

of our churches to-day is not owing so much to the want of knowledge on the part of the clergy; for if there is one thing that the Church can boast of it is the number of scholarly men that adorn her rank and file. Nay, but to the fact that the clergy are ignorant of the laws of elocution.

I trust that this important matter will be taken up by our theological professors and made a branch of the theological curriculum.

Will you kindly inform your readers who are good teachers of elocution in the city of New York, and how they may be reached.

EDWIN B. RICE.

Jamaica, N. Y.

Dr. Crosby's Interpretation of Gen. vi: 6.

I CONFESS I do not clearly understand Dr. Crosby's interpretation of Gen. vi: 6. "It repented the Lord that he had made man," etc. Dr. C. says: "God feels a *divine sorrow*," etc. Sorrow is always connected with unhappiness. A man is unhappy because he cannot control the circumstances that produce this disagreeable feeling. Repentance, or sorrow, implies a want of wisdom, and not even a human being, free from any sort of compulsion, would perform an act which he knew would cause grief or regret. Is God less wise than man? Is it possible that men can *thwart* God's designs? If so, I do not see how we can avoid the conclusion that they are more powerful than their Maker. Can the Omnipotent and All-wise God be subject to *pain*, either physical or mental? I have never thought so. I have been taught to believe that God cannot "repent" nor "feel sorrow."

What, then, is meant by the passage: "When God addresses us he speaks as if he were on our level." The explanation will be plain if we suppose that the Lord used language equivalent to this: "If you (Moses) had been in my place, and with your nature had created man, you would have repented." By thus remember-

ing from what *standpoint* God speaks to men, I, at least, have never been perplexed by those passages which impute human feelings or emotions to the Divine Being.

R. H. CROZIER.

Monroe, La.

Pronunciation of Scripture Proper Names.

A short article in the HOMILETIC REVIEW for February, on "Pronunciation," cites a few Scripture proper names as pronounced by Dr. Young in his concordance, and by Dr. Webster in his dictionary. The writer gives from Young Onesí'mus, Onesiphó-rus, Aquí'-la, Aris'-tarchus, against Onésimus, Onesiph'-rus, A'-quilla, Aristar'-chus, etc., of Webster, and naively asks, "Who is to decide? Is it not sufficient for a speaker to use the pronunciation that comes most natural, and has the least appearance of pedantry?" I scarcely need say, that in the above cases, Young is wrong and Webster is right. But scarcely crediting that Dr. Young's elaborate and excellent work could have so flagrantly erred, I looked into his preface, and found, to my surprise, this absurd rule laid down as his guide in the pronunciation of Scripture names: "Their proper syllables are marked and accented according to the *principles* of Hebrew and Greek, the accent being placed only on the last or second-last syllable of the word; never on the antepenultimate." Now, leaving aside the Hebrew, this is not the rule of the Greek, which places the accent under certain restrictions on either of the three last syllables, while our English classical pronunciation has forsaken the Greek for the Latin, and places the accent uniformly on the penult or antepenult, accenting the penult, if it is long; if it is short, the antepenult. Thus, with a long penult, the English, following the Latin, gives us Laodice'-a, Abite'-ne, Epaphrodi'tus, Thessaloni'-ca, Cesaré'-a, etc.; with a short penult, it throws back the accent, as