

Their stability may be doubted. It has, however, been repeatedly attested by ministers that the best members in their churches were those who had been received in childhood or early youth. A striking testimony was given some years ago by an American minister, as reported in one of our religious papers. He said, "During five and twenty years I have seen admitted into the Church not less than 150 children under the age of fourteen, and I say without fear of contradiction, that their evidence of true piety has been equal, aye, far superior, to that of very many adults admitted into the Church. We have received many between the ages of seven and nine. The youngest was seven years old. The whole Church stood back aghast to see that boy come forward to unite with the Church. The minister talked with him. 'I am satisfied that the boy has been born into the Kingdom.' We received him into the Church, and he has been for the last ten years a preacher of the Gospel in the State of Missouri. Another one joined at about the same age, and is now one of the best superintendents of the Sabbath school.

Mr. Spurgeon, with his large experience, bears strong testimony to the same purport. "I will say broadly that I have more confidence in the spiritual life of the children that I have received into the Church than I have in the spiritual condition of the adults thus received. I will even go further than this, and say that I have usually found a clearer knowledge of the Gospel and a warmer love to Christ in the child-converts than in the man-converts. I will even astonish you still more by saying that I have sometimes met with a deeper spiritual experience in children of ten and twelve than I have in certain persons of fifty and sixty."

Mr. McCheyne gives several examples of young Christians under fourteen manifesting great maturity of spiritual experience and wisdom, and knowledge of divine truth. The memoir of Samuel Wyke Kilpin gives another notable example. In some of our own churches also some young children have been received into fellowship, who have contrived to grow in grace, and promise to be most useful in days to come.

Having looked briefly at these few points, what is the result? It is that what is required is, first, a fuller baptism of the Holy Spirit, to be devoutly sought by all the Church. Next, and as the result of that, a more earnest working on the old lines, with modifications suited to circumstances rather than entirely new methods. Let Christian parents awake to greater activity and earnestness, and realize that on them the primary responsibility lies, and not on the Sabbath school teacher, not even on the minister and the Church. Let them teach their children God's truth with their own lips: let them carefully supervise their reading and their companionships; let them strive and pray for their early conversion and continually look for it, till their prayers are answered. Let Sabbath school teachers, whose priceless labours are a necessity for multitudes, and may be a great help to all, let them labour for the same great end, keeping it continually before them. Let ministers and elders look for this also, taking a constant and loving interest in the lambs of the flock, and striving both by public and private ministrations, to win them to the tender Shepherd whose arms are open to receive them.

And when the young, for whose conversion they are constantly praying, come forward to declare their faith in Christ, let them not be met with looks of surprise and suspicion, as if those prayers had no faith in them, but let them, on due examination, be welcomed into the fellowship of the Church, and there guarded and tended and trained, so that they may grow up in all things into Christ.

The prevailing interest in the spiritual well-being of the young is one of many indications that we are living in one of the glorious days of the Church. But if the Church aimed at were accomplished, as surely we may hope, and the rising generation of the young were all brought into the family of Christ, the present would have no glory by reason of the glory about to come, which would far excel it. Which may the Lord grant. Amen.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

FROM THE POSTHUMOUS PAPERS OF THE LATE MR. THOMAS HENNING—(Continued).

TYCHSEN'S OPINION.

In consequence of the difficulties attending both of the foregoing opinions, there is a third party who thinks that there must have been some foundation for what Aristæas relates, or his book never would have been received as it was by persons living not many centuries after his time, and who could easily have become acquainted with any traditions that might have contradicted his narrative. These imagine that the law was transcribed into Greek characters.

The supporters of this hypothesis lay much stress upon the motives which induced the king to have a copy of the law in his library. We may here note a few of the many suppositions made regarding the reasons.

WHY PTOLEMY WISHED FOR A COPY OF THE LAW.

Upon this Aristobolus is silent. Aristæas relates that the librarian represented it to the king as a desirable thing that such a book should be deposited in the royal library. Havernick thinks that a literary rather than a religious motive led to the version. This is very doubtful. Hody, Sturz, Frankel and others conjecture that the object was religious or ecclesiastical. Eichorn refers it to private impulse; while Hug takes the object to have been political. With Hug agree Tychsen and others. They say that while his ostensible object was to enrich his library with a valuable book, his real

motive was his wish to secure the constant residence in his dominions of the great multitude of Jews whom he found there on his coming to the throne, and thus he helped to effect by thus rendering them no longer dependent on their brethren in Judea for the administration of their civil and religious policy which they could read and understand, by giving them a copy of their law.

According to these the seventy-two were obliged to transcribe the law into Greek characters according to the pronunciation of the Hellenists. Five of the seventy-two, or perhaps five Alexandrian Jews, translated the Pentateuch from the transcribed copy, either by order of the king or for their own use. The Jews in Judea, finding how they had been deceived, that the law had not only been translated but transcribed so as to be legible in the original by the Hellenistic Jews, and thus polluted by Gentile characters, instituted a solemn fast.

The Jews in Alexandria commemorated the same event by an annual festival. Aristæas, wishing to establish the credit of this version, conceals the real design of the king—flatters him by giving an exaggerated account of his munificence toward the captive Jews, and sets forth minutely everything calculated to satisfy the vanity of the Jews and to induce them to receive the copy of the law offered them by Ptolemy.

Certainly, if we admit that Aristæas composed his history with these views, we shall find many difficulties removed and many objections against it obviated. We shall see what he had for the groundwork of his narrative, and the reasons he had for exaggerating it in so many particulars, and thus to a certain extent we can account for his speaking of the Jews and of the Greek version in the favourable way he had done.

As this transcription hypothesis is, in our opinion, an ingenious one, and deserving of more attention than many critics will allow, we shall give the heads of the arguments urged in its favour as we find them in "Hamilton's Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures."

He argues that it was no unusual thing among the ancients to transcribe the words of one language into the character of another, and adduces as a proof the passage in the "Pænulus" of Plautus, which is in the Punic tongue. He adduces the testimony of different writers. It is supposed that by Chaldee he meant Hebrew, but he speaks not of languages, but of letters, and says of them that they were changed into the Greek, which was done not by translating them into the language, but by transcribing them into the character. Hamilton thinks this argument altogether unsupported, but adds that the inconclusiveness of one does not affect the rest. Josephus says that the conference of Demetrius with the king was not about the interpretation, but about the transcribing the Jewish writings, which were written in the Hebrew character, and were unintelligible to them. In another place he says: "That the law should be translated and transcribed out of the Hebrew into Greek characters." And further he relates that the High Priest expressed his anxiety about the restoration of the copy which the LXX elders carried with them into Egypt, indicating that he was deceived by the manner in which the king acted. Besides, if Ptolemy merely wished for a version of the Scriptures to enrich his library, why could not such a work have been executed more commodiously and more expeditiously at Jerusalem? But if his intention were as stated above, then his object could not have been carried into effect otherwise than by bringing the elders into Egypt.

Justin Martyr apparently speaks of a Hebrew-Greek copy, which is confirmed by a fragment of Irenæus, in which are the words "Deus nobis servavit simplices scripturas in Egypto," meaning the autographs in opposition to copies. Tertullian says, "Hodie apud sererpeum Ptolemæi Bibliothecæ cum ipsis Hebraicis literis exhibentur, ut et Judæipalam lectitant," etc.

The Talmud is next appealed to in proof of the existence of a Hebrew-Greek code.

Origen wrote the second column of his "Hexapla" in Greek letters. Dr. Marsh says he did so that his Greek readers might have some idea of the formation and sound of the Hebrew words, but could this have been a sufficient reason, or could they, by reading this most uncouth column, have formed any judgment respecting the structure of the Hebrew language?

The next proofs are brought from the version itself. First from the manner in which the lines were divided into words.

It is attempted to be shown that in many instances the differences between the Hebrew original and the Greek version were not occasioned by a different reading in the Hebrew copy, but by the translators following the Alexandrian pronunciation of certain words. Hamilton brings forward many instances of this kind.

The writers who have examined and written against this view are Dath, Michaelis and Hessencamp.

Such is a sketch of the leading opinions held respecting the origin of this celebrated version, and when we look at the many contradictory statements made we may well adopt the language of Lightfoot, "In rebus ergo, tam minime inter se consistentibus, quid dicendum? Credere est credere incredibilia, negare est universæ antiquitati contradicere. Miracula supponere est absque fundamento; totam historiam rejicere est absque ratione."

We shall now proceed to state what is most generally held as the

PROBABLE HISTORY OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

It is most likely that this translation was effected during the two years when Ptolemy Philadelphus shared the throne with his father, Ptolemy Lagus, *i.e.*, about the years 286 and 285

B.C. It is probable that it was neither made by the command of Ptolemy nor at the request nor under the superintendence of Demetrius Phalereus, but was voluntarily undertaken by the Jews for the use of their countrymen. If it had been made by public authority, it would have been performed under the direction of the Sanhedrim, "who would have examined it, and perhaps corrected it if it had been the work of a single individual, previously to giving it the stamp of their approbation and introducing it into their synagogues." In either case the translation would, probably, be denominated the Septuagint, because the Sanhedrim was composed of seventy or seventy-two members. It is even possible that the Sanhedrim, in order to ascertain the fidelity of the work, might have sent to Palestine for some learned men, of whose assistance and advice they would have availed themselves in examining the version. If this could be proved it would account for the story of the king's sending an embassy to Jerusalem." (Horne.)

The translation was made by natives of Egypt and at Alexandria. We think that it has been clearly proved in opposition to Aristæas that the translators were Alexandrian, not Palestinian Jews. The internal character of the entire version, particularly of the Pentateuch, sufficiently attest the fact. Hody proves this satisfactorily.

The Jewish shekel, he says, is called Didrachmus. The Ephah, an Egyptian measure. Tharn mien (Ex. xxviii. 30) they render aletheia, which was the word inscribed on the breastplate of the Egyptian judges. The Egyptian name of Joseph they expressed differently from the Hebrew text, probably because they understood the true pronunciation of it. Various other Coptic words are introduced.

That the translation was made at Alexandria, Hody further proves from the Fast said to have been instituted by the Jews at Jerusalem, which would not have been the case had it been the work of men sent from Judea by the authorities of the High Priest. Frankel supposes that it was made not only at different times, but at different places. This is quite arbitrary. There is no reason for believing with him that different books originated in this fashion, the impulse having gone forth from Alexandria, and spreading to localities where the Jews had settled, especially Cyrene, Leontopolis and even Asia Minor.

(To be continued.)

APPLES OF GOLD IN PICTURES OF SILVER.

MR. EDITOR,—Such we think is a good description of the timely and fitting words of your correspondent, "C. M. D." of Toronto, in your issue of the 29th ult. The Church of which Christ Jesus is the Foundation and Head is the Catholic—the universal Church. He laid the foundation whereby man is justified by "suffering the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God" and is now the glorified Head superintending and giving efficacy to the work His Father gave Him to do. He is the good Shepherd, giving laws to guide, giving food to nourish—caring for the sheep and not the hireling shepherd caring for the fleece.

If the 188 were legislating for a community completely isolated, their case might seem plausible, but when for a part of a whole it is different. The whole is affected by the parts; the quality and strength of the chain by the quality and strength of individual links—the whole not being stronger than the weakest part. The noxious seed will spread from the bad-managed farm to adjoining farms. Indeed we may say while on this subject that the great error of the day in educational matters as regards both the State and individuals is confounding religion with sectarianism. As God's creatures our happiness is bound up with our knowing and confiding in Him, in which sense even the young lions are religious.

While all leaders should have a policy—that policy should be founded on truth and righteousness, not in scheming and unrighteousness, which must end in disaster. It would be well to remember the disastrous consequence to our first parents and the world of following Satan's policy. We should also remember the full meaning of the words of inspiration: "Let us do evil that good may come—whose damnation is just;" also "on each side walk the wicked when vile men are high in place." May not the embarrassed state of agriculturists especially be part of the outcome of so many non-producing parasites preying on their resources? J. R.

Warwick, Jan. 31st, 1890.

THE MOST ALARMING SIN.

If I were called to point out the most alarming sins of to day those which are most deceitful in their influence, and most soul-destroying in their ultimate effects—I would not mention drunkenness with all its fearful havoc, nor gambling with its crazed victims, nor harlotry with its hellish orgies, but the love of money on the part of men, and the love of display on the part of women. While open vice sends its thousands, these fashionable and favoured indulgences send their ten thousands to perdition. They sear the conscience, incrust the soul with an impenetrable shell of worldliness, debauch the affections from every high and heavenly object, and make man or woman the worshipper of self. While doing all this the poor victim is allowed by public opinion to think himself or herself a Christian, while the drunkard, the gambler or the prostitute is not deceived by such a thought for a moment.—Dr. Crosby.