

ing good is the art of enjoyment. It is not necessary that the laws of right should be made imperative — “pronounced in the form of a gerund, This or that ought to be done,—as some Schoolmen teach: because that fitness which is expressed by a gerund wants explanation, which is to be fetched, either from the necessary connection of the means with the end, or from the obligations of a law.” The bishop of Peterborough could hardly have denied more clearly and expressly the binding force of moral principles as inherent in themselves, than he has in these words. Method of ethics becomes method of happiness.

We are now prepared to see what he held virtue or moral rectitude in concrete action to be. And here begins his special relation to later ethics, to his successors, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, and to their divergent successors in England and this country, Butler and Edwards.

---

ARTICLE VIII.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD  
TESTAMENT.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, D.D., PROFESSOR IN CHICAGO  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THERE can be no question that a revision was needed, not because the style could be improved, for hardly any period could be more favorable for producing a faultless English than the early part of the seventeenth century. Indeed, there was the same danger of marring the classic beauty of the version as there would be of injuring the masterpiece of some great painter by retouching the canvas. But this view of the question would be to exalt the

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read before the State Congregational Association of Michigan at Flint, May 20th, and is published at the request of that body.

style of a particular version above fidelity to the text itself, and to demand for the Scriptures what even the Divine Spirit did not think requisite in the choice of those who wrote the sacred books, for while many portions of the Old Testament are models of beauty in the original Hebrew, others are not. No consideration, then, of preserving a classic like our English Bible should deter us from desiring a revision. God's truth is a jewel of infinitely more importance than the casket in which it is contained.

The need of such a revision was at least threefold:

1. On account of changes in the English language. Numerous words which were current two hundred and fifty years ago are obsolete, and the meaning of them is not understood even by people of more than ordinary intelligence. If for no other reason, a revision was needed in which words should be substituted which are commonly known.

2. On account of mistranslations. Dr. Chambers, in his admirable work entitled a Companion to the Revised Old Testament, gives a list of over sixty cases of words incorrectly rendered, some of which are of great importance.<sup>1</sup> Besides, there were entire passages which were wrongly translated, as, for example, Isa. ix. 1, which read in the King James' Version: "Nevertheless the dimness *shall* not *be* such as *was* in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict *her* by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations." This translation is not only obscure, it is absolutely incorrect. Compare with it that of the Revised Version: "But there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish. In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made it glorious, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations." This is a

<sup>1</sup> New York, 1885, pp. 29, 30.

messianic prophecy, indicating the honor that was to be put on Galilee by the revelation of the Messiah there.<sup>3</sup> This honor is contrasted with the contempt which God at first brought on the regions occupied by these tribes.

3. A revision was needed on account of the vastly superior helps for understanding the original meaning of the text. The process of translating the thoughts of writers who lived from twenty-four hundred to more than three thousand years ago into the conceptions of the present day is not an easy one. All their surroundings, their customs, and modes of life, and their religious views, were different from ours. Just as the painters and engravers of the sixteenth century did not know how to represent the persons and scenes of the Scriptures except as they saw men and things around them, but transformed patriarchs, prophets, and apostles into Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Germans, or Italians, according to the stand-point of the artist, so we are likely to conceive of Old Testament worthies from the stand-point of our time. This constitutes a difficulty in the reproduction of the color of the original. We must to a certain extent see them thus so far as all men in every age are alike, and at the same time in their true light. Modern exegetes should try, like modern painters, to reproduce the children of the East. Another difficulty in the rendering of the Hebrew is that no other contemporaneous Hebrew literature has been preserved to us, hence there may sometimes be a question as to what certain words mean which occur only once.

(1) We have much purer forms of the ancient versions which are of great importance in the preparation of such a translation. As has been intimated, the most ancient Greek manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments have been discovered or made available since then, and on these a critical text has been formed, although the most impor-

<sup>3</sup> The Talmud and Midrash say that the Messiah will be revealed in Galilee. See Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jesaja*, Leipzig, 1869, p. 157.

tant part of this work still remains to be done by Lagarde.<sup>4</sup> The version of Jerome, who was a good Hebrew scholar, and which was made in the last part of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, is of great value as showing the probable condition of the Hebrew text at that time, but the Latin Vulgate text which was accessible to those who prepared our English version was corrupt. For several years the text of Jerome has existed in a better form, although not in its pristine purity.<sup>5</sup> The Syriac version, called Peshitto, which was not published in 1611, has been brought to light in almost its original condition through a photolithographic copy of the Ambrosian codex dating from the sixth century, edited by Ceriani.

(2) The study of Hebrew grammar was almost in its infancy at that time. The treatises of Reuchlin and of Sebastian Münster were in existence, and Buxtorf's work was issued in 1609, perhaps a little more than a year before our Authorized Version went to press. But there has been an incomparable advance made in these studies within the present century, and Hebrew, read in the light of the latest grammatical research, becomes a new language in its flexibility and beauty.

(3) So, too, there has been a very marked improvement in lexicography, owing to the scientific study of the cognate languages, such as Arabic, Ethiopic, Syriac, and Assyrian.

(4) The science of sacred geography was still in embryo. The works of Pocock, Reland, Burckhardt, Buckingham, Robinson, and many others, had not seen the light. Probably those who prepared King James' Version had not then dreamed of a survey of western Palestine which should cover every acre of ground, now happily accomplished.

(5) Along with those studies the whole science of sacred antiquities has taken on an accurate form.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1885, p. 23 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

Now, when we view this vast field which is opened before us, we must all admit that there was need of a revision.

The question may be raised, whether the plan of the revision was suited to the wants of two great English-speaking countries, not to mention the dependencies of Great Britain. There can be no doubt that the work proposed was of a very conservative character. It was limited to a revision,—a revision which required as few changes as practicable in the Authorized Version. Would it not have been far better to have attempted an entirely new version? It seems to me not. Our Authorized Version, considering the time in which it was produced, was unsurpassed by any. Its phraseology is endeared to millions of hearts. To have made a radical change in the translation would have been to produce a book which probably would not have been adopted by English Christians. While this conservatism was wise, it has been carried too far, as it seems to me, in rejecting many of the readings suggested by the American company. But of this later.

The execution of this plan was committed to the most competent and representative scholars that could be found in England and America, with perhaps one or two exceptions.

The English company comprised the finest Hebrew grammarians in Great Britain, such as Professor A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, known by his *Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, and his work on the accents, besides his admirable commentary on the Book of Job, and Professor S. R. Driver, of Oxford, author of *Hebrew Tenses*, of whose knowledge and critical acumen Professor Delitzsch speaks in the highest terms.

Text Criticism was represented by Dr. Field, editor of *Origen's Hexapla*,—a work which is without a rival on the Continent, and by Dr. Ginsburg, author of a monumental work on the Massora, which represents not only

herculean industry, but also British enterprise and capital, and which is the forerunner of a critical text of our Hebrew Bibles.

Cognate Semitic languages numbered such English scholars as Dr. Robert Payne Smith, Dean of Canterbury, who is preparing an extensive Syriac lexicon, of which five parts have been issued; Professor William Wright, of Cambridge, eminent for his attainments in Arabic and Syriac, and Professor A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, who is honored among Continental scholars as an Assyriologist.

The best commentators belonged to the company, including Cheyne, whose work on Isaiah ranks with the most scientific productions of German exegetes, and Perowne, whose commentary on the Psalms is not excelled by any other work extant.

There were also in this company the brilliant scholar and critic, Professor W. Robertson Smith, and Dr. W. A. Wright, of Cambridge, chief contributor to Smith's Bible Dictionary in biblical geography and biography, who was enough of a Shakesperian scholar to be co-editor of the Cambridge Shakespeare and the Globe Shakespeare.

The American company, comprising such scholars as Drs. Chambers, Conant, Day, De Witt, Green, Mead, Strong, and Van Dyck, while not so eminent as the English company, with a few exceptions, was certainly respectable, and well fitted for the work.

Our next inquiry is as to the character of that which was accomplished by these Revisers. It is worthy of our highest respect, not only on account of those engaged in it, but also on account of the time devoted to this purpose. It represents fourteen years' study by the most eminent scholars that could be chosen for this purpose in England and America, with perhaps one or two exceptions.

The arrangement of the poetical books in such a way as to indicate their character is of great advantage. Some criticism has been made on the Revisers, because they did not introduce the same arrangement into the prophetic

books, as Lowth has done in his translation of Isaiah; but they say they have not done it because the language of these books is rather of the nature of lofty and impassioned prose.

The critical scholarship is found more commonly in the marginal readings. These are of great value, but some of them must be rather surprising to the ordinary English reader. If we turn to the messianic passages in Genesis, we find four where the promise reads in the text, "in thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," but in two other places in the margin we find the reading, "bless themselves" (Gen. xxii. 18; xxvi. 4). This is a concession to what is claimed to be an established grammatical principle, that the Hithpael is never translated as a passive, except in very late Hebrew.

Again, in the noted passage in Gen. xlix. 10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh come," where "Shiloh" is regarded as a person, the Messiah, but in the marginal note we have the alternative reading, "till he come to Shiloh," making it the name of a place.

In the books of Samuel, where the text is quite corrupt, there are at least thirty-one references in the margin to readings of the LXX., and some passages are marked as not occurring there, as 1 Sam. xiii. 1, where we read in the Hebrew text, בֶּן־שָׁנָה שְׁאֵל שָׂאֵל בְּכֶלֶבּוֹ, "a son of a year was Saul when he reigned," or in English, "Saul was a year old when he reigned." The LXX. omits this; also xvii. 12-31, and xvii. 55-xviii. 5, thus excluding the passage according to which Saul did not recognize David after his victory over Goliath, although he had previously been in his household. Our American Revisers did not approve of indicating any of these variants, but, as it seems to me, without sufficient reason, unless we can prove that the massoretic text has especial claims to be inspired, and this cannot be proved when we remember what use was made of the LXX. by New Testament writers.

The critics have had considerable discussion about Ps. ii. 12, which reads in our Authorized Version, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry." This is an important messianic passage in one of the chief messianic psalms; the marginal note indicates the reading, "Worship in purity," *נְשַׁקְרִיבֵר*, which is the way Jerome read the text.\* We should expect in ordinary Hebrew, *נְשַׁקְרִיבֵן פְּרִיאֲנֵה*. The introduction of the Aramaic word *בֵּר* for "son" makes a more euphonious sentence, *נְשַׁקְרִיבֵר פְּרִיאֲנֵה*.

In Ps. xii. 16 King James' Version reads, "They pierced my hands and my feet." This is the reading of the LXX., the Vulgate, and the Syriac, but we have in the marginal note of the Revised Version, "Like a lion" my hands and my feet, which is really the form of the Cethibh in the Hebrew text. In Ps. xlv. 6 the critics have found a place in the margin. The passage, as also found in Heb. i. 8, reads, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." The marginal note, "Thy throne is the throne of God," has arisen from the view that this psalm was originally an epithalamium, in commemoration of the marriage of a royal pair, and which was afterwards adopted for the worship of the temple service.

Turning to the prophets, we still read in Isa. vii. 14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The margin, however, reads, "maiden." This marginal reading is a concession to the modern critical view that the word *'almah*, which is not the specific term for "virgin" in Old Testament usage, simply means a "marriageable girl."

Great conservatism has been manifested in the alterations. None have been made except where the Revisers were clear that they were actually necessary.

The Revisers have been very sparing in their application of the principle, now generally accepted by leading

\* Adorate pure. Cf. *Biblia Sacra Latina Veteris Testamenti*, Lipsiae, 1873.

English' and German\* Hebrew grammarians, that the Hebrew verb is not used to mark distinctions of tense, but rather of action, as perfect and imperfect, or complete and incomplete. In Gen. ii. 6 we still read, "But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." But here we have an imperfect, and the force of the verb would have been more exactly given by the rendering, "And a mist was going up, and was watering the whole face of the ground." By not observing this principle, the Revision fails to reproduce the Hebrew of Gen. xxix. 2, 3: "And he looked, and behold a well in the field, and, lo, three flocks of sheep lying there by it; for out of that well they watered the flocks: and the stone upon the well's mouth was great. And thither were all the flocks gathered: and they rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the sheep, and put the stone again upon the well's mouth in its place." According to this translation, **we** should conclude that the stone was rolled away and the sheep **were** watered then and there; but an observance of the doctrine of **the** imperfect gives us a translation which does not indicate a fact that then occurred, but rather a custom or habit. These verses should be translated: "For from that well they were wont to water the flocks, and there was a great stone upon the mouth of the well, and all the flocks were wont to gather thither," etc. In these verses, as I have said, the custom is described, the actual watering of the flocks is indicated further on.

There are, however, not a few passages where the modern theory of the Hebrew perfect and imperfect is recognized. Ps. iii. 4, "I cry unto the Lord," instead of "I cried," where the imperfect is used, and in vs. 5, "I awaked,

<sup>1</sup> Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar, Edinburgh, 1876, p. 114 ff. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, Oxford, 1881, p. 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ewald, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes, Göttingen, 1870, p. 348 ff.; Böttcher, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, 2ter Band, Leipzig, 1868, p. 148 ff.; Gesenius, Hebräische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 103, 104, 279 ff.

for the Lord sustaineth me," hence the imperfect, where God's continual care is considered the ground of his preservation in the midst of enemies. Ps. v. 2, "Unto thee do I pray," instead of "will I pray;" so in vs. 6, "The Lord abhorreth the bloodthirsty and deceitful man," instead of "The Lord will abhor," etc.

There is at least one very interesting instance in a marginal reading in which the force of the imperfect as indicating customary action is brought to light. It is in 2 Sam. xv. 32, where David is regarded by Delitzsch as a type of Christ. In the fifteenth chapter we have an account of David's flight from Absalom, and in the thirtieth verse it is said that he went up by the ascent of the Mount of Olives, and in the thirty-second verse we read, "where God was worshipped," but in the margin, "where he was wont to worship God." According to Professor Delitzsch, this passage may be interpreted to mean that David, like his greater Son, was accustomed to worship in the Mount of Olives.\*

The spirit of conservatism has led the Revisers to retain the old version of Gen. vi. 3, "My spirit shall not strive with man for ever," which is generally supposed by those not acquainted with the text to have a theological significance. But neither the Hebrew original nor the ancient versions favor this meaning, but rather, perhaps, that the Divine Spirit, as the source of life, shall no longer be the medium of long life in man. The passage rather means, according to the marginal reading, "My spirit shall not rule in man," etc.

The English company seem to have clung unnecessarily to certain obsolete words, notwithstanding the suggestions of the American company. In Gen. xl. 17 we read of "all manner of bakemeats for Pharaoh," where the Hebrew is simply the indefinite word for food.

And this leads me to remark that it seems to me that

\* Cf. Delitzsch, *Old Testament History of Redemption*, Edinburgh, 1881, p. 90.

most of the suggestions of the American company should have been introduced into the text, instead of being placed in the appendix. There would certainly seem to be a gain in substituting the name "Jehovah" for "Lord," although there was probably a very good reason in the minds of the English Revisers for retaining this term, since the Jews always read the Hebrew word for "Lord," *'ādhondy*, when they had the consonants of "Jehovah" in the text. There is, besides, no evidence that "Jehovah" is the correct pronunciation of the ineffable name of the God of Israel.

The euphemisms suggested by the American Revisers were certainly desirable, instead of the rank words which offend American sensibilities, although they may not grate on English ears.

The question may now be raised as to the merits of the Revision, whether the spirit of conservatism has been so great as to prevent the Revisers from doing what they ought to have done, whether, after all, the Revised Version of the Old Testament differs essentially from that of King James.

This query has partially been answered in the points that we have passed in review. The Revisers have, to a great extent, removed obsolete words, have corrected passages that were wrongly translated, and have embodied the results of modern Semitic scholarship, at least to a useful extent, in the revision of the Old Testament.

While all parts exhibit the changes made, some present more changes than others. Perhaps the improvements are most numerous in the Book of Job, where they amount to several hundred. They also abound in the Psalms and in the Prophets. In almost every case the Revision more clearly reflects the meaning of the original, or, in passages which admit of a twofold translation, a better rendering is given.

A few quotations will show the merits of the Revision in giving a closer translation. In the first Psalm we have "wicked" instead of "ungodly;" "streams" instead of

“rivers;” “its” instead of “his.” In the second: “nations” instead of “heathen;” “peoples” instead of “people;” “I will tell of the decree” instead of “I will declare the decree;” “for his wrath will soon be kindled” instead of “when his wrath is kindled but a little.” In the third Psalm: “Lord, how are my adversaries increased” instead of “how are they increased that trouble;” “but thou, O Lord, art a shield about me,” instead of “thou, O Lord, *art* a shield for me;” “I cry unto the Lord with my voice, and he answereth me,” instead of “I cried unto the Lord,” etc. In the fourth Psalm: “Answer me” instead of “Hear me;” “thou hast set me at large” instead of “thou hast enlarged me,” and, to pass over other changes, “Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than *they have* when their corn and their wine are increased,” instead of “thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time *that* their corn and their wine increased.” In the fifth Psalm: “For unto thee do I pray,” instead of “will I pray;” “in the morning will I order *my prayer* unto thee, and will keep watch,” instead of “in the morning will I direct *my prayer* unto thee, and will look up;” “Evil shall not sojourn with thee” instead of “neither shall evil dwell with thee;” “the arrogant” instead of “the foolish shall not stand in thy sight;” “Hold them guilty, O God,” instead of “destroy thou them, O God.”

In the tenth Psalm: “In the pride of the wicked the poor is hotly pursued,” instead of “the wicked in *his* pride doth persecute the poor:” “And the covetous renounceth, *yea*, contemneth the Lord,” instead of “For the wicked boasteth of his heart’s desire, and blesseth the covetous, *whom* the Lord abhorreth;” “The wicked, in the pride of his countenance, *saith*, He will not require *it*. All his thoughts are, There is no God,” instead of “The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek *after God*: God *is* not in all his thoughts.”

Ps. xvi.: “I have said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: I have no good beyond thee,” instead of “*O my soul*, thou

hast said unto the Lord, Thou *art* my Lord; my goodness *extendeth* not to thee."

Ps. xix.: "There is no speech nor language; their voice cannot be heard," instead of "There is no speech nor language *where* their voice is not heard."

Ps. xxxvii. 3: "Trust in the Lord, and do good; dwell in the land, and follow after faithfulness [marg. "feed on faithfulness"]; instead of "Trust in the Lord, and do good; *so* shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed."

In Isa. liii. we have an important change in the tense, which brings out the true stand-point of the speaker. We read, "For he grew up before him as a tender plant," etc., instead of "For he shall grow up," etc.; that is, the stand-point of the speaker is among the repentant Jews of the future, who, in accordance with the prophecy in Zechariah (xii. 10), shall mourn their rejection of the Messiah, and are here represented as giving the reasons why they did not recognize his messiahship.

These are a few examples of a great number of changes which have evidently been made with great care, and with a desire to conform to the literal meaning of the text.

Let us next consider the criticisms that have been made on the Revision. They are mainly twofold, textual and grammatical; that is, critics of the Revision claim that the Revisers should have prepared a new, critical text of the original, or should at least have amended the text that they used; and that they should have brought their translation into stricter conformity with the latest established principles of Hebrew grammar.

The text which the Revisers used was the so-called massoretic<sup>10</sup> or traditional text. Inasmuch as the massoretic pointing was not brought to perfection before the seventh century of our era, and Hebrew was originally written before the massoretic period only with consonants, and as the ancient versions which antedate the massoretic

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, p. 18.

period from three to nine centuries present considerable variations from the massoretic text, especially in the LXX., it is inferred that they are based on a more ancient form of the text, and that the Revisers should have prepared an eclectic text prior to the work of revision, as was done by the New Testament Revisers. The difficulties, however, in the way of such an attempt were very great. New Testament text criticism has flourished more or less since the beginning of the century, especially subsequent to 1831," and in it English scholarship has taken a most honorable part. Old Testament text criticism, since the labors of Kennicott and De Rossi in the last part of the eighteenth century, and Holmes and Parsons in the beginning of the nineteenth, has made no great advance. The principles as to the sources for the formation of the New Testament text are well established. This, however, is not the case with the Old Testament. Scholars are not yet agreed what use shall be made of the text of the LXX. The sources of a new text, if the demands of the critics should be regarded, would be as follows: (1) The Septuagint; (2) the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion; (3) the Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum; (4) the Peshitto; (5) the Targums; (6) Jerome; (7) readings from the Talmud, and (8) of prime importance, a critical, massoretic text. In almost every case a critical revision of these sources needs to be secured, before the principles on which a new text can be founded could be established. The formation of a critical text of the Septuagint is a matter of peculiar difficulty, far more difficult than the formation of a critical text of the New Testament. That can be reasonably assured through a comparison of the most ancient manuscripts; but, by reason of the corruptions that have come into the text through Origen's Hexapla, a critical text of the LXX. cannot be secured except on the basis of three texts which are to be

<sup>11</sup> See Wescott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction and Appendix, New York, 1882, p. 13.

found largely through the medium of cursive manuscripts which go back to certain classes of ancient uncials. The difficulty of establishing such a text may be understood when it is remembered that Lagarde, after more than twenty years' labor, has succeeded in publishing only half of the text of Lucian. It is needful that he should also prepare the texts of Hesychius, and Origen, before he can issue the critical text that is to be based upon them. A critical text is also needed of the Peshitto, of Jerome's version, and of the massoretic text of the Old Testament. Had the Old Testament Revisers attempted this work, or waited for it, they might have entirely resigned the expectation of producing any revision of the Old Testament in this century. Such being the case, it is wise that they did not attempt to form a critical text. They have been blamed, however, for not making a greater use of the versions, and of the oldest dated Hebrew manuscript from the year 916 A.D., but on what principles should they use them? It seems an unreasonable expectation that with such an inadequate critical apparatus they should attempt a miscellaneous, undefined, emendation of the Hebrew text. The course pursued seems to be worthy of praise on the whole.

With reference to the grammatical conservatism of the Revision, it must be remembered that some of the Revisers were distinguished for their discriminating knowledge of Hebrew grammar. While the Revision does not exhibit those changes which they would undoubtedly have made if they had had entire freedom of action, it exhibits all that their co-laborers, who represented the conservative majority of American and English Christians, would allow. These colleagues stood for a large majority of Bible students in our English and American churches, who would not have accepted the Revision if too great changes had been made.

The question may be raised, in closing, what effect the Revision has on modern critical theories of the Pentateuch,

and on doctrines for which proof-texts have been found in the Old Testament. We reply:

1. Some of the changes and marginal notes are rather favorable to the theories of the modern critical school. In Deut. i. 1 we read, "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan;" cf. i. 5; iv. 46. In King James' Version we read, "on this side" (*cis* instead of *trans*). This, to be sure, would not prove that Moses did not write Deuteronomy, but it would seem to indicate that he did not write these verses. There is at least one case (1 Kings iv. 24) in which the Hebrew word is translated as signifying "on this side," where it refers to the Euphrates, and yet the marginal note even here has it "beyond."

It is evident, however, that these changes have not been made in the interest of any school of critics, but rather from a sincere desire to reproduce the meaning of the original.

There are some changes which are quite as favorable to the conservative view of the Pentateuch. The modern critical school holds that the Israelitish priesthood did not begin with Aaron, but that it was gradually developed, and that the Book of Deuteronomy marks a certain stage in that development; namely, that of Levitical priests, for it is a fact that wherever priests are mentioned in Deuteronomy we do not read of priests and Levites, as sometimes in those parts of the Pentateuch which the critics hold to be of a late origin, but simply of priests Levites, or Levitical priests. From this the critics argue that any Levite may be a priest. The passage, however, in Deut. xviii. 1, which fairly represents the original, is not favorable to this theory. It reads, "the priests, the Levites, *even* all the tribe of Levi," and in the margin, "and all the tribe of Levi."

2. The Revision clearly shows to the ordinary reader, what has long been clearly recognized by Hebrew scholars, that the Bible is not a dead level from Genesis to

Revelation. It is rather an ascent from Paradise to the New Jerusalem. It is not a legitimate use of the Old Testament to seek in it proof-texts for all the doctrines that are found in the New Testament. It is a mistake to suppose that the Patriarchs had any such clear views of the plan of salvation, and of the life beyond this, including the resurrection, as New Testament Christians have.

It would seem as though some supposed that since the Revision has appeared, hell and retribution have been destroyed, because the Hebrew word *Sheol*, indicating the abode of bad and good alike, has been transliterated.

Undoubtedly passages in the Old Testament where the word "hell" occurred were used in an illegitimate way to prove that there is a place of torment on account of the use of the word "hell," which is now always understood to mean a place of torment, but which, according to Bishop Horsely, in its primary and natural meaning signified the unseen and covered place; and which he says is properly used both in the Old and New Testament to render the Hebrew word in the one, and the Greek word in the other, which denote the invisible mansion of disembodied spirits, without any reference to sufferings.<sup>12</sup> It is unfortunate that the English company did not accept the suggestion of their American brethren, and transliterate the word *Sheol* throughout. Some object to the use of this term as one that requires definition, but any word that might be chosen would need to be defined.<sup>13</sup>

In closing, I may express my conviction that the Revised Version of the Old Testament should be adopted, and will be adopted, by all English-speaking Christendom. It must stand or fall on its merits. But as the version of Jerome overcame every prejudice and supplanted the old Latin Version, because of its superiority, so I believe that this work will finally be adopted by the churches. I do

<sup>12</sup> See Richardson, *A New Dictionary of the English Language*, London, 1867, sub voce.

<sup>13</sup> The Revisers have defined *Sheol* in connection with Gen. xxxvii. 35.

not see how a better plan for a revision could be devised, or how more competent men could be found to carry it out, or how they could be more industrious, patient, and charitable in its execution.

While the English company represented superior scholarship, it would have been well had they paid more heed to the clear discernment and common sense of the American Revisers. This, however, is a matter of minor importance. It is desirable every way that the great English-speaking commonwealth, which is making new conquests every year, should have one version.

The execution of this work is a noble tribute to the Christian scholarship and brotherhood of the nineteenth century, and is at the same time a clear evidence that those who would explore the treasures of God's Word and display them in their unalloyed richness must still have recourse to the Hebrew and the Greek, and that, for the minister at least, these should not be dead languages.