

Hence there runs an antithesis through the passage, first, between Jehovah and the gods of the nations (vers. 3-7), implying an antithesis between the nations and Israel (vers. 1-3); and secondly, between the destinies of those who trust in Jehovah or the gods. Of the gods, mere unspiritual matter, it is said, "they that make them shall be like unto them, every one that trusteth in them" (ver. 8); and this leads to an appeal to Israel in all its parts to trust in Jehovah, who alone saves (ver. 9 *seq.*):—

9. O Israel, trust thou in the Lord, etc.
10. O house of Aaron, trust ye in the Lord, etc.
11. Ye that fear the Lord, trust in the Lord, etc.
12. The Lord hath been mindful of us: He will bless: He will bless the house of Israel; He will bless the house of Aaron.
13. He will bless them that fear the Lord, both the small and the great.

This threefold division is difficult. We might regard "Israel" as an ideal unity (the verb is *sing.*), and consider ver. 10 as referring to the clergy, and ver. 11 to the people, under the conception of fearers of the Lord. Or ver. 9 might refer to the people as laity, ver. 10 to the sacred ministers (in Ps. cxxxv. Levi is added), and ver. 11 to both inclusive as fearers of Jehovah. At any rate, "they that fear the Lord" is not some small section like

Gentile proselytes, but some large body, as seems evident from the comprehensive words applied to them, "both the small and the great," *i.e.* in all their extent (Jer. xvi. 6, xxxi. 34). These words might suggest that the Psalmist's mind had risen to the widest generalisation, and that he included all who in every place feared the Lord, *i.e.* acknowledged Jehovah. But the intensely national and even local spirit of these Psalms is against this idea, for the poet proceeds: "The Lord add to you and to your children" (cf. "out of Zion," Ps. cxxxv. 21). Upon the whole, as Calvin long ago perceived, "ye that fear the Lord" are probably to be taken as the specifically God-fearing in Israel—*non loquitur de alienigenis, ut falso quidam putant* (cf. "the righteous," Ps. cxviii. 15, 20). It is in the manner of the Psalmists to pass in this way from the national to the spiritual Israel. In Ps. xxxiii., which greatly corresponds to Ps. cxv., "they that fear Him" is so used (ver. 18); and in Ps. lxxvi., greatly corresponding to cxviii., the usage is the same (ver. 16). The prayer also in cxv. 14 corresponds to the promises made to "him that feareth the Lord"—certainly the Israelite—in Ps. cxii. 1 *seq.* and cxviii. 1 *seq.* Ps. cxv. 9-13 is very similar to xxii. 22-26, and any reference to a Gentile element in the Palestinian community is altogether without probability.

The "Failure" of the Revised Version.

I.

By the Rev. Principal G. C. M. DOUGLAS,
D.D., Glasgow.¹

To the many things which you have published anent the alleged failure of the Revised Version, may I add something, including the Old Testament, to which little reference has been made in comparison of the New; though both these parts of the one work are noticed in the admirable statement of the Bishop of Durham in the recent Convocation of the Province of York, which you have printed. Many people, by the way, forget, or do not know, that this Province refused the invitation given by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to take part in the work of revision;

¹ Principal Douglas, it will be recollected, was a member of the Old Testament Company of Revision.—ED.

so that a certain coldness or disfavour in the Province of York is not surprising.

1. I feel deeply indebted to the New Testament Revisers for what they have done habitually in three directions, though many of your correspondents find fault with them. They have shown the English reader where the definite article is present or absent, a matter in which it has been said that Latin usage may have led King James' Revisers wrong. They have also endeavoured to show the niceties of the tenses in the Greek verb. And they have done the like with the prepositions. It is complained, indeed, that they have been too precise, and have assumed too much that the apostles wrote good Greek. The opposite assumption has led to endless mistakes, obscurities, etc. I think I can appeal to any reader of Paul's epistles for the benefits arising from attention to

the prepositions. And I know we toiled hard in these three respects when revising the Old Testament. With us the problem of the article was the same as in the New. On the other hand, our difficulty often lay in the simplicity of the Hebrew verbal forms and the small number of the Hebrew particles.

2. Much of the dislike felt towards the Revised Bible is connected with the number of "trivial changes." No one else, however, has paid so heavy a price for changes of association as have we who were Revisers. And at least one generation must elapse before this disadvantage is overcome. Nevertheless, changes which are called "trivial," besides being justified as part of a system, are often intentionally presented in this unobtrusive form, so as to minimise the disagreeable consequences. Take two examples of different kinds. "*Meal-offering*" stands instead of "*meat-offering*," that is, the bloodless offering in the Levitical law. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet *and* light unto my path," is instead of the tautological and inaccurate "*a light*." Already it is felt by multitudes that a parallel Bible, honestly studied, is one of the best commentaries possible.

3. I should make a somewhat similar remark about objections on the score of the rhythm, which our novelties are said to have destroyed. Our renderings are not wholly new. The reader of the revision of the Psalms may trace in it the influence both of the Prayer-Book Version and of the so-called Scotch metre psalms. And throughout, while we had the modern Jewish translation into English on our table, we had also the noble Geneva Version, and felt its influence often. I shall let others try to be fair in judging of this rhythm. Yet, as I had no share in making the revised New Testament, I shall venture to say that every time I read Revelations vii. 9-17, I am increasingly impressed with the superiority of the new translation over the old, in rhythm as well as in accuracy; yet this is a passage in which the old has very special associations fitted to attach us to it.

4. The New Testament revision, I am sure, suffers often most unjustly, and is unfairly contrasted with the Old Testament revision, on account of its *new readings*, which may not be liked. Others can argue on the merits of this New Testament text; but I may say that in the Old Testament the question of the right text was

a matter so very small and simple, that we held our task to be accomplished when we placed in the margin some of the most interesting readings of the Septuagint and other ancient versions.

5. Several complaints of want of uniformity, etc., are unavoidable, because ours is the work of a *body of men*, in the two companies amounting to about fifty. The number in actual attendance at the sittings of the companies varied considerably; and change of views in the minds of individuals, as well as change of individuals by death, involved alterations in procedure and practice. Again, the Bishop of Durham indicates, in the matter of the text (what might be said also of the translation), how readings which, as an individual, he accepted were often not supported by his vote as a member of the company of Revisers. I know that analogous action took place among the Old Testament Revisers. Some things, I willingly grant, might be much better done by a single man revising, like Jerome with the Latin Version; all of us are also painfully aware of instances in our revisions with which we have individually no sympathy. But I suppose the general conviction is that for a public version a body of men were to be much preferred to an individual reviser. And we reckoned that we had improved considerably upon the methods of King James' Revisers, partly in consequence of profiting by their experience. Certainly our method laid much heavier burdens upon us than theirs laid upon them.

6. King James' Bible was not a *brand new version*, it was a *revision*; so is ours. Every one who considers must see that this fact has to be taken into account in criticising what we have done. To make but one obvious remark, there were expressions which had too strong a hold in the minds of men to be dislodged; and some of the objections to our work are really connected with this fact. This is one reason for giving marginal renderings, which we, like King James' Revisers, held to be an integral part of our work; though we may suffer the wrong which they have suffered, when this has been forgotten and the marginal renderings have been left out of account.

7. Some people talk of overcoming difficulties by a *re-revision*, just as some people think that if they lived their life over again it would be much improved; while others have grave doubts of this, unless better principles regulate it, and exercise more power in the regulation. Such critics also

forget how long a struggle and how large a preparation led up to this revision. How is the preparation for a more effective new one to be made? For one thing, if they wish a Revised Bible for the English-speaking population, they have to face a much more complicated and troublesome problem than that on which we were engaged from 1870 onwards. We carried the Bible-readers of the United States with us. The question perhaps may be raised, Is it not *they* who will have to take the lead the next time? But even if the lead remains with *us*, we shall certainly have to count on our kindred in the Dominion of Canada and in the Australasian Colonies claiming to have a voice in the making of the new English Bible.

8. People ask whether the revision has not failed, overlooking the fact that the time is far too short yet to warrant a decided opinion. What the Bishop of Durham says about fifty years and a Revolution before King James' Version came into general use, does not strike impatient people, who ought to know that our New Testament revision was published only in November 1880, after fully ten years of labour; and the Old Testament not till July 1884. Nor is the revision of "King James' Version," which included the Apocrypha, quite completed even yet. I and others took pains to make it clear that we did not regard the Apocrypha as any part of the Holy Scriptures; but it is a part of the work undertaken to be revised, and I believe that both the text and the translation will give abundant evidence that the Revisers have not failed here. Apart from this, the Bishop does well to remind us that he knows of no "documentary evidence that the revision of 1611 was ever formally authorised by king or convocation." He may be supposed to speak especially for England. I shall say the like for Scotland; albeit the Church of Scotland was never slow to speak out on matters which it held to be within its province, and would have spoken distinctly on this matter of an authorised version had it thought this necessary, or had it found the royal authority *imposing* a Bible upon the Church and people. Antiquaries tell us how the Geneva Version long survived in Scotland. I know that the late Rev. Walter Wood of Elie, in Fifeshire, a most exact and trustworthy witness, declared that the Geneva Bible was used in the pulpit of Elie till the latter part of last century, and was laid aside then, merely because the volume was worn out and a

new copy of the Bible was needed. The absence of civil or ecclesiastical authority is to me no proof that our revision is a failure. Often a minister who thinks it best to use the Authorised Version, as he reads the Word of God publicly, feels himself stimulated by seeing that many of the people follow his reading on the Revised Version which they hold in their hands.

II.

By the Rev. ROBERT W. ROGERS, M.A., Ph.D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Semitic
History, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn-
sylvania.

The publication of the Revised Version, and especially the Old Testament portion of it, has, at the lowest estimate, *lessened my labour by one-third*. I bought a copy the first day it was issued in America, and began immediately a close study of it, with a minute parallel examination of the Hebrew text. From that day to this I have never wavered in my profound respect for the men who have made us such a superb present.

I have only two very slight objections to it, and one of them, and that the more important, I do not believe could have been avoided.

FIRST. *I wish it had gone farther*. There are other passages that I should have liked changed even at a complete sacrifice of the much-vaunted *rhythm* of the Authorised Version. The simple fact is, that, different from many men of great learning and wide experience, who have spoken in criticism of it, I am *not* in search of rhythm. *I want the Scripture*. I shall be happy indeed to have smooth, resonant, picturesque phrases if they are found naturally in the text itself, but I want no ring added which is not native to the Semitic air. I say that I wish it could have gone farther yet in its changes. But I realise that this was simply impossible. The objections now made to its lack of rhythm (*sic!*) would have been redoubled if yet more changes had been made. I realise, therefore, that the men who made it were wise beyond me in confining their changes to what men could "stand." Let those that come after us, who are less conservative than we, revise again.

SECONDLY. *I wish that chapter and page numbering might have been placed in different positions*. Let me indicate what I mean. There lies before me, as I write, an Oxford copy of the Revised

Version. On every page, at the outer corner, *in the most conspicuous position*, is the number of the page. Every time I open the book, the page number confronts me. Now that page number is absolutely worthless as far as my use of the book is concerned. I never use it. I never look at it,—if I can avoid it. I should never think of making a reference by means of it. On the same line with the page number, and just in the middle of each page, I find the name of each book. That is all right. I want that name, and I want it just where it is. I can never make a reference without it. But away on the *inside* of each page I find the chapter and verse number. Now I need that chapter and verse just as much as I need the name of the book. I most certainly do *not* want to return to the absurd divisions of the Authorised Version. I do not want any divisions in the text itself more “dividing” than these already given us in the well-printed and well-paragraphed Revised Version. But I do wish that instead of having the indication of chapter and verse at the *inside* of the page it might stand at the *outside*, just where the page numbering now is—that useless appendage being relegated to the bottom of the page. Perhaps this has already been done, or something like it, in editions not yet known to me.

These are my two little objections to the Revised Version. One of them is easily remedied, the other must be long postponed—and perhaps rightly so.

But even with these imperfections, I am delighted with the new Version. I use it altogether, to the complete exclusion of the Authorised Version, save when I preach in pulpits where I do not find it. In my class lectures here I invariably refer to it. My students I uniformly advise to use it constantly. It spares me, almost wholly, in teaching the English Bible, the irritating annoyance of constantly saying, as I must with the old version, “the translation is wrong here,” or “this is in Hebrew so and so.” My students, it must be confessed, are slow to adopt it. They come to college already provided with “Teacher’s Bibles” in the Authorised Version, and they are loath to give them up and buy the Revised Version; but there is progress even in this, and I do not lose heart.

We shall value more highly, as the days go on, this new version of the Scriptures done into sound, sinewy, and, in the main, faithful English.

III.

By the Rev. W. S. Wood, M.A., Ufford Rectory, Stamford.

As the result of *private* use, I think the Revised Version has some advantages and counterbalancing disadvantages as compared with the Authorised Version. The text is better. But the translation certainly requires a second revision. The Revisers have far too much Hellenised the English instead of Anglicising the Greek. Let me point out a few blemishes.

1. Errors of idiom, which offend the ear. Such is Matt. xxiii. 37: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which *killeth* the prophets, and *stoneth* them that are sent unto her.” No doubt this agrees with the Greek; but the *English* construction is given in the Authorised Version: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that *killest* the prophets, and *stonest* them that are sent unto thee.”

2. Positive mistakes. Thus Luke ii. 49: “Wist ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?” This is correctly rendered in the Authorised Version: “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?” “To be engaged in, devote myself to, my Father’s affairs (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου εἶναι*)” precisely follows the Greek idiom in such phrases as *ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ, ἐν ποιήσει, ἐν λόγοις εἶναι*, “to be engaged in philosophy, poetry, oratory.” But what authority from Greek analogy there is for the former rendering, I do not know. It sounds like a schoolboy’s shot. Besides, “I must be about my Father’s business” agrees well with the obligation expressed later, “I must do the work of Him that sent me while it is day.” To be in His Father’s house was in comparison only an occasionally felt obligation.

3. Incorrect force of predicate. The Revisers have fallen into the snare of rendering the anarthrous predicate by a substantive with the indefinite instead of the definite article, forgetful that the article is not needed by the Greek idiom in such cases, and is omitted, as a rule, in the Greek Testament. Thus we have (1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19): “Know ye not that ye are *a* temple of God?” “Know ye not that your body is *a* temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?” Where the Authorised Version has rightly “*the* temple.” We should not say in Rome: “That building is *a* temple of Vesta,” but “*the* temple of Vesta.” And so in speaking of a church in a city,

its members are not *a* temple of God, but *the* temple of God. It is not the thought of a number of like bodies that is in the apostle's mind, but the *sacredness* of the community he addresses.

4. Pedantic literalism. Such is the constant rendering of the Greek aorist by the English past tense, although the English perfect is often a far juster equivalent. Such again is the recurring translation of the preposition *ἐν* by "in," as though such were its import always, even in classical authors, much less in the Greek Testament, where it so frequently answers to the Hebrew *ב* in its special signification of "through, by means of."

These are a few of the faults of the Revised Edition, which make another revision imperative and essential before the present one can be *publicly* employed. Many more might be noted, but as specimens the above will suffice.

IV.

By the late Rev. EUSTACE R. CONDER, M.A., D.D.,
Leeds.

On the appearance of the Revised New Testament, like most other preachers, I brought it prominently and carefully before my hearers. I made the experiment, for about a month, of reading my Sunday lessons from it. But I did not find much enthusiasm or even interest among the people; and as I was often compelled to differ from the view of the Revisers, and feel no absolute confidence even in the Revised Greek Text, while I yet deemed it very unwise to controvert and criticise the Revisers' conclusions, the public reading was silently dropped, and no notice taken by my friends. My objections, for the most part, refer to the rendering of the aorist in a great many instances, and to the less vigorous, harmonious, and idiomatic English, resulting from what seems to me a mistaken effort to make the English rendering come as near the Greek as possible. What the English reader, who does not know Greek, wants, is not to have *Gracised* English, but the sense faithfully given in his mother-tongue. Here and there, the Revisers have broken out into paraphrase, e.g. 2 Tim. ii. 26 (where I cannot but think, too, they have mistaken the sense). Their rendering of the famous passage, 2 Tim. iii. 16, is inconsistent with their rendering of the same construction in 1 Tim. iii. 4.

On the other hand, there are a considerable number of our pulpits in which the lessons are read from the Revised Version, and a good many families in which it is read at family worship, and I meet with many to whom it has brought much light. I very frequently refer to it in the pulpit; and apart from both literary merit and the correct rendering of particular passages, it is an immense advantage to have the fact brought clearly before all intelligent people that our English Bible *is* a translation, and that in a multitude of instances different renderings are possible.

P.S.—On the whole, perhaps there has been a reaction from exaggerated expectations; and the Revisers have failed to remember that both popularity and immortality of books depend, first of all, on style.

V.

By the Ven. H. E. COOPER, M.A., Archdeacon
of Hamilton, Victoria.

The Notes and Criticisms upon the Revised Version in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will probably have come to an end ere you receive this; but personally you may be glad to hear that interest in the Revised Version has been quickened recently by the strong recommendation of the Bishop of Ballarat. Presiding at his Church Assembly or Synod, at which there were present over one hundred clergy and laymen, he said—

It seems clear that the law of our Church, reasonably interpreted, nowhere binds our clergy to the Authorised Version, in the lessons at any rate. But is it desirable, for the edification of the faithful, to make an alteration? After ten years' habitual use of the Revised New Testament, and six years' of the Revised Old Testament, I deliberately and most decidedly answer in the affirmative. Not only should I have no censure for a clergyman adopting the change, I strongly counsel its adoption in all our churches. I deem it best to speak with emphatic distinctness on this subject; but it must not be thought either that I assume the right to issue a command about it, or that I am insensible to the force of objections that may be felt to the advice given. I assume no right to "authorise" the supersession of King James' version by another. (The formal "authorisation" of the former, by the way, seems nowhere recorded. Nor should it be forgotten that the Revised Version is not a new version. It distinctly claims only to be the Authorised Version with emendations, made with the sanction of Convocation.) No, I am quite content to "advise" merely in this matter, and shall take no offence if my advice be not at once and everywhere followed.

As for the objections likely to be made, I have carefully weighed, and found them wanting. The Revised Version is doubtless neither perfect nor final; but it is the most accurate version likely to be publicly issued for a long time. The Authorised Version is more rhythmical and stately in its flow; but where strict fidelity in rendering the sense seems sacrificed to purchase this, shall we rest content with the bargain?

The matter came up subsequently for discussion, when—

Archdeacon Beamish moved "that in the judgment of this Assembly it is much to be desired that the lessons be read in Church from the Revised Version, rather than from the Un-revised Version, of the Holy Scriptures." This was, after discussion, withdrawn in favour of a motion by Archdeacon Cooper, which was carried unanimously, "that this Assembly rejoices to know from the President's address that lessons may be read in church from the Revised Version."

As a matter of fact, the Revised Version has been used for lessons in several of the churches for some time past; it is invariably used in the pulpit, and in many houses it is used in family worship.

With the publication of each Testament, I delivered courses of lectures upon the materials available for the purposes of revision, and the chief alterations made by the Revisers. The suggested use of the Revised Version in churches gives me the opportunity of redelivering the lec-

tures (in another parish), and considerable interest is being manifested.

We would gladly introduce the Revised Version in our Sunday schools, but the prices, except for very small type, are prohibitory. An edition in strong binding, nonpareil type, at one shilling, would meet with a ready sale; but the following comparison shows how heavily the Revised Version is handicapped:—

	Pearl.	Ruby.	Nonpareil.	Minion.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Bible Society (A. V.),	0 8	0 10	0 11	1 6
S. P. C. K. (A. V.), (non-members),	0 8	0 11	1 0	1 6
R. V.,	0 10	3 0	—	5 0

In the Diocese of Ballarat we are offered the "Pearl" edition at 9d., and the others at a corresponding reduction; but "Pearl" type is altogether too small for school use.

I am convinced that the Revised Version would be more appreciated if it were better known; and the publishers would do well to encourage its use both in Sunday and day schools by the publication of a cheap, readable edition, which, even if sold at cost of production, would be profitable as leading to a demand for higher-priced editions.

I thank you for reviving interest in the question by eliciting the opinions (mostly favourable) of so many head-masters of public schools.

The Early Narratives of Genesis.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR H. E. RYLE, B.D., CAMBRIDGE.

VIII.

NOAH AS THE VINE-DRESSER AND HIS THREE SONS.

Genesis ix. 18-29.

IN the short section which follows the narrative of the Flood, is related the prophetic declaration of the Patriarch Noah concerning the future destiny of the races that were to spring from his three sons.

The description of Noah as the first vine-dresser is quite in the style of iv. 17-24; and the incident, it will be observed, has no direct connexion with the narrative of the Flood. It is therefore not

impossible that what is here related (vv. 20-27) was drawn by the Jehovist from a distinct source of ancient Israelite tradition, and was connected by him with the Deluge section by means of vv. 18 and 19. Anyhow, this supposition is worth remembering in view of the well-known difficulty in the present passage occasioned by the fact that the curse is pronounced not upon Ham, but upon Canaan.

The suggestion has been made (1) that, in one Israelite form of the tradition, the three sons of Noah were Shem, *Canaan*, and Japheth; (2) that it was Canaan who treated his father with