

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

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

AUGUST, 1885.

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

THE USE OF ITALICS, AND THE DOCTRINAL WORDS.

THE eye of the most cursory reader will be struck with the great reduction of *italics* in the Revised Version. This is a great advantage, and the only doubt is whether the Revisers may not have gone a little too far. We still read “the *evil* Spirit from God” in 1 Sam. xvi. 23, and “*he made* the stars also” in Gen. i. 16. New italics are occasionally introduced, as in Isa. xxvii. 12, “the Lord shall beat off *his fruit*,” whilst the sense conveyed by others is altered, frequently for the better. This is notably the case in 2 Sam. i. 18, where we read, “He bade them teach the children of Judah *the song of the bow*,” instead of “*the use of* the bow.” In 1 Kings xi. 29, the sense is made much clearer by introducing the name of *Ahijah*; for in the Authorised Version it was not clear whether it was Ahijah or Jeroboam who had clad himself in a new garment. A missing link in Saul’s genealogy is supplied in italics in 1 Chron. viii. 29; at first this seems a bold step, but a reference to the next chapter, where we have a second copy of the genealogy, shows that the name must have been dropped out from the earlier copy by some accident. A similar thing had already been done in the A.V. in 1 Chron. ix. 41. The word “flesh” is rightly put in italics in 1 Chron. xvi. 3. We are not so sure that the Revisers are right in substituting “Jordan at Jericho” for “Jordan *near* Jericho” in Num. xxvi. 3 and other passages. The expression is a peculiar one, and the word *at*, if selected at all, ought certainly to have been in italics.

There is no doubt that our Bibles have hitherto been over-
VOL. XII.—NO. LXXI.

loaded with italics. A third of the supplementary words thus indicated might have been left out altogether, another third might have been printed in Roman characters, and the third remaining would have been all that was needed. A few instances will show the difficulty of deciding what ought to be done.

(a) The Hebrew text generally needs no *copula*, but English demands it. At times, however, there is an uncertainty as to what is the exact force of the original. Shall we say "Blessed *is* the man"? "Blessed *be* the man"? or "Blessed *shall be* the man"? in other words, shall we make the utterance a statement, a prayer, or a prophecy? In Deut. xxvii. the A.V. makes the curses to be imprecations, but in the following chapter the blessings and curses are treated as prophecies. The Revisers have done the same, but have dropped the italics.

(b) In Deut. ii. 13 the A.V. begins, "Now rise up, *said I*," etc., making the exhortation to rise up a thing of the past, and consequently part of the narrative. The Revisers have struck out altogether the words "*said I*," thereby making the sentence rather ambiguous. In a similar case, 1 Chron. xxiii. 5, we read, "the instruments which I made, *said David*, to praise therewith." Here the Revisers felt constrained to retain the italics. They have done the same thing in Nahum ii. 8, "Stand, stand, *they cry*," etc. The word "*saying*" is retained in italics in Ps. ii. 2, and in some similar passages.

(c) In the case of prepositions perhaps the most noteworthy idiom in the Hebrew is that which our translators render "Thou that dwellest *between* the cherubim." The Revisers do away with the italics, and translate, "Thou that sittest upon the cherubim." This certainly gives a very different sense. In the one case God is represented as enthroned on the Propitiatory or mercy-seat; in the other case He is regarded as high and lifted up above it, and borne upon the cherub's wings which are turned inward.

(d) The word *and* was introduced sometimes very needlessly in the A.V. Thus in Ps. x. 10 we read, "He croucheth *and* humbleth himself;" here the Revisers properly translate, "He croucheth, he boweth down." In Ps. xlix. 5, the word *when* ought to have been printed in italics, for the obvious reason that the verse is capable of another rendering than that given. It was printed rightly in the A.V. In Gen. xxxi. 30 we read, "*Though* thou wouldest needs be gone, *yet* wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?" The Revisers here retain the italics; but would it not have been more forcible to strike out the word *Though* altogether, and perhaps the word *yet* also? We should thus have an indication of the suppressed temper of the speech. In numbers of passages the words *as* or *like* are in italics in

the A.V. Sometimes the Revisers have retained the italics, as in Ps. xi. 1 ; and in other cases the words have been printed in Roman letters, as in Ps. xii. 6. It is hard to see the exact principle on which the Revisers have varied their course in this matter.

(e) The Hebrew writers sometimes omitted a name, when a particular person was conspicuously in their mind. Instances of this may be seen in Gen. xxi. 33, Ex. xxxiii. 9, and Num. xxiii. 15 ; in these cases the Revisers have followed the A.V. ; but in Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, they have varied their method, putting in the one case "the son of the Israelitish (why not Israelite ?) woman blasphemed the Name," and in the other "he blasphemeth the name of the *LORD*."

(f) Amongst other Hebrew expressions which call for supplementary words in English the following may be mentioned:

Gen. xxxiii. 8 : "What **meanest thou by all this drove ?*"

Ps. iii. 8 : "Salvation **belongeth unto the Lord.*"

Ps. cxviii. 2 : "His mercy *endureth for ever.*"

Eccl. viii. 2 : "I *counsel thee to keep the King's commandment.*"

Ps. xvi. 6 : "the lines are fallen unto me in pleasant **places.*"

Ps. iv. 6 : "Who will shew us *any good ?*"

Ps. ix. 18 : "The expectation of the poor shall **not perish for ever.*"

Ps. lxxv. 5 : "Speak **not with a stiff neck.*"

Gen. xviii. 28 : "wilt thou destroy all the city for **lack of five ?*"

Gen. xxiv. 60 : "be thou *the mother of thousands.*"

Gen. xxiv. 67 : "he was comforted after his mother's **death.*"

Num. xiv. 28 : "As I live, saith the Lord."

Num. xxiii. 20 : "I have received *commandment to bless.*"

1 Sam. xx. 16 : "Jonathan made a **covenant with the house of David.*"

In this list, which is printed from the A.V., the Revisers have turned the italics into Roman characters where the words are marked with an asterisk. In each case their course is defensible, on the ground that there is no doubt about the translation ; but whether it is expedient is another matter. The New Testament student looks to such passages as these to justify his translation of other passages, which might easily be enumerated ; and we are not sure if the peculiar characteristics of the Hebrew ought not to be indicated in all such cases, —whether by italics or in some other way.

Another list may be noted, containing idioms about which there is no uncertainty, where it is a question whether to print in italics or not. The following samples are the most note-

worthy: "the dry **land*," "the tenth **month*," "the first **day* of the month," "a thousand **pieces of silver*," "full of *years*," "the third **generation*," "torn **with beasts*," "bitter **herbs*," "gathered *unto his people*," "tread the *grapes*," "shut the *door*," "gird *sackcloth* upon *your loins*." These passages are marked on the same principle as those given above, so that the tendency of the Revisers can again clearly be seen.

We supply one more list, which will illustrate still more clearly the need of supplementary words in English, and the course pursued.

Ex. xxxiv. 7: "that will by no means clear *the guilty*."

R.V. the same.

Deut. xx. 19: "The tree of the field *is man's life*." R.V., "Is the tree of the field man?"

Judges ii. 3: "they shall be *as thorns* in your sides." R.V. the same.

Judges x. 11: "did not *I deliver you* from the Egyptians?" R.V. substantially the same.

1 Sam. ii. 32: "in all *the wealth* which God shall give Israel." R.V. prints "the wealth."

2 Sam. i. 21: "as though he had not been anointed with oil." R.V. omits words printed in italics.

2 Sam. xv. 32: "when David was come to the top of the Mount." R.V., "when David was come to the top of the ascent."

2 Kings x. 24: "he that letteth him go, his life shall be for the life of him." R.V. substantially the same.

2 Chron. xi. 22: "he thought to make him a king." R.V. substantially the same.

Job iii. 23: "why is light given to a man whose way is hid?" R.V. the same.

Job xi. 6: "God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth." R.V. all in Roman letters.

Job xx. 11: "his bones are full of the *sin* of his youth." R.V. omits the words in italics.

Job xxiii. 6: "he would put *strength* in me." R.V., "he would give heed to me."

Job xxxiv. 31: "I have borne *chastisement*, I will not offend *any more*." R.V. the same.

Job xxxv. 3: "what profit shall I have, *if I be cleansed* from my *sin*?" R.V., "more than if I had sinned."

Job xxxv. 8: "thy wickedness *may hurt* a man as thou art; and thy righteousness *may profit* the son of man." R.V. substantially the same.

Ps. vii. 11: "God is angry *with the wicked* every day." R.V. omits words in italics.

Ps. xxvii. 13 : “*I had fainted*, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord.” R.V. the same.

Ps. xxxiv. 17 : “*the righteous cry*,” etc. R.V. the same.

Ps. liv. 7 : “*mine eye hath seen his desire*.” R.V., *my desire*.

Ps. xc. 8 : “*our secret sins*,” etc. R.V. in Roman letters.

Ps. ciii. 9 : “neither will he keep *his anger* for ever.” R.V. the same.

Ps. cix. 4 : “*I give myself unto prayer*.” R.V. the same.

Ps. cxxxix. 16 : “In thy book all *my members* were written.” R.V. the same.

Prov. xviii. 17 : “*he that is first in his own cause seemeth just*.” R.V., “*he that pleadeth his cause first seemeth just*.”

Amos i. 3 : “I will not turn away *the punishment* thereof.” R.V., “*the punishment*.”

In some cases the Revisers have avoided italics by hitting upon a rendering that gives the sense without any supplementary words; but it will be seen from the long list now given that they have been somewhat lax in their proceedings, and that it would not be very easy for them to justify their method—if they have a method. We can readily appreciate the rendering of Isa. xxi. 8, “he cried as a lion” (though we should prefer to italicise the *as*), but it is not so easy to approve of Jer. xxiii. 6, “This is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteousness.” One is glad to read in Jer. iv. 2, “They swear, As the Lord liveth,” but one misses the little word *yet* in Jer. xxxvii. 4, where the Revisers simply say, “For they had not put him into prison.” We still read in Isa. xi. 4, “with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked,” instead of “the wicked one” (2 Thess. ii. 8).

We now pass to the consideration of the doctrinal terms of the Old Testament as affected by this Revision. Few things are more important for the Biblical student than a careful study of the sacred terminology of the Hebrew Old Testament, whether as bearing on great moral and theological topics, or in connection with sacred objects and rites. We propose to examine the R.V. to see what has been done with respect to these things.

I. The name of *God* remains unchanged throughout; but a few noteworthy changes have been made in certain passages, where the Hebrew name *Elohim* has been translated in some other way. Thus in Gen. iii. 5 the serpent is now made to say, “Ye shall be as God;” in Dan. iii. 5, on the contrary, Nebuchadnezzar is made to say that “the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods.” In Exod. xxi. 6, where the A.V. reads, “His master shall bring him unto the judge,” the R.V.

reads, "shall bring him unto God;" so in xxii. 8, 9, 28. If the Revisers had put "the gods" in the margin, with a reference to Ps. lxxxii. 6, the reader could have understood what he was about, and our Lord's reference to that passage in St. John's Gospel (x. 34-36) would have completely elucidated the text; but, as matters stand, the effect is doubtful. In 1 Sam. xxviii. 13 the woman now says to Saul, "I see a god coming up out of the earth;" why have not the Revisers indicated that the meaning here is "a judge"? The thought contained in this remarkable usage seems to be that the judges, as the expounders or administrators of the law, were to be representatives of the one living and true God. Where *they* were, there *God* was. Their decisions were to be final.

Another singular use of the word *Elohim* is to be noticed. In Ps. cxxxviii. 1 we read, "before the gods will I sing praises unto Thee." The Septuagint here has, "before the *angels*;" and there are several other places in which the Septuagint has interpreted the word with reference to angels. In this particular passage there may be reference to judges or men of high degree; if so, the fourth verse of the Psalm would convey a similar idea, where we read, "All the kings of the earth shall praise Thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of their mouth." The most important passage to examine in this connection is the eighth Psalm. The fifth verse runs thus in the English Bible, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels;" but the R.V. has, "Thou hast made him but little lower than God." Our old translators were probably guided in their rendering by the fact that the verse is quoted and commented upon in Heb. ii. 7; but the Revisers felt that they must revert to the original. The pity is that when they were about it they did not do it thoroughly. The word "made" introduced into both the Versions is very objectionable. There is nothing about "making" in the Hebrew text. The word which we render "to make lower" should be rendered "to put lower," or simply "to lower," or "to reduce," or "to bereave." The best illustration of the passage as a whole is to be found in the second chapter of the Philippians, where we are told that One who was originally in the form of God emptied Himself of the divine glory by assuming the limitations of manhood. The word translated by the Revisers "but little" would be better rendered "for a little while," as in Ps. xxxvii. 10 and other passages; and thus we should get the true significance of the passage in its bearing on our Lord's incarnation.

The Hebrew word *Elohim* occurs no less than 2,555 times in the Old Testament, in this plural form, and is used of the one living and true God in 2,310 of these passages. There is

a singular form of it ("Eloah") in 57 passages, chiefly in the Book of Job, and in all but 6 passages it is applied to the true God. There is an Aramaic form ("Elah") in Ezra and Daniel, and once in Jeremiah; altogether it is found in 85 passages, of which 72 refer to the true God. The Revisers have not attempted to distinguish between these; and any attempt to do so would have savoured of pedantry. The more simple form *El* is used of the true God in 204 passages, chiefly in conjunction with some other name, and is found especially in Job, the Psalms, and Isaiah. The A.V. begins the eighty-second Psalm thus, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty;" but the R.V. has, "God standeth in the congregation of God." This sounds very bald. The Hebrew is, "*Elohim* taketh His stand in the gathering of *El*." Would not the Revisers have done better to have left the text as it stood, and to have put a note on it in the margin? If they say No, then let them look at the Hebrew of Exod. xxv. 15, Job xli. 25, where it is possible that we have the same root; and let them look at Ps. xxix. 1, "O ye sons of the mighty," where they have retained the English version, and have put the word "God" in the margin.

Passing on from this word, we call attention to the words in the Revisers' preface concerning the name *Jehovah*. Probably the course there indicated will meet general approval, though we confess that we should have preferred to see the name introduced much more freely. We are glad to see it in Exod. vi. 2, 3, 6, 7, though we know not why it should be printed in small capitals in the first two of these verses, and in ordinary letters in the last two. But ought it not to have come in Exod. xv. 3, "Jehovah is His name," and in Exod. xx. 2, "I am Jehovah thy God," and in Exod. xxxiv. 6, 1 Kings xviii. 39, and other notable passages in later Books, where something special seems to hang upon the name?

The title *Shaddai* is still translated "Almighty." It has been pointed out¹ that the usage of the word is in favour of the rendering "All-sufficient" or "Bountiful" rather than "Almighty;" but it would hardly have been wise on the part of the Revisers to make any alteration. The title *Adonai*, usually translated "Lord," has also been left untouched. A peculiar expression is used of the God of Melchizedek in Gen. xiv. 18, etc., and translated "the Most High God" in the A.V. The R.V. has "God Most High." This title ("Elyon") is used also by Balaam and by Moses, and it occurs several times in the Psalms. In Ps. lxxviii. 35, where we have the exact title contained in Gen. xiv. 18, the Revisers have, for some unac-

¹ "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 56.

countable reason, neglected to make the translation consistent. In Micah vi. 6 the expression translated "the high God" is a different one. The word "high" ought to have had a capital letter in this passage, and in others where the peculiar title (*Marom*) is given to God.

Before leaving this particular topic we should notice one or two passages which bear on the nature of God, or on the interpretation of His name. In Exod. iii. 14 the Revisers have wisely retained the rendering "I am that I am;" but they have offered three alternative renderings in the margin; viz., "I am because I am," "I am who am," "I will be that I will be." These three interpretations by no means exhaust all that might be offered; but they are sufficient to set men thinking of the depth of the words before them. In Isa. ix. 6 the only alteration in the titles of the Son is that the three last have been made to harmonize with the two first by depriving them of their definite article. The first verse of Ps. cx. is printed thus: "The Lord saith unto my lord." It seems rather wilful and capricious of the Revisers to print the word "lord" with a little *l*, especially with the Revised Version of the New Testament before them (see Matt. xxii. 44). The only critical defence of the little *l* is the fact that the Hebrew word is here punctuated *adoni* not *adonai*; but it seems to savour rather of pedantry to attach any importance to this.

II. We pass now to certain doctrinal and moral words which run through the Bible, passing from the Old Testament to the New through the medium of the Septuagint. The word to *repent* stands as before. It is chiefly used of God's repentance in the Hebrew Scriptures, and signifies literally to comfort one's self or be relieved. The verb in its simplest form is translated "comfort" in about seventy passages, and although we are always told by the clergy in church that the word "comfort" has lost its old significance, the Revisers have stuck to it. Encouragement rather than consolation is the true idea of the word *nacham* in the Hebrew, and of *παρακαλεῖν* in the Greek.

When the Revised New Testament came out, certain people plumed themselves on the idea that *conversion* had gone out of the Book. The *thing*, however, remains, even though the word is altered. The Hebrew word (*shuv*) means to turn or return, and is used very frequently of the great critical change a man makes when he comes back to God with a contrite heart. There are few more earnest calls in the Bible than this, "Return unto Me;" and the soul which obeys this call is "converted."

The idea that people can be *improved* is a popular but not exactly a Biblical one. The expression "amend your ways"

is found several times in Jeremiah, in the A.V., and the Revisers have not altered it. But the Hebrew word means "to make good," that is "to make pleasing to God,"¹ and indicates anything but a gradual improvement.

There has been so much discussion over the doctrine of *perfection* that it is interesting to notice how the Old Testament terminology has been affected by the Revision. In 2 Chron. xxiv. 13, the word "perfect" has been left by the Revisers, but by a mistake. They ought to have used the word "repair" in that verse, and perhaps "restore" in the previous verse where the Hebrew is different. In Jer. xxiii. 20, the word "perfectly" ought to have been "thoroughly." In Ps. cxxxviii. 8, instead of "The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me," we ought to read "The Lord will *perform* that which concerneth me," as in Ps. lvii. 2. The expression in Prov. iv. 18, translated "the perfect day," is literally "the established day," when the sun is fully up. It seems a pity that these different Hebrew words should be translated "perfect," which ought to have been restricted in its usage as narrowly as the Greek *Τελείως* has been. There are two Hebrew words very like one another, signifying "completion," viz., *Caluh* and *Calal*; our translators unfortunately translated them "perfection" in several places, *e.g.*, Job ii. 7, Ps. l. 2, Ps. cxix. 96, Lam. ii. 15, Ezek. xvi. 14. In none of these places singled out for examination have the Revisers thought fit to correct the error of their predecessors. Another Hebrew word (*Shalam*) has three meanings apparently very different from one another, but yet related by an inner bond; the first of these is oneness or wholeness; the second, peace; and the third, restitution or recompense. We shall have to refer to this word presently in another connection, but meanwhile it is to be observed that our translators adopted the rendering "perfect" for it in a few passages, *e.g.*, Deut. xxv. 15 ("a perfect and just weight"); 1 Kings viii. 61, and similar passages ("a perfect heart"); 2 Chron. viii. 16 ("the house of the Lord was perfected"); Isa. xxvi. 3 ("thou wilt keep him in perfect peace"); Isa. xlvi. 19 ("who is blind as he that is perfect"). In all these passages, except the last, the Revisers have religiously followed the Old Translation instead of giving English readers a more accurate rendering; but in the last passage they have printed the text thus: "Who is blind as he that is at peace *with me*;" and in the margin, "or made perfect, or recompensed." The usage of the word is really most remarkable, and the Revisers might have brought down the numerous renderings of it to three or four with the greatest advantage. There is usually implied in it either "a

¹ See "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 154.

bringing of some difficulty to a conclusion, a finishing off of some work, a clearing away, by payment or labour or suffering, of some charge."¹

There yet remains the leading word answering to "perfection" in the Old Testament. It has over twenty different renderings in the A.V., and we had hoped that the Revisers would considerably reduce the number. It would be tedious to go through the whole, but a few shall be noticed which illustrate the Biblical doctrine of perfection.

Gen. vi. 9: "Noah was perfect in his generations," A.V. and R.V. The margin of the A.V. suggests "upright" as an alternative, but the R.V. suggests "blameless." Of these two the R.V. is the best, as will be seen by a reference to the usage of the Septuagint; but spotless or unblemished would have been better still.

Gen. xvii. 1: "walk before Me, and be thou perfect," A.V. and R.V. The A.V. puts in the margin "upright, or sincere;" the R.V. has no marginal note.

Deut. xviii. 13: "thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God," A.V. and R.V. The margin is the same as in the previous passage.

2 Sam. xxii. 31, 33: "his way is perfect . . . he maketh my way perfect." No substantial change introduced, and no marginal note. The same is the case in Job i. 1; viii. 20; ix. 20-22; Ps. xxxvii. 37; ci. 2, 6. In the last of these passages the R.V. suggests the word "integrity" in the margin; and this word is certainly useful, and was adopted by our translators in the text in several passages. The idea of the word is by no means sinless perfection in the modern sense, but thoroughness, whole-heartedness (if there is such a word), which will never let a man willingly commit any act of disloyalty to God.

The word *upright* ought to be reserved for the Hebrew *Yashar*. Our translators unfortunately adopted the word "equity" in some places for it, and the Revisers have not been altogether consistent. See Isa. xi. 4, where "equity" is retained; and Mal. ii. 6, where "uprightness" has been put in. The A.V. used the word "upright" in fourteen passages where the word "perfect" ought to have been adopted. The Revisers have corrected two of these; they put the word "integrity" in two others, and the other ten they have left unaltered. Why is this? One would think that one leading object of the Revision was to introduce something approaching uniformity in the use of important words. To walk "uprightly" is very good, but if God's Word uses the expression which we ought

¹ "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 160.

to translate "perfectly," why should not the Revisers be true to their Hebrew?

We now come to the important Hebrew word (*Tsaduk*) which answers to our words "righteous" and "just." We confess that we should have been pleased if the word "righteous" had superseded the word "just;" it is a far better word, and implies conformity to God's great law of right, which is the law of love,—in other words, it expresses the very nature of God. Sometimes distinctions are drawn in theological works between the righteousness and the love of God; but these distinctions are very dangerous, unless they can be clearly shown from God's Word. Justice to an English mind signifies too often the rendering of a *quid pro quo*; but the Righteousness of God is a very different thing from that. The only solid reason for retaining the Roman words *just* and *justice* is that we need the verb derived from them—to *justify*. This word signifies to *acquit*, or to reckon and pronounce in the right. We have a verb "to right," but it is little used, and after all it does not give quite the sense we need, which the Latin word "justify" fairly expresses; so we must put up with the imperfections of our language, and make sure that we always get beneath the surface and find out the sacred usage of words which so inadequately express the ways of God.

The tendency of the Revisers has been to introduce the words "just" and "justice" more frequently than the words "righteous" and "righteousness;" and for this we are sorry. In dealing with the *verb*, great care has to be used to give the force required by each voice. It is only once used in the reflexive voice, Gen. xliv. 16 (A.V., "How shall we clear ourselves?"). The R.V. has no change; but why did they not put, "How shall we justify ourselves?" What Judah and his brethren wanted was that they should be neither thought, nor pronounced, nor dealt with as guilty; and these are the ideas connected with justification. The word is used once in the passive, viz. Dan. viii. 14, of the cleansing of the Temple. The R.V. has rightly put "justified" in the margin. It is used five times in the intensive voice: in four of these the Revisers have made no alteration; but in Jer. iii. 11 we read, "Backsliding Israel hath shewn herself more righteous" instead of "hath justified herself." The word is used twelve times in the causative voice. The Revisers have left these passages as they stood before. None of them signify the producing a moral change in a person, but the doing justice to persons; that is, the decision in their favour, and the dealing with them accordingly.¹ The last of the twelve is Isa. liii. 11,

¹ These important passages are separately commented on in "Old Testament Synonyms," p. 257.

“By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many.” The Revisers have left the text as it stood before ; but they have thought fit to put in the margin, “or, make many righteous ;” and they have thereby committed a doctrinal blunder. The word *never* means to make a person morally different from what he was : it only has to do with the way in which he is accounted and dealt with. The Lord is first a sin-bearer and then a justifier, and these are the two thoughts in Isa. liii. 11 ; but there is nothing in this verse about implanted righteousness—that must be looked for elsewhere. There yet remains Dan. xii. 3, where the A.V. and R.V. read, “They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars.” This rendering, if correct, would seem to militate against what has now been advanced ; but a little reflection will probably lead us to the conclusion that we must interpret the verse in accordance with the last verse of St. James’s Epistle. We can no more justify a man than we can convert a man ; but we may be the means of bringing men to God in Christ, and then both conversion and justification become accomplished facts.

There still remain twenty-two passages where this verb is used in the active (or rather neuter) voice. These have been translated in the A.V. in no less than four ways, viz., “to be righteous,” “to be just,” “to be justified,” “to justify one’s self.” The Revisers have only abolished the last of these translations ; they might certainly have reduced them to *two*, or (by a right use of the margin) to *one*.

Another word of great interest is that which is ordinarily translated *judgment*. Our translators adopted the word “right” for it in fourteen passages. If the Revisers thought fit to follow the old translation in this respect (which they have generally done), they might have inserted the word “judgment” in the margin. At least, this ought to have been done in Gen. xviii. 25 (“Shall not the judge of all the earth do right ?”), where the force of the original is brought out far more clearly by the introduction of the word “judgment.” The Biblical idea of judgment is righteous administration of law without respect of persons ; and this sense must be borne in mind when we are dealing with special passages.

Several other words were rendered “right” in the A.V. which ought to have been translated in some other way, *e.g.*, Ps. li. 10, “Renew a right spirit within me.” The Revisers have left the text as it stood, but have inserted the word “stedfast” in the margin. Instability had led the Psalmist to fall, and he prays for stability ; but why not say so in the text ? The same word is used in Ps. v. 9, and translated “faithfulness ;” see also Ps. lxxviii. 37.

Only one word ought to have been translated "faithfulness," namely, the Hebrew word *Emunah*; whilst the word *Emeth* should always have been translated "truth." The former of these words is generally used of the faithfulness of God; but in Heb. ii. 4 it is man's faith or faithfulness which is spoken of. The Revisers have rightly inserted in the margin in this passage "in His faithfulness." Justifying faith is thus seen in a fuller and more practical light than can be otherwise conveyed. We are glad that in other passages the Revisers have inclined to the word "faithfulness" instead of "truth" as the rendering for *Emunah*: see, e.g., Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 4, lxxxix. 49; but here, as in so many other cases, they have not persisted in their good course: see, e.g., Isa. lix. 4.

We pass now from the idea of *faith* to that of *trust*. Although we are much in the habit of regarding these as synonyms, the Old Testament keeps them carefully apart. The Hebrew word generally translated "trust" means "to lean upon;" it is never translated by the Greek $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omega$, "to believe." Another word, which is rendered "trust" about thirty times in the Old Testament, conveys the idea of fleeing for refuge; and this idea might always have been brought out in our translation. Thus Ps. ii. 12 might be rendered, "Blessed are all they that take refuge in him." The Revisers have given this in the note; but why not in the text? In Ps. xxxiv. 8 they have retained the word "trust" without the note; so in Ps. cxviii. 8, Isa. lvii. 13, and Zeph. iii. 12. In Isa. xiv. 32 the translation is corrected, and reads thus, "The Lord hath founded Zion, and in her (? in it) shall the afflicted of his people take refuge."

In Ps. xxii. 8 a peculiar word, signifying "to roll," is used. Our A.V. notified the fact in the margin, but the Revisers have unwisely departed from their course here. In Job xiii. 15 we have a very familiar passage, "though he slay me, yet will I trust in him:" here a word usually rendered *hope* is used, but the Revisers have put in the word *wait* (see also their note). There is no objection to this rendering; in fact, if it had been always used for the Hebrew term in question, the English readers would have distinctly gained. In Isa. li. 5 we meet with it again. Here the A.V. is, "The isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust." The R.V. runs thus, "The isles shall wait for me, and on mine arm shall they trust." But they have neglected to do here what they have done in Job. The truth is, we have in this verse the two Hebrew words usually rendered "hope:" the first of them signifies the straining of the mind in an expectant attitude, and the second signifies patient waiting; so that we

need some such rendering as this, "The isles shall hope for me, and on mine arm shall they wait patiently."

We are sorry that the Revisers have not emphasized the distinction between *grace* and *mercy*. One of these conveys in Hebrew, Greek, and English the idea of freeness and undeservedness ; the other, of pity exercised towards one who is helpless. In Prov. xix. 17 we read, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord ;" but this is not the meaning of the sacred text. Why have not the Revisers translated the words according to their true usage ? So in Prov. xxviii. 8 and in Job xix. 21. The word signifies not to have pity but to deal graciously in all these passages. It is curious that the old-fashioned and ambiguous word "pitiful" has been preserved by the Revisers in Lam. iv. 10, "The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children." There are really two defects in this rendering, for the use of the definite article is as misleading as the use of the word "pitiful." What we need is, "The hands of compassionate women," etc. The Hebrew word expresses the most tender feelings. In two passages the A.V. rendered it "love," viz., in Dan. i. 9 and Ps. xviii. 1. In the first of these the Revisers have rightly put "compassion." The second they have left alone. They could not use the word "compassion," but they could have given the idea of tender feeling.

There is a special Hebrew word for *mercy*, translated $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma$ by the Septuagint in 135 passages. Our translators, unfortunately, did not keep to one rendering for it, but have sometimes used the words "pity," "favour," "goodness," "kindness," etc. In Ps. lxxxix., verses 33 and 49, the Revisers have rightly put "mercy" instead of "lovingkindness;" but in Hos. vi. 4 they have kept "your goodness is as a morning cloud," and have thereby caused readers to miss the connection between this verse and the sixth ("I desired mercy and not sacrifice").

It would be natural to suppose that the adjective derived from this word would be translated "merciful ;" and so it is in some passages, *e.g.* Ps. xviii. 25 ("with the merciful thou wilt show thyself merciful"); but the word seems to have obtained a peculiar significance amongst the Jews ; the LXX. renders it $\sigma\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma$, and our translators have frequently adopted for it the renderings "godly," "saint," and "holy." The Revisers must have felt the difficulty of dealing with the word, and all the more so because of its bearing on the New Testament ; we do not see, however, that they have mended matters at all. Thus in Ps. lxxxvi. 2 the A.V. reads "I am holy ;" whilst in the margin we read "one whom Thou favourest." The Revisers have put into the text "I am godly." Why not "I am merci-

ful"? In Ps. cxlv. 17 the A.V. reads, "the Lord is holy in all his works;" the margin adds "merciful or bountiful;" but the Revisers have discarded all three renderings and have unfortunately substituted the word "gracious." Is not this playing fast and loose with God's Word? Why should we not give to the English readers the benefit of a consistent rendering of important words? In Deut. xxxiii. 8 we read, "let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one." Here the Revisers have substituted "thy godly one," and have put in the margin "him whom Thou lovest;" but in Ps. cvi. 16, where the same word is used in the same connection, the Revisers have kept in the text "the saint," and in the margin "the holy one;" thus they have ingeniously succeeded in obscuring the relationship between these references to a characteristic found in two of the priestly family. In 2 Sam. vii. 15 we have the title-deed of the House of David, and the word "mercy" is retained, and so in 1 Chron. xvii. 13; but, alas! the reference to these passages is lost by the substitution of the word "kindness" in 1 Kings iii. 6 and 2 Chron i. 8, though retained in 2 Chron. vi. 42 and throughout Ps. lxxxix. The other most noteworthy passage where the word occurs is Ps. xvi. 10, still rendered "Thine holy one." We did not expect to find an alteration, but we looked with interest to the margin, where the reader will find "godly or beloved." Why not "merciful"? Is not Christ the embodiment of the divine mercy? Are not the sure mercies of David fulfilled in Him? Let the Greek Testament scholar read St. Paul's speech at Antioch (Acts xiii.); he will find the solution there.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)



ART. II.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

VIII. AUGUST. GOSPEL AND EPISTLE FOR ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.

A. THE LEARNING OF HUMILITY.

"Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."—MATT. xx. 26, 27.

"He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."—LUKE xxii. 26.

IT is remarkable that on two successive Saints' Days precisely the same moral lesson, and in nearly the same words, should be set before us in the appointed Gospels.