

Rev. Dr. John Hall, whose words are always sensible and timely, speaks as follows to young people :—There are two ways of setting up in life. One is to begin where your parents are ending. “Magnificent mansion, splendid furniture, and an elegant turn-out.” Is not that the pretty dream of many about their start in life? The other is to begin a little nearer the point where father and mother—of blessed memory—began. You see, my dear friend, you can go up so easily and gracefully, if events show it to be safe; but it would be trying and awkward to come down. And it costs much now to live; and business fluctuates; and health is uncertain; and temptations from the side of pride are strong; and many a young man who did not mean to be extravagant has been led along, and, rather than face the position and descend manfully, has tried to keep up by embezzlement, and been called “swindler.”

Many a child is lost forever for the Sunday School, when a single visit, a simple exhortation on the part of the teacher would have kept it for the school, and even often for the church. A good shepherd feeds his sheep, and takes care that none are lost. If the teacher perceives, therefore, that one of those entrusted to him relaxes in zeal, showing an inclination to withdraw from regular attendance, and the danger finally threatening of its remaining away altogether, then he should delay no longer to seek it at home, and exhort it alone, or in the presence of its parents. John B. Gough was saved by Joel Stratton's tapping him on the shoulder, and directing a friendly word of exhortation to him. Dr. Cuyler said, beautifully, that in the thunder of applause at Gough's triumph in Exeter Hall or in the Academy of Music, he always heard the echo of that tap upon the shoulder, and those words of loving interest.

THE BIBLE'S ACCURACY.—We read in Daniel v. 30, that when Darius took Babylon, Belshazzar, the king of it, was in the city, and in “that night was Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, slain.” Herodotus, the Greek historian, informs us that the King of Babylon, whose name was Labynetus, was absent when the city was taken; that he sought shelter in Barsippa; that Cyrus attacked him there, took him, stripped him of his regal dignity, but allowed him to retire and spend the rest of his life in ease in Caramansa. The two statements appear to be contradictory, and that the credit of historic veracity must be denied either to Daniel or to Herodotus. Thus stood the matter when Sir Henry Rawlinson, the celebrated Oriental scholar, discovered, in his Eastern researches, one of those cylinders on which historic records used to be written in the cuneiform character by the ancients. Having deciphered the writing on this relic of antiquity, it was discovered that at the time of the capture of Babylon, referred to by Daniel and Herodotus, there were two kings presiding over the empire, a father and his son; and thus we can understand that Daniel speaks of the son, who was slain. This unsuspected fact not only reconciles the prophet and the historian, but explains an otherwise inexplicable expression in Daniel, where it was promised to the prophet by Belshazzar, that if he could explain the writing on the wall, he would make him the *third* ruler in the kingdom. (Daniel v. 16.) Now, why not the *second* ruler, as Joseph in similar circumstances had been made in Egypt? The cylinder answers the question; there were two kings in Babylon, and therefore the place next to the throne could be only the *third* rulership in the kingdom. A very short time before the discovery which so triumphantly reconciles the seeming contradiction which cast a shade of suspicion on Daniel's accuracy, Mr. F. W. Newman had written these words in Kitto's Cyclopædia: “No hypothesis will reconcile this account with the other;” an instructive lesson this, teaching us to give the sacred writers credit for accuracy, even though we may be unable to explain facts which seem to impeach it.—*Church Herald*.