

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 52—October, 1902.

I.

PERSONALITY THE SUPREME CATEGORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

MODERN philosophy began with an emphatic assertion of dualism. The primary contrast in our experience between subject and object, self and not-self, mind and matter, was construed, by both the great men with whom modern philosophy took its rise, as an opposition not to be overcome.

Although Descartes started from the assumption of the competency of pure thought to explain reality, independently of observation—his principle being that everything must be true which is clearly and distinctly conceived—he failed to deal satisfactorily with the question as to the relation between the material and the spiritual. To him the world seemed to fall apart into two alien and unrelated realms. Mind has as its essential attribute thought, and matter has as its essential attribute extension; these predicates do not imply each other, but are mutually exclusive, and hence the substances to which they belong can have no natural basis of connection. On the one hand, Descartes wished to make due provision for the ethical and religious life of man, and, on the other hand, he desired to recognize the reign of law in nature, and the only way of securing these two ends seemed to him to be the making a sharp division between the world of mind, in which the free will of man is supreme, and the world of nature, which is subject to the sway of mechanical laws. Accordingly Descartes held that everything in the universe, except the mind of man, is explicable on mechanical principles; the whole world of nature, including the world of animal life, can be accounted for under laws of matter and motion. The two factors of

form and the other discrediting the other,—so that between them they take away both. In any case we shall get little comfort out of it, for neither appears to allow to prophecy anything like all that the prophets claimed for it. The article on "Prophecy" by Dr. Davidson has, indeed, received high encomiums. In these we cannot share. It does not appear to us to represent Dr. Davidson at his best in any way: and as an exposition of the nature of prophecy it is fatally naturalistic in tendency and, if taken at its word, would reduce it in principle to the level of manticism.

We must not, however, linger longer on a book so rich and varied in contents that it would supply occasion for almost endless remark. Besides the editors some 105 writers in all have been occupied in gathering the material here presented us. Two of these are well-known Jewish scholars, Mr. Israel Abrahams and Dr. W. Bacher, of Budapest (who contributes the long article on "Synagogue"). Of German scholars, Baudissin (the article on "Priests and Levites"), Budde (art. "Poetry, Hebrew"), König, Nestle ("Septuagint," "Sirach," "Text of New Testament," "Syriac Versions"), Nowack, Rothstein ("Song of Songs"), Siegfried, and Strack ("Text of the O. T.") have been drawn upon. Their contributions are marked by German thoroughness: but on the whole we think the topics would have been better treated by English-speaking scholars—with less learning perhaps, but more faculty of proportionate estimation. Some twelve American writers appear in this volume: Drs. Willis J. Beecher, Frederick J. Bliss, W. Adams Brown (theological articles treated in a semi-Ritschlite spirit), Selah Merrill, W. Max Müller (Egyptological articles), F. C. Porter (the very long article on the book of Revelation), Harvey Porter, G. Post (Natural History), I. M. Price, G. T. Purves ("Prætorium," "Preparation Day," etc.), G. B. Stevens, B. B. Warfield. The volume contains a map of Canaan as divided among the twelve tribes, and a few illustrations (*e.g.*, under "Pottery," "Tabernacle," "Temple" and the very excellent article on "Writing" by Dr. Kenyon).

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THE HOLY BIBLE, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues; being the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881-1885: Newly edited by the AMERICAN REVISION COMMITTEE, A.D., 1901. Standard Edition. Large 8vo, pp. xvi, 970+xviii, 295+8 and twelve maps. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons [1901].

The issue of the Revised English Bible in the form preferred by the American Committee—twenty years after the appearance of the Revised New Testament and sixteen years after the appearance of the Revised Old Testament in the British form—at last puts before the public the results of the labors of the Revision Committee in their completeness. The long delay in issuing this American revision, as everybody knows, has been due to an agreement with the University Presses of England. Its final issue is due to a natural desire on the part of the American Committee that the results of its labors should be given the world in some completeness and consistency. The points of difference between the British and American revisions are enumerated with some fullness in the Appendices attached to each Testament. In one point of view, of course, they are not very important: and we must always guard ourselves against hysterical overestimation of minute differences, as if the Word of God were not competently transmitted through the ordinary channels of translation through which it has reached the hearts of the multitude of English readers since the Reformation. Lan-

guage is sometimes employed which if taken literally might lead the thoughtless to doubt whether it was the Bible that he had been reading in King James' Version or whether he could obtain from that Version any safe guidance to faith and conduct. In another point of view this list of differences is of the utmost significance, and a mere perusal of it should be enough to convince any competent judge that in the same sense, though not in the same degree, that the Revised Version is better than the Authorized Version, the American form of the Revised Version is better than the British form. The Bible lies with competent exactness in all these forms, it is true,—and in several others also; and he who will diligently study it in any of its English forms shall not fail of his reward. But its best form is none too good for its most humble student; and it is found in its best extant form for the English reader, we are persuaded, in the recension that has been given us by the American revisers.

The difference between the American and British forms of the Revision is not, as has been sometimes represented, that the former is the more radical revision of the two—if, at least, we take that term in its most current sense. In many respects it is the more “conservative” revision. The difference lies in what we may perhaps call, in a broad sense, the greater “consistency” of the American revision. By this we do not mean merely that the Americans more consistently render the same Hebrew and Greek terms by the same English equivalents. This is doubtless the fact, and may or may not be thought a virtue. What we mean refers primarily to a deeper fact. The American revisers have more consistently carried out the main task given to the committees,—the task of bringing the English Bible at once closer to the original texts and closer to the reading public of our own day. They have freed themselves a little more fully from the tyranny of accustomed phrases, and bound themselves on the other hand a little more closely to the exact text of Scripture as it lay before them. In the one interest they have cleared the English Bible of many archaisms to which the British revisers inconsistently clung and have introduced a number of renderings which accord more with modern English idiom: in the other interest they have rendered the text somewhat more closely or ascertained the text to be rendered a little more soundly, and treated the text before them with a shade more deference. The difference is slight in any case and we would not exaggerate it: but the difference such as it is tends to make the American form at once a bit more modern, more scholarly and more reverent.

It is manifestly impossible to enter into a discussion here even of the main classes of differences. They are enumerated, as we have said, in the Appendices attached to each Testament. The first one mentioned for the Old Testament concerns the use of the divine name “Jehovah.” As is well known, the British revisers continued to employ statedly for this “covenant name” the words “the LORD,” “LORD,” “GOD,” printed in small capitals. The American revisers restore the Divine name. We cannot understand how there can be any difference of opinion as to the rightness of this step. This is the Lord's *personal* name, by which He has elected to be known by His people: the loss suffered by transmuting it into His descriptive title seems to us immense. To be sure there are disputes as to the true form of the name, and nobody supposes that “Jehovah” is that true form. But it has the value of the true form to the English reader; and it would be mere pedantry to substitute for it Yahwé or any of the other forms now used with more or less inaccuracy by scholastic writers. We account it no small gain for the English reader of the Old Testament that he will for the first time in his popular version meet statedly with “Jehovah” and learn all that “Jehovah” has been to and done for His people.

The propriety of the uniform use of "Sheol" appears to us to admit of more debate: a new and strange term is thus thrust before the people which needs a good deal of explanation to be properly understood, and which is not always properly explained. Its translation is nevertheless difficult, perhaps insuperably difficult: and a good deal can be said for its uniform employment if it is to occur at all.

We look upon the rather drastic dealing which has been accorded to the textual notes with which the British revisers ornamented the margin of the Old Testament as thoroughly deserved and very much to be commended. These notes were misleading in the extreme. The American revisers have reduced them from 240 to about 42 and have treated those they have retained rationally. We only wish that the New Testament company had subjected the textual notes there given to something like the same revision. The terms "most," "many," "some," "ancient authorities" are used in them with great latitude of meaning and can tend only to confuse.

Most of the other differences in the Old Testament concern details that cannot be entered upon here: but we can hardly doubt that the American preference will in the large majority of cases commend itself to most readers. Occasionally one fancies further improvement possible. For example, the Authorized Version and the British Revisers read in Prov. xxvii. 3: "heavier than them both." The Americans propose: "heavier than they both." This may be grammatically accurate, but it is not euphonious. One wonders why we may not have simply: "heavier than both"; or possibly: "heavier than both of them."

The changes proposed for the New Testament call for little separate remark. "Holy Spirit" is read everywhere for "Holy Ghost"; "through" instead of "by" is used generally with reference to prophecy; "try," "make trial of" is used instead of "tempt" when the reference to wrongdoing is not direct: sundry archaisms are removed: and a careful scrutiny is given the translation throughout. The most striking difference in the New Testament probably concerns the titles of the books and indeed of the book itself. The title-page is made to bear: "The New Covenant, commonly called The New Testament." The four gospels are treated as one book with the common title "The Gospel," while above each stands merely the defining adjunct: "According to Matthew"; "According to Mark," etc. Acts is entitled merely "The Acts." The "S." that stands for "Saint" is omitted in all cases: and "The Epistle to the Hebrews" has no further heading than these bare words. The word "General" is omitted from the titles to the Catholic Epistles: and the title to Revelation reads merely "The Revelation of John." We may judge differently of the changes here made: they are not of much importance in any case. Perhaps the omission of the word "Gospel" in the headings of Mark, Luke and John is of the most doubtful utility. And the insertion of the new rendering of *Diathéké* in the general title is liable to the objection that it brings this title-page out of harmony with the general title-page of the volume.

This last remark leads us to a point that concerns the make-up of the volume, to which attention should be drawn. There is a general title-page; and a special title-page to the New Testament: but no special title-page to the Old Testament. This is a flaw striking enough in itself: but there is worse than this to advert to. Not only is there no special title-page to the Old Testament, but the general Preface to the whole volume is confused with the Preface to the Old Testament. Those accustomed to carefully made-up volumes will surely take offense at this carelessness. We should have had, of course, first the general title-page; then the general preface; then the special title-page to the Old Testament; then the American preface

to the Old Testament (from p. iv); then the British preface of 1885; then the text of the Old Testament: and so on. The proof-reading of the Prefaces might also have been improved: *e.g.*, on p. v of Old Testament we have "occasional" for "occasionally," and on p. vii two flaws in the English that should not have escaped bettering; and on p. vii of the New Testament we have a sentence (opening the third paragraph) which fairly defies grammatical analysis.

The arrangement of the text on the page deserves a moment's notice. It is printed in two columns with three margins. Down the centre is given a well-selected and useful list of references. On the inside and outside margins are given the notes accompanying the Revised text. Across the top of the page there runs a line in thick-faced type indicating the contents of the page. The page numbers are at the foot of the page; chapter and verse numbers occupy the top. Chapter and verse numerals are inserted into the text instead of aligned along the margin. The paragraphing and punctuation have both been carefully revised. The printing is well done; the type is clear and sharp; the spacing and leading both judicious. The page has an open and clean appearance.

What is to become of the Revised Version, and especially of the American form of it? Who can tell? It has already served an excellent end as a kind of commentary to the text in the hands of the more eager Bible readers; that end it is destined to serve yet further. Whether it will ever become the popular English Version seems largely dependent upon whether the great Bible Societies can find it possible to take it up and circulate it. It is certainly to be desired that they may.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

STILISTIK, RHETORIK, POETIK in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur comparativisch dargestellt von ED. KÖNIG, Dr. Phil. und Theol., ordentlicher Professor an der Universität Bonn. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung: Theodor Weicher, 1900. [vi, 422, octavo.]

This work is meant to be a supplement to the author's *Historisch-comparativische Syntax des Hebräischen*. It contains 360 pages of subject-matter and sixty pages of indices—to wit, five pages of abbreviations, fifty of citations, and two shorter indexes, one of Hebrew words and the other of the *termini technici* of Arabic style. The title fairly represents the contents of the book. It is a work treating fully and in general satisfactorily of the style, rhetoric and poetry of the Biblical literature. Perhaps it would be better to say Old Testament Hebrew than Biblical literature, since the three pages of citations of illustrative examples from the New Testament and one and a quarter from the Apocrypha, as compared with the forty-five pages from the Old Testament, probably give more than the proportion of the volume taken up with the discussion of the style, rhetoric and poetry of these portions of Biblical literature. The New Testament and the Apocrypha might well be embraced under the word "comparativisch," though by this word the author seems more especially to have meant the style, etc., of the Greek, Latin and Arabic literatures.

As might have been expected from the learned author of the greatest Hebrew grammar ever written, this so-called supplement is massive, comprehensive and thorough. There is nothing like it, and hence nothing equal to it, in the sphere of which it treats. It will be an indispensable aid to all who aim at thoroughness and at a clear understanding of the "dark sayings" in the study of the Scriptures.

The method of treatment is original with Professor König. He treats of

