

Theology on the *Web*.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

breathing powers and store of fat in the salmon ; migrations of the salmon, herring, pilchard, sprat, and mackerel ; and, above all, the enormous fertility of fishes useful as food to the human race. I am satisfied that I should obtain a verdict in favour of my view of the case, namely, that in all these wonderful contrivances there exists evidence of design and forethought, and a wondrous adaptation of means to an end.

E. HOARE.



ART. II.—THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE TEXT, NOTES, GRAMMATICAL AND OTHER CHANGES, CONCLUSION.

ONE of the troubles of the New Testament Revisers was that they had to frame for themselves what is technically called a *text* as they went along. Owing to the antiquity of the Greek Scriptures, and the numbers of copies, versions, and quotations which have been made from them, the materials for the construction of a text which may fairly represent the autographs of the sacred writers, are embarrassing by reason of their superabundance. The case of the Old Testament is different. Here we have, in the first place, a limited number of variations, contained at the end or in the foot-notes of all Hebrew Bibles; beyond these, we have results of the collations by Kennicott and De Rossi, which can be seen in a compact form in Döderlein and Meisner's Hebrew Bible. The manuscripts from which these collations were made are not of very great weight ; and it appears to be the case that the oldest MS. which is known of, viz., the Aleppo MS., has never been collated at all. Another means whereby we can verify or correct the original text of the Hebrew Scriptures is the Septuagint. This Greek version, defective as it is in many respects, undoubtedly preserves many precious readings which have slipped out of our ordinary Hebrew copies. Those of our readers who know Dr. Cheyne's translation of the Hebrew Psalms, will notice that he often takes advantage of these readings. Sometimes a reading is obtainable by the study of the quotations from the Old Testament to the New, and still more often by the collation of repeated passages in the Old Testament. It should be mentioned that the editions of the Hebrew Bible which the Jews print for themselves differ in no material respect from those printed by Christians.

The Revisers have been very cautious in making textual changes ; and what little they have done will generally com-

mend itself to the student. Thus, in Isa. ix. 6, where we used to read "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy," we now read, "Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy." In Jud. xviii. 30, Jonathan, the son of Gershom, is now called "the son of Moses," instead of "the son of Manasseh," as in the A.V. The difference lies in one letter, and it is supposed that the Jews put in the letter *n* to save the credit of Moses' family. Those who consult their Hebrew Bible will observe that the letter in question is not printed exactly in the text but rather over it, as if to show that it did not really form part of the old manuscript. In 1 Sam. vi. 18, the R.V. reads thus: "even unto the great (stone of) Abel;" margin, "great stone." The Revisers have taken the old marginal rendering, and have adopted it as their text, quoting as their authority the interpretation of the LXX. and the Targum. In 1 Sam. xii. 11, we read, "the Lord sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel." Here the Revisers have left the text as it stands, but have rightly given Barak for Bedan in the margin; if they had also suggested Samson's name for that of Samuel, they would have got the four names which are grouped together in Heb. xi. 32. In 1 Sam. xiii. 7, the A.V. begins, "Saul reigned one year," in the margin we have, "Heb. The son of one year in his reigning." But this is a mistake, for the Hebrew word for *one* is not in the text. If we compare 2 Sam. v. 4, we have exactly the same idiom, "The son of thirty years in his reigning." It has been thought, therefore, that a word has dropped out from the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xiii. 1. Accordingly the Revisers print thus, "Saul was [thirty] years old when he began to reign." In the margin they state that the whole verse is omitted in the unrevised LXX.; but in a later recension, the number *thirty* is inserted.

The letters R and D are very like one another in Hebrew, and have been sometimes substituted for one another. Thus, in Gen. x. 3, 4 we read of Riphath and Dodanim, and in 1 Chron. i. 6, 7 of Diphath and Rodanim. The Revisers might, we think, have harmonized the text in such cases, putting the Hebrew reading from which they depart in the margin: so in the case of Hadadezer and Hadarezer, and similar proper names. In Jud. x. 12, against the word "Maonites," the Revisers have properly inserted the reading "Midianites" from the LXX. In Gen. iv. 7 they have pointed out the very ancient addition to the text, "Let us go into the field." In Gen. vi. 3 they give in the margin another sense for the Spirit *striving*, based probably on a slightly different reading. In Hos. xiv. 2 they have not ventured to put "the fruit of our lips" instead of "the calves of our lips," though

the difference involved by the change would be almost imperceptible, but they have given it in the margin. In Numb. xxi. 30 they have suggested in the margin a reading which only involves the addition of a single letter, and which certainly makes the sense clearer. In Amos iii. 12 they seem to have been puzzled, and have put in the text "on the silken cushions of a bed," and in the margin "in Damascus on a bed." Damask may have been a recognised material in those days, and a damask couch is probably what is referred to. In 2 Sam. viii. 13 they have not ventured to alter the text from Syria (Aram) to Edom, though they must have been morally certain that the alteration was needed. In one case, however, viz., 1 Chron. vi. 28, the Revisers have been bold enough to make a needful change. The word "Vashni," which stands in the A.V., means "and the second;" and a word has dropped out of the Hebrew text, which the Revisers have now added, on the authority of the 33rd verse, and the parallel passage in Samuel: accordingly they read, "the first-born *Joel*, and the second *Abiah*."

On the whole, nothing can exceed the caution with which the Revisers have acted in the matter of text; in fact, they have hardly given English readers the full benefit of the knowledge which the critical student possesses.

The *References* in the R.V. are very defective. One is almost inclined to say that there should either have been more, or none at all. Where a writer incorporates into his text a verse or longer passage taken from the work of one of his predecessors, there ought certainly to be some indication of it; and where there is a definite historical reference, as in Deut. xxiv. 9, "Remember what the Lord thy God did unto Miriam, by the way as ye came forth out of Egypt," it seems hard that the reader should not have the key to the allusion put into his hand. The rule appointed for our translators in 1611 was a very good one, that "such quotation of places should be marginally set down as should serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another." The tendency has been to have too many rather than too few. Dr. Scrivener says that more than half the references contained in the edition of 1611 are derived from manuscript and printed copies of the Latin Vulgate; but he adds that we have now seven times as many references as there were in the original editions of the A.V. The Revisers have gone to the opposite extreme, and have failed to show how the various books of the Bible are knit together; and how not only the most notable events, but the very words of passages contained in early Books are referred to or reproduced in the later. Now and then, indeed, the R.V. gives us

a remarkable reference. A good instance will be found in Isa. xl. 2. Here the Hebrew expression, translated in the A.V. "her iniquity is pardoned," is a very peculiar one. The Revisers have rendered it in the margin, "her punishment is accepted," and they give a reference to Lev. xxvi. 43. On turning to this passage we find ourselves near the close of one of the most remarkable prophetic chapters in the Pentateuch, a promise being held out that after Israel has been punished severely for their sin, if they should accept of the punishment of their iniquity, God would remember His covenant with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and would restore them to their own land. The prophet Isaiah is evidently contemplating that period, and is referring to the very words of the passage in Leviticus.

A great deal of interesting matter is contained in the Revisers' marginal notes. Some of these are geographical, as when *Acmetha* is called *Ecbatana* in the margin, or when one river is explained as the Euphrates, and another as Nile. Others give explanations of names and places. Thus in Gen. iv. 1, where we now read, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," the Revisers read, "I have gotten a man with (the help of) the Lord;" and in the margin, "Hebrew *Kanah*, to get"—whence the name Cain is derived. The text is a curious one, and it is not certain that the Revisers' translation is the right one. Luther has, "I have gotten the man, the Lord." Notes on names will be found in Gen. iv. 25 (Seth), Gen. xvii. 15 (Sarah), Gen. xxix. 32 (Reuben), Exod. ii. 10 (Moses), Exod. xviii. 4 (Eliezer), and in many other places.

We do not think all the notes equally fortunate or even intelligible. Thus in Gen. xxxii. 2, Mahanaim is explained as "Hosts or Companies," but the fact of the word being dual might have been referred to, in connection with the subsequent incidents. It is now thought, indeed, that those old dual forms are not really duals; it is certainly curious that where we get the words "two companies" a few verses further down we have the plural form in the Hebrew. In verse 28 of the same chapter we have given in the margin an interpretation of the name of Israel. In the A.V. it was interpreted as "A prince of God," but in the R.V. as "He who striveth with God, or God striveth." The idea of the word "prince" has vanished entirely from the text. On turning to Hos. xii. 3, 4, we now read thus: "in his manhood he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed;" and in the margin, against the word "power" (where it first occurs), we find "stroved." The Hebrew verb *Sarah* is only used in these two passages. The word *Sar* is a universal word in Hebrew for a prince. Why, then, should the thought of *strife* take the place

of it? The Revisers may be right etymologically, but where a rare verb can only be interpreted either by its cognate noun or else from Arabic sources, we shall generally prefer the former derivation.

Readers will notice the marginal rendering in Gen. xxviii. 13, according to which instead of reading "the Lord stood above it," we read "the Lord stood beside him." This certainly brings heaven very near to earth, and perhaps throws light on our Lord's words at the end of John i. But the interpretation seems hardly justified by the Hebrew. In the previous chapter (Gen. xxvii. 39) instead of Esau having his dwelling "of the fatness of the earth and the dew of heaven," it is suggested in the margin that he was to have his dwelling *away from* the fatness of the earth, etc. This is clever, but the Hebrew would probably be different if this idea was to be conveyed.

We do not know the good of putting the Hebrew word *kesitah* in the margin against Gen. xxxiii. 19; it cannot help an English reader. The interpretation of the "coat" given to Joseph, as "a long garment with sleeves," is what one would expect in a Bible Dictionary rather than in a Bible. The word first occurs in Gen. iii. 21, and it is a pity that if it means a long garment with sleeves the Revisers did not tell us so there. The truth is that the word needs no note; it is a most common word, and has travelled into many languages, including our own. If, however, a note had been put against the word translated "of many colours," something useful would have been done.

Passing by the note on Gen. xxxviii. 21, we observe that Pharaoh's magicians (Gen. xli. 8) are called "sacred scribes." The word is *Chartummim*, and we suppose that Khartoum is from the same root. These people *may* have been scribes. In Gen. xlvi. 7, instead of "Rachel died by me," the margin suggests "Rachel died to my sorrow;" but will the text bear it?

In Gen. xlix. 10, we now read: "until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be." The rendering of the latter clause is accurate. Three other interpretations are suggested in the margin—(1) *till he come to Shiloh*, having the obedience of the peoples; (2) *until that which is his shall come* etc.; (3) *till he come, whose it is*, etc. Some reviewers have found serious fault with the Revisers for inserting these alternative renderings, which are supposed to do away with the Messianic bearing of the text. But if the Revisers felt that there was sufficient cause for embodying those three suggestions in the margin they could not well help doing so. What does the passage state? it speaks of Judah as destined to hold the sceptre. This is plain, and it is also plain that Judah did not begin to hold the sceptre until David

was king. How long was this pre-eminence of Judah to continue? As a matter of fact, when Benjamin became absorbed in Judah so as to be counted as one tribe with it, Jerusalem (which was properly speaking, in the tribe of Benjamin) became the chief city of Judah, having supplanted Hebron. And Jerusalem retained its political and spiritual predominance until the Lord came. Then, when all peoples were gathered to Him and yielded obedience to Him Who was the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Jerusalem had served its purpose and the prophecy had been fulfilled. It would hardly be fitting to discuss at length in these pages the history of the interpretation of this text, or the critical difficulties which attach to some of the alternative renderings now inserted in the margin. An elaborate paper by Professor Driver in the summer number of the *Journal of Philology*, will lead most readers to the conclusion that no interpretation can give perfect satisfaction. Whether Shiloh means the peace-giver, or whether we should translate the sentence, "till he come to Shiloh," *i.e.* to the place of peace (compare the meaning of the word Jerusalem—the inheritance of peace), or whether there is some hidden sense in the then novel word Shiloh, answering to the words "He whose right it is"—whether any of these or some other interpretation of this particular clause be correct, may be open to question; but the general bearing of the words on the future of Judah and Jerusalem, and the fact that the passage is a link between the promise made to Abraham and that made to David, seems unquestionable.

In Deut. xxx. 3 we read, A.V., "the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity." This expression came into common use in after-times in Israel—probably on the strength of this primary passage. The Revisers have suggested in the margin "the Lord will return to thy captivity." At first sight this is not very clear. But the word "captivity" in the Bible frequently means the company of people taken captive; and the Revisers, we suppose, took it in this sense.

Attention may be called to one other marginal note in the Pentateuch, viz., in Exod. xxxiv. 29, where we read that Moses' face "shone" by reason of his speaking with God. The margin says it sent forth beams, or was horned. This interpretation is the origin of old pictures of Moses with horn-like objects protruding from his head.

The old marginal note in Judges xi. 40 is taken out. Perhaps some readers never noticed it. If the daughters of Israel went to "talk with" Jephtha's daughter; she was manifestly not slain. A reference is given in connection with this note to Judges v. 11, where the same Hebrew word (*Tanah*) is rendered "rehearse." The verb is only used in

these two places. The Revisers have put "to celebrate" (margin, "lament") in Judges xi. 40, but have not altered the other passage. There is a curious alternative rendering in 1 Sam. xviii. 10, where Saul is described as "raving" instead of "prophesying." The ordinary Hebrew word for prophesying is used in the passage. There seems little doubt that our idea of prophecy is too restricted, and that the stirring of the depths of the human soul which took place when God spoke to mortal man was sometimes (consciously or unconsciously) imitated when evil spirits took possession of the frame. We should have preferred the word "frenzy" to "raving."

There is a singular expression used by David in 2 Sam. vii. 19, translated in the A.V. "is this the manner" (margin, "law") "of man, O Lord God?" The R.V. has "this too after the manner of men;" in the margin, "is this the law of man?" In the parallel place (1 Chron. xvii. 17), the A.V. and R.V. have, "thou hast regarded me according to the estate of a man of high degree." The Hebrew in both passages is worth careful study. Luther sees in both passages an indication of Messianic doctrine, and has expressed this view in his version.

In 2 Sam. viii. 18 the Old Version has "David's sons were chief rulers" (margin, "princes"). In the New the text gives "David's sons were priests" (margin, "chief ministers"). The same change is made in chap. xx. 28. In what the priesthood of these men consisted no one knows; but the Hebrew word *cohen* was probably a political rather than a religious word, and perhaps signified an administrator. It might have been best to have put "minister" in the text, and in the margin "Hebrew *cohen*, the word usually translated priest."

In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 the Revisers have retained the old text, "Satan stood up," but have properly inserted in the margin, "an adversary." This ought to have been put in the text. Where the word Satan has the definitive article before it, as in Job i. 6, it may be taken as a proper name, but not otherwise. The best illustration of 1 Chron. xxi. 1 in connection with the parallel 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, is 1 Kings xi. 14, where we read that the Lord stirred up an adversary (*lit.* a Satan) against Solomon. The mischief done was in one sense the Lord's doing, and in another sense an adversary's doing. This was doubtless the case when David numbered the people.

The note against the first verse of Ecclesiastes will be observed; instead of "the preacher" we may read "the great orator." How the Revisers have extracted this meaning out of the word *koheleth* we know not. In some of the South Sea languages the word for Bishop means Big preacher, but English preachers have never till now had any encouragement

offered them to consider themselves great orators. Still, "great orator" sounds less dangerous than "Congregationalist," which is the literal rendering of the word. In Prov. viii. 22, instead of "the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," we read in the margin, "The Lord formed me as the beginning of his way, the first of his works of old." We strongly object to the word "formed." We know of no authority for this rendering. The word *Kanah* (from which Cain's name is derived) means to obtain, acquire, or purchase, but certainly not to form.

There are some important notes on the Psalms. We will only single out a few for observation. In Ps. ii. 12 the Revisers have retained the rendering "kiss the son," but they have given two other ancient renderings, "lay hold of instruction," and "worship in purity." Fault has been found with them for so doing, but they could not well do otherwise. If the word translated "son" in this verse had been the ordinary one which we have in the seventh verse, the case would have been different. Our own feeling is one of satisfaction that the Revisers as a body felt the existing version to be the best here, and we are not inclined to quarrel with them because they refer to other versions. Another interesting reference to ancient versions is to be found at Ps. xx. 9.

Against Ps. lxxxix. 15, for "the joyful sound" we have "the trumpet sound," which is good; but the note against Ps. xcvi. 9 does not strike us as so good—the verse becomes a call to worship the Lord "in holy array." This will please some readers, but we doubt if the Hebrew admits of it. In Ps. cxxxiii. 2, the oil, instead of going down to the skirt of Aaron's garments, only gets as far as the collar. The Hebrew word is mouth, or aperture, and is translated "collar" in Job xxx. 18 in the A.V. It signifies the part at which a man entered his garment, and we imagine that Aaron entered his garment at the lower end, not at the comparatively narrow aperture through which he could only push his head; but others, we suppose, think differently.

Passing to the subject of grammatical changes, we feel the exceeding difficulty of offering any criticism, or of making any suggestions. The Revisers have not done anything startling; but here, as in other matters, their work has been patiently done, though a good deal of it is almost of a character to escape observation. We can only touch on a few points.

Much could be done to improve our Authorised Version by a more careful use of the definite article. The Revisers have had this in their mind. It seems curious to read of "a Tophet" instead of "Tophet" in Isa. xxx. 33; but it is more

startling to find "a son of a God" in Dan. iii. 21, "and "a son of man" in Dan. vii. 13, and "one that was ancient of days" instead of "the ancient of days" in the ninth verse. A sort of intuitive tact is needed, as well as grammatical acumen, in order to decide what course to take in such cases as these. We quite approve of "*the cherubim*" in Gen. iii. 24, and "*a Redeemer*" in Isa. lxix. 20, and "*the King*" in Hos. x. 3 and 15; but why should we read "*the peoples*" in Hos. x. 10?

The use of prepositions in Hebrew is sometimes peculiar. In some cases the Revisers have sacrificed sense to what they believed to be grammar, as in Isa. xxvi. 4, where they read "in the Lord Jehovah is an everlasting Rock." The word *in* ought not to have been introduced. Readers will observe that in Ps. lxxii. 15 the Revisers have put "men shall pray *for* him." The word means "because of," or "for the sake of," and there ought to have been a marginal note to this effect. The Revisers have made a slip in Jonah ii. 9, where they have put "salvation is of the Lord," forgetting that the passage is a quotation from Ps. iii. 8, where we read "salvation belongeth unto the Lord."

In the use of the *tenses* the Revisers had a high authority among them. Some of the changes are noteworthy. Thus, Joel ii. 18: "Then was the Lord jealous for his land, and had pity on his people;" Mal. i. 11, "My name is great among the Gentiles;" Isa. liii. 2, "He grew up before him as a tender plant . . . and when we see him there is no beauty that we should desire him;" Numb. xxiv. 17, "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not nigh;" Ps. xviii. 43, "Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people: thou hast made me the head of the heathen."

The emphatic personal pronoun ought to be marked wherever possible. This may be done, as in Ps. xxvi. 11, by introducing the expression "as for me" before the principal verb, or by adopting the word "myself." We miss corrections which we had hoped to find in many places under this head; as in Ps. xl. 17, in lix. 16, and in Hos. ii. 8.

The change of conjunction and tense will be noticed in Ps. cii. 16, where the Revisers read, "For the Lord hath built up Zion; he hath appeared in his glory."

There is a word frequently used in the A.V. of the Old and New Testament which is often very misleading: it is the word "*then*." The student of the chronology of the Gospels and Acts has constantly to strike his pen through it; for many of the things said to have happened *then* are proved to have happened some time afterwards, or even before. In the Old Testament the case is somewhat similar; as the word frequently introduces a false sequence and gives a chronological

force which the original does not justify. Thus, 1 Chron. xxii. 1 : “Then David said, This is the house of the Lord.” It may have been *then*, but the Hebrew Bible does not say so. Readers of the English Bible might fairly have expected accuracy in the R.V. in this matter; but although some *thens* have been done away with, many remain which are misleading.

There are certain passages which the Revisers have left standing, where we looked for some alterations either in the text or in the margin. Thus, Gen. xxv. 18, “they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria.” The last clause is puzzling from a geographical point of view. In 1 Sam. xv. 7, we are told that “Saul smote the Amalekites, from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt;” and in 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, we read of the Amalekites and others as “inhabitants of the land, which were of old, as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt.” The words “Assyria” and “Shur” are almost the same in Hebrew; and a note on the passage in Genesis would have elucidated the text.

Gen. xxv. 32, “Behold I am at the point to die.” Is that the whole force of Esau’s words? Gen. xxxiv. 30, “Ye have made me to stink.” Would not “unsavoury” have been enough? In Gen. xl. 1, etc., Pharaoh is still represented as having “butlers.” Why not cupbearers, as in 1 Kings x. 5? According to the A.V. and R.V. in Exod. xiv. 21, the water is still made to go *back* by a strong east wind, but it probably went forward. In Numb. xxiii. 10, Balaam still prays that his “last end” may be like that of the righteous, whereas he is probably speaking of his “final condition,” a matter of far greater importance. In Deut. iii. 11, Og is still said to have been possessed of an iron bedstead; and in Deut. xxxii. 14, wheat is still supposed to have kidneys. “God save the king” is retained as a version of “vivat rex;” and “God forbid” is retained instead of “far be it.” Swearing is still described as “lifting the hand” (Ez. xx), and we continue to read of a “darling” in Ps. xxxv. 17.

The Revisers might have inserted, in text or margin, the exact renderings of some peculiar words or expressions with which every Hebrew student is familiar. Thus, Ps. ii. 6, “I have set my king.” The A.V. here has, in the margin, “anointed;” but the word means, to pour out as a drink-offering. Ps. xix. 3, R.V., “Their sound cannot be heard.” This is hardly literal. The margin of the A.V. gives the literal rendering, which ought to have been preserved. In Ps. xlix. 2, the rendering “high and low” runs easily, but is not exact. The literal reading should have been given in the

margin, in at least one of the places where the expression occurs. Compare Ps. lxii. 9. No alteration has been made in Ps. lxxxvi. 3, though preachers often take the close of the verse in another way. The grammar is certainly in favour of the English as it stands. In Ps. vi. 15, we read, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." There is a peculiarity in the grammar here which might well be noted in the margin. Jacob still says, "how dreadful is this place" (Gen. xviii. 17); and David continues to "scrabble," instead of "scribbling," on the doors of Gath. In Ps. viii. 6, the waters of Shiloah are represented as going "softly," without a reference to the translation suggested by the Palestine explorers. In Micah vi. 8, as well as Deut. x. 12, we continue to read, "What doth the Lord require of thee," without a hint given that the word means to seek, ask, or desire, rather than require. In Hab. ii. 2, a message is still to be written on "tables," although the word "tablets" has been properly used in Isa. xxx. 8. In Isa. vii. 23, we continue to read of "a thousand silverlings," although in Cant. viii. 11 the more intelligible expression is found. In spite of American protests, the word "fray" has held its ground in Zec. x. 21, and the "hornet" is retained in Exod. xxiii. 28, without any suggestion of the Egyptian national insect. We still read about "entering into peace" in Isa. lvii. 2, as if the expression "depart in peace" had never been heard of. The "region" of Argob is preserved without a note on the characteristic expression, and "like people like priest" is gravely retained in Hos. iv. 9, as if Isa. xxiv. 2 (where the same Hebrew idiom occurs) had never been written. We still read of the circle of the heavens in Isa. xl. 22, and the "circuit," where the Hebrew is the same, in Job xxii. 14. The Revisers have courageously retained the expression "should have reigned" in 2 Kings iii. 27, as if the Prince of Edom were not already reigning—a fact which the prophet Amos appears to certify; and in 2 Kings viii. 16, they have put "Jehoshaphat being *then* king," without printing the word "then" in italics, and thus obscuring the fact that father and son were reigning together.

These may be said to be all little things; probably all of them were considered at the time by some of the Revisers; but they did not see their way on these and some similar points to make the simple alterations or marginal suggestions which many students wished for.

Some interesting changes in familiar or difficult passages may now be noticed. Gen. i. 2, "waste and void." This is a decided improvement on "without form and void;" compare Jer. iv. 23, where the passage is quoted. The words appear again together in Isa. xxxiv. 11; but here, strange to say, the

Revisers have failed to give a harmonious rendering. They have given a strict rendering of Gen. i. 5. and similar verses; and although at first it may give no satisfaction, it will be seen in time to have a bearing on the truth. Sea-monsters are better than whales in the 21st verse. The serpent's question to Eve, Gen. iii. 1, is more accurate in the Revised Version, and brings out the fact that Satan attempted to exaggerate the restrictions which God laid on our first parents. We doubt if the marginal note in the 15th verse is called for; and we prefer a flaming sword to the flame of a sword: possibly a sword-like flame would convey the sense. Observe, in chap. iv. 7, "Sin coucheth at the door," and verse 15, "The Lord appointed a sign for Cain." People usually suppose that Cain was branded on his forehead; but the new rendering, which is accurate, gives a very different idea. The change in chap. ix. 5 is to be observed, "Your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require." In other words, God requires an account of life-blood. The introduction of the word "Dammesek" into the text, in chap. xv. 2., is ludicrous. Dammesek is the ordinary Hebrew spelling of Damascus. There are difficulties in the verse, but these are not alleviated by introducing this barbarous word into the text. Ishmael figures as a "wild-ass" now in Gen. xvi. 12, and Anah finds "hot springs" instead of mules in Gen. xxxvi. 24. Seraiah is no more a quiet prince but a "chief-chamberlain," or, if you will, a "quarter-master" in Jer. li. 59. The Israelites are no longer told to "borrow" jewels, but to "ask" for them (Exod. xi. 2). Abraham has been acquitted of "planting a grove," Gen. xxi. 33 (R.V., "tamarisk"). In Gen. xxii. 14 the true sense of "Jehovah Jireh" is indicated in the words that follow, "for the mount of the Lord it shall be provided." Leah cries out, "Fortunate!" instead of "A troop cometh" (Gen. xxx. 11); and the same Hebrew word is rendered "fortune" in Isa. lxv. 11. Leah and Rachel were half heathenish, and perhaps they had picked up the expression from others. In Gen. xlvi. 36 the Revisers have only ventured to put in the margin what deserved to find its way into the text—"all these things are upon me." The treasure cities of Exod. i. 11 are turned into "store cities." The word is peculiar, but occurs again in 2Chron. xvi. 4. Some people think that one of these cities has been discovered at Tell el Maskutah (near Tell el Kebir); but they have not noticed the possible relationship between the names. Moses figures as a bridegroom in Exod. iv. 25; and there is no note to give the Jewish interpretation of this difficult passage. Deut. xx. 19 now closes thus, "Is the tree of the field man, that it should be besieged of thee?"

No material change has been made in the Ten Command-

ments, but the word translated "in vain" appears to us to be imperfectly explained in the margin, and we still read of "all that in them is." The question of fermented wine is left very much where it was; but the discussion about marrying a deceased wife's sister nearly broke out afresh when the Revised Version of Lev. xviii. 18 was read. We are quite content with the margin of our Authorised Version here. We must leave it for zoologists to go through the list of clean and unclean beasts. There must have been the greatest pains taken in these things, as there have in all matters of topographical and antiquarian interest. Deut. i. 7 gives a good idea of the topographical changes introduced. The "Arabah" here stands for the Ghor or Jordan Valley; then comes the hill country, running north and south through the land; then the lowlands more westerly; then the south, or negeb, of Judea; and finally the sea-coast. We are almost sorry that the Revisers did not venture on the word *wady* for *nachal*, but watercourse would fairly have given the sense had it not been used in the R.V. for a very different term.

The "bleatings of the flocks" are turned to the "pipings for the flocks" in Judges v. 16, and the "ornaments" on the camels are now called "crescents," Judges viii. 21. The hollow place whence the water came is no more called the "jawbone" but "Lehi," in Judges xv. 19, the "jawbone" being allowed to lie in the margin. Huldah is no longer allowed to dwell in a "college," but in the "second quarter" (2 Kings xxii. 14). This is hard upon the advocates of ladies' colleges, but it was inevitable. We are glad to see "the tongue of fire" introduced in Isa. v. 24, and the formula "as the Lord liveth" in Jer. v. 2.

Great pains have been taken with the Book of Job, one of the most difficult books in the Bible. The passage which calls for most attention here is chap. xix. 25, 26, 27. Every reader of the A.V. must be struck with the number of italics this passage contains; and these italics exhibit the attempts to make up for the exceeding brevity and abstruseness of the text. The difficulty does not lie in the words, but in their sense. The middle verse stands thus in the R.V., "and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God." There are alternative renderings in the margin, but they are not clearer than this; a little touch often brings out the force of the original; thus Ps. v. 3 runs thus: "in the morning will I order (my prayer) unto thee, and will keep watch." Praying and watching are thus linked together. So in Ps. xvi. 2, "I have no good beyond thee," gives excellent sense. We do not care for the "cords of death," Ps. xviii. 4; "the bands" do better, and St. Peter's version, "pains," ought

to have been in the margin. Ps. ix. 17 ("the wicked shall return to sheol") reads rather strangely. Had they been there before? In Ps. xlv. 13 the King's daughter is now described as "all glorious within *the palace*," not in her inner being. This gives the true sense. "Free among the dead" is replaced by "cast off among the dead" (Ps. lxxxviii. 5). In Ps. cx. 3 we now read, "thy people offer themselves willingly in the day of thy power," another decided improvement.

In Isa. vii. 16 the R.V. runs thus: "The land whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken." This is a bold version; but will readers understand it?

The ninth chapter begins thus: "But there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish. In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made it glorious." This is a feeling after a better version, and will be helpful.

Isa. xxvi. 19 opens thus: "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise." At first sight this seems obscure; but there is ground for the departure from the old version. The twelfth verse of the next chapter gains precision from the new rendering, "the Lord shall beat off his fruit, and ye shall be gathered" (*i.e.*, as fruit is gathered) "one by one." A still greater change is made in chap. lix. 19. The old version is very beautiful, "when the enemy shall come in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." But the new version has much to be said for it: "for he shall come as a rushing stream, which the breath of the Lord driveth." The strangeness of Ezek. xiii. 18 is a little removed by the Revisers. The pillows are sown to elbows, and the kerchiefs are put on the head of persons of every stature. But the verse is still obscure.

The Revisers seem to have bestowed great pains on the prophecy of the seventy weeks in Daniel ix. But there is even yet room for improvement. We are sorry to lose the word "Messiah" from the text. The twenty-sixth verse now runs thus: "After the threescore and two" (why not sixty-two?) "weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing." We doubt this last clause. Interpreting this brief Hebrew expression by similar passages, we believe that it means, "and none shall be for him." The passage closes in the R.V. with the pouring out of wrath upon the "desolator," not on the "desolate."

The words "hear" and "answer" are frequently the same in Hebrew. Illustrations of this may be seen in the Revised Psalms; but the most interesting passage is Hos. ii. 21, where the R.V. reads: "I will answer the heavens, and they shall answer the earth," etc.

In Hag. ii. 7, instead of "the desire of all nations shall come," we read, "the desirable things of all nations shall come." The correspondence in the *Guardian* which this rendering has caused only tends to show the difficulty of determining absolutely the right rendering. The object of all nations' desire seems to be what is spoken of, but the words "shall come" is in the plural—hence the difficulty. A plural verb following a singular noun. We do not think that the Revisers have hit upon the real solution.

There is only one other point to notice before drawing these papers to a close. Will the R.V. of the Psalms chaunt? Some of the Revisers are musical, and they had this matter brought before them; but we know not whether it was specially referred to a musical sub-committee to arrange for the needful balancing of the sentences. We need not remind our readers that the reason why both the Roman and English Churches do not chaunt what may be called their authorised versions of the Psalms is because they had got used to the swing of the old words and could not brook the lack of the familiar rhythm. If the leading organists were to give a satisfactory report on the rhythmical character of the R.V., that would be a considerable step towards introducing the Psalms into public use. There is no reason in the nature of things why there should be one version in the Bible and another in the Prayer Book; and the sooner this anomaly is done away with the better.

The criticisms in the four papers now brought to a close may seem to some hypercritical; to others they may indicate that the Revision is unworthy of its authors. This conclusion is anything but what the writer desires. In reviewing so great a work it is hardly possible, and certainly it would not be right, to heap up indiscriminate praise, or to hide those defects which one observes by patient study of the whole work. It would be pleasant to go through passage after passage in order to show what has been done as well as to point out mistakes and omissions, but our readers would hardly thank us for our trouble.

On looking over the undertaking as a whole, we feel sure that the work has been faithfully and wisely done; many difficulties of idiom and translation have been removed; many obscurities and ambiguities have been cleared up; and there has been a tendency towards greater accuracy and consistency of rendering. When we consider the age of the Hebrew Books, the brevity and minuteness of the writers' allusions to the thousand fleeting ways and thoughts of their day, the variety of topics touched upon, and the absence of contemporary literature which would serve to illustrate the language,

we may well wonder and rejoice that we have so grand a Version and so helpful a Revision as we now possess. All honour to those who have laboured steadfastly to this great end. Their names will be emblazoned in the religious history of this century. They look not, however, to the praise of their contemporaries as their real reward, for they have a greater recompense owing to the nature of the work on which they have been engaged. May the blessing which they must have enjoyed amidst their sacred labours be widely diffused amongst our readers, and may it leave its healthful influence on the translations of Scripture to be made or revised hereafter for the benefit of all people and nations and languages upon earth.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.



ART. III.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

X. OCTOBER. ST. SIMON AND ST. JUDE.

A. THE APOSTOLIC AND PROPHETIC FOUNDATION.

“*The foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,¹ Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.*”—EPH. ii. 20.

FEW Collects are more frequently used in our English Churches before the sermon, and few are more appropriate to such use, than that which is appointed for the Festival of St. Simon and St. Jude. No prayer at such a time could be better than that we may be “so joined together in unity of spirit by the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets,” so that we may be all built “into a holy temple,” the one only “corner-stone” of that apostolic and prophetic foundation being “Jesus Christ Himself.” As to the practice of using a collect at this moment of the service, it is quite enough to say that it is a good custom, justified by very solid reasons. At no moment of the service is a special prayer of this kind more needed alike by the preacher and the congregation.

The composer of the Collect clearly took the words which we find here in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and incorporated them into the prayer for the day, and made them its distinctive feature. And if we were to seek for a reason why this was done in the Collect for the day marked by the names of St. Simon and St. Jude, we might perhaps say this. Other men, Apostles and Evangelists, who appear in this way in our

¹ A question, not quite easy to be answered, might be raised here in consequence of the word “Prophets” being placed after the word “Apostles.” Whatever we may say of the Old Testament, the Prophets of the New Testament must not be overlooked.