

Judges xi. 31.

והעליחיהו עליה

2 Kings iii. 27.

ויעלהו עליה

Psaln lxvi. 15.

עלות מחדש אלה-לך:

To thee will I offer burnt sacrifices  
of fatlings.

Amos v. 22.

כי אם-תעלו-לי עולות

Though ye offer (unto) me burnt  
offerings.

Here then are three undisputed clauses, and one concerning which a question is raised. The disputed passage coincides exactly with one and differs from the other two. Surely upon every principle of sound criticism, the clause under investigation must be translated like the one it exactly resembles, and not like those from which it differs.

There are undoubtedly examples to be met with of the ellipsis of the ל after some verbs, but what is required is an example of such ellipsis after the verb in question. For instance we may say in English "We will enter thy courts," or "we will enter into thy courts," but although the ellipsis of "into" after "enter" does not make a perceptible difference in the sense, yet it does not follow that the same ellipsis would be allowable after other verbs. The same may be said of the preposition "to" after the verbs "show" or "give." In like manner I contend that the use of a pronoun either with or without a preposition after the verbs בוא and נגד will prove nothing in respect to the verb עלה.

This general answer to the examples adduced from Job might appear sufficient to set them aside, but they admit of a still more specific reply.

A concise statement of the conditions to be fulfilled in order to render the instances parallel, will serve to show that these citations fail to support the proposed alteration. It is required then that there be a verb

with a noun in the direct objective, and a pronoun affixed to the verb in the oblique objective, answering to the dative in Latin, or to a preposition in English expressed or understood. The passage in Job xv. 21, "The destroyer shall come upon him," fails entirely, for the pronoun is the only objective; and it may fairly be questioned whether it be not, in the Hebrew, a direct objective, but the pursuit of this inquiry would carry us away from the main subject.

The other quotation from Job xxxi. 37—"I would declare unto him the number of my steps," is more to the point; but even in this case the pronoun is in the direct objective, and can be so rendered into English with the utmost precision, *e. g.* "I would make him know the number of my steps."

This rendering is by no means to be preferred to that in the authorized version. I give it simply to show that the sense can be expressed in English without the aid of a preposition. As a further proof that the objective, in this instance, is not oblique but direct, I would refer to Job xxvi. 4,—"To whom hast thou uttered words?" where the interrogative "whom" has, in Hebrew, the sign of the accusative case before it: and Ezekiel xlii. 10,—"Show the house to the house of Israel," in which instance both the objectives have the sign of the accusative case before them. Neither of these examples, therefore, fulfils the conditions which would make it parallel to the passage under investigation. On philological grounds, therefore, there is good reason to conclude that the translation of Jephthah's vow, as contained in the English version, is correct.

As for the omission of a particle answering to our English "for," no difficulty can fairly be raised on that ground; the construction of two nouns in opposition without any par-