

idea of eternal sin is employed as a justification of eternal punishment, though derived from Rev. xxii. 15, and Eccl. ix. 10, the critical reading in Mark iii. 29 being still unknown. But this is not the sole ground of punishment,<sup>38</sup> or of its eternity.<sup>40</sup>

We shall pass next to Hopkins and the Hopkinsians.

---

ARTICLE VI.

THE REVISED VERSION OF ISAIAH XL.—LXVI.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM HENRY COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

BEING a member of a Hebrew club which has been greatly interested for several years past in studying the second part of Isaiah, I offer some observations on this section of the Revision, while I should not venture to review any other portion.

It is often remarked of the revised Old Testament as a whole, that the changes are less numerous in proportion to its length than in the New Testament. This holds true of the section before us. A large minority of the verses are unaltered; five consecutive ones, for instance, in chapter xl. (12–16) and ten out of the thirteen in chapter lv. On the other hand, the next chapter has but one verse unchanged out of twelve; and chapter li. has but three out of twenty-three. The impression which many seem to have gained, that only a few changes have been made in the Old Testament, is entirely erroneous. A careful examination of these twenty-seven chapters shows that seventy per cent of the verses (362 out of 526) differ from the A. V., some slightly, some materially. It is much more

<sup>38</sup> Ib. iv. 460.

<sup>39</sup> Ib. iv. 446.

<sup>40</sup> Ib. iv. 404, 461, 463.

difficult to ascertain the number of variations; for, as Professor Mead has remarked,<sup>1</sup> opinions may differ as to how far a change should be analyzed. This practical difficulty is so great that I doubt if any two independent enumerations would agree throughout. My endeavor has been to reckon as only one change any word, or collocation of words, representing one distinct variation in the thought; and to notice all such variations, however slight. Thus, in xliii. 26, "set thou forth *thy cause*" (for "declare thou") is called a single change, since a part of it implies the whole; while, in verse 28, "I will make Jacob a curse" (for "have given Jacob to the curse") is counted as four changes, the steps being these:

1. I have given Jacob to the curse.
2. I have given Jacob to a curse.
3. I have made Jacob a curse.
4. I will make Jacob a curse.

No account has been taken of words italicized in the A. V. and printed in Roman letters in the R. V. Not to weary the reader with the details of each chapter, I give the following results: The chapters showing the greatest absolute and proportional number of changes are the sixty-sixth (71 changes in 24 verses), and the fifty-sixth (36 changes in 12 verses). Those showing the least are the fifty-fifth (6 minute changes in 13 verses), and the fortieth (34 changes in 31 verses). The first group of nine chapters contains 216 verses and has 371 changes; the second group of nine, 150 verses, 326 changes; the third group, 160 verses, 333 changes. Total, 526 verses, 1,030 changes, almost two changes for every verse. At this rate, reckoning by verses, the whole number of changes in the Old Testament would be 45,458; reckoning by pages, it would be 42,712. This last is a fairer way, for the average verse in our section is longer than the average verse in the Old Testament. Dr. Day, of the Revision Committee, informs me that, in some passages which he has taken at random,

<sup>1</sup> Roberts's Companion to R. V. of New Testament, p. 100.

the alterations average about one to a verse. Even thus, they would amount to nearly 24,000; a much larger number than the popular impression referred to supposes. I think it is safe to estimate them as exceeding 30,000.

We ought certainly to have expected a large number of changes, for Hebrew interpretation has made great strides within the present century, and Hebrew syntax, especially, may be called a recent science. The Revisers have evidently made thorough use of all attainable helps for elucidating their text. No one can fairly charge them with indolence, whatever their other faults. My examination of the second part of Isaiah has developed increasing respect for their painstaking care and admirable judgment. I shall now attempt to set forth some advantages of the new version, and then to suggest some amendments.

#### I. POINTS OF EXCELLENCE.

1. *Marginal Readings.* These prove a great convenience in the many passages of which the true sense is uncertain, the best authorities being divided. They show the caution of the Revisers and their freedom from dogmatism. Thus, in xl. 24, "they have not been planted;" margin, "scarce are they planted," and so on through the verse. In xlv. 24 the reader is informed of a difference of text, as so often in the revised New Testament. The A. V., "that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself," becomes "that spreadeth abroad the earth; who is with me?" margin, "Another reading is, *by myself.*" We shall return to this subject of the text further on.

XL. 2 is a difficult passage. Let us compare the two versions here, to illustrate the decided changes and the carefulness with which they are introduced. I place the marginal readings in brackets.

A. V. "Who raised up the righteous man [Heb. *righteousness*] from the east, called him to his foot, gave

the nations before him, and made *him* rule over kings? he gave *them* as the dust to his sword, *and* as driven stubble to his bow."

R. V. Who hath raised up one from the east, whom he calleth in righteousness to his foot? [Or, *whom righteousness calleth to its foot; or, whom righteousness meeteth whithersoever he goeth*] he giveth nations before him, and maketh him rule over kings; he giveth them as the dust to his sword, as the driven stubble to his bow."

The mere English reader will appreciate Professor Huxley's satire on the flexibility of the Hebrew tongue, when he compares the new and the old renderings of lix. 19, and is told that both may be obtained legitimately from the text. For the margin of the R. V. agrees verbatim with the text of the A. V. (except "adversary," for "enemy"); but it differs from the text of R. V. as follows: Margin—"When the adversary shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the LORD shall lift up a standard against him." Text—"For he shall come as a rushing stream [Heb. *a stream pent in*], which the breath of the LORD driveth." And yet no fairer course could have been taken than to present both renderings, and admit the ambiguity of the original. The Semitic languages are far more pictorial, but far less precise, than the Aryan.

In the present state of the Pentateuch controversy, it is somewhat annoying to have no decision in such a case as xlii. 21 (text: "to magnify the law and make it honorable;" margin: "to make the teaching great and glorious"), but the former reading appears to have retained at least a numerical preponderance.

In xlvi. 14 the text reads (similarly to A. V.) "the Lord hath loved him; he shall perform his pleasure on Babylon." The margin reads "he whom the Lord loveth shall," etc. This construction is given in Ewald's syntax (Eng. ed. p. 218) and adopted by Cheyne and Delitzsch.

In xliii. 28 the future tense is given ("I will profane,"

etc., "will make," etc.) while the perfect appears in the margin. The present tense would seem best, so (apparently) Driver, p. 117.<sup>2</sup>

In xlvi. 3 the A. V., "I will not meet *thee* as a man," becomes "I will accept no man," margin, "*make truce with, Heb. meet.*" The American Revisers have *spare* for accept, and omit *make truce with*. I prefer Alexander's explanation: "I shall encounter no man," i. e. none who can withstand me.

These specimens will perhaps sufficiently illustrate the marginal readings of the Revision.

2. *Grammatical Relations.* Among the Revisers were the well-known grammarian, Professor Davidson of Edinburgh, Professor Driver of Oxford, author of the valuable work on the Hebrew tenses, and Dr. Chøyne, who has written the foremost English commentary on Isaiah, which gives much attention to grammatical as well as to critical questions. Accordingly the internal evidence of the Revision shows that all such questions have been considered with care, though the published judgment of one or more of these scholars has often been overruled by the majority.

XLII. 28. A. V., "For I beheld and there was no man." R. V., "And when I look there is no man." This seems better than Driver's rendering (p. 221), "and suppose (if) I looked."

XLII. 21. A. V., "The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law and make it honorable." R. V., "It pleased the LORD for his righteousness' sake to magnify," etc. The gain is manifest, however one settles the burning question between text and margin already referred to.

XLIII. 14. A. V., "I have sent to Babylon and have brought down all their nobles." R. V. preserves the change of tense, transporting us into the midst of the scene. "I have sent to Babylon, and I will bring down all of them as fugitives."

<sup>2</sup> The references are to ed. 2 of *The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*.

XLVI. 1. A. V. begins in the present tense, changes to the imperfect, and returns to the present. R. V. preserves the present throughout, making the account more vivid, thus: "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth; their idols are upon the beasts and upon the cattle; the things that ye carried about are made a load, a burden to the weary beast."

L. 10. This is greatly improved by a slight change in structure. A. V., "Who is among you that feareth the LORD, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the LORD, and stay upon his God." R. V., "Who is among you that feareth the LORD, that obeyeth the voice of his servant? he that walketh in darkness and hath no light, let him trust," etc.

LIII. 2, 3. There is no need to transcribe so familiar a passage. The improvement appears in the choice of tenses, and the connection of clauses, especially at the close: "and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised, and we esteemed him not." The margin here reverts to the A. V.

LVIII. 4. A. V., "Ye shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your voice heard on high;" R. V., "Ye fast not this day so as to make your voice to be heard on high." Here also the margin accords with the A. V. The next verse contains a singularly adroit change, though so slight a one that it would pass unnoticed with many. A. V., "Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul?" R. V., "Is such the fast that I have chosen? the day for a man to afflict his soul?" This indicates that the fast *is* instead of *is not* the day to afflict the soul,—and thus the verse becomes a clear allusion to the day of atonement, before the time of Ezra.

This, however, is a somewhat perilous rendering. It is singular that Cheyne, who espouses it, says nothing in defence of the article before *fast* and *day*. Nägelsbach and Delitzsch make both nouns anarthrous, but agree with

the R. V. against the Vulgate and the A. V. in the general sense of the passage.

LXIII. 19. A. V., "We are thine; thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name." R. V., "We are become as they over whom thou never barest rule; as they that were not called by thy name."

LXV. 2. is very harsh in A. V., "which walketh in a way that was not good." R. V., "That is not good."

3. *Miscellaneous Cases.* "Peoples" for "people," in xli. 1; xliii. 4, 9; xlix. 1; lv. 4; lx. 2. This preserves the distinction between the people of God and other peoples. See the preface of the Revisers.

"Of old" instead of "from that time," in xliv. 8; xlv. 21. It would have been much better, I think, to keep the same, instead of "from of old," in xlvi. 3, 5, 7, 8. The Hebrew is precisely the same, <sup>אֲנִי</sup>אֲנִי, in all these places.

XLVII. 6, A. V., "polluted;" R. V., "profaned." So xlvi. 11; lvi. 2, 6.

XLIX. 20. A. V., "the children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other." These twelve words represent only two in the original, <sup>בְּנֵי שָׂדֵה</sup>בְּנֵי שָׂדֵה. R. V., "the children of thy bereavement."

L. 11. A. V., "sparks;" R. V., "fire-brands."

LI. 20. A. V., "wild bull;" R. V., "antelope."

LIV. 8. A. V., "in a little wrath;" R. V., "in overflowing wrath."

LVI. 3. A. V., "son of the stranger;" R. V., "stranger."

LVIII. 11. A. V., "make fat thy bones;" R. V., "make strong thy bones."

LIX. 4. A. V., "None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth;" R. V., "None sueth in righteousness, and none pleadeth in truth" (a very different thought).

LX. 5. A. V., "forces of the Gentiles;" R. V., "wealth of the nations." So lxi. 6., "nations" for "Gentiles."

LXIII. 1. A. V., "travelling;" R. V., "marching."

LXIV. 2. A. V., "as when the melting fire burneth;" R. V., "as when fire kindleth the brushwood."

LXVI. 8. A. V., "Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day?" R. V., "Shall a land be born in one day?"

A few passages quite obscure in the old version are cleared up in the new.

XLI. 26. A. V., "The first shall say to Zion, Behold, behold them;" R. V., "I first will say unto Zion, Behold, behold them." The American Committee suggest here, "I am the first that saith," etc. Several other renderings have been proposed, but either of the above is a decided improvement on the A. V. It was quite an oversight in Dr. Chambers to criticize the English Revisers on this passage as follows: ' "It is very hard to attach any meaning to the rendering of xli. 27, copied by the Revision from the A. V., 'The first shall say unto Zion, Behold, behold them.' But the Appendix renders sensibly," etc. The English Revisers have by no means copied the A. V.

XLVIII. 7, 8. The A. V. has the unintelligible translations, "even before the day when thou heardest them not;" "from that time that thine ear was not opened." The R. V. substitutes: "and before this day thou heardest them not;" "from of old thine ear was not opened."

LI. 14. A. V., "The captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit." R. V., "The captive exile shall speedily be loosed; and he shall not die and go down into the pit."

LVII. 6. A. V., "Should I receive comfort in these?" R. V., "Shall I be appeased for these things?"

LXV. 11, 12. A. V., "That prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the drink offering unto that number. Therefore will I number you unto the sword." R. V., "That prepare a table for Fortune and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny; I will destine you to the sword." Cf. the commentaries of Cheyne and Delitzsch *in loco*.

LXVI. 2. A. V., "For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been." R. V., "For all

\* Companion to Revised Old Testament, pp. 207, 8.

these things hath mine hand made, and so all these things came to be."

I pass next to suggesting some amendments to the Revised Version of the section before us.

## II. PROPOSED CHANGES.

1. *Textual Notes.* I have already called attention to the marginal note on xliv. 24: "Another reading is, *by myself.*" The only other passages containing precisely this designation, "another reading is," are: xlvi. 11; xlix. 5; lii. 2; lxiii. 9; and lxiii. 11. All these are cases of variation in the margin of our Hebrew Bibles.<sup>4</sup> The note, "Or, as otherwise read," marks an extra-Massoretic interpretation, arising from a different vocalization of the Hebrew consonants. (See Revisers' preface.) It occurs only twice, xliii. 14, and lxv. 1. A third form, "Or, according to another reading," is found only at lxiii. 6, one of the passages disputed between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews. All these variations are agreed to, without comment, by the American Committee. It is otherwise when the English Revisers indicate their authority for a proposed change of text. This occurs as follows: xl. 6. ("Sept. and Vulgate"); xlix. 24 ("Vulgate and Syriac"); xliv. 21, and lxiv. 7 [Heb. 6] ("Some ancient versions"); xlix. 17, and liv. 9 ("Some ancient authorities"); lxvi. 17 and 18 ("Many ancient authorities"). One more passage stands by itself, lxiv. 5 [Heb. 4] where the English Committee note in the margin, "the text is probably corrupt," and the American Committee omit the note.

We have thus found eighteen textual annotations, of which just half are accepted and half rejected by the American Revisers. In the last case cited there are strong reasons for the decision of the American Committee. It is to be hoped that the Bible will remain a book for the

<sup>4</sup> The last example disappears from the margin of the Baer and Delitzsch text, but is discussed on page 81 of that edition.

people, and as the popular mind is unfamiliar with the technical use of the word "corrupt," it will undoubtedly be puzzled and stumbled thereby. Here, at least, the bones of the skeleton should not have protruded. In the other cases neither committee appear to have been thoroughly self-consistent. Why, for example, should a reference to the versions have been inserted at xlv. 21 and not at xliii. 14? and why should the American Committee have objected to the former and not to the latter? for they do not simply strike out the *references* to ancient authorities, but the *renderings* also. These two passages are parallel; we have, in each case, a different vocalization of the same consonants, supported by ancient authority. Without entering fully into the vexed question of textual changes, I suggest that the facts brought out in the Revisers' preface warranted a departure from the Massora, on ancient authority, in certain extreme cases; but that the margin of the revised translation should no more have specified the *particular* authorities for a given reading than those against it. Every one knew that the Revisers would carefully weigh all questions legitimately before them; their results, not their processes, should have been given to the public. Hence the formula "another reading is" would have been proper in all these cases; and whenever such a reading failed to commend itself to the American Committee, they could have suggested its omission. But, as the matter stands, the average reader is put in possession of the light which makes darkness visible; his little learning proves a dangerous thing. What he needs to know is, that, according to the judgment of the majority of the Revisers, the reading of the text is *probably* right; that of the margin *perhaps* right. The attempt to establish degrees of probability by the various expressions in the margin cannot be deemed a success, and becomes somewhat ludicrous when reduced to its minimum in li. 6, "in like manner"—margin, "Or, *perhaps*, like gnats." The italics are mine. The majority of Revisers having agreed

to insert the word *gnats*, it stood as an inferior rendering without any "perhaps."

2. *Words frequently occurring.*

(1) יהוה. When I found that the Revisers had retained LORD, I wondered with great admiration (in the archaic sense); for I had supposed the popularization of the name Jehovah, as the personal appellation of the true God, would be one of the great gains of the new version. As every one knows, this is the first of the suggestions on which the American Committee insist; it is to be devoutly hoped that it will be made effectual, at no distant day, throughout the English-speaking world. In the section under review, the various names of God form a most interesting subject of investigation, as reflecting the religious ideas of the period. For instance, in the sublime address to Cyrus at the beginning of chapter xlv., the thought is brought out distinctly that Jehovah is not to remain to the monarch an unknown God. The message is in effect: "As I have called thee by thy name, learn thou to call me by my name." The last part of verse 3 should be rendered, as I think: "that thou mayest know that I, who call thee by thy name, am Jehovah, the God of Israel." So Delitzsch takes it in his interpretation (Jes. 3 ed. S. 473, "Solches Siegesglück" u. s. w.). But how the sense is weakened, when we read, in the R. V., "that thou mayest know that I am the LORD, which call thee by thy name, even the God of Israel"! A curious ambiguity results from this rendering in lvi. 4—"Thus saith the LORD of the eunuchs," as though He were ruler of a class. The old version is preferable here, "Thus saith the LORD unto the eunuchs." "Concerning the eunuchs" would be better still.

(2) רוּחַ יְהוָה. This is rendered "spirit of the LORD" (with a small *s*), or "breath of the Lord." Why was not a distinction made between passages like xl. 7, "the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it;" lix. 19, "a rushing stream which the breath of the Lord driveth," on the one hand,

and the passages on the other hand where the personal divine being is clearly intended? These are xl. 13; xlviii. 16 (his Spirit, the pronoun referring to Adhonay Jehovih); lix. 21 (my Spirit, the pronoun referring to Jehovah); lxi. 1, and lxiii. 14. Besides, the phrase "his Holy Spirit," occurs twice, lxiii. 10, 11, and is printed thus: "But they rebelled, and grieved his holy spirit;" "where is he that put his holy spirit in the midst of them?" I cannot but regard this as an obstacle to the recognition of the unity of the Old and New Testaments.

(3) אֲיִלִּים. *Islands* appears inadequate; *far off coasts*, or *coastlands*, as in the margin of lix. 18, R. V., would be preferable. "A distant region reached by water" seems to be the meaning in the passages referred to, which are as follows: xli. 1, 5; xlii. 4, 10, 12; xlix. 1; li. 5; lix. 18; lx. 9; lxvi. 18.

(4) שָׁרָה and שָׂרָה. I find no good authority for the renderings *sing* and *singing*. As they often denote other than musical sounds, the word *shout* seems generally a better equivalent. The Revisers give *singing* for שָׂרָה except in xliiii. 14, where *rejoicing* is substituted. שָׁרָה is translated *sing* except in lxi. 7, "they shall rejoice in their portion." In xlii. 10, שָׂרָה, both noun and verb, is well rendered *sing* and *song*; hence some other term should be found for שָׁרָה in the next verse, even if that may be properly rendered *sing*. The synonym שָׁרָה, a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, rendered *shout*, occurs here. I suggest the following for the whole clause: "let the inhabitants of Sela exult, let them cry out from the top of the mountains."

(5) הִנֵּה and הִנְיָה exactly correspond to the English *lo* and *behold*, the dissyllable being the more common in each language. I would give these respective renderings, except perhaps in lxiv. 9; "behold, look, we beseech thee, we are all thy people." (Even here *lo* might answer; cf. Cheyne.) The Revisers translate both words by *behold*, except in xlix. 12, where *lo* (twice) represents הִנְיָה. The A. V. gives *behold* throughout.

I do not forget the distinction between a revision and a

translation, but I think the above changes came properly within the scope of the Revision.

3. *Grammatical Relations.*

XL. 30. For "Even the youths shall faint," read, "Though youths may faint." (Ewald's Grammar, English ed., p. 283.)

XLI. 6. Change "they helped" and "every one said," to present tense. (Driver, as above, p. 44.)

XLII. 6. For "and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee," read, "that I may hold thy hand and keep thee." (Ewald, p. 256.)

XLIII. 8. For "Bring forth the blind people that have eyes," read, "Bring forth a people blind, although they have eyes." (Driver, pp. 227, 228.) In the next verse, change "let all the nations," etc., to a simple statement, "all the nations gather together, and the peoples assemble." (Driver, p. 30, n. 3.)

XLIV. 20. A. V. and R. V., "He feedeth on ashes; a deceived heart hath turned him aside." Driver (p. 233, obs. 2): "Feeding on ashes, a deceived heart hath turned him astray," i. e., while he feedeth on ashes. So lvii. 19, "Creating the fruit of the lips, Jehovah saith, Peace, peace." I think these suggestions of Professor Driver might well be adopted even in a revision.

XLVIII. 8. A. V., "I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously,"—a proof-text for the divine fore-knowledge. R. V., "I knew that thou didst deal," etc. Driver, p. 51, defends the A. V., and I see not why it should be abandoned. The imperfect may, however, express here a permanent quality; in which case we should render, as Delitzsch, "I knew that thou art utterly treacherous."

XLVIII. 21. For "They thirsted not when he led them through the deserts," read, "They thirsted not whom he led through deserts." (So Ewald, p. 219 and n. 1.)

XLIX. 23. For, "and they that wait for me shall not be ashamed," read, "on whom those who wait shall not be ashamed." Similarly, Cheyne, Delitzsch.

LIII. 7. "He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself."

Driver, p. 229, suggests "He was oppressed, he being (already) afflicted." Perhaps the abruptness of the Hebrew may be imitated thus: "Oppressed and afflicted he, yet he opened not his mouth."

LIV. 6. For "when she is cast off," read "she shall not be rejected." (Ewald, p. 206.)

LXIII. 9. A. V. and R. V. text: "In all their affliction he was afflicted," following the Q'ri. R. V., margin, translates the K'thibh thus: "In all their adversity he was no adversary." The latter is adopted by Dr. Kay in the Speaker's Commentary, and by Dr. Moore in the American edition of Lange. They object to the former rendering that if  $\text{יָרָה}$  were said of Jehovah, it would mean, not he was afflicted, but he was hard pressed (*ἐν ἀπορίᾳ*). Following this hint I suggest that we read the K'thibh, and render it thus: "In all their straits he was not straitened, but the angel of his presence saved them." Cf. Isa. lix. 1; 2 Cor. vi. 12.

#### 4. *Miscellaneous Cases.*

XL. 19. "The graven image, a workman melted it." Appendix: "omit graven." The American Revisers certainly did well to avoid melting a *graven* image.

XLI. 2 *fn.* Despite Delitzsch's criticism, I think Nägelsbach has this essentially right. I would translate: "his sword maketh them as dust, his bow as driven stubble."

XLI. 15. If we put "make of thee," for "make thee," we shall show the English reader that Israel is to be, not to have, a threshing sledge.

XLIV. 10. "Or molten a graven image?" Cf. xl. 19, above.

XLIV. 28. "And to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid." The Hebrew is simply  $\text{וְיִסַּד בְּהֵיכָל־יְהוָה}$ , and the whole, including the previous clause, may be rendered thus: "saying also of Jerusalem, She shall be built, and the temple founded." Similarly Gesenius and Delitzsch.

XLV. 18. "He created it not a waste, he formed it to be inhabited." Better, "*for* a waste."

XLVII. 13. The version of Delitzsch, Nägelsbach, and

Cheyne deserved a place in the margin, if not (as I think) in the text. "Let them now rise up and save thee — the dividers of the heavens, the star-gazers, who every month give report of what shall come upon thee."

XLIX. 21. Put margin, "who hath borne me these?" in place of text. (Professor H. P. Smith, O. T. Student, Oct., 1885, p. 64.)

LI. 17. "The bowl of the cup of staggering" seems inelegant. Better, "the goblet-cup of stupefaction" ("goblet-cup" from Cheyne; "stupefaction" from Riggs, Suggested Emendations). I would justify this change even in a revision, for I think the phrase "the bowl of the cup" conveys no idea.

LII. 2. Instead of "arise, sit thee down," which reminds one of the fabled king of France, or, "arise, sit on thy throne" (American Committee), read "arise, take thy place."

LII. 15. I think the margin, "startle," or the word suggested by Dr. Riggs and others, "astonish," should take the place of "sprinkle."

LVIII. 13. Read, "If thou turn away thy foot from doing thy pleasure on the Sabbath, my holy day." So Riggs, Suggested Emendations.

LXIII. 15. For "yearning of thy bowels" read "multitude of thy mercies."

I remark in conclusion that I believe a farther revision of the new version to be entirely impracticable. I regard the present Revision as a great improvement upon King James's, but I hope the time when an equally competent committee shall be able to produce a new English *translation* of the Scriptures, may not be more than a century distant.