

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 26.—April, 1886.

I.

THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE A PROOF OF
ITS DIVINE ORIGIN.

SILENCE is sometimes big with testimony. Evidence does not all get syllabled in speech. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language." The praise does not get spoken audibly to the ear of men; but the swinging worlds are forever testifying to the "eternal power and divinity" of Him who fashioned them in the past, and holds them still in his resistless and measureless leash. All the starry hosts of the sky are "moving their rounds in silent rhythm and inaudible song."

Robert Hall has a sermon on the text: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing,"* in which he says it is difficult to determine whether the glory of God appears more in what He displays or in what He conceals. "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." Hiding, while yet revealing, He, in the very revelation, has given proof of the divinity that shaped it by the silences that thunder along the sacred text.

It would ill befit silence to claim for it everywhere the place of "Sir Oracle." Silence is not always a pearl of great price. It is not a pearl of any price when enforced by ignorance. It must be "cunning in dumbness"—not dumb from mere stupidity. Its worth lies in its withholding speech with a purpose, and for some high end. When it is of necessity, because of the utter paucity of its own

* Works of Robert Hall, London, 1845, vol. vi.

VI.

THE CRITICS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE Revised Version of the Old Testament has now been nearly a year before the public, during which it has been freely criticised and with no small diversity of judgment among its critics. It is proper that it should be narrowly scanned, that it should be estimated from every possible point of view, and that its merits and demerits should be carefully weighed. No one can object to the freest expression of opinion on the part of those competent to judge. Even censorious and captious fault-finding and gratuitous asperities may be tolerated, if they lay bare any real deficiencies or suggest any desirable improvements.

The Authorized Version has a prestige and there are solid advantages attaching to its employment which are not to be lightly thrown away. It has been hallowed by the use of two centuries and three-quarters. It is now the common heritage of the English-speaking world, accepted by all Protestant denominations, the basis of our entire religious and theological literature, endeared to all who love the word of God by the most sacred and tender associations, and entwined with every devout feeling of their hearts and with their whole spiritual life. It is, moreover, universally confessed to be the best popular version of the Scriptures ever prepared in any language. Nothing can justify the displacement of this version by the recent Revision unless there be some solid compensating advantage in the way of a more fitting and adequate expression of the inspired word; and unless the progress made in this respect is reasonably correspondent with the present more advanced state of sacred learning.

I shall not pretend to forecast the ultimate judgment of Christian scholars and of the public at large as to the adoption of the Revision. If we are to judge by the history of the Authorized Version itself, its adoption, should this be the final issue, could only be expected to take place gradually, as it came to be better appreciated upon actual trial, and would not be accomplished in a single generation. Yet if an augury may be taken from the three articles which have succes-

sively appeared on the subject in this REVIEW, the prospect is not unfavorable. The fierce onslaught in the first article was followed by courteous and respectful treatment in the second, and this by positive commendation in the third.

No critical estimate of any production is worth having unless it proceeds upon a proper standard of judgment. Every work must be tested by its fitness for the purpose intended ; and it is not to be disparaged because it fails to accomplish ends which are foreign to its legitimate design. The task set before the Revisers was to incorporate the ascertained results of modern Biblical scholarship and at the same time to sacrifice nothing that is valuable in the Authorized Version. This is what was proposed in their original appointment. This is what the Christian public expected of them. This is what they have conscientiously and to the best of their ability endeavored to do. This is the only responsibility to which they can be held. And the only fair question in judging of their labors is, How far have they been successful in doing what they undertook ?

It was not their province to advance Biblical scholarship beyond its present status, whether by the production of a revised text for which the materials do not exist, or in any other way ; nor to introduce the brilliant and plausible conjectures of individual scholars which have not found general acceptance ; but, as Principal Caven judiciously phrases it (PRES. REV., Jan., '86, p. 68), " to put the people in possession of the well-ascertained results of Biblical scholarship so far as these bear upon the translation of the Scriptures." The venerable Dr. Charles Hodge, in response to a note of inquiry addressed to him at the outset of this work, thus expressed himself : " The Church is bound not to misrepresent the Scriptures, and therefore should correct all acknowledged errors in the translation which it gives to the people. They should, however, be errors which are acknowledged to be such not by this or that scholar, or this or that class of interpreters, but by the great body of competent judges of every class."

No one will expect absolute perfection in a work of this description or imagine that it is attainable. I presume that the Revisers would not hesitate to confess that they have not come up to their own ideal. No doubt every one of them could point out blemishes which he regrets ; some that are due to oversight, a greater number where much labor has been spent without after all reaching a perfectly satisfactory result.

It is very easy to pick flaws. It is very easy to array reasons, which at first sight seem plausible, against many of the changes which have been made as well as against many of the old renderings

which have been retained. There are arguments *pro* and *con* in a multitude of instances ; there is a diversity of judgments ; there is a conflict of authorities. What the Revisers had to do was patiently to weigh all this, and then decide each case in accordance with the considerations which seemed to them preponderating. It is impossible that every one should find that his judgment or fancy has been suited in the treatment of all passages. The best thing that could be done toward making it universally acceptable was by a liberal use of the margin. Renderings that have been urged by any respectable body of scholars will commonly be found either in the text of the Revision or in the margin. And it should be remembered that the latter belongs to the Revision equally with the former. In many instances in which objection is made to the renderings adopted, the very thing which the objector clamors for is before his eyes in the margin, and if some find fault that it is put there rather than in the text, a larger number might have found fault, and with greater reason, had the text and margin been reversed.

The margin is necessarily somewhat miscellaneous. There was no help for it. As a rule the preferred rendering went into the text. But this preference might be accorded to it for any one of several reasons. In most instances this was due to its more exact correspondence with the Hebrew ; or though less strictly accurate, it may have been sufficiently so to yield the substantial sense, and at the same time more intelligible, or more familiar or more rhythmical or better English, all which are good grounds for preference in a popular version where nothing really important is sacrificed in the meaning. Moreover, the margin became to some extent a repository of American suggestions. While many of these were adopted into the text in form or in substance, a considerable proportion were thrown into the margin as alternative renderings.

Dr. Briggs doubts whether a satisfactory revision of the English Scriptures can be made until a more propitious era.

"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 the 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 of 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 the enmity of Roman Catholic and Protestant may depart ; the Jew may rise from the grave of centuries and recognize in a higher and nobler Christianity the historical realization of Judaism ; and one Bible may satisfy the cravings of all devout souls."—PRES. REV., July, '85, p. 533.

But until that devoutly to be desired millennium is introduced and the new Tyndale and Luther make their appearance, we must to some

extent put up with compromises. King James's version, which has so long fed the life and faith of English-speaking Christians, was the fruit of compromise. Dr. Burgon, if he was the author of the critique in the *Quarterly Review* for last October, would plainly not be satisfied with any version which would suit Dr. Briggs; nor *vice versa*. If they meet at all on common ground there must be a compromise somewhere. Or every man must have his own version to suit himself. This probably would, in the opinion of Dr. Briggs, be the best thing, next to his wished-for consummation. He regards an authorized version as "hurtful and not helpful to the study of the Scriptures" (PRES. REV., p. 489), and would even count the Revision "a blessing" if it "should succeed in breaking down the slavish adhesion to the version of King James . . . without assuming its place."

The incompetency of a critic to judge of the Revision, who thus at the start confesses himself out of sympathy with the very end proposed, is absolute. He ridicules "revision by votes," "deciding by a majority" (p. 532), as if a company of scholars could work together in any other way, or as if the conjoint action of numbers was not the best method of avoiding individual eccentricities or pet fancies, and of securing the average result of the best scholarship. He derides the measures devised to guard the Authorized Version from unnecessary change, and to keep it intact in form and substance except so far as is demanded by faithfulness to the original. Conservatism is to him the greatest of bugbears. And in his own renderings, which seem to be presented as models, so far from adhering to the style or preserving the flavor of the Authorized Version, he departs from it as of set purpose in the most gratuitous and uncalled-for manner. How far he is from the conception of what is demanded in a version for general use, is apparent from his proposal to substitute "Jahveh" for "Jehovah" throughout the Old Testament (p. 527). He would be willing to shock the devout feelings of every worshipper by offering what is to them an unheard-of and unmeaning combination of sounds for a name which has the most sacred associations and whose utterance awakens their adoring homage; and this from a pedantic regard to exact transliteration, which is not exact after all, and which by parity of reasoning would compel us to say "Firenze" for "Florence," and "Deutschland" for "Germany."

But while denying the right of those to sit in judgment on the Revision and to pronounce oracularly on its merits, who are not in accord with the enterprise itself as set forth by its projectors or with the general public who have expectantly awaited its completion, we hold ourselves bound to consider fairly and dispassionately the vari-

ous grounds of objection which have been urged from any respectable quarter. They divide themselves into four classes : 1, alleged mistakes in Hebrew prosody ; 2, mistakes of translation ; 3, inaccuracy of text ; and 4, errors in theology.

Dr. Briggs calls the Revisers to account for their deficiencies in Hebrew prosody (p. 497). He first charges " a grave inconsistency in their treatment of Hebrew poetry." The poetical books are arranged in parallelisms ; " and also a number of the most important pieces of poetry in the historical books and a few pieces in the prophetic books," but not the prophets nor the poetical sections of Ecclesiastes, " and they leave a considerable portion of the poetry of the historical books as if it were prose." This last must have occurred by an altogether unintentional oversight. It was simply because they could not anticipate the Doctor's recent discovery that the narratives of the creation and of the fall in Genesis were poems.* They erred with the rest of the world in mistaking them for prose, and printed them accordingly. All the rest of the poetry in the historical books, it is believed, is dealt with as such, unless indeed farther discoveries of the same kind have been made more recently still.

In the prophets they followed good precedents, and they had excellent reasons for so doing. Delitzsch in his commentary takes great pains to exhibit the parallelisms of the Psalms, but with the exception of the major portion of ch. 12, ch. 27 : 2-5, and Hezekiah's psalm 38 : 10-20, the entire book of Isaiah, even in its most elevated and impassioned parts, and those in which the structure is most regular and rhythmical, is printed in a manner not distinguishable from ordinary prose. Ewald, who paid the most elaborate attention to the subject of Hebrew poetry in its principles and the details of their application, arranged the poetical books and the poetic sections of the historical books in parallels, but, with the exception of a few brief and scattered passages, the prophets are printed as prose,†

* PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, pp. 522, 523. *The Old Testament Student* for April, 1884. *The Reformed Quarterly Review* for July, 1885.

† Ewald and Delitzsch agree in finding a poetic passage at the beginning of Isa. 12, and another at the end, separated by the prosaic verse 3. Ewald places in parallelisms the triumphal songs over Babylon's downfall, Isa. 14 : 4-21, Hezekiah's psalm 38 : 10, etc., also ch. 47 and 60, besides various other scraps, viz. : 1 : 21 ; 5 : 1, 2 ; 6 : 3, 9 ; 26 : 1, 2 ; 27 : 3-5 ; 42 : 10-13 ; 49 : 13 ; 54 : 1 ; 66 : 10, 11. So in Jeremiah parts of 33 : 11 and 38 : 22. In Ezekiel 7 : 10-14 ; 19 : 2-14 ; 21 : 9-17 ; 26 : 17, 18. In Daniel 2 : 26-23. So Amos 5 : 2, Jonah 2 : 2-9, Micah 2 : 4, Habakkuk 2 : 5, ch. 3, Zeph. 2 : 15. With these exceptions the prophetic books are printed solidly as prose, but with two vertical strokes marking the end of each verse, and single strokes dividing it into two, and sometimes three, clauses, mostly at the place of Athnahh or the leading disjunctives. The members of the verse thus formed are so long that Umbreit, who presents the

rhythmical, and balanced indeed as belonging to the elevated and oratorical style, but still clearly distinguishable from poetry in the proper sense. Ewald* says, in justification of his mode of exhibiting the prophets in non-poetic form :

“ Whilst it can be shown in the purely poetic books that they were originally written in separate clauses, no trace can be found of such a mode of writing the prophetic books ; so that we must conclude that antiquity has in this respect again definitely distinguished the prophetic compositions from proper poems. Modern German translators have indeed written the prophetic verse just as the poetic in ever separate clauses, but have thus introduced an innovation, which confuses an essential distinction valid with the ancients, and brings something quite foreign into the prophetic words.”

The propriety and even necessity of following the example of Ewald and Delitzsch in this matter further appears from the immense and ever-changing variety which characterizes the prophetic or oratorical style. This may express itself in pure poetic form with nicely-balanced parallels, but more frequently with a partial or total neglect of the correspondence of clauses, even in its most earnest and glowing periods, while it may likewise sink into the quiet and even flow of simple discourse. The attempt sharply to discriminate between its more and less elevated portions for the sake of presenting the one as poetry and the other as prose, would be introducing an unfounded distinction, which could only confuse instead of helping the ordinary reader, and this without the slightest countervailing advantage. And the futility of such an attempt is sufficiently illustrated by the wide divergence between those who have made it. The scheme of parallel clauses could not by possibility be carried through the prophets, except on the machine theory of Hebrew verse that a given number of words or accents may be held to constitute a line. And the case is the same with the book of Ecclesiastes. It passes from poetry to prose by insensible gradations, so that the transition cannot be accurately indicated in all cases, and no advantage would arise from marking it, even if this were possible.†

prophets almost continuously in parallelisms, commonly makes two or three lines out of each. Ewald carries these vertical strokes, indicative of balanced members, through some most incorrigibly prosaic passages, *e. g.*, Jer. ch. 27, 34 : 13-22 ; 35 : 13-19 ; 36 : 29-31 ; 44 : 2-14, 25-30 ; Ezek., ch. 40-48 ; Zech., 1-6 ; Dan., ch. 2-12. Hitzig presents Isaiah as poetry, and for the most part Jer., ch. 1-25. He prints as prose Jer., ch. 26-29, 34-45, the whole of Ezekiel except ch. 7, 15 : 1-5 and 19 : 2 ff ; also nearly the whole of Hosea and Zechariah, ch. 1-8.

* Die Propheten d. alten Bundes, 2d edit., vol. i., p. 58.

† Ewald prints the following paragraphs and verses of Ecclesiastes as poetry (and all the rest as prose) : 1 : 1-8, 15, 18 ; 2 : 2, 11 (last half), 14 (first half) ; 3 : 1-9, 15, 19, 20 ; 4 : 5, 6 ; 5 : 3, 7 (except last clause), 10 (except last clause), 14 ; 6 : 4, 5 ; 7 : 7, 12, 19, 29 (except first clause) ; 8 : 1 (last half), 5 ; 9 : 4, 17, 18 ; 10 : 1, 2, 6, 8-13, 18, 20 (last half) ; 11 : 4, 10 ; 12 : 2, 6, 8. Whatever advantage the student of Hebrew verse might gain under such distinguished guidance from having his attention specially directed to these

It is further charged that where the Revisers do undertake to exhibit the parallelisms, they make mistakes. I have no hesitation in conceding that Dr. B. is correct in Job 14 : 7. His division of this verse is the same that was proposed by the American Company in their metrical arrangement of this book, the only one in fact which they did divide up independently in this manner. Their suggestion was not accepted and they thought the matter too trivial to insist upon. I will make a like admission in regard to Gen. 49 : 3 ; but not Ps. 8 : 2. If the Revisers " spoil " it " by their arrangement," so do Hitzig, Hupfeld, Delitzsch (in both editions) and Ewald (in his first), with whom they precisely agree ; Ewald's second edition divides as Dr. B. In Ps. 45 : 3 the Revisers are with Hitzig, Hupfeld, Delitzsch, Ewald. " The striking harmony of the music of the words as well as the parallelism " seem to have been lost upon others as well as the Revisers. In Ex. 15 they are with Ewald, notwithstanding the fact that " any one can see that there is no poetry in such an arrangement." Dr. B. here follows Dillmann's scheme of three stanzas of 6, 12 and 18 lines, though their reckoning of the accents does not agree, Dr. B. having imported an extra quantity of Makkephs into the text to make out his " tetrameter."

Next comes the song of Deborah, Judg. 5, which is transcribed at length perhaps to exhibit the improved translation* which is given,

isolated passages, I cannot imagine that it could be of the slightest profit to ordinary readers of the Bible, or that it could be other than a hindrance. Delitzsch says in the introductory remarks upon this book in his Commentary, p. 208 : " The symmetry of clauses is in large part lacking in Koheleth. It is written almost throughout in oratorical prose, which winds off its instructive material in a rectilinear direction, in sections without symmetry of clauses." Umbreit differs from the majority of commentators in arranging the entire book in parallel clauses, though occasionally with an immensely long, dragging line. Dr. Tayler Lewis did the same (in Lange's Commentary), but his success is chiefly owing to the liberty which he exercised in framing his choice and metrical diction, which is of course inadmissible in strict translation.

* So far as these improved renderings consist in the substitution of equivalent words or phrases, such as " volunteered " for " offered themselves willingly " and the like ; and so far as concerns the general style and finish of the language in all the passages translated, the case may be submitted without argument to any competent judge of good English. Many of the other corrections made are of such a trivial nature that it is difficult to treat them with any show of respect. " The Revisers violate Hebrew grammar by rendering לֹא with the jussive, as if it were לֹא with the indicative," p. 499, *note*. Very well : Gen. 49 : 4 should accordingly be translated, not as Dr. B. has it, " excel not," which is not the meaning, but as it is in the margin of the Revision, " have not thou the excellency." But inasmuch as this, while imperative in form, was designed to express the certain and inevitable future, the true sense is best conveyed by the rendering in the text, " thou shalt not have the excellency." This might be inadmissible in a Hebrew class-room, where exactness of form is insisted on, but it is nevertheless the proper interpretation of the thought. The comment on Ex. 15, p. 501, *note*, begins with a perfectly gratuitous fling. " They ought to have seen that וַיִּכְרַת in line 1 was

perhaps to afford ocular demonstration "that it is composed of three great strophes of thirty lines each." The appearance of numerical symmetry is brought about by detaching vs. 21*b*, 22, from the preceding, to which they properly belong, and attaching them to the third stanza, with which they have no affinity. Such long unwieldy stanzas have no inherent probability, are contrary to the analogy of what is commonly attributed to Hebrew verse, and in this particular instance they have no superior claims above other schemes which have been proposed, and are, to say the least, quite as plausible and

shortened from וַיִּרְתֵּי in order to combination with הָ." How does it appear that they did not see it? Dr. B.'s rendering of the word and that of the Revisers are *verbatim et literatim* the same. "They neglect the weak Vavs with the imperfects, which express purpose in line 2, and render them as futures." On the basis of a rule, which does not apply to the case, he would render "The same is my God that I may glorify him," instead of "This is my God and I will praise him." It is obvious to what an extent the sense is weakened by the dependent construction. Ewald and Dillmann are here under the same condemnation as the Revisers.—Judg. 5 : 6, p. 502, *note*. "אֲרוֹחַי should be 'caravans' as in the margin." So he can find there the rendering that he prefers. But Ewald, Bertheau, Bachmann render as in the text of the Revision, and they do not sanction his proposal to eject the same word from the next clause, because "it makes the line too long."—v. 8. The substitution of "new rulers" for "new gods" אֱלֹהִים is neither necessary nor justifiable, though it has the sanction of Ewald and Bertheau. "The Revisers have transposed 'sing ye' from line 26 to line 24, destroying the emphasis." It is only necessary to read ver. 10 in the Revision and as given by Dr. B. in order to see whose rendering is to be preferred.—The change proposed in the Massoretic pointing of v. 13 is needless, as is shown by the American rendering, which is that of Bachmann, and is more vigorous and poetic and corresponds better with the imperatives of ver. 12. "The absence of the preposition before וְ" cannot be satisfactorily explained by the American Revisers." The preposition is no more required by their view of the passage than it is by that of the British Revisers, who follow Ewald and Bertheau. "The Revisers entirely ignore the change of tenses in v. 17, *seq.*, and translate the imperfect and perfect as if they were alike." Dr. B. does precisely the same thing himself in v. 6. And the distinction which he makes here, while warranted by the Hebrew form, really adds nothing to the sense. "Why did he remain" and "Why was he remaining?" in this instance amount practically to the same thing.—His comment on v. 19 is most extraordinary: "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." As if it made the slightest difference except in the smoothness of the English whether we say "The kings came, they fought," or "The kings came and fought." And it is the same with the cavils on vs. 25, 26.—He objects to "ancient river," v. 21, but that is the meaning given by the best lexicons; and even if another sense is to be sought for this word, which occurs but this once, it does not follow that it must mean "encounters, battles." Ewald, at least, thought not.—For "curse bitterly," v. 23, he would translate "curse forever," which is ambiguous. It most naturally means "pronounce a curse that shall last forever," which has no advantage over the Revisers' rendering in expressing the emphasis where the infinitive follows the finite form. If it means "be forever cursing," and he insists that this is the only possible sense of such a combination, he is respectfully referred to Ewald's Grammar, § 280, *b*. The conjectural change of text in v. 30 is needless.

symmetrical. Delitzsch, *Psalms*¹ II., p. 374, finds fifteen stanzas of six lines each. Bertheau divides into three sections, each having three stanzas of three verses each, in which the lines are disposed according to the following scheme 9, 11, 9—9, 11, 9—9, 9, 11. Ewald nine stanzas of nine lines each. Köster eight stanzas of three or four verses, combined into three sections, each of which is preceded by an introductory verse. Bachmann eight stanzas of varying length. It would be foreign to our present purpose to discuss the merits of these several schemes. They cannot all be correct; and that of Dr. B. is not so obviously and necessarily the true one as to justify the positive air with which it is affirmed as unquestionable.

In regard to the parallelisms, there are in these ninety lines four deviations from those given in the Revision. In vs. 2, 9 the Revisers put Bless ye the LORD "in separate lines destroying the rhythm"; so do Ewald and Bachmann: Bertheau agrees with Dr. B. In ver. 13 "the lines should be reconstructed"; the Revisers here have Ewald, Bachmann, and Bertheau all on their side. In vs. 15, 16, Dr. B. has the sanction of Ewald in uniting two of the Revisers' lines into one; Bachmann is with the Revisers; Bertheau and the traditional mode of writing the song are with them in ver. 15, but with Dr. B. in ver. 16. In ver. 20 the Revisers are sustained by Ewald, Bachmann, and Bertheau.

But "the worst work of all" "is in the pentameters." In Ps. 19: 11-14, where the Revisers "have entirely misrepresented the movement," Delitzsch divides as Dr. B., so does Ewald² in ver. 13. Hupfeld, Hitzig, and Ewald agree with the Revisers in vs. 11, 12. Ewald² agrees with them in the arrangement of ver. 14, which Dr. B. calls "utterly perverse." Hupfeld, Hitzig, and Ewald¹ agree more nearly with them than with Dr. B. in vs. 13, 14. The division of ver. 14 in the Revision was rendered necessary by a very proper reluctance to alter a familiar and favorite verse, in which the sense of the original is admirably expressed, for the mere sake of conforming the order of the words to that of the Hebrew. In Ps. 110: 1-3 Ewald and Hitzig are with the Revisers; Hupfeld¹ with Dr. B., but in the second edition, edited by Riehm, the latter declares himself on the side of the Revisers.* Delitzsch breaks each of Dr. B.'s lines in two, and puts the semicolon in its proper place. In Ps. 123 Hitzig is with the Revisers; so are Hupfeld and Ewald, except in the last line. Delitzsch is with Dr. B. In Isa. 38: 10 the Revisers, "in following the Massoretic accents, have mistaken the structure of the pentameter"; Ewald, Delitzsch, and Hitzig have done the same.

* The American Appendix here accords with Dr. B. by placing the semicolon where he does, but in my judgment makes a mistake in so doing.

The Revisers are censured in Ps. 144 for making "the last four lines into five" (*Hebraica* for January, 1886). Hupfeld and Hitzig do the same. Delitzsch agrees with Dr. B. in the number of his lines, but divides them differently. Ewald divides as Dr. B. The Revisers' arrangement of Ps. 87 is substantially confirmed by Ewald, Hitzig, and Delitzsch; and even Hupfeld, whom Dr. B. follows in his disregard of the accents and change of the text, does not agree with him in the lines. Where such divergences, as have been exhibited above, are to be found among the most distinguished scholars, it might be reasonable to infer that there is an element of uncertainty in the case, and a measure of modesty and toleration might be expected in a critic. The Revisers have not been servile copyists. They have used their own independent judgment. But from first to last their decisions in this matter are supported by the very best authorities in Germany; and the English Company included within itself the best authorities in Great Britain. Dr. B.'s attention was called to this shortly after the appearance of his article. He replied with a slur upon English scholarship in this department, and added: "As for Hupfeld, Ewald, and Delitzsch, Dr. Green is mistaken. The Revisers have not followed them." (*The Evangelist* for July 30, 1885.) Arraigning the Revision for defective scholarship, where it is found in such company, as has already been shown in detail, simply because it does not square with a theory of Hebrew verse, in which Dr. B. stands alone, has in it a touch of the heroic. The allegation that the Revisers have perhaps "done more harm than good in their attempt to give English readers an idea of Hebrew poetry" (p. 507) betrays a misconception of their aim in this whole matter, which was not to teach the structure of Hebrew verse, but to direct attention to the parallel or manifold expression of the thought, which often sheds much light upon its meaning. In many of Dr. B.'s lines this would be lost unless the cæsure was indicated likewise, which would spoil the appearance of the page.

This whole matter, after all, is one of very inferior consequence, and so much space would not have been devoted to it here but for the great ado made over it for so slight cause. We pass to alleged mistakes of translation. There are two conceptions of the work of rendering from one language into another, that of the pedant and that of the genuine translator. The outward form may be pressed for the sake of giving precise equivalents to every word and inflection, however this may disregard the best usage of the language into which the translation is made. Or the aim may be to give an exact expression of the thought of the original and to transfer its true spirit,

even though this should involve such modifications of form as the ideas and usage of the two languages may severally require. The most of Dr. B.'s strictures are based upon the former idea ; though he himself (PRES. REV., p. 490,) censures the New Testament Revisers for "their anxiety to give the literal rendering when they ought to have paraphrased in order to give the essential meaning." Participles must always be translated by participles. Each verbal form must have its peculiar rendering, no matter whether any added force or clearness results, and no matter how awkward the sentence becomes, or how far it departs from good English usage. The aim of the Revisers has been to adhere to the form of the original as far as is consistent with the proper genius of the English language, but to make the adequate expression of the thought their main concern, to which the form shall always be held subordinate. This is particularly the case in regard to the Hebrew tenses, which are based on a peculiar conception of time, and are often used in a manner so foreign to our usages and ideas that it is impossible to represent by any translation all the niceties which they involve to a reader of the original ; and the attempt to reproduce these will only confuse and perplex the reader without the slightest advantage. The case is very different in the New Testament. The Greek is a language kindred to our own, and its tenses and moods have their definite equivalents among ourselves. The Greek conception of time is substantially identical with ours and admits of being exactly transferred. But in many Hebrew passages, particularly in the Psalms, the tenses are intermingled in a manner which imparts a vividness and vivacity to the original that cannot possibly be transferred to an English version by any manipulation of tense forms.

The Hebrew participle when denoting present time and used predicatively, is properly expressed by the present tense of the verb in English. This is the usage of our version, from which there was no occasion to depart, and it corresponds in this respect with the prevalent style of the best writers. "He cometh . . . is like . . . standeth," etc., as aptly express the participles of Solomon's Song 2 : 8, 9 as Dr. B.'s "is coming," "is coming like," which he acknowledges to be paraphrastic, and "is standing" ; they are translated as in the Revision by Delitzsch, Ewald, Döpke, Renan, Hengstenberg, Umbreit, Meier, and I do not know by how many beside. "Deep calleth unto deep," Ps. 42 : 7, is as accurate as Dr. B.'s "is calling." Delitzsch, Hupfeld, Ewald, Hitzig, and the rest have "Fluth ruft der Fluth." And the contrast with the perfect "are gone" in the next line is as marked as with Dr. B.'s "have gone," which is foreign to the idiom of our version. What advantage there would be in

changing "The rulers take counsel together," Ps. 2 : 2, to "do take," or, ver. 3, "Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us," to "let us cast," it is difficult to imagine. For "He that sitteth in the heavens," ver. 4, Dr. B. would substitute "He that is enthroned in heaven," and he remarks that this verb "has the pregnant meaning 'sit enthroned' frequently in the Old Testament. The Revisers ignore it." God's sitting in the heavens can have no other meaning than his being enthroned there. In connections where this is not so obvious it is expressed in the Revision, as Ps. 9 : 7, 29 : 10 and in the margin of Ps. 22 : 3, 102 : 12. "Yet I have set my king," ver. 6, Dr. B. says ought to be "verily I even I have set my king." "The pronoun is employed before the verb and should be expressed in English by repeating the subject. The vav that precedes is the vav of the oath or solemn assertion. It is not 'but' or 'yet,' but rather 'yea' or 'verily.'" Neither Delitzsch, Hupfeld, Hitzig, nor Ewald agree with Dr. B. in the sense imputed to vav, nor in the repetition of the pronoun. The clause opposes what God has done to what the rebellious nations are doing ; and the contrast suggested by the particle 'yet' (Germ. *doch*) throws an emphasis upon the pronoun in English correspondent with that of the Hebrew.

He objects that while most of the verbs in Ps. 23 are correctly rendered as presents, the future is used in several instances, though "the Hebrew tense is the same." But in ver. 6 the explicit reference to the future makes this necessary. It is an incorrect use of language to say with Prof. B., "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." Accordingly Delitzsch, Hitzig, and Ewald, who use the present throughout the rest of the Psalm, employ the future in one or both clauses of this verse. In ver. 1 for "I shall not want" he would render "I want not." Either is correct, but the former seems preferable as more comprehensive ; it really means "I do not and shall not want." It represents, as Dr. B. correctly says, "a present and abiding experience." Hupfeld translates not only this verse but the entire Psalm as future.*

* The incomparable rendering of this Psalm in the A. V. is retained unaltered in the Revision. Where there is a possibility of misconception it is corrected in the margin. Dr. B.'s substitution of "me myself he restoreth" for "he restoreth my soul" mistakes the point of the emphasis. It does not mean "me myself" as distinguished from some one else. It is 'my soul' in the familiar sense, in which this word is used throughout the Old Testament, my conscious sentient being, my life, that is invigorated. Delitzsch, Hitzig, Hupfeld, and Ewald all have "Meine Seele." The assertion that "the Revisers take וְשָׁכַחְתִּי (ver. 6) as the perfect with וְ consec." is entirely gratuitous. They give the sense correctly upon any explanation of the form.

It surely would be no improvement to change the vigorous and exact rendering of Num. 10 : 35, " Rise up, O Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered," into that of Dr. B., " that thine enemies may be scattered." The latter expresses purpose, to be sure, but the former implies it equally well, and in addition declares the result. That Moses said this not once merely but whenever the ark set forward or rested, is so plain from the connection that it was unnecessary to indicate it further. Or is Dr. B. of the opinion that there is a significance in the use of " different tenses in vs. 35 and 36," to which he calls attention, and that the first formula was only used on a single occasion when the ark set forward, while the other was repeated every time that it rested?

Dr. B. says : " In Ps. 90 : 3-5* there are some strange mistakes of tense. . . . Here imperfects and perfects are rendered as if they were the same." Delitzsch and Hengstenberg agree throughout with the Revisers ; and neither Ewald, Hitzig, Hupfeld nor any respectable commentator, so far as I know, sanctions the manner in which he " ventures to render " ver. 3. The assertion that the perfect is used to " express a wish " in Solomon's Song 2 : 3-6 perverts the meaning entirely. He charges the Revisers with adopting an incorrect rendering to sustain a particular theory of the Song, because they give the word its natural and proper sense, whilst he is himself in the very act of violating the clearest grammatical rules for the sake of bringing the passage into harmony with a false theory of his own. Of course he is here again in conflict with the best commentators, and there are few besides Ewald who agree with him in substituting " vineyard " for " banqueting house." Ewald, Delitzsch, and Maurer ignore " the modal force " of the cohortative in Prov. 8 : 3, 9 : 3 as well as the Revisers, and commit the same " error " that is charged upon them in Prov. 31 : 10. Ewald agrees with Dr. B. in finding a final clause in Isa. 38 : 12,† but Delitzsch and Hitzig do not.

The vav of the oath, which Dr. B. discovers in Amos 9 : 5, is an

* " Yesterday, when it passeth," is put in the margin as more exactly representing the Hebrew tense, though " yesterday when it is past " is properly retained in the text. The former might suggest to ordinary readers the contradiction in terms of yesterday now passing and but partly gone ; whereas the Hebrew properly means that having reached its termination it is taking its flight. The German commentators are able to use the present tense " vergeht," " vorüber geht " or " schwindet," because the association of the word is different.

† In Isa. 38 : 10 Dr. B. prefers " I must go," which would be a proper rendering. It does not, however, differ in this case materially from " I shall go." Constraint is implied in the very nature of the subject spoken of.

unwarranted invention of Ewald. There is no proof in this passage or in any other that *vav* is so used, and other commentators do not admit it. "Toucheth the earth and it melteth" suggests the same relation in a more vigorous and less awkward form than Dr. B.'s proposed correction, "so that it doth melt." He says that it is altogether incorrect to give to the emphatic infinitive the force of "surely," and that it is wrong to say "surely die," Gen. 2 : 17, where Dillmann has "sicherlich sterben" so Delitzsch; "surely seen," Ex. 3 : 7, so Dillmann; "surely be put to death," Ex. 21 : 12, where Dillmann finds certainty expressed by the emphatic construction in contrast with ver. 29, which does not employ it. In Ps. 24 : 10 I fail to see the great difference between "Who is this king of glory?" and Dr. B.'s suggested improvement, "Who is this, the king of glory?" except that the former is more smoothly and better expressed. It is probable that the Revisers knew as well as Dr. B. that the Hebrew pronoun does not agree directly with the following noun.

In regard to the emphatic plural, which is the last specification in this branch of the indictment, the Revisers have followed the common usage of the best translators in not accepting such paraphrastic renderings as Dr. B. proposes. At the same time they have sufficiently indicated the fact of such emphasis by putting the plural form in the margin, though Dr. B. sneers at this as "childish."

The series of five articles by Rev. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe in the *Expositor* (of London) entitled "The Revised Version of the Old Testament: a Critical Estimate," is of a very different style from the petty carping criticisms with which we have thus far had to do. The tone is imperious, and the judgment on the whole unfavorable; heavy blows are dealt with a strong hand and a determined will. But there is an air of lofty scholarship, a manly grasp of the questions at issue, a high conception of the task of the translator, an uncompromising application of the elevated standard which is in the mind of the critics, together with an ungrudging appreciation of what is meritorious in the Revision when tested by this standard, and all expressed in terse, crisp sentences of pure classic English which it is a delight to read. The demand is no longer for the pedantic rendering of word for word, and the exact reproduction of each form and inflection with the utmost literality, however cramped and awkward the resulting translation may thus become, but for a free and spirited rendering, which, embodying the latest and best results of modern scholarship, shall express them in a forcible and vigorous manner in clear, intelligible English, so that there shall be conveyed to every reader, without any remaining ambiguity or obscurity, the full

meaning of the original, and both the thought and the emotion of the sacred writer shall find adequate expression. With the general aim of these critics we most cordially concur, however we may differ in our judgment of particulars and however we may dissent from some of the principles upon which their estimate is based.

The first of these papers deals mainly with questions of text, the succeeding four with those of translation. The censure of the second is chiefly directed against what is alleged to be a too close adherence to the Authorized Version in favorite passages which are often misapplied, and in archaisms; the third against a literalness of rendering which leads to obscurity; the fourth adherence to obsolete and inadequate renderings; the fifth an occasional want of sharp, decided, and perspicuous renderings in confessedly obscure and doubtful passages. These are all illustrated by what are considered pertinent examples.

The charge of "servile literalism," *Expositor*, pp. 279 ff., is made "in connection with such words as 'soul' (= 'desire' or 'life,' rarely the 'soul' of our religious idiom); 'heart' (= often the seat of 'understanding' not of 'compassion'); 'bowels' (= the seat of 'compassion'); 'hand' (used where we should say 'strength' or 'assistance'); 'eye' (where we should say 'glance')." Accordingly it is claimed that "refreshing the spirit" should be substituted, Ps. 19 : 7, for "restoring the soul"; "living creature," as Gen. 1 : 20, 24, for "living soul," Gen. 2 : 7; "the wise is intellectually righthanded," Eccles. 10 : 2, for "a wise man's heart is at his right hand"; "my compassion is stirred on his behalf," Jer. 31 : 20, for "my bowels are troubled for him," and generally there should be "a clean sweep of this archaic pathology"; "their prosperity is not in their own power," Job 21 : 16, for "is not in their hand"; "thou hast ravished my heart with a single glance," Sol. Song 4 : 9, for "with one of thine eyes," etc., etc.

Complaint is also made of "Hebrew-English" constructions, as "the chastisement of our peace," Isa. 53 : 5, where "of course we must render, the chastisement tending to our peace." So it is urged that "the oath of God," Prov. 8 : 2, and "the oath of the Lord," 1 Kin. 2 : 43, should be "the oath made to God" or "to the Lord"; "the star of your god," Amos 5 : 26, should be "your star-god"; "the zeal of thine house," Ps. 69 : 19, should be "for thine house"; "the flock of the slaughter," Zech. 11 : 4, should be "flock destined for the slaughter"; "prisoners of hope," Zech. 9 : 12, should be "prisoners who yet cherish hope," etc., etc.

Further occasion of censure under this same head is found "in the obscurity which hangs about so many noble passages. A free ren-

dering or paraphrase was necessary ; but the Revisers dared not attempt it." For " I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting," Isa. 1 : 13, it is proposed to read " iniquity and solemn assembly I cannot tolerate in conjunction." Isa. 33 : 18, where the A. V. has " Thine heart shall meditate terror," " the R. V. is better, ' Thine heart shall muse on the terror.' But why not add ' of the past ' ?" " Call the Sabbath a delight and the holy of the Lord honorable," Isa. 58 : 13, should be " the holy [day] of the Lord "; " the former desolations," Isa. 61 : 4, should be " what has lain in desolation for years past "; " the perpetual ruins," Ps. 74 : 3, should be " the places permanently desolated," or " places long desolated," etc., etc.

No doubt greater perspicuity and elegance could often be attained by paraphrase than by strict translation. But it is a debatable question how far paraphrase is admissible or desirable in a popular version of the Scriptures, where the form has its importance as well as the thought to be expressed, and in which the words and phrases objected to have grown familiar and are readily understood. It is easy to see that there may be a loss as well as a gain in this direction. The Revisers have made occasional changes of this nature in the Authorized Version where they seemed most necessary or desirable. But it is not to be expected that all would be satisfied with the precise line at which they halted. On the one hand fault is found with them for not adhering more strictly to the precise forms of the Hebrew ; and on the other hand for binding themselves to it too slavishly. It is not unlikely, after all, that the majority of capable and impartial judges may think that these conflicting censures neutralize one another ; and that the Revision is not far removed from the proper mean between the two extremes.

In regard to alleged erroneous or inadequate renderings, one-half of the substitutes proposed in the *Expositor* are already expressed in the margin of the Revision, either in precisely the same terms or substantially. The critics of the PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW and of the *Expositor* ignore the margin and base their strictures on the text ; while the critic of the London *Quarterly Review* (Oct., 1885) ignores the text and assails the margin. They seem equally to forget that margin and text alike belong to the Revision ; and if the rendering to which they give the preference is not found in the one but is found in the other, the Revision is not to be censured as though it did not contain it. It is there before the eyes of all readers, and they that look can see it. The utmost that can be charged is that the Revisers have not in all cases graded the various possible renderings of a passage precisely as their critics would have done, and they have

sometimes given preponderance to one where their critics would have laid chief stress upon another. This is not surprising, and in fact could scarcely be avoided. In some instances there is a conflict of opinion among the best scholars, and whichever was put in the margin, good authority can be adduced and strong reasons urged to show that it ought to have been admitted to the text. In other instances that has nevertheless been put in the margin which the present sentiment of scholars seems to favor; the reason for which is that in difficult passages, not wholly free from doubt and obscurity, the rendering that is now commonly preferred is sometimes not so certainly correct that it could rightfully displace that which, in addition to its inherent claims, has from long currency and familiarity acquired a certain right of possession.*

* The corrections proposed in the *Expositor*, articles 2d, 4th, and 5th, are simply a substitution for the text of marginal renderings or their equivalents in the following passages, viz.: Sol.'s Song 2 : 1 (where "rose of Sharon" is properly retained in the text as more poetic in English, while botanic accuracy is unessential to the thought), Isa. 35 : 5, Gen. 37 : 3, Job 29 : 24, 39 : 24; Ps. 25 : 17, 72 : 15, 73 : 25; Prov. 12 : 27, 4 : 7, 23, 6 : 13, 8 : 36, 28 : 18 (except the paraphrastic form of the proposed correction, in which the last word is not correctly rendered according to the best authorities); Isa. 1 : 27, 40 : 2, 42 : 19, 52 : 15, 53 : 8, 54 : 11, 59 : 18; Amos 6 : 10; Ps. 75 : 3, 36 : 1, 127 : 2; Ezek. 21 : 25; Hab. 2 : 5; Mic. 6 : 9 (except the paraphrastic substitution of "hear ye the destined penalty" for "hear ye the rod"), Isa. 13 : 1; Ps. 27 : 10. The *Expositor*, p. 123, affirms that "striving after wind," Eccles. 1 : 14, 17, "conveys no sense to English ears." It is of course unfamiliar. But it naturally denotes grasping after what is empty and unsubstantial, is the rendering adopted by the best authorities, and is the idea demanded by the connection in which it occurs as well as by the argument of the book, which the proposed substitute, "unprofitable thought," certainly is not, though it has at least the partial sanction of Fuerst in his *Lexicon*. The ambiguity of Job 19 : 27 is no greater than is necessary in a strict translation (the same is the case with Prov. 21 : 28, *Expos.*, p. 427); while the sense preferred by the *Expositor* is more clearly and forcibly stated in the margin than by the critics themselves. In the criticisms on Ps. 104 : 4 (p. 125), the archaisms of Isa. 54 : 12, and Nah. 2 : 9 (p. 354), on Isa. 41 : 27 (p. 355), and the rendering of חֶרֶם (p. 431), the American company concur. In several passages the substitutes proposed are incorrect, or, to say the least, of doubtful propriety, while the renderings given in the Revision have the sanction of the best authorities. This is the case in Gen. 45 : 24 (p. 347), where the Revision is supported by Knobel, Keil, Dillmann, and Delitzsch, who says of the substitute proposed: "It yields a superfluous and wholly unsuitable thought." So Prov. 10 : 9, 11 : 21, 17 : 7, 6 : 30; Isa. 5 : 30, 47 : 3 (where the substitute proposed, though good, is not favored by most commentators), 53 : 7; Prov. 21 : 4; Ps. 40 : 15 (70 : 3); 77 : 10; the sense attributed to עֲבָרָה; Ps. 55 : 18; Sol.'s Song 4 : 3, 6 : 7. In Eccles. 6 : 10 there is no material difference between the rendering in the Revision and that proposed as a substitute; in as far as they differ the Revision is superior in accuracy.

The critics of the *Expositor* make themselves merry (p. 347) over the rendering in Gen. 49 : 14, "a strong ass couching down between the sheepfolds," which they affirm "is not a familiar spectacle," and they propose to substitute "couching in the midst of the pen." But the Hebrew has "between," not "in the midst of"; accordingly there is no avoiding the conclusion that we have here the image of two sheepfolds or cattlepens with the ass reposing between them. The laugh goes for nothing; and there is no

Here the question arises, Should the Authorized Version be deferred to at all in making a revision? Rev. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe say, No! in the most decided manner, and rail at the rules and

incongruity in the case after all, and no occasion to abandon "sheepfolds" for "pens" or "enclosures" here or in Judg. 5 : 16; Ps. 68 : 13. Although "makest all his bed," Ps. 41 : 3, probably does not express the Psalmist's thought correctly, the proposed substitute, "wilt turn all his prostration," is not very felicitous.

Few would think that anything was to be gained by heeding the proposal (p. 349) to substitute "no light matter" for "precious" in Ps. 116 : 15, "Precious in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints"; or "swelling" or "surging waters" for "proud waters" in Ps. 124 : 5; or "God that actest mysteriously" for "God that hidest thyself" in Isa. 45 : 15. For "the chief of their strength," Ps. 78 : 51, 105 : 36, it is proposed to substitute "the first begotten"; but if this is really the meaning, the reader is put in the way of discovering it for himself, by placing before him in the margin all the evidence tending in that direction, viz. : that the Hebrew reads, "the beginning of their strength," coupled with a reference to Deut. 21 : 17. In Prov. 6 : 34 "Jealousy is the rage of a man" is the correct translation, and is sufficiently intelligible; though it might of course be more elegantly expressed by a paraphrase. For "the whole *duty* of man," Eccles. 12 : 13, it is proposed to substitute "the whole business of man," and with equal propriety "the whole *welfare* of man" might have been suggested. All that concerns man is really included, but no one word could express it. The wide sweep of the original can easily be perceived by him who notes that "*duty*" is in italic. To most readers "whose breath is in his nostrils," Isa. 2 : 22, as fitly expresses human frailty as the proposed substitute, "in whose nostrils is mere breath." "Abhorred" is the primary and proper sense of the verb used in Isa. 7 : 16; Exod. 1 : 12; the proposed substitute, "dreaded," is very commonly assigned to it in these passages as a secondary sense; but it is after all inadequate, for the idea intended is a loathing or detestation resulting from intense fear. The justice of the criticism on Isa. 41 : 26 is acknowledged; "right" would be better than "righteous," which is here employed in an archaic sense, and does not so readily suggest the precise meaning to the ordinary reader.

The substitute proposed for Ps. 90 : 4, "a thousand years, when past, are but as yesterday," agrees with the rendering of Hitzig and Hupfeld, though they give the tense with greater exactness, "for (or when) they pass away." Even with this correction, however, it needlessly assumes an enallage of number, and has not commanded the suffrages of commentators generally. After the admission in regard to Isa. 53, that "the Revisers have dealt fairly well" with this "notoriously difficult" passage, it is added: "But what do they mean by their 'yet' in v. 12, 'Yet he bare the sin of many'?" They mean just what Ewald and Hitzig meant by "*doch*," and what Delitzsch meant by saying that this clause is in opposition (*aufhebender Gegensatz*) to the preceding. It is not of much consequence, whether in Zech. 10 : 12 we read with the A. V. and Revision "walk up and down" or simply "walk," as the critics in the *Expositor* propose, though the former gives fuller expression to the thought of the original that whithersoever they go, in all the devious paths of life, they still walk in the name of the LORD. It is alleged that in Isa. 36 : 10, 53 : 4; Ps. 73 : 28, 75 : 3, 76 : 8 there is the "neglect of an emphasis distinctly marked in the original." But it is not necessary to follow slavishly the order of the Hebrew words for the sake of expressing an emphasis, which can in all these cases be brought out sufficiently by the proper stress of the voice on the words shown to be emphatic by the thought and the connection. Prov. 27 : 16, "his right hand encountereth oil," and Ps. 73 : 10, "therefore his people return hither," are certainly obscure. The meaning of the original is itself doubtful, and no rendering could be made clear except by paraphrasing more than seems to be ad-

limitations under which the Revisers acted as to the last degree unreasonable and wrong (the *Expositor*, p. 277) :

"The decree of the 'Revision Committee of Convocation' elevated the A. V. during the period of the Revisers' labors to the status of an Austrian Constitution. No change was to be lawful till two thirds of the assembly voted for it. Passages were thus discussed not on their own merits, but on the assumption that the A. V. was probably right. To this systematic prejudication we emphatically object. It was an injustice to the Revisers themselves; and a greater injustice to the Hebrew authors.

"The rights of conservative minorities may deserve recognition in politics, but in questions of scholarship they have no place."

This last clause reveals the mistaken point of view which has biased this judgment, and which has led to similar censures in other quarters. The whole question is treated as though it were simply one of "scholarship," and there was nothing else to be considered. The standard of comparison is taken from classic authors. Every thing is ruled out which would not be tolerated "in a translation of a stiff passage in *Æschylus* or *Thucydides*" (*Expositor*, p. 125). In putting a foreign classic into English, no competent scholar would dream of simply revising some former translation, much less of trammeling himself by association with a body of Revisers whose decisions were to be rendered whether by a majority or a two thirds vote and by whom he was liable to be overruled even when not convinced. His one aim would be to reproduce the original author, as he understands him, with exactness and perspicuity; and with this aim he would not hesitate to resolve metaphors, to rid himself of such encumbrances as an "archaic pathology," or to change the form of expression by paraphrasing difficult and obscure passages to whatever extent he deemed necessary in order to bring out his conception of the meaning with clearness and force. The result of this process necessarily is that foreign authors are rendered not strictly as they are in themselves but as they are seen through the eyes of some individual translator, who has unavoidably incorporated more or less of himself in his work, and this in larger measure in pro-

missible in a translation. And it is by no means certain that the meaning attributed to the second of these passages in the *Expositor* is the correct one.

If in Eccles. 7 : 28 "which" is referred to the immediately preceding noun as its antecedent, there will be no occasion for asking, "How could the Preacher have found what he had not found?" nor for assuming an "anomalous use" of the relative in order to escape this imaginary self-contradiction. The same word is used for "Noah's *ark*" and the "*ark* in the Temple," though different terms are employed in Hebrew, because an established English usage has attached this common name to both. "Answered," Isa. 21 : 9, is a correct rendering; it introduces a response not to something previously said, but elicited by what had just been witnessed.

This completes, we believe, the entire list of renderings which are censured as faulty and inadequate. And we cannot find that the charge has been sustained.

portion to those very qualities which fit him for his task, his scholarship, his enthusiasm, and his independence of judgment.

But if *Æschylus*, *Thucydides*, or *Plato* are warped in the translation, no great harm is done. It is a pure question of scholarship after all, to which no further and more serious consequences are attached ; and scholars have their easy remedy in direct access to the original and in the comparison of the results of others who have discussed the same authors. In translating the Scriptures there is a demand for the highest and best results of scholarship, that they may be rendered into the vernacular with the utmost attainable accuracy. But it is also of the greatest consequence that the individual opinions of translators should not be imposed upon the Scriptures and suffered to color or distort their genuine sense. And there is no way of eliminating idiosyncrasies so effectual as by the combined action of different minds. A single lens, of whatever material, will tinge the object looked at by its own peculiar style of refraction. It is by combining lenses of different refractive power that the proper correction is made and an achromatic effect secured.

The Authorized English Version is the product of all preceding ages. It gathers up the fruit of all the study and thought bestowed upon the Bible from the beginning. It embodies the best results of antecedent versions from the Septuagint to that of Luther. It was the last of a long series of revisions and improvements of the English Bible and was elaborated by the best scholarship of the time. It is incomparably the best popular version of the Bible ever prepared in any language. It is accepted as the standard by all Protestant bodies. It is the basis of all our religious literature. It is dear to the heart of every lover of the word of God in English-speaking lands, the recognized source of all religious life, and indissolubly linked with the most sacred associations. It is our noblest English classic, universally admired for the purity, simplicity, and dignity of its diction and style. It is a most precious inheritance received from our fathers. Its errors and blemishes are not to be defended or retained. But if the attempt to purge these away were to open the door for sweeping and uncalled-for alterations, the loss might be far greater than any possible gain. The only thing that could be tolerated is resolutely to hold fast whatever in it is good while endeavoring to correct whatever needs correction.

And how could this be done with better hope of success than by the rules under which the late Revision Committee acted and which were framed for this very purpose? Reckless and inconsiderate changes should not be allowed ; and the best way to prevent this was to order that no change whatever should be made, unless its

necessity or importance was sufficiently obvious to command the suffrages of two thirds of the Revisers. No human arrangements are perfect. Some improvements may have been hindered by the application of this rule. Probably no one of the Revisers themselves was entirely satisfied with every decision made. And yet the average result thus reached was unquestionably wiser, safer, and better than could have been achieved by the solitary labor of any one member of the committee, however eminent for scholarship, good taste, and sound judgment.

As the end sought in a translation of the Scriptures is not the mere literary enjoyment of an author by men of cultured taste, but the religious benefit of the great mass of readers, nice attempts at reproducing a foreign idiom which could only be appreciated by the scholar, but which would encumber the thought and prove a source of embarrassment to ordinary readers, are out of place. At the same time, as the Bible is the authoritative standard of faith, with power to bind the conscience, its form is sacred as well as its contents. It is not for the translator to usurp the function of the expositor and commentator. It is not for him to make that definite and precise which in the original is general and vague. Nor has he the right, in phrases that are obscure and doubtful and have been variously explained, to forsake the exact rendering and substitute a free paraphrase which may convey merely his own thought. He is to reproduce the inspired original with all possible fidelity. Explanatory comments and homiletic applications may be left to others.

We now proceed to the third point in regard to which there appears to be some misapprehension even in friendly quarters, viz., the original text, on which the Revision is and should be based. On this point I remark, in the first place, that Dr. B. depreciates the Massoretic text, both in respect to its antiquity and general correctness, in the most extravagant manner, in a manner not justified by the facts nor by the consensus of the best scholars. He says (PRES. REV., p. 494) :

“ 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 basis 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 Mas-

soretēs. 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 Massoretēs have given us, and an independent witness of the first rank."

If this language means anything to the purpose for which it is employed, it means that there is no certain voucher of the present so-called Massoretic text prior to the tenth century; that not only the LXX but the Syriac and the Vulgate antedate it by several centuries, and thus have greatly the advantage of it, in antiquity at least, as authorities for the determination of the true text of the Old Testament. And when Dr. Chambers interposes the suggestion respecting various readings drawn from these versions, that, while they are "well worthy of the scholar's careful attention," "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," Dr. B. replies:

"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."

And Professor H. P. Smith, in the October number of the *PRES. REV.*, p. 641, says of the Revisers:

"The proper title of their Old Testament would be, 'The Mediæval Jewish Edition of the Old Testament, translated into English, with marginal corrections for some of its errors.'" On p. 625 he concedes a higher antiquity to the Massoretic text: "The most we can infer is that it has preserved for us with tolerable fidelity a manuscript of the fourth or the third Christian century."

There is no question among scholars of any critical school that the present Massoretic text is in every substantial particular the text possessed by Jerome, and to which he makes constant appeal as to "the Hebrew verity," freely censuring the LXX and its child, the old Latin Itala, for their numerous departures from it. These created the necessity for Jerome's own independent version, which was made from the Hebrew, as we now have it, and interpreted according to the sense required by the vowel points; though occasionally he deviated from it contrary to his own better judgment and followed the Greek because of the clamor raised about the changes which he was introducing into the popular version. The oldest Chaldee Targums, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, plainly follow the Massoretic text. The Greek versions of the second Christian century by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, which were used by Origen in the preparation of his Hexapla and for the correction of the LXX, deviate from the latter, in the direction of the Massoretic text, and they owe their existence to the confessed variance of the LXX from the Hebrew text then current. Passages in the Talmud,

which were once supposed to indicate a variant Hebrew text at a later period, must, as is now confessed, be interpreted differently (Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 66). Nöldeke (*Die Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 241) attributes the definite fixing of the text of the Old Testament to "about the time of the birth of Christ," and adds :

"This text then fixed is now universally received and is yielded by all mss. so that only faint traces of divergent readings occur in them. True, errors of copyists have naturally crept in again, but by careful measures, though somewhat prolix, the Jewish schools have always rendered possible the restoration of the correct text. It may be maintained that, with the exception of quite isolated cases, the text then fixed can by the application of these measures be recovered again, even to the smallest minutiae of orthography."

Dr. Dillmann (*Bibeltext d. A. T. in Herzog and Plitt's Encyclopædie*, p. 387) says of the period immediately following the destruction of Jerusalem :

"Now, when all Judaism was subjected to the strict rule of its rabbinical leaders, it became possible to put an end to all divergences of text and to produce an exclusively valid official text. This, too, did not take place suddenly ; several generations more labored at it. The Greek versions of the second century A.D., viz., those of Aquila and Theodotion, already have far fewer deviations from the Massoretic text. The official Targums on the Law and the Prophets (Onkelos and Jonathan) completed in the third and fourth century in Babylon have a text closely approximating the Massoretic ; for it is a groundless assumption that the Jews at a much later time corrected their text by the Targums. The Hebrew text of Origen and Jerome agrees with the Massoretic far more exactly than any other of the Greeks. In the Talmud the consonant text already appears as absolutely fixed, and so unalterable that variations could only be appended as a *Keri* to the *Kethibh*. The fixing of the text, together with the remnants of its critical apparatus, is already regarded as a work of remote antiquity, and referred to a *Halachah* of Moses from Sinai."

Thenius ventured the remark that "the Hebrew text, which lay at the base of the translation of Jerome, is evidently derived from that which the LXX had before them." Wellhausen replies (*Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 3) : "The truth is, it agrees even to minutiae with our Massoretic text, as the *Codex Amiatinus* proves." And Justus Olshausen, holding like extreme views of the faulty condition of the received text and of the need of conjectural emendation, expresses himself thus in relation to its antiquity (*Die Psalmen*, p. 18) :

"The comparison of all versions teaches us that the great majority of the faults and blemishes now recognizable in the text existed in the copies on which they were based precisely as to-day. We are thereby led to the assumption that there was very early, at least in the first times of Christianity, a recension of the consonantal text which was extremely similar to the Massoretic ; and it must have had, at least with the Palestine Jews, an official character."

And Dr. W. Robertson Smith, in his "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," p. 69 : —

“The text of the Hebrew Old Testament, which we now have, is the same as lay before Jerome four hundred years after Christ ; the same as underlies certain translations into Chaldee called Targums, which were made in Babylon in the third century after Christ ; indeed the same text as was received by Jewish doctors of the second century, when the Mishna was being formed, and when the Jewish proselyte Aquila made his translation into Greek. I do not affirm that there were no various readings in the copies of the second and even of the fourth century, but the variations were slight and easily controlled, and such as would have occurred in MSS. carefully transcribed from one standard copy. The Jews, in fact, from the time when their national life was extinguished and their whole soul concentrated upon the preservation of the monuments of the past, devoted the most strict and punctilious attention to the exact transmission of the received text, down to the smallest peculiarity of spelling, and even to certain irregularities of writing.”

Our present text is traceable to the days of Jerome not only in its consonants but its vowels. These last were unwritten, but their pronunciation was traditionally fixed. Dr. Dillmann says on this point (*ibid.*, p. 390) :

“Jerome has a thoroughly certain tradition in respect to the reading of the text, appeals to it as to an authority over against the Greek versions, and on the whole deviates very little from the Massoretic reading, and this often probably only from yielding to the Greek versions. In the Talmud, notwithstanding the lack of vowel-signs in the text, the correct mode of reading is presupposed as known, fixed, certain and universally approved. . . . It appears, consequently, that long before the close of this period (the ante-Massoretic) the fixing of the reading of the text had already been effected, and in so far the scholars of a former age were right in maintaining the pre-Massoretic origin of the vocalization. This reading was, however, not yet fixed in writing, but only taught and propagated orally.”

The Massoretic text was not the production of the Massorettes any more than Calvinistic doctrine originated with the Genevan reformer. The text, to which their name was given, was in existence long before their time and was regarded as sacredly and unchangeably fixed. They did not venture to modify in the slightest particular what had been delivered to them by a steadfast tradition. They simply sought by the most elaborate methods to secure its exact transmission, both in its written form and in its oral pronunciation. They aimed to accomplish the former by gathering and recording the huge mass of critical notes and textual statistics which composes the Massora. They aimed to accomplish the latter by a minute notation of vowels and tones in a system of points attached to the letters of the text. The written signs are an invention of the Massorettes, but the pronunciation which they yield and which they were invented to perpetuate had been the heritage of scholars through preceding ages. Dr. Dillmann further says, (*ibid.*, p. 395) :

“The Jewish pronunciation of the Hebrew is therein reliably recorded in the purest form that has been thus far preserved. The remarkable deviations in the pronunciation of Hebrew among the Greeks and in the Greek versions of the older time cannot be used as a proof that the Massoretic pronunciation is arbitrary and unreliable, inas-

much as that extra-Palestine pronunciation was impure and strongly inclined to Aramean, and moreover the Hebrew was at one time pronounced differently in different countries. As a whole it rests upon the most correct and purest tradition and verifies itself as such by linguistic analysis."

Of course the Massoretic vowel-points are not faultless, and are open to correction where this is necessary and where there is good reason for departing from them, but they record for us with marvellous exactness and minuteness not a mediæval but a very ancient text. Nöldeke says (*Die Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 242):

"Extremely valuable as this so-called punctuation is, as the reproduction of a fixed ancient tradition of the schools, it cannot be decisive for us in every respect. . . . But in spite of all this, this punctuation, carried out with an incredible pedantry and containing much that is superfluous and unsuitable, is an invaluable means for the explanation of the ancient writings. Yes, without it it would be scarcely possible for us to gain more than a quite superficial understanding of them."

Dr. B. tells us (*PRES. REV.*, p. 493), that "the Ante-Nicene Church knew nothing of a Massoretic text"; which simply shows that the textual errors of the LXX, however multitudinous and serious in a literary and critical point of view, did not, after all, materially affect the integrity of Christian doctrine. But this is no reason why we should revert to or restore them. He goes on to say, "The Massoretic text was not used by the Christian Church until the sixteenth century." And (p. 508), "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* (the italics are Dr. B.'s) is regarded as the real text, and then it is enriched with the light cast upon it by the most ancient versions and authorities." These statements may be judged by what has been shown above. The Massoretic text, whether in its consonants or vowels, is not mediæval. It is no departure from Christian precedent and involves no adoption of Judaic error to accept it as, on the whole, the best accredited and most accurate form of the text of the Old Testament that has been preserved to us. If that is Jewish, what was the Septuagint? And what, in fact, was every form of the original text from which any Christian version has ever been made?

My second remark on this general subject is that it is impossible at the present time, by any aids within reach, to execute a thorough revision of the text of the Old Testament. Such a thing has never yet been attempted by any scholar or any body of scholars, for the plain reason that it is simply impracticable in the present condition of available critical materials. What persistent scholarship may be able to accomplish hereafter in this direction, no one can now say.

It is pushing its approaches vigorously from every direction, and the problem which is now insoluble may one day become entirely manageable. At any rate, after the preliminary work has been done and thoroughly done, it will become apparent what can and what cannot be effected, and with what ultimate result.

The sources to which we are to look for the correction of the received Hebrew text are obviously manuscripts, the Massora, early Jewish writings, particularly the Talmud, and ancient versions. But not one of these sources is at present in a really available and trustworthy condition. An immense amount of preliminary work remains to be done before the critical reconstruction of the text of the Old Testament on a sure and solid basis can be begun. Extensive collations of MSS. were made by Kennicott, and, with greater accuracy and on a larger scale, by De Rossi. The variations noted were unimportant, and the comparison has done little more than to establish the fact that all known MSS. yield substantially the same text. Other important MSS. have since been brought to light from Odessa and elsewhere, without materially altering the general state of the case. Professor Strack,* whose eminent critical labors entitle him to speak with an authority upon the subject which few men possess, complains that collation has thus far yielded only a confused wilderness of unmanageable materials. A classification of MSS. must be effected based on their several affinities, and they must be graduated according to their respective worth, before there can be any scientific handling of their various readings, any fair determination of the proper resultant of all this testimony, which must proceed upon a just estimate of the evidence instead of random guesswork, or making up a verdict by simply counting the witnesses on each side irrespective of their mutual independence or intrinsic worth.

The Massora, with its vast and heterogeneous congeries of textual annotations, its enumerations of words and letters, its concordance of particular words or combinations of words, or instances of peculiar orthography or unusual vocalization or remarkable grammatical forms, or words in given positions in the clause or verse, its memorial phrases, etc., etc., affords a complete apparatus for the determination of the text as traditionally transmitted in its minutest particular. But no complete edition of the Massora has ever been published. Dr. Ginsburg is now bringing out for the first time, as the fruit of many years of research, the Massora in a truly reliable form and one that is satisfactory to those who are competent to judge. The first serious attempt to produce a critical edition of the text on the basis of the Massora is that of Baer, with the aid and superintendence of

* *Prolegomena Critica in V. T. Heb.* p. 33; also in *Zöckler's Handbuch*, I., p. 178.

Delitzsch. The several books thus far issued, while exhibiting a multitude of corrections in minutiae, which can be appreciated only by the Hebrew student, contain almost none that affect the translation even in the slightest degree.

In one important matter Professor Strack* takes issue with Baer, as well as with Lagarde, Olshausen and others. He contends that there is not an absolute uniformity in the textual statements of the Masora, but that diversities of tradition are traceable, showing that there was not, as critics now commonly assume, one standard codex to which all deferred and from which all existing MSS. have been derived. If a thorough sifting of the material now furnished in authentic form by Dr. Ginsburg shall afford the means of definitively settling this question, it will plainly have a very important bearing on the future course of critical investigation. Whether non-conforming MSS. were authoritatively suppressed, or simply fell into neglect or disuse, or whether the standard copy was the lucky survivor of some great catastrophe which destroyed all others, become irrelevant and unmeaning inquiries, if the presupposition on which they are based turns out to be a mistake.

In order to the use of the Talmud for purposes of criticism a critical edition of the Talmud itself is necessary. See Strack, "Prolegomena," p. III.

And finally, the text of the early versions is very far from being in a satisfactory condition. The oldest of all, and the one which would therefore be the most serviceable, if only the text from which it was made could be reconstructed, is the LXX. But the divergence in its MSS. has been proverbial from the earliest times. It was such, Origen complains in his day, as to be destructive of all certainty in quoting Scripture; and every different MS. had a different text. He spent twenty years of his life in compiling his Hexapla, with a view to its correction not so much with a critical design as to enhance its value for polemical and exegetical purposes. As a result he increased the confusion which he sought to remedy. Lucian revised the text in Syria, Hesychius in Egypt. The text was blended with that of the other Greek versions; it was modified for the sake of conforming it to the Hebrew. The consequence is that the MSS. present a confused medley, or, to use the words of Wellhausen, "ein entsetzlicher Wirrwarr," Bleek⁴, p. 590. It is out of this seemingly hopeless tangle that scholars are patiently struggling to educe the primitive text of the LXX translators, which is, of course, the indispensable condition of reaching the Hebrew as it lay before them. Tischendorf sought, by the republication and comparison of the most

* "Prolegomena," p. 43. Zöckler's Handbuch, pp. 177, 178.

ancient and valuable codices and by successive critical editions, to work his way toward a consummation so much desired. Wellhausen speaks thus contemptuously of his critical labors in this field (Bleek⁴, p. 593) :

“ Tischendorf understood nothing of the Hebrew Old Testament and consequently nothing of the Greek ; and if those who know just as much about the matter believe his assertion that he has been of far greater service in regard to the LXX than the Oxford edition, this is ridiculous. Lagarde, the chief authority in this department, denies him all critical merit.”

Lagarde has been for forty years* working by an entirely different method. A simple reliance on MS. testimony, he is convinced, will not reach the case. He selects his readings by internal rather than external evidence. The readiness with which a clause or passage can be reconverted into Hebrew is the proof that it was originally translated from the Hebrew, and is not the error of some Greek scribe. Of two readings, a free rendering is preferred to one that is slavishly literal, and that which departs from the Massoretic text to one that coincides with it. Thus he hopes to eliminate what has been borrowed from the later Greek versions. The method is ingenious and plausible. But the grounds are largely subjective and require consummate skill and tact in their application. Thus far the Pentateuch and historical books have appeared. When the rest is finished, it may be hoped that the text of the LXX will be substantially settled ; so far at least as it can be settled on these principles and by this method. Lagarde† says as to the use of the LXX in criticism :

“ The LXX can only be applied in its original form to the criticism of our Massoretic recension. If we would satisfy ourselves about the Hebrew text, we must first find the primitive form of the Greek version. Before this is obtained, the Egyptian recension cannot be used to control the Palestine.”

Berliner has recently published a critical edition of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. Critical editions of the Syriac Peshitto and of Jerome's Latin version are still desiderata.

* Rev. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe (the *Expositor* for July, 1885, p. 61) give their conception of the burdens which should have been assumed by the Revisers : “ Why, we ask here, did not some of the company work out a scholarly recension of the LXX, with a full account of the state of each book ? It is not likely we shall ever have better material ; the occasion was suitable ; and the men were not wanting.” And then, we suppose, a similar service should be performed for the Syriac Peshitto, and for Jerome's Latin version. And after that has been accomplished to the satisfaction of the learned world, they would still have to address themselves to the task of applying these materials to the production of a correct Hebrew text. And then they may begin the work of revising the Authorized Version on this basis.

† “ Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien,” p. 2. Lagarde's immediate aim is to reproduce one of the early revisions of the LXX as a stepping-stone to the ultimate restoration of the primitive form of the version itself.

What has now been recited relates merely to the preliminaries, the indispensable prerequisites of the critic's work. As Lagarde says (*ibid.*, p. 3): "The real labor begins where that of collation ends. Draymen are not architects, though architects make use of draymen." Collections of various readings do not end the task of obtaining a correct text; they do not certainly ensure its accomplishment. Learning and tact and patient toil coupled with the discovery of the true principles of selection and the right application of them, can alone achieve the result.

Any expectation that the Old Testament Revisers would undertake the correction of the text in the same manner as was done in the New Testament, was altogether unreasonable. There is no parallel between the cases. In the New Testament there was an ample critical apparatus ready to their hand. The testimony of all critical authorities of any importance had been gathered and sifted, and the relative value of each accurately determined. Critical texts had been elaborated by successive scholars, accompanied by a detailed exhibition throughout of the evidence on which they severally rested.

The whole ground had been canvassed again and again. Principles and methods had been thoroughly discussed and practically applied. There is not a word or a syllable from Matthew to Revelation in regard to which the precise state of the evidence was not known and tabulated. In the Old Testament no such apparatus exists; and the conditions are so different that the principles and methods applicable to the one cannot be transferred to the other. Under these circumstances the demand upon the Revisers (*PRES. REV.*, pp. 496, 497, the *Evangelist* for June 25 and July 30)* that they should themselves produce an adequate apparatus, that they should institute a collation of MSS. or apply themselves to the collecting of materials, is simply and utterly preposterous.

My third remark on the general subject of the text is that the rules or principles explicitly proposed or implicitly assumed by the critics of the Revision are fallacious; and that the specific corrections which they censure the Revisers for not having made are in many

* Dr. B. says that he has "examined a number of passages of the St. Petersburg Codex" and is "surprised to find no evidence of its use by the Revisers. Some of its readings are clearly better than the common text, but they have not been regarded." He has been repeatedly called upon to state what these improved readings are; and the proof has been exhibited that Professor Strack's collation of Isaiah in this MS., while yielding a multitude of minute variations in vowels and accents, has brought to light nothing affecting the sense which the Revisers have disregarded. This is now further confirmed by Dr. B.'s deliverance in the *Hebraica* for Jan. 1886. If he has nothing better to adduce than is exhibited there, his readers must be involuntarily reminded of the old fable of the mountain and the mouse.

instances no corrections at all, while in other cases they are not so undisputed or free from doubt or suspicion as to justify their introduction into a version designed for popular use. It is, of course freely conceded that the impossibility of thoroughly revising the Old Testament text at the present time does not preclude its correction in individual passages, where the necessity and propriety of so doing is clear. Have the Revisers been negligent of their duty in this respect? Let us see.

Dr. B. proposes a tangible canon of criticism (PRES. REV., p. 495): "When we have the Samaritan Codex, the Septuagint, Peshitto and Vulgate versions agreeing over against the Massoretic text. . . we have evidence superior in weight to the Massoretic text." And he illustrates his canon (p. 514) by

"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."

Professor Smith follows in the same line (PRES. REV., p. 644):

"The inserted clause is sustained by LXX, Sam., Syr., Vulg. and the Jerusalem Targums—almost unparalleled strength of external testimony. The internal testimony (as pointed out by Dr. Briggs) is in the same direction." And, p. 643: "Where the internal evidence is not conclusive, but the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate are united (or any two of them) against the M. T., their reading should be preferred."

Dr. B.'s canon has enough of superficial plausibility about it to make it attractive at first sight. It was in vogue to some extent at one time, but more exact investigations have consigned it to the realm of "antiquated scholarship"; and even the American Revisers would seem to have had intelligence enough for once to shake it off. Field's Hexapla, I., p. 18, will show us the state of the evidence as to the verse in question. Origen prefixed an obelus to the words "Let us go into the field" in the LXX, to indicate their absence from the Hebrew. It is explicitly stated that these words were not in the Hebrew, nor in Aquila, nor in any other of the Greek versions, but only in the Samaritan; and their insertion in the LXX is traced to an apocryphal source. They are in the Itala, because that was translated from the LXX; it has therefore no independent weight. Their presence in the Vulgate is due to a corruption of the text. That

Jerome did not insert them, but translated as the Revisers have done, is plain from his express language : " What the Lord had just spoken is here understood ; ' Let us go into the field,' as found in the Samaritan and LXX, is superfluous." No one attributes any critical value to the paraphrastic and legendary Jerusalem Targum ; Onkelos agrees with the Massoretic text. Gesenius, while exploding forever the claims of the Samaritan Pentateuch as a critical authority, thought that he detected " four grains of gold in this heap of rubbish" (Pent. Sam., p. 62), one of which was the addition in the passage before us. It is not strange, however, that subsequent scholars have been of a different mind, and that Gesenius himself altered his opinion afterward. Dillmann, while inclining to follow Gesenius in the first edition of his commentary, gives it up in the second and adopts Böttcher's conjecture of וישמר for ויאמר. Delitzsch, however, Keil, Tuch, Drechsler, and Baumgarten affirm the integrity of the Massoretic text, but regard it as elliptical and to be supplied either from what precedes, as Ex. 19 : 25, or from what follows, as Gen. 3 : 22, Josh. 9 : 21, Jon. 2 : 11, 2 Chron. 1 : 2, 32 : 24. Boehmer and Merx do not even admit an ellipsis, the latter adopting substantially the rendering of the Authorized Version (Schenkel's " Bibel Lexicon," I., p. 6).

The estimate which Wellhausen puts upon critical arguments drawn from the concurrence of the Vulgate with the LXX will appear from his strictures upon Thenius (Text Samuel, pp. 2, 3) :

" He trusts to an old Basle edition, and takes for granted that it agrees accurately with the version of Jerome. In no one of the extremely numerous passages, particularly in the Books of Samuel, in which the Vulgate has a text differing from the Massoretic and agreeing with the LXX, does the thought which is not very remote appear to occur to him that a passage from the Itala may in the course of time have slipped into the work of Jerome." " How illusive well nigh all (so gut wie alle) critical results are, for which we are indebted to this comparison of the Vulgate, now appears incontrovertibly from Vercellone's Collection of its various readings. But that the more considerable and extensive deviations of the Vulgate are not independent coincidences with the LXX, and are not to be directly referred to a Hebrew original, was certain long before we had the documentary proof in our hands that they did not even go back to Jerome."

And we have besides already seen that in the common judgment of scholars the Hebrew text possessed by Jerome was in every essential particular identical with the Massoretic. The numerous coincidences of the Syriac Peshitto with the LXX are due, according to Strack (Zöckler's Handbuch, p. 184) partly to the direct use of the latter by its translators, partly to its being subsequently altered into further conformity with it. " Only rarely can a text deviating from the Massoretic have been before the authors of these two versions." See also to the same effect, Schrader in his edition of De Wette's

Einleitung, p. 132. The fallacy of Dr. B.'s canon is obvious. Where the Vulgate and the Syriac agree with the LXX against the Massoretic text, the correspondence is traceable not to their being alike derived from a divergent Hebrew text, but to the direct influence of the LXX itself upon the other versions.

Most of the critics of the Revision, however, rest their case not upon the combined testimony of several versions, but upon the single authority of the LXX. They examine passages in which the LXX departs from the Massoretic text, and decide, on the sole ground of the internal evidence, which reading is to be preferred. This method of procedure must obviously be conducted with the utmost caution and skill, if it is to lead to trustworthy results. That which suits the caprice of the critic, pleases his taste or commends itself to his judgment, as what he would have written under the circumstances, need not always be what the original author actually did write. It is very easy to fall into the mistake of manufacturing a text, while professing to restore it. This, however, does not deter every newspaper scribbler, who can place the two texts side by side, from freely suggesting corrections which the Revisers ought to have made, as though he were beyond the possibility of blundering himself.

This whole process further assumes the precise equivalence of the two texts in point of authority; that the critical judgment is at an equipoise between them in the general and on the whole, so that a slight weight thrown in on one side or the other from internal considerations in particular places will incline the balance accordingly. This Wellhausen explicitly affirms, and it lies at the basis of his attempted settlement of the text of Samuel. It is a position, however, which has never yet been proved. It does not correspond with the judgment of the great majority of the best critics. The general mind of the most careful scholars is voiced by Dillmann (*Bibeltext d. A. T.*, Herzog und Plitt, *Encyk.* II., p. 388): "Their text (the Massoretic) is beyond comparison the best and most accredited, though not absolutely correct." This being the case, the proof which sets its readings aside in favor of those of another text not so well attested, must be correspondingly strong. Unless there be some evidence of corruption in the Massoretic text itself, it is clearly on general grounds entitled to the preference.

It should inspire additional caution in the use of the LXX for the correction of the Massoretic text, that a twofold process of translation is involved, in each of which there is a fresh liability to error. It presents us with the text not in its original form, but as translated out of Hebrew into Greek, from which it must be translated back again in order to obtain the text which the translators had

before them. It is not to be assumed that every divergence of the LXX from the Hebrew, as we now have it, indicates a difference in the Hebrew text from which it was made. Wellhausen says (Text Samuel, p. 1) :

“ Even distinguished scholars have often regarded errors in the copies of the LXX as original peculiarities of its primary source, and drawn conclusions from them as to the Hebrew base of the old version. . . . The more thoroughgoing and systematic the manner in which the LXX is adduced for comparison and used as a critical aid, the more baleful are the consequences of the uncritical use of its received text.”

And Dr. W. Robertson Smith remarks (O. Test. in the Jewish Church, p. 103) :

“ Even if we possessed the Septuagint in its original form, it would be necessary to use it with great caution as an instrument of textual criticism. . . . In the present day it is an affair of the most delicate scholarship to make profitable use of the Alexandrian version for the confirmation or emendation of the Hebrew.”

In undertaking the correction of the Massoretic text by the aid of the LXX, the first thing to be ascertained in any given case is, in the language of Professor Strack, whether the Hebrew is in that passage “ really corrupt.” There is no more fruitful cause of error in criticism than undertaking to amend where there is no occasion for emendation. Professor Smith (PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 628) appeals to the numerous discrepant forms of proper names. Some of these are doubtless due to the errors of scribes, who have transposed or omitted letters or confounded those of like shape or sound ; though a large proportion of those which he traces to this source may be readily explained as different forms in current use, or a variant orthography, or changes resulting from the lapse of time.* But to whatever source they are attributable, the Revision dealt with them in the only proper method. The form as found in the Hebrew is regularly retained in the text, with a reference to the alternate form in the margin, with this exception : that to avoid confusion familiar names are always put in the text in their standard form, and any variations in the Hebrew are noted in the margin. All the facts are thus laid before the English reader which are in the possession of the student of the original ; and the one can draw his inferences as well as the other.

Professor Smith deduces from these instances the conclusion that the Massoretic text in general is seriously corrupt ; but this is quite unwarranted. For, as has been explained already, the majority of these variations are not textual errors ; and besides, errors are particularly liable to arise in unfamiliar names, so that no inference can be drawn from them discrediting other parts of the text.

* These sources of variation might all be abundantly illustrated from proper names in English. In how many different ways has “ Shakespeare ” been written ?

Reference, however, is made to the parallel sections of the Old Testament and their divergent readings adduced as so many textual errors, witnessing to a most unreliable condition of the existing Hebrew text. Thus in regard to the noted parallel of 2 Sam. 22 and Ps. 18, Prof. S. tells us, p. 631 :

“ We have two copies of exactly the same original, and *all* the differences result from the process of transmission. Of each pair of variant readings, one only can be right, the other must be wrong.” Of any other view of the case, he says : “ I cannot assert that the supposition is impossible. But all the evidence is against it.”

Rev. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe express themselves more guardedly (*Expositor*, p. 66) :

“ Comparing 2 Sam. 22 and the Psalter’s recension of the same poem, we find the following suggestive divergences—וירא ‘and was seen,’ ויף ‘and did fly ;’ חשרת מים ‘gathering of waters,’ חשכת מים ‘darkness of waters ;’ ים ‘sea,’ מים ‘waters ;’ ויתר דרכו ‘and guideth in his way,’ ויתן דרכי ‘and maketh my way ;’ ארקם ‘stamp them,’ אריקם ‘cast them out ;’ תשמרני ‘hast kept me,’ תשימני ‘hast made me.’ It is far out of our province to reconstruct the original text of this poem ; we only point out that in all the cases we have cited one of the two variants is *certainly wrong*. . . . The variations of Pss. 14 and 53, on the other hand, may be considered for the most part intentional.”

Here and in all similar cases the Revisers have done the only proper thing. They have translated each text as it stood, so far as this was possible, making no correction except where, as in 2 Sam. 22 : 27, 46, the sense manifestly required it. The reader thus has both texts fully before him without alteration or mutilation, and can compare them for himself. This Messrs. Jennings and Lowe acknowledge.

“ The Revisers were, perhaps, justified in leaving such passages uncorrected. The duplicates can be compared ; a good sense is given in each case.”

It is obvious upon a simple inspection that the variations in the title and in the first two verses of this Psalm have been made intentionally, and that they cannot possibly be imputed to a slip in transcription.*

* A comparison of the texts of Ps. 18 and 2 Sam. 22 shows the following differences : 2 Sam. omits the technical title (comp. Ps. 36) ליהוה ליריד and changes “ who spake ” to “ And David spake,” in order to have a suitable beginning. It omits ver. 2 (the numbers here used are those of the Hebrew text), and balances the omission by adding a new clause at the end of ver. 3. Minor omissions, which modify the form without impairing the sense, are לפניו תבוא before him came, 7 ; סתרן his hiding-place, 12 ; רב manifold, 15 ; וימינך תסערני and thy right hand hath holden me up, 36. A repetition not superfluous but emphatic ואכלם and I have consumed them, 39 ; a fuller form of expression to emphasize the pronoun לי “ my deliverer, even mine” מפלטני.

Changes are made affecting the sense, which cannot have been mere slips of the pen : אסור ממנה “ did not depart from them” for אסיר מני I put not away (his statutes) from me, 23 ; כברי “ my cleanness” for כבר ידי the cleanness of my hands, 25 ; ואת for וכי-אתה (dropping the emphatic pronoun), 28 ; ועיניך על-רמים תשפיל “ thine eyes are upon the haughty that thou mayest bring them down” for עינים רמות תשפיל haughty

This favors the assumption, that the other significant changes were for the most part, if not altogether, intentional likewise. And there is much in the character of the changes themselves to recommend

eyes thou wilt bring down, 28 ; אתה נירי יהוה "thou art my lamp, O Jehovah" for יתה תאיר נירי thou wilt light my lamp, 29 ; כיעוה חיל "my strong fortress" for חיל הכיארני חיל "that girdeth me with strength," 33 ; ואשמדם "destroyed them" for ואשינם overtake them, 38 ; יקומון "rise" for יקום be able to rise, 39 ; תשמרני לראש "kept me to be the head" for תשימני לראש made me the head, 44 ; ומריר "bringeth down" for וידבר (a word unusual in this sense) subdueth, 48 ; ומויציא "bringeth me forth" for מפלטי "rescueth me," 49.

Changes for the sake of conformity of expression : כף "hand" for יד, because כף precedes ; אלהי "my God" dropped after יהוה "Jehovah" and יהוה inserted in the preceding clause, 29 ; מכליעדי "save," as in the preceding clause, for זולתי "besides," 32 ; צור "rock" inserted as in the preceding clause, 47, comp. ver. 3, where this identical construction is introduced.

Changes for more perfect parallelism : משברי "waves" of death (a combination which occurs nowhere else, but here adopted as a parallel to נחלי floods) for הכלי cords (comp. ver. 6, Ps. 116 : 3) ; השמים the foundations of "heaven" (an expression used here only as parallel to הארץ the earth) for ההרים mountains (comp. Deut. 32 : 22) ; ים "sea" (parallel to תבל world) for מים waters, 16 ; ארץ "earth" for על-פני-רוח before the wind ("the dust of the earth," parallel to "the mire of the streets"), 43 ; ארקם ארקם ("stamp them," parallel to "beat them small" and "spread them abroad" is added as a variation from "cast them out").

Changes to relieve a bold and difficult construction : בעירו substituted for עברו ברר 13, thus creating a correspondence with ver. 9 ; עברו ברר 14, since after the preceding change had been made it no longer corresponded with ver. 13.

Change of the word for God : אלהי God of (used to express the altered construction) for אל my God, 3 ; אל (to correspond with האל, vers. 31, 33) for אלוה 32.

Changes in the sense by the alteration of a single letter : וירא "was seen" for וידא flew swiftly, 11 ; חשרת "gathering" for חשכת darkness, 12 ; ויתן "guideth" for ויתן maketh, 33 ; דרכו (Ch'thibh) "his way" for רכבי my way (with which the K'ri agrees), 33 ; רגליו (Ch'thibh) "his feet" for רגלי my feet (with which the K'ri agrees), 34 ; ישעו "looked" for ישועו cried, 42. The suspicion of an accidental alteration might seem plausible here ; but the numerous instances of like character, in which the variation is obviously intentional, make it extremely doubtful whether this is the true solution. Habakkuk 1 : 8, "His horses are swifter than leopards," is, Jer. 4 : 13, by the change of a single letter, transformed into "his horses are swifter than eagles;" and "evening wolves" by a slight change, Jer. 5 : 6, to "wolf of the deserts." Upon which Delitzsch remarks, Habakkuk, p. 13 : "It is a peculiarity of Jeremiah to transform the figures and expressions of his predecessors by a slight change in the letters," etc. He adds several illustrations from Jeremiah and other parts of the Old Testament. And many more examples are given by Kueper, *Jeremias librorum sacrorum Interpres atque Vindex*, pp. xiv., xv., who says : "Illud maxime notatu dignum est, loci principis verbo aliud, pronunciatione et litterarum alphabeti prisci forma propinquum, sensu vel accurate congruum vel parum diversum, substituti solere."

Clauses are transposed, 45 ; words transposed (to bring יהוה next to the pronoun referring to it), 50 ; letters transposed, יתרו "gird" for יתרונו "tremble," 46. The last is probably a clerical error, and is so treated in the Revision, though it is possible to understand it as a pregnant construction, "gird themselves (and come) out of," etc.

Changes in prepositions and other particles מן for ב thundered from (in) heaven, 14 ;

this assumption and nothing to contradict it. Olshausen traces all the variant texts of duplicate passages in the Old Testament to intentional alterations. He says, *Psalmen*, p. 20 :

“ These parallel passages, even when they are of but small compass, regularly show a certain number, and often a very great number of deviations from one another, which cannot possibly have been occasioned by the bare negligence of copyists, by accidental injury to the manuscripts, or similar causes. The mutual relation of the variant readings plainly shows, on the contrary, that prevailing it is only a free-handling with an innocent design, which has given rise to them ; a slight variation in the form was preferred by which the essence of the matter, its real substance, was but little or not at all affected. To be sure, there are cases of which a somewhat different judgment must be formed, but their number is extremely small ; and that casual circumstances may also have contributed here and there to increase the divergence is a matter of course.”

The able argument of Hengstenberg to establish the same point, *Psalmen I.*, p. 375, is too long to be repeated here ; but his quotation, p. 277, from Venema in relation to Pss. 14 and 53 is equally applicable to the case before us : *variatio nulla contigit, quæ sensum non fundat in utroque Ps. egregium et scopo congruum.*

It is foreign to our present purpose to enter into the interminable question of the relation of these texts to one another. We shall not inquire whether both editions were issued by the author himself, whether one is the priestly and one the popular recension, whether with Delitzsch the priority is to be accorded to the former or with Böttcher to the latter, or what is to be thought of the multitudinous hypotheses on the subject framed by different critics to suit themselves. It is enough that we here possess two authorized editions of the Psalm, which were already in circulation at the time of the earliest witness that it is possible to summon. These texts were in their present form, according to Olshausen, when the canon was closed ; according to Ewald and Delitzsch, when the book of Samuel was written and the book of Psalms was collected. It is demonstrable that they lie back of all existing critical authorities. They were as we have them when the LXX was made. Much the greater number of these divergent readings, which are capable of being represented

ב for מן by (at) the rebuke, 16 ; ה omitted after ויהי, 19 ; ה for עת perfect toward (with) him, 24 ; אה for על made necessary by the change in the preceding verb, 42 ; ו for אף 49.

These are all the changes which affect the sense. There are other variations of no moment, as in the grammatical form, which may be likened to the substitution of *bidden* for *bid*, *brethren* for *brothers*, or *sha'n't* for *shall not* ; in the *lectio plena* or *defectiva*, which is like the difference between *honor* and *honour*, except in a single instance, where מנרל is in 2 Sam. resolved into its two possible forms, the Ch'thibh כנררל “ making great,” and the K'ri מנררל “ a tower,” 51 ; and finally in the insertion or omission of the copulative or consecutive vav.

This rapid survey is sufficient to show that these variations are not the mistakes of a scribe who has confounded similar letters.

in a version, are found in the LXX in precise correspondence with the Hebrew ; and the rest are vouched for by other ancient testimonies. All judgments as to the priority of one or other of these variant readings are void of external authority, and rest on purely internal considerations. If any of these readings were unintelligible or violated the laws of the language, this would indicate a blunder that required correction. But in nearly every instance each reading yields a perfectly good sense, so that the grounds of preference are purely subjective, and commentators are far from unanimous in their conclusions.

It has been urged in various quarters that the Revisers ought to have made a much freer use of the LXX for the correction of the Massoretic text, and this not in the margin only, but in the body of the English version. Thus Professor Smith, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, pp. 644, 645 :

“ We find twenty cases in the Pentateuch where reference is made to the versions. Of these eight corrections should be inserted in the text.” “ To these should be added three passages where the Revisers have suggested emendations which are inadequate, and where more thoroughgoing corrections should be made in the text.” “ The proportion thus established will probably hold for the remainder of the Old Testament.”

Before expressing my own opinion, which might be suspected of prejudice in the case, I here submit the judgment of two European critical scholars of acknowledged eminence, who certainly know what the present advanced state of biblical learning demands, and whom none can imagine to be unduly biassed, whether in favor of the Massoretic text or of conservative views generally. I mean Dr. A. Dillmann, of Berlin, and Dr. Edward Reuss, of Strasburg. In order to elicit their views the following inquiries were addressed to them, to which they kindly and promptly responded—viz. :

“ Are there any certain tests by which to distinguish those readings of the LXX, which are to be preferred to the Massoretic text, or to discriminate merely plausible conjectures from emendations which ought to be adopted ?

“ In a translation designed not for scholars but for popular use, is it wise or practicable, in the present state of Biblical science, to attempt the correction of the Massoretic text, or to depart from it where it yields an intelligible sense ?”

Dr. Reuss replied as follows :

“ There is a great inclination in the most recent times to take counsel of the LXX for the restoration of the authentic text. (The Peshitto and Targum are of less consequence, but the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion can also be consulted.) Only in the work of emendation from these sources it is easy to go too far, as the LXX especially are not always reliable as translators, and their text often greatly needs correction itself. For the quite particularly corrupt text of the books of Samuel and Ezekiel, the latest commentaries have given good contributions from the LXX. In general our present *philological* commentaries are certainly worth regarding, and many conjectures even to be well considered. Only it is a question whether a

translation of the Bible for practical ends may (darf) reach out after such aids, if it can still help itself at all with the traditional text."

Dr. Dillmann said (the italics and parentheses are his own) :

"General rules for *certainly* distinguishing the variants according to their respective value can scarcely be given. But where the Massoretic text yields only a precarious sense or none at all, and, on the other hand, the other critical testimonies (ancient versions) or even the LXX alone gives a reading which is thoroughly satisfactory in matter and in language, this is certainly to be preferred to the Massoretic reading.

"In a version intended not for scholars but for the Church and the people, the Massoretic text should, in my opinion, be translated pure and simple ; and only where this is unmeaning or does not yield a satisfactory sense should the better reading of the other critical authorities be given in annotations. If the emendations were to be admitted into the text itself, it would be difficult to fix a limit for this procedure. The suffrages of a majority of scholars can decide nothing. In the confusion of the opinions of scholars we may be glad to have an official (Massoretic) text, which can be made the basis of a church version. For the use of the people the divergent (better) readings are of subordinate consequence ; but where they are of any real moment for purposes of edification or instruction, giving them in the annotations may suffice."

There is a clear distinction between what commentators and critics may do in their private capacity, and what is allowable in a version of the Scriptures for general use. The former may deal with variant readings *ad libitum*, and may express their individual preferences for this or that without stint. Others can judge of the strength of their reasons and the correctness of their decisions, and no one is compromised but themselves. But a public version is not the place for venting doubtful opinions, however plausible, or for insecure, much less for rash adventures in criticism or interpretation. Changes should not be made in it hastily or without solid reasons. In this matter it is far better to err on the side of excessive caution than the reverse. Where there is an obvious necessity for correcting the text the Revisers have not hesitated to do so, the American Company freely concurring with the British. Beyond that the American Company were disinclined to go.

They hence disapproved of the numerous references in the margin to the LXX, Vulgate, and other ancient versions or authorities. This was not because they believed the Massoretic text to be faultless or incapable of correction by the versions. This has been repeatedly charged upon them in spite of repeated denials by various members of the company. And the contradictory charge has been further made of "perverseness" and "inconsistency," because in point of fact they did correct the text in sundry instances where imperative necessity required. Where the Massoretic text yielded an intelligible sense, and there was no obvious error, they felt that there was no occasion for going beyond it. The general presumption was strongly in favor of the superior accuracy of the received text.

And there is no agreement among scholars as to the corrections which should be made. It seems needless to encumber the margin with variant readings, many of which appear even to Professor Smith and other critics to be of no account, and which are to this extent misleading, that while the testimonies against the received text are set forth, the counter testimony in its favor is not exhibited.

If anybody feels himself helped by these references to the versions, I see no great objection to their remaining where they are. But they that are curious in such matters would do better to get an English translation of the LXX or of the Targums and make comparisons for themselves. When criticism has so advanced that corrections can be made with comparative certainty, and a general agreement among scholars has been reached, it will be time for popular versions to take note of them.*

Professor Smith tells us, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 641 :

“ We have the Old Testament in a copy that is disfigured by a multitude (I use this word advisedly) of more or less important errors. We have at hand the means of correcting at least half of these errors. The English Committee do correct a number of them in the margin. The American Committee would only admit the dozen or so which they were forced to put into the text, because with their best efforts they could not otherwise make sense out of it. The position of the American Committee, at least, is inexplicable.”

The position of the American Committee has already been sufficiently explained. But the sweeping deduction that there is “ a multitude of errors ” in the Hebrew text is at variance with all the evidence. That such parallel passages as Ps. 18 and 2 Sam. 22 have been preserved distinct in all their minute variations, notwithstanding the temptation, which is apt to infect scribes as well as critics, to correct them into mutual correspondence, is of itself a very instructive fact. Even critics who, like Hitzig and Olshausen, are ready to

* Of the eleven marginal corrections which Professor Smith would transfer to the text, my own opinion is that but two, or at the most three, are at all helpful or have any claim even to remain in the margin—viz., Lev. 25 : 33, Num. 21 : 30 (the Revisers' margin only), and possibly Gen. 47 : 21. If instead of proposing twenty marginal readings from the versions in the Pentateuch the British Company had suggested these three only, I, for one, would not have objected to them, nor to others like them in the remaining books of Scripture. My idea cannot be better expressed than in the closing proposition of Professor Smith (PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 652), if he will allow me to change it slightly : “ The English Company have made a number of corrections in the margin ” (not “ where they ” but—which) “ will be of little benefit to the majority of readers, and in selecting these out of two or three times as many which have equal claims have been guided by no clear or consistent plan.” I only add in a word that if Professor S. will look more carefully at the margin of Gen. 47 : 21 he will find there precisely the correction that he desires ; and in his acceptance of Meyer's extraordinary enendation of Num. 21 : 30 he is as much at variance with Dr. Briggs (Biblical Study, p. 273) as with the Revisers.

find pretexts for amending the text almost without limit do not go to the LXX for evidences of its corruption or for its corrective. Thus Hitzig denies the existence of separate recensions of the Psalms in Alexandria and in Palestine, *Psalmen II.*, p. 22 :

“That which the LXX translated was identical with our Hebrew text, is not to be co-ordinated with it as another text, but flowed with it from the same final recension. . . . Wrong translations proceed, as a rule, from misunderstanding the same text, which they perhaps pronounce differently ; and the corruptions are in great part common to both texts.”

Olshausen in the most explicit terms abandons the ancient versions as sources of textual emendation, and plants himself squarely upon conjecture, *Psalmen*, pp. 19, 21 :

“Scarcely any other value can be attributed to the deviations of the ancient versions than that of more or less fortunate conjectures. Further, the deviations which evidently exist [in the Hebrew] from the original form of the text must in general be very old, even probably reaching beyond the Christian era, and hence are chiefly to be found in the consonant text not then as yet provided with points, and not in the vocalization.” “When a passage gave offence to critics, they consulted the collections of various readings and the ancient versions, and either found the reading of the text confirmed, and accordingly regarded it as completely assured, or they passed judgment upon the deviations that they found, and then they were not often moved to prefer these to the reading of the text ; and justly so certainly. . . . Most critics seem not to have come to the recognition of the fact that the errors in the Old Testament text, with very few exceptions, must all have originated in a time which reaches back beyond all critical witnesses, and so they could believe that they must renounce the only means of criticism that under existing circumstances remains. To be sure, conjectural criticism is an imperfect and insecure means for restoring a damaged text. But as the case stands, we have only the choice either to retain a damaged text in its miserable condition or to make the attempt to restore a corrected text by way of conjecture.”

If, now, we are thrown for evidence of the state of the text upon internal considerations, we have the right to demand that the conclusions drawn shall in all cases be warranted by adequate premises. Conjecture cannot be allowed to go ranging at random through the Old Testament, unsettling and reconstructing, as may suit each critic's fancy. If it is not to be a source of endless confusion, but is to be made available for corrections in which any confidence can be placed, it must not be used merely to exhibit the critic's dexterity, but be strictly limited to cases of actual and obvious necessity. If there is an evident mistake—if, for example, a sentence is unmeaning or ungrammatical, and an easy correction will remove the difficulty, it is clearly right to make it. But passages are not to be tinkered simply because the critic thinks it would be better if the writer had said something different from what he did say.

The change of אכל to אמן in 1 Sam. 6 : 18, *PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW*, p. 513, which the connection demands, opens no “flood-gates,” nor does it justify the bracketing of 1 Sam. 17 : 12–31, 55—18 : 5, p. 514,

to relieve an imaginary difficulty; nor the change of "raven" ערב to "evening" ערב in Job 38 : 41, p. 511, where the former is entirely appropriate, the great mass of interpreters being judges; nor altering the refrain of Ps. 42 : 5 into accordance with ver. 11, p. 510, regardless of the altered turn of the thought and of the language of address in ver. 7, which calls for an initial vocative; or in the familiar hymn, "More love to thee, O Christ" must the first line be conformed to the oft-repeated, "More love, O Christ, to thee." Where a poetic passage does not agree with Dr. Briggs's laws of Hebrew verse, p. 507, note, plainly something is wrong. In such cases the Doctor thinks that the text is at fault and requires correction.* This applies, moreover, to passages which "no one has previously observed" to be poetic. Dr. Briggs† has discovered "that the earlier chapters of Genesis are a series of real poems, which have passed through the hands of several editors in the earlier collections of the Elohist and Jehovist, until at last they were compacted by the redactor of the Hexateuch into their present form." Here the poetical structure settles the text, shows what editorial notes have been added by successive editors, guides to the interpretation, transposes clauses, and eliminates what is said of the Sabbath 2 : 2, 3 from the Hebrew "poem of the creation," which it seems was as silent on this subject in its original form as "the Babylonian poem."

Rev. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe, *Expositor*, p. 62, suggest some emendations for which they claim a moral certainty :

"Lev. 11 : 14 proscribes the eating of *two* birds—the 'kite' ראה, and the 'falcon' איה. But the law in Deut. 14 : 13 gives *three* birds—*i.e.*, it includes with the 'falcon' and the 'kite' (here spelt ריה) what the Authorized Version and the Revised Version agree to call the 'glede.' The Hebrew is ראה. This word is wanting in the Samaritan codex and LXX, and but for this passage it would be unknown to the Hebrew language. In view of the misleading similarity of ר and ר, is not its origin plain? A scribe noticed the divergent spelling ריה, and wrote at the side of his manuscript an explanatory ראה. It was easy for a later scribe to misread the word as ראה, and incorporate it in the text as a third unclean bird. We are convinced the most lax of Jews never infringed the Torah by eating a ראה."

This is certainly possible. Many have thought it probable. But it is far from being certain. ראה from its etymology might well denote a keen-sighted bird. Its being known to this passage only need create no prejudice against it, since the same is true of other names whose genuineness is not suspected. Much might be plausibly said in favor of the hypothesis that Deuteronomy, with its ריה, איה, ראה, preserves the original form of the text. And that in Lev. ריה had

* For additional examples see Dr. Briggs's article in the *Hebraica* for January, 1886, pp. 71, 73, 75.

† The *Old Testament Student* for April, 1884. The *Reformed Quarterly Review* for July, 1885.

been dropped, as might easily happen after a word of like termination, while ראה, which nowhere else occurs, though ריה does, was a slip of the pen for ראה. Or each passage may have been originally written as it now is, a third species of "kite" being introduced into Deuteronomy, as three species of "eagle" were named in the preceding verse. There is uncertainty enough to justify the Revisers in leaving each text as they found it, and adopting the rendering already current in the Authorized Version.

The correction proposed in Joshua 9 : 4 is indicated in the margin, which is its only proper place. The correction made in 1 Sam. 17 : 12 has as much probability as any other ; it is as natural to suppose that בימים has fallen out of the text, comp. Gen. 24 : 1 ; Joshua 13 : 1, as that באנשים is an error for בשנים, which never occurs with בא in this sense, while the Vulgate, Targum and LXX (Alex. Cod.) vouch for the word "men" in the text. 2 Sam. 6 : 5 and 24 : 13 should not be corrected by the parallel passages in Chronicles, but each left in its integrity, with proper marginal references, as has been done by the Revisers. In 2 Sam. 8 : 13 the marginal reference is all that is required. In 2 Sam. 9 : 11, 24 : 23 no emendation is necessary. The allegation (made also by Dr. Briggs, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 509) that על-מות, Ps. 48 : 15, are not the closing words of the Psalm, but a musical sign, has the sanction of Hitzig and Delitzsch. But musical directions are never found at the end of any of the Psalms, but always in the title at the beginning. The rendering given in the Authorized Version and retained in the Revision is that of Hengstenberg and Hupfeld, who adds : "So most interpreters after Kimchi." Ewald and Riehm render as in the margin of the Revision, and claim that the Psalm would be unfinished without these words ; this Delitzsch admits, and finds it necessary to suggest that the original termination of the Psalm may be lost.

We proceed to the fourth and last division of our subject—the errors of theology with which it has been alleged that the revision is chargeable. Dr. Briggs confidently affirms, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 532 : "It is quite evident that in the whole department of Biblical Theology the Revision has failed to adequately represent the original text." How much weight is to be attached to this opinion will appear from the specifications on which it is based. In 1883 he was himself still entangled in the "grave error" of using "the impossible word *Jehovah*" (see *Biblical Study, passim*). With the new light which has since broken in upon his mind he insists upon the transliteration of the name of God into the unfamiliar form "Jahveh," which has at present no devotional association whatever, is utterly foreign to our current religious thought and language, has no place in

our hymns or prayers or devout literature, and could only shock and chill the mind and heart of every reader of the Scriptures. At the same time he would adhere to the translation of אֱלֹהִים by "angels" in Ps. 8 : 5, in defiance of the proper meaning of the word and the universal consent of scholars. He pronounces the rendering "loving-kindness" a "sentimental weakening of a strong and all-important word," since according to him חַסֵּד = ελεος = mercy. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe, in the *Expositor*, p. 431, correctly declare precisely the reverse, and Rev. T. K. Cheyne, in a communication to the *Independent*, expressed his regret that the rendering "loving-kindness" had not been uniformly adopted for this word agreeably to the American suggestion. He does not like "meal-offering," while Dr. Ederheim, if he be the author of the article in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1885, says, p. 481 : "There can be no doubt of the absolute gain of such changes" as this and others, which he specifies in the same connection.

He objects to the rendering, Isa. 53 : 10, "offering for sin" as a "serious error," and adds : "Such conduct is altogether inexcusable. This essential Messianic passage ought to have been correctly rendered at any cost of popular or theological prejudice." This insinuation, often as it is repeated by Dr. Briggs, is wholly gratuitous in this case and in every other. "Theological prejudice" had no conceivable connection with the matter. The generic expression "offering for sin" was placed in the text as more generally intelligible and as conveying to every reader "the idea of substitution and the representation of the Messiah as the sin-bearing victim, suffering for the sins of His people, which," Dr. Briggs correctly says, "is the great theme of the passage." The technical meaning in the Levitical ritual of the precise species of sacrifice denoted by the original term could scarcely be presupposed in ordinary readers. Instead of placing it in the text, therefore, attention is called to it in the margin. This term the English Company prefer to render "guilt-offering," while the American Company adhere to the rendering of the Authorized Version, "trespass-offering" as more exactly expressing its characteristic feature and design, which was that of compensation by a pecuniary equivalent for a trespass—that is to say, for damages inflicted upon the rights or property of another. The use of this word in this connection suggests the important thought that, in addition to expiation for the guilt of sin, Messiah would render an adequate satisfaction or compensation for the damage wrought by sin, its infraction of the divine rights and claims.

His proposed substitution of "he himself" for "his soul" mistakes the point of this emphatic word. The stress is not laid upon

the offering which "he himself" brings as contrasted with those brought by others, but upon the fact that the offering which he made was not of something external to him, but his own soul or life.

Dr. Briggs has detected "two other errors" in this important passage—viz., the rendering "sprinkle," Isa. 52 : 15, and "made intercession," 53 : 12. But the translation is correct in both instances. The first of these words occurs twenty-four times; in twenty-three of these it is universally admitted to mean "sprinkle." In this one passage it has been claimed that "startle," a meaning derived from the Arabic, is better suited to the context. In deference to those who hold this opinion, that rendering is put in the margin. But the established sense of the word is properly put in the text. "The Revisers are also in constant error in rendering יָחַד 'sacrifice.' It is ever the 'peace-offering,' whose essential feature is the communion-meal." But the proper meaning of the word is "sacrifice;" the customary application of it to peace-offerings is just as readily seen in the English as in the Hebrew.

In common with the *Quarterly*, p. 296, and the *Edinburgh Review*, p. 486, he objects to the substitution of "Azazel" for "scapegoat" in Lev. 16 : 8, 10, 26. Dr. Briggs would render "entire dismissal;" the *Quarterly* would retain "scapegoat;" the *Edinburgh Review* would render what amounts to the same thing, "'an azazel'—i.e., destined to be far removed or going far away," and strangely supposes the Revision to imply "a service of demons." On the contrary, the eminent interpreters who adopt the rendering "Azazel" regard the rite prescribed as an act not of homage, but of defiance to the evil spirit. I do not myself approve of the rendering, but would greatly prefer that the American suggestion "removal" should be substituted for it as indicating the true significance of the transaction, that the sins of the people are thus not only expiated and pardoned, but completely and forever removed. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the English Revisers did not see their way clear to deal with "Sheol" in some uniform way. The word certainly never means "the grave," or "the pit," or "hell" in its modern sense; but whether "Sheol" should be retained, as the American Company suggests, or "Hades" substituted for it, or some such rendering as "underworld" adopted, which Dr. Briggs would prefer, is simply a question of taste, not of signification.

The indictment in the *Quarterly* is of a much more serious nature. It is that the most important Messianic passages in the Old Testament are neutralized by changes in the text of the version itself or by alternative renderings suggested in the margin. The writer says, pp. 305, 306 :

"We cannot believe ourselves to be correct in attributing them to a decided animus of the Committee against the Catholic faith, for among their number are bishops of the Church, ecclesiastics of high position, and others whose orthodoxy is above suspicion. It is inconceivable that these divines should have purposely consented to the suppressing of the Messianic references which we have mentioned. . . . The difficulties of the Committee may have been enhanced by the fact that some members, who possibly shrank from the Catholic interpretation of a passage, yet bowed with humble obedience to the authority of such names as Ewald, Gesenius, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Olshausen, and other German commentators."

He objects to the change made in Hag. 2 : 7 from "the desire of all nations" to "the desirable things of all nations," insisting that the rendering of the Authorized Version should have been retained. And the *Edinburgh Review*, p. 489, gives this as "an instance of the displacement of one critically doubtful rendering, which on good grounds has become dear to many, by another at least equally doubtful." Yet the construction, the meaning of the original word, and the context combine to show that the only correct rendering is that which is adopted in the Revision; and it has the sanction of the best and most judicious commentators. Rev. Dr. C. H. H. Wright says: "No honest band of Revisers could have avoided the alteration of the clause; . . . the 'desirable things' referred to being unquestionably the presents and gifts from the kings of the Gentiles spoken of in the 72d Psalm."*

The Messianic passages are to a considerable extent encumbered with margins representing diverse views from that which is exhibited in the text. And the sufficient reason is because such views are actually entertained by respectable authorities, and as far as regards the meaning of words and grammatical construction they are admissible. Thus in Gen. 49 : 10 the Hebrew equally admits of either rendering "until Shiloh come" or "till he come to Shiloh." The reasons which must decide in favor of one or of the other lie outside of the clause itself and of the region of grammatical interpretations. The scope of the passage and the various considerations bearing upon the case are differently conceived by different persons. The object of the version being not to represent the peculiar view of any one class of interpreters or one type of theological belief, but to reproduce the original as far as possible, and to set forth what the original means when fairly interpreted, the Revisers felt bound to record not merely their own individual conception of each passage, but any other of consequence, which has been reasonably maintained.

The most important passages have naturally been most disputed; and as interpreters approach them with different prepossessions,

* The Official Report of the Church Congress (London, 1885), p. 62.

they understand and explain them differently. Where the attempt has been made to force upon the Hebrew inadmissible translations, these have of course been disregarded. But legitimate renderings should be acknowledged as such ; and the English reader of the Bible is entitled to be put in possession of that range of possible meanings which the student of the original can discover there for himself.

In addition to Messianic passages and those which, for various reasons, are of special importance, there are likewise not a few obscure and difficult passages, the meaning of which can scarcely be said to be satisfactorily explained, and about which the best expositors are perplexed and are greatly divided. A variety of interpretations have been proposed in such cases, which may be regarded as more or less successful approximations to the genuine meaning. Some of these are more probable than others, and stronger reasons can be urged in their favor. Still, no one is so evidently and positively correct as to exclude the rest. Here again there is no other resource than to submit to the necessities of the case. It is due to the English reader that these various renderings should be laid before him.

And thus the margin has grown to a rather inconvenient size, and has become a somewhat miscellaneous repository. But this was inevitable, in the nature of things. Perhaps the door may have been opened too widely, and some things needlessly admitted which are of no value or importance, and might better have been excluded. This, however, is a matter of taste and of judgment. The necessity of a somewhat copious margin, much fuller upon occasion than that of the Authorized Version, was not to be escaped.

It is said in the *Quarterly*, and it has been said elsewhere, that this is confusing to the English reader, who is only bewildered by this array of renderings, with no clue to the respective value to be attached to each. This is true to a certain extent ; but it is one of the unavoidable embarrassments which spring out of the nature of the case, and it simply has to be submitted to. It would have been a very happy thing if one definite and lucid rendering, yielding the exact sense of the original, could in every case have been given, and all others could have been dispensed with. Thus all doubt and ambiguity would have been precluded. But where these do in fact exist, it is only honest to admit it. If there is a diversity of judgment among interpreters, which has any real warrant in the original, this ought not to be denied or concealed. It is of course impossible so to guide the judgment of the reader in each individual case as to relieve all perplexity. That which on the whole was deemed preferable was assigned a place in the text ; all others were remanded to the

margin. These latter accordingly represent every various grade of probability, from that of co-ordination with the text, where it may really be doubtful which should preponderate, to that of a vanishing value, where it may be doubtful whether it deserved mention at all. But it was obviously impossible to classify them upon any graduated scale, or to assist the reader's judgment further than by simply recording them for his inspection. The reasons *pro* and *con* in the case of each could not have been exhibited without writing a commentary.

With the disapproval expressed in the *Quarterly*, p. 304, of the change made in Dan. 9 : 25-27 I entirely accord, and introduce here what I have said on that subject elsewhere—the *Presbyterian Journal* for June 25th, 1885 :

“ The most serious alteration to my mind in the entire Old Testament is in the famous passage of the seventy weeks in Daniel, ch. 9. The common voice of Christian interpretation from the beginning has found in these verses a signal prophecy of the period of the advent and ministry of the Messiah, of His death, terminating the sacrificial system of the old dispensation, and of the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by the Romans. A different interpretation has been maintained in modern times, and is ordinarily connected with the view that the Book of Daniel was not written by a prophet of that name living during the Babylonish exile, but in the Maccabean period, shortly after the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and about the time of that tyrant's death, and that the prophecies so called of this book do not reach beyond that event, but are in reality descriptions of the past in the guise of prophecy.

“ The translation given in the Revision evidently proceeds upon the hypothesis that this passage stands in no relation whatever to the coming of Jesus Christ, and that it refers to no event later than the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. The simple fact that ‘ Messiah, the prince,’ is changed to ‘ the anointed one, the prince,’ need not of itself be significant, for that is the proper meaning of the word, and it is so rendered in other passages, as in Ps. 2, where the reference to the Messiah is not denied. The form of the margin, *Or Messiah, the prince*, seems, however, to suggest that the ‘ anointed one ’ of the text is another than the Messiah ; accordingly the American Appendix changes this margin to Heb. *Messiah*, thus affirming their identity. Instead of the semicolon after ‘ threescore and two weeks,’ the text of the Revision punctuates after ‘ seven weeks.’ This is in accordance with the Massoretic interpunction, which, however, in so difficult a prophecy need not be decisive. It absolutely closes the door to the Messianic interpretation, and is the rendering adopted by those who make the first ‘ anointed one ’ to be Cyrus, and the second Onias, and ‘ the prince that shall come ’ Antiochus Epiphanes. This cannot be carried through without further assumptions of errors in the numbers and violence to the terms employed ; nevertheless, this is the issue to which these changes point. And other changes make this still more evident, as ‘ from the end thereof’—*i.e.*, of the city and sanctuary, which were destroyed by the Romans, to ‘ his end,’ that of Antiochus Epiphanes. ‘ In the midst of the week’—*i.e.*, the last of the seventy weeks of years, which began with the entrance of Christ upon His public ministry, declares that after a ministry of three years sacrifices and oblations should be abolished by the offering of that one perfect sacrifice, which effectually and forever supersedes them. For this the Revision substitutes ‘ for the half of the week,’ meaning that the worship of the temple was suppressed by Antiochus Epiphanes during three years and a half. And the final change from ‘ desolate ’ to ‘ desolater ’ again alters the reference from the fall of Jerusalem to the death of Antiochus.

“ I do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. The reference of this passage to Antiochus Epiphanes, though adopted by those who deny the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, does not necessarily involve any imputation, whether upon its genuineness or inspiration. It is consistent likewise with a typical application to the Messiah ; not so much to His first coming and vicarious death, as to His second coming and the overthrow of Antichrist. If that translation be correct, let it be accepted, whatever cherished interpretations fall in consequence.

“ As, however, the American Revisers believed that this prophecy by its terms points directly and explicitly to the Lord Jesus Christ, they restore in the several particulars already named the rendering of the Authorized Version in their Appendix. The modifications in this passage, slight as they may appear to the superficial reader, alter so completely its application that it is due to the Christian public that its bearings should be fully exhibited, in order that it may be judged of understandingly.”

To this paragraph Professor Francis Brown refers in the *Independent* of September 10th, as an illustration of “ an alteration in the text . . . made to satisfy dogmatic prepossessions.” And Dr. Briggs reaffirms the same, *Hebraica*, p. 69 :

“ This, then, is what Dr. Green regards as an ‘ imperative necessity.’ The necessity springs from the desire to preserve the ‘ Messianic interpretation.’ It is not a necessity of documentary evidence, or of the authority of versions, but purely internal evidence which is offered for the departure from the Massoretic text, and this of a somewhat slender kind.”

The purpose of the paragraph was not to present the grounds of decision, but to explain the effect of the modifications in the Revision. And how could fair-minded men overlook the statement that the Messianic interpretation is required by the terms of these verses, while the non-Messianic view does violence to these terms, and requires the assumption of errors in the numbers, and that correct translation is the decisive criterion, not cherished interpretations? Dr. Briggs’s allusion to the “ authority of versions” is here particularly unfortunate, for with one voice they sustain the Authorized Version and the American Revisers against the Massoretic interpolation. There is no Targum on Daniel. But the Vulgate and Theodotion, whose translation of Daniel superseded that of the LXX, combine “ seven weeks and sixty-two weeks.” The text of ver. 25 in the LXX is exceedingly corrupt, and has no numbers at all ; but in ver. 26 “ seven and seventy and sixty-two” are combined, where in all probability “ seventy” stands for the Hebrew “ weeks.” So that if anything whatever can be inferred from the LXX, it is in favor of the Authorized Version. And while the Syriac is not absolutely decisive, the seven weeks and sixty-two weeks are there most naturally to be combined, and were so explained by Ephræm Syrus, the most ancient commentator on the Peshitto, *Opera* (Romæ, 1740) II., p. 222.

The propriety of departing from the Hebrew accents, where there are strong exegetical reasons for doing so, is conceded and acted upon

by all interpreters. That Dr. Briggs finds the internal evidence against the accents "of a somewhat slender kind" does not surprise us, since, in tracing the doctrine of the "Messianic King" through the Old Testament, he never once mentions or alludes to this prophecy of Daniel, apparently not believing that "Messiah the prince" is here referred to. See the *Independent* for December 24th, 1885.

Of Ps. 22 : 16, where the Revisers have retained the rendering of the Authorized Version, "They pierced my hands and my feet," Dr. Briggs says, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, p. 511 :

"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." See also *Hebraica*, p. 71.

The simple fact is, that the clause cannot be made intelligible otherwise. Even though the Hebrew word be read "like a lion," there will still be an "imperative necessity" to supply "they pierced" or some verb of like signification. So the *Edinburgh Review*, p. 479. Dr. Briggs further says of Sol's Song 2 : 4-7, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, pp. 511, 512, 520 :

"Our American Revisers do not hesitate to interpolate in order to avoid an interpretation which is against their *a priori* theory." "The underlying reason of the American Revisers seems to be a hostility to the realistic interpretation of this marvellous drama of love. . . . The American Revisers would foist an erroneous interpretation into the drama." "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."

The rendering of the Revision in 2 : 4 and of the American Revisers in 2 : 7 is correct, whatever view be taken of the Song ; while that which Dr. Briggs proposes for 2 : 4 violates the grammar for the sake of sustaining not only a very precarious and slenderly supported but a very objectionable hypothesis in relation to the Song, and one entirely inconsistent with Solomon's authorship, and contrary to that which has been held by the great body of evangelical interpreters from the earliest times. The hypothesis which he would thus carry through at all hazards is that Solomon is not the lover of the Song, but that he is striving to seduce a damsel from her constant fidelity to her affianced lover, while she indignantly repels his advances. Dr. Briggs says of the proposal in the Appendix to restore substantially the rendering of the Authorized Version in Hosea 8 : 12 (the *Evangelist* for July 30th, 1885) :

"The American Company violate one of the first principles of the doctrine of tense, in order to gain an argument for their theory of the composition of the Pentateuch."

The rendering is in accordance with the frequent and universally acknowledged usage of the Hebrew tense ; and no one would ever have dreamed of inventing another but for the sake of escaping the

evidence therein afforded that there was a written divine law in the time of Hosea. Adherence to what is most surely believed among us on solid and irrefragable grounds is characterized by Dr. Briggs as "a stolid adamantine traditionalism" which has "thrown itself athwart the great advance in Biblical learning which has been made in recent years" (*Evangelist, ibid.*).

But this article has already swollen beyond the dimensions within which I had resolved to confine it. One word more and I have done. The critics of the Revision complain of the diversity of judgment among the Revisers. A like diversity characterizes the critics themselves. In the language of the *Edinburgh Review*, p. 454, some "complain that the revision has been made by too timid hands, held back by other considerations than the requirements of exegetical science;" others "urge that too many alterations, some of them not at all wise, have been introduced." The *Quarterly* deprecates not only every departure from the Massoretic text, but apparently every deviation from the Authorized Version. The *Edinburgh*, p. 467, affirms "that the Revisers had no other alternative than to use the Massoretic text," and would it only admit variations from different readings or the ancient versions, "where the text evidently requires them or where they seem so plainly congruous to it as to have almost self-evident force." And p. 459: "Perhaps this suggestion to the Revisers by their American colleagues was too sweeping: 'Omit from the margin all renderings from the Septuagint, Vulgate, and other ancient versions or authorities.' Yet, as pointing to a very serious danger, there was practical wisdom in it, and this in more than one direction. . . . In most cases it is a subject for critical discussion, suitable for a commentary intended for students, but manifestly impossible in a people's Bible." Dr. Briggs and Professor H. P. Smith would not be satisfied without an extensive use of both the ancient versions and critical conjecture for the correction of the O. T. text.

Rev. Dr. C. H. H. Wright approves (Church Congress, p. 62), the *Edinburgh*, p. 479, censures the margin to Ps. 2 : 12; he approves, p. 60, the rendering of 1 Kings 22 : 38, which the *Quarterly*, p. 315, condemns. Rev. Professor Kirkpatrick, of Cambridge (Church Congress, p. 55), approves the change made in Isa. 9 : 3, which Dr. Briggs (*Hebraica*, p. 74) disapproves. Messrs. Jennings and Lowe (the *Expositor*, p. 433) include among the "incontrovertible" translations that of Judges 5 : 14, to which the *Edinburgh*, p. 486, takes exception; they place in the same list Hos. 14 : 2, while in the judgment of Professor Kirkpatrick, p. 58, "it is hard to believe" that their rendering "should not give way" to another.

It is vain to expect a harmonious acquiescence at the present time in any revision that could possibly be produced. And the *Edinburgh*, p. 451, holds out the not very cheering anticipation that there will be less harmony in the future than now—"We may at least express a doubt whether twenty years after this so large an accord of critical opinion could be expected." All hope of bettering the Authorized Version must be abandoned, if nothing would be acceptable that does not completely satisfy every one. Ideal perfection is impracticable. The only reasonable question respecting the Revision is whether it is a sufficient improvement upon the Authorized Version to warrant its general acceptance. This is the question to be answered by the Christian public. I shall not anticipate its verdict. I simply place on record here the judgment expressed at the late English Church Congress by certain well-known scholars who took part in the discussion upon this subject. Rev. Canon Driver, Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, said, Official Report, p. 53 :

"I know that it contains renderings with which I disagree ; I know also that there are cases in which I would gladly have seen what is now in the margin introduced into the text ; but I know besides that for one rendering in the Revised Version with which (perhaps wrongly) I disagree, there are ten in the Authorized Version which I am sure are positively incorrect and misleading, and a hundred where, though serious error cannot be imputed, the sense is more accurately and faithfully reflected in the Revised Version. . . . I think—speaking not as a member of the company of Revisers, but as a Hebrew scholar, desirous simply of promoting a clearer and truer knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures—that it deserves to be brought into general use."

Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, said, p. 54 :

"In fidelity and lucidity the Revised Version is vastly superior to the Authorized Version. Am I too sanguine if I think that, when we come to be familiar with it, we shall find it not so very much less enjoyable ? I am not optimist enough to think that it is perfect ; probably the Revisers would themselves be the first to admit its imperfections. But whatever those imperfections may be, a noble and thankworthy task has been accomplished, of which the century may well be proud."

Rev. Dr. C. H. H. Wright said, p. 59 :

"Few will deny that the work accomplished by the Old Testament Company is most valuable. It may be said to be generally conceded that the new translation as a whole is much superior to the Authorized Version ; and I fully indorse this opinion."

A word of personal explanation is proper at the close of this article. It deals simply with the criticisms of the Revised Version of the Old Testament, not with the persons of the critics nor with any other of their productions. These criticisms are discussed, it is believed, with entire fairness, though with a freedom and frankness which they have themselves invited. In all that is here written there is no intentional, and I trust that there will be found no actual, transgression, of the rules of legitimate debate.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.