

plainly teach a universal resurrection of all that are in their graves, and a general judgment of all mankind, bad and good, as concomitants of Christ's second advent." Now we come to an important matter. The meaning of the writer is clear and definite. To some things that are in the above quotation we all subscribe; to others we object. It strikes me that the word "simultaneous" should have been used by the writer, instead of "universal." All classes of Christians believe in a universal resurrection of the dead, but some of us do not believe in a simultaneous resurrection. All shall rise but they may not rise at the same time. They come "every man in his own order" or brigade. In proof of his belief of a general simultaneous resurrection of the dead—good and bad—he quotes John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Here let me raise a question about these two soul-stirring verses of the Word; do they teach that all the dead shall rise together? They do not. They teach the broad, general fact that all shall rise from the grave; but that the rising shall be simultaneous is neither stated nor implied. That passage is brought forward to do what it cannot do. On the point of simultaneousness it is silent as the tomb. The Doctor does not deal with this point at all. He simply quotes it and seems to think that enough. He seems to think if a man is not blinded by theory he can see that those verses teach that all the dead shall come at once from the graves. It is not enough to say that men like the Bonars, McChesney, McKay, Kellogg and Parsons and such like are blinded by theory and pass on. An attempt should have been made to prove that that passage teaches the simultaneousness of the resurrection of the dead. The attempt would have been a failure; but it should have been made. It is not enough to cry out prejudice! prejudice! while men like Chalmers and Candlish hold otherwise. The great Dr. Brown tried his hand on that passage and failed to draw from it the testimony that he so much desired. He directed the strength of his expository remarks to the word *hora*, hour. "The hour is coming, in the which," etc. "Hour" denotes a point of time. There is just where Dr. Brown fell into a mistake. "Hour" may mean something different from a point of time. It may mean a period of long duration. It is so used in John iv. 21, "Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father." *Hora* there signifies an age. By no means did Dr. Brown make it clear that the term meant a point of time. Our own Doctor did not attempt it. Perhaps he took warning from the effort made across the ocean. In the absence of elucidation and explanation it should not be expected that we would accept the conclusion. I repeat the statement that John v. 28, 29 does not establish a simultaneous resurrection of the dead. Take an illustration. Mr. A. is a fruit grower. Mr. B. comes to him and wants to purchase some of his delicious growths. "No," says Mr. A. "all this fruit goes to such a man in the city." Query Does it follow that a simultaneous shipment of that fruit takes place? Does it follow that it all goes by the one train? Nothing of the kind follows. That fruit may go each kind in its own order and in its own season. "All shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth," but that they shall all come at the one time is not said. "The rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." N. Y. Z.

THE AUGMENTATION DEFICIT.

MR. EDITOR,—To all lovers of the Presbyterian Church the announcement of the deficit in the Augmentation Fund, making it necessary to lessen the grants to every aided congregation by \$25 or \$50, is a sad one. Not only is it a personal hardship to the minister whose income is thus so materially affected, but it is the paralyzing of the very arm with which alone the Church can hope to seize on and develop her weaker congregations. Without such a fund in good condition her energies must be crippled and her progress checked at every hand. Yet, discouraging as the deficiency is, there is an aspect of the case which is far more serious than the mere want of the financial help. From the very first notice of a failure in the response to the call for the fund, there has been the attempt to fix the responsibility of the deficit on a certain part of the Church, which is consequently spoken of as mean or disloyal or both. Language giving utterance to such sentiment has been used on the floor of the General Assembly, it has been voiced in resolutions by the Home Mission Committee, and now we are reminded by the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell that "it would not be fair to ascribe disloyalty to the General Assembly to all sections of the Church alike." As proof of this there is given the quotation from the Assembly's minutes, by which the writer seems to take for granted that the loyalty of every Presbytery to the various schemes is correctly tabulated in the number of cents put down as the average contribution. The absurdity of making such a comparison, without carefully estimating the relative wealth of the various congregations, is evident on the slightest examination. In a Presbytery, for instance, where most of the congregations give no more than \$750 to their own pastor, a large amount to help others cannot reasonably be expected. In many cases these have just emerged from a dependent position, and rightly feel that in the very effort they are making to pay their own pastor they are most effectively contributing to the fund. As the strength

of such congregations increases, and they are able to raise \$800, \$900 or \$1,000 a year, what is more natural than that they should first of all seek to raise the salary of their own pastor, to whose labours their increased prosperity may largely be due. Thus in congregations giving salaries below \$1,000 a year, the contributions to the fund are small not only in Western Ontario, where we are so "indifferent" or "hostile," but even in the model Presbytery [of Toronto itself. This is no mere conjecture, for if the contributions to the fund in that Presbytery from congregations giving \$1,200 and under towards the support of their own pastor are summed up, it will be four that the average giving of each member from such congregations is a little less than 11 cents. That is only a fraction of a cent more than is given by the Presbytery of Chatham. Nor is the comparison of that section of Toronto Presbytery with Chatham Presbytery unfair, for it contains five congregations that are reported as giving \$1,000 or over toward the support of their minister, while in Chatham altogether there are only four coming up to the \$1,000, and of these only one that goes above the \$1,200. That is, Chatham Presbytery in the west gives virtually as much as corresponding congregations in Toronto, and yet, by the current method of counting loyalty to the Church, these congregations in Toronto Presbytery stand high just because they happen to be near liberal and wealthy congregations in the city, while we who have no wealthy brethren to swell our contributions must be dubbed "disloyal" or "hostile." Surely it does not need to be said that success in raising funds for the scheme will never be achieved by the east kicking at the west, and the west stirring all their strength to kick back again, but by each, with some appreciation of the position and difficulties of the other, doing what he can, be it less or more.

Failings indeed we in the west are willing to confess. We believe that, as a rule, the weaker congregations have left the support of the fund too much to those who are wealthier, and yet the sweeping statements accusing all of disloyalty who do not give up to any given standard, we feel to be grossly unfair. If the weaker congregations throughout the Church, notwithstanding the difficulties with which they contend, would cheerfully do what they can and the small sums from the many be blended with the larger sums from the few, the hearts of all who love our Church will again be cheered by seeing the Augmentation Fund placed on a sure and substantial basis.

WM. FARQUHARSON.

The Manse, Oungah.

THE KINDERGARTEN.

MR. EDITOR,—In your issue of April 2, under the heading "Deaconesses in the Churches," there is an extract from *The Missionary Review* of an article by the Rev. Dr. A. H. Bradford, in which the following appears: "It is impossible even to mention all the names of the distinguished workers in the field of charity in Germany. Pestalozzi, the founder of the Kindergarten, did a noble work, but in it the religious element was lacking. At the age of eighty he saw for the first time what he had been striving for during his whole life, when, in 1826, he visited the institution of the venerable Zeller at Beuggen. When the children of that institution presented him with a beautiful wreath, as they sang one of their sweet hymns, Pestalozzi said to Zeller: 'This is what I wanted to accomplish.' His mistake was that, in his school at Stanz, there was no place for religious instruction."

All this may be true as regards Pestalozzi, but it is not true that Pestalozzi is the founder of the Kindergarten. Therefore, as far as the Kindergarten is concerned, the episode narrated above is of no value. A short historical account of the Kindergarten and its founder, Frederick Froebel, might not be out of place in the columns of THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN, but for the present it may be sufficient to say that the Kindergarten is part of the Educational System of the Province of Ontario, and by recent enactment has been incorporated as part of the Educational System of Manitoba. That it lacks the religious element is a statement not founded on fact.

WILLIAM SELBY.

Toronto

THE SEPTUAGINT.

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

OF THE VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE LXX.

Of the value and importance of the Septuagint version various estimations have been formed by learned men, while some have elevated it to an equality with the Hebrew Original, others have rated it far below its true value. Some of the ancients preferred this translation before the "Hebrew fountain," and said: "It is not credible that the seventy interpreters which translated at one time, and in one sense, could err, or would lie or err where it concerned them not, but the Jews, seeing that the law and the prophets are come to us by their interpretation, have changed some things in their books that the authority of ours might be lessened." Augustine, however, who gives this quotation, thinks differently. "Let that tongue be rather believed (says he) out of which a translation is made into another by interpreters." And again, "the truth of things must be fetched out of that tongue out of which that that we have is interpreted." Lightfoot entertained a very different opinion regarding it. "It were easy," says he, "to instance in thousands of places how they add men and years, how they add matter of their own

heads, as how they help Job's wife to scold, adding them (Job ii.) a whole course of female passion. 'I must now (saith she) go wander up and down and have no place to rest in,' etc. To trace them in their mistakes is pretty, to see how their unpricked Bible deceived them." Says Dr. Pyc Smith: "Its unsupported testimony is not of much weight in any instance of doubtful criticism, and its character is particularly low in relation to those passages of Scripture which respect the Messiah. Those translators had faint ideas of the doctrine and promise of a Messiah. The Alexandrian Jews, living out of Palestine, having disused the Hebrew language, being immersed in worldly pursuits and daily associating with their heathen neighbours, were more likely than the Jews of Judea to become indifferent to the hope of Israel."

The Septuagint is but the work of fallible man, as such, however, it is highly valuable. It is not only a translation of the Old Testament, but it is the Old Testament translated into the language of the New. "Let it be remembered that the Gospel was in its aspect to the world a hellenistic thing. In the providential designs of God the Roman was the herald to proclaim silence to the world, the Greek was the interpreter. And this was in keeping with the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles. It did not merely facilitate the grand scheme of universal preaching, but Greeks, in the language of Scripture, were Gentiles, and Gentiles were Greeks. See John vii. 35; Rom. i. 14. There is reason to believe that the very knowledge of Hebrew now existing among us has been won, in a measure at least, by the patient labour of those who have diligently compared the original Scriptures with the Septuagint." But not only is it useful in elucidating the Hebrew Scriptures, but it also greatly serves to correct the Hebrew text itself. One or two examples will serve to show the value of the Septuagint in this respect. In Gen. iv. 8, the Hebrew is rendered in the English version Cain talked with Abel his brother. Analogy requires, however, that the words should rather be translated Cain said to Abel (the words of the speaker following). These words the Septuagint supplies, "Let us go into the field." Again, Deut. xxxii. 43, the following words occur in the Septuagint, "Rejoice, ye heavens, with Him, and let all the angels of God worship Him." This passage is not in the Hebrew, and yet they are quoted, Heb. i. 6. Another remarkable instance of the use of the Septuagint in correcting the Hebrew is afforded by the omission of a verse in one of the acrostic Psalms (cxlv. 13), where the order of the alphabet requires that it should begin with a bracket. This verse also the Septuagint supplies.

Further, the Septuagint is highly valuable for confirming those proofs of Christ's Messiahship and of the truths of the Christian religion which the writers of the New Testament have drawn from the Old. Compare Heb. viii. 9 with Jer. xxxi. 32, also Heb. x. 38 with Heb. ii. 4.

Again, the Septuagint is absolutely necessary for rightly understanding and accurately explaining the New Testament. In it are many Greek words used which cannot be rightly understood except by a collation with the Hebrew and a knowledge of the sense in which the LXX used them.

The value of the Septuagint will be still further enhanced and the duty of carefully studying it more binding when we consider that without a knowledge of it it is impossible thoroughly to understand the valuable writings either of the Greek or Latin fathers—who, for example, could understand Ambrose when, in his oration on the death of Theodosius, he speaks thus of Heleas: "Adoravit illum qui pependit in ligu, illum, inquam qui sicut scarabaeus clamavit, ut persecutoribus suis peccata condonaret," unless he knew that the writer had in view Hab. ii. 11.

"The book (says Michaelis) most necessary to be read and understood by every man who studies the New Testament is the Septuagint, which alone has been of more service than all the passages from profane authors collected together. It should be read in the public schools by those who are destined for the church; should form the subject of a course of lectures at the University, and be the constant companion of an expositor of the New Testament."

"About the year 1785 (says Dr. Adam Clarke) I began to read the Septuagint regularly, in order to acquaint myself more fully with the phraseology of the New Testament. The study of this version served more to expand and illuminate my mind than all the theological works I had ever consulted. I had proceeded but a short way in it before I was convinced that the prejudices against it were utterly unfounded, and that it was of incalculable advantage towards a proper understanding of the literal sense of Scripture."

When we consider then that by means of this translation the sacred volume was spread over a great part of the civilized world in the language most universally understood, and that by it the substance of the text was fixed and authenticated at least 270 years before the appearance of our Lord; when we remember that it, "quasi stella matutina, solis orientis prodromus," contributed so largely to prepare the way for the Gospel, "when Japheth should come to dwell in the tents of Shem," by making accessible to the learned and the inquisitive in every quarter of the then known world the grand truths of religion, the history of Divine Providence and the prophecies announcing the Messiah; when we consider these things in addition to those stated above, its unspeakable importance will be manifest. We may truly welcome it not indeed as the rival, but as the handmaid of the Hebrew Scriptures, "the pleasing tribute of Gentile literature to the house of God; who, from the midst of all the infidelity and error that darken the earth can elicit blessings for his people; who could make the inauspicious land of Egypt at one time a shelter for the young child from the jealousy of a Jewish king, at another the faithful repository of the written word. The Jews were thus providentially led to deposit a pledge for the truth of the Gospel which they could never recall, and in the heart of their inspired records had treasured up a picture of the Man of Sorrows, of which it was too late to deny the likeness to Jesus of Nazareth."