

help. Of course we never should make tradition authoratative but it is a very valuable help. If you had simply the Heb. Bible and nothing else and scietifically work into it and slowly you get something from it simply by comparing section with section, one could make quite a bit of progress in that way. But we are tremendously advanced because we have tradition because there have always been those who could read it. The translations have been made right down through the ages. The translator may have made a mistake and is not as dependable as the original of ~~xxx~~ course since he might have made a mistake and tradition is only a crutch but an extremely use-fully crutch. We have a tradition passed as to what the Heb. means. A certain form has a certain meaning or certain expression and all of that is very useful but we must always recognize that it is always a tool and not an authoratative proof of anything. Naturally the first students of the Heb. Bible spent their time assimilating the tradition and feeling out just what the tradition that has been passed on down to us. Just what have the writers down through ages said about this verse and how did the ancient Greeks translate this Hebrew? What did the ancient Syriac say. They were interested in the traditon. Then they went onto a new approach. Students began to study Arabaic and Aramaic and this proved to a be most useful tool. As soon as something like is found you will find some that will go to extreme of either saying it is worth more than it is or not worth anything but the truth naturally lies in between. We have the Hebrew and then the cognate language in the Aramaic. The Arabaic is related. You can find a word which perhaps occurs one or twice in the whole Heb. Bible and you are not sure just what it means and tradition translates it differently in both places that it occurs. But in the Arabic you might find that it has a different meaning altogether and this seems to make sense and then you take the cognate and see what the original was. No doubt sometime all these languages were the one. Comparang it with these other languages gives us valuable proof as to the meaning of the forms so that the cognates are very very useful. For a time though the value of the cognates were greatly ~~exaggerated~~ exaggerated and people would say that just because some word meant so and so in the Aramaic it would necessarily mean that in the Hebrew. A cognate never proves. You can see how two cognates are related but it nev r proves the meaning of the other. ILL. in GERman you have KNAVE and that word is used today as mean a boy. In the English you have KNAVE and are the same word in the original but that doesn't tell us what the English is. You can imagine how it got our meaning through usage for a boy that was not depenadable, etc.