

# *Theology* on the *Web*.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



*Buy me a coffee*

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN  
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

—  
VOL. XII.  
—

LONDON  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW  
1885

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

JULY, 1885.

---

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

THE EDITING, ORTHOGRAPHY, AND USE OF CAPITAL LETTERS.

AT length this great work is accomplished, and we are allowed to hold in our hands the Revised Old Testament. Fourteen years have elapsed since the first meeting of the Revisers, and during this time ten of the company have passed away. The task was spread over eighty-five sessions of ten days each, six hours of close application being given on an average each day, to say nothing of the amount of preliminary work done by each Reviser in his own home. Here is a fruitful subject for meditation; for if so much labour has been called forth in the revision of our English Bible, which was confessedly an accurate version to begin with, what must be the toil and responsibility in which the missionary is involved, who has to undertake almost single-handed, with no—or next to no—literary assistance, and amidst exhaustive labours and bitter disappointments of every sort, a translation of the Scriptures book by book into a language which possesses no literature whatever! As we turn over the list of the British and Foreign Bible Society's Versions, one gets a new idea of the magnificence of their undertaking in the light of this new work just accomplished. Bible translation, however, though difficult, is intensely interesting. It calls for a number of gifts, and it ought not to be undertaken without clean hands and a pure heart and a spirit of dependence on the enlightening grace of God. But when taken in hand in this loyal spirit, the work will bring its own reward. One cannot ponder over these ancient sacred records, and weigh and scrutinize the words which they contain, and examine the bearing of tensc

and preposition and definite article, and compare passage with passage to find out the usage of special terms, without gaining strength and depth in one's own convictions, and in one's grasp of sacred truth. This has been the experience of translators in all times and countries; and we cannot doubt that the bishops, professors, and learned men who have been engaged on the work before us will add their testimony to that of others on this point.

Touching the mode of carrying out the work, there appears to have been a marked difference between the plan adopted by the Revisers and that which was thought best when James I. arranged for the Authorized Version. In those days the Old Testament was divided into three parts, certain learned men in London undertaking the Pentateuch and Historical Books to the end of the Kings; Cambridge being answerable for the Books of the Chronicles onward to Ecclesiastes; and Oxford for the Prophetical Books. To Cambridge was also allotted the Apocrypha; to Oxford the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse; and to Westminster the Epistles. Moreover, in those days all the learned clergy were urged by their bishops to send notes to the various companies, a course which does not seem to have been thought necessary now. Our Revisers met all together, and discussed the whole Old Testament verse by verse, admitting no change into the text which had not a majority of two-thirds of those present, and subjecting the whole revision when accomplished to a farther revision, which probably tended in a more conservative direction, when the work could be read as a whole, and its effect on the ear could be judged of. It must have been a delicate matter to deal with the suggestions of the American Revisers, who had the great disadvantage of not being present to argue out the results of their own company's labours, and who represent a more "modern" style of expression, even in sacred things, than we are used to. The list of rejected American suggestions appended at the end of the Old Testament is very imposing and somewhat perplexing. It would have been much more convenient to the general reader if some of them had been admitted into the margin, and the letter A prefixed to mark their source.

But now it is high time to pass from these prefatory remarks to the book itself. And first comes the *title-page*. This compares very favourably with the old one, but is still very defective. The old title-page was simply ludicrous, because it spoke of "His Majesty's special command," without telling people who "His Majesty" was, whilst those who consulted the fulsome dedication (which is fast disappearing from modern Bibles) would only learn that he was "the most high and

mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland." The revised title-page does not tell us by whose command the new work has been taken in hand, but affirms in the most conspicuous type that the work is "printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge"—a statement which might lead some to imagine that these learned bodies had put their *imprimatur* on the text, whereas they have only bought the copyright of the work as a commercial transaction.

The *Preface* gives us the real history of the Revision; and though it is not such a monument of learning as the Translator's preface to the Authorized Version, now no longer printed in the Bible, but to be obtained separately by the studious, yet it is clear and sensible, and gives just the information needed about the principles on which the Revision was undertaken.

As to the *editing* of the book, one or two remarks may be made, based upon an examination of the 8vo. (minion) edition. The general appearance of the book is good, and the type is fair but rather closely packed; the stereotype plates from which the text is printed are already becoming damaged and need looking after; the paper and presswork are capable of improvement, but the press has been very well read, and we doubt if many misprints will be detected. The most serious editorial defect is the arrangement of the page-headings, which give chapter and verse on the inner margin instead of the outer. How any practised Biblical editor can have ordered this is a marvel. If the numbers of the chapters were inserted with the title of the book, and the paging was put at the bottom in the centre, then there would have been room for what are called "running page-headings," which would have been most convenient to the reader, and would not have been of the nature of comment. Readers of the Bible Society's Paragraph Bible will see carried out what is here suggested. Another slight editorial defect appears to be in the numeration: the numbers marking the chapters are too small, and those marking the notes are too large. These seem little things to speak of, but they tend to mislead the student, who wants clearness above everything.

The book is rightly printed in paragraphs, and the poetical parts are in some cases printed in indented lines; but a great deal more of the Old Testament might have been exhibited in its poetical form to great advantage. Editors will differ in their arrangements, but the Revisers must have had before them not only the Paragraph Bibles of the three great English Societies, but also some foreign Bibles, such as that prepared by M. Louis Ségond, and might have easily told off one or two

of their members to submit to their company a copy based on those works. Apparently the New Testament Revisers thought that the Prophetical Books would be printed in parallels. This has led to the anomalous fact that passages cited in the New Testament as poetry appear in the Old Testament as prose.

It is strange that the Revisers have not availed themselves of the use of *inverted commas* for extracts from speeches and documents in some passages where they would be very helpful, as in the fourth, fifth, and sixth of Ezra. The editors have not divided the Psalms into strophes, as they might well have done, though now and then they have attempted it; but they have grouped some chapters and passages together, and have separated others by "a white line," as may be seen in parts of Job and in the Canticles.

The next things that we naturally look at are the *spelling* and the *English*. Putting aside for the present the spelling of proper names, we observe a slight inconsistency in the Revisers' orthography. It would be natural to suppose that they would adopt the spelling of the day. This they do sometimes, but not always. They have thought fit to write "inclose," not "enclose;" they have put an *e* into the middle of the word "judgment"—as the New Testament Revisers have done—but with what object? The spelling of the word was settled, and called for no revision. They have done away with "sope," "clift," and "pilled," but have retained "fat" for "vat," "fitches" for "vetches," "jubile" for "jubilee," "agone" for "ago," "confectionaries" for "confectioners," "wringed" for "wrung," "tired" for "attired," "astonied" for "astonished," "chapiter" for "capital," "knop" for "knob." No one will quarrel with "crookbackt," or "pluckt," or with "borne," in the active sense, as in Gen. xxx. 20, as compared with Isa. ix. 6.

The word "its" is introduced instead of "his" or "her," where required, in accordance with modern usage, and we no longer read in 1 Kings xiii. 27, "Saddle me the ass; and they saddled him." Is the word "wist" retained? "Forgat" is still left, though we suppose it ought to be pronounced "forgot," as "plat" should probably be pronounced "plot."

A good many *new words* are introduced into the Revision, but not more than might be expected, and there are not so many changes in this respect as in the Revised New Testament, in proportion to the size and nature of the Books. Though the "dragon" has been retained, the "unicorn" has gone out, being replaced by the "wild-ox" (though the "bison" would have been better). "Songs of Degrees" are turned into "Songs of Ascents;" the "college" where Huldah lived is become the "second quarter" (2 Kings xxii. 14); the King's

“chapel” is a “sanctuary;” we are introduced to palanquins, crescents, pendants, satraps, darics, raids, tent-pins, he-lambs, bull-calves, tumours, pipings, and swoons. We have the lotus, the greyhound, the caperberry, hatchets, henna, lye, sandals, caravans, tubes; we read of godless men, worthless men, cavillers, marshals, sorrel horses, moats, castanets, satchels, sashes, shawls, canopies, amulets, terebinths, tunics, interdicts, vaults, bolts, spouts, obelisks, basilisks, papyrus, acacia, gasping, glowing, whirling, gamboling, rustling, festering and teeming. “Artillery” has disappeared, Spirits no longer “peep” (*i.e.* “pipe”), but they adopt the more pleasant method of “chirping;” “carriages” are turned into “baggage,” and “Lucifer” becomes “Daystar.” “Distemper” is still called “untempered mortar;” doves still have “mouths,” and “footmen” figure as before.

Out of respect, no doubt, for the instigators of the Revision, the word “convocation” has been retained; but it is not so clear why the words “candlestick,” “beeves,” “emerods,” and “assay” have been left. Though “foxes” have generally been turned to “jackals,” they have been left occasionally for old acquaintance’ sake, *e.g.* in Ps. cxvi. 11.

The Revisers have been apparently puzzled as to the use of the hyphen. Thus they print “birthstool” like “footstool.” This is well enough, though the word is a queer one; but if they print “almond-blossom,” why leave out the hyphen in “snuff-dishes”? Why invent such marvellous compounds as “Presence-bread” and “Anointing-portion”? If they print “sand-lizard” and “land-crocodile,” why print “sea miews”? There are some very serious omissions in the matter of hyphens, which will be adverted to in a later paper. Meanwhile we may add a few more to the list of new words. “Bowlful” is good, but “omerful” looks rather curious. “Mirror” is good, instead of “looking-glass,” as tending to remind the reader that the object in question was made of metal. “Clasp,” “shoulderpiece,” “headtire,” are good words; of “screen,” more anon. It is well to have got rid of “matrix,” “tache,” “bonnet;” and ladies will be glad to read of “sealskins” instead of “badgerskins,” in connection with the Tabernacle. “Ouches” are still left.

The Revisers rather take credit to themselves for having retained the word “bolled” in Exod. ix. 31. But have they explained it rightly? Perhaps it was safe to translate a hard Hebrew word by a hard English one, but if a “Boll” is simply a “ball,” or “circular seed-pod,” the word can hardly mean “in bloom.”

It will be a relief to everyone to find that certain indelicate expressions are removed from the text; and the wonder is that

one or two very strong, not to say coarse idioms, have been allowed to remain, as in 2 Kings xviii.

One of the most noteworthy changes in the terminology of the Old Testament is the introduction of certain Hebrew words into the text. First among these is the word *Sheol*, which generally answers in its usage to the Greek *Hades*. It is doubtful if the expedient is a good one, and whether such an expression as "the nether world" would not have found more favour with the public. Again, *Abaddon* has been introduced into the text in three places. There is less reason for this innovation than for the last, because the meaning of *Abaddon* is quite clear, and if it had always been rendered "Destruction" or "Ruin," with a capital initial, and with a marginal note on its first appearance, all would have been done that was needed. Besides, if it is good in Job xxvi. 6, why not in Job xxviii. 22 and xxxi. 12? If good in Prov. xv. 14, why not in Ps. lxxxviii. 11; to say nothing of Esther viii. 6, and ix. 5? In the regulations for the Day of Atonement the word "scapegoat" has gone out, and the Hebrew term *Azazel* has been introduced. This change is very questionable, though it may be justified as a confession of our ignorance as to the exact force of the word. Other expressions have been retained which are quite as doubtful as "scapegoat," e.g. "familiar spirits." The idolatrous objects called "groves" are turned to *Asherim*. This, again, may be easily justified on literary grounds, but it seems useless from a practical point of view to interpret the obscure by the obscurer. Then there are the *Teraphim*, e.g. Gen. xxxi. 19, for and against which the same arguments may be adduced. The words *Nephilim* and *Rephaim* cannot be objected to (see Gen. vi. 4; Deut. ii. 11).

There has also been a tendency to introduce Hebrew names of persons and places instead of their interpretations or translations in several cases. Thus we read of *Atharim* in Num. xxi. 1, 14 instead of "spies," and of *Abarim* in other passages instead of "fords," and of *Beth Merhak* in 2 Sam. xv. 17 instead of a place that was far off. The word "Dammesek" in Gen. xv. 2 looks strange. There seems to be some play on the word "Damascus" in the Hebrew, but the Revisers have been foiled in their attempt to bring it out. The introduction of the word *Rosh*, in Ezek. xxxviii. 2, 3, and xxxix. 1 will interest students of prophecy. The old Greek version has the word; and so have the Sclavonic and Russian Bibles, which represent the people most deeply interested in the chapters in question. We are very glad to see *Suph* substituted for "Red Sea" in Deut. i. 1, and *Cush* for "Ethiopia" in Gen. ii. 13, for the text, as it stood in the Authorized Version, was most bewildering to the geographical investigator. Similarly it is pleasant to observe that

“populous No” is turned into “No-amon” (*Nahum* iii. 8); but what will be thought of *Isa.* xxx. 7, where instead of “Their strength is to sit still,” we read “Rahab that sitteth still.” The margin suggests another interpretation, viz., “They are but arrogancy—be still.” The passage has to do with Egypt, and Rahab is supposed to signify Egypt in *Ps. lxxxvii.* 4, and *lxxxix.* 10, and *Is. li.* 9. So that there is probably a play on the word in the passage before us; but we doubt if the Revisers have hit the true point.

“Sela” is rightly introduced into the text in *Isa. xvi.* 1, *xlii.* 11 (query “Sela’”), being the Hebrew name answering to the Greek “Petra,” the picturesque but now desolate centre of Edomite life. “Palestine” is rightly turned into “Philistia” in *Isa. xiv.* 29; and the Revisers have boldly inserted the *Nile* in *Jer. xlvi.* 7. They seem to entertain no shadow of doubt that they are right, and they may be so; but the text is, to say the least, capable of another interpretation, the uprisings of Egypt being compared to the flooding of a *nachal*, that is, a *wady* or watercourse.

In *Jer. xli.* 17 a new locality has crept into the text, viz. *Geruth*, the rendering “lodging-place” being retained in the margin. Everyone will be glad to find “Meribah” and “Massah” in *Ps. xcv.* 8. There is a curious note on *Jer. li.* 1. Here, instead of the old rendering, “The midst of them that rise up against me,” we find the Hebrew words “Leb-Kamai” inserted in the text, and a note, saying that according to ancient tradition this is a cypher for *Casdim*, that is Chaldaea.

We confess to a feeling of considerable regret on finding that the name or title of *Messiah* has been omitted from the ninth of Daniel. There must have been potent reasons to cause a two-thirds majority to consent to the change, whereby a word in common use amongst Jews and Samaritans in the days of our Lord is obliterated from the pages of the Old Testament.

The “captains” in *2 Kings xi.* 4 are turned into “Carites,” who seem no more at home in the passage than the “Matrites” do in *1 Sam. x.* 21.

Passing to the spelling of *proper names*, it must be acknowledged that the Revisers have been very merciful to those with which we are most familiar, but they have “taken it out” by touching up *ad libitum* those which are only occasionally referred to in Scripture. So it has come to pass that we have “Grecians” retained where the word is evidently wrong, in *Joel* iii. 6, and the respectable name “Aphses” (*1 Chron. xxiv.* 15) turned into the barbarous “Happizzez”! The word “cherubim” being the plural of “cherub,” is no more printed “cherubims;” and so the words “Emims” and “Horims”

have taken their departure. The Revisers seem to have shrunk from taking a further step, which, at any rate, would have been welcomed in the margin, viz., the putting "cherubs" and "seraphs" for "cherubim" and "seraphim." For national and tribal names the termination *-ite* seems better than *-im*; at any rate it would be preferable to read "Caphtorites" for "Capthorim."

The change from "Nazarite" to "Nazirite" seems somewhat pedantic, and the change from "Bekah" to "Beka" (e.g. Exod. xxxviii. 26,) is hardly needful, though it may be defended as in analogy with the popular spelling of Beer-sheba. We really need an inverted comma, or some such mark, to stand for the Hebrew letter *Ain*. We are glad to see "Hai" changed to "Ai" in Gen. xiii. 3, for the Hebrew spelling is identical in Genesis and in Joshua (viii. 9), and the letter *H* is here the Hebrew definite article, which stands before several names of places for some obscure reason. "Ships of Chittim" look very strange as "Ships of Kittim" (Numb. xxiv. 24), but the *C* is certainly hard. There is a passion now amongst classical students for the letter *K*, and we may be thankful, under the circumstances, that we do not read of Kyrus. Perhaps it is as well that *Cab* should be turned into *Kab*, but is *Cub* better than *Chub*? The "Kenite" is turned into "Kain" in Numb. xxiv. 22; whilst "Giblites" are turned into "Gebalites" (1 Kings v. 18), but other names of the same kind are unaltered. "Non" is rightly turned into "Nun" in 1 Chron. vii. 27, and "Shemuel" into "Samuel" in 1 Chron. vi. 33; but why is "Jeshua" left standing in Ezra, instead of the more familiar "Joshua"? We are not bound to follow the caprices of dialects in these matters. In 2 Kings xvi. 6 we read "Elath" where the Hebrew is "Eloth," but in 2 Chron. viii. 17 we find "Eloth" retained; why is this? and why do the Revisers print "Zeboiim" in Gen. x. 19, but "Zeboim" in Hos. xi. 8? An "Ephrathite" is turned into an "Ephraimite" in 1 Sam. i. 1, without a note of explanation, so that the unfortunate reader is led to imagine that Samuel belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. There is indeed ground for the translation (see Judges xii. 5); but all Ephrathites were not Ephraimites, as may be seen from Ruth i. 2. There has been such an interminable discussion on the localities mentioned in 1 Samuel, in the pages of the "Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund," that the greatest accuracy is called for in the translation of the names. In Micah v. 4, "Ephratah" is turned into "Ephrathah." The marvel is that "Euphrates" is not restored to its Hebrew name *Phrath*! We see little good in altering "Kirjath," wherever it occurs, into "Kiriath," (e.g., in the name "Kirjath Jearim," where the Revisers take away the

first *j* and leave the last), or to have introduced the words Goiim, Shallun, Hananel, Hanamel, Nethanel, Chislev, Ziv, Pashhur, Morashrite, Oholah, Oholiab, Tehaphnehes (Ezek. xxx. 8), (*but* Tahpanhes in Jer. xlivi. 10).

In dealing with Ezek. xxix. 10, "from the tower of Syene," the only alteration made, is for the worse. Syene (which we have retained in the word Syenite) is turned into Seveneh.

Another thing that will strike the attentive student as a novelty is the use made of the word *Aram*. This is the Hebrew name for Syria, and is to be found in Genesis x. 22, as the name of one of the descendants of Shem. A Syrian is an Aramean, and the Syrian language is the Aramean or Aramaic language; but now—oh, horror of horrors!—a Syrian lady is introduced as an Aramitess! The Syrian language is still called Syrian in 2 Kings xviii. 26 (note, Aramean); "Syriack" is turned to "Syrian" in Dan. ii. 4, (note, Aramaic); the Chaldee language or dialect is now spoken of as Aramaic; see notes on Dan. ii. 6, Jer. x. 11, Ezra iv. 7. At the same time the Revisers occasionally refer to Chaldee in their notes. In 1 Chron. xix. 6, we read of *Mesopotamia* and Aram Maachah. Would it not have been better to have dropped the Greek equivalent (if it is an equivalent) for "Aram Naharaim" in this place? But is it certain that the country which we call "Mesopotamia" is the country always referred to in the Bible as "Aram Naharaim" (or Syria of the two rivers)? There are reasons for doubting this, as any student of the Bible will see, if he will examine the usage of the expression.

Before bringing this First Paper, which is rather of a preliminary character, to a close, it should be noticed that the Revisers have dealt with *capital letters* in rather an inconsistent way. In Gen. xxxi. 21 we are told that Jacob rose up and passed over the River, and a note is appended, "that is the Euphrates;" but in Deut. xi. 24 we read "from the river, the river Euphrates." Surely the first of these words (river) should have been begun with a capital. In Numb. xxxiv. 12 we read of the "Salt Sea," but in verse 6 we read of the "great sea." Why is this? In Gen. xii. 9 we read of the South, and in a note "Heb. *Negeb*, the southern tract of Judah"; and in Gen. xiii. 10 of the Plain of Jordan, and in a note "or Circle," whilst in Neh. iii. 22 the Plain is explained as "Circuit." Which is right? Thus technical or local words of a peculiar character are marked with capitals. But if it is good to speak of the Tent (Exod. xxxi. 7), why should we read of the "tent of meeting" (Lev. i. 1)? Why not print other technical words with equal care, *e.g.* Pit and Grave, when they stand for *Sheol*, as in Numb. xvi. 30, Gen. xxxvii.

35? This is the only method by which the Revisers' strange inconsistency with reference to *Sheol* could be justified.

In Exod. xxiii. 20 we read, "Behold, I will send an angel before thee;" see also xxxii. 34, and xxxiii. 2. This was no ordinary angel, as is plain from the context in the first-named passage; compare Josh. v. 14. Would not a capital letter have been well placed in these passages, and in the reference to them in Isa. lxiii. 9?

Public attention has already been drawn to the absence of the capital *S* in the word "spirit" in some passages, *e.g.* Gen. i. 2, and viii. 3; but there are other noteworthy passages where the defect is to be noticed, *e.g.* Isa. xlii. 1, "I have put my spirit upon him;" Isa. lxi. 1, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me;" Isa. lxiii. 10, "They grieved his holy spirit." The Revisers of the New Testament are far better in this respect, for in the passages where these three verses are referred to, the capital letters are retained. See Matt. xii. 18, Luke iv. 18, and Ephes. iv. 30. There are certain passages where it may be difficult to decide what to do about capitals, but we cannot acquit the Old Testament Revisers of serious blame for cutting the knot in this rough-and-ready fashion.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(*To be continued.*)



## ART. II.—THE CHURCH AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

SINCE the passing of the Education Act of 1870, it is to be feared that an idea has been gaining ground that the Church is no longer under any obligation to give her attention to the formation and maintenance of Elementary Schools. This idea has, of course, been fostered from the first by the advocates of a purely secular education, and also by those who, having taken up the Board School System like a new toy, have made up their minds that there is no school to be compared with a "Board" school, while others have gradually adopted it as a natural effect of the twofold tax which has been laid upon their purse by the demand for a School Board Rate in addition to their accustomed voluntary subscriptions to their Parochial Schools. These influences have operated, more or less powerfully in different neighbourhoods, to chill the growing enthusiasm which was formerly felt in favour of Voluntary Schools, and to endanger the continuance of the Voluntary System; so that up to the present time no fewer than 750 Church Schools have already been abandoned, while