

CRITICAL NOTES ON H. T. ANDERSON'S TRANSLATION.

I will offer some remarks on tenses, as found in N. T. Greek. The Hebrew language has but two tenses, a Perfect and a Future. I must remark that a present—an actual present—is inconceivable. Let any one make the trial of thinking a present time. Time, more rapid than thought, rushes on, stops not, but hastens into the past. Yet, grammarians speak of a present. True: but what is called present time, is continued time now going on. Time present may be the present hour, the present day, the present year, the present age, &c. But let any one, if he has adoubt, look to his watch; and while he may say, The present hour, can he have a present second? The hand moves continuously, and as there is no cessation, he can find no present.—Now in one hour, which we call the present-hour, we have but two parts of time, past and future, as the general divisions of the hour.—We can say, the second hand has moved, or moves: also, the second hand moved, or moves. Here, then, is a Perfect; that is, time past continuing up to the present: also an Aorist, that is, indefinite time, often repeated, equal to a present. But, leaving the watch, let us turn to an example of an Aorist in James's letter, i. 11. I will translate the Aorists as past tenses: "For the sun *rose* with its burning heat, and *withered* the grass, and its flower *fell*, and the beauty of its form *perished*."

The English scholar will cry, No: we must have a present tense; for the apostle speaks of what is common, not of what took place in past time merely. Yet the apostle uses the Aorist in each instance. The Aorist, then, expresses what is common, and must, in many instances, be translated by our Present; or, it expresses a general truth, and must be translated by our Present.

Let us consider the use of a Present, as in John v. 24: "He that hears my word, and believes on him that sent me, has eternal life, and comes not into condemnation; but has passed from death to life."—It is evident that the verbs *hears*, *believes*, *has*, and *comes*, cannot be limited to what we call the immediate present. The power of these present tenses is great. Let us unfold them. He that continues to hear my word, and continues to believe on him that sent me, both *has* and continues to have eternal life, and comes not, can not and shall not come, into condemnation; but has already passed from death to life, and remains in this condition. The condition on which the sense of the Perfect, *has passed*, rests, is found in the continued hearing and believing above mentioned.

We find an instance of the same kind in John's Testimony, iii. 36. "He that believes on the Son has eternal life. But he that believes not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him." How often have we to offer some explanation of such expressions, because of the want of knowledge on the part of readers and hearers. The Present tense, *believes*, expresses the same as the verbs in the sentence above quoted—continued believing. Not only so; but there is comprehended under the one term *believe*, the whole result of such belief—a faithful obedience to God.

I regret to say that I find myself frequently called on to explain what I have said, although I have used the common language of Scripture. Some years since, after having delivered a discourse on faith, hope and love, in which I had shown the power of these three, I was called on by a brother to know whether a man could be a Christian without being immersed. I had said that faith, hope and love, when possessed by any one, made him a Christian. So, John the Immerser: "He that believes on the Son, has eternal life." The Immerser says nothing, in this place, of immersion, of repentance, of good works. He seemed to think that the believer had eternal life. Why so?—Evidently, his language implies continued faith; and faith, as he thought, was some active thing, that would not permit the possessor to be idle. The inspired writers used brief, comprehensive expressions, that were full of meaning; and they were evidently more disposed to express truths, than to follow the exact forms of the language in which they wrote.

The terms *yod* and *point*, Matt. v. 18, require a remark or two.—The former is the name of the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet. The *point* is a small horn-like projection, which distinguishes some of the Hebrew letters from others. The following will illustrate the Savior's meaning:

"In Shir Hashirim Rabba are these words: Should all the inhabitants of the earth gather together in order to whiten one feather of a crow, they could not succeed; so if all the inhabitants of the earth should unite to abolish one yod, which is the smallest letter in the whole law, they would not be able to effect it. In Vayikra Rabba, 3. 19, it is said: Should any person, in the words of Deut. vi. 4, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is (achad) one Lord, change the d (ד) into r (ר) (achar), he would ruin the world; because the word *achar* signifies a false god."

The English scholar can see the force of this, by comparing the Hebrew letters. The letter *Dalet* (ד) is distinguished from *Resh* (ר) by the *keras* (*keras*), horn-like projection on the right of the top

stroke. To drop this point would be but a small change, yet the Savior says even this shall not be done. Not the smallest matter in the law should fail. It would be needless for me to say, that the full efficiency of every word requires that it be spelled, pronounced and understood correctly.

In Matt. vii. 13, I have translated του πονηρου, the Evil One; because the Lord does not propose to deliver us from the evils of life. Believers are as much subjected to *evil* in general, as other men; but they are delivered from the Evil One.

In verse 18, the words εντω φανερω are rejected by Scholz, and bracketed by Bloomfield. The word *openly* does not then occur here in my Translation. In Acts ix., a part of the sixth verse is not in my Translation, for a similar reason. Acts viii. 37 is not in my Translation, for the same reason. See Horne on this passage.

The term κατακηνοεις, viii. 20, has the meaning *haunt* given by Robinson. Green, like a sensible Englishman, gives *roost*. All men know what is meant by a crows' roost: the expression crows' haunt, or crows' lodging, would provoke a smile. The word *nest* is impossible in this place.

The words εις ονομα προφητου, Matt. x. 41, are equal to ως προφητην, and hence, "as a prophet," or "because he is a prophet."

The word *fornication* does not occur in my Translation. I have used the term *lewdness*. This is a general term. *Fornication* is specific, and does not express the meaning of the original.

Blaspheme, and Blasphemy, occur not in my Translation. I have instead, "Impious words," and, "To speak impiously"; these express the meaning of the Greek terms.

In Matt. xiv. 2, the supplement, *of the spiritual world*, is necessary to the sense. The article before δυναμεις forbids the translation as in C. V. The verb ενεργουσι is active, and not middle, as C. V. makes it. Trollope translates, "The spirits are active within him." Green gives to δυναμεις, here, the meaning, spiritual powers. The meaning seems to me to be obvious from the connection: "This is John the Immerser: he has risen from the dead, and for this reason the powers of the spiritual world are activewithin him."

This is in accordance with the commonly received opinion, that one from the spiritual world should possess extraordinary powers.

In Acts xix. 2, the verb εμι (*emi*) has the same meaning as in John vii. 36. Let us compare the two. In John, ουτο γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον.— In Acts, ει πνευμα αγιον εστιν. In the former instance, the king's translators supplied the word *gives*. I have given to the verb εμι the same sense in each instance. In the former, "The Holy Spirit had not yet

been given"; in the latter, "Whether the Holy Spirit is given."—No one can doubt that this is the real sense; for, to say the former, "The Holy Spirit was not yet," and in the latter, "Whether the Holy Spirit is," could not be admitted. The ellipsis at *Ἀλλουός*, I have supplied.

In Hebrews vi. 1, we have an instance of the attributive construction, in the words, *τον της αρχης του Χριστου λεγον, της αρχης τον Χριστον*. The law of such construction is—When a clause begins with the article, and ends with the noun to which the article belongs, the intervening words are of the nature of an attribute, and limit the noun. If we translate literally, the above clause would be—"The account of the beginning of the Christ." In this there would be no definite idea. But the words mean, That which is first taught concerning the Christ. This meaning I have expressed, according to the attributive construction, thus: Omitting *the elementary Christian teaching*, let us go on to the perfection of Christian instruction. That the term *τελειωτηα* means the perfection of instruction, and not moral perfection, is obvious.

In Rom. v. 20, the verb *περισσευχεται* means, "To go or come in beside or with any thing." The first offense had come; and the law came in, or was introduced, along with, or beside the first offense.—I have, therefore, so translated. As to what some say about the law's entering secretly, it is inadmissible. Such an idea contradicts the fact; for the law was introduced with pomp and splendor.

The word *doctrine* does not occur in my Translation. I have chosen the Saxon word *teaching*.

In Rom. vi. 17, for "form of doctrine," I have, "form of teaching." On this, I will make no remarks here. H. T. A.

RELIGIOUS DUTIES OF CHILDREN.

It is now well understood in the religious world, that before infants arrive at years of moral accountability, their eternal welfare is not endangered. The Savior regarded all such as already accepted by God, and similar in character to those who compose the heavenly kingdom. Even those theologians whose theory of man requires them to regard all infants as totally depraved, have in late years provided a supplement to the theory, by which those who die in their infancy are regenerated by the Holy Spirit in the act of dying, and thereby saved. Whatever the theory, then, it is well settled that at this tender age children are safe.

There is another proposition almost as well settled; that at a subsequent period, every child must yield positive obedience to the requirements of the gospel, in order to make its salvation sure. At what