

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 23.—July, 1885.

I.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF THE SCIENCES.

IN seeking to attain self-consistency and completeness philosophy must strive to solve four very comprehensive and complex problems.

In the first place, it has a duty towards the special sciences. It is bound to form a right estimate of them and to take up a right attitude towards them. It is science, yet not merely a special science, but the science which has the processes and results of all the special sciences for its data—the general or universal science which has so risen above the special and particular in science as to be able to contemplate the sciences as parts of a system which reflects and elucidates a world of which the variety is not more wonderful than the unity. Philosophy should neither attempt to do the work nor to dispense with the aid of any special science, but must seek so to understand the methods, to appreciate the findings, and to trace the relationships of all the special sciences as to be able to combine them into a harmonious *cosmos* or well-proportioned *corpus*. When engaged in this task it may appropriately and usefully, perhaps, be called positive philosophy, and nearly corresponds to what has been so designated by Comte.

In the second place, philosophy is bound to institute an investigation into the nature of knowledge itself. All the special sciences aim merely at the extension and acquisition of knowledge. They assume that there are things and truths to be known, but make no attempt to verify the assumption or even to understand what it implies. What are things apart from knowledge and in relation to

V.

THE REVISED ENGLISH VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE Sacred Scriptures of the Christian Church are divided into two great collections: the Old Testament, composed of writings grouped about the great covenant of Sinai; and the New Testament, containing writings based upon the Messiah's covenant of Calvary. The writings of the New Testament were composed in the Greek language; the writings of the Old Testament were given to ancient Israel in the Hebrew language, with the exception of a few of a late period, which are in Aramaic. The original Scriptures are the standard authority, and no translations or reproductions, however excellent, can ever take their place. It is indispensable that there should always be a considerable body of scholars who have immediate access to these originals, and who have such a mastery of their contents as to be able to reproduce them in other tongues and in other forms.

The Sacred Scriptures are for the use of all the nations of the world; they are to be translated eventually into every language under heaven. If we distinguish between the form and the substance of language, between the thought and emotion, and their expression; then we may say that the essential thought and emotion may be reproduced in all the languages of mankind; but the forms, the expressions, cannot be reproduced except to a limited extent; and the more delicate shades of thought and emotion escape the translator's art. It is impossible to produce an exact translation of any writing whatever. A writing is a product of the author's entire nature—it bears the traces of his individuality, of his nationality, of his race, and of his age. If a writer like Isaiah, of the Hebrew nation, of the Shemitic race, and of the eighth century before the Christian era, could be reproduced in our day, then we might hope for an exact reproduction of his writings. But this is impossible. The best that we can do is to learn the Hebrew language, study the traits of the Shemitic race, discern the character of the Hebrew people, master

the history of Old Testament times, and, by reason and imagination, enter into the life and experience of the Hebrew author, and so understand him. If this cannot be done we should be willing to accept a translation, and a more or less imperfect reproduction of the original.

We ought not to be surprised, therefore, that the English peoples have been so often engaged in the revision of their versions of the Sacred Scriptures; and that it has taken a large company of Christian scholars fourteen years to produce the revision of the so-called authorized version which is now offered to the public.

The New Testament Revisers tells us :

“The English Version of the New Testament here presented to the reader is a Revision of the Translation published in the year of Our Lord 1611, and commonly known by the name of the Authorized Version.

“That Translation was the work of many hands and of several generations. The foundation was laid by William Tyndale. His translation of the New Testament was the true primary Version. The Versions that followed were either substantially reproductions of Tyndale’s translation in its final shape, or revisions of Versions that had been themselves almost entirely based on it. Three successive stages may be recognized in this continuous work of authoritative revision: first, the publication of the Great Bible of 1539-41 in the reign of Henry VIII.; next, the publication of the Bishops’ Bible of 1568 and 1572 in the reign of Elizabeth; and lastly, the publication of the King’s Bible of 1611 in the reign of James I. Besides these, the Genevan Version of 1560, itself founded on Tyndale’s translation, must here be named; which, though not put forth by authority, was widely circulated in this country, and largely used by King James’ translators. Thus the form in which the English New Testament has now been read for 270 years was the result of various revisions made between 1525 and 1611; and the present Revision is an attempt, after a long interval, to follow the example set by a succession of honoured predecessors” (*Preface to the Revised New Testament*).

This representation of the origin of the common version of the New Testament applies sufficiently well to the Old Testament. In the first century, subsequent to the Reformation, there were many revisions of the English Bible, and it was not until after a strife of the versions for nearly half a century, that the English people accepted the Version of King James for a quarter of a millennium. The reasons are not difficult to discover. The Version of King James became the authorized version owing to its intrinsic excellence, notwithstanding it was destitute of ecclesiastical and civil authority. The authorized Bible bearing with it civil authority was, and still is, the Great Bible of Cranmer. The ecclesiastical authority of the Church of England was given to the Bishops’ Bible. The Puritans adhered to the Genevan Bible. It was not till the Restoration in 1660 that the Version of King James became predominant in Great Britain.

I.—A REVISED VERSION NEEDED.

The Version of King James was never entirely satisfactory to Biblical scholars. The learned Lightfoot doubtless expressed the views of the Westminster divines when he addressed the House of Commons on this subject :

“ I hope you will find some time among your serious employments to thinke of a review and survey of the translation of the Bible ; certainly that might bee a worke which might very well befit a reformation, and which would very much redound to your honour.

“ It was the course of *Nehemiah* when hee was reforming, that hee caused not the Law onely to bee read, and the sense given, but also caused the people *to understand the reading*, Neh. 8. 8. And certainly it would not bee the least advantage that you might doe to the three nations (if not the greatest) if they by your care and means might come to understand the proper and genuine reading of the Scripture, by an exact, vigorous, and lively translation. I hope (I say it again) you will find some time, to set afoot so needful a worke : and now you are about the purging of the Temple, you will look into the Oracle, if there bee any thing amisse there and remove it” (*A Sermon preached before the Honorable House of Commons by John Lightfoot. 1645. pp. 30, 31*).

The demand for a further revision of the Version of King James found expression in an act of the Long Parliament in 1653, appointing the eminent divines, John Owen, Ralph Cudworth, William Jenkins, William Greenhill, Samuel Slater, William Cowper, Henry Jessey, Ralph Venning, and John Row, to do the work, and ordering that it should be submitted for final approval to the three Westminster divines, Thomas Goodwin, Antony Tuckney, and Joseph Caryl, “and that what those persons shall so approve of, shall accordingly be printed and published for the general edification and benefit of the whole nation, to be read both privately, and in the public congregation.” The dissolution of the Long Parliament and the troublous times that followed rendered it impossible to prosecute this work. Earnest efforts were subsequently put forth by such eminent Biblical scholars as Bentley, Bishop Lowth, Dr. Geddes, and others, in the next century, but in vain.

Indeed, Biblical studies were declining in Great Britain, and they were destined to enter into a still further decay ere the revival came.* During this period the Version of King James became supreme, and English theologians became almost as dependent upon it for their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures as the Roman Catholic divines were upon the Latin Vulgate. It is no credit to the English people, or to British scholarship, that the Version of King James has so long retained its pre-eminence. It is rather an evidence of a long period of ignorance of the originals of the Scriptures, and of the aban-

* See author's *Biblical Study*, pp. 148 210.

donment of the Exposition of the Scriptures for the sake of discussion of dogmatic commonplaces, where the Scriptures were used as an arsenal of texts which, by the special pleading of the advocate, could be made to prove the desired opinions, and it became a proverb that one could prove anything from the Scripture.

In the heroic age of Protestantism, extending a little past the middle of the seventeenth century, the Bible was studied in the original languages, and expounded from the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures with which the preachers were familiar. The Version of King James came into general use at the time of the Restoration, when the best preachers of England were driven from their flocks into exile and poverty, and its rise to absolute supremacy was accompanied by decline in the religious life of the nation. It is our opinion that an authorized version is hurtful and not helpful to the study of the Scriptures. If the Revised Version should succeed in breaking down the slavish adhesion to the Version of King James, which has too long subsisted, without assuming its place, it will accomplish a blessing different from that of its designers, but in our judgment one vastly greater. There are no sufficient reasons why a Christian people should be confined to any common version. The history of common versions shows that they no sooner gain the confidence of the people, and exclusive claim to public use, than they become the rule of faith, lord it over the real Scriptures, and bar the way to the divine originals, which must ever remain the fountain of inspiration and guidance. As the Septuagint Version assumed the place of the Hebrew originals to the ancient Greek Church and the Latin Vulgate to the Latin Church and the Peshitto to the Syriac Church and the Massoretic pointed text to the Jewish Synagogue, so the versions of Luther and King James have assumed such an imperious position that it has been regarded as temerity for a Biblical scholar to suggest that they are fallible and improvable. The Revised Version has to overcome this vulgar prejudice. It can overcome it only by being faithful to the originals, and entirely honest in its renderings. "Great is the truth and it will prevail."

The fundamental questions in any revision of the Scriptures are, Have the Revisers been faithful to the truth of God; have they given it to the people in a form which they can understand? The Revised Version of the New Testament was issued in May, 1881. It has received the applause of scholars for its fidelity to the original text, its conscientious adherence to the best readings, the marvellous skill with which it has rendered the delicate shadings of the Greek moods and tenses and sentences, and its firm grasp and distinct representation

of the fine distinctions of etymology and synonym. The New Testament Revisers have given us a masterpiece of scholarship. But it is doubtful whether they have succeeded in making a people's book. Its fine scholarship is beyond their grasp and appreciation. There seem to be overrefinements of scholarship, an occasional exhibition of pedantry, and the sacrifice of the substance, the essential thought, to the external form and coloring. We do not object to the attempt to reproduce the beauties of Greek expression in the English language. We regard this as one of the features of excellence of their Revised Version. The Revisers have not transcended the laws of the best English style; they have used its native powers to express, as far as possible, the delicate shadings of the Greek. This is really an enriching of the English language, for which the Revisers deserve commendation and not censure. They are lifting it above the common speech of the day, and even of the average writing of the day, but they have given a new impulse to the revival of a purer and a higher English style. The scholarly Selden in the seventeenth century said:

“The *English* translation of the bible, is the best translation in the world, and renders the sense of the original best, taking in for the *English* translation, the bishop's bible, as well as King *James's*. The translators in King *James's* time took an excellent way. That part of the bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue (as the *apocrypha* to Andrew *Downs*) and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some bible, either of the learned tongues, or *French, Spanish, Italian*, etc. If they found any fault they spoke, if not, he read on. There is no book so translated as the bible for the purpose. If I translate a *French* book into *English*, I turn it into *English* phrase, not into *French-English*. *Il fait froid*; I say, *'tis cold*, not *it makes cold*. But the bible is rather translated into *English* words, than into *English* phrase. The *Hebraisms* are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept” (Selden, *Table Talk*, Opera 1726, iii. p. 2009.)

The revisers who gave us King *James's* Version enriched the English tongue by their very *Hebraisms*. They have made the English language more like the Hebrew than any other modern language. If the present revisers have succeeded in enriching the language still further by using the native energies and resources of our English tongue to express *Græcisms*, they deserve thanks and will receive them in the 20th century, if not in the 19th. Their fault is in their occasional failure to apprehend the spirit of the original; and in their anxiety to give the literal rendering when they ought to have paraphrased in order to give the essential meaning.

The revised English Old Testament has now been given to the public, and it has become our duty to examine it. We do not propose to consider its value as a people's book. We leave this to an eminent scholar who is to examine the revised English Bible as a

whole, in the January (1886) Number of this REVIEW. It is our purpose to estimate it from the point of view of Hebrew scholarship.

It ought to be said at the outset that Hebrew scholarship is not in that mature state that we find the Greek scholarship of our day. It is at present in a transition state, and this condition of transition is manifest in the entire work of Revision. It could not be otherwise. New Testament scholarship is a half century in advance of Old Testament scholarship. Within the past twenty years there has been a great revival of Old Testament study, which has been increasing in power and influence, and which is constantly rising to greater heights.

This revival has been taking place while the Revisers have been at work. The majority of the Revisers were chosen of necessity from the older Hebrew scholars who had been trained in the old-fashioned Hebrew scholarship, and had been accustomed to its principles and methods of work. It has been hard for them to change their methods. Consequently, some of them have taken no part in the Revival, but have resisted it. Others have hung on to the skirts of it, and have conscientiously endeavored to combine the old with the new. Only a minority of the Revisers have been active in this advance in Biblical study. This advance has been all along the line. In Textual criticism it has gone back of the Massoretic pointed text to the unpointed text, and has given fresh study to the ancient versions in order to improve the unpointed Hebrew text itself. In the Higher Criticism it has studied with enthusiasm the literary forms of the Old Testament, its History, Poetry, and Prophecy, and has learned to estimate its literary graces and beauties as never before. Younger Biblical scholars have devoted themselves to the cognate languages, especially the Arabic, the Aramaic, and the Assyrian, in order to a comparison of the Shemitic stems and a proper apprehension of the history of words and phrases. They have mastered the principles of Hebrew Syntax, which were unknown to the older Hebrew scholars. When these are understood they shed new and marvellous light on the whole of the Old Testament. Biblical History and Geography, and above all, Biblical Theology, have enabled the younger Hebrew scholars to apprehend the marvellous unity and variety of the Old Testament in the historical origin and development of its literature, and the Religion which it teaches to mankind. The Old Testament is indeed a new world to those who have taken part in this great revival; and to them it seems that the old-fashioned Hebrew scholars are living in an entirely different atmosphere of Biblical study. No one can examine the Revisers' work without observing that these differences are represented in the Revision which they have given us. The advanced Hebrew

scholarship is ordinarily to be seen in the margin of the Revision. The Revision itself occupies an intermediate position. We regret to say that the appendix of the American Revisers represents too often an antiquated Hebrew scholarship.

II.—THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE REVISERS.

The fundamental question in the work of translation of the original Scriptures is, What are the original Scriptures which it is proposed to translate? Upon what original text do the revisers base their work? It is instructive to compare the attitude of the Old Testament Company with that of the New Testament Company in regard to this question.

The New Testament Company explain their work thus :

“A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work ; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various readings which might properly affect the translation. . . . In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that the fourth rule, by requiring that ‘the text to be adopted’ should be ‘that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating, was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times, and therefore to employ the best resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. . . . In the introductory formula, the phrases ‘many ancient authorities,’ ‘some ancient authorities,’ are used with some latitude to denote a greater or lesser proportion of those authorities which have a distinctive right to be called ancient. These ancient authorities comprise not only Greek manuscripts, some of which were written in the fourth and fifth centuries, but versions of a still earlier date in different languages, and also quotations by Christian writers of the second and following centuries.”

The Old Testament Company take a different position. They did not consider a revision of the Hebrew text “the necessary foundation” of their work. They confess that the condition of Old Testament criticism is such that they could not pursue this course.

“The Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament Scriptures, has come down to us in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension. That other recensions were at one time in existence is probable from the variations in the ancient versions, the oldest of which, namely, the Greek or Septuagint, was made, at least in part, some two centuries before the Christian era. But as the state of knowledge on the subject is not at present such as to justify any attempt at an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the versions, the revisers have thought it most prudent to adopt the Massoretic Text as the basis of their work, and to depart from it, as the authorized translators had done, only in exceptional cases. With regard to the variations in the Massoretic Text itself, the revisers have endeavored to translate what appeared to them to be the best reading in the text, and where the alternative reading seemed sufficiently probable or important they have placed it in the margin. In some few instances of extreme difficulty, a reading has been adopted on the authority of the ancient versions, and the departure from the Massoretic Text recorded in the margin. In other

cases, where the versions appeared to supply a very probable though not so necessary a correction of the text, the text has been left and the variation indicated in the margin only."

This position is sufficiently conservative. It does not express the views of the best Hebrew scholars of the day; but it is a good average position, which ought to satisfy all but the most extreme adherents to Jewish traditions. But the American Revisers were not satisfied. They have taken an extreme reactionary position and have expressed their dissent from the English Revisers in their Appendix, in the following terse and sweeping declaration: "Omit from the margin all renderings from the LXX, Vulgate and other ancient versions or authorities." Dr. Chambers defends the American Revisers by the following extraordinary statements:

"The insertion of these is based on the presumption that the variations found in these versions originated in variations in the Hebrew codices, which the authors of those versions had before them. Without denying that such matters are well worthy of the scholar's careful attention, the American Committee yet felt that there was an element of uncertainty about them which forbade the notion of presenting them even as alternative readings in a book intended for the people. The English Bible is a version of the Hebrew Bible as we have it from the hands of them to whom 'were committed the oracles of God'" (174). . . .

"It seemed to them that all these references had in them too much of the uncertain, conjectural and arbitrary to be entitled to a place on the margin, as if they had some portion of intrinsic authority. We are not sure in any case that the makers of these versions did not follow their notion of what the text ought to be rather than that which they found in the codices before them. And conjectural emendations are of no value" (75).

The position of Dr. Chambers is a strange position for a Christian scholar to take. He seems to hold that the oracles of God were committed to the Jewish Massoretic scholars of the Middle Ages; for he insists with the American Revisers in adhering to the text which we receive from them. The Ante-Nicene Church knew nothing of a Massoretic text; they used either the Septuagint or Peshitto versions of the Old Testament which were made from Hebrew manuscripts centuries earlier than the Massorettes began to point their Hebrew text. The Latin Church used at first the Itala, a translation of the LXX, and subsequently the Latin Vulgate, composed chiefly of the version of Jerome, which was made from Hebrew manuscripts a considerable time before the work of the Massorettes began. The Massoretic text was not used by the Christian Church until the sixteenth century; and then the Reformers and the Roman Catholic divines alike discriminated between the more ancient unpointed text and the text as given by the Massorettes. It remained for Buxtorf and the Swiss and Dutch scholastics to give themselves unreservedly into the hands of the Massorettes, and abandon Christian tradition and

Christian freedom of criticism for the sake of a slavish adherence to the Jewish tradition. It was only in keeping with this that they should go against the best Hebrew scholarship among the Jews themselves as represented by Levita, and rely upon cabalistic forgeries in carrying these points back to Ezra and claiming their inspiration and infallibility.* None of our American Revisers, so far as we know, hold to the inspiration of the Massoretic points, yet they have not entirely escaped from the tendency to that position when they represent that these pointed texts are the oracles of God, to be followed so exclusively that even the most ancient Christian versions, the Samaritan Hebrew codex, and the New Testament citations and other ancient authorities are all alike to be regarded as having "an element of uncertainty about them," and as having "too much of the uncertain, conjectural, and arbitrary to be entitled to a place in the margin."

The text of the Old Testament is in a very different position from the text of the New Testament. The text of the New Testament rests upon a number of ancient MS. authorities, and the versions are subsidiary sources of information or side-lights. But this is not the case with the text of the Old Testament. The Massoretic text rests on the basis of late MSS., the earliest of the tenth century of our era, whereas the Versions lead us back to a Hebrew text centuries earlier than these MSS. Under such circumstances the Versions are not merely subsidiary sources, they antedate in their evidence the Massoretic text in our possession. The Vulgate version was made in the fourth century by St. Jerome from Hebrew MSS. which were at least six centuries earlier than the earliest Massoretic MSS.; the Syriac version was made in the second century from Hebrew MSS. at least eight centuries earlier than the St. Petersburg codex; the LXX version was made in the second century B.C., on the base of MSS. twelve centuries before the St. Petersburg codex; the LXX version is contained in the same great uncials, \aleph , A, B, which give us the basis for our New Testament text; MSS. not only antedating by many centuries the MSS. of the Hebrew text, but also antedating the beginning of the works of the Massorettes. Under such circumstances it is not at all correct to represent these ancient versions as merely side-lights upon the Hebrew text. Moreover, the Samaritan codex of the Hebrew text is an independent manuscript authority, older than any Hebrew MSS. that the Massorettes have given us, and an independent witness of the first rank. When, therefore, we

* See author's *Biblical Study*, pp. 140, *seq.*

have the Samaritan codex, the Septuagint, Peshitto, and Vulgate versions agreeing over against the Massoretic text, and know that these versions have MS. authority for their rendering centuries older than any in our possession, we have evidence superior in weight to that of the Massoretic text.

We do not propose to enter upon a full discussion of the question of this neglect of textual criticism by the Revisers and its influence upon the Revision. This is reserved for a competent hand in the October Number of this REVIEW. But as this is a fundamental question, there are some general phases of the subject to which we must refer. The American Revisers insist upon adhering to the Massoretic text alone, and yet they seem to be entirely indifferent to the fact that a critical edition of the Massoretic text itself is greatly needed. On their own principle it was their duty to do as the New Testament revisers have done, and, first of all, correct the Massoretic text. It is well known that a complete Massoretic apparatus has not been in the possession of the Revisers; that the St. Petersburg codex and other ancient Hebrew manuscripts have not been used in any edition of the Hebrew Bible; that the best editions of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament are defective. Holding the views that the American Revisers hold, it ought to have been a matter of extreme importance to them to have a critical Massoretic text. They give us no information whatever on this important point. There is sufficient evidence that they have not been careful to secure even the best Massoretic text. They seem to have followed rather any ordinary texts they might have at hand. It is true that the variations in the editions and MSS. consist almost entirely in the vowel-points and accents. But these are the very things to which the American Revisers adhere with a tenacity which one rarely finds among learned Hebrews. We observe that they sometimes follow the Qeri and sometimes the Kethibh, but in this they seem to be entirely capricious. We fail to see any sifting of evidence. The real ancient MS. authority is in the Kethibh. We have no evidence beyond probability to show that the Qeris are anything more than ancient Jewish conjectural emendations. We fail to see why such emendations of Rabbinical scholars should be superior to the emendations of ancient Christian authorities or even modern Biblical scholars. To prefer them to the ancient versions and the Samaritan codex is against the principles of sound criticism. It is necessary for us briefly to indicate what it is upon which the Revisers base themselves when they speak of the Massoretic text. The Massoretic text is the Hebrew text, pointed with vowels and accents. The original text had

no vowels or accents. The recensions upon which the LXX, Peshitto, and Vulgate versions were made were unpointed. The texts used by the Mishna and the Targums and the early Jewish Commentaries were unpointed. The vowel-points are of the nature of interpretation. In their present form, they date from the seventh Christian century. The accents were not completed in their present form until late in the Middle Ages. For all purposes of Textual Criticism of the Old Testament, the Kethibh or unpointed text is, and must be, the basis. Bishop Lowth, who has probably done more for the study of the Old Testament than any English-speaking scholar, correctly stated in the middle of the last century :

“ If it be asked, what then is the real condition of the Hebrew Text ; and of what sort, and in what number, are the mistakes which we must acknowledge to be found in it ; it is answered that the condition of the Hebrew Text is such, as from the nature of the thing, the antiquity of the writings themselves, the want of due care, or critical skill (in which latter at least the Jews have been exceedingly deficient), might in all reason have been expected ; that the mistakes are frequent, and of various kinds ; of letters, words, and sentences ; by variation, omission, transposition ; such as often injure the beauty and elegance, embarrass the construction, alter or obscure the sense, and sometimes render it quite unintelligible. If it be objected, that a concession, so large as this is, lends to invalidate the authority of Scripture ; that it gives up in effect the certainty and authenticity of the doctrines contained in it, and exposes our religion naked and defenceless to the assaults of its enemies ; this, I think, is a vain and groundless apprehension. Casual errors may blemish parts, but do not destroy, or much alter, the whole.” “ Important and fundamental doctrines do not wholly depend on single passages ; an universal harmony runs through the Holy Scriptures ; the parts mutually support each other, and supply one another’s deficiencies and obscurities. Superficial damages and partial defects may greatly diminish the beauty of the edifice, without injuring its strength, and bringing on utter ruin and destruction ” (Isaiah, second edition, *MDCCLXXIX*, pp. *lix, lx*).

Prof. Dillmann gives his testimony as follows :

“ It is true that the necessary foundation for all further textual criticism is given in the Massoretic Text when it is presented as accurately as possible, but the entirely correct text has not thereby been found. Besides this officially established Massoretic Text many more original and better readings have been preserved in the ancient versions, and also, although seldom, in Hebrew manuscripts. Moreover, we cannot always approve the Massoretic pointing as appropriate to the text, and besides there are involved some errors in the text itself which come from the most ancient times, to which no critical monument extends. It is the aim of criticism to attain to constantly greater certainty by the purification of the text from such faults, which therefore cannot despise even conjectures in case of necessity. The knowledge of the history of the text must show that this criticism is not only a right, but a duty of the exegete towards his text ” (Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopädie*, Band 2. Leipzig, 1878, p. 399).

The Revisers have simply built upon a very late Massoretic text, and that not sufficiently correct. They have had immense advantages beyond the Revisers of 1611, in the possession of the Samaritan codex, the Syriac and Arabic versions, and better texts of the Septuagint and Vulgate, besides a large number of ancient authorities, in-

accessible to the Revisers of 1611; but it does not appear that they have made very much use of them beyond that which appears in the margin, and our American Revisers set themselves as a flint against even that. The Revisers of 1611 used the helps at their command, but the Revisers of 1885 have neglected the vastly greater helps which God has given them in the rich disclosures of more than two centuries.

This reliance upon the Massoretic accents has involved the Revisers in an entirely incorrect presentation of Hebrew Poetry. There are two systems of accentuation, but both were designed for cantillation in the Synagogue, and have no regard to the poetry as poetry. Hebrew Poetry is composed of lines which are ranged in parallelism with one another. The lines are measured by beats of the word accent, and divided into trimeters, tetrameters, pentameters, and hexameters.* The principle of Parallelism extends to the *strophe* as well as the line. We do not claim that the Revisers ought to have adopted the theory of the strophe, and the measurement of the line, which are still legitimate matters of dispute between Hebrew scholars; but they ought to have correctly presented the parallelism of lines.

We are impressed at the outset by a grave inconsistency in their treatment of Hebrew Poetry. They attempt to give the so-called Poetical Books: Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Song of Songs, in parallelism, and also a number of the most important pieces of poetry in the Historical Books, and a few pieces in the Prophetical Books, such as the songs of Jonah, Hezekiah, and Habakkuk. But they do not venture to give the parallelisms of the Prophets or of the poetical sections of Ecclesiastes, and they leave a considerable portion of the poetry of the Historical Books as if it were prose. Why this inconsistency? We can explain it only on the ground that it was impossible for the Revisers to accomplish the task of arranging the other poetry in parallelism because of their failure to find a sufficient guide in the Massoretic accentuation. In the so-called Poetical Books the verses are ordinarily distichs. In this case it is easy to make the two lines of the parallelism by following the Massoretic division, for Hebrew Poetry ordinarily makes every line of the poem a distinct clause, and follows the greater divisions of the sentences. But we observe that when the verse is a monostich, and is divided by the Massoretic dichotomy, the Revisers generally slip and make it into a distich of poetry. They slip also in a considerable proportion of the verses which are composed of three or more lines. In our examination of the paral-

* See author's *Biblical Study*, pp. 264 seq.

lelism given by the Revisers we shall begin with the trimeters where the lines are measured by three beats of the accent. Such a trimeter is the song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. This is marked off into its lines by a very ancient Hebrew method of writing, which doubtless comes down from the earliest times. Following this guide the poem is accurately given, so far as the lines are concerned; but the division into strophes is ignored. In the Book of Job, also, the trimeters are easy to be discerned. The verses are generally of two or three lines, and there is such a number of the verses of two lines that it is easy to ascertain the movement in the others. The same is true of the trimeters in the book of Proverbs and the Psalter under the same circumstances, and yet there are numerous cases of error even here.

Thus in the Book of Job, xiv. 7, the Revisers arrange :

“ For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.”

It should be a tristich :

{ For the tree has hope.
 { If it be cut down, it will sprout again,
 { And the tender branch thereof will not cease.

The impropriety of the arrangement of the Revisers is clear from the Hebrew. We present it correctly in three lines. They combine the first and the second in one line :

כי יש לעץ תקוה
אם יכרת ועוד יהלום
ויונקתו לא תהדל.

The condemnation of Reuben by his father Jacob is a hexastich and a trimeter, which the Revisers have spoiled by a capricious combination of two lines into one, which is transparent even in their rendering. The proper arrangement is :

{ O thou Reuben, my first-born ;
 { My might and the beginning of my strength ;
 { The excellency of dignity, and excellency of power,—
 { Bubbling over like water—excel not ;
 { For thou wentest up to thy father's bed,
 { Then thou didst defile it. To my couch he went up.

The Revisers make their first line out of two lines of the poem :

Reuben, thou art my first-born, my might, and the beginning of my strength ;

One sees from the Hebrew the impropriety of their arrangement, which is as follows :

ראובן בכורי אתה | כחי וראשית אוני
 יתר שאת ויתר-עז
 פתח כמים אל תותר
 כי-עלית משכבי-אביד
 אזחללת יצורי עלה. *

The eighth psalm is a beautiful hymn, composed of two strophes of eight lines each, the refrain coming at the beginning of the first strophe and at the close of the second strophe, enclosing, as it were, the entire psalm. We render verses 1 and 2:

“Thou, whose glory doth extend over the heavens,
 Out of the mouth of little children and sucklings,
 Thou dost establish strength because of thine adversaries,
 To silence enemy and avenger.”

The Revisers spoil the second and third lines by their arrangement :

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou established strength,
 Because of thine adversaries,

The incorrectness of this is clear from the Hebrew :

מפני עוללים ויונקים יסדת עז
 למען צורריך.

It needs but a glance to see that the lines should be as we have rendered them :

מפני עוללים ויונקים
 יסדת-עז למען צורריך.

Psalm xlv. 3 is arranged by the Revisers :

Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one,
 Thy glory and thy majesty.

חגור חרבך על ירך גבור
 הודך והדרך.

It should be :

Gird thy sword on thy thigh,
 O hero, thy glory and thy majesty.

חגור חרבך על-ירך
 גבור הודך והדרך.

The striking harmony of the music of the words, as well as the parallelism, ought to have guided the Revisers aright.

* The Revisers violate Hebrew grammar by rendering אל with the jussive, as if it were לא with the indicative. The rendering, “Thou shalt not have the excellency,” ver. 4, is inexcusable. The rendering of “first-born” as predicate is possible, but prosaic.

In the tetrameter are more serious errors. An example of this is in the magnificent ode of victory, Exodus xv. This ode is a tetrameter measured by four beats of the accent. It is composed of three strophes, according to the scheme of 6, 12, and 18 lines, increasing in length as the strains of victory rise higher and higher to the climax. The piece has its refrain, which comes in at the close of each strophe. The Revisers do not attempt to reproduce the strophical divisions, and also entirely fail in the parallelism.

The first strophe should be arranged thus:

“ My strength | and song is Jah | and he has become | my salvation.

The same is my God | that I may glorify him || my father's God | that I may exalt him.

Jehovah is | a warrior, | Jehovah is | his name.

The chariots of Pharaoh | and his host || he hath thrown | into the sea,

And the choicest | of his charioteers || are drowned | in the sea of reeds.

The depths | cover them over, || they descended | into the deep places | like a stone.”

The last line is lengthened to a pentameter for the climax. Each line has a cæsura dividing it in two parts.

The key to the movement of the poem is given in the refrain:

Shirû		l ^e Jahveh		khî ghâ 'ôh		ghâ'âh
Sûs		v ^e rok ^e bho		ràràh		bayyam

This movement is recognized by the rendering of the Revisers:

Sing ye to the LORD, for he hath triumphed gloriously ;
The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.

But when they come to render the poem itself, they ignore this movement and arrange as follows:

2. The LORD is my strength and song,
And he is become my salvation:
This is my God, and I will praise him;
My father's God, and I will exalt him.
3. The LORD is a man of war :
The LORD is his name.
4. Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea:
And his chosen captains are sunk in the Red Sea.
5. The deeps cover them :
They went down into the depths like a stone.

The tetrameter is preserved by the Revisers only in verse 4—the other lines are all broken into two parts. They have probably been misled by the short verses, 3 and 5, which are really monostichs. Dividing them, they lose the rhythm, and are misled to a false construction of the entire poem. We shall present the Hebrew text, in order to show how impossible the arrangement of the Revisers is:

עזי זמרת יה
 ויהי לי לישועה
 זה אלי ואנוהו
 אלהי אבי וארממנהו
 יהוה איש מלחמה
 יהוה שמו
 מרכבות פרעה והילו ירה בים
 ובחר שלשיו טבעו בים סוף
 תהמת יכסימו
 ירדו במצולת כמו אבן.

Any one can see that there is no poetry in such an arrangement. It should be :

עזי זמרת-יה | ויהי-לי לישועה
 זה-אלי ואנוהו | אלהי-אבי וארממנהו
 יהוה איש-מלחמה | יהוה שמו
 מרכבות-פרע והילו | ירה בים
 ובחר שלשיו | טבעו בים-סוף
 תהמת יכסימו | ירדו במצולת כמו-אבן.*

The song of Deborah (Judges v.) is one of the finest examples of the Hebrew ode. Its lines are generally tetrameters, but they are sometimes changed into trimeters, and occasionally into pentameters, in order to express the varying emotions of the poet. It is composed of three great strophes of thirty lines each. It seems probable that each strophe was accompanied by the same refrain, which we find at the close of the poem, thus :

“So let all thine enemies perish, Jahveh,
 But let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might.”

The original Hebrew shows that this is clearly a tetrameter :

כך יאבדו כל-אויביו יהוה
 ואהביו כצאת השמש בגברתו.

We shall give the entire poem in order to illustrate the faults of the Revisers, as well as the Massorettes. We shall retain the rendering of the Revisers, except where it is incorrect ; but we shall give the

* The faults of the Revisers in dealing with this beautiful ode are not confined to the arrangement. They ought to have seen that זמרת in line 1 was shortened from זמרתִי in order to combination with ירה. They neglect the weak Vavs with the imperfects which express purpose in line 2, and render them as futures, which is contrary to the laws of Hebrew Syntax, which would require Vav consec. of Perfect for that rendering.

proper parallelism, and call attention to the mistakes of Revisers in foot-notes.

I.

1. For that the leaders led in Israel,
2. For that the people volunteered, bless ye Jahveh. (*a*) and (*d*)
3. Hear, ye kings, give ear, ye nobles ;
4. I, even I will sing unto Jahveh ;
5. I shall sing praise to Jahveh, the God of Israel.
6. Jahveh, when thou wentest forth out of Seir,
7. When thou marchest out of the field of Edom.
8. The earth trembled, the heavens also dropped,
9. Yea, the clouds dropped water,
10. The mountains flowed down at the presence of Jahveh,
11. Yon Sinai at the presence of Jahveh, the God of Israel.
12. In the days of Shamgar ben Anath,
13. In the days of Jael, the caravans ceased,
14. And the wayfarers walked through by-ways ; (*b*)
15. The rulers ceased, in Israel they ceased,
16. Until I Deborah arose,
17. Until I arose a mother in Israel.
18. He chooses new rulers ; (*c*)
19. Then was war in the gates :
20. Was there a shield or spear seen
21. Among forty thousand in Israel ?
22. My heart is toward the governors of Israel,
23. Those that volunteered among the people : Bless ye Jahveh. (*d*)
24. Those riding upon white asses,
25. Sitting upon saddles ;
26. And those walking by the way, sing ye. (*e*)
27. With the voice of archers, at the places of drawing water,
28. There let them celebrate the righteous acts of Jahveh, (*f*)
29. The righteous acts of his rule in Israel.
30. Then the people of Jahveh descended to the gates.

II.

1. Awake, awake, Deborah ;
2. Awake, awake, utter a song :
3. Arise, Barak, and lead thy captivity captive, son of Abinoam.

(*a*) The Revisers' rendering, "offered themselves willingly," was probably to represent that they were free-will offerings in accordance with the use of נדבה in the law code, but this is a mere conceit.

(*b*) אַרְרֵהֶנּוּ should be caravans, as in the margin. It seems to have slipped into the fourteenth line by an early copyist's mistake. It makes the line too long, and seems without force.

(*c*) The rendering of the Revisers, "they chose new gods," is that of the LXX, but is against the context, which implies a turning to God and not from him. The Peshitto and Vulgate versions render "God chose new wars," or "new things." It seems better to give אֱלֹהִים the meaning judges or rulers here, which suits the context and refers to Barak and Deborah.

(*d*) The Revisers break up lines 2 and 23, and give the phrase, "Bless ye Jahveh," in separate lines, destroying the rhythm.

(*e*) The Revisers have transposed "sing ye" from line 26 to line 24, destroying the emphasis.

(*f*) The margin, "let them rehearse," is preferable to the text, "shall they rehearse," on account of the context.

4. Then descended a remnant of the nobles, (*a*)
5. The people of Jahveh descended for me against the mighty.
6. Out of Ephraim they whose root is in Amalek ;
7. After thee, Benjamin, among thy peoples ;
8. Out of Machir descended governors,
9. And out of Zebulun they that handle the marshal staff.
10. And the princes in Issachar were with Deborah ; (*b*)
11. And Issachar was like Barak ;
12. Into the valley they rushed at his feet.
13. By the water courses of Reuben were great resolves of heart. (*c*)
14. Why satest thou among the sheep-folds,
15. To hear the pipings for the flocks ?
16. At the water courses of Reuben were great searchings of heart. (*c*)
17. Gilead abode beyond Jordan
18. And Dan, why was he remaining at the ships? (*d*)
19. Asher sat still on the shore of the sea,
20. And by his creeks was abiding. (*d*)
21. Zebulun was a people that risked himself unto death,
22. Naphtali upon the high places of the field
23. Kings came, they fought, (*e*)
24. Then fought the Kings of Canaan,
25. In Taanach by the waters of Megiddo ;
26. Gain of money they took not,
27. From heaven fought the stars, (*f*)

a The lines of ver. 13, as given by the Massorettes, should be reconstructed as in the margin of the Revision, and as we have given them, thus :

אז-ירד שריד לארירים
עס-יהוה ירד-לי בגבורים.

The Massoretic pointing of רר should be changed from jussive to perfect, as in the text of the Revision. The American Revisers adhere to the Massoretic pointing and division, and render,

“Then go down, O remnant, for the nobles, the people,
O Jehovah, go down for me against the mighty.”

One can easily see that עם with first line makes it too long, and leaves the second line too short. One can also see that by the change the same two classes appear here as through the poem,—namely, the nobles and the people. The absence of the preposition before עם cannot be satisfactorily explained by the American Revisers.

(*b*) שרי “my princes,” as given by the Massorettes and followed in the margin, gives no good sense. It should be pointed שר with the Ancient Versions, and rendered as construct, as in the text of the Revision.

(*c*) The Revisers break up lines 13 and 16 into two lines each, following the Massorettes, but at the expense of the rhythm. The lines are thereby reduced from tetrameters to dimeters without any justification whatever in sense or parallelism.

(*d*) The Revisers entirely ignore the change of tenses in verse 17 *seq.* and translate imperfect and perfect as if they were alike.

(*e*) The Revisers insert “and” between the verbs, and destroy the emphasis of these two Hebrew perfects, which are placed side by side without a conjunction. The rendering of the Revisers would require a Vav consec. of the imperfect for the second verb.

(*f*) The Massoretic arrangement, which the Revisers follow, is incorrect. It makes the first line too short, and the second line too long, and gives no proper parallelism. The Revisers render,

“They fought from heaven,
The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.”

28. From their courses they fought with Sisera ;
 29. The river Kishon swept them away,
 30. The river of battles, the river Kishon. (*g*)

III.

1. March on my soul with strength.
2. Then struck the hoofs of the horses,
3. By reason of the wild galloping of their mighty ones. (*a*)
4. Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Jahveh,
5. Curse forever her inhabitants ; (*b*)
6. Because they came not to the help of Jahveh,
7. To the help of Jahveh against the mighty.
8. Blessed above women be Jael,
9. The wife of Heber the Kenite,
10. Above women in the tent let her be blessed.
11. Water he asked, milk she gave ; (*c*)
12. In a lordly dish she brought him curds ;
13. Her hand she puts forth to the tent pin,
14. And her right hand to the workman's hammer,
15. And she smote Sisera, she smote through his head,
16. Yea she pierced, and she struck through his temples ; (*c*)
17. At her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay ;
18. At her feet he bowed, he fell :
19. Where he bowed, there he fell slain.
20. Through the window she looked forth and cried,
21. The mother of Sisera through the lattice,
22. Why is his chariot so long in coming ?
23. Why tarry the paces of his wagons ?
24. Her wisest ladies answer her,
25. Yea, she repeats her words to herself,

The הַכּוֹכְבִים should be transposed from the beginning of the second line to the close of the first line, thus :

מִן שָׁמַיִם לְלַחְמָה הַכּוֹכְבִים
 מִמְּסֻלוֹתֵם לְלַחְמָה עַם־סִיסְרָה.

Then the parallelism becomes perfect :

"From heaven fought the stars,
 From their courses they fought with Sisera."

(*g*) קְדוּמוֹם means encounters, battles, on account of the historical reference to the frequent battles, of which the Kishon had been the scene. There is no propriety in "ancient" river.

(*a*) This passage refers to the flight of the chariots from the battle-field. It is connected by some with the previous strophe. It is then difficult to explain the prophetess' stimulation of herself for the brief statement of the closing two lines. She is here rousing herself to the climax of description of the entire strophe, as she had already done at the beginning of the previous strophe.

(*b*) Curse "*bitterly*" is an improper rendering. The infinitive absolute when it follows the verb cannot have this meaning. Its proper rendering is "*forever*," as we have given it. The Revisers are throughout faulty in their conception of the infinitive absolute.

(*c*) The Revisers mar the beauty of this passage by the insertion of conjunctions and neglect of proper emphasis. The rendering of the Revisers: "He asked water, and she gave him milk," would require a Vav consec. of imperfect for the second verb, whereas the verbs are perfects without a conjunction. The Revisers also ignore the imperfect תִּשְׁלַחנָה, and render it "she put," instead of "she puts forth." They ignore the Vav co-ordinate of line 16, which requires a repetition of the subject in English to bring out the emphasis. The Revisers render again as if it were a Vav consec. of imperfect.

26. Are they not finding, dividing the spoil, (*d*)
 27. A damsel, two damsels, to every man,
 28. A spoil of dyed garments for Sisera,
 29. A spoil of dyed garments, a piece of embroidery,
 30. A dyed garment, two pieces of embroidery for my neck a spoil? (*e*)

The worst work of all, in the Revisers' exhibition of Hebrew Poetry, is in the pentameters. The pentameter movement is preserved in Lamentations iii. It would be exceedingly difficult to mistake the movement here. This dirge is an acrostic in which each strophe is marked by the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in their order. But furthermore, every line of the strophe is marked by the letter characteristic of the strophe. Accordingly the Revisers translate as follows:

"I am the man that hath seen affliction | by the rod of his wrath.
 He hath led me and caused me to walk | in darkness and not in light.
 Surely against me he turneth his hand | again and again all the day.
 My flesh and my skin hath he made old ; | he hath broken my bones.
 He hath builded against me, and compassed me | with gall and travail.
 He hath made me to dwell in dark places, | as those that have been long dead."

The same movement is clear in the nineteenth psalm, verses 7-10:

"The law of the LORD is perfect, | restoring the soul :
 The testimony of the LORD is sure, | making wise the simple.
 The precepts of the LORD are right, | rejoicing the heart :
 The commandment of the LORD is pure, | enlightening the eyes.
 The fear of the LORD is clean, | enduring forever :
 The judgments of the LORD are true, | and righteous altogether.
 More to be desired are they than gold, | yea, than much fine gold :
 Sweeter also than honey | and the honeycomb."

But why did the Revisers not represent this same movement in the remaining verses of the psalm? We expect the same movement to continue. It is not so self-evident as in verses 7-10, but it is sufficiently clear to those who have a proper apprehension of the principles of Hebrew poetry. They ought to have arranged thus:

"Moreover thy servant is warned by them : | in keeping them there is great reward.
 Errors who can understand : | from secret sins clear me.
 Moreover from sins of pride restrain thy servant : | let them not rule over me.

(*d*) The Revisers render the imperfects as if they were perfects, thus:

"Have they not found, have they not divided the spoil," which is against the laws of Hebrew syntax.

(*e*) The pointing of the Massorettes אַרְבָּעָה צְוֹנִים is followed by the Revisers in their rendering "on the necks of the spoil," which involves the mere conceit that she saw the captive maidens coming home with their necks adorned with the spoil. This would be the last thing for the mother of Sisera to be thinking of, and would be entirely inappropriate as the climax of so grand an ode. The Massoretic pointing should be changed so as to read אַרְבָּעָה צְוֹנִים = for my neck, a spoil, that is for the mother of Sisera, the speaker. The mother is comforting herself with the thought that her son is thinking of his mother, and is bringing her the choicest of the spoil.

Then shall I be perfect, | and clear from great transgression.
 Let the words of my mouth be for acceptance, | and the meditation of my heart.
 In thy sight, Oh Jahveh, | my rock and my Redeemer."

The Revisers have entirely misrepresented this movement. They have given us the following:

"Moreover by them is thy servant warned:
 In keeping of them there is great reward.
 Who can discern *his* errors?
 Clear thou me from hidden *faults*.
 Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous *sins*;
 Let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be perfect, (a)
 And I shall be clear from great transgression.
 Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy
 sight, (b)
 O LORD, my rock, and my redeemer."

So also in the one hundred and tenth psalm we have the same movement. This psalm is composed of two strophes of six lines each. The first should be rendered as follows:

I. The oracle of Jahveh to my Lord, | Sit enthroned on my right hand,
 Until I make thine enemies | a stool for thy feet.
 The sceptre of thy strength | Jahveh will send forth from Zion.
 Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. |
 Thy people shall be volunteers in the day of thine host, | in the beauties of
 holiness;
 From the womb of the morning, | thou shalt have the dew of thy youth.

The Revisers give this movement in four lines, but fail to give it in the last two lines of the strophe:

"The LORD saith unto my lord, Sit thou at my right hand,
 Until I make thine enemies thy footstool.
 The LORD shall send forth the rod of thy strength out of Zion:
 Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.
 Thy people offer themselves willingly in the day of thy power:
 In the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning,
 Thou hast the dew of thy youth."

The pilgrim psalms are generally of this movement. Psalm cxxiii. should be rendered thus:

"Unto thee do I lift up mine eyes, | O thou that art enthroned in the heavens!
 Lo, as the eyes of servants | are unto the hand of their lords:
 As the eyes of a maid servant | are unto the hand of her mistress:

(a) The Revisers have been obliged to stumble over the truth in order to this arrangement. They have indeed followed an incorrect Massoretic accentuation. Dr. Wicks (*Treatise on the Accentuation of the three so-called Poetical Books*, Oxford, 1881) has shown that the verse is to be divided at בַּי by the Olév'yored. The common text which points with tipcha is erroneous, and has misled the Revisers to divide at אִתָּם where there is an Athnach. The correct Massoretic accentuation therefore divides the verse as we have given it, and certainly the rhythmical movement and the sense would be sufficient without the Massoretic authority.

(b) The Revisers' arrangement of this verse is utterly perverse. Here the Massorettes are also wrong. But the movement of the poem shows sufficiently well that the arrangement should be as we have given it.

So our eyes are unto Jahveh our God | until he be gracious unto us.
 Be gracious unto us, Jahveh, | be gracious unto us : | for we are exceedingly filled
 with contempt.
 Our soul is exceedingly filled | with their scorning,
 With the scorning of those that are at ease | with the contempt of the proud op-
 pressors.”

This is given by the Revisers :

“Unto thee do I lift up mine eyes,
 O thou that sittest in the heavens.
 Behold, as the eyes of servants *look* unto the hand of their master,
 As the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress ;
 So our eyes *look* unto the LORD our God,
 Until he have mercy upon us.
 Have mercy upon us, O LORD, have mercy upon us :
 For we are exceedingly filled with contempt.
 Our soul is exceedingly filled
 With the scorning of those that are at ease,
 And with the contempt of the proud.” *

We have given a sufficient number of examples to show that the Massoretic points are no safe guide to the arrangement of the lines and strophes of Hebrew Poetry, and that the Revisers have made so many mistakes through a misapprehension of this fact, that it is doubtful whether they have not done more harm than good in their attempt to give English readers an idea of Hebrew Poetry. Bishop Lowth well says that the Hebrew Massoretic text is “the Jews’ interpretation of the Old Testament.”

“We do not deny the usefulness of this interpretation, nor would we be thought to detract from its merit by setting it in this light : it is perhaps upon the whole preferable to any one of the antient versions ; it has probably the great advantage of having been formed upon a traditional explanation of the Text, and of being generally agreeable to that sense of Scripture, which passed current, and was commonly received by the Jewish nation in antient times ; and it has certainly been of great service to the moderns in leading them into the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. But they would have made a much better use of it, and a greater progress in the explication of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, had they consulted it, without absolutely submitting to its authority ; had they considered it as an assistant, not as an infallible guide ” (Isaiah, second edition, *MDCCCLXXIX*, p. *lv.*)

So Dr. Wicks in his admirable treatise says :

“But what interest, it may be asked, have these musical signs for *us*? And it must

* The last line shows us how Hebrew Poetry helps us to restore a corrupt text to its purity. The pointing followed by the Revisers gives us **הַלְעַב הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים**, or an article with a construct which is against the principles of Hebrew Grammar, and puzzles the Grammarians dreadfully to explain it. The last two words of the psalm are given as one in the *Kethibh*, but as two in the *Qeri*. Here the *Qeri* is correct, and ought to have been followed by the Revisers instead of the *Kethibh*.

The movement of the poetry requires this. If now we make the first line of the verse close with **הַלְעַב**, and suppose that the next line began with **לְעַב** in the construct, we see that this is in accordance with the marching rhythm of the Pilgrim’s songs, and removes a grave difficulty ; and the omission was such as is common for copyists to make. After making this insertion the whole difficulty of grammar and poetic movement vanishes, and the *Qeri* is justified.

be allowed that, regarded simply as *musical* signs, they have no interest or importance at all; for the Jews themselves allow that the musical value of the accents of the three Poetical Books is altogether lost. Happily, however, they have *another* value. Those who arranged this system of musical recitation must have felt that they had something more important to do than merely to produce a melody pleasing to the ear. The text was to be so recited *as to be understood*. Above all things it was necessary to draw out its *meaning* and impress it on the minds of the hearers. The music itself was to be made subsidiary to this end. Hence the *logical* pauses were duly represented—and that according to their gradation—by *musical* pauses; and when no logical pause occurred in a sentence, then the *syntactical* relation of the words to one another and to the whole sentence decided which of them were to be sung together, and which were to be separated by a musical pause. In this way the music was made to mark not only the broad lines, but the finest shades of distinction in the sense; and when its signs were introduced into the text, they were also the signs of *interpunction*; no others were needed. The value and importance of the accents from this point of view is at once apparent. They help us, in the most effective way possible, to the understanding of the text; they give us, that is, the meaning which tradition among the Jews assigned to it" (Treatise on the Accentuation, 1881, pp. 2, 3).

It is a strange feature of this slavish adherence to Jewish accentuation, by Christian scholars, that they do not see that they are insensibly led by these accents and also by the vowel-points into the Rabbinical interpretation of the Old Testament. The apostle Paul said of the Jews in his time: "But unto this day, whenever Moses is read a veil lieth upon their heart. But when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iv. 15-17). Thus it is that Christian scholars who use the Hebrew Bible through the veil of the Massoretic accents and vowel-points, see it with the eyes of the Jew and not with the eyes of the Christian. There can be no true Christian Hebrew scholarship until this veil is removed, and the *unpointed text* is regarded as the real text, and then it is enriched with the light cast upon it by the most ancient versions and authorities.

Older than the accents is the verse-divider, the *soph pasuk*. In adhering to this the Revisers have also sometimes fallen into grave errors. Thus in Gen. ii. 4, they have rendered:

"These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made earth and heaven."

This combines in one verse the title appended to the first narrative of the creation, and the protasis of the temporal clause which begins the second narrative of the creation. That this is so, is recognized by the great majority of critical scholars. The book of Genesis has no less than eleven of these titles. See v. 1: "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man," etc.; and vi. 9: "These are the generations of Noah. Noah was a righteous man," etc.

The Revisers have exactly followed the Massoretic accents in the

verse divisions ; but they have not followed them in giving the same sign to represent the greater division of their verse. Thus, the Massoretes give an *Athnach* after "when they were created," ii. 4 ; and also after "Adam" in v. 1 ; and *Zakeph Katon*, a lesser distinctive, after "Noah," vi. 9. And yet the Revisers give a period after the two last mentioned, and only a comma after the first mentioned. In this they advance to a false interpretation, which even the Massoretes did not venture to give. The Massoretes gave the first part of the verse as a title of the second narrative of the creation. They made a mistake in this, but not so bad a blunder as that which King James' Revisers made, and which has been perpetuated in the present revision. We cannot understand it, except on the theory that a two-third rule could not be secured to make the change.

That the title is appended to the first narrative and does not belong to the second is clear : (1) from the scope of the first narrative—the generations of the heavens and the earth, whereas the second narrative has nothing to do with the generation of either heaven or earth, but of the garden of Eden and mankind ; (2) from the term for creation *ברא*, which is used in the first narrative, but not in the second ; (3) from the use of the article in connection with heaven and earth, as in i. 7, and the use of earth and heaven in a different order and without the article in the protasis of the conditional clause, which begins the second narrative.

The Revisers have followed the Massoretes, in including the titles of Genesis in the verses of the chapters. They would have been at least consistent if they had done the same thing in the titles of the Psalms. In the Psalter they have not done so except in the HALLEJAH, which is the title of a considerable number of Psalms, sometimes at the beginning, and sometimes at the end ; and in the appended *על מרת* of Psalm xlviii., which has led them to the blunder of translating it "unto death," instead of seeing that it is a shorter form of *על מרת לבן* in the title of Psalm ix.

We shall give but another example of this slavish adherence to the Massoretic verse-divisions. Psalms xlii.—xliii. constitute one great poem of three equal strophes marked by refrains. The refrain is exactly the same at the close of the second and third strophes. But there is a slight difference in the refrain of the first strophe. The last line of the regular refrain is,

"The health of my countenance, and my God."

The closing line of the refrain of the first strophe is,

"The health of his countenance."

The last line is suspicious at once on account of its shortness when compared with the other line. The reader of the English Version will also notice that the missing "*my God*" appears at the beginning of the very next line. If now we examine the Hebrew, it is easy to see that there has been an error in marking the division of the verses. The Massorettes separate thus :

ישועות פניו | אלהי.

If now we mark the separation thus :

ישועות פני ואלהי |

this refrain becomes identical with the others. Who would hesitate under such circumstances to make the correction, especially when it is in accordance with several ancient versions, and makes the refrains of this beautiful psalm harmonious and symmetrical? These are a few examples of a large number of cases in which the Revisers have been unfaithful to their task of Revision owing to their bondage to the Massoretic accents.

The vowel-points are somewhat older than the accents ; but they do not belong to the original text, and should not be regarded as of any superior authority to the readings of the ancient versions. We shall leave to our friend, who is to follow us in October, this phase of the subject. We shall only remark that this is a field in which there is an appropriate use of what is called conjectural criticism. We call attention to it here because there is a wide-spread misapprehension of the real facts of the case. It ought to be clear that in dealing with the Massoretic pointed text we are not dealing with an original text, but with a text clothed with an interpretation. For the purpose of criticism the Hebrew Text must be stripped of all the points and divisions, and considered in its original character as the Kethibh. It is worthy of remark that the sacred synagogue-rolls of the Jews are always in this form. The Shemitic writers use regularly unpointed text, and there is no difficulty in reading, to one familiar with the language. The context is ordinarily a sufficient guide. There always must be, however, more room for differences in interpretation than in the languages where vowels are a part of the text. There is no sufficient reason, however, why we should allow the mediæval Rabbins to interpret for us here, or even submit to the judgment of the ancient versions and interpreters. We have the original unpointed text, and have a right to use it for ourselves, and no Hebrew scholar is worth the name who does not use his liberty in this respect. Conjectural criticism here is not emendation of the original text, but emendation of the Massoretic pointing of the text. Indeed the English Revisers

themselves take this liberty in Psalm xxii. 16, and the American Revisers give their consent, for they agree to the margin, "The Hebrew text as pointed reads 'Like a lion,'" and also agree to the translation, "They pierced my hands and my feet." Here is a case in which the interest of *dogma*, the desire to retain a particular Messianic reference, has caused them to cast their critical principle behind their back. They give no reason for their adherence to this reading. They can get it in two ways by changing the text from כָּאֲרִי into כְּאֲרִי or by changing the pointing from כָּאֲרִי into כְּאֲרִי. This conjectural emendation of the Massoretic pointing ought to have been carried much further. It would have removed many Rabbinical conceits and glosses from the Hebrew Bible.

There is an appropriate emendation recently suggested by Head-Master G. H. B. Wright.* There is a very peculiar mention of the *raven* in a strophe giving an account of God's care for the lion and his whelps (Job xxxviii. 41). The next strophe gives an account of the wild goat; then come in their order the wild ass, the wild ox, the ostrich, and the horse, and the whole closes with a single strophe for the great birds of prey. The raven is too insignificant to bring into the strophe of the lion, and it has no propriety in the context, when we bring into consideration the method of the other strophes. This infelicity is removed by a simple change of pointing, לְעֵרֵב into לְעֵרֵב. Then the strophe gains a new beauty and harmony in the translation.

"Wilt thou hunt the prey for the lioness?
 Or satisfy the appetite of the young lions,
 When they couch in their dens,
 Abide in the covert to lie in wait?
 Who provideth *in the evening* his food,
 When his young ones cry unto God
 Wander for lack of meat?"

I cannot conceive that any one should hesitate to accept this reading unless he has such a reverence for the Massoretic vowels as to deem them well-nigh infallible.

Our American Revisers do not hesitate to interpolate in order to avoid an interpretation which is against their *à priori* theory. A curious specimen of this is to be seen in their proposed rendering of the refrain of the Song of Songs. This is explained by Dr. Chambers thus:

"The adjuration in ii. 7, iii. 5, and viii. 4 to the daughters of Jerusalem, not to stir up 'nor awaken love until it please,' which is the rendering of the revision, rests upon

* *Book of Job*, 1883.

the view that the words refer to the spontaneity of love, which must not be aroused, but awaken of itself—a doctrine neither of Scripture nor of sound ethics. The Appendix, with the great body of interpreters, takes love as (abstract for concrete)—beloved one, and conceives the words as those of the bride, who at peace in the arms of her beloved, prays that He may not be aroused by any intrusion, thus—'nor awaken my love until He please.' It is true the verb is feminine, but this is because the antecedent is feminine" (Chambers' *Companion to the Revised Old Testament*, 1885, pp. 204, 205).

The underlying reason of the American Revisers seems to be a hostility to the realistic interpretation of this marvellous drama of love. To our mind the reasons presented by Dr. Chambers are without force. The English Revisers have rightly adhered to King James' Version here. It is the refrain of the drama, and gives the key to the interpretation of the whole composition. The American Revisers would foist an erroneous interpretation into the drama.

The American Revisers have also involved themselves in a grave inconsistency by their rendering of one of the finest passages of Isaiah.

The Revised Version gives lxiii. 1-6 as follows :

"Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, marching in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the peoples there was no man with me: yea, I trod them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury; and their life-blood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment. For the day of vengeance was in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I trod down the peoples in mine anger, and made them drunk in my fury, and I poured out their life-blood on the earth."

Looking at the text as unpointed, and following the classic Hebrew Syntax, we should point the imperfects that follow *ררכתי* (ver. 2) as *Vav* consecutives, all the more that we have a jussive form: *יך* in ver. 3, which would by rule be used with *Vav* consec.; and it is followed by a perfect at the close of the verse; so the imperfects in ver. 5 *seq.* would be *Vav* consecutive of the imperfect. If this pointing, which is urged by Cheyne and other scholars, and favored by the Versions, be accepted, then the rendering of the Revisers is correct. But the Massorettes did not point it in this way; they pointed the imperfect with the *weak Vav*, and they did it because they rendered the verbs as future, and King James' Revisers followed them in this. The difficulty of this pointing is, that according to classical usage it would involve final clauses with all these imperfects, for the change of tense from the perfect to the imperfect is given by a *Vav* consecutive of the perfect. We might, however, suppose that the piece is of late composition when the classic usage is neglected, as in Ezra and Ec-

clesiastes. But we presume the American Revisers would not carry their Higher Criticism to this height. In consenting to this change from the future to the past, which puts the whole prophecy in a different light, the American Revisers have either violated the laws of Hebrew Syntax in a most outrageous manner, or they have changed the Massoretic points in defiance of their own principles. Dr. Chambers gives us no light here, and the American Appendix is as silent as the grave.

The whole question of the Revision from the point of view of the ancient versions and other ancient authorities, we leave to the competent scholar who is to discuss it in the October Number of this REVIEW.* We shall, however, give an example of a correct change of the text and also of a neglect to improve the text.

Dr. Chambers† justifies the change of אבֵּל into אֶבֶן in I. Samuel vi. 18 as “one of the few instances in which the existing Hebrew text is corrected on the authority of the early versions, the internal evidence in their favor being overwhelming.” This correction is justified by the principles of Textual Criticism, but these same principles would require still more important changes in the same verse and in the next following verse, and, indeed, throughout the Book of Samuel. In consenting to this infringement of their principle of adhering to the Massoretic text, the American Revisers ought to have seen that they were opening the flood-gates to a critical revision of the text of the entire Book of Samuel. Indeed, this is one of the things which the Revisers ought to have done, for until it has been done no satisfactory version of this book can be given. There is considerable difference between the LXX and the Massoretic text in this book. Professor Kirkpatrick, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, in his recent excellent commentary on the books of Samuel, after a careful examination of the question, on the principles

* We cannot refrain, however, from giving a very few instances of the inconsistency and perversity of our American Revisers. Thus in Job xxxix. 21, the Massoretic unpointed text is יִחַפְרוּ “they paw,” as in the margin of the Revision. The English Revisers have rightly conjectured that there has been a transposition of the last two letters of the word, and read יִחַפִּיר which best suits the context, and render “he paweth.” We do not find any protest from the American Revisers against this change of the *unpointed text*. In Psalm xvi. 2, the English Revisers have pointed אֲמַרְתָּ as first person, in accordance with the context, after the LXX, Vulgate, and Peshitto, but the American Revisers insist upon the Massoretic pointing even at the cost of supplying the text with a subject, and they render “O my soul, thou hast said.” This is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. In Micah iv. 13, the English Revisers correct and read וְהִחַרְמֵתִי into וְהִחַרְמֵתָּ in accordance with the context; the American Revisers adhere to the Massoretic text at the cost of rendering “I (the Lord) shall devote their gain unto the Lord.”

† *Companion to the Revised Old Testament*, p. 100.

of sound criticism, prefers the text of the Septuagint, excluding I. Sam. xvii. 12-31, 55-xviii. 5, from the original Hebrew text, and in preferring the reading of the LXX to the Massoretic text in II. Sam. iv. 6; xxvii. 3. In this he agrees with many of the best critics of modern times. These views were represented among the English Revisers, and they expressed themselves in the margin. Thus the margin of I. Sam. xvii. 12, states, "The Sept. omits vv. 12-31, and 55—ch. xviii. 5," and on the margin of II. Sam. iv. 2, we find, "The Sept. has, 'And, behold, the woman that kept the door of the house was winnowing wheat, and she slumbered and slept; and the brethren Rechab and Baanah went privily into the house.'"

Dr. Chambers in the N. Y. *Independent*, May 21st, calls our attention to the fact that

"One peculiarity of the Revised New Testament fails entirely to appear in this volume, viz.: the bracketing of certain portions, and the entire omission of others. The reason is that there is little or no variation in the existing Hebrew manuscripts. The text was settled nearly or quite a thousand years ago by a body of critics called Massorettes," etc.

The Massorettes may have settled the text for the American Revisers, but they have not for other Hebrew scholars. There is as good reason for bracketing I. Sam. xvii. 12-31, 55-xviii. 5, as for bracketing Mark xvi. 9-20 in the New Testament. In fact, the Old Testament Revisers have treated these passages in Samuel in essentially the same way that the New Testament Revisers have treated Mark xvi. 9-20.

We shall give but a single example of an omission from the Hebrew unpointed text which should be supplied in the text of Gen. iv. 8. The English Revisers give it in the margin: "Many ancient authorities have, 'said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field.'" These ancient authorities embrace the LXX, Samaritan Hebrew MS., Itala, Vulgate, Peshitto, Targum of Jerusalem, and are endorsed by a great number of critical scholars. It is supported by intrinsic probability. Rather than render "*and Cain said unto his brother,*" as we have constantly "*Jahveh said unto Cain,*" and "*Cain said unto Jahveh,*" in every case giving *what* was said; they turn from the natural and proper rendering, and pervert it into, "*told Abel his brother,*" in order to obscure the difficulty. But it does not remove it. What did Cain tell his brother? The English Revisers give us the answer in the margin. But the American Revisers would even deprive us of this light, and leave us in the darkness of the Massoretic text.

III.—THE HEBREW GRAMMAR OF THE REVISERS.

The next question which presents itself is whether the Revisers have been faithful to the principles of the Hebrew language. So far

as etymology is concerned they build upon Gesenius, and consequently the Revision is an improvement upon King James' Version, in this regard, in the measure that the Thesaurus of Gesenius is in advance of the Lexicon of Buxtorf. But the improvements which have been made in Hebrew Lexicography by the school of Ewald, and especially in the more recent studies of stems, and the history of words through the more careful comparison of the cognates, especially the Arabic and the Assyrian, seem to have received trifling consideration.

It is well known that Hebrew Syntax is a new study to the modern Hebrew scholar. The Jewish grammarians were misled by their Aramaic, and the late Hebrew of the Mishna, into a false conception of classic Hebrew Syntax. It is altogether owing to the labors of Christian scholars, through the help of the cognate languages, that the principles of Hebrew Syntax have been mastered. This acquisition is so recent that the average Hebrew scholarship of the Revisers seems not to have made it their own. Although such eminent grammarians as Profs. A. B. Davidson and S. R. Driver were in the English Company, they seem not to have been able to lift the Company as a body to their higher knowledge of Hebrew Syntax.

It is said that Bishop Cox, of Ely, recommended to Archbishop Parker, in connection with the preparation of the Bishops' Bible, "the translation of the verbs in the Psalms to be used uniformly in one tense." It sometimes appears as if King James' Revisers thought that they might render the Hebrew tenses indifferently as it pleased them at the time. According to the teaching of some Hebrew grammars still in use in theological halls, it would appear as if the Hebrew tenses might be used interchangeably. It is evident that there is a vast improvement in the Revision in the presentation of the phenomena of Hebrew Syntax, but it is also manifest that the Company have not followed the lead of the best scholars among the Revisers themselves in their rendering of moods and tenses. The Revision is a compromise in this respect. The errors of tense mount up to thousands in the Revision. We are well aware that it is exceedingly difficult at times to present the delicate shadings of tense in the English language. The New Testament Company, however, were quite successful in their efforts to accomplish this. The Old Testament Company seem to have been frightened into the adoption of a more hesitating and inconsistent policy in this department of their work.

We propose to consider this phase of the Revision in connection with several passages of the Old Testament, which sufficiently illustrate it. We shall endeavor to make this subject intelligible to the ordinary reader by the use of concrete examples. We shall avoid as far as possible technical treat-

ment, and show the faults of etymology incidentally in connection with faults of syntax.

The Hebrew tenses do not express the sphere of time, but the kind of time. We depend upon the context to determine whether the tense is past, present, or future; but the Hebrew tenses carefully distinguish between action as originating, as progressing, and as having become an established fact. The Hebrew participle expresses progressive action, or action which goes on continuously without interruption. It expresses either the English progressive present, or the progressive past, or the corresponding phase of the future. Thus in the Song of Songs, ii. 8-9, we have a series of participles. This passage is rendered by the Revisers :

“The voice of my beloved ! behold, he cometh,
Leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills.
My beloved is like a roe or a young hart :
Behold, he standeth behind our wall,
He looketh in at the windows,
He sheweth himself through the lattice.”

The English reader would not suppose that “cometh,” “leaping,” “skipping,” “is like,” “standeth,” “looketh in,” “sheweth himself,” are all participles in the original. The English language is surely capable of giving proper expression to these participles. We venture to render :

“Hark ! my beloved ! See there, he is coming,
Leaping over the mountains, skipping over the hills,
My beloved is coming like a gazelle, or a young hart.
See there ! he is standing behind our wall,
Looking in through the windows, glancing through the lattice.”*

Another example of the neglect of the participle is found in Ps. xlii. 7. The Revisers retain the rendering of King James' Version :

“Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts :
All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.”

The psalmist represents that he is in the rapids of the Jordan, and that the rushing waters are calling to one another to overwhelm him. The rendering should be :

“Deep is calling unto deep at the noise of thy cataracts ;
All thy breakers and thy billows have gone over me.” †

* קָרַב is frequently used as an exclamation, “Hark !” This is ignored by the Revisers here and elsewhere. They leave the demonstrative הַהָּ untranslated after הַהָּ in both cases. It is emphatic, and the rendering should be, “see now,” or “see there.” The preposition עַל is “over,” rather than “upon.” She sees him coming over the mountains, leaping and skipping. In this he is like a gazelle. The Hebrew expression is “being like,” or “acting like.” To express the movement we paraphrase, and render “coming like.” The same preposition מִן is used with window and lattice, and it ought to have the same rendering in English. The parallelism of the Revisers is also wrong. They make one line too many.

† צַנּוּרוֹת is not “waterspouts,” as in the text of the Revision of the King James' Version, but

The difference between the perfect and the imperfect in Hebrew is often a difference which corresponds with the difference in English between the simple present and the emphatic present, and we have to determine by the context whether the imperfect is to be rendered in present time or future time. As an example of this, we take the first part of the second Psalm. This is given by the Revisers :

“ Why do the nations rage,
 And the peoples imagine a vain thing ?
 The kings of the earth set themselves,
 And the rulers take counsel together,
 Against the LORD, and against his anointed, *saying*,
 Let us break their bands asunder,
 And cast away their cords from us.
 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh :
 The Lord shall have them in derision.
 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath,
 And vex them in his sore displeasure :
 Yet I have set my king
 Upon my holy hill of Zion.”

The English reader would suppose that the four verbs in verses 1 and 2 were of the same tense in Hebrew, but this is not the case. Furthermore, verses 4 to 6 constitute an anti-strophe to verses 1 to 3, and they ought to be put in the same sphere of time.

This passage should be :

“ Why do the nations rage,
 And the peoples meditate a vain thing ?
 The kings of the earth set themselves,
 And the rulers do take counsel together ;
 Against Jahveh, and against his anointed,
 (*Saying*) Let us break their bands asunder,
 And let us cast away their cords from us.

He that is enthroned in heaven laugheth :
 The Lord derides them.
 Then he speaks unto them in his wrath,
 And in his sore displeasure troubles them :
 (*Saying*) Verily, I, even I have set my king
 On Zion my holy mountain.”*

cataracts or waterfalls, as in the margin. The difference between the participle קָרָא and the perfect קָרָא is expressed by rendering the former “is calling,” and the latter “have gone over.”

* The margin “meditate” is better than “imagine” of the Revisers’ text. The Revisers neglect the Vav co-ordinate of verse 3, וְנִשְׁלַיְכָה, which makes the verb entirely parallel in expression. This co-ordination of thought we can express in English by repeating the subject and modal form, “let us.” The Revisers render as if it were Vav consecutive of perfect. יָשַׁב has the pregnant meaning “sit enthroned” frequently in the Old Testament. The Revisers ignore it. The Revisers insert “saying” before the words of the rebels, but strangely omit it before the answering words of the Lord. The וְנִשְׁלַיְכָה is employed before the verb, and should be expressed in English by repeating the subject in verse 6. The ׀ that precedes it is the ׀ of the oath or solemn assertion. It is not “but” or “yet,” but rather “yea,” or “Verily.”

There is a constant tendency in King James' Version to render the Hebrew imperfect as a future. The Revisers have only in part overcome this evil. Thus, in the familiar Psalm xxiii., while they correctly represent the general time of the Psalm as a present and abiding experience, they improperly follow King James' Version in departing from the present time for the future in several instances. Notwithstanding, the Hebrew tense is the same. This Psalm should be rendered in three strophes :

“ Jahveh is my shepherd, I want not.
In pastures of green grass he causeth me to lie down ;
Unto waters of refreshment he leadeth me ;
Me myself he restoreth.

He guideth me in paths of righteousness for his name's sake ;
Also when I walk in the valley of dense darkness,
I fear not evil, for thou art with me,
Thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest before me a table in the presence of my adversaries ;
Thou hast anointed with oil my head, my cup is abundance ;
Surely goodness and mercy pursue me all the days of my life,
And my dwelling is in the house of Jahveh for length of days.”*

The Hebrew imperfect like the Greek imperfect is often a frequentative, and expresses habitual, or oft-repeated action. The New Testament Revisers have been successful in giving this frequentative in English. Why should not the Old Testament Revisers have done it? Thus, in Num. x. 35, 36, the Revisers render :

“ And it came to pass, when the ark set forward, that Moses said, Rise up, O LORD, and let thine enemies be scattered ; and let them that hate thee flee before thee. And when it rested, he said, Return, O LORD, unto the ten thousands of the thousands of Israel.”

* “Waters of rest” is the marginal rendering. The Revisers, in adhering to King James' Version, “still waters,” have simply adhered to error. They are not still waters, but waters which soothe—give refreshment to the flock, parallel with “green grass.” The version of King James is followed by the Revisers here and elsewhere in neglecting the reflexive meaning of נפש. The Psalmist is not thinking of refreshment of soul as distinguished from refreshment of body. The subsequent context shows that this cannot be the case. He is thinking of himself as refreshed by the good shepherd.

The Revisers have left another error in this beautiful psalm by the rendering, “shadow of death.” It is well known that the English reader has generally understood that the Psalmist is finding comfort in the hour of death or peril of death. This is not the case. He is thinking of perils of life, the darkness and gloom of trouble. צלמות is an abstract noun, meaning “deep darkness,” as in the margin. The pointing, צְלֹמֹתַי, is a mere conceit, and is against the genius of the Hebrew language. In the last line it is better to take the Hebrew שְׁבִתִּי as infinitive construct : and point it שְׁבִתִּי, as Perowne, my dwelling, which best suits the context. The Revisers take it as the perfect with ך consec., in which the initial yodh is elided, as if it were וְשָׁבִתִּי. The Massoretic text gives it as the perfect שְׁבִתִּי, from שׁוּב, “return,” with the pregnant ך, implying the verb “to dwell,” and rendering “I shall return to dwell.”

No one would suppose from this rendering that the Hebrew gives different tenses in verses 35 and 36, where the Revisers render "said"; moreover, we have here two little snatches of poetry which the Revisers have overlooked. This passage should be rendered as follows :

" And it came to pass, when the ark set forward, that Moses said,
 ' O rise up Jahveh ! that thine enemies may be scattered,
 That those who hate thee may flee from thy presence.'
 And whenever it rested, he said (used to say),
 ' O return Jahveh !
 Unto the ten thousands of the thousands of Israel.' " *

Take also the passage Exodus xxxiv. 33-35 :

" And when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face. But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out ; and he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded ; and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone : and Moses put the veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with him."

In verse 33 the Hebrew tenses are *Vav* consecutives of the imperfect, and are to be translated as aorists. One would suppose from the rendering of the Revisers that the same Hebrew tense ran through verses 34 and 35. But the reverse is true. The tense is changed in verse 34 to the imperfect in order to indicate what Moses was accustomed to do whenever he went into the presence of the Theophany, and whenever he came forth from the Theophany to address the people.

In Psalm xc. 3-6 there are some strange mistakes of tense. The Revisers render :

" Thou turnest man to destruction ;
 And sayest, Return, ye children of men.
 For a thousand years in thy sight
 Are but as yesterday when it is past,
 And as a watch in the night.

Thou carriest them away as with a flood ; they are as a sleep : "

Here imperfects and perfects are rendered as if they were the same. The passage has great difficulties, but we venture to render :

" Wouldst thou turn man to dust ;
 Thou dost say, Return, ye children of men,
 For a thousand years in thy sight
 Are as yesterday when it passeth,
 And as a watch in the night.

Hast thou carried them away as with a flood ; they fall into sleep : " †

* The Revisers are capricious in their renderings of the Hebrew imperative. There are two imperatives, the simple and the cohortative, sufficiently well expressed in English by " Return " and " O Return." But the Revisers pay no attention to the distinction ; they frequently render the simple imperative with exclamation and omit the exclamation with the cohortative. We are not prepared to say that we should observe this distinction throughout, or that it is necessary to render, " O Rise up " and " O Return " here ; but we do urge that it is improper to render in Psalm xliii. 1, **רִיבָה** simply " plead," and **שְׁלַח** in verse 3 " O send." It is possible to render the *Vav* with sheva as the apodosis of the imperative. But it is better, we think, to regard it as the weak *Vav* to express purpose.

† In verse 3 the form **רִיבָה** gives great difficulty. It is often explained as if the *γ* consec. were

The perfect is occasionally used in Hebrew to express a wish with reference to completed action.

Song of Songs ii. 3-6 ought to be translated as follows :

“ As the apricot among the trees of the wood,
So is my beloved among the sons.
In his shadow I delightedly sat,
And his fruit was sweet to my taste.
O that he had brought me to the vineyard,
His banner over me being love—
Sustain me with raisin-cakes, support me with apricots ;
For I am sick with love—
His left hand would be under my head,
His right hand would embrace me.”*

The Hebrew language distinguishes three moods of the imperfect : the indicative, jussive, and cohortative. It cannot make these distinctions throughout in form, as is the case in the Arabic language. But where they cannot be distinguished in form, they may yet be distinguished by syntactical construction and context. The cohortative form is proper to final clauses. Thus in Prov. viii. 1-4, the Revised Version gives :

“ Doth not wisdom cry,
And understanding put forth her voice ?
In the top of high places by the way,
Where the paths meet, she standeth ;
Beside the gates, at the entry of the city,
At the coming in at the doors, she crieth aloud :
Unto you, O men, I call ;
And my voice is to the sons of men.”

There are here two glaring faults. We have a rare example of the cohortative third fem. in **תִּרְנָה**. Its modal force ought to have been given. It expresses purpose : “ In order to cry aloud.” The same construction is found in the **תִּקְרָא** of ix. 3, but ignored by the Revisers. Besides the

omitted on the theory that this is occasionally the case in Hebrew, just as in Greek the augment is sometimes omitted. We doubt this, although it is held by Ewald, Driver, and others. It seems to us that we have here a conditional clause with imperfect in protasis and perfect in apodosis, and that in verse 5 the construction is simply reversed. This explains the change of tense in both cases which the Revisers have hidden to the English reader by rendering the contrasted tenses as if they were identical. The Revision also mistakes the tense, and renders the imperfect of verse 4, “ when it is past,” deliberately rejecting the correct rendering which is given in the margin: “ when it passeth.” The margin is as usual correct over against the text when it urges that “ dust ” should be substituted for “ destruction ” in verse 3. We venture the paraphrase in the last line. The rendering of the Revisers, “ they are as a sleep,” is obscure, and is not as the Hebrew has it. The literal rendering is, “ they become sleep ”—this means that they pass into a condition of sleep, the sleep of death. We give the idea more clearly by a little paraphrase.

* We prefer to render **תְּפֹרֵחַ** “ apricot,” with Tristram. **בֵּית רֵיחַ** is “ vineyard,” and not “ banqueting house.” The Revisers neglect the perfect optative and render “ He brought me,” which throws the whole piece into confusion, and represents the damsel as rejoicing in the presence of her beloved, when the reverse is true. It renders it impossible to explain satisfactorily her urgent call for cordials to keep her from fainting, her representation that she was love-sick, and the adjuration at the close of the act. One can easily see that it was the desire to retain the allegorical interpretation of the Song that influenced the Revisers to this and other incorrect renderings of this wondrously beautiful drama.

Revisers render the perfect נצבָה "standeth," just as if it were an imperfect, and in the same tense with the previous verb. The Hebrew author changed the tense with a purpose, and his purpose ought to have been carried out by the Revisers.

Another example of mistake in mood is to be found in Is. xxxviii. 10-12 :

"I said, In the noontide of my days I shall go into the gates of the grave :
 I am deprived of the residue of my years.
 I said, I shall not see the LORD, even the LORD in the land of the living :
 I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world.
 Mine age is removed, and is carried away from me as a shepherd's tent :
 I have rolled up like a weaver my life ; he will cut me off from the loom :
 From day even to night wilt thou make an end of me."

There are several faults in this translation. (1) They render the Hebrew cohortative, I *shall* go ; it ought to be, I *must* go. (2) "The gates of the grave" is an improper rendering of "the gates of Sheol." The reference is not to the grave, but to the abode of departed spirits. (3) In ver. 12 the verb is not, "He *will* cut me off," but is in a final clause, "that I may be cut off"; or, "that He may cut me off." (4) In following the Massoretic accents, they have mistaken the structure of the pentameter. It should be :

"I said, in the noontide of my days, I must go ;
 Within the gates of Sheol, I am deprived of the residue of my years."

Another example of the perpetuation of error is the rendering of Prov. xxxi. 10, "A virtuous woman who can find?" giving an endorsement to the idea that virtuous women are so rare that they can hardly be found. It ought to have been rendered :

"A capable wife, O that one might find."

The poet expresses the ardent longing to have such a wife as he depicts in this unique acrostic.

The moods in Hebrew, as in other languages, are ordinarily associated with conjunctions. The most remarkable feature of the Hebrew language is the conjunction Vav—which, under different conditions of pointing and the position of the words of its clause, is capable of great variety of meanings. Upon the proper understanding of these, depends the mastery of Hebrew Syntax. King James' Version entirely ignored these distinctions, and the present Revision only partially recognizes them. Take, for example, Amos ix. 5, 6, which they render :

"For the Lord, the GOD of hosts, is he that toucheth the land and it melteth, and all that dwell therein shall mourn ; and it shall rise up wholly like the River ; and shall sink again, like the River of Egypt ; it is he that buildeth his chambers in the heaven, and hath founded his vault upon the earth ; he that calleth for the waters of the sea and poureth them out upon the face of the earth ;"

This piece is an oath of God, introduced by the Vav of the oath—it is a trimeter :

"By the Lord, Jahveh, Sabaoth :
 He who toucheth the earth so that it doth melt,
 And all that dwell therein mourn,
 And it riseth up wholly as the river,

And subsideth as the River of Egypt ;
 He that buildeth in the heaven his chambers,
 And hath founded his vault upon the earth ;
 He who calleth to the waters of the sea,
 So as to pour them upon the face of the earth."

The principal fault of this passage is that it ignores the Vav consecutive of the imperfect in two instances, viz., וַתִּמְרוּג in verse 5 and וַיִּשְׁפַּכֶּה in verse 6. Vav consecutives of the imperfect after a participle or imperfect can only express the immediate result of the previous action. They cannot be rendered, "and it melteth," "and poureth," as the Revisers have given them. Such a rendering would require Vav consecutives of the perfect. We have, indeed, a Vav consecutive of the perfect וַאֲבָלוּ immediately following וַתִּמְרוּג and clearly carrying on the tense of the participle. It is entirely wrong to render it with the Revisers "shall mourn." In this case the Revisers mistake both the ׀ consec. of imperfect and the ׀ consec. of perfect.

Job iii. 11-13 may be taken as a fair example of the neglect of the weak Vav, with the imperfect. The Revisers render :

Why died I not from the womb ?
 Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly ?
 Why did the knees receive me ?
 Or why the breasts, that I should suck ?
 For now should I have lain down and been quiet :
 I should have slept ; then had I been at rest.

It should be rendered :

Why *was I not to die* from the womb ?
 Why did I not go forth from the belly *to expire* ?
 Why did the knees receive me ?
 Or why the breasts, that I should suck ?
 For now I had lain down *to be quiet*.
 I should have slept ; then had I been at rest.

Here the Revisers render the weak Vavs with the imperfects, which, according to the laws of Hebrew Syntax, express purpose, just as if they were *Vav consecutives* of the imperfect, and expressed result ; in other words, the reverse of the truth.

We shall take Genesis i. 1-5 as an example of the neglect of the Vav circumstantial by the Revisers. They render :

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was waste and void ; and darkness was upon the face of the deep : and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light : and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good : and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day."

It should be rendered :

"In the beginning when God created the heaven and the earth ;
 The earth being waste and empty, and darkness upon the face of the deep,
 And the spirit of God hovering over the face of the waters,

God said, let light come forth, and light came forth.
 And God saw the light that it was excellent,
 And God divided between the light and the darkness,
 And God called the light day and the darkness he called night.
 And evening came and morning came—one day."

The *Vav* circumstantial is easily determined in Hebrew by the order of the words in the sentence. The regular order is (1) verb, (2) subject, (3) object. The subject or object may be placed before the verb for emphasis. But, ordinarily, when the subject immediately follows the *Vav*, it is a circumstantial clause. This is the case in lines 2 and 3, where no proper emphasis can be found in the subjects. Furthermore, the first word is a construct before a relative clause of time, whose protasis is found in line 4—this is a further evidence that the intervening lines are circumstantial.*

We shall give Psalm xxii. 3-5 as an example of the neglect of the *Vav* co-ordinate by the Revisers :

" But thou art holy,
 O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel.
 Our fathers trusted in thee :
 They trusted, and thou didst deliver them.
 They cried unto thee, and were delivered :
 They trusted in thee, and were not ashamed."

This should be rendered :

" But O thou holy one,
 Enthroned upon the praises of Israel ;
 In thee our fathers trusted,
 They trusted and thou didst deliver them.
 Unto thee they cried and they escaped :
 In thee they trusted, and they were not ashamed."

The force of this splendid passage is in the peculiar emphasis in the repetition of the verb, **בטחו**, "they trusted," in lines 3, 4, and 6, with the synonymous verb, "they cried," in line 5. In line 4 the deliverance is represented as a consequence of the trust by the *Vav* consec. of the imperfect. But in line 5, instead of a *Vav* consec. the author uses a *Vav* co-ordinate, in order to place the verb, "They cried unto thee" and "they escaped," in emphatic co-ordination. This we can express in English by repeating the subject. Moreover, there is a forcible word-play here. By the change of a single letter, **פלט** becomes **מלט**. These are synonymous words, but are not the same. The English language is not so poor as to justify the Revisers in their rendering of these two Hebrew verbs by the same English verb. Moreover, **מלט** in the Niphal may be a passive, but the Niphal is ordinarily, especially in this verb, a reflexive. Hence it should be rendered, "saved

* This passage may illustrate the neglect of the Revisers to apprehend that **היה** is primarily "to become," and not "be." This involves a mistranslation of a large number of passages, also a misconception of the divine name, **יהוה**, which is derived from this root. The translation of the Revisers, "and there was evening," etc., is an improvement. But it should be, "It became evening," or "evening came." It should also be said that this first chapter of Genesis is poetry, as we have arranged it.

themselves" or escaped. This illustrates another fault which the Revisers have inherited from King James' Version and have not corrected. The Hebrew Niphal is primarily and ordinarily a *reflexive*. There are hundreds of instances where the Revisers have perpetuated a false conception of this species of the Hebrew verb by rendering it as *passive*.*

We cannot, for lack of space, illustrate the neglect of the finer features of Hebrew Syntax in the Revision; the lack of appreciation of the relative, conditional, circumstantial, and temporal clauses, and the tendency to break up the longer sentences at the expense of rhetorical and poetical beauty and grace of expression. But we must call attention to the Revisers' entire misapprehension of the Hebrew infinite absolute. They allow the ancient blunders of King James' Version to remain. The infinitive absolute is used with a finite verb to give emphasis to its idea. It is placed before the verb to give intensity to its essential meaning. It follows the verb to give a temporal emphasis. It is altogether incorrect to give it the force of "surely." Thus, in Gen. ii. 16-17, the force is correctly given in "freely eat," but is missed in "surely die." It should be "utterly" or "altogether die." In Ex. iii. 7, "surely seen" should be "entirely seen" or "altogether seen." The renderings, "triumphed gloriously" (Ex. xv. 1), and "diligently hearken" (Ex. xv. 26), are correct, but "surely be stoned" is incorrect in Ex. xix. 13—it ought to be "stoned to death"; and Ex. xxi. 12, "be surely put to death," ought to be changed to "put to a violent death." In Judges v. 23 the infinitive absolute follows the verb. The rendering, "curse ye bitterly," would be correct if the infinitive absolute preceded the verb. But as the text gives it, the rendering ought to be, "curse forever," or "to the bitter end." Psalm cxxvi. 6 should be rendered :

" He goeth *forth*, weeping as he goes, bearing a handful of seed;
He cometh *home* with shouting, bearing his sheaves."

Before leaving the Hebrew verb we must call attention to a serious error which has been perpetuated in the second commandment (Ex. xx. 5). The Revisers make the trifling change, "*upon* the third generation," for "*unto* the third generation." But they have neglected the Hebrew Hophal, and have left the rendering "nor serve them," when it is properly "be led to serve them." The original brings out beautifully the seductive nature of this image worship and a warning not to yield to its influence :

" Thou shalt not bow thyself unto them nor be led to serve them "

There are frequent mistakes in the pronoun. An example of misapprehension of the demonstrative is found in Psalm xxiv. 7-10 :

" Lift up your heads, O ye gates ;
And be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors :
And the King of glory shall come in.
Who is the King of glory ?

* We have given another rendering of the first line, in order to illustrate another common fault in the tendency to such prosaic renderings as the Revisers give in the first line.

The LORD strong and mighty,
 The LORD mighty in battle.
 Lift up your heads, O ye gates ;
 Yea, lift them up, ye everlasting doors :
 And the King of glory shall come in.
 Who is this King of glory ?
 The LORD of hosts,
 He is the King of glory."

The correct rendering is :

" Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
 Yea lift yourselves, ye everlasting doors,
 That the King of glory may come in.
 Who then is the King of glory ?
 Jahveh strong and mighty,
 Jahveh mighty in battle.
 Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
 Yea lift them, ye everlasting doors,
 That the King of glory may come in.
 Who is he, the King of glory ?
 Jahveh Sabaoth,
 He is the King of glory."

King James' Version renders "Who is *this* king of glory ?" in verses 8 and 10. In verse 8 the Hebrew is **מִי זֶה מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד**, and then in verse 10 **מִי הוּא זֶה מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד**. The English language is rich enough to express this difference, and without error. The Revisers escape the error of ver. 8 by omitting the demonstrative altogether. This is not a brilliant method of translation, to say the least. But in ver. 10 they simply perpetuate the error of King James' Version. The Revisers render as if the Hebrew stood **מִי מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד זֶה**. The demonstrative **זֶה** is used with the interrogative simply to emphasize it. This the Revisers recognize in Job xxviii. 20, where they render **אֵי זֶה** "whence then." In ver. 10 there are two clauses in apposition for greater emphasis, namely, **מִי הוּא זֶה**, "who is this one ?" or "who is he ?" and **מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד**, "the king of glory," namely, the one you are speaking about.*

There is also a constant neglect of the emphatic plural, which is one of the finest features of the Hebrew language. For example : "tabernacle" should be "great tabernacle" or "sacred tabernacle" (Ps. cxxxii. 5) ; "death" should be "martyr death" (Isa. liii. 9). It is childish in such cases to give the simple plural in the margin : "Heb. tabernacles," "deaths." So "crown" should be "crown of glory" (Job xxxi. 36) ; "Holy," "most holy" (Prov. ix. 10) ; "night," "dark night" (Song iii. 1) ; "Creator," "great creator" (Eccl. xii. 1) ; "higher than they" should be "the most high over them" (Eccl. v. 8). These are a few of a large number of similar examples.

* This piece gives us another example of the incorrect rendering of the reflexive, "lift yourselves," by a passive "be ye lift up," and also a neglect of the weak Vav of the final clause, which should be rendered "that the King of glory may come in."

In calling attention to these faults of the Revisers in neglecting to give a proper rendering of the Hebrew grammatical forms, we would not be understood to ignore the very large number of improvements that have been made by the Revisers in the changes from King James' Version. The Revision is far better than the old version. But we are compelled to express our conviction that the Revisers have not stood on the heights of Hebrew grammar. They have pursued a mediating and hesitating policy which contrasts unfavorably with the course of the New Testament Company. They have given us a revision which needs to be revised. The Revision that will be required to satisfy the twentieth century will be at a much greater stage of advancement beyond the present Revision, than the present Revision is beyond the version of King James.

IV.—THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE REVISERS.

The most important question relating to the Revision is, how far has it succeeded in improving the Theology of the English Old Testament so as to make it correspond more closely with the Hebrew originals? This is a vast subject. We must confine ourselves to a few particulars.

It is always a serious matter to translate the names of the deity from one language into another. Christian missionaries experience this difficulty wherever they go. The Hebrew language is peculiarly rich in its divine names. The common name for God is אלהים an emphatic plural, representing God as the supreme object of reverence; or, according to another derivation, as the strongest of all beings. It seems necessary to render this term by "God" in English, and yet the two words express very different conceptions of the deity. The Hebrew language has, moreover, a proper name, peculiar to God, יהוה. It represents the deity as an ever-living and acting person who enters into personal relations with his people, and would have them address him by a proper name in their personal approaches unto him in prayer and worship. The later Jews, influenced by feelings of profound reverence, which soon passed over into superstition, abstained from pronouncing this name, and substituted for it usually אדני "LORD"; or where אדני יהוה occurred, אלהים, "GOD." Hence the Massorettes pointed יהוה with the vowel-points which belong to אדני or אלהים, in order to indicate that these other names of God were to be used in place of יהוה; and so the original pronunciation of יהוה became lost. Hence in the LXX, and in most translations, "LORD," or its equivalent, is substituted for יהוה. The word "Jehovah" is sometimes used in English for this word. But it is a linguistic monstrosity. Scholars are generally agreed that the original pronunciation was *Jahveh* (the *j* pronounced as *y*). There can be little doubt that the substitution of "LORD" for *Jahveh* in the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the Jewish Rabbinical Theology, has been associated with an undue stress upon the *sovereignty* of God. The Old Testament revelation in its use of יהוה emphasized rather the *activity of the ever-living personal God of revelation*. The doctrine of God needs to be en-

riched at the present time by the enthronement of the idea of the *living* God to its supreme place in Biblical theology, and the dethronement of the idea of *divine sovereignty* from its usurped position in dogmatic theology. The American Revisers differ from the English Revisers here. The former wished to substitute *Jehovah* for LORD and GOD wherever it occurs in the Hebrew text. There can be no doubt that there would be an immense gain by such a substitution. The ordinary reader would then get the idea that *Jehovah* is a proper name, even if he did not grasp its more essential meaning. We do not know why the English Revisers preferred to adhere to the ancient substitute. They might well hesitate to commit the English Bible to such a grave error as would be involved in so extensive a use of the impossible word *Jehovah*. The Revisers ought to have risen to the occasion and performed their duty by using the correct form, *Jahveh*. It is true the word would be strange to the English reader, and would require explanation at first. But it would receive the well-nigh unanimous support of Hebrew scholars; and Christian people would prefer to know the real proper name of God, as given by himself to his people. In a few years it would become familiar as a household word, pregnant with the richest associations, and all that wealth of meaning which it conveys to the enrichment of theology and Christian life.

Besides these two great terms for God the Hebrews have many others which the English language ought to be able to express in some way to the English reader. We fail to see why the different names אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים should be rendered in the same way. There is another difficulty in the Old Testament use of אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים, in that they are not used exclusively for God. They are used for the gods of the heathen, for spiritual intelligences, and also for exalted persons. The same is true of אֲדֹנָי and בַּעַל, which mean "Lord." There can be no doubt that these two terms were originally used interchangeably for the true God of Israel, and that subsequently בַּעַל *Baal*, and בַּעַל־יָם "the great Baal," or "supreme Lord," were appropriated for the God of the Canaanites and discarded by Israel. The Revisers have correctly rendered Hosea ii. 16, so as to show this: "And it shall be at that day, saith the LORD (*Jahveh*), that thou shalt call me *Ishi* (my husband); and shalt call me no more *Baali* (my Lord). For I will take away the names of the Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be mentioned by their name."

The Revisers have fallen behind King James' Version in their apprehension of the use of the divine name אֱלֹהִים for angels and exalted persons. They show a disposition to exclude references to any other than the true God, so far as possible. In this spirit they have revised Psalm viii. 5. The Authorized Version properly followed the LXX, and other ancient authorities, in rendering: "For thou hast made him a little lower than the *angels*." This is given by the New Testament in Hebrews ii. 7, and is certainly correct. The Revisers do not make it intelligible when they render: "For thou hast made him but little lower than *God*." It seems to us that they

introduce into the Old Testament doctrine of God a conception which is alien to the usage of the Old Testament writers.

The doctrine of the attributes of God ought to have been enriched by rendering אֱמִתּוֹ "faithfulness" when it is associated with the divine mercy. The use of "lovingkindness" for "mercy," which is occasional in King James' Version, and still more frequent in the Revision, and which the American Revisers would substitute throughout, in our judgment is a sentimental weakening of a strong and all-important word. There are three synonymous words in Hebrew which lie at the basis of the doctrine of the divine grace. They are: (1) חַן = χάρις = grace; (2) חַסֵּד = ελεος = mercy; (3) רַחֲמִים = οὐκτιρμοί = compassion. These are such near equivalents in the three languages, that it is a great convenience to translate uniformly in the same way. We shall place the three most important passages side by side in order to show the inconsistency of the Revision, as well as King James' Version in this particular: (4) The word רַב = great or abundant, is also used in the three passages, and variously given in the Authorized Version and the Revision. We shall place the numbering after the words in order to show these words in their different renderings. King James' Version gives:

The LORD, the LORD God, merciful³ and gracious¹,
 Long suffering⁴ and abundant² in goodness and truth. (Ex. xxxiv. 6.)
 Have mercy¹ upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness²,
 According to the multitude⁴ of thy tender mercies³, blot out my transgressions.
 The LORD is merciful³ and gracious¹, (Ps. li. 1.)
 Slow to anger, and plenteous⁴ in mercy². (Ps. ciii. 8.)

The *Revisers* render:

The LORD, the LORD, a God full of compassion³ and gracious¹,
 Slow to anger, and plenteous⁴ in mercy² and truth; (Ex. xxxiv. 6.)
 Have mercy¹ upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness²:
 According to the multitude⁴ of thy tender mercies³ blot out my transgressions.
 The LORD is full of compassion³ and gracious¹, (Ps. li. 1.)
 Slow to anger and plenteous⁴ in mercy². (Ps. ciii. 8.)

The American Revisers would remove one inconsistency by substituting "lovingkindness" for "mercy" in Ex. xxxiv. 6, and Ps. ciii. 8, but they would leave the inconsistencies of Ps. li. 1 unchanged. We are well aware that any change in these comforting passages is disturbing to old associations. But it seems to us that these three passages, which are so closely related, ought to be harmonious, and that there is enrichment to faith and life in their sublime harmony. We venture therefore to render:

Jahveh, Jahveh, a compassionate and gracious God,
Slow to anger, and abundant in mercy and faithfulness. (Ex. xxxiv. 6.)

Be gracious unto me, O God, according to thy mercy,
According to the abundance of thy compassion, blot out my transgressions.
(Ps. li. 1.)

Jahveh is compassionate and gracious,
Slow to anger and abundant in mercy. (Ps. ciii. 8.)

It is well known to those who have carefully studied the institutions of the Old Testament religion that there is a considerable confusion in King James' Version with regard to these things, and that this has wrought mischief in several respects in Christian theology. The Revisers have corrected "tabernacle of the congregation" into "tent of meeting," and thereby removed the error of confounding the *משכן* with the *אהל מועד*; and also introduced a new idea to English readers, that the tent was the place where Jahveh met with his people in the graded access to them through the three veils which divided Israel into three orders of priesthood. The *מנחה* was rendered by the A. V. "meat-offering." The word "meat" has changed its meaning so as to indicate cooked flesh, whereas the *מנחה* always in the Mosaic ritual consisted of vegetable offerings. The Revisers have changed *meat* into *meal*. This is a tempting word-play, but is altogether inadequate to give the English reader a proper conception of the *מנחה*. This offering consisted sometimes of meal, but more frequently of bread, cakes, and wafers, and then again of the green grain or the grain roasted in the ear. We confess that we do not see our way to an entirely appropriate term. We should prefer "vegetable-offering" over against "animal-offering," which latter divides itself into the four varieties, *ערלה*, *זבח*, *חטאת*, and *אשם*. There is another difficulty in connection with *מנחה*, namely, that in Gen. iv. 4, 5, it is used with reference to the animal-offering of Abel as well as the fruit-offering of Cain. The Revisers moreover constantly render it by "offering" in the poetical books. We doubt the propriety of this. In many cases at least there is a reference to the vegetable-offering where they render "offering."

The Revisers disagree in their rendering of *אשם*. The American Revisers prefer to retain "trespass-offering"; but the English Revisers change into "guilt-offering." The essential idea of this offering is the giving satisfaction or compensation. And yet the Revisers allow the serious error of King James' Version in Isaiah liii. 10, "offering for sin," to stand in the text for the Hebrew *אשם*. They kindly, in the margin, inform the attentive reader that it is "Hebrew a guilt-offering." It seems to us that such conduct is altogether inexcusable. This essential Messianic passage ought to have been correctly rendered at any cost of popular or theological prejudice. There is also a mistake in rendering the reflexive *נפש*, as if it indicated the Messiah's soul as distinguished from his body, which is an altogether false conception. The proper rendering is, "When he himself offers a trespass-offering." The trespass-offering is most appropriate to the idea of sub-

stitution, and the representation of the Messiah as the sin-bearing victim suffering for the sins of his people, which is the great theme of the passage. The sin-offering has a very different meaning in the Hebrew ritual. It represents the atonement as accomplished by the application of the blood of the victim to the divine altar.

The rendering, "offering for sin," is connected with two other errors which ought to have been removed from this sublime passage. The one is in lii. 15, where they continue the rendering "sprinkle," as if the Messiah was to sprinkle many nations with his atoning blood. This doctrine is a true doctrine, but it is not conveyed in this passage. The marginal rendering, "startle many nations," is alone suited to the context. Moreover, it is not in accordance with the idea of either the sin-offering or the trespass-offering that the blood should be sprinkled on the people. In both these offerings the blood went to the altar of God. It belonged to the covenant sacrifice which is a species of the זֶבֶח, or peace-offering to sprinkle the blood upon the people, as in Ex. xxiv. 8. The Revisers thus help to perpetuate the error of confounding these three different offerings, the זֶבֶח, the הַטָּהַר, and the אֲשֵׁם. The final error, resulting from the two previous faults, is the rendering, "made intercession for the transgressors," liii. 12. This again is a true Messianic idea, but it is not taught in this passage. The verb is the same as that which is rendered in ver. 6, "laid on him the iniquity of us all." This idea of substitution is the essential idea of the whole passage. We would expect it to reappear again in the climax. This clause should be rendered, "acted as a substitute for the transgressors." The passage throughout has to do with the Messianic *victim*, and not with the Messianic *priest*.

The Revisers are also in constant error in rendering זֶבֶח "offering." It is ever the "peace-offering," whose essential feature is the communion-meal. This is the usual offering in the poetical and the prophetic books. It is an offering used among all civilized nations. There is a constant obscuring of the sense, therefore, when it is rendered by the general term, "offering." It naturally leads the ordinary English reader to think of the sin-offering, which he has been taught is the most important of all the Old Testament offerings.

The sin-offering culminates in the Old Testament in the great sin-offering of the day of atonement, described in Lev. xvi. This sin-offering has two sides; expressed by two goats. The one goat is used very much as in the ordinary sin-offering, save that its blood is sprinkled upon the propitiatory in the Most Holy place. The other goat is represented as bearing the sins of the people away from the sacred places to the wilderness. In connection with this latter goat the Hebrew word "*Azazel*" is used. There are several interpretations of it. King James' Version gives it as "scape-goat." The Revisers very properly have abandoned this interpretation, but they divide themselves into three parties in their interpretation of it. The majority of the English Revisers have left it untranslated in the text

of the Revision, which carries with it the interpretation that it is a name of the evil spirit. A minority of the English Revisers give us in the margin "dismissal." The American Revisers would read "removal." The word is an intensive abstract, and should be rendered "entire dismissal."

Our examination of the Revisers' interpretation of the sacrificial terms of the Old Testament religion shows that as a body they have not mastered the subject. Their revision increases the difficulties, which are already sufficiently great to the English reader in the so-called Authorized Version.

It would be profitable if we had sufficient space to consider the work of the Revisers in all the departments of Biblical theology, but we must confine ourselves in the remainder of this article to the single department of Eschatology.

We are met on the threshold by a very grave inconsistency with regard to the Hebrew word "*Sheol*," which means the under-world, the abode of departed spirits. In considerable sections of the Old Testament the English Revisers leave it untranslated, and then in a large number of other passages they translate it variously by "grave," "pit," and "hell." The American Revisers deserve great praise for insisting on a uniform rendering of this important word. They say in the Appendix, "Substitute 'Sheol' wherever it occurs in the Hebrew text, for the renderings 'the grave' 'the pit' and 'hell' and omit these renderings from the margin." "*Sheol*" in the Old Testament is the equivalent of "*Hades*" in the New Testament, and also of the English word "Hell" in its original meaning. It is a strange proceeding to represent the same place by "*Sheol*" in one part of the Bible, and "*Hades*" in another part.

It works a great confusion in dogmatic Eschatology to use the same word, "hell," for the abode of the lost in the intermediate state, and also for the final abode of those who are condemned in the last great day of judgment. The Revisers might have found a proper English word for the abode of departed spirits. Not a few scholars have used the term "under-world." There are grave objections to the renderings, "pit" (Deut. xxxii. 22), "grave" (Is. xxxviii. 10), and "hell" (Jonah ii. 2). In our judgment the renderings involve false interpretations of these passages. The same confusion is found in the use of the Hebrew term for departed spirits, "*Rephaim*." This is sometimes left untranslated; sometimes rendered "the dead," "the deceased," and so on. The meaning is clear enough. It indicates the shades, ghosts, or spirits of the dead.

The American Revisers also deserve credit for insisting upon the rendering, "without my flesh shall I see God," in Job xix. 26. The English Revisers have weakly yielded to the ancient interpretation which would derive the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh from this passage. Accordingly, they render, "from my flesh shall I see God," and place in the margin, "without my flesh." There can be little doubt that this passage teaches the beatific vision of God after death in the disembodied state. It does not help, but rather weakens the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body to bring such a passage as this to sustain it. It is vastly richer and

more comforting to Christian experience to find here such a strong assurance of the enjoyment of the presence and favor of God in the abode of the dead.

It is quite evident that in the whole department of Biblical Theology the Revision has failed to adequately represent the original text.

If we had the space to examine the Revision in the departments of Biblical History, Geography, and Archæology, we should find more to praise and less to condemn, but we must leave this to others.

The Revision is also an improvement upon the Version of King James, in its closer adherence to the principles of the grammatico-historical exegesis, but it is less successful in the higher fields of doctrinal and practical interpretation. All translations are indeed interpretations of the originals. As we have seen, exact reproduction is impossible. It is only through the interpretation of the Revisers that we get their rendering of the original Scriptures. Luther and Tyndale were model translators of the Scriptures, because they appropriated their *essential spirit and life*. They were more anxious for the substance than the form, more careful for the spirit of the originals than the letter; and they gave to the people of Germany and Great Britain not mere literal translations, but translations animate with the very life and soul of the original texts. This feature makes them precious to the Protestant world. They are, indeed, Protestant Bibles—translations conceived and produced in the essential Protestant spirit. It is impossible for any body of men, however intelligent or pious, to do such work as this. The very act of voting and deciding by a majority pinches the spirit of the translation and makes the work prosaic and dull. There is too much of the mechanical, artificial, and pedantic in the work of revision by votes. The best of King James' Version is that which came from Tyndale. The successive revisions of Tyndale, which resulted in the Authorized Version, were all made in the heroic age of Protestantism; while the spirit of Tyndale, the great English Reformer, dominated the Revisers.

We are so far removed from the age of Tyndale, that it is impossible to revise King James' Version in the same spirit and on the same principles. It is like putting new wine into old skins, to mingle the interpretation of the 19th century with that of the 16th century. There is ground for the objection of the Roman Catholics to King James' Version and Luther's Version that they are Protestant versions. There can be no doubt of it. No Roman Catholic could remain a Roman Catholic with these versions in his hands. As Protestantism is an advance upon Romanism in its apprehension of the essential truths and spirit of the Scriptures, so these translations by the great Protestant Reformers, Luther and Tyndale, express the great principles of Protestantism and are the bulwarks of Protestantism.

There is also ground for the objection of the Rabbinical Jews, that the Old Testament in King James' Version is a Christian book and not a Jewish book. The Christian Hebrew scholar translates the Old Testament as a Christian Old Testament, and conceives that it is prophetic of Christi-

anity. And the Christian scholar is right. The Rabbinical scholar cannot understand the Old Testament until he becomes a Christian. The Roman Catholic will never understand the New Testament in its higher doctrines until he becomes a Protestant. It would, in our judgment, be destructive to Romanism and to Judaism to use King James' Version or the Revised English Version of the Bible as their Bible.

It seems to us, therefore, extremely doubtful whether any body of Christian scholars can at the present time give a satisfactory revision of the English Bible. The Christian public want to know the real truth of God and will not be satisfied with compromises of scholars whether they compromise with one another or with popular prejudice and error. When the Holy Spirit comes upon the Church, to enable it to understand the Scriptures and to arouse it to a new advance in doctrine and life, then a new Tyndale and a new Luther will rise up to give us new translations of the Scriptures to suit the higher faith and life of the Church. Then, as the work of Jerome passed over into that of Luther and Tyndale, the work of these heroes of Protestantism will pass over into the work of still greater heroes of a better age of the world. In view of the Prophecies of Scripture, it is not too much to hope that then the enmity of Roman Catholic and Protestant may depart; that the Jew may rise from the grave of centuries and recognize in a higher and nobler Christianity the historical realization of Judaism; and that one Bible may satisfy the cravings of all devout souls.

C. A. BRIGGS.

New York.