

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 17.—JANUARY, 1876.

Art. I.—THE AUBURN DECLARATION.

By Rev. E. D. MORRIS, D.D., Professor of Theology in Lane Theological Seminary.

AMONG the treasures preserved in the Library of Lane Seminary, is the original draft of what is widely known as the AUBURN DECLARATION. More than thirty years after its preparation, just when the separated Presbyterian Churches were happily uniting, this interesting historical document was presented to the Institution by its author, the venerable BAXTER DICKINSON, D.D. It was also accompanied by valuable memoranda with respect to its authorship, and to the circumstances which occasioned its preparation. Its contents have at various times been made public through the press, and have recently been incorporated under another name in the Presbyterian Digest. Its doctrinal quality and its important historical relations to the Presbyterian Church, both as separate and as united, are such as justify its further introduction to public notice in the columns of our denominational REVIEW. What will be attempted in the present article, is a narrative of the origin of this declaration, an analysis of its contents, and a brief discussion of its doctrinal significance and value, as one among the interesting memorials of our beloved Zion.

It is hardly needful to say that this task is undertaken in no conscious mood of partisanship, and with no anticipation of awakening old animosities or arousing new oppositions, but

phraseology and teaching of the Auburn Declaration to be an improvement in several particulars upon those of the Westminster Symbols: that he humbly trusts and prays that the Presbyterian Church of the future may have yet clearer apprehension, larger knowledge, more inclusive faith respecting these great mysteries of grace; but that, so far as present creeds are concerned, he cordially, and after full examination, accepts the legal motto, *STARE DECISIS*. It should be added, that the responsibility of the editors of this REVIEW, for the present discussion, is limited entirely to their kind consent to its admission in these pages.

Art. II.—THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

By W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary.

We propose, as we may be able in a brief article, to illustrate the importance of an accurate and thorough knowledge of the Hebrew in the interpretation of the Old Testament. We must get beyond the province of the beginner and the smatterer—beyond the mere work of making a translation as a linguistic exercise. We are to deal with language as the medium of thought and feeling. We are to hear what God the Lord will speak. We come to learn the truths which it was given to holy men to impart by divine inspiration, and to receive the impressions which they sought to make. Our aim is, or should be, to grasp these truths in the exact form and in the same clearness in which they lay before the minds of those to whom they were originally addressed, and to gather these impressions, as far as may be, without any loss of their original vividness and force. We wish these words to convey to us precisely what they were intended and adapted to convey to the contemporaries of the sacred writers themselves, neither less nor more.

In order to this it is essential that the thought should not be warped or distorted by the medium through which it is transmitted, but that it should be faithfully and accurately delivered to us in its own proper and genuine forms. This cannot be unless the language is to us what it was to those who

originally used it, and means to us just what it did to them. We must, so far as possible, get our minds into the same familiar and unembarrassed readiness to receive true and correct impressions from all its utterances, as they were. We must strive to be no longer foreigners to the Hebrew, but place ourselves, as far as this may be, in the attitude of natives.

We cannot accomplish this by merely fixing upon a tolerable English equivalent for each Hebrew word, and then transferring each sentence into English, word by word. We shall be greatly mistaken if we suppose that this mechanical process will yield, as its result, the precise counterpart of the Hebrew sentence. We shall doubtless obtain something that bears a vague and general resemblance to the original, but this is all. The vigor and beauty of the expression, its life and sparkle, will be missing, and perhaps even the very point and meaning of the thought may have escaped us. Words of one language cannot be exchanged for those of another by a fixed law of valuation, as foreign coins can be converted into our native currency. Words are the representatives of mental conceptions, or mental states; and are liable to the same variety of signification as those conceptions and states themselves. The Hebrew language represents the mind of the people that spoke it. It embodies their conceptions of the various objects of thought and knowledge, and of their mutual relations. And just as certainly as there are diversities in national character and national life, in the range of objects which address themselves to each people's observation or reflection, or in the aspects under which these present themselves, just so surely must their respective languages be incommensurable. The style of thought and mode of conception belonging to any one people must differ from that of every other, and this difference will be reflected in every individual element of their several languages. As a rule, those words which most nearly approximate each other in different languages, are not after all exact equivalents. They do not cover precisely the same tract of thought or extent of signification; or by reason of derivation or usage, or some special association, one wears a complexion differing more or less from the other.

Take one of the simplest of all illustrations, the term employed to denote the Supreme Being. The Hebrew *El*, or

Elohim, and the Greek *Θεός* are alike rendered by *God* in English; but they suggest very different conceptions. *El* is the mighty One; it points to the Divine Omnipotence. *Elohim* is the adorable One; or, as is indicated by the plural form, the one who concentrates in himself all adorable perfections. The God of the Hebrews is a God of might, and one that is to be feared. *Θεός*, like *Ζεύς*, and the Latin *Deus*, is from the same root with the Latin *dies*, day, and primarily describes the brightness of the firmament. It belongs to the worship of nature; it is a deification of the brilliant sky. And, besides, as the language of a pagan people it is infected with polytheism. It means not God, but a god—one of many deities, of many similar personifications of natural objects. This very word is indeed used of the Most High in the Greek Scriptures, but in a new and exalted sense; it had first been purged of its old associations of nature worship and polytheism, and transfused with Jewish thought by Hellenistic use. Its materialistic is exchanged for a spiritual meaning, as is the case in so many New Testament words, so that when the apostle declares *ὁ θεός φῶς ἐστὶ*, “God is light,” no one thinks of the glowing sky, but only of the splendor of his moral perfections. And our word “God” is of a different meaning still. It is a simple offspring of Christian ideas, radically connected with “good,” and indicating at once his benevolence and his moral purity.

When the Pagan Greeks and Romans called their Supreme Deity the Father of Gods and men, they thought of physical generation; it was from him they lineally sprang. When the Hebrew people called God their father, who had made them and established them, and who claimed Israel as his son, even his first born, it was with a totally different idea. They thought of his creative power and his gracious choice by which he had brought Israel into being as a nation, and as his own peculiar people, and of the paternal care which he continued to exercise over them. When the New Testament teaches us to address God as *Abba*, Father, it is with a different idea still—that of individual adoption to sonship in Christ, God’s own eternal son by a mystical generation. The same word may thus have an entirely different meaning growing out of the conceptions of those by whom it is employed. We cannot interpret language intelligently and correctly, it will inevitably convey to us a per-

verted meaning, unless we place ourselves in the very position of those who used it. We must think their thoughts. We must look upon things as they regarded them. We must learn to move in the same world in which they moved, and not put into their words notions which, however natural or familiar to us, were strange to them. We must divest ourselves of all that is modern or occidental in our style of thought, and for the time become, as far as may be, genuine Hebrews, in entire sympathy and accord with the old prophets and psalmists, and other Hebrew penmen—penetrating so far as possible into their exact state of mind, and making their precise ideas our own.

In order to employ the Lexicon in the most effective way to accomplish this end, the student must not simply glance at any given word, for which he is consulting it, and hastily picking out a meaning which will answer in the sentence that he has before him, pass on to the next. He wants to acquaint himself with that word before he looks further. It is as though we were to meet a stranger on the street; we bestow a passing glance upon him; a friend mentions his name, whereupon we bow and pass on. We have had a casual introduction; we may possibly recognize the stranger when we meet again; but we have not made his acquaintance. We know very little more about him than we did before. The student who aims at thoroughness must seek to make the acquaintance of every Hebrew word he meets; he must, if possible, get upon intimate and familiar terms with them. He wishes to know something about their origin and history—their character and associations—the estimation in which they have been held by those who knew them best. He must interrogate his Lexicon until he finds all this out. The article in the Lexicon under each particular word is intended to supply him with this very information—to give him, so to speak, the biography of the word so far as it can be ascertained; to gauge for him its precise standing and worth.

Thus, he needs, in the first place, to inquire into the derivation of words. The Hebrew has various terms to express anger, or excited passion, in different degrees or manifestations. But each of these places a different picture before us, thus: אָנֵן , from אָנַן , to breathe strongly, depicts a person as *panting* from excite-

ment; זַעַם, as *foaming*; זַעַף, as *blazing*; חֶמֶה, as *heated*; חָרוֹן, as *on fire, burning*; בַּעַם, as *indignant*; עֲבָרָה, as *overflowing*; עִיר, as *boiling*; קִנְיָה, as *red in the face, flushed*; קִצָּף, as *bursting, or breaking out*; רָגַז, as *in commotion*. The diverse conception attached to these words gives to each some specialty of employment. We do not and cannot reach a proper understanding of them by taking the various English words expressive of strong excitement—as anger, displeasure, fury, passion, rage, wrath, etc., and attaching these severally to the Hebrew terms, in the list above given. This would mislead entirely; it would introduce distinctions foreign to the Hebrew words, and it would overlook those which really do exist. There is, in fact, no exact equivalence between the series of terms in use in English and in Hebrew to express excited feeling in its various forms and aspects. Each must be studied independently if it is to be correctly understood. So “wicked” may be expressed by several different words in Hebrew, in each of which the fundamental image is different, thus: אֲוִיל, *foolish*; מַבְיֵשׁ, *of ill odor*; נִבְּל, *wilted, or faded*; עֵיִל, *twisted*; רִיק, *empty*; רַע, *broken, and therefore worthless*; רִשָּׁע, *tumultuous*.

The derivation of words, or, where this is obscure, their primary sense, often opens curious and welcome glimpses into the links of association by which objects are bound together in the Hebrew mind, or the point of view under which they regarded them. These are sometimes of the most graphic character; sometimes they involve lessons that are worth pondering. Thus, what poetic beauty there is in calling the eye עֵיִן, that is, “*a fountain*,” as it is the spring whence flow streams of pity or of sorrow, and whose watery surface mirrors whatever passes in the mind within; and the face, פְּנִים, from פָּנָה, *to turn*, since it turns with ready attention to every object which presents itself; the sea, יָם, from its ceaseless commotion and roaring; and eternity, עוֹלָם, *the hidden period*, which no keenness of vision can penetrate, and from which no mortal can lift the veil; and קִדְּשׁ, *holy*, as related to חָדָשׁ, *new and bright*, that which is ever new, retaining its primal condition untarnished and undecayed. What true insight into the fact that

man's distinctive prerogative is speech, in calling beasts and cattle בְּהֵמָה, *dumb*. What a suggestion of the calamities of war in naming it מְלַחֵמָה, *devourer*, and the sword הַרֶבֶב, *desolator*, and peace שְׁלוֹם, *soundness*, or *wholeness*! What an admonition that time is named from its ceaseless flow, עֵת, from עָרָה, *to pass*! What a commendation of *hope* in its name, תְּקוּנָה, the emblem being that of a strongly twisted cord, to which one can hold securely! How aptly descriptive of trust in God is הֲטָה, *to flee to or take refuge in*; of faith, is הֲאֲמִין, *to lean upon*; of truth, אֲמִתָּה, that upon which one can *lean* with safety; of love, אַחֲבֵה, *to breathe after*; of desire, אֲוֶה, *to bend toward*; there is a sermon in each word! What sarcasm of idolatry in the contemptuous terms for idols, אֱלִילִים, *non-entities*, or upon another explanation, *god-lings*, הַבְּלִים, *vanities*, גְּלוּלִים (from גָּלַל, *to roll*), *stumps* or *logs*, such as are rolled about! What ridicule of Israel's oppressors in the derisive turn given to their names, as the King of Mesopotamia, Chushan-rishathaim, *Chushan of double wickedness*, and the King of Babylon, *Evil-merodach, i.e. the god Merodach's fool*! What scorn of evil spirits in the name Beelzebub, *god of flies*, or, worse still, Beelzebub, *dung-god*! What a suggestion of degradation when the patriarchal Bethel, *house of God*, is, for its idolatry, nicknamed Bethaven, *house of iniquity*, and Shechem, the home of the Samaritans, called Sychar, *a lie*! What interesting local associations are brought to light in such words as אֲדָמָה, *ground*, so called from the red soil of Palestine; and לֵבְנָה, *brick*, literally *white*, from the whitish clay of which they were made; and חֹדֶשׁ, *month*, literally *new*, from the new moon, which marked its beginning, since the Hebrew months were lunar; and נֶשֶׁף, *twilight*, from נִשְׁף, *to blow*, because of the breeze which was there customary in the evening; and the name of the Nile, שִׁחֹר, *black*, from its turbid waters; and Lebanon, *white*, from its limestone rocks; and Bethlehem, *house of bread* from the great fertility of the neighborhood; and Jordan, from יָרַד, *to go down*, on account of its unusually rapid descent!

What a peculiarly oriental grouping of ideas is shown in יָשַׁב, *to sit*, then *to dwell*! The Greek word, *to dwell*, is οἰκέω, from οἶκος, *house*; to the Greek a man dwells where he builds his house. The Latin is *incolo*, from *colo*, to cultivate; a man dwells where he tills the soil. But the more nomadic oriental dwells wherever he sits down. So again, in יָד, *the hand*, from יָדָה, *to point out*, the hand is the index with which one points. The more active and vigorous occidental calls it, in Greek χεῖρ, in English, *hand*, from *prehendo*, that with which one grasps. So, too, נִשְׁבַּע, *to swear*, identical in root with שִׁבְעָה, *seven*, tells of the sacredness of that number, on which the Jewish Sabbaths and sacred seasons generally were based.

In tracing the derivation of words it will sometimes be found that they are of foreign extraction, and interesting consequences may follow from this circumstance. There are some Egyptian words—names of persons, places, and objects belonging to the land of Egypt—in the books of Moses, each of which is a fresh corroboration of their authorship by one who had lived in Egypt, and was familiar with its language. The Persian words in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, point to the origin of these books in the period of Persian domination. The so-called Greek words of the book of Daniel, and one alleged to be such in the Song of Solomon, have been adduced in evidence that these books belong to the period of the Greek empire in Asia under the successors of Alexander. An earnest battle was waged over these words. But the strife has been settled without prejudice to the antiquity and genuineness of the books in question, except as now and then some novice in the art of criticism stumbles on these broken and worn-out weapons, and fancies he has made a new discovery in the interest of skepticism.

The articles brought from Ophir by Solomon conjointly with the king of Tyre, the ivory, apes, and peacocks, bear Sanscrit names, showing that their fleets sailed as far as India; and possibly Ophir itself may be recognized in the native name of a district on the Indian coast. And, *per contra*, the Hebrew, or what is the same, the Phœnician, names of commodities which passed into occidental languages, as Greek and Latin, and

through them to the modern languages of Europe, mark the articles which were carried to the West by Phœnician traders, and first became known there through them, as hyssop, balsam, fig, sycamore, wine, cummin, myrrh, cinnamon, cassia, cane, ebony, jasper, sapphire, camel, turtle-dove, etc. It is also a matter of interest, as may here be observed in passing, to note other coincidences between Hebrew roots and those of occidental tongues. Some of these have their bearing upon the question, which is still in dispute among philologists, whether any clear linguistic evidence still remains, in the Semitic and Indo-European families, of languages of their original community of origin. A still greater number are words directly borrowed by the Indo-European from the Semitic, as those, which the English has, taken from the Hebrew of the Old Testament. These are religious terms, as amen, cherub, ephod, hallelujah, hosanna, jubilee, manna, messiah, paschal, sabbath, seraph, shekinah. There are also words that have come to us from the Arabic, but whose roots are likewise found in the cognate Hebrew. Whether these words were brought by the crusaders or by subsequent intercourse, or whether they are relics of the Saracenic conquest of Spain, as Gibraltar, גִּבְרַלְטוֹר, *the mountain of rock*, the word for "mountain" having reached its present signification by a series of steps, which the Hebrew enables us still to trace. From a root meaning *to twist*, it first denoted *a cord*, then *a line* for measurement, *a boundary line*, *a mountain*, as marking the natural limits or boundaries of countries. Guadalquivir, *the great river*, from יָרָה, *to cast or pour*, whence the Arabic *wady*, and גְּבִיר, *great*; Sultan, from שָׁלַט, a title borne by Joseph in Egypt; Pacha, from פָּחָה, the official designation of Zerubabel and of Nehemiah; Koran, from קָרָא, *to call*, then *to read aloud*, that which is to be read; Salaam, the customary salutation, from שָׁלוֹם, *peace*, in the standing phrase, "peace be unto thee;" and, from the same root, *Islam*, the religion which secures peace with God, and *Moslem*, he who has embraced this religion of peace; the dual form of this word in Arabic has also been Anglicized as though it were a singular *Mussulman*, and by another curious blunder its plural is sometimes written "Mussulmen," as though it were compounded with the English

word "man." Admiral, originally written *amiral*, is properly a commander, from מַצֵּחַ, *to say*, then *to command*—the "d" being due to its having been confused with the word "admirable." And some facts in ecclesiastical history are embedded in the words abbot, abbey, and abbess; that a monastery is called an abbey, and its head an abbot, from אָב, or the Syriac, *abba*, "father," shows that religious establishments of this character took their rise in Syria and the East. Analogy would then lead us to expect that the Syriac word for mother would be applied to the lady who presides over a nunnery. But, instead of this, she is called *abbess*—not mother, but female father—by a strange mongrel formation, an occidental feminine ending being appended to the oriental word; the reason is, that in their origin and in the East these institutions were for men exclusively, and that religious houses for women took their rise subsequently in the West.

We cannot now dwell longer upon the study of the origin of Hebrew words, or their derivation, whether from native or foreign roots, and their affinities with words in our own and other occidental tongues. He who prosecutes it can hardly fail to find it fascinating and attractive.

The lexicon will aid the student further in acquainting himself with the history and usage of words. In the limited space at our command, we shall be obliged to pass rapidly over the additional points which enter into a complete acquaintance with a word, without pausing, as we would like to do, to illustrate them. The first important inquiry is as to the extent of its signification—the various senses in which it is employed. Its derivation has helped us to the knowledge of its primary or fundamental import. Its various senses in actual use are to be traced from this, as they have successively arisen from it, or from one another. Further, from each primary word have arisen other derivative words, developing the fundamental signification still more, or branching out more widely from it. Then there are cognate roots, having the same or similar sounds, or with identical or related radical senses, and these have their derivatives likewise. In tracing all this out, we are following lines of association characteristic of the Hebrew mind; we see its peculiar development of thought, grouping of ideas, mode of conception.

But after a word has thus been examined in connection with the root from which it springs, in its own individual usage and various significations, and in its place in that particular stock of words which has sprung from the same root, and from closely related roots, it may be still further specialized by comparing it with its several synonyms. If there are other words expressing the same general idea, how are these to be discriminated? What distinctions exist between them? Why is one of these words used rather than another in a given connection, and what are the particular cases in which one or another of them should be employed?

Then, still further, is a word of frequent or rare occurrence? If the latter, what are the grounds upon which its assumed meaning rests, and are these sufficient and decisive? Then, to what style does it belong—the elevated and ornate; or the more common place—the poetic, or prosaic? And to what age? Is it employed by the earlier or the later writers of the Old Testament, or by both? If confined to one period, what substitute is used for it at another? If used equally in all, does it maintain its sense unchanged, or does it undergo any discernible modifications of meaning?

These hasty suggestions may show that there is much to be learned, even about an individual word. He who means to master the words he is dealing with in Hebrew, and to make them thoroughly his own, will not feel as though a slight or perfunctory use of his Lexicon was all that was necessary. A person may get out the translation of a passage, and know very little about the words that compose it, after all.

And he who aspires to be a good Hebraist can quite as little afford to dispense with careful attention to his grammar. The words of a sentence are not to be jumbled together in any sort of way, which will bring out an intelligible sense. They stand in fixed grammatical relations, which must be rigorously adhered to, in order that the sense really intended by the writer, or speaker, may emerge. The Hebrew tenses is, perhaps, the most puzzling part of the grammar, and the one of which it is most difficult to gain a clear conception in all cases. The notion of time upon which they proceed is different from ours, in disregarding the momentary and vanishing present, and comprehending all duration under the two categories of the past and

the future. To this add the use of the tenses at times in direct contrariety to what, with our laws of thought, we would have expected; the apparently promiscuous employment of them at others; the neglect of modal relations almost entirely in the forms of verbs, leaving them to be suggested by particles or by the connection; and, to crown all, the strange enigma of the conversive *vau*;—all this, so foreign to our methods and ideas, induces in many a perplexity, or despair, which ends in giving the whole thing up as incomprehensible, or impracticable; and, quite disregarding the Hebrew tense relations, translating as the sense or context may seem to require, altogether irrespective of them.

And yet, no principle ought to be more firmly fixed in the mind of a conscientious interpreter, than that language must be held to mean precisely what it says. It is not his office to create a text, or to determine what a writer should have said, or must have meant to say, but what he actually did say. It is safe to assume, that where a writer uses the future tense, he does so intelligently, and has a reason for using that rather than the preterit, which the interpreter is bound to ascertain and recognize. Much of the vivid beauty of Hebrew description depends upon its idiomatic use of tenses, by which the writer transports us into the very midst of the scene which he depicts, part of it already transacted, part yet to come, and futures passing into preterits, even while he speaks. And there is an unrivaled strength in its universal assertions, when, in the first member of a parallelism that is affirmed for all time past, which, in the succeeding member, is similarly affirmed for all time to come, and thus the entire horizon of human experience is swept at a stroke. All this is confused and lost if we fail rigorously to note the tenses, and either gratuitously substitute one for the other, or indiscriminately render both alike by our vague and colorless present.

In other cases this disregard of the tenses works a more serious mischief still, and not merely blurs or blunts, but actually perverts, the sense. Thus, with all the general accuracy of our common English version of the Scriptures, there is, nevertheless not infrequently an error in the tense that alters the whole purport of a psalm, or disturbs the connection of the thought. The Psalmist's confident anticipation of God's deliv-

ering aid, or his resolve to seek it, is arbitrarily converted into a reminiscence; and his grateful survey of God's past benefits, by which he strengthens himself in the midst of trials, is, on the contrary, converted, without any propriety, into the language of petition or the utterance of hope. Thus, in the 3d Psalm, "I cried unto the Lord with my voice, and he heard me out of his holy hill," should be "I will cry" and "he will hear." "I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for the Lord sustained me," should be "the Lord will sustain me." David not merely recognizes God's sustaining power and grace on that single occasion, but he takes encouragement from that instance of preserving care to trust for the present and the future. He who guarded and preserved him then, will guard him ever. Ps. viii: 1—"O LORD, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who has set thy glory above the heavens"—should be "which glory of thine set above the heavens." It is not a declaration of what God had already done, but a prayer that he would render his glory exalted and conspicuous. In the prophet Obadiah's indignant denunciation of Esau for his unbrotherly spirit toward Judah, our version renders, ver. 12, "Thou shouldest not have looked on the day of thy brother in the day that he became a stranger; neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress"—as though it had already taken place; and as the occasion referred to is that of Jerusalem's overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar, it would follow that Obadiah prophesied as late as the exile; whereas, the correct translation is, Look not,—rejoice not—speak not proudly—showing that the event referred to is still future, and a directly contrary conclusion from that warranted by our version, must be drawn as to the age of the prophet.

The grand theophany in Habakkuk, ch. 3, receives a totally different sense, and the whole meaning and connection of the entire prophecy is obscured by the failure to render correctly the tense of the verb in verse 3: "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran." By this rendering the magnificent coming of the Lord, here described, becomes a thing of the past; it is a *résumé* of the grand and glorious deeds achieved on Israel's behalf in their past history. The

whole of this splendid chapter is thus taken out of the sphere of prophecy and reduced to a mere commemoration of what God had anciently done for his people. But the power of the passage is immensely increased by letting it remain what the tense of the opening verb requires, and what the whole connection of the prophecy, in fact, demands—a glowing prediction of God's future coming in infinite majesty, amid dread displays of omnipotence, to rescue his people, and execute his purposed vengeance on their foes. The only correct translation is—“God will come from Teman and the Holy One from Mount Paran.”

And the observance of grammatical rules in other matters may be equally important. Haggai predicts (ii: 7) that “the desire of all nations shall come.” A popular interpretation of this passage makes this a personal designation of the Messiah, in whom the longings of every human heart shall find their highest satisfaction. There is an undoubted beauty and fitness about this conception, but that it is not what the prophet meant is shown in an instant by the form of the verb; it is in the plural number. Its subject, therefore, does not represent an individual person, but is a collective noun; the desire of all nations is their desirable things, their precious treasures; these shall come to adorn and enrich God's house.

So, too, the accurate rendering of particles, trifling as these may appear, is essential to correct interpretation. Thus, what graphic power there often is in the definite article; what a pledge, too, of accuracy of statement, which is lost, if it be disregarded. When the sacred writer speaks (Gen. xix: 30)—not vaguely and indefinitely, as our version has it—of Lot, as dwelling “in a cave,” but says “he dwelt in *the* cave, he and his two daughters,” he shows himself familiar with the region, and able to refer to the particular cave as one well known in that locality. So (Gen. xxxv: 8), Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, was buried at Bethel, not “under an oak,” but “under the oak,” the well-known old tree that stood there. In Ex. xvii: 14, Moses is enjoined to make a record, not “in a book,” which would be a very unimportant, if not wholly unmeaning, appendage to the injunction, but “in *the* book,” which discloses a fact of great moment, that there was a well-known book that could be thus referred to, in which Moses was keeping a record; and thus

this passage, by the sheer force of its definite article, becomes a link in our argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The article, also, may be of doctrinal consequence. It plays, as all are aware, an important part in some leading proof-texts for the Trinity in the New Testament. It also brings a series of passages in the Old Testament to the support of the same doctrine, that mention is made not of "*an* angel," but of "*the* angel of the Lord," who can be readily identified with the Eternal Son. On the other hand, the insertion of the article (Gen. xli: 38) where it does not belong, makes Pharaoh speak like a monotheist, calling Joseph "a man in whom the spirit of God is;" whereas, all that Pharaoh actually says of him is that he is, "a man in whom is a divine spirit."

So of other particles. When the Psalmist says (cxvi: 10), "I believe, for I speak," alleging the fact of his speaking in confirmation of his faith, we have no right to invert the order of his thought by rendering it "I believed, therefore have I spoken," as though he were presenting his faith as the reason of his speech. Our version disregards a grammatical form, and omits a preposition in rendering Hos. xiii: 9: "Thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help;" the real sense is, "It has destroyed thee that thou art against me, against thy help." The prophet's declaration is, that the real cause of Israel's destruction is their hostility to God, their only helper. Ps. lxxxvii: 3, is rendered in our version "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God;" what the Psalmist really says is, "Glorious things are spoken in thee." It is not the statements made about Jerusalem, but the blessed revelations made in it, that filled him with rapture.

Fairness of interpretation further demands, that we should translate the text precisely as it lies before us, without any gratuitous alterations or additions. The prophet (Amos iv: 4), in his sarcastic representation of the profitless and offensive character of Israel's religious services, bids them "Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days." As the actual bringing of tithes with such frequency as every three days is insupposable, our translators have taken the liberty of altering it to "three years," which is the time named in the Mosaic law. But such an emendation is as needless as it is

unwarrantable. The very extravagance of the exaggeration adapts it all the better to the prophet's purpose. They might multiply their services to the most unheard of and impossible extent; they might bring their tithes not merely every three years, as the law enjoined, but every three days, and it would do them no good.

In the beautiful description of the heavens, as testifying to God's glory, in Ps. xix, the third verse reads, in our version, "There is no speech nor language *where* their voice is not heard;" as though its universality was the thought insisted upon. Wherever any human speech is found, that is, to all mankind, this voice of the heavens addresses itself. But the italic word, "*where*," which gives this turn to the thought, has nothing corresponding to it in the original. The true translation is "There is no speech, nor language; their voice is not heard," that is to say, the utterance of God's praise by the skies is not in words; it is voiceless and silent. Its universality is not affirmed until the next verse, "Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

In Ps. lxxvii: 13, who is *so* great a God as *our* God?—*so* and *our* are both in italic, and both weaken the effect. It should read, "Who is a great God like God?" To compare the deities that others serve with *our* God, and admit that they are great, but not so great as he, does not present them in such decided and glaring contrast as it does to deny at once their greatness and their deity, and to set them over against him who is not merely our God, but God—God, absolutely and exclusively, the only being who can properly be so called.

Ps. civ. speaks of the copious rains, with which God watereth the hills from his chambers, causing grass and herb to grow, and adds verse 16, "The trees of the Lord are full," have drunk their fill, that is, from these abundant showers. It is both needless and a belittling limitation of the meaning to add the italic words found in our version, "The trees of the Lord are full *of sap*."

And to add but one more illustration of this point. Ps. lxxviii: 19, reads, in the common English version, "Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us *with benefits*, even the God of our salvation." The words, "*with benefits*," are in italic, and there is no suggestion of the sort in the original. The

load referred to is not from God, but from man, and instead of consisting of benefits, is the burden of oppression. The correct rendering is, "Blessed be the Lord day by day; whoever lays a load upon us God is our salvation;" that is to say, whatever be our burdens he will rescue us.

Art. III.—JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION.

By THOMAS H. SKINNER, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.

HUMANLY judging, it was a superhuman undertaking for a few Jews, poor fishermen of Galilee, and Saul of Tarsus, a disinherited son and recent convert, to establish the name and Gospel of Jesus Christ in the chief cities of the Roman empire, and so to establish them as to secure their eventual triumph throughout the whole world.

Here was a new thing upon the earth. There had been nothing like it in all previous history. There has been nothing like it in all subsequent history. No mind could deduce the idea of the actual person and work of Christ from the Old Testament Scriptures, or from anything else. Those who took these Scriptures as the basis of their Messianic expectations, formed a totally different conception both of his person and his mission. Some time after his appearance in the world, there was found to be a marvelous congruity between the Old Testament statements and the living Christ of Galilee. The promises that ran through the Bible, of a Seed that should bruise the head of the serpent; of one in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed; of a prophet, like unto, but superior to, Moses; of a king, in comparison with whom David and Solomon were as nothing; of a priest, before whom Melchisedec and Aaron would pale—a priest upon a throne; of a Messiah who should be despised and rejected of his people, and suffer and die as an atoning sacrifice—all this became clear and vivid. But so intermingled and seemingly conflicting were these descriptions, that no Jew, no Gentile, ever had a