

I offer a few remarks upon each of these hypotheses.

Mr. Babbage is careful to state that he has not "any acquaintance with the language in which the sacred volume" of the Old Testament is written. This deficiency is justly to be regretted. Had it not existed, the acute investigator would never have taken up his hypothesis, or any approach to it. He would have felt himself assured that, as a consequence of the uninterrupted use of the Hebrew language by the Jews, and the constant public reading of these very writings, from the days of Moses down to our own, we have in fact as firm a hold upon the meaning as we have in regard to the Greek and Latin; that, from its being one of a family of languages, all of which possess literary monuments and those of great antiquity, we are furnished with aids and guarantees, in the comparison of the cognate tongues, by which the correct understanding of Hebrew is made sure to those who will rationally study it; and that, by the aid of the Greek Version, all or most of which was made in the third century before Christ, we have a still further ground of satisfaction for the intelligence of the Hebrew Scriptures. There are oriental scholars, especially in Germany, and of whom some are awfully hostile to the truth and the authority of revelation, who would inform Mr. Babbage that the fact of a clear and certain understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures is above all reasonable doubt. The construction of the language is the most simple and luminous that can well be imagined; its peculiar idioms are well ascertained and illustrated; few very difficult passages occur; the principal obscurities lie in the determination of a small number of words referring to natural objects and operations of art; and the text is settled to a degree of

which he rightly characterizes "as involving in entire ambiguity the landmarks of Christian truth:—by neutralizing it *destroys* the whole evidence of the gospel." Tradition Unveiled; page 68.