

## Our Contributors.

### CANNONADED AND CANONIZED.

BY KNOXONIAN.

Dr. Wayland Hoyt says that some men are cannonaded during their lives and canonized after their death. That is an historic fact neatly stated. It is a great thing to be able to state facts in that way. Some writers would spread the same fact over a page and when you had pondered through the page you would perhaps have to guess what they were trying to say. The art of putting things is an art well worth cultivating.

John Bright was cannonaded during the greater part of his life but when he died a few months ago the English speaking world canonized him. Bright, on the hustings, was, in the estimation of many people, a rampant Radical ready to destroy the British constitution: Bright in his coffin was a great, loyal, patriotic Briton.

Gladstone is fearfully cannonaded at the present time. He is a target for more missiles, from guns big and little, than any other Englishman. As the next general election comes near the cannonading will grow louder and fiercer. The Grand Old Man stands up serenely amidst the noise and smoke and declares he would rather serve his country in the latter half of this century than at any other period in the history of the Empire. He enjoys his work and says Englishmen are a fine people to work for. It is a great blessing that somebody enjoys serving the public. If Gladstone would only die the fierce cannonading would suddenly stop and he would be canonized before his body was laid in Westminster Abbey. Gladstone fighting for Home Rule is a dangerous man whose reckless schemes may break up the Empire; Gladstone in his grave was a great British Statesman who loved his country and his Queen and served both long and well. Great is public opinion.

Scotchmen are popularly supposed to be a staid kind of people, not greatly given to sudden changes of opinion and feeling, but the fact still remains that Dr. Chalmers was freely cannonaded in '43 by about half the nation and that in less than fifty years he is canonized by Scotchmen the world over with as much unanimity and heatiness as Scotchmen can do anything.

When Hugh Miller was editor of the *Edinburgh Witness* he enjoyed a fair share of cannonading. Most editors do. A timely well put reference to Hugh Miller will bring out a hearty cheer now from a Scotch audience in any part of the globe, even though nine-tenths of them belong to the Old Kirk.

Spurgeon was cruelly cannonaded for many years after he began his work in London. The Church people disliked him; the Literati ridiculed him; hypocrites of all kinds hated him; journalists feared him. With the artillery of jealous friends and bitter foes playing upon him from all directions he was a well cannonaded man. Most of the guns are silent now and if the great London preacher would only consent to die he would be canonized before his clay became cold.

Coming across the Atlantic we find some splendid illustrations. George Washington was literally cannonaded for years. No bullets happened to hit him: his rebellion proved successful, and now he is lauded as a pure, patriotic statesman by the English-speaking world. Some of the highest eulogiums that are passed upon Washington come from the lips of men who would have hanged him a hundred years ago.

Abraham Lincoln was a well cannonaded man during his life. Public opinion is fast settling down to the conclusion that Lincoln was one of the best public men of this century. Had he been a candidate at the last presidential election enterprising Democratic editors would have thought nothing of spreading a report to the effect that he made too free with his neighbours' horses out on the prairie. There's nothing that saves a public man's reputation like being dead.

William Lyon Mackenzie was more fiercely cannonaded during his life than any other man that ever served in Canada. There are not many candid, fair-minded men now who will not cheerfully admit that William Lyon Mackenzie loved his adopted country, perhaps not always wisely, but always well. Every reform he contended for has long since been secured and enjoyed by the people. It is easy to say these reforms could have been secured by constitutional means. Perhaps they could, but not so quickly. Have Englishmen always measured and timed the blows they struck for freedom? It ill becomes those who enjoy the reforms Mackenzie lost his all in contending for to criticize harshly the means by which he helped to give them the rights of freedom. One of these days a statue of Mackenzie will adorn the Queen's Park and perchance it may be unveiled by a good Conservative, as the statue of George Brown was.

George Brown was a well cannonaded man. So was Robert Baldwin. Baldwin was canonized long ago and George Brown is freely quoted by men on both sides of politics and by one side about as much as the other. There are not many fair-minded people who will not now admit that George Brown was one of the greatest men Canada ever saw and the day is not far distant when everybody will say he was a good one too.

Sir John Macdonald and Oliver Mowat are being cannonaded more fiercely just now than any two men in Canada. Fifty years hence both will be canonized. By simply dying either one of them could change the cannonading into canon-

ization in an hour. It is altogether probable that both would prefer going on as they are, for some time longer, but we all know how quickly the canonizing would begin if they stepped off the stage.

The moral is—don't cannonade public men so fiercely. It does not make much difference to the men, but it does make thoughtful people suspect that the public are mostly fools if they cannonade a man one day and canonize him the next. When public opinion changes suddenly and without any cause it is hard to keep from treating it with contempt. Don't cannonade so hard and then the change to canonization won't seem so painfully inconsistent.

### THE SEPTUAGINT.

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

THE TRANSLATION OF THE SEVERAL BOOKS MADE AT DIFFERENT TIMES AND OF UNEQUAL VALUE.

Hody thinks that the translators (five in number) translated nothing but the Pentateuch, and appeals to the testimony of Aristobulus, Josephus, etc. He contends that the term "τομος" used by Aristobulus, meant at that time the Mosaic books alone; although it was afterwards taken in a wider sense so as to embrace all the Old Testament. Valckenaer thinks that all the books were comprehended under it. It is certainly more rational to restrict it to the Pentateuch. That the Pentateuch, however, was translated a considerable time before the prophets is not warranted by the language of Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, etc. (Davidson).

The thirteen places said to have been altered by the translators all occur in the Pentateuch. Hody thinks that the prophetic books were probably translated when the Jews resorted to their reading the prophets, the use of the law having been forbidden by Antiochus Epiphanes. It is said, however, that it is wholly improbable that Antiochus interdicted the Jews merely from reading the Pentateuch (comp. I Macc. i. 41, and Josephus Antiq. xii. 5. Frankel). Hody's proof that the book of Joshua was not translated till upwards of twenty years after the death of Ptolemy Lagus founded upon the word γαυρος is said by Davidson to be perfectly nugatory, although the time assigned cannot be far from the truth. The same writer adds that the epilogue to the work of Esther does not state that this part of the Old Testament was translated under Ptolemy Philometer or that it was dedicated to him. On the contrary it refers to a certain epistle containing apocryphal additions to the canonical book of Esther (Valckenaer, pp. 33 and 63).

It is a fruitless task to attempt to ascertain the precise time at which separate portions of the version were made. All that can be known with any degree of probability is that it was begun under Lagus and finished before the 38th year of Ptolemy Physcon.

The translator of the Pentateuch appears to have been the most skilful of all, being evidently master of both Greek and Hebrew. He has generally followed very closely the Hebrew text and has in various instances introduced the most suitable and best chosen expressions (Horne).

Next to the Pentateuch for ability and fidelity of execution ranks the translation of the book of Proverbs, the author of which was also well skilled in both languages. Michaelis says, "Of all the books of the Septuagint the style of the Proverbs is the best, where the translator has clothed the most ingenious thoughts in as neat and elegant language as was ever used by a Pythagorean sage to express his philosophic maxims."

The translator of the book of Job being well acquainted with the Greek poets, his style is said to be more elegant and studied, but he was not sufficiently master of the Hebrew language and literature and consequently his version is often erroneous. Many of the historical passages are interpolated, and in the poetical parts, according to Jerome, there are wanting as many as seventy or eighty verses. Origen supplied these out of Theodotion's translation.

The Psalms and Prophets were translated by men unfit for the task. Jeremiah is the best executed among the prophets and next to this the books of Amos and Ezekiel are placed.

Bishop South says that Isaiah was translated upwards of 100 years after the Pentateuch, and by a very inadequate person; there being scarcely any book so ill-rendered in the Septuagint as this. The vision of Daniel was found so erroneous that it was totally rejected by the ancient church and Theodotion's translation substituted in its place. The books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel and Kings appear to have been translated by the same person but at what period is not known. Michaelis and Bertholdt conjecture that Daniel was first translated after the advent of Christ.

FROM WHAT MANUSCRIPTS DID THE LXX. TRANSLATE?

This is a question which has sadly puzzled Biblical philologists. As we have already seen, Professor Tyschen has offered an hypothesis that they did not translate the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek but that it was transcribed in Hebrew-Greek characters and that from this manuscript their version was made. Others say that the letters of the MS. from which this version was made were substantially the same as the present square characters, that there were no vowel points, that there was no separation into words; no final letters; that the letter  $\zeta$  wanted the diacritic point, and that words were frequently abbreviated. The division into verses and chapters is much later than the age of the translators. Grabe says that the Alexandrine Code has 150 divisions or, as they

may be called, chapters, in the book of Numbers alone, Bishop Horsley (quoted by Horne) doubts whether the MS. from which the LXX. translated would (if now extant) be entitled to the same degree of credit as our modern Hebrew text. "After the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, perhaps earlier, the Hebrew text was in a much worse state of corruption in the copies which were in private hands than it has ever been since the revision of the sacred books by Ezra. These inaccurate copies would be multiplied during the whole period of the captivity and widely scattered in Assyria, Persia and Egypt; in short, through all the regions of the dispersion. If the translation of the LXX. was made from some of those old MS. which the dispersed Jews had carried into Egypt, or from any other of those unauthenticated copies (which is the prevailing tradition among the Jews, and is very probable) it will be likely that the faultiest manuscript now extant differs less from the genuine Esdrim text than those more ancient, which the version of the LXX. represents." It has been a question much discussed:

DID THE TRANSLATION OF THE PENTATEUCH FOLLOW A HEBREW OR A SAMARITAN CODEX?

The Septuagint and Samaritan harmonize in more than a thousand places. Hence it has been supposed that the Samaritan edition was the basis of the version. De Dieu, Selden, Whiston, Hottinger, Hassencamp and Eichhorn are of this opinion. Against it, it is argued that the irreconcilable enmity subsisting between the Jews and Samaritans, both in Egypt and Palestine, effectually militates against it. Besides in the Prophets and Hagiographa the number of variations from the Masoretic text is even greater and more remarkable than those in the Pentateuch, whereas the Samaritan extends no farther than the Mosaic books. No solution, therefore, can be satisfactory, which will not serve to explain at once the cause or causes both of the differences between the LXX. and Hebrew in the Pentateuch and those found in the remaining books.

Some suppose that the one was interpolated from the other. Jahn and Bauer imagine that the Hebrew MS. used by the Egyptian Jews agreed much more closely with the Samaritan in the text and forms of its letters than the present Masoretic copies. Gesenius puts forth another hypothesis, viz.: That both the Samaritan and Pentateuch flowed from a common recension (εκδοσις) of the Hebrew Scriptures, one older than either, and different in many places from the recension of the Masorites now in common use. "This supposition," says Prof. Stuart, by whom it is adopted, "will account for the differences and for the agreements of the Septuagint and Samaritan." To this it is objected, 1st, It assumes that before the whole of the Old Testament was written there had been a recension or revision of several books. 2nd, It implies that a recension took place before any books had been written, except the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and the writings of David and Solomon. 3rd, It supposes that an older recension was still current after Ezra had revised the whole collection and closed the canon. The suppositions are not in unison with right notions of the inspiration of Scripture.

Prof. Lee (Prolegom. to Bagster's Polyglott) conjectures that the early Christians interspersed their copies with Samaritan glosses, which ignorant transcribers afterward inserted in the text. But there is no evidence that Christians in general were acquainted with the Samaritan Pentateuch and its additions to the Hebrew copy; besides he has not taken into account the reverence entertained by the early Christians for the sacred books.

Frankel mentions another hypothesis, viz., That the Septuagint flowed from a Chaldee version, which was used before and after the time of Ezra—a version inexact and paraphrastic which had undergone many alterations and corruptions. Dr. Davidson states that this was first proposed by R. Asaria di Rossi, and adds that no hypothesis yet proposed commends itself to general reception. He thinks that the great source from which the striking peculiarities in the LXX. and the Samaritan flowed was early traditional interpretations current among the Jews, targums or paraphrases—not written perhaps but orally circulated.

HOW WAS THE SEPTUAGINT RECEIVED AT FIRST?

Great difference of opinion exists on this point as well as on almost every other connected with the LXX. Some think that it did not obtain general authority as long as Hebrew was understood at Alexandria, and doubt whether it was ever so highly esteemed by the Jews as to be publicly read in their synagogues in place of the original. The passages quoted by Hody from the Fathers go to prove no more than that it was found in the synagogues.

Philo adopted it. Dr. Hody thinks that Josephus corroborated his work on Jewish antiquities from the Hebrew text; yet Salmasius, Bochart, Bauer and others have shown that he has adhered to the Septuagint throughout that work (Horne).

When controversies arose between Christians and Jews and the former appeared with irresistible force of argument to this version, the latter denied that it agreed with the Hebrew original. Thus by degrees it became odious to the Jews, as much execrated as it had before been commended. They had recourse to the translation of Aquila, who is supposed to have undertaken a new work from the Hebrew, with the express object of supplanting the Septuagint and favouring the sentiments of his brethren.

After the general reception of the Septuagint version, numerous mistakes were made in the transcription and multiplication of copies. In the time of the early fathers its text had already been altered, and the Jews, in argument with the