some of them were not written till many years of the Christian era had already passed. In the concluding verses of the 11. Book of Esdras, for instance, we have a manifest copy of St. John's vision of 144,000 clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands (v. 45). The dialogue with the angel, too, is but little varied from that given by St. John (chap. 7, Rev.) While the way in which the writer causes God to speak of "*My Son Jesus*," and "*My Son Christ*," (7, v. 28-9) is, perhaps, in itself sufficient proof that the book was written after the birth at Bethlehem.

As for the Divine authorship of these Apocryphal Books, the Jews did not receive them as inspired, and at least in some of them the authors seem to have disclaimed such a character for themselves, as e.g., 1. *Macc.* ix. 27, we read, "So was there a great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them." Or again, more pointedly, in 11. *Macc.* ii. 30, 31, "To stand upon every point and go over things at large, and to be curious in particulars, belongeth to the author of the story; but to use brevity, and avoid much laboring of the work, is to be granted to him that will make an abridgment." This writer declares in verse 23 that his "*one volume*" is but a shorter re-statement of "*the five books*" of one "*Jason of Cyrene*."

The United Catholic Church of the early centuries certainly did not receive these Books as inspired, as might be proved by many quotations from the *Fathers*. One such will be enough: In his argument with *Vigilantius*, S. Athanasius says, in reply to a statement founded upon one of the Books of Esdras, "Why take in hand what the Church does not receive? Read, if you like, all the figured relations of all the patriarchs and prophets," &c. The great champion of orthodoxy continues in a tone of scornful railery, but these words are already sufficient to shew how far he recognized the authority, at least, of this one Apocryphal book.

Never at any period of history were these Books received as Canonical on a par with the writings of

the Old Testament, until in the 4th Session of the Council of Trent they were pronounced, (though even then with the exception of the Prayer of Manasses and the two Books of Esdras,) together with the unwritten traditions relative to faith and manners, as strictly and in every sense canonical, and of the same authority as those undoubted which have been copied from the Jewish into the Christian Canon. This decree of the Council of Trent was confirmed by severe anathemas against all who should reject it. As we are included in these anathemas we may take comfort in Bishop Browne's calm remark (on art. vi.): "We might speak more strongly of the danger of 'cursing whom God hath not cursed,' but we may rest satisfied with the assurance 'the curse causeless shall not come'."

The position which the Anglican Church gives to these Books is seen at once from the 6th article, where she says: "The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." It is objected against us that selections from these Books are read in the public services. It is true. Portions of the Books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiastius* and *Baruch*, are appointed to be read as the first lessons on certain days, but never on the Sundays, "*for*," to quote Wheatley, "as the greatest assemblies of Christians are on those days, it is wisely ordered that they should then be instructed out of the undisputed word of God." Even when these Chapters are read they are announced (I hope I am correct in making the assertion) by the reader, as from the Apocryphal book of ———, and the second lesson is invariably from the Canonical Scriptures. If the objection be insisted on that nothing should be read in the service but inspired compositions, I reply: first, this will deprive us of some of our most beautiful canticles, of all our Hymns, and of all our Prayers but the "Grace of our Lord," &c. But, second, on the other hand, it will relieve the Clergy of considerable labor in writing, and the Laity of "much weariness of the flesh" in listening to sermons, when, perhaps, it may be that even good George Herbert's words are disregarded:

When "all lacks sense,  
God takes the text, and preaches p-a-t-i-e-n-c-e."

Of the "Apocryphal Books of the New Testament," so called, I need not here speak. They have certainly an interest of their own, but they are known to be without authority, and are now so regarded by all branches of the Church Catholic, as well as by "*all who profess and call themselves Christians*."

(To be Continued.)

#### Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

#### UNBAPTIZED PERSONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Is it lawful to appoint an unbaptized person a Churchwarden or Vestryman?

CHURCHMAN,  
St. John, New Brunswick.

[ANSWER. No. An unbaptized person is not eligible for any office in the Church.—Eds.]

#### W. AND O. FUND.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—What is being done for the W. and O. Fund? Is that most cruel reduction to be made? I see that St. Luke's has contributed \$114 to prevent it. Have you heard anything from St. Paul's? There are rumours that a collection is to be made, and I hear, if only that great parish will give the comparatively small sum of \$200, the threatened reduction need not be made. It was very generous to the widow of one of its late lamented curates, and cheerfully supplemented her pension of \$200 from the Fund. I hope, for the time is drawing near, that it will not stand by and see that widow's small income reduced \$25 a year. I am sure if the attention of the parish and its eloquent Rector is called to it, it will not suffer it to occur; and this must be my excuse for troubling you.

W. O. C.

[For the benefit of our correspondent it may be as well to state that St. Paul's has promised a liberal contribution at an early day.—Eds.]

#### KING'S COLLEGE.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—I am sorry to learn from the GUARDIAN and other Halifax papers that the College Bill has come to grief, that King's College will now lose a grant of \$2400, and that those who ought, under the circumstances, to have supported the Bill in the House when it failed to pass not only spoke, but

voted against it. Truly, one's foes are they of one's own household. I hope, now that the mischief is done, they will help to make it good by sending the Visitor of King's College a cheque on their respective banks for a good, round sum. I am glad that his Lordship the Visitor is about to make an appeal to Churchmen in the Provinces, and hope it will meet with a hearty response, for it would be a lasting disgrace to allow King's, the oldest University in the Dominion, to sink into merely a Theological College. I have no doubt that all the members of the University, past and present, will gladly give what they can to help in warding off the evil. I shall be happy to contribute my mite.

Yours, truly,  
AMICUS.

Bermuda, May 9, 1881.

#### "THE CHURCH."

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Permit a few words in reply to "Quero," whose letter appeared in the CHURCH GUARDIAN of the 21st ult. The appeal for good-will towards our non-Episcopal friends was urged upon grounds of Scripture. I cannot see that it is pertinent to meet it by references to alleged "well-supported history" or "historical matters" of any complexion. The contradictions and dinness of history are too well known to allow the assumption that it can be "well-supported." Inspiration only commands the submission of all. The question from the Bible, "Is Christ divided?" merits a candid reply. If the religious bodies founded upon the faith and doctrines of the Gospel do not contain Christ's one invisible Church—His mystical body, in which His elect are knit together—then the answer must be, Christ is divided. Here are five or more "historical Churches," each claiming to be true, each claiming to possess the true Apostolic succession, each asserting that it has kept the pure primitive faith; yet these Churches are not in communion with each other; some of them anathematize the others as heretical and schismatical. If but one visible religious body in the world is entitled to the appellation "The Church," how shall we decide which is that Church? and having selected the true Church from among them, what is the status of the others? Upon the basis that THE CHURCH—our Lord Jesus Christ's Body on earth—is an invisible Church, the whole company of believers, the difficulty disappears, and sub-divisions, however we may lament them, do not compel us to say Christ is divided.

What your correspondent says of the Baptists being divided into several separate Churches, is unhappily true with respect to Episcopal bodies of Christians. The Roman Catholic Episcopal Church is separate and independent of the Reformed Episcopal and our own branch of the Church. If sub-division casts the Baptists out, it leaves us in the same disqualified state. The promise of our Lord, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them," is a promise as definite, as emphatic, and as positive as any in the Bible, not excepting the parting commission to the disciples. And can we, ought we, to doubt that where not two or three merely, but where multitudes are gathered and organized permanently for promoting Christ's Kingdom that He is with them? And if the seal of the Holy Spirit is set to the work effected by these non-Episcopal bodies, by using them to build up the Kingdom of the Redeemer at home and abroad, should we say slighting things of them? should we forbid them "because they follow not us?" That I am not overstating the case in alleging that these bodies are used by the Master to extend His Kingdom, permit the following extract from the CHURCH GUARDIAN of the 26th February, 1880, to bear testimony. It appears in a book on Missions, entitled, "Under His Banner," and is written by Mr. Tucker, the Secretary of the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," the well-known author of the lives of Bishop Selwyn and Bishop Field:

"Three men, differing in most things from each other as widely as it is possible to differ, laboured, each in his separate fashion, for one common end—Henry Martyn, Frederick Schwartz, William Carey; English Churchman, Lutheran, Baptist; one of gentle birth, one from the lower middle class, one from the lower artisan class; one a Senior Wrangler at Cambridge, one a German student, one a self-taught man. And when we come to estimate the result of their labours, it may be that the man of fewest intellectual gifts, will be found to have left the deepest mark and to have done more than his two contemporaries towards the perfection of the work at which they all aimed."

I value the orders in our own Church, but in the presence of the great work which goes on in the other Christian Churches, and which is as patent to observation as though it were written with the sunbeams in living characters upon the face of the heavens, I hold the validity of our orders in such a way as not to require that I deny the authority of others who serve the same God and seek the same ends; and I regret that a moderate appeal for kindness of expression to neighbouring Churches has called out a more than usually extreme denial of their claims.

Your typos made some errors in my first letter. Allow me to correct the quotations; they should have read: Mark ix. 38-41; Luke ix. 49, 50; Phil. i. 18; Eph. vi. 24; Numb. xi. 27-29.

Yours truly,  
ROTHESAY.