

Nature and Art," and (vol. iv., p. 521) I read: "February 5, 1674. M. Hevelius, near Marienburg, wrote: 'Under the sun, near the horizon, there appeared a mock sun of the same size to sense as the true sun. The spurious sun grew clearer and clearer, and put on the genuine solar light.'" I can't give all the account, only enough for me to ask: "If Almighty God in Nature has granted continuance of light by mock suns, are we to limit His Divine power for continuing the rays of light of the true sun?" The examination of the Hebrew discloses the folly of anticipating the utter destruction of the universe, and that it concerns merely the rays of light, and not universal ruin!

Was it a worthy occasion for the exercise of Divine power? Undoubtedly! It was a crisis in the history of the world. If Israel had been vanquished and annihilated in that battle, what of God's promises to Abraham, of Israel's future, of the Christian dispensation? Besides, Baal, the sun—the god of the heathens—fighting for Israel must have disconcerted the heathen armies, and Joshua's decisive victory may have prevented innumerable battles and further destruction of life, so then in wisdom and compassion was granted the continuance of that long double day.

W. COLLINS BADGER,
Rector of Bressingham.



ART. VIII.—SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR HEBRAISTS.

IT is well known that Hebrew, like Latin and Greek and French, has two forms for the negative particle. The one we may call the objective, the other the subjective, negative. It is on the force of these negatives respectively, and their appropriate rendering in English, that I want to offer, as the fruit of careful study, a few hints. I would offer them with all becoming modesty. Yet I would add that the habitual adherence to the principles involved has, in my own case, led to results which have been interesting and profitable.

Before going farther, it will be needful to remind readers of another well-known fact, the bearing of which will presently be seen. It is this: The Hebrew language admits no such thing as a direct *negative imperative*. What, then, is its practice? To express cautions or prohibitions by means of the future tense. (With Peter Mason, who is, perhaps, the greatest of living Hebraists, I retain that name; and, indeed, the fact just stated is one of the facts which manifestly

support the name's propriety.) Now, it is to the force of the two negative particles in connection with this tense that my remarks will refer.

In English, Henry Martyn observes, we have but two tenses, as in Persian and in Hebrew. We call our two present and past. When we want to express other tenses of other tongues we use what we call auxiliary verbs. And, in regard to the future, we have this peculiarity. In the case of simple indicative futures, we regularly use "shall" for the first person, "will" for the other two. In the case of *dependent* or *hypothetic* futures, curiously enough, we act differently. It should be noted, too, that so careful an English scholar as the late Dr. Weymouth doubted whether, at the time our "A.V." was made, this distinction between "shall" and "will" was so firmly established as it is now. This, if it be so, may account for many passages which, if the principles I am advocating be sound, should undergo the change which I am about to point to.

For one thing which I am specially driving at is the modifications which careful attention to the usage of Hebrew and English severally would bring about in the case of the cautionary and prohibitive utterances above referred to. Let us begin with the earliest.

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 17).

Here, as is so commonly the case in first occurrences in Holy Scripture, we have a clue to later ones. (It is one of the characteristic maxims of Thomas Boys always to note these first occurrences; it has been pointed out by a still more recent very diligent Biblicist that they generally, as has been above hinted, furnish a clue for future ones.) What strikes a student in this passage of Genesis is that it is not the subjective, but the objective, negative that is found. (Observe, too, that here the Greek has the same feature.) So, then, the idiomatic rendering in English will be: "Thou *will* not eat of it." But this raises the question: Why should we have this form rather than the other here? The answer, if I am not mistaken, is this: The Divine Speaker is addressing one who had been created in "His own image"; one who is spoken of in Luke iii. 38 as a "[son] of God." So He presupposes that *he will act in character*; will show himself, that is, a son worthy of the name. (And here it may be instructive to observe that, if I have been rightly informed, the custom in our own army is to avoid "shall." "You *will* do so-and-so," rather than "you *shall* do so-and-so," is, I am told, the military style. It is the naval usage, I believe, too.

But what is the underlying principle? Just this: "Thou art a soldier or sailor of thy King and country: thou wilt act in character.") And what a high and noble principle this is! How worthy of Him from whom all that is high and noble comes! This, at least, is how the case presents itself to my own mind. I find a sacred pleasure in so looking at it.

Let me observe, before proceeding to my next instance, that this and the foregoing verse in Genesis supply us with an instance of the *concessive* future, if we may so style it, as well: "Of every tree . . . thou *wilt* freely eat"; and also of the simple, direct future: "For in the day of thy eating of it thou *wilt* surely die."

The next instance—and for the present the only other one—which I wish to adduce is that of the Ten Commandments. And here, I think, we have a very specially instructive illustration of the value of the principles now contended for. The customary rendering, "Thou shalt not," does seem to favour the erroneous idea that the Law embodied in these Ten Commandments is more or less a *covenant of works*. Let us consider, however, to whom these "ten words" were spoken, and when and where. They were not spoken in Egypt. They were not spoken immediately after the passage of the Red Sea even. They were spoken in the desert, the type of that world in which God's people "pass the time of their sojourning." They were spoken when Joshua, the type of "the Captain of Salvation," had won his first prayer-gotten triumph over Israel's foes. They were spoken, therefore, as time and place and circumstance show, to a baptized, redeemed, covenanted people, who had begun to feed on the Divinely-sent food, and to slake their thirst with the Divinely-furnished water, and to fight the good fight of faith. And what is the principle, then, that underlies these "ten words" themselves? Just as the principle which underlies the setting apart of the Jewish nation as God's peculiar People is, as Moses so carefully points out, the principle of *Divine spontaneity*, or *grace* (see, e.g., Deut. vii. 6-8), so the principle which underlies the Ten Commandments is that principle of *characteristic action* already set forth. It is, so to say, the counterpart of the other. "As thou hast been Divinely chosen, and hence hast been redeemed, covenanted, baptized, and art being Divinely led and protected and fed, thou wilt act in character. Thou wilt have no other gods but Me. Thou wilt not make for thyself any graven image." And so throughout. While, as we have seen the *positive* side of the question, so to call it, in Gen. ii. ("Thou *wilt* freely eat," wilt eat with all the conscious freedom of a *son*), so here, too, in the two central commandments we have a similar blending of the positive

with the negative: "Remember the Sabbath day," "Honour thy father and thy mother." (In these *positives* we have one infinitival imperative, and one which *may*, it would seem, be either infinitival or ordinary. These infinitival imperatives deserve exact study.)

This view of the Commandments seems to me very helpful toward the right understanding and use of them—in teaching the Catechism, for instance, to learners. And it seems to offer a beautiful explanation of the place they are directed to hold in our Churches. For they are indissolubly connected, not with the entry, nor with the font, the typical "laver" of new birth, but with the Lord's Table—the Table at which the Lord's children, His sons and daughters, are invited to meet, to refresh themselves in their warfare and their service and their hardships. And with them on either side stand the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. So that we have the rule of *faith*, the rule of *walk*, and the *Source* whence strength for continuance in the faith and continuance in the walk must be gained.

SYDNEY THELWALL.



ART. IX.—THE MONTH.

THE Islington meeting is generally admitted to have been an important one. The attendance was very large—perhaps larger than ever; and it is probably true, as has been observed in the press, that a larger number of clergy were collected there than at any other similar gathering. The subjects selected on this occasion were of urgent interest and of cardinal importance. The Incarnation and the Atonement are, in practice, the cardinal points of Christianity, and the question of the true standard of Catholicity is a vital one in the Ritualistic controversy. The Vicar of Islington is to be congratulated upon having obtained a paper on the first of these subjects from Dr. Knowling, the Professor of the Exegesis of the New Testament in King's College, London. Dr. Knowling's influence as a learned and judicious scholar has been steadily growing, and the part he has taken in the current discussion on the Gospel narratives of the Incarnation has been of great service to the Church. He is thoroughly acquainted with the course of thought on the subject, and his combination of wide learning, impartial judgment, and deep spiritual conviction renders his treatment of the question peculiarly valuable at this juncture. The Bishop of Durham's paper on the Atonement was very weighty, and ought to assist in bringing that vital truth into a position in current