

# 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 Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

a clearer voice to our age than to any that has preceded it. Our yearning after unity, our recognition—faint though it still be—of the meaning and the mission of the Church, is enabling us at last to catch something of the sense of the prophetic voices of the past.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

*THE NEW VERSIONS OF THE PSALTER AND  
THE BOOK OF JUDGES.*

BEAUTIFUL as the Authorized Version is, it must be confessed that its too exclusive use is one of the chief hindrances to a living appreciation of the Scriptures, and, accurate as it is, if compared with the Latin Vulgate, its frequent obscurity shows that the translators often missed the sense of the original writers, and that something more is wanted to open the door effectually to this priceless literature. Hebrew scholars have now and then attempted to retranslate the Old Testament, but they have generally taken as their basis the text received by us from the Jews, which, though both as a text and (in the vowel-points) as an interpretation by no means contemptible, is obviously full of faults, not a few of which may with practical certainty, and many more with different degrees of probability, be removed. Prof. Haupt, an eminent Semitic scholar, whose career as an Assyriologist has been as brilliant perhaps as it could be, and who is also interested in the future of religion, has therefore conceived the idea of getting the Old Testament retranslated on the basis of a critically revised text. For himself he has selected the modern thinker's favourite book—Ecclesiastes; the other books have been allotted by him (as general editor) to different English, American, Australian, German, and Dutch

scholars, who have all undertaken to carry out the well-thought-out rules set forth in the original prospectus. There is to be a Hebrew edition of the text of each book, in which the grounds of all critical corrections are set forth for the Hebraist. There is also to be an English edition, presenting, in addition to the English translation, a brief commentary on all those points which even in a strictly popular version may remain obscure. The different parts of each composite work (and of such the Old Testament contains many) are printed, where expediency demands this, in colours, to enable the reader to tell at a glance to which record or document a section belongs; each section having its own colour, except where, for convenience sake, some principal document is printed in black, without further colouring. All necessary critical information, with approximate dates for the composition of the records, is given with the notes.

It would have been a serious blot in the plan of this work if Dr. Haupt had been the sole editor. For most persons will doubt whether a German scholar, transplanted to America, could possibly obtain a perfect mastery of English diction, and above all of English rhythm. They will admit that Prof. Max Müller is in truth one of our best living English writers, but they will account for this by the fact that literature has always been his recreation, as indeed in the case of a poet's son we should expect it to be. And so, to meet these sceptics, and with a proper diffidence in his own qualifications, Dr. Haupt applied for assistance to Dr. H. H. Furness, who knows English literature in its greatest period as few besides him do, and who to a profound knowledge of words joins a sensitive ear for rhythm. With no slight degree of self-sacrifice, Dr. Furness consented to join Dr. Haupt as his assistant. It is his self-denying work to read through all the transla-

tions sent in by the English, American, and Australian contributors, and, where in his judgment it is desirable, to suggest modifications. Still more trouble is in store for him in dealing with English translations of German (or Dutch) translations of the Hebrew text; here the collaboration of Dr. Haupt will no doubt be specially necessary. In the only case of a German scholar's contribution as yet made known to us Dr. Furness has actually been at the pains to recast the whole translation himself in an English mould, and the result is the most beautiful version of the Hebrew psalms which exists in our language.

Regarding it simply as a specimen of translation, it is the Psalter which interests me most in the three volumes of the Old Testament which lie before me. The *Isaiah* is my own work; in spite of Dr. Furness's invaluable suggestions, it is still my own, and I therefore cannot refer to it. The volume on *Judges* certainly has many points of interest, but the subject-matter of the book does not appeal to one's deepest nature as the Psalter does. Besides, since such a great English scholar as Dr. Furness is from one point of view the translator of the Psalter, we can form an opinion here, better than in *Isaiah* and *Judges*, whether the modern theory of a translation of the Bible, advocated by Dr. Haupt and himself, is in all points satisfactory or not.

If the reader should ask, What is the modern theory of a translation of the Bible? I should reply, The theory that good modern English (or French, or German, as the case may be) is good enough as a vehicle of the sense of the original. This was not the theory upon which King James's translators acted. Their theory was one upon which no other book in their day or in ours has been translated. Let Selden be witness. He says in his vigorously expressed *Table Talk*:

“There is no book so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not into French English. I say, 'tis cold; not, it makes cold; but the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept.”

Selden then quotes an example, and remarks that “[this] is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it; but when it comes among the common people, Lord, what gear do they make of it?” But this wise old scholar might have chosen many less striking but almost more instructive instances. No student of Hebrew can have failed to perceive the large number of Hebraisms by which the translators of our Bible have corrupted the pure English of their day. Idioms such as cannot be found in North's *Plutarch* abound in the Authorised Version; and though Archbishop Trench, I think, accounts these Hebraisms, or some of them, to be enrichments of our language, we must examine them very closely, in the light of our best subsequent literature, to determine whether they are so. Dr. Furness and Dr. Haupt have, at any rate, decided in an adverse sense. They have sought for an English which is modern without being vulgar, and with just such an occasional suggestion of the Elizabethan language as, without embarrassing the unscholarly reader, may please the ear of the literary, and remind them of the great old age of English undefiled.

I will now endeavour to draw out the merits of the Wellhausen-Furness Psalter as a translation, leaving altogether on one side the question of the correctness of the text. I feel that I should draw aside the reader's attention from the main point if I were to expatiate on the merits or demerits of Wellhausen as an editor, and

will only assure the ordinary reader that the text has, on the whole, been dealt with very tenderly by the Göttingen professor. My specimens shall be taken first from those psalms which appeal most to Christian experience, or are concerned with moral problems, and next from those which are of special interest from their traditional connection with the life of Jesus Christ. I venture, however, to substitute Jehovah for the unpronounceable JHVH,<sup>1</sup> and also to neglect the division into lines, and the symbols relative to the comparatively few corrections of the received text.

“<sup>1</sup>Jehovah is my shepherd; therefore I can lack nothing. <sup>2</sup>On pastures growing green He lets me lie down, to waters of repose He leads me. <sup>3</sup>He refreshes my soul, and in paths of righteousness He guides me, for His Name’s sake. <sup>4</sup>Yea, though I walk through a valley of deep darkness, I fear no harm; Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy crook, they comfort me. <sup>5</sup>Thou spreadest my table in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runs over. <sup>6</sup>Nought but goodness and mercy will follow me all the days of my life, and in the house of Jehovah I shall dwell evermore.”

In *v.* 1 note the fine effect produced by the substitution of “can” for “shall”; “I can lack nothing.” It reminds us of St. Paul’s “If God be for us, who can be against us?” Then, in *v.* 2, observe the fine emphasis on the quality of the pastures, and the delightful tripping of the words; also the alliteration, which in this, as in every version of the Psalms, is all too rare, and deserves all the more grateful recognition when it does

<sup>1</sup> On pages 163, 164 Dr. Haupt states as his opinion that the true pronunciation of JHVH was Yahwè (Iahway). It is apparently out of regard for educational prejudices that he does not place the true form (vowels included) in the text. The same regard leads me (only) in the present article to adopt the monstrous but familiar form Jehovah, which is as old in English literature as Marlowe (“Doctor Faustus”).

occur.<sup>1</sup> In *v.* 2 and *v.* 4 observe that Hebraisms, when beautiful in themselves and not repugnant to the genius of our language, are not avoided by the new translators. I am not sure, however, that the Hebraisms in these verses are not a mistake. In *v.* 4 note the fine effect produced by the omission of the (in English) unnecessary "for"; "I fear no harm; Thou art with me." In *v.* 5 how delicately the word "crook" suggests the shepherd's office! In *v.* 6 how fine is the new idea introduced, "nought but goodness and mercy!" The translator seems partial to this interpretation, for again in lxxiii. 1 we read in this Psalter, "God is good, and good only, to Israel." Such is the new version of one of the best-loved psalms. I will not say that friendly rivalry is not possible even here. Translation is a marriage of minds—the author's and the translator's, and between the two comes a middle man, the scholar. But I would not in this article expose myself to be accused of captiousness; I will, as far as possible, forget that I am of the craft of Wellhausen. For no one has a right to criticise, except very humbly, this new setting of David's melodies, unless he is prepared for a wrestling match with its authors.<sup>2</sup>

Here is a portion of Psalm xxxii.:

"<sup>5</sup>My sin I laid bare to Thee, my guilt I did not conceal. I said, I will acknowledge my sin to Jehovah. Then Thou forgavest the guilt of my sin. <sup>6</sup>Therefore let all pious men pray to Thee: that, in the hour of distress, the rush of great waters may not overtake them.

<sup>1</sup> The parallel lines in Wellhausen-Furness's edition are virtually free metrical unrhymed verses. The want of rhyme would to some extent be compensated by a judicious use of alliteration, which is so frequent in the oldest English poetry.

<sup>2</sup> It is, however, of course only incidentally that my forthcoming revised translation of the Psalms will assume a controversial character. I may be permitted to say that the idea of basing it on a new revision of the text was formed quite independently of Wellhausen's example.

<sup>7</sup>Thou art my shelter, Thou dost protect me from danger, Thou dost encompass me with security."

Notice here in *v.* 5 "laid bare" for "acknowledged." A stronger expression than the Hebrew, to compensate (it would seem) for any occasional weakening of the Hebrew phrase. "Then thou forgavest," instead of the too weak rendering, "And Thou forgavest." In *v.* 6 a brilliant (though possibly improvable) conjecture of Lagarde is adopted, to the great advantage of the sense. The two closing words of *v.* 7, however, seem to me to need the symbol "?". I should also like to have heard the debate on the phrase, "Thou forgavest the guilt of my sin."

Then take Psalm *xlvi.* :

"<sup>1</sup>God is our Refuge and Stronghold, a Help well proved in distress. <sup>2</sup>Therefore we fear not, though the earth bubble, and though mountains shake in the heart of the sea. <sup>3</sup>Let its waters roar and foam, let mountains quake at its uproar: Jehovah Sabaoth is with us, the God of Jacob is our fortress.

"<sup>4</sup>A brook, whose waters make glad the city of God, is the Most High in His habitation. <sup>5</sup>God is in the midst of her, therefore she totters not; God helps her, when the morning dawns. <sup>6</sup>Nations rage, kingdoms totter, thunder rolls, till the earth trembles: <sup>7</sup>Jehovah Sabaoth is with us, the God of Jacob is our fortress.

"<sup>8</sup>Come hither, and behold the works of Jehovah, what signs He sets on the earth! <sup>9</sup>Who, throughout the world, suppresses wars, bows He snaps, spears He breaks, chariots He burns with fire. <sup>10</sup>Be still, and know that I am God: I triumph over the nations, I triumph over the world. <sup>11</sup>Jehovah Sabaoth is with us, the God of Jacob is our fortress."

In *v.* 1*b* the old familiar rendering is no doubt beautiful, but it is too vague. Facts alone are arguments when the

foundations of the physical or moral world are shaking. It is past experience to which the old Jewish saints appealed as a remedy for doubt (see lxxvii. 5). Thus far Jehovah has proved Himself a Help in distress; can He cease to be so now? In *v.* 2 Dr. Furness (who must surely have the credit of this) again substitutes a strong English phrase for a weak Hebrew one. The Hebrew is, literally, not "though the earth bubble," but "though the earth change." I wonder if Dr. Furness thought of Shakespeare's "suffer a sea-change." I will not criticise this; Dr. Furness no doubt did his best with Wellhausen's German, and Wellhausen is, on the whole, very tender with the received text. The whole version is most effective. But I should like to have heard the debate on "Who, throughout the world, suppresses wars."

Perhaps no psalm has been more carefully done than the 77th. I will quote the first ten verses, which Wellhausen regards as a separate fragment of a psalm.

"<sup>1</sup>With my voice I cried unto God,—with my voice unto God,—I hoped He would hear me. <sup>2</sup>In the hour of my need I turned to the Lord; my hand was stretched out in the night without ceasing. But my soul would allow itself no consolation. <sup>3</sup>I cried unto God and I wailed; I prayed, but my spirit was wrapped in gloom. <sup>4</sup>My eyelids Thou holdest fast closed; I was filled with unrest, and nought could I speak. <sup>5</sup>I pictured the days of old, the years of ancient times. <sup>6</sup>I remembered my harp in the night, and I prayed from my heart; but my soul suffered anguish. <sup>7</sup>Will then the Lord be for ever rejecting, and never again show Himself pleased? <sup>8</sup>Is then His goodness ended for ever? And His faithfulness—is it clean gone for all time to come? <sup>9</sup>Has God forgotten again to be gracious? Has He withdrawn His pity, in wrath? <sup>10</sup>And I said: Lo, this is my anguish: the right hand of the Highest is no longer the same."

How perplexing this passage is, even in the Revised Version, need not be said. The new translators have deserved well of the public by giving a clear, interesting, and suggestive version. I will not spoil the reader's enjoyment of it by criticism. It may have been hard to give up the time-honoured rendering, "My soul refused to be comforted." But when the surrounding context had been so much altered, a single bit of the Authorized Version would have seemed like a patch from an old garment. The rhythm of the new rendering is not indeed the old one, but it is good, and it suits the fine flowing rhythm of the rest of the passage. How fine is the new seventh verse! And how touching is the nobly expressed idea of the new tenth verse! I speak here simply from the point of view of lovers of clear, melodious English. Preachers, too, will, I think, be grateful for this noble speech of the much-trying Jewish Church.

Among those psalms which, like Job, are specially concerned with moral problems, the 73rd stands pre-eminent. I am bound to give a sample of the new version of it. I think it will be plain here that much as the translator loves rhythm, he values intelligibility still more. The result is a compromise, in which rhythm is but seldom worsted. I omit verses 20-22.

"<sup>13</sup>Surely in vain have I kept my heart pure, and in innocency washed my hands; <sup>14</sup>for all the day long I am plagued, and my chastisement starts every morning afresh. <sup>15</sup>Had I, in this sort, wished to exclaim, to the community of Thy children I had then proved a traitor. <sup>16</sup>But when I pondered that I might understand it, it seemed in mine eyes a wearisome task, <sup>17</sup>until I penetrated the mysteries of God, and marked their final days. <sup>18</sup>It is but on slippery ground that Thou settest them; down to ruin Thou hurlest them. <sup>19</sup>How in a moment are they turned to nothing! gone! ended by terrors! . . . <sup>23</sup>Yet do I

stay by Thee ever, Thou holdest my right hand fast, <sup>24</sup>Thou ledest me, according to Thy counsels and takest me by the hand, after Thee. <sup>25</sup>Whom have I in heaven? whom beside Thee do I care for on earth? <sup>26</sup>My body and my heart pass away, but the Rock of my heart and my portion is God evermore. <sup>27</sup>For lo, they who abandon Thee perish; Thou destroyest all those who break faith with Thee. <sup>28</sup>But my happiness lies in my nearness to God; in the Lord, Jehovah, I put my reliance, that I may rehearse all Thy works."

In *v.* 15 the rendering "in this sort" delicately expresses the true meaning, viz., that verses 13, 14 are not the exact words, but a sample of the thoughts of a Jewish sceptic. To have indulged in them would have cut the speaker off from the true Israel, the "community of God's children" or worshippers. In *v.* 17 the phrase "mysteries of God" takes the place of "sanctuary of God." Certainly it is a fine idea, if this metaphorical use of the term "sanctuaries" be admissible in the Psalter. Wellhausen doubtless thought of Wisdom ii. 21, 22.

"Thus reasoned they, and they were led astray; for their wickedness blinded them, and they knew not the mysteries of God."

The "mysteries of God" are the principles of His government which He discloses to those who "know" Him, such as will amply justify the seeming anomalies of the present age. One of these "mysteries" related to the continued existence of the wicked, which was like a discord in the concert of the hymn of praise to the Creator. Verses 23-26 are certainly one of the gems of the book; for the sake of them we can excuse that excessive craving after clearness of rendering which, to a lover of rhythm, may seem to have spoiled some passages. I am not sure, however, that the second half of *v.* 24 is quite equal to the first. The fault, if fault there be, is not Dr. Furness's, but

Prof. Wellhausen's, who believes the received reading corrupt, and endeavours to heal the corruption.

Turning now to what have been sometimes, but I think wrongly, called the specially Christian psalms, must we not pause first at Psalm xxii.? I will quote a small portion, which includes a rearrangement specially dear to Wellhausen.

“<sup>12</sup>Strong bullocks encompass me, bulls of Bashan have beset me round. <sup>16</sup>Dogs encompass me, a crew of villains encircle me. <sup>13</sup>Their mouths gape open wide at me (like) a ravening, roaring lion. <sup>14</sup>Like water am I poured out, all my bones are disjointed; my heart is like wax, and melts in my bosom. <sup>15</sup>Dry as a sherd is my throat, and my tongue cleaves to the roof of my mouth. In the dust of death Thou dost stretch me! <sup>17</sup>I can count all my bones. My enemies stare, and on me feast their eyes. <sup>18</sup>My garments they part among them, for my vesture do they cast lots.”

Two things will at once strike the reader, viz., the absence of the famous words, “they pierced my hands and my feet,” and the insertion of *v.* 16 between verses 12 and 13. On the former point a note states that “the reading in the Greek Bible, ‘They have dug through [*ᾠρυξάν*] my hands and feet,’ is inexplicable in this connection.” He adds that “the Hebrew word which the Greek translator thought he read can hardly mean ‘to pierce through,’ notwithstanding xl. 6,” and that “in the Gospel, also, there is nothing said about the piercing of the *feet* of Jesus.”

I fancy that some readers may smile at the last remark. How can the non-mention of the piercing of the feet of the Lord Jesus have anything to do with the correct reading of a passage in a psalm? They may also criticise Wellhausen's implied disbelief in the piercing of the feet of the Crucified One, and observe that such an extreme critic of the evangelical narrative as Brandt thinks the

piercing of the feet as well as the hands probable.<sup>1</sup> However there is no doubt much to be said in favour of the rendering, "as a lion my hands and my feet," which Wellhausen (after Olshausen) relegates to the foot of the page as a combination of two explanatory glosses which has by accident found its way into the text. The transposition of *v.* 17 is at any rate less plausible, but will be received by students with the respect due to the name of its proposer. Wellhausen thinks that the connection is much improved by it, and it would be captious on this occasion to express a critical doubt as to his procedure.

To Dr. Furness is due the credit of the rhythm. Of course, in *v.* 17 we should read "ὄν me feast their eyes," not "on mé feast their eyes." Of course, too, in *v.* 14 it is not a preference of the phrase "disjointed" to the phrase "out of joint" which has dictated the form of the rendering, but a sense of rhythm. In this context, "all my bones are out of joint" would not have been in perfect rhythm.

In xxxi. 5, the Authorized Version has "Into Thine hand I commit my spirit." The Revised Version, to harmonize the passage with Luke xxiii. 46, substitutes "I commend." Dr. Furness, however, sees that "I commend" suggests a wrong idea. For a moment, as we read the Revised Version, we cannot help thinking of the narrative of the Passion. But the translator has no right to impose a reminiscence of the Passion upon us. He has only to give the best rendering, and in this case, not "commend," but "commit" is clearly the best. But whether it was necessary to say, "I commit my life" (instead of "my breath"), I cannot help doubting. Dr. Furness perhaps thought that in English "breath" cannot be said to be committed to any one's hand. But if so, why

<sup>1</sup> Brandt, *Die evangelische Geschichte* (1893), pp. 188, 189. He thinks that Luke xxiv. 39 is more directly historical than John xx. 25.

not change "hand" into "keeping." At any rate, the choice of rhythm is, even in this minute point, admirable. The passage runs :

"I commit my life to Thy hand ; Thou deliverest me, O Jehovah, Thou faithful God !" The change of "Thine" into "Thy" is also a change for the better. In Luke xxiii. 46 even the Authorised Version has "into *thy* hands."

In viii. 2 the Hebrew and the Greek Psalters differ, whence arises a discrepancy between the Authorized Version of the Psalm and that of Matthew xxi. 16. "Thou hast ordained strength" in the former becomes "hast Thou perfected praise" in the latter. The new version runs thus :

"Thou createst, from the mouths of children and of sucklings, a power, because of Thine enemies, to silence the foe and the revengeful."

Here Dr. Furness has not ventured on as much freedom as on some other occasions. The only new experiment on which he ventures is the prefixing of the verb. Of course he was limited by the German translation sent by Wellhausen. All the explanation given by the latter in his note is, that "the continued adoration of JHVH is ensured by the next generation. Enemies trouble themselves in vain." I do not wish to obtrude my own opinions, but I think that the ordinary reader will desiderate a fuller comment.

In lxxviii. 18, the Hebrew text and the Greek version given by Paul in Ephesians iv. 8 differ, and it is probable, as Kirkpatrick remarks, that Paul's quotation has influenced the rendering of Psalm lxxviii. 18, in the Authorized Version. Certainly, "Thou hast received gifts for men," which the Prayer-Book version also has, is "an impossible rendering" (Kirkpatrick). The whole verse runs thus in the new version :

“Thou hast ascended the height, Thou hast made booty of men, Thou hast received men as a gift; only the rebellious dwell not with Jah, God.”

I can scarcely think that Dr. Furness allowed the two closing words to stand without a pang. Prof. Wellhausen's note states that “the men whom God brings home from Jerusalem, as spoils from His campaign, are the Jews who are led back from the heathen land (v. 6).” The reference to verse 6 is certainly suggestive, whether the view of the text is in all points correct or not. In passing, we may notice Dr. Furness's boldness in introducing the word “comfort” (Delitzsch, *Wohlergehen*) into the rendering of v. 6. Here at any rate I do not see the dash of Elizabethan English which Dr. Haupt has led us to expect. I notice this in no captious spirit, and am prepared to be corrected.

In Psalm cx. 1 the only difficulty consists in the right rendering of  $\Upsilon$ . Prof. Beet, out of deference to apostolic authority, interprets the passage thus: “This prophecy declares that on the right hand of God Christ shall sit, ruling among His enemies, until their power shall be utterly destroyed. Therefore, not till then can He give up to God His redemptive reign” (*Commentary on Corinthians*, 1883, p. 276). But, as Delitzsch remarks, “ $\Upsilon$  does not exclude the time on the other side of the event referred to, but includes it (as in cxii. 8, Gen. xlix. 10), though certainly in doing so it indicates the final subjugation of the enemies as a turning-point.” To avoid Prof. Beet's error, may not Prof. Wellhausen be justified in boldly rendering (as Dr. Furness represents him), “. . . Sit Thou at My right hand, that I may make Thy foes Thy footstool”? On the historical reference of the passage this is what we are told in the note: “Cf. Zech. vi. 13, in the Greek Bible, ‘And he (Zerubbabel) shall rule upon the throne, and he (Joshua) shall be priest on his right hand.’” In a subsequent note, however, we hear that “Melchizedek resembled the founder

of the Hasmonean priestly dynasty (167 B.C.)," and that "the warlike character here ascribed to the Messiah also suits the Maccabees, who believed themselves to be fulfilling Messianic prophecy." "Messianic and Maccabean were identical; it was not until a later date that they became separated." Certainly here is material for thought. But could not the annotator have given a little more aid to the process of assimilation? For it is not so very long since the Maccabean date of the psalm was represented as a theological heresy. How came a friend of the Maccabees to use such strange expressions? And if the Psalm is Maccabean, what is the precise weight attached by the annotator to the reference to Zechariah vi. 13. It would be useless to blame Prof. Wellhausen, whose style so admirably represents the mind of the writer—keen, clear, and averse to all illusions. With a hearty recommendation of the very useful and fact-full appendix on the Music of the Ancient Hebrews, with its helpful illustrations, I take my leave, at present, of this great contribution to the better understanding of the Psalter.

The translation of Judges is the work of Prof. G. F. Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary. I shall treat it in the same manner as the translation of the Psalter, but with much less fulness. All special students of the Old Testament know the commentary on Judges which the present translation may be said to represent, and which carries the study of this important collection of Hebrew traditions a stage forward. To criticise the views here taken of the composition of the book and of difficult passages of the text would carry me too far; indeed it would be still more uncalled for than in the case of the Psalter because the Hebrew edition of the text is not yet published, whereas that of the text of the Psalter has long been in our hands. Suffice it to say that I admire the skill with which the most necessary information on the origin of the book is here

communicated to the English reader, and the fulness and yet conciseness of the notes. As to the colours which indicate the sources of the existing composite work, I can by no means sympathize with the laughers who have begun to show themselves. If the public are to be enabled to see what analytic criticism comes to, such a plan as Dr. Haupt has devised, and Prof. Moore and others have endeavoured to carry out, was indispensable. But certainly a parallel series of semi-popular handbooks is equally necessary to assist the ordinary reader, and to prevent the ordinary reviewer from falling into errors which but for ignorance would be unpardonable.

As to the style of the translation, it must, I think, be admitted that upon the whole it suits the subject. I have not the same feeling of enjoyment as I read it that I have when I read or say the Psalms of Dr. Furness. Now and then I put a query to the words used. But is not this a worthy rendering of a grand passage? (I give the parallel lines, partly because here at least there is no doubt as to the division.)

28. "Through the window peered and . . .  
 The mother of Sisera through the lattice:  
 'Why are his chariots so long in coming?  
 Why tarries the trampling of his horses?'
29. The wisest of her princesses reply,  
 Yea, she answers her words herself:
30. 'They must be finding, dividing the spoil,  
 A wench or two for each man,  
 Booty of dyed stuffs for Sisera,  
 A piece of embroidery or two for the neck of . . .'
31. So perish Thine enemies all, O Jehovah!  
 But be Thy friends as the sun when he rises in power."

As a specimen of fine prose I would gladly quote the story of Jephthah's daughter (Judges xi. 54-40), but it may be enough to invite the reader to get the book, and turn to the passage at once.

On one point Prof. Wellhausen and Prof. Moore deserve equal commendation. They are not afraid to say upon occasion that they can neither translate a passage, nor, when corrupt, suggest a satisfactory way of healing the corruption. Hence the dots which interfere with the flow of the Song of Deborah. Perhaps further consideration may somewhat diminish the number of these dots in future editions. It is also an excellent practice to place sometimes a small ? by a doubtful word. Altogether the task of the contributors has been no easy one. The rules of the editor were elaborate and stringent, so elaborate and so stringent that with a less zealous editor success would have been still harder to attain. And I am well assured that no one will speak more modestly of the work thus far completed than the editor. A turning-point in Bible study had, he felt, arrived, and, having the strength and ability for the task of registering results and popularizing critical study, he set himself to perform it. And though finality in such enterprises is hopeless, let us trust that for some time to come serious students of the Old Testament may continue to draw from this abundant source of knowledge.

T. K. CHEYNE.

### DIFFICULT PASSAGES IN ROMANS.

#### III. JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH.

As St. Paul turns towards his readers at Rome, his thoughts assume the form of a desire to preach to them the Gospel. This desire he justifies, in view of any shame which might be evoked by the grandeur of Rome and the lowliness of a word spoken by a stranger, by a description of the Gospel. *It is a power of God*, i. e. a manifestation, and thus in some sense a concrete em-