

# 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/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

whom Paul and Titus placed themselves, as we find them in *vv.* 1-3 of this chapter. From the former they appealed to the latter, and happily not in vain.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

---

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.—I.

Two distinguished literary laymen have made the Book of Isaiah their own. Mr. Matthew Arnold in 1883 published some remarkable papers on "Isaiah of Jerusalem" in *The Nineteenth Century*; he had already made a benevolent attempt to revise and annotate the A.V. of the "great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration" (Isa. xl.-lxvi.) for Government elementary schools, to which he prefixed a stimulative and finely written introduction. Sir Edward Strachey, the friend of Maurice and popularizer of *Morte Darthur*, went much more thoroughly into the subject, I am afraid to say how many years ago, in his *Jewish History and Politics*, to which in the second edition (1874) he appended a revision of the A.V. of the Book of Isaiah. Reading over again the words in which these authors have expressed themselves towards the A.V., one realizes the better the enormous difficulties of the task which the Revisers of Isaiah had before them. Both are lovers of their native tongue and of the glories of its literature; both regard the A.V. of Isaiah primarily as a masterpiece of English, and would have only those alterations made in it which could not be evaded by the utmost ingenuity of an advocate. It would have been no use to reply to these writers (not known as Hebraists) that the Authorized Version is an admirable *testo di lingua*, but no longer adequate as a translation. The retort would

have been that Hebraists had no ear, and were not competent to express true meanings of the Hebrew in noble English. The remark has at any rate often been made with no affected timidity; the profession whether of the higher<sup>1</sup> or of the lower criticism is often represented as incompatible with a literary sense. "Yea, who knoweth not such things as these?"

It would be interesting to ask these two jealous guardians of our language whether they would not soften their tone, now that the revision of the A.V. of Isaiah is before them. Nowhere—if I may trust my own judgment—has a more persistent effort been made to preserve the rhythmic effect of the original (*i.e.* of the A.V.) even when altering the words. For my own part, I am at once pleased with the result—and displeased. Let me explain. The problem of revision has long been before the world of scholars. My own solution would have been at once a simpler and a bolder one than that adopted by the Revisers, *viz.* to provide (1) a faithful translation of the O.T. (and especially of the Psalms and Isaiah), with a few brief paraphrastic notes for the home use of educated readers; and (2) a much slighter revision of the A.V. for churches and for the home-use of simple readers, in which only the most notorious errors were corrected, and that as tenderly as possible from the point of view of English rhythm. This plan of course was never even considered, because it never occurred to Convocation, by which body the two Revision Companies were called into existence. Still, under the circumstances of the case, pleasure may well predominate over the opposite feeling. Even though one may question the literary principles on which the fabric of our Bible has been "restored," and be disposed to apply the saying in Matthew ix. 16, one may cheerfully admit that the result in

<sup>1</sup> Higher, only in so far as it is based upon simpler and in a certain sense more primary criticism; not with any arrogant or contemptuous implication.

many parts jars less upon the ear than might have been expected.

Let us now proceed to compare Mr. Arnold's version of Isa. vii. 16 with that given by the Revisers. The former runs thus,—

For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land shall be forsaken, whose two kings make thee afraid.

The latter agrees with this as far as "choose the good," and continues,—

. . . the land whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken.

The rendering of R.V. has been anticipated, so far as the rhythm and the order of the clauses are concerned, by Sir E. Strachey; but Mr. Arnold's is nearer to the rhythm and even to the sense of the Hebrew. If the rhythm of A.V. had to be renounced, why did not the Revisers adapt their English better to the Hebrew? Simply because they felt bound by the old rendering, here certainly inadequate, "thou abhorrest" (קָרַן אֲתָהּ). "Inadequate" is, I hope, not a disrespectful word; a reference to Num. xxii. 3 will show that the leading idea of קָרַן, when constructed with מִפְּנֵי, is "to be afraid"; for in that passage two notices from different documents are put side by side, in one of which the Moabitish feeling towards Israel is expressed by גִּיר, and in the other by קָרַן. Next compare Ex. i. 12, where the same idiom is used as here; it appears from this passage (taken along with *vs.* 8-11) that קָרַן expresses a fear intensified by fresh causes for strong dislike. It would seem as if a special theory of the "Christology of the Old Testament" dictated the rendering of A.V., which is however clearly wrong, (1) because the dislike and fear of the Jews was related not to the land of Pekah and Rezin, but to these kings themselves, and (2) because it is against Hebrew usage, as established by those two Pentateuch passages.

For another example, see the several revisions of ix. 5. Mr. Arnold's is as follows,—

For all the trampling of the warrior with confused noise, and the war-cloak rolled in blood—they shall be for burning and fuel of fire.

Now compare this with the freer movement and simple but not undignified English of Sir E. Strachey,—

For all the warrior's armour with its clang, and his garments rolled in blood, shall be for burning and food for fire.

We can hardly hesitate between them. The latter represents both sense and parallelism more clearly, and is supported in the main by the R.V., which runs thus,—

For all the armour of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall soon be for burning, for fuel of fire.

“Supported in the main,” not in all points. **בְּרֵעַשׁ** might, no doubt, be expected to mean “with (its) clang,” if **סִמּוֹן** meant “armour.” This meaning, however, is not sufficiently proved. There is not the least reason (but a misplaced dislike of humble images) for rejecting the help of Aramaic (Syr. *sāūn*), and rendering, with R.V. marg., “Every boot of the booted warrior.” But I fear I cannot express admiration for the English either of R.V. or of R.V. marg., which seems to me needlessly awkward, while “garments” is a poor, colourless rendering of **שִׁמְלֹה** (cloak, *sagum*), though it fits well with the general term “armour.”

The tendency of these remarks is to show the great importance to the student of a judiciously chosen variety of translations of the Bible. A great deal too much has been said of the obscurity of the prophets; if their language is obscure, it is frequently owing either to the faultiness of the text or to a want of philological tact on the part of the translators. For the first of these drawbacks there is no remedy, if we adhere, as the Revisers were instructed to

do, to the Massoretic text (the references to the ancient versions in the margin seem far too few to meet the wants of a student, nor can the versions help us in half our perplexities). There is indeed only a partial remedy, at the best; and the free, not arbitrary, handling of the Hebrew text must begin in the scholar's commentary and not in a popular handbook.<sup>1</sup> The second can be remedied somewhat more easily. Philological tact can only be learned in a good school, and few of our theologians have time or opportunity for this. But the comparison of versions will develop a kind of instinct even in a weak Hebraist, if not preoccupied by the errors of antiquated commentaries. Without pretending that either criticism or exegesis fit to publish can be produced without sound scholarship, I think there is an element of truth in M. Renan's contention that mere literary students can sometimes detect the errors of a scholar; "les hébraïsants de l'ancienne école ont été à la fois les plus patients, les plus soigneux, et les moins clairvoyants des hommes."<sup>2</sup> It may be dangerous to tell this to every one; Arnolds and Stracheys, Astrucs and d'Eichthals, do not leave college every year. But many more, both of those who know but little Hebrew and those who know none at all, might become critics and exegetes for themselves (not for the public) by the discriminating use of modern<sup>3</sup> as well as ancient translations.

<sup>1</sup> The writer may be said to blame himself for inverting the proper order, and offering to the public first a popular edition of the Psalms involving such a "free handling," and only now a student's work on the same book with some attempted justification of his corrections. But circumstances are sometimes too strong for us. I see that Prof. Davidson anticipates the worst consequences from "free handling" (Expositor, Oct., 1887), but he evidently favours the Semitic idiom which prefers absolute to relative modes of expression.

<sup>2</sup> Article on Gustave d'Eichthal, *Journal des Savants*, Sept., 1887.

<sup>3</sup> Selden in his *Table Talk* and King James's translators in their Preface testify to the value set upon modern translations in the 17th century. The versions which were then modern may at the present day be of little importance. The same fate may sooner or later befall our own "modern" versions; but ignorance alone can depreciate the value of Gesenius's German and Rodwell's English translation of Isaiah, to mention no others.

Briefly and perhaps too drily I must now point out some of the Revisers' many careful alterations of the old version. In i. 27, A.V.'s *her converts* remains in the text; a rendering which reminds us somewhat of Rashi's paraphrase, עושי תשובה, "those who perform penitence." In the one case a technical term of Christian, in the other one of Jewish theology is thrust upon the old prophet. Mr. Rodwell, in his scholarly version, gives *they that turn in her* (cf. lix. 20), R.V. margin, *they that return of her* (cf. xxxi. 6, Rodwell, but not R.V.).—In ii. 3, *the law* becomes in marg. *instruction*. The choice between the renderings will depend on our view of Isaiah's relation to the collections of laws. In v. 24 however the margin gives *teaching*.—ii. 16. A.V., *pleasant pictures* (supposing that the pictures are for superstitious purposes, as Ezek. viii. 12); R.V., *pleasant imagery* (cf. Rev. xxv. 11, R.V. marg.).—In iv. 2, *branch* remains in text, but marg. gives a choice between *shoot* and *sprout*, with great gain to intelligibility. Rodwell, "upgrowth"—doubtful English but good interpretation, צֶמַח being generally used collectively. *Earth* becomes *land*, following the parallel of Gen. iv. 3 (see the Hebrew).—Notice the pleasing assonance and striking picture in v. 17 b.; also the new light thrown on vi. 13.—In vii. 15, *that he may know* (Vulg., *ut sciat*) passes into the margin; *when he shall know* becomes the approved rendering. This has the authority alike of Hitzig, Ewald, and Delitzsch; cf. Judg. xx. 10 לְבוֹאֵם, "when they come" (A.V.). Kay and Bredenkamp, both somewhat fond of standing alone, still adhere to A.V.'s rend., which is however most difficult to explain, and is opposed by the Septuagint and the Targum (both these versions explain לְ "up to the time when").—viii. 12, *conspiracy* takes the place of *confederacy* (which makes no clear sense); cf. 2 Kings xi. 14, where A.V. and R.V. have "Treason," but de Wette "Conspiracy."—viii. 20, *it is because*, etc. (A.V.), is a bold attempt to remove the veil from

Isaiah's inner life. One of the psalmists says, "Jehovah my God doth enlighten my darkness" (Ps. xviii. 28), and another, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet" (Ps. cxix. 105). In the manner of Luther, our translators make a dash at the meaning, and promote edification at the cost of philology. *Light* is obviously too free; *no morning* points sadly to the future of these men. *Surely* in R.V. is doubtful; the accurate Delitzsch prefers the view given in marg. (*for whom*, etc.).—In the next verse, R.V.'s correction, *curse by their king*, etc., is in agreement with Hebrew usage (1 Sam. xvii. 43; 2 Kings ii. 24). Some have felt however that the object of the curse ought to be named, and so, appealing to the analogy of נְלַחֵם בְּ, הַתְּעַבֵּר בְּ, retain the traditional view, which has been recorded in R.V. marg.—In ix. 1, the abruptness of the opening words of R.V. recalls that of the original; we expect "but in days to come," etc., but the prophet trusts to the reader to supply the missing link. Mr. Arnold's adaptation of the old framework of the sentence deserves chronicling however, *Nevertheless the dimness shall not remain unto that which was vexed*.—In ix. 3 we find one of those alterations which even that slighter church revision which I desiderated would certainly have included. *Thou hast increased their joy*. This is the reading of the Hebrew margin; the text-reading can only be rendered, "(whose) joy thou hadst not increased" (so Hitzig, and lately von Orelli). The order of the words is more natural according to the latter view, but the parallelism in the rest of this paragraph is so perfect that one can scarcely admit this view of the meaning. No alternative remains but to follow the late Prof. Selwyn, and read הַגִּיל (the Germans quote Studer for this, but Selwyn has the priority), or Krochmal, and read הַגִּילָה (lxv. 18). An unfettered reviser would therefore substitute for R.V.'s text and margin, *Thou hast multiplied exultation, thou hast increased joy*.—At ix. 8, the critical conscience of the



Revisers has expressed itself in a margin; אֲבִי עֶדֶת may be rendered literally "Father of eternity." Certainly the educated reader has a right to expect more. *Everlasting Father* may stand alone in a church-Bible, but a version which represents modern scholarship ought undoubtedly to have given one or two marginal renderings. The rend. *father (i.e. giver) of booty* has been advocated by some who may be accused of partisanship; but scholarship is bound to recognise it, nor is it objectionable from the point of view of believers in *progressive* revelation. See Isa. xxxiii. 23, and cf. liii. 12. One of the most learned of the Revisers is discontented with the word "everlasting" in this connexion, and proposes to render, *Father of the age to come*, i.e. author of a new dispensation (Dean Perowne, *Psalms*, ed. 5, vol. i., p. xxiv.); Bishop Lowth had rendered, *Father of the everlasting age*.

At ix. 8, an entirely new prophecy begins, demanding, from a literary point of view, a change in the style of the translator. Bickell has admirably illustrated this in his *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, i. 47-49: we are not bound, of course, to accept his metrical theory. The margins on vv. 11-14 are of much exegetical significance. Literally, they are undoubtedly correct. It is only those who regard the "tenses" as "prophetic perfects" who will feel grateful to R.V. for retaining the futures of A.V. The prophecy extends to x. 4—a most difficult verse, which in R.V. becomes, *They shall only bow down under the prisoners*, etc. Here we encounter one of the problems of translation. Are we to admit renderings which savour at all of exegesis? The Revisers have virtually answered in the negative; and yet, will not the Church expostulate? Who, listening to x. 4 in R.V., can attach a meaning to it? As M. Renan once said, "La traduction littéraire peut être la pire des trahisons"; but may we not say the same of "la traduction littérale"? And are we not thus gently drawn to the solu-

tion of the comprehensive problem of translation already proposed above, *viz.* that two versions are required, at any rate for the poetical and the prophetical writings? Or will any one say that the late D. G. Rossetti<sup>1</sup> is a poet worthy of more honour and more careful translation than David and Isaiah? Sir E. Strachey and Mr. Arnold, thinking chiefly of English, retain A.V.'s *Without me*; but, if the text is correct, there is surely no alternative for a translator who would be both scholarly and intelligible but to paraphrase, *There is nought but to bow down under the prisoners and fall under the slain?* Lagarde's emendation, obtained by a regrouping of the consonants of the text, and rendered, "Beltis stoops, Osiris is confounded," would be plausible if a reference to these foreign deities suited the text, and especially if there were evidence of their having been worshipped by heathenish Israelites.—At x. 27, the margin *by reason of fatness* deserves notice. It is undoubtedly correct, but makes no good sense. Bishop Lowth, whose historical importance is so great, ventures to correct in accordance with the Septuagint's ἀπὸ τῶν ἄμων ὑμῶν, which represents מַעַל שְׂכַמְכֶם (not Lowth's impossible מוֹשְׁכֵיכֶם). But as the Bishop remarks elsewhere, the repetition of the same word (see first verse-half) "has a poverty and inelegance extremely unworthy of the prophet" (note on lix. 10). The words כּוֹפְנֵי שִׁמּוֹן, if no more, are evidently corrupt, and a radical cure is wanted.<sup>2</sup>—xi. 3, *And his delight shall be in the fear of Jehovah*, has the merit of smoothness and intelligibility. The difficulty of the idiom בְּיִרְיָהוּ is acknowledged by the insertion of the margin; a literal rendering would have been useless without further explanation. It was not felt to be within the province of the Revisers to suggest the corruptness of the text.—Two small changes in

<sup>1</sup> The French translator of Rossetti's poems renders each of them first "littéralement" and then "littéairement."

<sup>2</sup> See Dr Robertson Smith's article, *Journal of Philology*, 1884.

xi. 10 clear up the meaning—*unto him, and his resting-place* (cf. Ps. cxxxii. 14, R.V.).—At xi. 11, for *islands*, the margin gives *coastlands*. This is important, because this alternative rendering is not repeated elsewhere in the R.V. of Isaiah. Lowth renders the whole phrase, אֲרָצוֹת הַיָּם, “western regions”; Rodwell, “coasts of the sea.” The equivalent in the Targum is אֲרָצוֹת יַמָּא, or simply אֲרָצוֹת, which Buxtorf renders *insulae maris*, but which is clearly connected with the common Assyrian word *nagû*, “district.” That *distant* regions are meant, is clear from most of the contexts in which this phrase occurs (cf. lxvi. 19); so that Mr. Arnold’s equivalent “far lands” in some of the passages in Isa. xl.–lxvi. is a good one from the point of view of sense as well as (where A.V. has “islands”) of English rhythm. Rodwell in xli. 5, gives “countries”; is there a “charm” in the word “islands,” or may one express a regret that sense was not preferred by R.V. to convention? In Isa. xxiii. 2, 6, “island” is certainly out of place (so also in xx. 6, where even R.V. gives “coastland”); in Jer. xxv. 22, however, R.V.’s “isle” may perhaps stand if the “coastland” referred to be Cyprus, which is described by Esar-haddon as “lying in the midst of the sea” (*Records of the Past*, iii. 108).

I have ventured to insist on the variety of style requisite in a translation of Isaiah. Surely there is a fresh justification of this in the splendid poetry, suffused with emotion, of chap. xiv., following immediately upon the elaborate but cold description of the judgment in chap. xiii. Both chapters are finely rendered in A.V., and if, in spite of some five combinations of words, the English of xiv. 4–21 falls below the original, this is simply because Robert Lowth had not yet arisen to unfold the principle of parallelism. But how beautiful is the line, which even Lowth retains from A.V., *How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning* (v. 12), which is deftly corrected in R.V. by the

substitution of *daystar* for *Lucifer*. Rodwell has, “. . . Bright One, son of the dayspring,” which is equally clear and still nearer the Hebrew; had he given “thou Shining One,” he would have completely preserved the rhythmic effect so dear to Mr. Arnold’s heart. In *v.* 19, A.V. has done its best in the violent style of the elder Hebraists to make sense of a troublesome phrase; but the more natural rendering given in R.V. is at least as intelligible, *clothed with the slain*, i.e. not reverently attired in a winding-sheet, but on all sides pressed upon by other corpses. Rodwell, whose version of the ode is terse and energetic, renders the whole line, “Clad with sword-pierced slain, like a trampled carcase,” which gives more of the effect of the Hebrew than A.V. and R.V. Both Rodwell and the Revisers however have been hampered by regard for the Massoretic text. Why should this be held sacred? One proposed change is to transfer the four awkward words rendered “[those] that are thrust through with the sword” to the beginning of the next verse. This, which is at any rate the easiest change, is Ewald’s, and is adopted by Rodwell.

Two very questionable expressions in the A.V. of this ode have been retained in R.V. One is “golden city,” in *v.* 4. I have ventured elsewhere to speak of “inspired mistranslations”; certainly a phrase like this cannot but enthral those who give an undivided homage to our native speech. Thus we find Bishop Alexander singing in *Super Flumina*,

“And rises to the earth a cry  
Of triumph and of agony,  
Far over all the ancient East —  
‘How hath the golden city ceased!’  
In shadow of his dim blue room,  
High overhead in painted gloom,  
Like sunset cloud-encompassed, Bel  
Sleeps golden in his oracle.”

And yet, though the inscriptions speak of the temple of

Bel as "overlaid with glittering gold,"<sup>1</sup> and a poet might perhaps transfer the epithet "golden" to the city of the wondrous temple, I do not see how an expositor with the least tact can admit the rendering. Our Revisers doubtless were not professedly expositors. But even they have inserted in the margin, "Or, exactness," and but for their dislike of "perhaps" would I suppose have added, "Or, as the ancient versions perhaps read, violent dealing." The other doubtful legacy of A.V. is "Hell" (with a capital letter) in *v.* 9. Strictly the revisers ought no doubt to have substituted Sheól. But as long as "hell" remains in our version of the "Apostles' Creed," we may be thankful for at least one striking passage in the English Bible in which "hell" cannot mean "the place of torment" (comp. Preface to Revised Version). Bishop Alexander in his fine poem adopts "the grave" (A.V.'s margin), with great loss to the definiteness of his picture; why not have boldly adopted the not unmelodious Babylonian term Arâlu?

I trust I have not lingered too long on this fine poem. Surely God intended us to enjoy the records of His dealings with Israel as a literature. How much the Bible has suffered from what Roger Ascham calls, "a divorce between the tongue and the heart"! Why should we disparage the "tongues" of poets not inferior in their own styles to the singers of the West? As a rule, the translators of this noble ode seem to have been lifted up by its spirit. One curiosity may be noticed, *viz.* that whether Hebrew poetry be metrical or not, some translators of Isa. xiv. 4-21 have themselves shown a slight tendency to metre. A.V.'s hexameter line has been quoted already; Ewald in his version has four, and his English translator two (different ones from Ewald's). Is it possible that just as Michelet and (see Mr. Cabot's biography) Emerson used in certain moods to fall into metre unawares, so their sympathy with

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 95; cf. Perrot, *Chaldean Art*, i. p. 379.

their original has made our translators involuntarily assume the outward bearing of poets? Are there any other hexameters in A.V. besides those in Ps. ii. 1, Isa. xiv. 12? I do not say that hexameters represent the Hebrew metre, or approximation to metre, either in Ps. ii. or Isa. xiv.

The problems of translation are in fact much more complicated than the old translators saw. The last clause of xiv. 31 could be rendered more idiomatically and not less faithfully than in A.V. and R.V. The latter gives a clearer form to A.V.'s view of the meaning, but one misses the winged short syllables in *none shall be alone*. Mr. Arnold feels the need of such, and renders, agreeing with R.V. marg., *none is away from his fellow in his ranks*. This is English. All at once a change of style occurs in the Hebrew; and no English could adequately represent this. Still it must be said that A.V. increased the difficulties by mistakes as to the point of time assumed in the Hebrew; Mr. Arnold too has been misled here. I need not say that R.V. has corrected the tenses, and the prophet becomes a poet again. Mr. Arnold has the advantage at xvi. 4 by adopting a more correct pointing of the text from the ancient versions, which R.V. only chronicles in the margin; but he leaves a manifest error in xvi. 6, rather happily corrected by R.V.'s vigorous rendering, *his boastings are nought*. Both have corrected A.V. in xvi. 13, in accordance with a deepened grammatical insight (cf. R.V. xlv. 8, xlv. 21). The vision passes at length into plain prediction, and two manifest improvements (neglected by Mr. Arnold) are due to R.V., in xvi. 12, 14.

In the "burden" or "oracle" of Damascus two marginal notes call for grateful mention, the record of the Septuagint reading in xvii. 9, and the rendering *plantings of Adonis* in xvii. 10. The former has been advocated in the commentary which corresponds most to the "Speaker's" in Germany; it had been adopted long before Orelli by Bishop Lowth.

The historical significance of the reading is not small. The Amorites are only twice referred to in the received text of the prophetic writings (Am. ii. 9, Ezek. xvi. 3); this passage would make a third. Notice the importance of this race in each of the three passages; notice too that both here and in Ezek. *l.c.* it is coupled with one other race, *viz.* here with the Hivites and in Ezekiel with the Hittites. Possibly "Hivites" in the Hebrew text of the Septuagint translator may have been corrupted from "Hittites," as some critics think was the case in the Hebrew of Jud. iii. 3. From a comparison of Josh. ix. 7 and 2 Sam. xxi. 2 on the one hand, and of Gen. xxxiv. 2, xlviii. 22 on the other, it would seem that to combine "Hivites" and "Amorites" is tautological. If so, I would venture to ask certain critics whether if "Hivite" was already a mere name to Isaiah, it is likely that "Hittite" was more than this to Ezekiel, and whether it is safe therefore to support theories of the extension of a "Hittite" empire into S. Palestine by Ezek. xvi. 3? That "Canaanite" and "Amorite" had a well defined acceptation is of course not in dispute. But I attach much more importance to the second marginal note, referring the young student for an explanation to my own work on Isaiah. The rendering mentioned may be regarded as certain (comp. Dr. Robertson Smith, *English Historical Review*, 1887, p. 307). It may compensate us to some extent for having to reject Lagarde's very brilliant correction of x. 4.

The famous prophecy on Ethiopia, with its introduction on the hostile nations, has been almost transformed in R.V.; and truly a radical cure was needed. The passage now fairly represents the views of the majority of scholars, except in xvii. 13 (*shall rush for rush*) and in xviii. 2, where very few will be found to endorse the rendering (perfectly possible, of course) *that meteth out*. The latter sprang, I presume, from the Company's pious reverence for A.V. A

*nation meted out* could not be retained, but it seemed barely possible that the Hebrew might mean *a nation that meteth out*, and so this was adopted in the text, and A.V.'s rendering relegated (with *dragged away and peeled*) into the margin. The effect of these corrections of the Revisers on popular exegesis ought in time to be considerable.—In the following chapter I can only notice two important renderings. In *v. 6*, which reads very differently in A.V., note especially *the streams (or, canals) of Egypt*, and in *v. 10* marg., *all they that make dams*. “Maçor” (מַצוֹר), as the punctuation vocalizes the traditional consonants, is simply a synonym for Mizraim, equivalent to the Assyrian Muşur. The margin on *v. 10* can hardly be right (see the first half of the verse), but is supported by the Targum and other Jewish authorities. A better margin would, I now venture to think, have been “those that prepare strong drink” (Weir, Klostermann, and Bredenkamp, after the Septuagint and Peshitto). Adopting this, however, we must obviously read just before שְׂתִיבָה “those that drink it” (so Bredenkamp); some other slight change may also be necessary.

Passing to chapter xxi., it is impossible to overlook a number of seemingly small changes which convert this obscure passage into one of the most vivid and lucid in the book. There is first the change of imperatives into presents in *v. 5*. A.V. and Luther followed the old versions, but on looking at the latter part of the verse in the Hebrew no one with any tact will justify them. The margin on *set the watch* (or rather “maintain the watch”), is *spread the carpets*. This has been supported by a reference to later Hebrew; the word for “watch” is in fact of unique occurrence. It is less probable however than the ordinary rendering. But exegesis has a word to say. The order “Maintain the watch,” mars the picture of the arrogant security of the Babylonians. Hence the latest critical commentator (Bredenkamp) proposes to transfer it to *v. 6*,



where the prophet himself is described as watching. In *v.* 8 we read in R.V., *he cried as a lion*. No doubt, A.V. is here wrong; I suppose our translators thought of the "lion" in *xv.* 9. But those who know what a number of errors, small and great, have crept into our Hebrew text will not be deterred from favouring Klostermann's plausible view that אַרְיֵה is a corruption of אֶקְרֵא, a variant for אֶקְרֵא which intruded into the text. "He cried (as) a lion," is a possible rendering; אַרְיֵה may be the "accusative of manner," which is now used very freely in Arabic (Prof. W. Wright quotes "Zeid charged, a lion," *i.e.* lion-wise), but also with more moderation in Hebrew (see Ps. xxii. 13, Heb. 14). But the sense of "he cried lion-wise," is not perfectly clear; Rev. x. 3 referred to by Delitzsch, does not help us, I fear. The Septuagint, in perplexity, gives *Oὐπλαν*—a non-word. Lastly, to illustrate R.V.'s view of the construction in *v.* 7, comp. Dr. Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, § 149.

The correction in xxiii. 13 was as necessary as any in the Revised Bible. The rendering of A.V. not only spoils the parallelism of the verse but implies an exegetical view which is opposed to history. The only natural rendering is that of R.V., and the historical allusion is cleared up by the cuneiform inscriptions (see *Records of the Past*, vii. 59, 61). Once, however, I confess that I was attracted by Ewald's ingenious emendation "Canaanites" for "Chaldeans"; the German *Speaker's Commentary* (if I may call it so) has indeed quite lately given weighty support to it.—In chap. xxiv. "earth" and "land" seem used indiscriminately in A.V.; with great fairness, R.V. retains the alternative rend. "land" as a margin for *vv.* 1, 3, 4, etc., but renders "earth" in the text throughout. In *v.* 15, *fires* (or rather, as R.V. marg. expresses the meaning by preference, *lights*="regions of light") becomes *east*; a rare deviation into the province of exegetical paraphrase. In *v.* 16, *I pine away* takes the

place of *my leanness* (in Ps. cvi. 15, "leanness" = "pining sickness").

Chap. xxvi. is, in spite of its obscurity, so familiar to the English reader that but few corrections were ventured upon; the margin however is full of useful emendations. Who could think of altering *v. 3* in a version meant to be read aloud? Yet the rhythm and construction of the Hebrew are better reproduced in the margin. In *v. 14* a scrupulousness which the sacred writers themselves were far from feeling (or was it simply to avoid suggesting non-Semitic analogies?) kept the Revisers from giving the preference to *shades* over *deceased* as a rendering of *re-faim*; "shades" however finds a home in the margin (as in Ps. lxxxviii. 11). In *v. 19*, Kimchi's explanation *together with my dead body* is rejected in favour of that suggested by the Targum, *my dead bodies* (the singular being used collectively); the Church, and not the prophet, is the speaker.—In chap. xxvii. (omitting minor alterations), observe the dramatic vividness of the R.V. of *vv. 4, 5*. Some may regret that the reading חִיִּים "wall" for חֵמָה "wrath" was not mentioned in the margin; but this would have required a long explanatory note. In *v. 8*, a fine phrase, but a mistranslation, has disappeared; in *v. 9* (an important passage) one view of the sense is given, though not the only one worth considering (see Grätz, *Monatsschrift für Gesch. des Judenthums*, 1886, p. 21, and cf. all this scholar's suggestions on this partly corrupt section).

Chaps. xxviii.—xxxiii., belong together—a splendid specimen of Isaiah's various styles. Verses 7–13, of chap. xxviii. bring before us a truly vivid scene from the prophet's personal experience. With a few quotation commas, and brief paraphrastic notes, and perhaps a slight change in *v. 12*, R.V. would be all that the student wants. Notice also the good effect of the insertion of the word "con-

tinually" in *v.* 24, and the very striking margin on *v.* 28; also the happy paraphrase in the margin on xxix. 13. How successful too is the vigorous correction of xxix. 16 and xxx. 7, not rejecting A.V.'s phraseology, but simply adapting it better to the construction in the Hebrew! Nor must we omit to record a *Topheth* for *Topheth* (xxx. 33), and the striking close of Isaiah's definitions of character, *But the liberal deviseth liberal things; and in liberal things shall he continue.*

If time allowed, I should like to dwell at some length on the careful treatment of chap. xxxiii. (an epilogue, says Delitzsch, added to the preceding cycle of prophecy in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah), one of the finest sections of Isaiah. The change of *hypocrites* (A.V.) to *godless ones* is surely not unimportant; Gataker, an ornament of Puritan scholarship, showed long ago by an examination of passages how unsuitable the rendering "hypocrite" was, maintaining that "per totam paginam sacram verbum חנף in profani ac polluti notione, citra contradictionem ullam fere, perpetuo usurpatur."<sup>1</sup> "Godless" however well suits the contexts, and agrees with the Septuagint rendering (both here and sometimes in Job). A phrase of infinite suggestiveness to devout readers has passed, with the change of *the land* into *a land*, into the margin upon xxxiii. 17; but truth is better than a suggestion of what could not have been referred to by Isaiah, especially in this context. The *far-stretching land* of course means the land of the Jews, which has been darkened with the swarms of Assyrian warriors, but which can now be seen far and wide in its full beauty. But may it not mean more than this? Some think that an extension of the borders of the land of Israel is a part of Isaiah's promise. . Certainly this view does justice to the use of the same Hebrew phrase (lit., "land of distances") in Jer.

<sup>1</sup> *Adversaria Miscellanea* (1659), p. 249.

viii. 14 (cf. "distances of the earth," Isa. viii. 9); it may at any rate serve to justify the marginal rendering.

Chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., form an independent prophecy, chiefly valuable to Christian readers for its lovely picture of the land of the redeemed (cf. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 318-320). Yet I think that those who are "grieved for the affliction of [Israel]" will be grateful for the margin "Heb. *Lilith*" on xxxiv. 14, which will remind them of the load of "superstitious vanities" which oppresses the minds of many Jews even on English soil. To them, *Lilith* is a present danger; but the prophet relegated "the night-monster" to the uninhabited desert, the horrors of which could be dimly imagined by the help of the mythopœic fancy. Chap. xxxv. was doubtless too familiar a passage to be roughly treated by the Revisers. The old rhythm remains; scholarship has done its best however in the margin. Not that any scholarship could give a certain view of the prophet's meaning in *v.* 8. Among the marginal renderings, there are two which deserve special notice; "the land and the book" must ever be taken together, and no one, in a Bible for home-use, would be satisfied with A.V.'s *rose* (xxxv. 1) and *parched ground* (*v.* 7). Whether the *autumn crocus* suits S. of Sol. ii. 1 as well as the narcissus may be doubted. But no one can question the accuracy of *mirage*. Would not "phantom-lake" have been more intelligible English than *glowing sand* for the text of *v.* 7? Australian readers of the Bible (as well as old Palestine travellers) have a claim to consideration; Mr. Kendall, an Australian poet, gives "mock-waters" as a descriptive term for this optical illusion in his poem *On a Cattle-Track* (see *Contemporary Review*, Sept., 1887).

The "writing of king Hezekiah" (xxxviii. 9-20) is of course presented in parallel lines, in accordance with the laudable custom mentioned by the Revisers in their prefaces. The version now offers a fair compromise between

the standards of that Bible for the Church and that Bible for the educated which I ventured in my unpractical way to wish for. In xxxviii. 10 we get the fine expression *in the noontide of my days*, which even Mr. Arnold will admit to be finer gold than Kimchi's and A.V.'s *in the cutting-off of my days*. The margin *tranquillity* represents a view widely held, and supported by the names of Gesenius and Delitzsch; the expression *the residue of my years* favours the explanation in the text. How much more finely, too, the verse reads, now that *I said* is separated from what follows, as in v. 11! But how unfortunate that the obscure phrase *the gates of the grave* could not be changed into "the gates of Sheól" (or, "of hell," cf. xiv. 9; or, "of Hades," cf. Matt. xvi. 18, R.V.)!—In v. 12, *mine age* is left in the text, but the more vivid *mine habitation* has found recognition in the margin. On the rend. *I have rolled up*, see Dr. Kay's eloquent paraphrase in the *Speaker's Commentary*.—In v. 13, R.V.'s *I quieted myself* is rather uncertain, though supported by Gesenius and Delitzsch; cf. Ps. cxxxi. 2, "I have stilled and quieted my soul."—In v. 15 the fine expression, *I shall go softly all my years*, copied by Mr. Browning, is shown to be a possible mistranslation by the margin, *go as in solemn procession* (see Ps. xlii. 4). The royal poet imagines himself pacing along with the leisurely, careless step familiar to us in Italian pictures.—In v. 17, the fine pregnant Hebrew phrase, *thou hast loved my soul from the pit*, is recorded in the margin; cf. Ps. xviii. 21, "and have not by sin forsaken my God" (De Witt), or more literally, "and have not sinned away from my God."

The second part of Isaiah differs considerably both in style and in thought from the first, and demands a separate paper.

T. K. CHEYNE.

(To be continued.)