

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/robbradshaw>

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

that we dared presume upon His approval or reward ! But He employs the feeblest instruments—"earthen vessels;" therefore, "Here am I, send me."

Lastly, we may comfort ourselves in the fellowship of our brethren in the world ; the communion with the faithful, gone and alive, triumphant and militant ; the increasing band of lay helpers ; the manifest life in the English Church ; the unspeakable support of the Bible, that wonderful, Book, ever opening in increased light and convincing language to meet the emergency of the Church ; the unfailing might of Communion with our Life in the Lord's Supper. But behind and above all we have the communion and fellowship of God the Holy Ghost—His inspiration, His light, His guidance, strength and peace ; to Whom we ever fly for comfort, in Whom we ever trust. Oh, how much more should I like to say ! but let us end with, "Have compassion upon our infirmities ;" "Thy kingdom come ;" "I will glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me ;" for "When I am weak, then am I strong ;" "I will love Thee, O Lord, my strength ;" and "I will make mention of Thee and of Thy righteousness only." "Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen."

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

CEREMONIAL AND TECHNICAL TERMS, AND QUOTED PASSAGES.

IT is not easy to over-estimate the value of a careful study of Jewish ceremonial ; and, for this purpose, one must begin by strictly weighing the ritual language of the Hebrew Old Testament. Nothing can exceed its technical accuracy ; and this accuracy of usage is represented to a considerable extent in the Septuagint, and so passes on into the Greek New Testament. If the translators of 1611 somewhat failed in exhibiting the force of Hebrew ceremonial terms, and in supplying uniform renderings where needed, it might have been expected that our Revisers would have corrected any such failures. Let us see how far they have done so.

The first chapter of Leviticus begins thus : "And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tent of meeting, saying. Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When any man of you offereth an oblation unto the Lord, ye shall offer your oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock. If his oblation be a burnt offering of the herd, he shall offer it a male without blemish : he shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting, that he may be accepted before the Lord. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering ; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."

We first notice in this passage that the place formerly called

the tabernacle of the congregation is now called the tent of meeting. Our ideas of a tabernacle are rather hazy, and are affected in some degree by the fact that Mr. Spurgeon has thought fit to dignify his vast and substantial meeting-house by this sounding title. It may be well that all readers should be reminded that the object described in the Pentateuch is somewhat of the nature of a tent. The New Testament Revisers, however, shrank from doing away with the word "tabernacle," as will be seen in Acts vii. 44, Heb. ix. 2, and Rev. xxi. 3; moreover, in John i. 14, against the word "dwelt" they have put in the margin "tabernacled." On the whole, it might have been better to have retained this word tabernacle, giving it a capital T, and explaining it to mean a tent, in the first passage where it occurs. It will be observed, however, that the Revisers have retained the word "tabernacle" in Exod. xxv. 9 and xxvi. 1, and other passages, where they might have done better by using the word "dwelling-place." The Hebrew word here used is not *ohel* (a tent), but *mishcan*, from the root of which the word "Shekinah" is derived, and which found its way into Greek in the word *σκηνη*. The Revisers translate it "tent" in Cant. i. 8. As this word *mishcan* was translated "tabernacle" in about 120 passages in the A.V., the Revisers had ample excuse for retaining it; only we feel that if the word "tabernacle" is good for *mishcan*, it would be still better for *ohel*. Before leaving this word, we may observe that where we read of the Feast of Tabernacles the word *sucah* (booth) is used. The Revisers have wisely retained the word "tabernacles" in the text, and have put "booths" into the margin.

So much for the word "tabernacle;" but were the Revisers justified in turning "the congregation" into "meeting"? We think they were; though the word "meeting" is not quite strong enough. The real thought in the word is "appointment," in the sense in which we speak of making an appointment with a person, and it is equally applicable to times and places.¹ There are two important passages where it is used, viz., Exod. xxv. 22, "There" (*i.e.* over the mercy-seat) "I will meet with thee;" and Exod. xxix. 43, "There" (*i.e.* at the entrance of the tabernacle) "I will meet with the children of Israel." The ordinary Septuagint rendering for the tabernacle of the congregation is *σκηνη του μαρτυριου*, Tabernacle of

¹ I have discussed the usage of this and other words referred to in these papers, in "Old Testament Synonyms" (Longmans); and perhaps I may be excused for referring to this book, as it is, I believe, the only book in the English language which has applied to the Old Testament, however imperfectly, the method which Archbishop Trench applied to the New.

Witness, and this expression is reproduced in Acts vii. 44. It would seem that the Greek translators connected the word with a Hebrew root which signifies to bear witness.

Reverting to our passage, we notice that the Revisers, in company with the translators, say that the offering is to be brought to the door. It is strange that they should not have recognised the difference between a door and a doorway. There is nothing whatever about a door in the Hebrew. The word simply means an entrance or opening, and this idea, which is a far pleasanter one, ought certainly to have been presented. The object which had to do duty for a door is now translated "screen" (Exod. xxxv. 12, etc.); in the A.V. it is called a hanging or covering.

The word "offering" has been turned to "oblation" where it stands for the Hebrew *Corban*. We have no particular fancy for the word "oblation," but we would gladly accept it for the sake of consistency, if only we could have a good rendering for the verb from which it is derived, which the translators rendered "bring" instead of "bring near" or "offer." On the whole, we should prefer the word "offer," and it is satisfactory to find that the Revisers have sometimes adopted this word—why not always?

The expression "burnt offering" is retained for the Hebrew *'olah*, which probably means something which is caused to ascend; but why are not the two English words joined with a hyphen to show that they stand for one Hebrew word? The same question may be asked with respect to all the offerings. We think that the Revisers have strangely neglected their duty by omitting this hyphen; we think also that they should have given the literal meaning of the Hebrew names for the offerings in the margin, because they are the best possible comment on the nature of the rites in question.

Readers will notice that the words "he shall offer it of his own voluntary will" are altered to "he shall offer it that he may be accepted." This is an important and most necessary change, though we should have preferred the more literal rendering "for his acceptance." The force of the third verse is thus brought out in its connection with the fourth, where we read that "it shall be accepted for him" (literally "to him," as if put down to his account).

The sentence continues thus: "to make atonement for him." We desiderate a hyphen connecting the words "make atonement;" in fact, there is no reason why the Revisers should not have said "to atone;" and with regard to the expression "for him," it would have been well to have noted in the margin that the literal meaning is *on* or *over*, the idea being that of a covering or shelter beneath which the sinner is accepted. It

is not till Lev. xvi. 10 that the Revisers deemed it wise to point out this last fact in a note, and even then it seems doubtful if they observed its real significance.

We notice, when we get on to the fifth verse, that the word "offer" has been departed from, and the word "present" has taken its place. This is a serious drawback, because it leads the reader to the idea that the priest's work has a different object from the offerer's, whereas the same word is used in the Hebrew to indicate that the priest is carrying on the offerer's work; acting, in fact, as his representative. Again, in the ninth verse, the priest is described as "burning" the whole on the altar, without a note of indication that the word translated "burn" does not mean "burn," but rather "turn to vapour," the idea being not *consumption* by fire but *ascension* by fire; the victim going up to heaven in the form of vapour as an acceptable sacrifice, having been presented by the offerer through the mediation of the priest.

We have thus far traced the Revisers through the first nine verses of Leviticus, noting only salient points, and the result is by no means perfectly satisfactory. When we look at the names of the Revision Committee we feel sure that they must have weighed all such matters as we have referred to; no careful student of the Hebrew text could fail to do so; yet they seem in their united wisdom to have come short just where we expected them to have succeeded.

We must now pass rapidly over other sacrificial words. The "meat offering" is rightly changed to "meal offering," but without the hyphen. "Peace offerings" are retained, but a feeble effort is made in the direction of a better rendering in the margin, where we find "thank offerings." The so-called "peace offering" is really something *rendered* to the Lord in return for His mercies; and "recompense-offering," or some such expression, ought to have been put in the margin. The word is translated "make restitution" in Lev. v. 17 (A.V., "make amends").

"Sinning through ignorance" is turned into "sinning unwittingly" in Lev. iv. 2; but the margin gives a far more adequate rendering, viz., "sinning through error." It will be observed that four cases come under the sin of error (Lev. iv.); the cases of the priest, the congregation, the ruler, and one of the common people. The first of these is introduced thus in the A.V.: "if the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people." For this we find in the R.V.: "if the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people." The Revisers are manifestly right in establishing the distinction between the Hebrew words for "sin" and "guilt" (*chattah* and *asham*), and perhaps they are right in the noteworthy inter-

pretation they give to the passage; but a marginal note is needed—to say the least—indicating that the literal meaning of the word is “for the guilt of the people.” In the second case the Revisers have retained the distinction (Lev. iv. 13) between the *congregation*, that is the people as a whole, and the *assembly*, that is the people in conclave as represented by their elders (*Adah* and *Kahal*).

The “trespass offering” (Lev. v. 6) is most properly changed to a “guilt offering,” and the word “trespass” is rightly reserved for the acts of the offender (Lev. v. 14—vi. 7). The English student will also see the advantage of having the early part of the sixth of Leviticus grouped with the latter part of the fifth, the cases of restitution for trespass being thus thrown together.

In Lev. vi. 9, instead of reading “it is the burnt offering because of the burning upon the altar,” the Revisers read “the burnt offering shall be on the hearth” (marg., “or on its firewood”) “upon the altar.” We are not sure that the translation is strictly grammatical; but the rendering “hearth” is defensible, as the Hebrew student will see by a reference to Ps. cii. 3, A.V. (R.V., “firebrand”). The defect of this new rendering is that it destroys the connection between the middle part of the verse and the last part, where the Revisers still read “the fire of the altar shall be kept *burning*.” The meaning of the passage is that the fire should be allowed to smoulder on, and the fresh offering should be laid on the old embers, the fagots being renewed and the ashes removed day by day. Perhaps the word “embers” might have been introduced here, and certainly they would have given the right sense in Ps. xxx. 14, where we read of a potsherd being used to gather fire from the “hearth.”

The change from a “heave shoulder” to a “heave thigh” (Lev. vii. 32) will strike everyone. We all know the difference between a leg and a shoulder of mutton; and the Revisers have come to the conclusion that it was the former that was allotted to the priest. But if so, why not say “leg” plainly? It is really ludicrous to read in 1 Sam. ix. 24, “the cook took up the thigh.” Meanwhile, the most important authorities, the Targums, the Septuagint, and Gesenius, are altogether in favour of our old rendering. We know of no reason whatever for departing from Gesenius’ view of the Hebrew word (*shok*), viz., that whilst it means “leg” or “thigh” in a man, it means what we technically call a “shoulder” in a quadruped.

Leaving the Revisers to digest their heave thigh at leisure, we observe that Lev. vii. 35 now runs thus: “this is the anointing-portion of Aaron and the anointing-portion of his sons . . . it is a due for ever throughout their generation.”

We are glad that for once the Revisers have recognised the use of the hyphen; and the word "due" is good, provided it is true, but "statute" or "ordinance" is better. Why then make the change?

There are two singular expressions in several verses of Lev. xiii., rendered in the A.V. "to pronounce clean" and "to pronounce unclean." We looked with interest to see if the Revisers had altered them or had condescended to add a note to them, but it is not so. The point of the expressions lies here, that in the Hebrew "to pronounce clean" is literally "to cleanse;" and this bears on our Lord's work in cleansing the leper, on the words spoken in vision to St. Peter in Acts x., and on the declarative idea connected with the doctrine of justification and absolution.

We now come to the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.). It is not our intention to write a treatise on the word *Azazel* (A.V., "scapegoat"), or to dilate on the baldness of the marginal alternative ("dismissal"). In the sixth verse Aaron is described as offering (R.V., wrongly, "presenting") a bullock because of his own sins. (The Revisers have missed the force of the preposition "because of.") He then causes the two goats to stand (the Revisers weakly "set" them, as if they were tables) before the Lord, at the entrance of the tabernacle (R.V., "the door of the tent"). Aaron's business, after deciding the destiny of the two animals by lot, is (A.V.) to offer the one for a sin-offering. Now the Hebrew here (verse 9) is very noteworthy: "He shall make him (*to be*) sin" (compare 2 Cor. v. 21). The Revisers have tamely reproduced the A.V. without giving a hint in the margin of the literal meaning of the words, and without even preserving the italics supplied in the A.V. Again, in the sixteenth verse the R.V. follows the A.V. in saying that the priest makes atonement for the holy place because of the uncleannesses of Israel. There is no real objection to this rendering, but the fact ought to be pointed out that the preposition here rendered "because of" literally means "from," indicating the doing away with the contamination referred to. When, however, the Revisers get on to the nineteenth verse they venture to put the word "from" into the text (following the A.V.). But if the word "from" is good for the nineteenth verse, why not for the seventeenth?

Our translators began the twentieth verse thus: "When he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place." The reason which led them to use the word "reconcile" rather than "atone" was probably the fact that the preposition which ordinarily follows the verb to "atone" is missing from the Hebrew text. The Revisers ignore this fact, and print,

"When He hath made an end of atoning for the holy place," neglecting to mark the word "*for*" in italics.

One more point in this important chapter has been missed by the Revisers. In the twenty-seventh verse we read (A.V. and R.V.) that the bullock and goat whose blood was brought into the holy place were to be burnt without the camp. But the Hebrew word for burning is a very strong one, and utterly different from that used in the ritual of the offerings. It means to *burn up*, not to turn to vapour. The force of this apparently small point will be considered when the remarkable rites of the Great Day of Atonement are fully weighed. Sin produces two effects. It contaminates God's dwelling-place, and it brings death to the sinner. Blood-sprinkling and utter consumption are provided to meet the one evil; escape and life are provided for the other.

There is an important passage in the seventeenth of Leviticus which must not be passed over. The eleventh verse runs thus in the A.V.: "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Here, against the word *life* the Revisers have given a correct marginal note (Heb., *soul*), and they have translated the last clause thus; "for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." This is an improvement on the A.V.; but it is not absolutely accurate, for the preposition rendered "by reason of" means simply "in." There are three statements in the text; first, the soul-life of an animal is in its blood. Every physiologist knows what this means. Secondly, God appoints the life-blood of victims to make atonement for (or over) the soul-life of man. Thirdly, the reason of this is that the life-blood of victims is one with (literally *in*) their soul-life. Again in the fourteenth verse we read (A.V.): "It is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof;" but the R.V. has, "As to the life of all flesh, the blood thereof is *all one* with the life thereof." The expression rendered "all one with" is literally *in*; and if the Revisers had simply put "one with" in both passages, with a marginal note on the literal meaning of the word, the sense of the whole would have been clear.

Before passing from the sacrificial rites, it is worth while to examine how far the Revisers have been consistent in their terminology in some other notable passages of the Old Testament where these are mentioned. In Ps. xl. 6 we have the four classes of offerings named together, viz., the sacrificial feasts, which all partook of; the meal-offerings and sin-offerings, of which the priests ate certain parts; and the burnt-offerings, which no one ate. Here the Revisers have failed in

one point only, viz., that they have put meal-offering into the margin and not into the text. The sacrificial passages in Pss. i. and li. are fairly dealt with, but in Isaiah liii. the interesting reference to the guilt-offering (verse 10) is thrown into the margin instead of being brought into the text.

Lying at the root of the Old Testament sacrificial system is the thought of *atonement*. It has often been remarked upon that this foundation-word only occurs once in the New Testament, and then by a mistranslation; but the *thing* is there, under the name of propitiation. The Hebrew term (*capbar*) has not been translated very consistently in the A.V., so that the Revisers have had an excellent opportunity for improving the version in this respect. The word occurs in the following passages where italics are used. They are quoted from the A.V., and the changes in the R.V. are appended:

Num. xxxv. 33: "The land cannot be *cleansed* of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." Margin, "there can be no *expiation* for the land." R.V., "no *expiation* can be made for the land."

Deut. xxi. 8, 9: "*Be merciful* unto thy people whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood *shall be forgiven* them." R.V., "*Forgive* thy people whom thou hast redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood (to remain) in the midst of thy people Israel. And the blood *shall be forgiven* them."

Deut. xxxii. 43: "He *will be merciful* unto his land (and) to his people." R.V., "He will *make expiation* for his land, for his people."

1 Sam. iii. 14: "The iniquity of Eli's house shall not *be purged* with sacrifice nor offering for ever." R.V. the same, but the word "*expiated*" put in the margin.

2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19: "The good Lord *pardon* everyone that prepareth his heart to seek the Lord." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxxv. 3: "As for our transgressions, thou shalt *purge* them away." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxxviii. 38: "He being full of compassion *forgave* their iniquity." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxxix. 9: "*Purge away* our sins for thy name's sake." R.V. the same.

Prov. xvi. 6: "By mercy and truth iniquity *is purged*." R.V. the same; but in the margin, "*is atoned for*."

Isa. vi. 7: "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin *purged*." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxii. 14: "This iniquity shall not *be purged* from you till ye die." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxvii. 9: "By this shall the iniquity of Jacob *be purged*." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxviii. 18: "Your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*." R.V. the same.

Isa. xlvii. 11: "Mischief shall fall on thee; thou shalt be unable to *put it off*." R.V., "to *put it away*."

Jer. xviii. 23: "*Forgive* not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight." R.V. the same.

Ezek. xvi. 63: "When *I am pacified* toward thee for all that thou hast done." R.V., "*I have forgiven* thee."

The reader who carefully studies these passages will note a slight tendency towards a consistent rendering, though very slight, on the part of the Revisers, and he will observe the introduction of the word "expiation" for the first time into the text; but is all done that ought to have been done? In all the passages where the A.V. had "reconciliation" for "atonement" the Revisers have very properly returned to the word "atonement" except in one, viz., Dan. ix. 24. Why was not the change made here also? They have turned "satisfaction" into "ransom" in Num. xxxv. 31, 32, and "bribe" into "ransom" in 1 Sam. xii. 3; while "bribe" remains in Amos v. 12. A "sum of money" is turned into "ransom" in Exod. xxi. 30; and this word is retained in Exod. xxx. 12; Job xxxiii. 24; xxxvi. 18; Ps. xlix. 7; Prov. vi. 35; xiii. 8; xxi. 18; and Isa. xliii. 3. In the large number of passages still remaining to be noticed—about eighty altogether—the Revisers have retained the word "atonement."

Passing to the kindred idea of redemption, we find no such multiplicity of renderings for the Hebrew *gaal* in the A.V. or R.V. The idea of Kinsman is still combined with that of Redeemer, in the use of *Goel*. In Job xix. 25, as a marginal note against the passage, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," we find the word "vindicator" introduced. There is another word (*padah*) which signifies deliverance from slavery, or rescue from some danger, which has been rendered "redeem" in the A.V. in several passages, but this seems unfortunate; and, strange to say, the Revisers have not thought fit to correct one of them.

It is only one step from the thought of redemption to that of salvation. Our translators have given us six English representatives for the Hebrew *yasha'* (from which the names of Jesus is derived); namely, save, help, preserve, rescue, defend, and deliver. Of these the most misleading is the word "help," which gives to an English reader the idea of assistance, as if God did part of the work and man another part. Singling out this word, we find that the Revisers have only corrected three out of the seventeen passages which needed to be dealt with.

We pass now to the subject of *repeated and quoted passages*—a very profitable topic for study. Not only are there about 600 Old Testament texts quoted in the New, more or less exactly, but also the later Old Testament writers quote their predecessors to a very much larger extent than many people are aware of. The Pentateuch seems to have been a sort of Bible to the Israelites after their entrance into Canaan. It was studied by prophets and kings, and its con-

tents were known to a certain extent among the common people. It was their handbook to the sacred places of the Patriarchal age, as well as their text-book of Law and Promise. It provided them not only with the ritual of their national feasts, but also with the circumstances under which those feasts came into existence. No wonder, then, that we find it verbally quoted again and again in the subsequent historical writings and the prophetic books. But this is not all. The Psalms are not only historically, but also verbally related to the records contained in Samuel and Kings. Isaiah and Micah, who were contemporaries, had access the one to the other's writings. Jeremiah, who lived some time afterwards, makes free use of both, and of other prophets also. Joel had probably read Jonah; Daniel had certainly read Jeremiah; Malachi had read Zechariah. These are only samples of a vast treasury of facts which have hitherto been little used, but which will, we trust, ere long be exhibited before the student. Their bearing on certain Biblical questions must be self-evident. We observe, in the first place, how special thoughts and passages stamped themselves on the mind of godly men. We are not surprised to find words spoken at the crisis of Israel's history, when the Egyptians were behind them and the Red Sea before them, reproduced at a later crisis, when, humanly speaking, the dangers were as great (compare Exod. xiv. 13 with 2 Chron. xx. 17); or portions of the song delivered by Moses reproduced *verbatim* in the Psalms and prophets (compare Exod. xv. 2 with Ps. cxviii. 14 and Isa. xii. 2); or the poem committed to the people before Moses' death, leaving its mark on several later writers. We do not wonder to find words from David's lament over Saul quoted verbally by Micah (2 Sam. i. 20 and Micah i. 10); or Micah's own prophetic utterance of the downfall of Jerusalem quoted and commented on a hundred years afterwards (Micah iii. 12 and Jer. xxvi. 18). But there are other things to be learnt. We find Psalm after Psalm and chapter after chapter in duplicate, to an extent hardly realized until we put them side by side; and the phenomena thus presented give us new light on the ways of God and on the doctrine of inspiration—perhaps, also, on the relationship of certain books to one another in the New Testament. All this goes without saying; and yet we have not got to the bottom of the matter. There are at the present time many speculations about the age, compilation, and authorship of the books of the Old Testament, about the variations in dialect, and about the condition of the sacred text. What if God has preserved to us in the Hebrew Old Testament a sort of stratification answering to that which we find beneath the surface

of our soil, whereby many of our present speculations may receive, if not solution, yet illumination?

Readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*, however, will not thank us if we pursue this subject further; but they will probably agree thus far: (1) that all quotations should be exhibited, whether by inverted commas or otherwise; (2) that quoted passages should be translated uniformly where the text is the same; (3) that where the text is only slightly different the differences should be minimised. The translators of the A.V. aimed fairly at the second of these principles; and the Revisers have gone a little further in the same direction, and that is about all that can be said. They have frequently notified in the margin that certain Psalms and chapters are to be compared with certain others, and textual differences have been occasionally noted; but the work has not been carried out fully or consistently. Possibly they feared to go too much into matters purely critical, but it might at least be expected that such passages as those noted above would have been marked as quotations; yet of the nine passages which we have cited as examples only one has so much as a side-note referring to the passage from which it is quoted, viz., Jer. xxvi. 18.

The more familiar branch of this topic, viz., the reproduction of passages from the Old Testament in the New, has yet to be considered. We are not now dealing with the Revised New Testament. Most of our readers have heard enough about it, and we shall neither bless it at all nor curse it at all; but it must be our business in the remaining part of this paper to inquire into the treatment of the quoted passages by the Old Testament Revisers.

After examining the whole series, which may easily be done with the aid of such a book as Gough's "New Testament Quotations," we find that only about 40 out of the 614 passages to be dealt with have been materially altered, and even here the touches are slight, and usually for the better. We will now give in their order the passages which strike us as most interesting or suitable for comment.

Gen. xviii. 14: "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" No change is made here. The margin has "wonderful." But the LXX. has "impossible." If any reader compares the Greek rendering of the verse with Luke i. 37, and the analogous nature of the circumstances referred to, and the comment on the history given by St. Paul in Rom. iv. 19-21, he will come to the conclusion that the angel Gabriel intended to remind the mother of the Lord of the words spoken in Genesis. But alas for the rendering of Luke i. 37 in the R.V. "No word from God shall be void of power"! All that we desiderate here, then, with respect to the Old Testament, is that the

Revisers should have given us the word "impossible" as an alternative rendering, and should have put with it a reference to St. Luke. Before going on it may be as well to observe that the Hebrew word translated "hard" is that which we have in Isa. ix. 6, where the Revisers have retained the rendering "wonderful;" it occurs also in Judges xiii. 18: "Why asketh thou thus after my name, seeing it is *secret*?" (R.V., "wonderful").

Gen. xlvii. 31: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." No change in the R.V., and no reference. The Septuagint has, "Israel bowed himself (or worshipped) upon the top of his staff;" and in this form the verse is reproduced in Heb. xi. 21. It is strange that the Revisers should have ignored this fact, with which they were all familiar. The Hebrew words for "bed" or "staff" are the same, the vowel points (which are not part of the original Hebrew) being different. Whether it was the staff of office which Joseph carried—as seems most probable—or whether it was Jacob's own staff which is referred to, there can be no doubt that it was this staff which the old man touched with his forehead in the act of prostration, not the head of the bed. It is not even clear what a "bed's head" would mean in those days, or what attitude Jacob would have to put himself into in order to prostrate himself upon it; whereas the sense of the text, as conveyed through the LXX., is clear, though neither our translators nor Revisers have done justice to it in the Old and New Testaments.

Exod. ix. 16: "For this cause have I raised thee up." R.V., "have I made thee to stand." The Revisers have here fallen into the fault which they have usually avoided, but to which their brethren of the New Testament were so prone. In the attempt to be literal they have become absurd. St. Paul's version of the passage (Rom. ix. 17) is quite as literal, and far more sensible and conformable to similar passages.

Exod. xxxiv. 33: "And (till) Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." R.V., "and when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." The difference of sense is noteworthy; and the new rendering, which is advanced without any marginal alternative, seems to be borne out by the comments made by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii.

Deut. xxvii. 26: "Cursed (be) he that confirmeth not (all) the words of this law to do them." R.V., "cursed be he that confirmeth not the words of this law to do them." The Revisers are justified in omitting the word "all," which, however, must still be understood. The Septuagint is very strong, "Cursed is every man who continueth not in all the words of

this law to do them;" and St. Paul's citation is according to the tenor of the LXX. (see Gal. iii. 10).

1 Kings xix. 18: "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel;" margin, "or, I will leave." The Revisers adopt this margin, led to do so by the grammar of the first clause of the verse, without reference to the second clause; concerning which we say, with all respect, that St. Paul was as good a grammarian as the best of them (see Rom. xi. 4). The LXX. has, "Thou shalt leave." There is no material difference in the sense in any case.

Ps. ii. 9: "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron." R.V., "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron." The Septuagint has, "Thou shalt rule (or shepherd) them;" and this rendering is retained in Rev. ii. 27; xii. 5; xix. 15. Moreover, in the first of these passages there is a definite reference to the second Psalm in the words, "even as I received of my Father." We think, therefore, that if the Revisers felt constrained to alter the rendering in the Psalm, they should at any rate have retained the old rendering in the margin, on the authority of the LXX.

Ps. iv. 4: "Stand in awe, and sin not." R.V. the same; but in the margin, "Be ye angry." This note is useful. The verse, as given in the LXX., is quoted verbatim in Eph. iv. 26.

Ps. xvi. 9: "My flesh also shall rest in hope;" margin, "Heb., dwell confidently." R.V., "shall dwell in safety." Of these three renderings the middle one is the most accurate, and the Revisers have got it in the margin. The expression to dwell safely or in safety is such a common one in the Old Testament that the Revisers were quite justified in introducing it here. There is some doubt in the mind of the English reader whether it is the dwelling in life or the lying down to rest in death which is here referred to; but the Hebrew and LXX. are both in favour of the former view. The same Hebrew words for dwelling safely are to be found in juxtaposition in Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28; Prov. i. 33; Jer. xxiii. 16; xxxiii. 16.

Ps. xxii. 8: "He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him;" margin, "he rolled himself on the Lord." R.V., "Commit thyself unto the Lord; let him deliver him." The revised margin gives the old rendering of the A.V., and for this view of the passage we have both the authority of the LXX. and the citation in Mat. xxvii. 43.

Ps. lxxviii. 18: "Thou hast received gifts for man;" margin, "Heb., in the man." R.V., "Thou hast received gifts among men." Our margin is literal, and the LXX. almost agrees with it. From a theological point of view, the passage might be taken as meaning that the Lord in human nature went up

and received gifts which he might dispense. St. Paul in quoting it (Eph. iv. 8) does not profess to give the passage exactly as it was written.

Ps. lxxix. 22: "Let their table become a snare before them; and (that which should have been) for (their) welfare, let it become a trap." St. Paul quotes this in the following form: "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them." At first sight his version looks very different from the Hebrew; but when we remove the words put in brackets, and turn the word "welfare" into "recompense," which the Hebrew word frequently means, we find that the difference is considerably reduced. The R.V. has: "Let their table before them become a snare; and when they are in peace, let it become a trap." The word translated "when they are in peace" cannot possibly mean it; and the LXX. and St. Paul are ignored without a shadow of reason.

Ps. xciv. 7, 8: "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness." R.V., "To-day, Oh that ye would hear his voice! Harden not your heart, as at Meribah, as in the day of Massah in the wilderness." We are glad that Meribah and Massah should be referred to, either in the text or in the margin; and we are glad that the Revisers have found out that "if ye will" means (according to Hebrew idiom) "Oh that ye would;" but it is a pity that they did not find it out when translating Exod. xxxii. 32, where, instead of, "if thou wilt forgive their sin," we ought to read, "Oh that thou wouldst forgive their sin."

Ps. civ. 4: "who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flame of fire." R.V., "who maketh the winds his messengers, his ministers a flaming fire." R.V., margin, "who maketh his angels winds." In Heb. i. 7 we read, "And with reference to the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits (or winds), and his ministers a flame of fire." We should reject the Reviser's text, but we approve of their margin. If the Revisers were right in their text, they ought to have read thus, "who maketh winds his agents, flaming fire his ministers." This would make good sense, and would fit in with the context; but the order of the words in Hebrew is decidedly in favour of the view taken in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and we believe that the Psalmist is comparing the action of God's angelic ministers to the action of the wind and of fire. The second and third verse of the Psalm describe God's dwelling-place and his personal movements; the fourth verse describes the position and characteristics of ministering angels; the fifth and following verses describe the preparation of earth for man.

Ps. cxvi. 10: "I believed, therefore I have spoken." R.V., "I believe, for I will speak." R.V., margin, "I believed when I spake thus." St. Paul translates the passage as the LXX. does, and deliberately applies it to himself: "according as it is written, I believed, therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak." The Revisers by their alteration have slipped into a bit of pedantry, and have lost the sense which the LXX. and St. Paul fortunately retained. Hengstenberg's note on the passage is good. He shows that the real force is, "I believed, for I did speak," the speech being the proof of the presence of faith, just as the love of the sinful woman in Luke vii. marked her sense of obligation. We must not sacrifice our common-sense on the altar of grammar; we must rather enlarge our grammars so as to take in such brief and pregnant sentences as that under consideration.

Prov. iii. 4: "so shalt thou find favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man." The LXX. rendering of this passage is twice referred to by St. Paul (Rom. xii. 17; and 2 Cor. viii. 21), but the Revisers, following the A.V., ignore the possibility of any meeting-place between the Hebrew and the Greek.

Prov. iv. 26: "Ponder the path of thy feet." R.V., "Make level the path of thy feet." This is an improvement. The LXX. has "Make straight paths for thy feet;" and in this form the passage is quoted in Heb. xii. 13.

Isa. vii. 14: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son." R.V. the same; but there are three notes: first, instead of saying *a* virgin, we may say *the* virgin; secondly, instead of using the word "virgin," we may use the word "maiden" (which means exactly the same thing); thirdly, we may read it "the virgin is with child, and beareth a son," which, when one comes to reflect on the matter, is nonsense, unless it is supposed that there was some virgin in Isaiah's days who was then and there to bring forth a son. The arrangement of the Hebrew words is peculiar, and the Revisers have been thus led on to think that the grammar was doubtful; but in this case the arrangement is manifestly adopted in order to give emphasis to the leading word in the great prophecy of the Incarnation.

Isa. viii. 17: "And I will look for him." R.V. the same. But the LXX. has "I will be confident in him;" and in this form it is quoted in Heb. ii. 13. The rendering of the LXX. might have easily been grafted into the text thus, "I will hope confidently in him."

Isa. x. 22, 23: "Though thy people be as the sand of the sea, (yet) a remnant of them shall return; the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. For the Lord shall

make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of the land." R.V., "Though thy people be as the sands of the sea, (only) a remnant of them shall return: a consumption is determined, overflowing with righteousness. For a consummation, and that determined, shall the Lord make in the midst of all the earth." The passage is not an easy one. It is quoted by St. Paul, in Rom. ix. 27, 28. The first part of it is easy to translate, but the difficulty is to know exactly the force of it. This the Revisers have given, according to a view held by many commentators, by inserting the word "only" into the text. The Revisers of the New Testament have done something similar, for they have put, "it is the remnant that shall return." This interpretation goes on the supposition that a remnant is a small portion only of the population, as we talk of a remnant of cloth, etc.; but this is not the force of the Hebrew. The idea *may be* exactly the contrary, and the sense may be given thus, "though the people become" (not *be*) "as the sand of the sea in multitude, yet the whole number shall be restored;" or, as St. Paul puts it, "*all* Israel shall be saved." There are no less than eight Hebrew words translated "remnant" in the A.V. The expression here used for "the remnant shall return" is *Shear Jashub*, which is given as a significant proper name in Isa. vii. 3; we have it also in the twenty-first verse. We trace this "remnant" in process of restoration in Isa. xi. 11-16, where we get a triumphant reminiscence of the old days, when they came out of Egypt leaving not a hoof behind. On the whole, we think the Revisers have been too clever in putting in the word "only," and we recommend readers to strike their pen through it.

Passing to the latter part of the verse, we may notice first that the words "consumption" and "consummation" stand for two forms of one and the same Hebrew word; secondly, that the obscurity of the passage is somewhat relieved when it is read in the light of Isa. xxviii. 22, which has a manifest reference to it; and thirdly, that the passage should be compared with the latter part of Dan. ix. 27. St. Paul quotes from the LXX., but the English version hardly gives the force of the Greek, whilst the Greek is not so full and expressive as the Hebrew. The meaning of the whole passage may perhaps be found in some words of our Lord's, "except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." We are not, however, writing a commentary, but a critique on a Version, and we must pass on.

Isa. xxv. 8: "He will swallow up death in victory." R.V., "He hath swallowed up death for ever." The expression may

mean "for ever," but it seems rather to mean "utterly" or "triumphantly." St. Paul translates it literally.

Isa. liii. 4: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." R.V. the same. We desiderate the word "Himself," which both St. Matthew and St. Peter give us in referring to this verse. It lies in the Hebrew, and ought to have been expressed in the English.

Isa. liii. 8: "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living." R.V., "By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who (among them) considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living?" The preposition which the Revisers translate *by* means "from," and the A.V. is literal enough, whatever meaning we attach to it. But the Septuagint is based upon a slightly different Hebrew reading, and this is the version preserved to us in Acts viii. 32, 33. But by no possible means can the sense put by the Revisers on the last portion of the verse be got out of the Hebrew; for the word "generation" is in the accusative case, but they have so twisted it about that it is hard to know what case they make of it. The word translated "declare" (R.V., "consider") means to meditate or muse upon something, and hence to commune or talk of it. Thus the question is, "who will meditate upon his generation?" or, "who will tell it to others?" not "who of his contemporaries considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living?"

Isa. lxiv. 4: "neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him." R.V., "neither hath the eye seen a God beside thee, which worketh for him that waiteth for him." St. Paul's reference to the passage is, we think, undoubted, though fragmentary. The Revisers have approached the sense of the LXX., which runs thus: "neither have our eyes seen a God beside thee, and thy works which thou shalt do for them that wait for mercy."

Hos. vi. 7: "They like men have transgressed the covenant." The Revisers have followed the margin of the A.V., and have put "like Adam." There may be a reference to this passage in Rom. v. 14.

Hos. xiii. 14: "O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." R.V., "O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?" This is an approximation to the familiar text in 1 Cor. xv. 55. It is to be noticed, however, that the word translated "grave" is "Sheol" or "Hades," and that for "destruction" the LXX. has "sting."

Zech. xiv. 11: "And there shall be no more utter destruction." R.V., "And there shall be no more curse." This change is a

good one, as it enables us to recognise the quotations from the LXX. in Prov. xxii. 3.

With this text we may close what we hope is neither an unimportant nor an uninteresting part of our inquiry.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)



ART. IV.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. IX. SEPTEMBER. ST. MATTHEW THE PUBLICAN.

A. THE TRUE FOLLOWING OF JESUS CHRIST.

"Follow Me : and he arose and followed Him."—MATT. ix. 9.

THE instruction derived from the incidents of this kind that are described in the Gospels is like the instruction which we draw from the parables.

Such cases as the calling of John and James, Peter and Andrew, from the fishing-nets, by help of which they exercised an honest trade;¹ or the calling of the rich young man to part with his possessions, to "sell all that he had," and then to "follow Christ" in His poverty;² or the calling of St. Matthew here to leave the toll-booth or custom-house (such appears to have been the fact of the case) where he was collecting the tax levied on those who came along the Damascus road by a bridge over the Jordan³—such cases, as a very little reflection will show us, cannot possibly for ourselves, under ordinary circumstances, be literal examples.

These three instances might be taken as representative of the three sections into which the sum-total of the ordinary occupations of men may be divided. We have here the labourer, the capitalist, and the man of business. Now it is manifest that if, in every instance, the labourer were to give up his craft, the capitalist to dispense his property and separate it from himself, the man of business to close his shop, to burn his ledgers, to give up communication with all his correspondents, the great machine of social human life would come to a standstill : and the principles of Christianity would not, by this method, have penetrated the world. The principles of Christianity would, in fact, have very little remaining on which to act at all.

These Gospel incidents, therefore, are intended to be, so far as we are concerned, not so much examples to be imitated, as

¹ Matt. iv. 20.

² *Ibid.*, xix. 21.

³ See below, in the next section for this month.