

REMARKS on a Criticism in No. 4, p. 76.

A Correspondent observes—"The construction that "*Nu*" would give is, indeed, the only one that can be given to the Septuagint; but I am not so certain that that is the case also with the Hebrew.

The word *Roshaicham* has a pronominal affix, but not, as it appears to me, a *personal* pronominal affix. If "*Nu*" will have the goodness to turn to Frey's Hebrew Grammar, page 43, he will find this pronominal affix, and that its meaning is not *ye*, but *your*.

Will "*Nu*" give me an instance of the pronominal affix, *echam*, being used in the sense of *ye*, either absolutely or in regimen? Does he request me to give him instances of the use of it in the possessive sense? I can give him as many as he needeth. *Dibraicham, your words*; Gen. xlii. 16, 20. Josh. ii. 21. Job xxxii. 11. Jer. xlii. 4. *B'naicham, your sons*, which occurs every where, is a word of the same class. In Gen. xlii. 33, the words *your brethren, your households*, are of the same form. But to produce the thousandth part is needless.

It is my opinion, then, with all deference to "*Nu*," whom, by the way, I have not the pleasure of knowing, the plain meaning of this phrase is, according to the Hebrew, *Lift up, O ye gates, your heads*. This sense, as I conceive, is confirmed by the latter part of the verse, and the whole scope of the Psalm. Why should it be thought that a different object is addressed in the latter part than in the former? Yet the Septuagint renders it differently. The speaker there does not speak to the heads or leaders, but the gates. And what reason can be assigned for rendering the word *pulē* in the accusative in one place, and in the nominative in the other? It is not a command to the gates to be lifted up, *i. e.* by their chiefs; for neither the Hebrew word *yehbosku*, *et attollite vos*, nor the Greek *Epar-*

thēte, attollite, will bear that construction. Should "*Nu*" be disposed to enquire why the command should be repeated to the same persons in the same verse, I answer this by asking, why is it repeated in the very same words in verse 9? But the repetition is made with great propriety and gracefulness, to show the extreme reluctance of the one party to grant, and of the earnestness of the other to obtain, admission.

It has been considered that this Psalm was written by David upon the removal of the ark from the house of Obed-edom to the city and place which he had prepared for it, and perhaps having in his eye the Temple where it should be more permanently fixed. And considering the Temple a type of the church, and the ark of the indwelling Deity, why may we not understand the words in question as addressed to the church? I can see nothing against this. Vide Isa. lx. 11; Rev. iii. 20; Deut. v. 2. The church, by her drowsiness, apathy, and lukewarmness seems in the present day to have driven the Lord from her, Isa. lix. 2. But he is desirous to return, and re-occupy his rest. This view of the subject is strengthened by what is said in verses 3—6, which, I conceive, express an enquiry, and an answer to it. Who are proper persons to become members of the Church of Christ? Acts ii. 47. The church being composed of such characters, the Lord Jesus is most solicitous to obtain his residence in the midst of her. *Lift up, ye gates, your heads, and lift up yourselves, ye eternal doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Come in, thou King of glory, and subdue every thing that opposes thy reign.*"

SPREAD OF BAPTIST PRINCIPLES IN ENGLAND.

The Rev. Edward Battiscombe, A. M., late fellow of King's College, Cambridge, has resigned his fellow-