

ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH

---

G. WASHINGTON MOON, HON. F.R.S.L.

IN MEMORIAM  
BERNARD MOSES



EX LIBRIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

682

5 Quot

Persecutione

ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH.

KENNY & CO., PRINTERS,  
25, CAMDEN ROAD, LONDON, N.W.

*With the Author's respects.*

# ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH:

A SERIES OF CRITICISMS

SHOWING THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISERS' VIOLATIONS  
OF THE LAWS OF THE LANGUAGE,

ILLUSTRATED BY MORE THAN 1000 QUOTATIONS.

BY

G. WASHINGTON MOON, HON. F.R.S.L.

*Author of 'The Dean's English', &c.*

---

SECOND EDITION.

With a facsimile of an Autograph Letter to the Author

FROM

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. E. GLADSTONE,

ON THE NEGLECT OF THE STUDY OF ENGLISH.

(Reprinted by permission.)


---

LONDON:

WARD & DOWNEY,

12, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.

1887.



D 5888  
M 6  
1887

## Dedication.



I dedicate these Criticisms to one whose many excellencies endear him to the mightiest in the land, and whose additional commendation to me is his mastery over the English language. The purity of his diction, the felicity of his expressions, and the gracefulness of his style, are unsurpassed by those of any other of my literary correspondents.



DEDICATED TO  
*SIR ANDREW CLARK, BART.*  
M.D., LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.P., &c.  
**BERNARD MOSES**

TO THE  
LIBRARY OF  
THE  
MUSEUM OF  
COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY  
AND  
ANATOMY  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY



10, Downing Street,

Whitehall.

May 24. 1886

Dear Sir

I thank you very  
much for your work which  
I shall read with the ut-  
most interest.

Our language has need  
at the present-day of vigi-  
lent and jealous guardians.

I can bear testimony to



## PREFACE.



The recent Revision of the Sacred Scriptures occupied the most illustrious English scholars nearly fifteen years; and such was the anticipated extent of the sale of the work, that the quantity of paper ordered for the edition was so enormous, that had the sheets been piled one upon another in reams as they left the mill, it was said that they would have formed a column ten times the height of St. Paul's Cathedral; or, had they been made into a strip six inches wide, it would have been sufficient with which to "put a girdle round the world"! Yet, within a few months of the issuing of that stupendous work, the great excitement which had heralded and accompanied its publication, died down; and so cooled became the once glowing ardour of the booksellers who, under its influence, had

been induced to make excessive purchases, that they were offering their surplus copies at less than half price,—and offering them in vain.

Englishmen had long regarded their Bible as the “well of English undefiled”; and many of them, when speaking of the then forthcoming Revision of the Sacred Scriptures, seemed, by their enthusiasm, to believe that, under the mighty influence of those learned Doctors, a miracle would be wrought, as of old, and the water of this well would, as it were, be changed into wine. Was there ever so joyful an anticipation of a rich draught of delight so cruelly mocked as was this one by the discovery of the lamentable emptiness of the *fiasco*? There was no wine in the cup; and even the water from the old well was found, upon examination, to be charged with effete matter.

But, whence was the bitterness of this disappointment—the source of this *Marah*? It sprang from the ignorance of those who had entertained the sanguine belief respecting the wonders to be wrought by the Revisers. Those persons little knew the nature of the

education of the men who had been born in the early part of the present century. *In those days the study of English was utterly ignored in the higher Schools and Colleges of the land.* The writer gladly recognises the vast stores of learning possessed by the Revisers, and joins his countrymen in acknowledging the debt of gratitude due to those eminent scholars for so generously devoting their time and talents to the accomplishment of the great work. They did their duty nobly to the best of their ability, but they had not made English their study. What wonder, then, is it that their work is not characterized by purity of diction or elegance of style?

To say that there are errors in it, that those errors are gross, that their grossness is flagrant, and that they abound throughout the work, is indeed a grave charge to bring against it; but, in the interests of our language, it must be brought; and the gravity of the charge is the greater because of its transparent truth.

But gross, and flagrant, and abounding as are the errors, they would be freely pardoned

had they been made by uneducated men. The *gravamen* is that the work, with all its faults, has gone forth to the world as the result of years of combined effort of England's most illustrious scholars! And if the present state of our language—a language glorified by being the vehicle for conveying to mankind the sublime thoughts of Milton and of Shakspeare—be judged by the English of the Revisers, the world's unfaltering verdict upon it must be "Ichabod! Ichabod!"

And shall we, by our silence, pardonable though it would be as emanating from respect to the Revisers, allow their English to be accepted as the accredited evidence of the accuracy, gracefulness, and strength to which our language has attained? The proud love which we cherish for our language impels us to say No!

But, even were Englishmen willing to be silent, sooner or later the truth would declare itself, and reveal to the world that a sacred trust having been committed to the Revisers to translate the Divine Records into faultless English based on the time-hallowed version

of 1611, the Revisers, instead of making the Scriptures a model of excellence—the language worthy of the thoughts that it conveyed—had given to the English-speaking peoples a work marred by violations of grammar, ungracefulness of style, and infelicities of expression, all evidencing but too plainly that however learned the Revisers were in the classic languages of antiquity, they were not masters of their own mother tongue. In this sweeping charge, the writer does not wholly include the American Revisers. They suggested many great improvements which were not carried out by their English collaborators, with whom rested the final decision in all matters.

The reader will find in these pages a truthful exposure of the Revisers' most glaring errors of language, with chapter and verse for every quotation, so that the accuracy of the writer's statements may be tested. Were he not able thus to challenge investigation of the charges which he brings against the Revisers, he would shrink from publishing these criticisms, for he is certain that this work would not be received as truthful; so difficult would it be to believe

that such errors had been committed by such men.\*

The task has not been an enviable one ; but no man should shrink from the performance of obvious duty. The exposure had to be made, and the writer has made it ; and he trusts that in so doing he has rendered some slight service to all students of the language.

As for the work itself, he hopes that at some future time his labours will be useful to those who will not merely undertake the revision of the Sacred Scriptures, but will faithfully accomplish that which they undertake, and make the Word of God, what the writer has always contended that it should be, **THE EMBODIMENT OF THE PUREST TRUTH IN THE PUREST LANGUAGE.**

*London, 1886.*

---

\* "The Revised Old Testament represents the result of the patient deliberation of the best scholars of the whole English-speaking world."—*The Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1885, p. 412.



THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISERS,  
1870—1885.

---

- ALEXANDER, Dr. W. L. .... Professor of Theology, Congregational Church Hall, Edinburgh.
- BENSLY, Mr. R. L. .... Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge.
- BIRRELL, Rev. J. .... Professor of Oriental Languages, St. Andrews.
- BROWNE, Dr. HAROLD .... Bishop of Ely.
- CHANCE, Dr. F. .... Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- CHENERY, Mr. T. .... Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, Oxford.
- CHEYNE, Dr. T. K. .... Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.
- COOK, Rev. F. C. .... Canon of Exeter.
- DAVIDSON, Dr. A. B. .... Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Edinburgh.
- DAVIES, Dr. B. .... Professor of Hebrew, Baptist College, Regent's Park, London.
- DOUGLAS, Dr. .... Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Glasgow.

- DRIVER, Dr. ....Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.
- ELLIOTT, Rev. C. J.....Formerly Fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
- FAIRBAIRN, Dr. P. ....Principal of the Free Church, Glasgow.
- FIELD, Dr. F. ....Formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- GEDEN, Mr. J. D.....Professor of Hebrew, Wesleyan College, Didsbury.
- GINSBURG, Dr. CHRISTIAN D...Editor of "*The Massorah*", &c.
- GOTCH, Dr. F. W.....Principal of the Baptist College, Bristol.
- HARRISON, Rev. B. ....Archdeacon of Maidstone.
- HERVEY, Lord ARTHUR.....Bishop of Bath and Wells.
- JEBB, Dr. JOHN .....Canon of Hereford.
- KAY, Dr. WILLIAM .....Honorary Canon of St. Albans.
- LEATHES, Rev. STANLEY .....Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.
- LUMBY, Dr. ....Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- MCGILL, Rev. J. ....Professor of Oriental Languages, St. Andrews.
- OLLIVANT, Dr. ....Bishop of Llandaff.
- PEROWNE, Dr. J. J. S. ....Dean of Peterborough.
- PLUMPTRE, Dr.....Dean of Wells.
- PUSEY, Dr. ....Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

ROSE, Archdeacon .....	
SAYCE, Rev. A. H. ....	Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford.
SELWYN, Professor .....	
SMITH, Dr. PAYNE .....	Dean of Canterbury.
SMITH, Dr. W. ROBERTSON ...	Professor of Hebrew in the Free Church, Aberdeen.
THIRLWALL, Dr. ....	Bishop of St. David's.
WEIR, Dr. D. H. ....	Professor of Oriental Languages, Glasgow.
WORDSWORTH, Dr. ....	Bishop of Lincoln.
WRIGHT, Dr. W. ....	Professor of Arabic, Cambridge.

Of the above, Dr. Pusey and Canon Cook declined to serve; the Bishop of Lincoln and Dr. Jebb soon withdrew; and somewhat later Dr. Plumptre resigned.

The following members died during the progress of the work:—Mr. Chenery, Dr. B. Davies, Rev. C. J. Elliott, Dr. P. Fairbairn, Rev. J. McGill, Dr. Ollivant, Archdeacon Rose, Professor Selwyn, Dr. Thirlwall, and Dr. D. H. Weir. And Dr. W. L. Alexander and Dr. F. Field died during the interval between the completion and the publication of the work.

The Secretary to the Old Testament Company was Mr. W. Aldis Wright, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Company was strengthened by the coöperation of the American Revisers; as was also the New Testament Company.



## CONTENTS.

---

A.		Page
‘A’ or ‘an’ .....	27, 63-70,	
	96, 101	
Adjectives and adverbs		
	112, 116	
‘Afore’ and ‘before’...	15	
‘After’,-‘according to’	157	
‘Afterward’ and ‘after- wards’ .....	138, 139	
‘Again’ .....	76-78, 211	
Agur.....	129	
Aha! for Ha, ha! .....	210	
All <i>of you</i> .....	87, 88	
‘Also’, redundant .....	92	
‘Always’ and ‘always’	138	
‘Am’, the verb ‘ <i>to am</i> ’	103	
Ambiguity .....	162, 163	
Angels ‘ascending and descending’ .....	49	
‘Annul’ and ‘disannul’		
	30, 31	
‘Another’, for ‘the other’ .....	97-99	
‘Apparalled’, for ‘clothed’		
	18, 19	
‘Are’ and ‘be’ ...	103-107	
A son of man .....	100	
‘As—as’, and ‘so—as’		
	151-154	
Assembled together ...		80
‘Astonied’ and ‘aston- ished’ .....		15, 16
‘Attired’ and ‘tired’...		22
‘Aught’ and ‘ought’...		16
‘Augmenteth’, for ‘in- creaseth’ .....		19
Avenged <i>of</i> , for <i>on</i> .....		123
		B.
‘Back’ and ‘backward’		28
‘Backward’ and ‘back- wards’ .....		139
Baker’s ‘ <i>Remarks on English</i> ’ .....		1
Bath and Wells, Bishop of .....		11
Be, the verb ‘to be’..		103- 107, 154
‘Before’ and ‘afore’...		15
‘Beside’ and ‘besides’		
		132-136
Bible, the ‘Temple of Truth’ .....		213-215
Black and white iden- tical .....		29
Blackness and paleness		28
Bloomed blossoms ...		79

	Page		Page
'Both', redundant ...	85	D.	
Both of <i>them</i> .....	87-89	Darwinism .....	29
Both of those—right	89, 90	'Dead body that is dead' .....	79
Brass, a natural pro- duct .....	209	Dead corpses .....	212
'Bridles' for 'bits' ...	209	'Deceased' for 'dead'	18
Broken hearted .....	17	'Depart <i>away</i> ' .....	85
Budded buds .....	99	'Descending' and 'as- cending' .....	49
'Builded' and 'built'..	14	'Despite' .....	123
'But', the meaning of	85, 86	'Devised devices' .....	80
'But' redundant .....	86	'Diminished' and 'mi- nished' .....	20
'But', for 'that' .....	85	'Disannul' and 'annul'	30, 31
C.		'Doubled' twice .....	77
'Cankerworm' .....	17	'Downward' and 'down- wards' .....	139
'Chiefest' .....	27	'Drave' and 'drove' ...	15
'Clothed' and 'appa- ralled' .....	18, 19	'Dwelled' and 'dwelt'	15
Collocation of words...	52	E.	
Colour, non-existent...	29	Each of <i>them</i> .....	87, 88
Comma, its importance	212	Each one .....	148
'Common Errors in <i>Speaking and Writ- ing</i> ' .....	33	'Eagle', for 'eagle's' .	210
Compound words ...	17, 18	Earth, neuter and femi- nine .....	30
'Congregation', singu- lar and plural .....	39	'Eat' and 'eat up' ...	148
Convocation's vote of thanks .....	5	' <i>Edinburgh Review</i> ' ...	10
Corpses, live and dead.	212	'Either', for 'each' ...	144, 145
Cowper quoted .....	35	'Else but', for 'else than' .....	91
'Cry with my voice' ...	80		

CONTENTS.

xvii.

Page	Page
'Else save', for 'else than' ..... 91	'Forward' and 'forwards' ..... 139
Emphasis, the place of 55, 62	G.
End, no or none ..... 70	Garment, an hairy ..... 27
Errors, cause of the Revisers' ..... 102	'Gathered to his fathers' ..... 28
'Established' and 'stablished' ..... 19, 20	'Gathered up his feet' ..... 28
Esther, Queen ..... 127	German revision of Luther's Bible ..... 12
Eunuch, a or an ... 69, 70	Gift, to take ..... 28
'Ever' and 'never' ... 161	'Good English' ..... 11
'Ever and ever' ..... 176	Grammar, the Revisers' ..... 32
'Every drove by themselves' ..... 143	'Grapegatherers' ..... 17
'Every man by their families' ..... 144	H.
'Exceeding' for 'exceedingly' ..... 115, 116	H, a and an before ... 63-67
'Exceeding magnificent' ..... 116	H, my and mine before 63, 73, 74
'Except', for 'unless' ..... 205-207	H, thy and thine before 64, 72
'Expended' ..... 7	Ha, ha! or aha! ..... 210
Eye, no or none ..... 70	'Had rather be' ..... 190
F.	'Hairy' and 'airy' ... 68
Feet, stood on ..... 79	Hairy garment, an ..... 27
'Firstripe' ..... 17	Hairy man, a ..... 27, 68
'For' before infinitives 117-119	Hairy man, an ..... 27, 68
'For ever' ..... 78	Hairy mantle, a ..... 27
'For', redundant ..... 119	Half, 'one half' ..... 148
	Handmaids ..... 30
	'Hardly', its two meanings ..... 25
	'Harlots unto the King' ..... 53

	Page		Page
' Heard with our ears ' .	80		
' Heart deceitful above all things ' .....	129		
' Heavier than <i>them</i> ' ..	213		
Hebrew language .....	76		
' Hence ' and ' from hence ' .....	74-176		
Hermaphroditos .....	30		
Hiatus .....	69		
' Homer ' or ' omer ' ...	26		
Honour .....	74		
I.			
' If ' and ' though ' .....	205		
' If ', for ' whether ' ...	205		
' In ' and ' on ' .....	122		
' In ', for ' into ' .....	119-121		
' In ' or ' on ' .....	61		
Inconsistency ...9, 26, 112			
' Increaseth ' and ' aug- menteth ' .....	19		
Infinitive past, for pre- sent .....	7		
Inhabitant, no and none	71		
' Inward ' and ' in- wards ' .....	139		
<i>ιστορία</i> .....	14		
' Its ', date of introduc- tion into Bible .....	208		
J.			
Joash and Jehoash.....	201		
Joahaz and Jehoahaz...	201		
Journey, to take.....	28		
		K.	
			Page
		Kneeling on his knees.	79
		Knowledge and wis- dom .....	35
		L.	
		' Last end ' .....	95
		Latinisms .....	18
		' Latter end ' .....	95
		' Let ', its two mean- ings .....	22
		' Lettan ', to hinder ...	22
		Levins, Peter, quoted .	14
		Levity .....	68
		' Look sad ' and ' look sadly ' .....	114
		Lightning and thunder	48
		Live corpses .....	212
		' Lœtan ' to loose .....	22
		' Loose ' and ' unloose '.	31
		Lowth, Bishop, quoted	1
		M.	
		Maacah, Rehoboam's wife .....	128
		Maids .....	30
		Man, a or an hairy ...	27
		' <i>Manipulus Vocabu- lorum</i> ' .....	14
		Mantle, a hairy .....	27
		' Minished ' and ' di- minished ' .....	20
		Mood, subjunctive	107-111



CONTENTS.

xix.

Page	Page	
Moses, meeker than all men ..... 127	'Of', for 'by', for 'on' for 'with' .....122, 213	
Multitude, noun of ... 6	'Of', omitted .....124, 125	
'Multitude', singular or plural ..... 39	'Of', redundant..... 124	
N.		
'Naught' and 'nought' 16	'Of them', redundant 161	
'Naughty' and 'noughty' 16	'Omer' or 'homer' ... 26	
'Never', for 'ever' ... 161	One; 'each one' ..... 148	
'Nitrate', for 'natron'... 208	'One half' ..... 148	
'No end' and 'none end' ..... 70	Oneness of all animals 29	
'No eye' and 'none eye' ..... 70	Oneness of all colours 29	
'No inhabitant' and 'none inhabitant' ... 71	One; 'such a one', or 'such an one'..... 70	
'No—nor' ..... 159	Other; 'none or no'... 131	
'No—or' ..... 159	'Other', omitted...126, 130	
'No' or 'not' .....154, 155	'Other', redundant 130, 132	
'None' and 'no one'... 71	'Outward' and 'outwards' ..... 139	
'None other' and 'no other' ..... 131	'Ought' and 'aught'.. 16	
'None', singular or plural ..... 71	P.	
'Not—nor' ..... 156	Pale, waxed.....28, 29	
'Not—or' ..... 156	'Parted them both <i>asunder</i> ' ..... 85	
Noun of multitude ... 6	Participle, present for past ..... 7	
O.		
'O' and 'Oh' .....201-204	Past infinitive, for present .....7-10	
Of; 'all of', 'both of', 'each of' .....87, 147	'People of his pasture' 201	
	'People', singular or plural .....37, 38	
	'Peoples' .....39, 40	
	'Persons' .....39, 40	
	Perspicuity ..... 52	

	Page		Page
'Pitched with pitch' ..	79	Second times, two.....	212
'Plain' or 'plainly'...		'See it with thine eyes'	80
	112, 115	Sequence of words...47-60,	
'Plastered with plais-		183, 190-193	
ter.....	79	Shakspeare quoted ...	23
Positive assertions,		'Shall' and 'will'..177-182	
weak .....	175, 176	'Sheep of his hand' ...	210
'Praying a prayer' ...	79	'Sick of love' .....	212, 213
'Precede' or 'prevent'	22	Smith, John, his book	174
Prepositions .....	122	'So—as' and as—as'...	
'Prevent' .....	121	151-154	
'Probe-bibel' .....	12	Solomon wiser than	
Pronouns, ambiguous..		all men .. .....	126
	162, 163	Somersetshire witness	163
Pronouns, errors in ...		'Son of man' .....	100
	167, 173	'Speak plain', or 'plain-	
Pronouns, redundant ..	83,	ly'.....	112, 113
	92-94	'Spite' and 'despite'..	123
Pronouns, relative..164-166		'Stablished' and 'es-	
'Pruninghooks' .....	17	tablished' .....	20
		Stargazers .....	17
		'Stole' and 'stole a-	
R.		way'.....	28
Rams' skins.....	18	'Stone him with stones'	
Rather; 'had rather be'	190	82, 83	
Redundancy ... ..	75-82	'Stood up on his feet'	79
Rise up .....	84	'Storehouse' .....	17
		'Storeys' and 'stories'	14
S.		'Stories' in the ark ...	14
'Sarai Abraham's wife'	211	'Strewed', 'strawed'	
Saxon words .....	18	or 'strowed' .....	26
Sea, masculine, femi-		'Stronghold' and	
nine and neuter .....	30	'strong hold'.....	17
Seal skins .....	18		

Page	Page
Subjunctive mood.....	'Thy' and 'thine'..... 72
107-111, 183	'Tidings', singular and
'Such <i>a</i> one' and 'such	plural ..... 43
<i>an</i> one' ..... 70	'Time past' and 'times
Swallowed 'up' and	past'..... 139
'down'.....149, 150	<i>Times, The</i> , quoted ...5, 13
T.	'Tired' and 'attired' . 22
Take, a gift and a	'Tired wheels' ..... 22
journey ..... 28	'To' and 'unto'..... 121
Tautology .....10, 75-82	Tongue, 'in' or 'on'
'Tell', to count .....23, 24	the ..... 61
Temple of Truth, the	'Toward' and 'to-
Bible .....213-215	wards'..... 139
Tentative Edition of	U.
Revision ..... 12	'Unless' and 'except'
'Than'..... 132	205-207
'Than them' ..... 213	'Unloose' and 'loose'. 31
'The', 'a', or 'an' ...96, 97	'Unto' and 'to'..... 121
'Thee', for 'thou'.....	Up; 'eat up' .....148, 149
170, 186	Up; 'swallowed up'
'Them' and 'those'... 172	149, 150
'Thence' and 'from	'Upward' and 'up-
thence' .....194-196	wards'..... 139
'The son of man', for	V.
'a son of man' ..... 100	Vacillation of the Re-
'This' and 'that' ..... 200	visers ..... 137
'This twenty years'	'Vanish <i>away</i> ' ..... 84
and 'these twenty	Verb, its primary im-
years' ..... 141	portance ..... 32
'Though', for 'if'..... 205	
'Thunder and light-	
ning' ..... 48	

	Page		Page
Verbs, errors in...33, 41-49, 183-189		Whom; 'the man's rod <i>whom</i> ' .....	173
'Vomit them up <i>again</i> '	78	'Will' and 'shall'...	177-182
Vote of thanks to the Revisers .....	6	'Wilt', for 'willest'...	204
W.		'Widow <i>woman</i> ' .....	81
'Waxed pale' .....	28, 29	'Wisdom' and 'know- ledge' .....	35
Weighed out, 'ex- pended' .....	7	Wisdom, its existence ignored .....	36
'Weight...in weight'.	10	'Women servants' ...	30
'Whence' and 'from whence' .....	194-196	'Wonderful great' ...	116
'Whether' and 'if' ...	205	Y.	
'Which', for 'who' ...	10	Years, 'this twenty' and 'these twenty'.	141
'While' and 'whiles'..	141	'You' and 'ye' ...	166, 170
'Who' and 'which' 164-166		Youth, 'like an eagle'.	210

## INDEX OF TEXTS.

<i>GENESIS.</i>			<i>Genesis—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	15 ...	118	xv. ...	1 ...	115
	17 ...	76		9 ...	65
	18 ...	65		10 ...	98
	29 ...	65	xvi. ...	1 65, 210, 211	
	21 ...	162	xvii. ...	6 ...	115
iii. ...	6 ...	118	xviii. ...	2 ...	183
iv. ...	2 ...	211		21 ...	205
	12 ...	30	xix. ...	12 ...	134
	13 ...	179	xx. ...	1 ...	196
	14 ...	179	xxi. ...	16 ...	183
	17 ...	162	xxii. ...	4 ...	183
	22 ...	124		6 ...	88
vi. ...	5 ...	122		8 ...	88
	6 ...	122	xxiii. ...	6 ...	86
	7 ...	89	xxiv. ...	11 ...	118
	13 ...	122		23 ...	76
	14 ...	79	xxv. ...	25 ...	27, 68
	16 ...	13	xxvi. ...	1 ...	135
	17 ...	56, 122		17 ...	196
vii. ...	21 ...	90		22 ...	196
viii. ...	3 ...	65	xxvii. ...	11 ...	27, 68
	8 ...	204		21 ...	155
	10 ...	130	xxviii. ...	12 ...	49
	20 ...	14		17 ...	130
ix. ...	20 ...	65	xxix. ...	4 ...	106
xii. ...	12 ...	179	xxx. ...	18 ...	117
	17 ...	210, 211		19 ...	28
xiii. ...	12 ...	15		20 ...	28
	18 ...	14, 15		38 ...	141



INDEX OF TEXTS.

xxv.

<i>Exodus—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xiii. ...	19 ...	196
	21 ...	118
xiv. ...	8 ...	65
	13 ...	78
	26 ...	77
xv. ...	18 ...	176
	26 ...	183
xvi. ...	4 ...	155
	16 ...	26
	27 ...	117
xvii. ...	7 ...	155
xviii. ...	4 ...	64
xix. ...	6 ...	65
	16 ...	39, 115
xx. ...	18 ...	48
xxi. ...	15 ...	183
	16 ...	183
	29 ...	139
	36 ...	139
xxii. ...	8 ...	205
xxiii. ...	11 ...	73
	12 ...	73
	26 ...	160
xxv. ...	18 ...	98
	20 ...	98
	22 ...	57
	25 ...	65
	30 ...	138
xxvi. ...	14 ...	56
	17 ...	99
xxviii. ...	32 ...	63
xxix. ...	28 ...	66
	40 ...	66
xxx. ...	15 ...	167

<i>Exodus—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxx. ...	23 ...	153
xxxii. ...	20 ...	26
xxxiii. ...	4 ...	43
	15 ...	196
xxxv. ...	23 ...	18, 29
	25 ...	91
	35 ...	171, 172
xxxvi. ...	19 ...	57
	22 ...	99
	29 ...	88
xxxvii. ...	9 ...	98
	26 ...	91
xl. ...	37 ...	110

LEVITICUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
viii. ...	4 ...	39
ix. ...	17 ...	134, 135
	22 ...	124, 183
x. ...	1 ...	87, 146
	12 ...	134, 147
	14 ...	107
xi. ...	1 ...	121
	31 ...	107
xiii. ...	1 ...	121
xv. ...	1 ...	121
xvii. ...	3 ...	101
xx. ...	2 ...	82
	8 ...	183
	11 ...	88
	12 ...	88
	13 ...	88
	18 ...	88
xxiii. ...	12 ...	63, 67

<i>Leviticus--(con.)</i>			<i>Numbers--(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxiii. ...	22 ...	168	xii. ...	3 ...	127
	38 ...	135		14 ...	78
xxiv. ...	16 ...	82		15 ...	78
	20 ...	77		18 ...	205
	23 ...	83		19 ...	205
xxv. ...	47 ...	134		20 ...	205
xxvi. ...	34 ...	153	xiii. ...	18 ...	38
	35 ...	153		28 ...	38, 107
xxvii. ...	16 ...	67		31 ...	106
	27 ...	73	xiv. ...	7 ...	115
				10 ...	83
				13 ...	179
			xv. ...	35 ...	83
				36 ...	83
			xvi. ...	3 ...	39
				32 ...	150
				33 ...	150
				49 ...	134
			xvii. ...	5 ...	173
				8 ...	79
				27 ...	205
				29 ...	143
			xix. ...	13 ...	79
			xx. ...	17 ...	156
			xxi. ...	2 ...	74
				32 ...	15
			xxii. ...	29 ...	74
			xxiii. ...	5 ...	121
				10 ...	95
				12 ...	121
				16 ...	121
				19 ...	101
			xxv. ...	13 ...	121
			xxviii. ...	10 ...	135

## NUMBERS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	44 ...	148
ii. ...	24 ...	67
	34 ...	144
iv. ...	45 ...	107
v. ...	20 ...	72, 132
	26 ...	66
vi. ...	9 ...	134
vii. ...	13 ...	88
	19 ...	88
	25 ...	88
	31 ...	88
	37 ...	88
	43 ...	88
	49 ...	88
	55 ...	88
	61 ...	88
	67 ...	88
	73 ...	88
	79 ...	88
ix. ...	16 ...	138
	18 ...	153



INDEX OF TEXTS.

xxvii.

<i>Numbers—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxviii. ...	15 ...	135
	24 ...	135
	31 ...	135
xxix. ...	6 ...	135
	11 ...	135
	16 ...	135
	19 ...	135
	22 ...	135
	25 ...	135
	28 ...	135
	31 ...	135
	34 ...	135
	38 ...	135
	39 ...	135
xxx. ...	6 ...	63
	14 ...	111
	16 ...	67, 106
xxxi. ...	28 ...	89
	30 ...	89
xxxvi. ...	5 ...	115

*DEUTERONOMY.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	1 ...	106
	11 ...	153
	39 ...	181
ii. ...	5 ...	154
	7 ...	72
	24 ...	72
	27 ...	121
iv. ...	1 ...	118
	42 ...	139
v. ...	15 ...	196
	29 ...	66, 138

<i>Deuteronomy—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page
v. ...	32 ...	156
vi. ...	23 ...	196
	24 ...	138
vii. ...	4 ...	168
viii. ...	2 ...	155
	9 ...	208
	13 ...	44
	14 ...	165
	15 ...	165
ix. ...	12 ...	196
x. ...	5 ...	106
	14 ...	42
	15 ...	128
xi. ...	1 ...	138
	12 ...	138
	30 ...	134
xii. ...	22 ...	45
xiii. ...	9 ...	139
	10 ...	83
xiv. ...	2 ...	128
	23 ...	138
	27 ...	159
	29 ...	159
xvi. ...	21 ...	134
xvii. ...	7 ...	138
	11 ...	156
	20 ...	156
xviii. ...	1 ...	159
	8 ...	135
xix. ...	2 ...	83
	3 ...	83
	4 ...	139
	6 ...	139
	19 ...	8

<i>Deuteronomy—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxi. ...	1 ...	83
	21 ...	83
xxii. ...	1 ...	172
	2 ...	172
	21 ...	83
	22 ...	67
	24 ...	83
xxiii. ...	18 ...	88
xxiv. ...	1 ...	121
	3 ...	121
xxv. ...	11 ...	118
xxvi. ...	3 ...	118
xxvii. ...	2 ...	79
	4 ...	79, 107
	8 ...	112
xxviii. ...	1 ...	128
	14 ...	156
	29 ...	138
xxix. ...	5 ...	168
	10 ...	86
	11 ...	168
xxxi. ...	6 ...	156
	27 ...	141
xxxii. ...	29 ...	95
	30 ...	205
xxxiii. ...	17 ...	88
	29 ...	73
xxxiv. ...	4 ...	80

*JOSHUA.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	6 ...	156, 157
	7 ...	156, 157
	11 ...	83

<i>Joshua—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	2 ...	118
v. ...	15 ...	79
vi. ...	21 ...	90
vii. ...	9 ...	178
	12 ...	205
	25 ...	83
ix. ...	8 ...	196
x. ...	18 ...	118
xii. ...	9 ...	134
xvi. ...	10 ...	15
xvii. ...	18 ...	183
xxi. ...	42 ...	144
xxii. ...	14 ...	144
xxiii. ...	6 ...	156
xxiv. ...	13 ...	166

*JUDGES.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	20 ...	15
	21 ...	185
ii. ...	22 ...	155
iii. ...	17 ...	54
iv. ...	21 ...	66, 67
vi. ...	13 ...	110, 202
	15 ...	202
	31 ...	110
vii. ...	10 ...	120
	14 ...	91
viii. ...	5 ...	106
	18 ...	148
ix. ...	33 ...	37
	34 ...	37
xi. ...	26 ...	107
xii. ...	6 ...	113

INDEX OF TEXTS.

xxix.

*Judges—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xiii. ...	4 ...	159
	7 ...	159
xiv. ...	16 ...	156
xx. ...	16 ...	66
	48 ...	88

*RUTH.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	18 ...	117
ii. ...	14 ...	134
iv. ...	1 ...	70
	7 ...	118
	11 ...	72
	12 ...	72

*1 SAMUEL.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	6 ...	118
	13 ...	83
ii. ...	2 ...	135
	29 ...	27
	34 ...	88
vi. ...	12 ...	156
ix. ...	22 ...	27
x. ...	5 ...	67
xii. ...	8 ...	165
xiv. ...	7 ...	72
xv. ...	3 ...	90
xvii. ...	5 ...	66
	38 ...	66
xix. ...	11 ...	180, 181
xx. ...	14 ...	141
	20 ...	205
xxi. ...	7 ...	27

*1 Samuel—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxi. ...	9 ...	131
xxiv. ...	11 ...	73
xxv. ...	22 ...	153
	34 ...	205
xxix. ...	6 ...	41
	8 ...	153
xxx. ...	6 ...	82

*2 SAMUEL.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	4 ...	106
	5 ...	106
	25 ...	64
ii. ...	19 ...	156
iii. ...	13 ...	205
	17 ...	139
iv. ...	6 ...	205
	8 ...	123
v. ...	2 ...	140
	6 ...	205
vii. ...	22 ...	135
	23 ...	169
	28 ...	107
viii. ...	1 ...	209
ix. ...	10 ...	138
x. ...	4 ...	148
xi. ...	8 ...	72
	10 ...	72
xii. ...	2 ...	116
	18 ...	141
	21 ...	141
	22 ...	141
	33 ...	116
xiv. ...	5 ...	73, 81





*2 Chronicles—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xi. ...	20 ...	128
	21 ...	128
xv. ...	2 ...	141
xvi. ...	1 ...	157
xvii. ...	19 ...	135
	6 ...	135
xviii. ...	9 144,145,146	
xxiv. ...	21 ...	83
xxv. ...	17 ...	99
	19 ...	64
	21 ...	99
xxviii. ...	6 ...	53
xxix. ...	8 ...	66
xxxii. ...	7 ...	39, 40
xxxiv. ...	3 ...	141
	4 ...	26

*EZRA.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii. ...	27 ...	121
viii. ...	20 ...	88
	22 ...	41
	33 ...	41, 45
ix. ...	7 ...	116

*NEHEMIAH.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	2 ...	91
	5 ...	110
	10 ...	119
	12 ...	121
iii. ...	23 ...	133
iv. ...	3 ...	181
vii. ...	5 ...	63, 121

*Nehemiah—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ix. ...	5 ...	176
	19 ...	117
xii. ...	27 ...	90

*ESTHER.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	17 ...	181
	20 ...	181
ii. ...	11 ...	181
	14 ...	205
	17 ...	127
iii. ...	8 ...	123
iv. ...	4 ...	116
	14 ...	110
v. ...	3 ...	204
	7 ...	
	13 ...	153
vi. ...	13 ...	110
viii. ...	5 ...	110

*JOB.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	7 ...	196
	10 ...	66
ii. ...	2 ...	196
iii. ...	16 ...	66
	17 ...	107
	18 ...	107
v. ...	9 ...	165
	11 ...	107
vii. ...	9 ...	84
	16 ...	138
	19 ...	149
viii. ...	7 ...	95

*Job—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
viii. ...	20 ...	60
ix. ...	30 ...	161
x. ...	18 ...	70
	19 ...	205
xii. ...	2 ...	85
	13 ...	36
	16 ...	41
xiv. ..	3 ...	70
xv. ...	21 ...	46
xviii. ...	2 ...	139
xix. ...	3 ...	25
xx. ...	15 ...	78, 149
	18 ...	149
	23 ...	141
xxi. ...	21 ...	46
xxiv. ...	15 ...	70
	25 ...	109
xxv. ...	6 ...	100
xxvii. ...	6 ...	153
xxviii. ...	22 ...	80
xxx. ...	1 ...	9
	5 ...	55
xxxi. ...	11 ...	66
xxxiv. ...	33 ...	204
xxxv. ...	8 ...	100, 101
xxxvi. ...	20 ...	39
xxxix. ...	16 ...	205
	25 ...	209
xl. ...	8 ...	31
xlii. ...	12 ...	95

*PSALMS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii. ...	2 ...	141

*Psalms—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii. ...	9 ...	203
	10 ...	165
viii. ...	4 ...	101
ix. ...	5 ...	175
x. ...	16 ...	176
xiv. ...	2 ...	204
xvi. ...	8 ...	138
xvii. ...	7 ...	60
xix. ...	11 ...	124
xxi. ...	4 ...	176
xxiii. ...	6 ...	181
xxv. ...	16 ...	170
	17 ...	202
	20 ...	202
xxvii. ...	7 ...	80
	13 ...	206
xxxiii. ...	19 ...	118
xxxiv. ...	18 ...	105
xxxv. ...	14 ...	205
	26 ...	64
xxxvi. ...	10 ...	202
xxxviii. ...	4 ...	66
xl. ...	3 ...	121
	12 ...	73
xliii. ...	1 ...	202
	3 ...	202
xliv. ...	26 ...	84
xl. ...	6 ...	176
	17 ...	176
xlviii. ...	14 ...	176
xlix. ...	7 ...	160
	18 ...	141
l. ...	21 ...	70
lii. ...	8 ...	176

<i>Psalms—(con.)</i>			<i>Psalms—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
liv. ...	4 ...	64	xcviii. ...	1 ...	45
lvi. ...	8 ...	24	c. ...	3 ...	210
lviii. ...	5 ...	161	ci. ...	2 ...	202
	7 ...	205	cii. ...	27 ...	70
lxi. ...	7 ...	202	ciii. ...	5 ...	209
lxii. ...	7 ...	41		9 ...	138
lxiii. ...	4 ...	141		10 ...	157
lxiv. ...	6 ...	41	civ. ...	1 ...	19
lxvii. ...	4 ...	202		33 ...	141
lxviii. ...	21 ...	70	cvi. ...	4 ...	202
lxix. ...	6 ...	172	cix. ...	26 ...	202
	16 ...	170	cxix. ...	8 ...	202
	31 ...	101		10 ...	202
lxxi. ...	8 ...	74		44 ...	176
lxxii. ...	5 ...	152		50 ...	73
lxxiii. ...	26 ...	43, 44		92 ...	73, 206
lxxiv. ...	19 ...	202		96 ...	116
	21 ...	202		97 ...	202
lxxx. ...	17 ...	100		112 ...	73
lxxxiv. ...	2 ...	44		147 ...	21
	10 ...	190		161 ...	73
lxxxv. ...	12 ...	181	cxxiv. ...	8 ...	165
	13 ...	181	cxxv. ...	4 ...	105
lxxxvi. ...	16 ...	202	cxxvii. ...	1 ...	205
lxxxvii. ...	5 ...	45	cxxxi. ...	1 ...	183
lxxxviii. ...	10 ...	18	cxxxii. ...	4 ...	157
	13 ...	21	cxxxv. ...	21 ...	165
lxxxix. ...	47 ...	202	cxxxix. ...	4 ...	61
xc. ...	14 ...	202		10 ...	181
xciii. ...	1 ...	18, 19		24 ...	204
	2 ...	19	cxliv. ...	3 ...	101
xciv. ...	17 ...	206		14 ...	41
xcv. ...	6 ...	201	cxlv. ...	1 ...	176
	7 ...	201, 210		2 ...	176



INDEX OF TEXTS.

xxxv.

<i>Psalms—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
cxlvi. ...	3 ...	100
	5 ...	166
	6 ...	166
	7 ...	166
cxlvii. ...	4 ...	24
	7 ...	166
	8 ...	166
	11 ...	171
cxlviii. ...	20 ...	128
	6 ...	176

*PROVERBS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	16 ...	118
	23 ...	170
	27 ...	34, 43
ii. ...	6 ...	43
iii. ...	16 ...	187
iv. ...	16 ...	206
	27 ...	156
v. ...	11 ...	44
	19 ...	138
vi. ...	16 ...	104
viii. ...	30 ...	138
x. ...	22 ...	93
	24 ...	94
xvi. ...	18 ...	66
	24 ...	66
xvii. ...	15 ...	87
xviii. ...	4 ...	188
	11 ...	67
xix. ...	2 ...	94
xx. ...	3 ...	74

<i>Proverbs—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xx. ...	10 ...	88
	12 ...	88
	14 ...	16
	17 ...	139
xxi. ...	8 ...	116
	20 ...	42, 149
xxiv. ...	10 ...	110
	21 ...	171
xxv. ...	16 ...	153
	20 ...	207
xxvi. ...	4 ...	92
xxvii. ...	3 ...	212
	9 ...	50
xxviii. ...	8 ...	19
	14 ...	138
xxix. ...	12 ...	107
xxx. ...	2 ...	129
	13 ...	202
xxx. ...	18 ...	104
	24 ...	104, 116
	29 ...	104
xxxi. ...	26 ...	60

*ECCLESIASTES.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	13 ...	153
iii. ...	12 ...	153
iv. ...	8 ...	70
	16 ...	70
v. ...	2 ...	55, 188
	8 ...	27
vii. ...	24 ...	116
ix. ...	8 ...	138
xii. ...	12 ...	70

## CANTICLES.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	5 ...	212
v. ...	8 ...	212
	10 ...	27
vii. ...	12 ...	204

## ISAIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	6 ...	28
	9 ...	205
iii. ...	7 ...	66
v. ...	7 ...	189
	10 ...	26
	13 ...	39
	29 ...	209
vi. ...	2 ...	148
vii. ...	19 ...	88
viii. ...	6 ...	37
ix. ...	7 ...	70
	13 ...	38
xi. ...	9 ...	156
	11 ...	211
xiv. ...	27 ...	31
xvi. ...	11 ...	66
xxii. ...	16 ...	66
xxiii. ...	16 ...	67
xxv. ...	4 ...	184
xxviii. ...	18 ...	31
	29 ...	165
xxix. ...	8 ...	66
xxx. ...	8 ...	176
	13 ...	67
	17 ...	66
	28 ...	209

## Isaiah—(con.)

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxx. ...	6 ...	170
xxxii. ...	2 ...	66
	4 ...	113
xxxiv. ...	10 ...	156, 176
	16 ...	71, 92
xxxv. ...	6 ...	66
	8 ...	201
xxxvi. ...	19 ...	43
xxxvii. ...	29 ...	208
	36 ...	212
	xli. ...	22 ... 117
	xlili. ...	11 ... 135
		13 ... 23
	xliv. ...	6 ... 135
		8 ... 135
	xlvi. ...	6 ... 135
		24 ... 45
	xlvii. ...	9 ... 123
		10 ... 34
		13 ... 17
	xlviii. ...	5 ... 45, 92
	xliv. ...	22 ... 73
		26 ... 54
		5 ... 28
	l. ...	6 ... 28
	li. ...	6 ... 84
		8 ... 148
		12 ... 101
		23 ... 121
	lii. ...	14 ... 15
	liii. ...	2 ... 159
	lv. ...	6 ... 141
		10 ... 47
	lvi. ...	2 ... 101

<i>Isaiah—(con.)</i>			<i>Jeremiah—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
lvi. ...	7 ...	73	xvi. ...	16 ...	138
lvii. ...	2 ...	148	xvii. ...	9 ...	129
	16 ...	138, 181	xviii. ...	9 ...	118
lix. ...	21 ...	58, 121		15 ...	37
lx. ...	11 ...	156		18 ...	80
	17 ...	73	xxii. ...	17 ...	118
lxi. ...	1 ...	17	xxiii. ...	14 ...	66
lxiii. ...	11 ...	211		29 ...	67
	15 ...	42	xxv. ...	5 ...	176
lxv. ...	25 ...	156	xxvi. ...	15 ...	181
			xxx. ...	2 ...	56
			xxxi. ...	32 ...	210
			xxxiii. ...	13 ...	24
			xxxiv. ...	9 ...	71
				10 ...	71
				11 ...	138, 139
			xxxvii. ...	4 ...	121
				15 ...	121
				18 ...	121
			xxxviii. ...	7 ...	69
			xl. ...	4 ...	117
				5 ...	141
			xlii. ...	18 ...	47
			xliv. ...	6 ...	47
			xlvi. ...	12 ...	87
			xlviii. ...	33 ...	45
			xlix. ...	6 ...	138
				9 ...	17
				18 ...	101
				24 ...	45
				33 ...	101
			l. ...	6 ...	37
				40 ...	101
			li. ...	43 ...	101

<i>JEREMIAH.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	10 ...	204
iv. ...	22 ...	37
v. ...	1 ...	204
	9 ...	123
	23 ...	37
	29 ...	123
vi. ...	7 ...	42, 45
	20 ...	50
vii. ...	7 ...	176
	16 ...	37
viii. ...	5 ...	37
ix. ...	9 ...	123
xi. ...	8 ...	144
	19 ...	80
xii. ...	4 ...	95
xiv. ...	9 ...	16
	11 ...	37
	18 ...	212
xv. ...	9 ...	141
xvi. ...	12 ...	144

*LAMENTATIONS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	9 ...	95
	12 ...	204
ii. ...	12 ...	42
	19 ...	72
iii. ...	38 ...	50
	47 ...	34
<i>EZEKIEL.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	11 ...	98
ii. ...	10 ...	42
iii. ...	5 ...	66, 68
	6 ...	66, 68
	15 ...	16
iv. ...	4 ...	99
	8 ...	99
vii. ...	2 ...	97
	15 ...	189
	16 ...	88
xiii. ...	11 ...	214
	15 ...	214
xiv. ...	16 ...	180
	18 ...	180
	20 ...	180
xvi. ...	5 ...	70
	13 ...	116
	40 ...	83
xx. ...	8 ...	144
	40 ...	88
xxi. ...	29 ...	141
xxii. ...	6 ...	143
xxix. ...	21 ...	67
xxx. ...	4 ...	30
	17 ...	105

*Ezekiel—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xxx. ...	18 ...	105
xxxii. ...	25 ...	105
	30 ...	105
xxxiii. ...	11 ...	170
	20 ...	143
xxxvii. ...	16 ...	99
	17 ...	99
xxxix. ...	12 ...	124
xli. ...	13 ...	105
xliii. ...	1 ...	138
	19 ...	106
xliv. ...	8 ...	73
	13 ...	73
	17 ...	141
xl. ...	11 ...	26, 67

*DANIEL.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	10 ...	159
	11 ...	131, 206
	20 ...	176
iii. ...	22 ...	116
	28 ...	206
iv. ...	10 ...	64
	14 ...	173
	15 ...	173
	19 ...	16, 157
	21 ...	189
	23 ...	67
	31 ...	141
v. ...	6 ...	97
	11 ...	35
	14 ...	35
vi. ...	5 ...	205

INDEX OF TEXTS.

xxxix.

<i>Daniel—(con.)</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vi. ...	10 ...	79
	11 ...	80
	15 ...	159
	23 ...	116
vii. ...	11 ...	80
	14 ...	45
	15 ...	81
	18 ...	176
	19 ...	116
viii. ...	5 ...	67
	13 ...	67
	27 ...	16
ix. ...	17 ...	54
	20 ...	141
	21 ...	141
x. ...	5 ...	189
	6 ...	189
	21 ...	142
xi. ...	25 ...	80
xii. ...	3 ...	176

<i>HOSEA.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vi. ...	11 ...	67
vii. ...	6 ...	141

<i>JOEL.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	13 ...	42
ii. ...	6 ...	28
	14 ...	204
iii. ...	3 ...	63

<i>AMOS.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii. ...	3 ...	205
vi. ...	2 ...	104
vii. ...	14 ...	67
ix. ...	1 ...	88
	2 ...	195
	3 ...	195
	4 ...	195

<i>OBADIAH.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	3 ...	191
	4 ...	190, 194
	16 ...	205

<i>JONAH.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	10 ...	116
iii. ...	8 ...	143
	9 ...	205

<i>MICAH.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	11 ...	170
iv. ...	3 ...	17
	5 ...	176
	13 ...	72
v. ...	7 ...	47
vii. ...	1 ...	17

<i>NAHUM.</i>		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	9 ...	70
	10 ...	28

*Nahum—(con.)*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii. ...	3 ...	70
	15 ...	17

*HABAKKUK.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iii. ...	10 ...	30

*ZEPHANIAH.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	10 ...	67
ii. ...	5 ...	71
iii. ...	6 ...	71

*HAGGAI.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ii. ...	16 ...	118
	19 ...	45

*ZECHARIAH.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	19 ...	106
iv. ...	4 ...	106
	5 ...	106
	11 ...	106
	12 ...	106
vii. ...	10 ...	167
viii. ...	17 ...	167
ix. ...	3 ...	17
	12 ...	170
x. ...	6 ...	205
	11 ...	85
xiii. ...	4 ...	27, 68

*MALACHI.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	13 ...	142
	14 ...	142
iii. ...	10 ...	17, 204

*MATTHEW.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xvi. ...	13 ...	100
xviii. ...	10 ...	49

*MARK.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii. ...	35 ...	113

*ACTS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
viii. ...	27 ...	69

*ROMANS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i. ...	22 ...	141
iv. ...	3 ...	142
xiii. ...	7 ...	74

*1 CORINTHIANS.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
iv. ...	6 ...	140
xiv. ...	8 ...	27

*REVELATION.*

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
xx. ...	13 ...	30

# ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY.

CONTENTS.—Bishop Lowth on the neglect of the study of English. Convocation's vote of thanks to the Revisers. The *Times*' sarcasm on the wording of the vote. Its grammatical errors. Singular and plural mixed. "Expended". Past infinitive for present. Inconsistency the chief characteristic of the Revisers' work. "Which" for "who". Tautology, "the weight in weight".

It is sad to relate that there is nothing new in the fact that Englishmen are often ignorant of English. A century ago it was said, "Is it not amazing that some, who have beyond doubt been very excellent Greek and Latin scholars, have written their mother tongue not only inelegantly, but even very ungrammatically?"—*Baker's Remarks on the English Language, Edition 1799, p. 84.*

Bishop Lowth, writing still earlier in the

last century, points out the source of this deficiency. He says, "A grammatical study of our own language makes no part of the ordinary method of instruction which we pass through in our childhood; and it is very seldom that we apply ourselves to it afterward. Yet the want of it will not be effectually supplied by any other advantages whatsoever. Much practice in the polite world, and a general acquaintance with the best authors, are good helps; but alone will hardly be sufficient: we have writers who have enjoyed these advantages in their full extent, and yet cannot be recommended as models of an accurate style. Much less then will what is commonly called Learning serve the purpose; that is, a critical knowledge of ancient languages, and much reading of ancient authors. The greatest critic and most able grammarian of the last age, when he came to apply his learning and his criticisms to an English author, was frequently at a loss in matters of ordinary use and common construction of his own vernacular idiom."—*Preface to*



‘*A Short Introduction to English Grammar*’, by *Dr. Lowth*, 1762.

More than one hundred and twenty years have passed since the foregoing was written, yet the lament over the neglect of the study of our language is as applicable to the present generation, as it was to the generation of our forefathers who lived in the days of Bishop Lowth.

This neglect must not be allowed to continue; but how is its continuance to be prevented? I know of no plan so likely to be effectual, as the public exposure of the errors of those persons whose innate delicacy of feeling will render them ashamed of their shortcomings, while their philanthropy will arouse in them the resolve that their influence shall thenceforth be exerted to secure, to the rising generation, freedom from the disgrace of having to blush for their ignorance of the laws governing their own language.

In a former work\* I exposed the errors and

\* ‘The Revisers’ English.’

inconsistencies found in the language of the Revised Version of the *New Testament*. I purpose now to expose the errors and inconsistencies found in the language of the Revised Version of the *Old Testament*, and shall show that they are as gross, as flagrant, and as numerous as are those in the *New*.

But the Revisers are not the only transgressors of the laws of our language. In the resolution which was passed by Convocation to thank the Revisers for their labours, there are errors which would disgrace a school-boy. Yet I have no doubt that the Members of Convocation are, to the present day, in happy ignorance of that fact, and if they chanced to read in our leading daily journal, as they might have done, that their resolution was "*carefully and wisely worded*", they happily failed to see the covert sarcasm of the remark, and smiled complacently at what they in their simplicity believed to be a well-deserved compliment!

It is a pity to awaken them from their dream of self-congratulation; for has it not been said,

and is it not generally believed, that

“Where ignorance is bliss,  
’Tis folly to be wise.”

Still, for the good of others, the dream, however pleasant, must be broken.

The resolution (quoted in *The Times* of May 16th, 1885, p. 11, last column) was as follows:—

“That this House presents its hearty thanks to the learned Revisers of the Authorised Version of the Old Testament for the unwearied labour and singular diligence which they have expended during many years in carrying out the weighty task intrusted to them by Convocation. They desire to express their great gratitude to Almighty God for permitting so important a work to have been executed at this time, and they pray that it may be blessed by Him to the increase of the knowledge of His Holy Word by His people.”

It will be observed that, in the first sentence

of this paragraph, the Members of Convocation speak of themselves collectively, and therefore with strict propriety they employ the singular number and say,

“ *This House presents its hearty thanks to the learned Revisers* ”.

This form, having been adopted at the beginning of the paragraph, should have been continued throughout, and not have been changed into the plural, as it has been in the second sentence, where we read,

“ *They desire to express their great gratitude* ”.

The change is the more objectionable because it is momentarily misleading, seeing that the pronoun “ *they* ”, which really refers to the Members of Convocation, does of course grammatically refer to the plural pronoun just preceding it, namely “ *them* ”, i.e., to the “ *Revisers* ”, and not to “ *Convocation* ”, because that term, being used collectively, as I have already remarked, is in the singular number.

The first sentence of the paragraph, then, should have been continued thus :—

“ *This House presents its hearty thanks . . . . .  
and desires to express its great gratitude*”.

A second error in the sentence consists in employing the word “*expended*” to describe the rendering of the services of the Revisers. To “*expend*” means to weigh out, the word being derived from the Latin “*ex*”, out, and “*pendo*”, to weigh; and it implies a certain carefulness of bestowal which is not applicable to the generous manner in which those services were given. But even had it been applicable, its use there could not be designated felicitous, seeing that the word “*weighty*” almost immediately follows it.

But that is not all, another error occurs in the concluding sentence of this short paragraph, viz., the using of the present participle and past infinitive, instead of the past participle and present infinitive. The passage reads thus :—

“They desire to express their great gratitude to Almighty God for *permitting* so important a work to *have been* executed at this time”,

which is equivalent to saying,

“They desire to express their great gratitude to Almighty God for [*now*] *permitting* so important a work to *have been* executed [*in the past*] at this time”!

They should have said,

“for *having permitted* so important a work to *be* executed at this time,”

or, better still,

“for having permitted the accomplishment of so important a work.”

That the Revisers themselves would probably have avoided this error, might be inferred from their having corrected a similar one in Deut. xix. 19, where, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“Then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to *have done* unto his brother.”

In the Revised Version it is,

“Then shall ye do unto him, as he had thought  
*to do* unto his brother.”

Again, in Job xxx. 1, a similar error has been corrected by the Revisers. In the Authorised Version we read,

“But now they that are younger than I have  
me in derision, whose fathers I would  
have disdained *to have set* with the dogs  
of my flock.”

In the Revised Version it is,

“Whose fathers I disdained *to set* with the  
dogs of my flock.”

Had the Revisers shown the same grammatical acumen throughout their work, as they have shown in these instances, there would have been no necessity for these criticisms. But, unfortunately, *the chief characteristic of the Revisers' work is its inconsistency.* Oftentimes the very error which the Revisers correct in one place, they themselves fall into in another; and not infrequently they render ungrammatical

a construction which if left unaltered would have remained correct.

Turn now to 2 Sam. xxi. 16, and there you will find a perpetuation of the error which the Revisers had corrected in Deuteronomy and Job. The passage is,

“He being girded with a new sword, thought  
to have slain David.”

But surely what he “*thought*” was not “to have slain David”, but to slay him.

I remark, in passing, that there are four errors in that one verse. It reads as follows,

“And Ishbi-benob, which [*who*] was of the sons of the giant, the weight of whose spear was three hundred shekels of brass in weight, [*the weight of it was so much in weight!*] he [*this pronoun is redundant, Ishbi-benob being the nominative to the verb*] being girded with a new sword, thought to have slain [*to slay*] David.”

As the *Edinburgh Review* of October, 1885, p. 476, remarked, “There is something ludicrously self-contradictory in a Revised Version



which revises itself without yet being revised; which was intended to make everything clear, and only makes it clear that what is most important is quite dark."

That the Revisers knew what was required of them is evidenced by the Paper read by the Bishop of Bath and Wells at the Church Congress held at Portsmouth in the autumn of last year. See *The Times'* report, October 7th, 1885. The Bishop's words were, "That task, let me repeat it, was to represent *in good English*, as exactly as we could, the meaning of Holy Scripture." \* \* \* "Our responsibility was confined to expressing *in good English* the natural meaning of the Hebrew words."

Specimens of the Revisers' "*good English*," or what they considered to be such, will be found in the following pages.

## CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS.—The German revision of Luther's Bible.

Orthographical errors; 'stories', for 'storeys'; 'build-ed', and 'built'; 'dwelled', and 'dwelt'; 'drave', and 'drove'; 'afore', and 'before'; 'astonied', and 'astonished'; 'aught', and 'ought'; 'naught', and 'nought'; 'strong hold', and 'stronghold'; 'a theist', and 'atheist'; compound words, 'firstripe', 'store-house', 'brokenhearted', 'stargazers', 'cankerworm', 'pruninghooks', 'grapegatherers'; 'rams' skins', and 'sealskins'; 'deceased', for 'dead'; 'apparelled', for 'clothed'; 'augmenteth', for 'increaseth'; 'stab-lished', and 'established'; 'minished', and 'dimin-ished'; 'prevent', and 'let', their double meanings; 'tell', to count; 'hardly', its two meanings; 'omer', and 'homer'; 'strewed', 'strawed', and 'strowed'; 'an hairy man', and 'a hairy man'; 'an hairy gar-ment', and 'a hairy mantle'; 'chiefest', and 'higher than the highest'; 'stole', and 'stole away'; 'take'; 'gathered'; 'wax pale', and 'gather blackness'; the oneness of colour, Darwinism, the gender of earth and of sea, the myth of Hermaphroditos; 'handmaids'; 'annul', and 'disannul'; 'loose', and 'unloose'.

The Germans are now engaged in revising Luther's Bible, and have issued what they call a *Probe-bibel*, or a tentative revision of the Scrip-

tures. They have adjourned for two years; at the end of which time they will meet again to re-examine their work in the light of the abundant criticisms which they have invited from the press.

This is the course of action which eleven years ago (see *The Times* of May 22nd, 1875) I suggested to the English Revisers; but, for reasons best known to themselves, they ignored the suggestion. The public, however, will not accept as final any revision which leaves in the Bible such errors and inconsistencies as those which I shall expose.

Let us begin with orthography and etymology, and afterwards take up syntax.

We read, in Gen. vi. 16, of there having been "*stories*" in the ark; a spelling which might, to some minds, suggest the idea that Noah and his family had provided themselves with a little light literature for rainy days.

Modern usage discriminates between "*story*", a tale, and "*storey*", the flat of a building, by spelling the latter with an *e* before the *y*; and

words so spelt make their plural by the addition of an *s* to the singular—*storey, storeys*; and not by changing the *ey* into *ies*; that form of the plural appertains to only those words which end in *y* immediately preceded by a consonant.

“*Story*”, a tale, from the Gr. *ιστορία*, a history, was formerly spelt “*storie*”; see ‘*Manipulus Vocabulorum*’, by Peter Levins, 1570; and the plural of that spelling would be what the plural of *story* is, namely *stories*, which is the spelling adopted by the Revisers in speaking of the floors or stages in the ark. They should, of course, have written *storeys*.

I am aware that the word is written “*stories*” in the Authorised Version; but what was the object of the revision in regard to archaisms? Was it not to remove those which might lead to misunderstanding?

There are many inconsistencies in the Revisers’ spelling. For instance, they say that Noah “*builded*” an altar, Gen. viii. 20; and that Abram “*built*” an altar, Gen. xiii. 18;

and that Solomon both "*builded*" and "*built*" the house of the Lord, 2 Chron. vi. 18 and 33.

This latter inconsistency is entirely the Revisers' own invention; it is not found in the corresponding passages in the Authorised Version.

Again, why do the Revisers say that Lot "*dwelled*" in the cities of the plain, Gen. xiii. 12, and say, that Abram "*dwelt*" by the oaks of Mamre, Gen. xiii. 18?

Why have we to read that the Israelites "*drave*" not out the Canaanites, Josh. xvi. 10; but "*drove*" out the Amorites, Num. xxi. 32; and "*drave*" out the three sons of Anak, Judges i. 20?

Why have we, "*afore*" in 2 Kings xx. 4; and "*before*", with the same signification, in the verse immediately preceding it, 2 Kings xx. 3?

Why have we, in the Revised Version, sometimes the word "*astonied*", and sometimes "*astonished*"? And if it is a matter of indifference which we have, why did the Revisers alter "*astonished*" to "*astonied*" in Isa. lii. 14;

Jer. xiv. 9; and Ezk. iii. 15; and leave the word unaltered in a dozen other passages?

Reference to Dan. iv. 19, and viii. 27, will show that Daniel was both "*astonied*" and "*astonished*"; and so must those persons be who study the English of the Revisers.

Very properly, the Revisers have, in every instance, spelt the noun "*aught*" with an *a*; but, very improperly, they have spelt its negative, "*naught*", with an *o*; except in 2 Kings ii. 19 and Prov. xx. 14.

Why the Revisers made exceptions of those passages, and of those only, we have yet to learn.

"*Aught*" means "*anything*"; and its negative is "*naught*", "*nothing*".

"*Ought*" means "*owe*", of which it is the old preterite and past participle, and implies obligation; its negative would be "*nought*"; but we have no such word, though we have what looks like the adjective derived from it, "*naughty*", and if so, it should, in strictness, be spelt "*noughty*"; the meaning being "*not-ought-y*"; i.e., not in accordance with obligation or duty.

While speaking of the proper spelling of words, let me ask the Revisers why they have made two distinct words of the compound word "*stronghold*", and said in Zech. ix. 3,

"Tyre did build herself a *strong hold*."

There is a right use of each form, which may be illustrated thus,

"He had a *stronghold* on the sea-coast; and his native land had a *strong hold* on his affections."

These forms are not interchangeable. Would the Revisers write "*a theist*" for "*atheist*"?

If the Revisers did not act from caprice in repeatedly making two distinct words of the one word "*stronghold*", why did they single out that word for division, and leave as compounds the words "*firstripe*", Micah vii. 1; "*storehouse*", Mal. iii. 10; "*brokenhearted*", Isa. lxi. 1; "*stargazers*", Isa. xlvi. 13; "*cankerworm*", Nah. iii. 15; "*pruninghooks*", Micah iv. 3; "*grapegatherers*", Jer. xlix. 9, &c.? Why have they written "*rams' skins*" as two words;

and, in the very same verse, "*sealskins*" as one word? See Ex. xxxv. 23. It is not so in the Authorised Version.

The Revisers have, in general, wisely refrained from altering the character of the language of the Authorised Version; but here and there we find a few Latinisms introduced; fortunately they are but few, for they contrast very unfavourably with the simple Saxon words which they supplant.

For instance, in Psa. lxxxviii. 10, instead of

"Shall *the dead* arise and praise thee?"

we have now,

"Shall *they that are deceased* arise and praise thee?"

In Psa. xciii. 1, instead of

"The Lord reigneth; He is *clothed* with majesty",

we have now,

"The Lord reigneth; He is *apparelled* with majesty",



and yet, in Psa. civ. 1, we have,

“Thou art *clothed* with honour and majesty.”

Surely, if the grander word “*apparelled*” is more needed in one passage than in the other, it is in the latter, where the Almighty is spoken of as being clothed “with honour” as well as with majesty.

Again, in Prov. xxviii. 8, instead of

“He that *increaseth* his substance”,

we have now,

“He that *augmenteth* his substance”;

both Latinisms, but the latter the more unusual, and therefore the less simple of the two. But why have the Revisers changed the word at all? Is not “*increase*” to augment? and is not “*augment*” to increase?

In Psa. xciii. 1, 2, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“The world also is *established*. . . . thy throne is *established*”;

but, in the Revised Version, the former of

these (and why the former, rather than the latter, or why either of them, it is impossible even to guess) is changed to “*stablished*”; so that now, in two consecutive verses, we read that the world is “*stablished*”, and God’s throne is “*established*”.

What, I ask, is the supposed difference in the meaning of the two words, that the Revisers thought it needful to substitute one for the other in one instance? I know of none: “*stablished*” is from the L. “*stabilio*”; and “*established*” is from the same root through the old French “*establi*”.

Another question which we may ask, but ask in vain, is, Why have the Revisers written, in verse 8 of Ex. v.,

“Ye shall not *diminish* aught”;

and, in verse 19 of the same chapter,

“Ye shall not *minish* aught”;

the reference in each passage being to the same transaction?

The meaning of words changes with the

lapse of time. The word "*prevent*" now means to obstruct; but, formerly, it had no such meaning. It is from the L. *prævenio*, to precede; and in that sense is used in the Church prayer,

"*Prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings";

a rather strange prayer to be offered up to God by those persons who know only the modern signification of the word. The Revisers have altered it in Psa. lxxxviii. 13. In the Authorised Version it is,

"In the morning shall my prayer *prevent* thee."

In the Revised Version it is,

"In the morning shall my prayer *come before* thee."

But why do we read, in the Revised Version, Psa. cxix. 147,

"I *prevented* the dawning of the morning, and cried."?

"How is it possible to *prevent* the dawning

of the morning?" an uneducated man might ask. The Psalmist's meaning was, evidently, that his cry, or prayer, *preceded* the dawn. Why did not the Revisers make that meaning plain?

The Revisers speak of Jezebel's head being "*tired*", see 2 Kings ix. 30; they meant "*attired*", but the word which they have used sounds very like a joke, and reminds me of the reply which a coachman made to a passenger who had remarked to him that the horses seemed tired, "Yes, Sir", said he, "they are tired, *and so are the wheels.*"

Another word which has now a meaning different from that which it had, is "*let*"; or rather, I should say, that of the two words "*let*", which formerly were in use—the one from the Saxon "*lætan*", to loose, to let go, to allow; and the other from the Saxon "*lettan*", to hinder,—only the former has continued to the present day. The other, though in common use in Shakspeare's time, would not be recognized in the English of the nineteenth

century; and were we to read in any modern composition,

“I’ll make a ghost of him that *lets* me”;

*Hamlet, Act 1, Scene iv.*

we should naturally understand the writer to mean that the speaker would make a ghost of him that *allowed* him to do so; whereas Hamlet’s words meant that he would make a ghost of him that *hindered* him. This is shown by the words immediately preceding;—

“Unhand me, gentlemen!”

All this is perfectly familiar to the Revisers, yet they have left unaltered Isa. xliii. 13, where the word “*let*” means “*hinder*”; the passage reads as follows,

“I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand: I will work, and who shall *let* it?”

It should be,

“I will work; and who shall *hinder* it?”

Another word which might with advantage have been changed, is the verb to “*tell*”, in

the sense of to “*count*”. That meaning of the word is obsolete; yet it has been left, in Jer. xxxiii. 13, thus,

“In the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, shall the flocks again pass under the hands of him that *telleth* them.”

The word has been left in Psa. lvi. 8, also,

“Thou ‘*tellest*’ my wanderings;”

and in Psa. cxlvii. 4,

“He *telleth* the number of the stars;”

likewise in 1 Kings viii. 5,

“Sheep and oxen, that could not be *told* nor numbered for multitude.”

But in 2 Kings xii. 11, the Revisers have altered the word, and thereby have rendered the passage intelligible to all. In the Authorised Version it is,

“And they gave the money, being *told*, into the hands of them that did the work.”

In the Revised Version it is,

“And they gave the money that was *weighed out* into the hands of them that did the work.”

But why did the Revisers limit the alteration to this one solitary passage?

Great care is needed in using any word that has two meanings, lest it should be understood in a sense different from that which was intended.

The word "*hardly*" is such a one; and its two meanings are almost the opposites of each other. It means "*severely*", and it means also "*scarcely*".

In Job xix. 3, of the Revised Version, we read,

"Ye are not ashamed that ye deal *hardly* with me."

Here, probably, the word means "*severely*"; but in the Authorised Version we read,

"Ye are not ashamed that ye make yourselves strange to me";

in other words, "that ye *hardly* deal with me".

It is remarkable that these two renderings embody the two meanings of the word.—

"Ye deal *hardly* [*severely*] with me."

"Ye *hardly* [*scarcely*] deal with me."

Ought we to say “*an omer*”, “*a homer*”, or “*an homer*”? The Revisers give us the choice of all three. The first occurs in Ex. xvi. 16; the second in Isa. v. 10; and the third in Ezk. xlv. 11.

Should we say “*strewed*”, “*strawed*”, or “*strowed*”? The Authorised Version has “*strawed*” in Ex. xxxii, 20; this the Revisers have altered to “*strewed*”; yet in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 4, have written “*strowed*”.

The anomalous character of the Revisers’ work is its most striking feature, and will constitute the chief subject of remark in these criticisms. There appears to have been no comprehensive supervision of the Revisers’ labours, having for its object the consistency and homogeneousness of the whole. Not infrequently the teaching of a judicious alteration correcting an error in one place is rendered nugatory by an alteration in exactly the opposite direction elsewhere; so that a student cannot possibly determine, from the work before him, which is right, and which is wrong.



Should we speak of “*an hairy man*”, or “*a hairy man*”? The former expression is found in 2 Kings i. 8; the latter in Gen. xxvii. 11; and if we should say “*a hairy man*”, why “*an hairy garment*”, Gen. xxv. 25? and if “*an hairy garment*”, why “*a hairy mantle*”, Zech. xiii. 4?

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle? 1 Cor. xiv. 8., and if the Revisers show that they did not know their own minds, who can have confidence in their judgment?

There are many minor errors which I gladly pass over; but I must speak of the Revisers' persistent use of the word “*chiefest*”: see 1 Sam. ii. 29; ix. 22; xxi. 7; and Cant. v. 10; a fourfold repetition of a word that conveys an untruth! It affirms that the chief is not chief; in fact, that there is a “higher than the highest”; and yet—will it be believed?—the Revisers, with their usual inconsistency, have corrected that very error in Eccl. v. 8.

It is not in good taste, to say the least of it,

to insert in the Bible such plays upon words as the following appear to be.

“Rachel *stole* the teraphim that were her father’s. And Jacob *stole away*.” Gen. xxxi. 19, 20.

“*Take*, I pray thee, my gift, . . . and he *took* it. And he said, Let us *take* our journey.” Gen. xxxiii. 11, 12.

“He *gathered* up his feet into the bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was *gathered* unto his people.” Gen. xlix. 33.

“I was not rebellious, neither turned away *backward*. I gave my *back* to the smiters.” Isa. l. 5, 6.

Neither is it in good taste to speak of faces “*waxing*” pale, seeing that the word “*wax*” has two meanings.

By-the-bye, that reminds me of two of the strangest alterations to be found in the Revised Version of the Old Testament. See Joel ii. 6; and Nahum ii. 10. In the Authorised Version we read,

“All faces shall *gather blackness*.”

In the Revised Version it is

“All faces are *waxed pale*.”

Is black, then, really white? and is it true that colour has no existence? I am aware that this has long been the theory of physicists; and now it seems to have the sanction of the most eminent divines; but I must say that their way of recording their sanction is rather droll. However, the fact that they do hold the belief of the oneness of all colour receives confirmation from their rendering of Ex. xxxv. 23, where they say,

“And every man, with whom *was* found blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats’ hair, and rams’ skins dyed red, and sealskins, brought them.”

But surely this theory of “*oneness*”, based on the fact that the verb is in the singular, proves too much; and yet, I do not know that it does; for it may be that the Revisers intended to indicate their approval of the Darwinian doctrine of the original oneness of all animals also; for here we have goats, rams, and seals;

and the verb referring to them, as well as to the colours, is in the singular.

The investigation of the Revisers' language is certainly fraught with much interest; and the careful student of it will meet with many surprises; as, for instance, when he reads, in Gen. iv. 12, that the earth is both neuter and feminine. But the most astounding surprise will be that which he will experience when he regards collectively Ezk. xxxi. 4, Hab. iii. 10, and Rev. xx. 13.

Talk of the Greek myth of Hermaphroditos! That is far surpassed by the Revisers' account of the mighty deep, which, they tell us, is at once feminine, masculine, and neuter.

Moreover, here is a mysterious affair, Bilhah and Zilpah still were maids though they had each borne Jacob two sons; at least, so the learned Revisers say. See Gen. xxxii. 22, where the expression "women-servants" has deliberately been altered to "handmaids".

Why do the Revisers use the word "*disannul*"? The preferable word is "*annul*",

which means to reduce to nothing, to make void or of no effect. "*Disannul*" appears to mean its very opposite, and therefore is misleading, when the Revisers use it in the sense of "*annul*". See Job xl. 8 ;

"Wilt thou even *disannul* my judgment?"

In Isa. also, xiv. 27, we read,

"The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall *disannul* it?"

Again, in Isa. xxviii. 18, we read,

"Your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*, and your agreement with hell shall not stand."

A similar incongruity in our language exists with regard to the word "*unloose*". If to "*loose*" means to liberate, does to "*unloose*" mean to make fast? The word is not in the Bible, neither should "*disannul*" be found there.

## CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS.—Verbs, violation of the rules governing them; knowledge and wisdom, their difference; ‘people’, singular and plural; ‘multitude’, singular and plural; ‘persons’; ‘peoples’; ‘kings’, singular, and ‘gods’, plural; ‘flesh and heart’, singular, and ‘heart and flesh’, plural; sequence of events governs the order of their relation; ‘lightning and thunder’, not ‘thunder and lightning’; angels ‘descending and ascending’, not ‘ascending and descending’.

Having briefly glanced at the Revisers’ errors in orthography and etymology, let us now look at their syntax; and knowing that in every sentence the verb is, as its name implies, *the word, par excellence*, we will begin with that.

The first rule respecting it, is that it shall agree with its nominative. The Revisers, however, treat with lofty disdain all rules of grammar; and yet, occasionally, they seem to have had a twinge of conscience concerning

their violations of some of them, and a consciousness of the offence likely to be given by such a course; for here and there we see evidence of their having “trimmed their way to seek love”, by altering a passage to make it in accordance with what, I suppose, they call popular prejudice.

Some years ago I read, before the Royal Society of Literature, a Paper entitled “*Common Errors in Speaking and Writing*”; and in it I called attention to certain violations of grammar occurring in the Authorised Version of the Scriptures. A copy of the Paper was sent to the Revisers; and they have corrected some of the errors which I pointed out. For instance, in Ex. ix. 31, the Authorised Version reads,

“The flax and the barley *was* smitten.”

I stated that this is equivalent to saying “*they was*”. The Revisers, very properly, have altered it to,

“The flax and the barley *were* smitten.”

Again, in Lam. iii. 47, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“Fear and a snare *is* come upon us”.

This the Revisers have altered to,

“Fear and the pit *are* come upon us”.

Though what they mean by “*the pit*” coming upon us, I cannot imagine.

See also Prov. i. 27. The Authorised Version has,

“When distress and anguish *cometh* upon you.”

In the Revised Version it has been corrected thus,

“When distress and anguish *come* upon you.”

Why, then, after altering the verb to agree with its nominative in the foregoing passages, have the Revisers left uncorrected such errors as the following?

“Wisdom and knowledge *is* granted unto thee.” 2 Chron. i. 12.

“Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, *it hath* perverted thee.” Isa. xlvi. 10.



Do the Revisers hold that wisdom and knowledge are one? Let the poet Cowper explain to them the difference:—

“Knowledge and wisdom, far from being one,  
Have ofttimes no connection; knowledge  
dwells  
In heads replete with thoughts of other men,  
Wisdom, in minds attentive to their own.”

Perhaps the Revisers consider wisdom as nothing, and therefore have taken no account of it; for I see that elsewhere when mention is made of it in conjunction with a noun other than knowledge, they still put the verb in the singular; e.g.,

“Thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the  
fame which I heard.” 1 Kings x. 7.

See likewise Dan. v. 11,

“Understanding and wisdom *was* found in  
him.”

and Dan. v. 14,

“Understanding and excellent wisdom *is*  
found in thee.”

The same singularity occurs in Job. xii. 13,

“ With him *is* wisdom and might.”

This apparent ignoring of the existence of wisdom is much to be regretted. The Revisers would have found a little more of it very useful to them.

Sometimes the Revisers, in their uncertainty as to which is right, give both singular and plural verbs to the same nominative in the same verse. This plan has at least one advantage—it ensures that the Revisers shall for once be right, though with the disadvantage that they shall also once be wrong.

In Gen. xli. 48, we are told that,

“ Joseph gathered up all *the food* of the seven years *which were* in the land of Egypt, and laid up the food in the cities: *the food* of the field, *which was* round about every city, laid he up in the same.”

Perhaps the Revisers meant

“ the food (of *the field which was* round about every city) laid he up in the same ”;

but the passage really means,

“*the food of the field* (which was round about every city) laid he up in the same.”

The Revisers' error is in the earlier part of the verse. They ought not to have said,

“*the food* . . . which *were* in Egypt.”

See also Isa. viii. 6,

“Forasmuch as this people *hath* refused the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and *rejoice* in Rezin and Remaliah's son.”

Is “*people*” singular, or plural, in this verse? If singular, “*rejoice*” is wrong; if plural, “*hath*” is wrong.

The same confusion of singular and plural with regard to “*people*” occurs in Jer. iv. 22; v. 23; vii. 16; viii. 5; xiv. 11; xviii. 15; l. 6; and elsewhere.

In Judges ix. 33, we read of

“The people that *is*”;

and, in the very next verse, this singular people is made plural, and we read of

“The people that *were*”.—Judges ix. 34.

The word "*people*" seems to have sorely troubled the Revisers; evidently they did not know what to do with it. In Num. xiii. 18, we read,

"See the land, what it is; and the people that *dwelleth* therein, whether *they* be strong or weak."

But, in verse 28 of the same chapter, it is no longer,

"the people that *dwelleth*";

but,

"the people that *dwel*".

Yet, in each instance, the word "*people*" refers to the same inhabitants, the possessors of the land of Canaan.

See likewise Isa. ix. 13,

"The people *hath* not turned unto him that smote *them*, neither *have they* sought the Lord of hosts."

I cannot but express my surprise at the Revisers' persistent inconsistency. They carefully altered, twice over, the phrase

"all the people that *was*",

(see Ex. xix. 16; and 2 Sam. xv. 30;) to

“all the people that *were*”;

and yet in 2 Chron. xxxii. 7, they leave the phrase

“all the multitude that *is*”.

The Revisers cannot plead that they were bound by the Hebrew verb; for the verb is not expressed in the Hebrew. In Lev. viii. 4, we have

“The congregation *was* assembled”.

But in Num. xvi. 3, “congregation” is plural,

“All the congregation *are* holy.”

By way of contrast to 2 Chron. xxxii. 7, the Revisers give us, in Isa. v. 13,

“their multitude *are*”.

In Job xxxvi. 20, the Revisers have altered “*people*” to “*peoples*”; but I think that there, “*persons*” would have been a better rendering. In ordinary parlance, the word “*people*” is

often misused for "*persons*"; e.g., we hear it said,

"There were three *people* present."

The error here will be apparent if you ask yourself what the result would be if two of those "*people*" were to leave. Would there be *one people* present? The passage in Job is as follows :

"Desire not the night,

When peoples [*persons*] are cut off in their place."

The Revisers' alteration of "*people*" to "*peoples*" is in most instances judicious; and I think it would have been as well to make that alteration in 1 Kings x. 15 also. The passage there is,

"All the kings of the mingled *people*".

Surely, as there were "*kings*", it should have been "*peoples*".

I have said that in the Hebrew of 2 Chron. xxxii. 7, the verb is not expressed; nor is it in any of the following score of passages. There-

fore the blame of putting the verb in the singular while the nominative to it is in the plural, in these several passages, rests entirely on the Revisers.

“Thy going out and thy coming in with me in the host *is* good.” 1 Sam. xxix. 6.

“Thy silver and thy gold *is* mine ; thy wives also and thy children, . . . *are* mine.” 1 Kings xx. 3.

“With them *was* Jozabad the son of Jeshua, and Noadiah the son of Binnui.” Ezra viii. 33.

“His power and his wrath *is* against all them that forsake him.” Ezra viii. 22.

“My petition and my request *is*”. Esther v. 7.

“With him *is* strength and effectual working; The deceived and the deceiver *are* his.” Job xii. 16.

“With God *is* my salvation and my glory.” Psa. lxii. 7.

“The inward thought of every one, and the heart, *is* deep.” Psa. lxiv. 6.

“There *is* no breaking in, and no going forth.” Psa. cxliv. 14.

- “There *is* precious treasure and oil.” Prov. xxi. 20.
- “Before me continually *is* sickness and wounds.” Jer. vi. 7.
- “Where *is* corn and wine?” Lam. ii. 12.
- “There *was* written therein lamentations, and mourning, and woe.” Ezk. ii. 10.
- “The meal offering and the drink offering *is* withholden.” Joel i. 13.
- “Unto the Lord thy God *belongeth* the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, the earth, with all that therein is.” Deut. x. 14.
- “Thine, O Lord, *is* the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty.” 1 Chron. xxix. 11.

In the following passage we have “*is*” for “*are*”, and “*are*” for “*is*”;

- “Where *is* thy zeal and thy mighty acts? *the yearning* of thy bowels and thy compassions *are* restrained toward me.” Isa. lxiii. 15.
- “Where *is* the king of Hamath, and the king of Arpad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivvah?” 2 Kings xix. 13.



Read 2 Kings xviii. 34 ; and Isa. xxxvi. 19 ; there we have,

“Where *are* the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad ? Where *are* the gods of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivvah ?”

Why are “*kings*” singular, and “*gods*” plural ?

“There *is* tidings in his mouth.” 2 Sam. xviii. 25.

Compare this with Ex. xxxiii. 4 ; there the word “*tidings*” is plural ;

“*These* evil tidings.”

Again,

“Out of his mouth *cometh* knowledge and understanding.” Prov. ii. 6.

In the previous chapter, Prov. i. 27, we have,

“When distress and anguish *come* upon you” ;

but, in the Authorised Version, it is “*cometh*”. Why did the Revisers correct the latter, and leave the former uncorrected ?

“My flesh and my heart *faileth*.” Psa. lxxiii. 26.

Why did the Revisers leave this error, yet correct a parallel one in Psa. lxxxiv. 2? There, in the Authorised Version, it is

“ My heart and my flesh *crieth* out for the living God ” ;

but, in the Revised Version, it has been corrected to,

“ My heart and my flesh *cry* out ” .

In Prov. v. 11, also, we have,

“ Thy flesh and thy body *are* consumed ” ;

therefore, their leaving uncorrected the passage in Psa. lxxiii. 26, is the more inexcusable.

There are, in the Revised Version, many other passages where the verb does not agree with its nominative. I will give a few of them.

“ There *was* hail, and fire mingled with the hail.” Ex. ix, 24.

“ Thy silver and thy gold *is* multiplied.” Deut. viii. 13.

“ Ahaz took the silver and gold that *was* found.” 2 Kings xvi. 8.

“On the fourth day *was* the silver and the gold and the vessels weighed.” Ezra viii. 33.

“Even as the gazelle and the hart *is* eaten.” Deut. xii. 22.

“Only in the Lord, shall one say unto me, *is* righteousness and strength.” Isa. xlv. 24.

“This one and that one *was* born in her.” Psa. lxxxvii. 5.

“Violence and spoil *is* heard in her.” Jer. vi. 7.

“His right hand, and his holy arm, *hath* wrought salvation.” Psa. xcvi. 1.

“My graven image, and my molten image, *hath* commanded them.” Isa. xlvi. 5.

“The vine, and the fig tree, and the pomegranate, and the olive tree *hath* not brought forth.” Hag. ii. 19.

“There *was* given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,” Dan. vii. 14.

“Gladness and joy *is* taken away.”—Jer. xlviii. 33.

Why are “*gladness and joy*” singular, and “*anguish and sorrows*” plural, as they are in the following chapter, Jer. xlix. 24? Will the

Revisers say that the verb is governed by the noun nearest to it, and that “*joy*” is singular, and “*sorrows*” plural, and therefore the verbs are respectively singular and plural? That is plausible, but not logical. The nominative to the singular verb is not “*joy*”, but “*gladness and joy*”; therefore the verb should be plural, to agree with its nominative.

Besides, if the verb is governed by the noun immediately preceding it, why did the Revisers write, in Job xv. 21,

“A sound of *terrors* is in his ears”?

They knew very well that the nominative to the verb is “*sound*”, and not “*terrors*”; and that therefore the verb had to be in the singular. See, likewise, Job xxi. 21,

“The number of his *months* is cut off.”

Here the nominative to the verb is “*number*”, and not “*months*”; and therefore here also the verb had to be in the singular. Again,

“The rain *cometh* down and the snow from heaven, and *returneth* not thither, but

watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower." Isa. lv. 10.

It would be grammatically correct to write thus of either the rain *or* the snow; but it is not allowable to write thus of the rain *and* the snow.

"The remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many peoples as dew from the Lord, as showers upon the grass; that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men." Micah v. 7.

Here "tarrieth", being singular, seems to refer to "*grass*", and therefore is misleading, because it really refers to "*showers*"; and that being plural, the verbs "*tarrieth*" and "*waiteth*" also ought to have been plural, to agree with it.

"Mine anger and my fury *hath* been poured forth." Jer. xlii. 18.

"My fury and mine anger *was* poured forth, and *was* kindled." Jer. xliv. 6.

Not only is the verb wrong here, but the sequence of events is wrong: the kindling must

have preceded the pouring forth, and therefore should have been mentioned first. Events should be recorded in the order of their occurrence.

For this reason we ought not to speak of “*thunder and lightning*”, but of “*lightning and thunder*”—the cause first, the effect afterwards. The Revisers have erred in this matter also, see Ex. xx. 18,

“And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the voice of the trumpet.”

How they “*saw*” the “*thunderings*” and the “*voice*”, I cannot conceive; there is evidently some mistranslation here.

I suppose that the reason why the thunder is generally spoken of before the lightning, is that it is the more impressive of the two. Indeed, by ignorant persons, it is often thought to be the cause of the damage that is really done by the lightning. I remember once, when on a walking tour in Normandy, speaking to a poor old man respecting a tree that had been struck

by the lightning. But the old man could not agree with me that it was the lightning which had caused the destruction: "*Mais non, Monsieur; c'était le tonnerre,*" were his words.

Another instance of the Revisers' non-observance of the order of sequence is found in Gen. xxviii. 12, where we read,

"And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God *ascending* and *descending* on it."

As the angels' abode is in heaven (Matt. xviii. 10) they must have *descended*, before they could *ascend*. However, it was a dream; and events are often strangely transposed in dreams.

Let us return to the consideration of the Revisers' errors with respect to verbs. The Revisers may say that, in some of the passages which I have quoted, the verb has been put in the singular because although there are in the nominative two nouns joined by the conjunction "*and*", the two really are one; e.g., "*fury*" and "*anger*"; "*rain*" and "*snow*", which is

rain in another form. But will the Revisers call "*evil*" and "*good*" one? Surely not; yet, in Lam. iii. 38, we read,

"Out of the mouth of the Most High cometh there not evil and good?"

Again, in Jer. vi. 20, we read,

"To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country?"

Compare this with Prov. xxvii. 9; there we read,

"Ointment and perfume *rejoice* the heart."

How is it that the Revisers consider "*ointment and perfume*" plural, and "*frankincense and sweet cane*" singular?

In 2 Kings xxv. 5, we are told that

"The army of the Chaldeans pursued after the king, and overtook him in the plains of Jericho; and all his army *was* scattered from him";

but in verse 10 of the same chapter we are told that

"All the army of the Chaldeans, that *were*



with the captain of the guard, brake down the walls of Jerusalem".—2 Kings xxv. 10.

Now, in the name of common sense, I ask why the Revisers have made "*all the army*" of the Jews singular; and, in the same chapter, "*all the army*" of the Chaldeans plural?

This inconsistency does not exist in the Authorised Version; there both verbs are plural. Why did the Revisers create this anomaly?

I am afraid that I ask in vain: their inconsistency baffles all conjecture as to its cause, and its object.

## CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS.—Perspicuity; ‘harlots unto the king’; men ‘oppressed with their own flesh’; order of words in a sentence; errors of omission, virtually errors of commission; ‘in her tongue’ (i.e. ‘in her speech’), erroneously altered to ‘on her tongue.’

By way of varying our study of the English of the Revisers, let us for a while turn from their errors in grammar, and look at their arrangement of the sequence of their words; a matter which we slightly glanced at in the previous chapter.

Perspicuity, which is of primary importance in literary composition, depends very greatly on this. Indeed the collocation of the words may be said to govern the meaning.

In 1 Kings iii. 16, we read,

“Then came there two women, that were harlots, unto the king, and stood before him.”

Do the Revisers mean that in Solomon's days there were women who held the appointment of "*harlots, unto the king*"? It cannot be! Why, then, did not the Revisers, by arranging the sequence of their words as follows, guard against the suggesting of such a thought?

“Then came there, unto the king, two women that were harlots.”

In 2 Chron. xxviii. 6, we read,

“Pekah the son of Remaliah slew in Judah an hundred and twenty thousand in one day, all of them valiant men; because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers.”

Here, again, the sequence of the words is bad; for it might lead to the inference that the hundred and twenty thousand were “all valiant men because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers.”

A very slight transposition and change of the words was needed, to avoid this error. The Revisers should have said,

“Pekah the son of Remaliah slew in Judah in one day, a hundred and twenty thousand valiant men, because they had forsaken the Lord, the God of their fathers.”

In Isa. xlix. 26, we read,

“I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh.”

What does this mean? Does it refer to such persons as Eglon, the King of Moab, who was a very fat man? Judges iii. 17. Their flesh may certainly be said to oppress others besides oppressing themselves. But probably the Revisers meant nothing of the sort, but meant,

“I will *feed with their own flesh* them that oppress thee; and they shall be drunken with their own blood.”

Then why did not the Revisers say so? It was easy enough. In Dan. ix. 17, we read,

“Hearken unto the prayer of thy servant, and to his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord’s sake.”

Was the sanctuary “*desolate, for the Lord’s sake*”? Certainly not; therefore the Revisers should have said

“And, for the Lord’s sake, cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate.”

Besides, by this arrangement, not only is the meaning made clear; but the most emphatic word in the sentence comes last, where it will be the most impressive:—

“Thy sanctuary that is *desolate*”!

Of course I am speaking as if the words had been addressed to man, and not to God. But in our addresses to Heaven, we should “set our words in order”, Job xxxiii. 5, and not be rash with our mouth nor let our hearts be hasty “to utter anything before God.” Eccl. v. 2.

Again, in Gen. xxxix. 5, 6, we read,

“The Lord blessed the Egyptian’s house  
 . . . . and he left all that he had in  
 Joseph’s hand.”

The Revisers do not mean what the words

affirm, viz., that the Egyptian left "all that he had in Joseph's hand"; but that

"He left in Joseph's hand all that he had."

In Jer. xxx. 2, we read,

"Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book."

The words were not spoken unto him in a book.

The Revisers should have said,

"Write thou in a book all the words that I have spoken unto thee."

In Gen. vi. 17, we read,

"Behold, I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven."

This is a very badly arranged sentence. It would read better thus,

"Behold I bring upon the earth the flood of waters to destroy from under heaven all flesh wherein is the breath of life."

In Ex. xxvi. 14, we read,

"And thou shalt make a covering for the tent of rams' skins dyed red."

The Revisers did not mean to speak of a “*tent of rams’ skins dyed red*”, for which some kind of a covering was ordered to be made; therefore they should have said,

“And thou shalt make for the tent a covering of rams’ skins dyed red.”

The error is repeated in Ex. xxxvi. 19.

In Ex. xxv. 22, we read,

“There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.”

This should have been,

“There I will meet with thee, and from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, I will commune with thee of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.”

The Revisers’ sentence is faulty because two

parts of it, which are most intimately connected in sense, are separated by eighteen intervening words; with the result that instead of our reading,

“I will commune with thee of all things”,

we read of,

“The ark of the testimony, of all things”.

Once more; in Isa. lix. 21, we read,

“This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.”

Here, in the latter part of the sentence, the words “*saith the Lord*” are redundant, as they occur in the former part of it; but if for emphaticness it was thought necessary to repeat them, they should have followed the words “*from henceforth and for ever*”, seeing that those words refer, not to the expression “*saith*



*the Lord*”, but to the eternity of God’s covenant with his people. The passage, then, should have been written thus,

“This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put into [not “*in*”] thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, from henceforth and for ever, saith the Lord.”

Frequently the Revisers’ errors are those of omission; but as the duty which the Revisers undertook was that of thorough revision of the Scriptures, the errors of omission become errors of commission; for by perpetuating those of the former translators (or what by changes in our language have virtually become errors) the Revisers have made them their own, and are equally responsible for them and for those which they themselves have introduced.

The following, however, is not an error of omission, but of commission; the error con-

sisting in not leaving the passage as it stood in the Authorised Version, Psa. xvii. 7.

*Authorised Version.*

“Shew thy marvellous loving-kindness, O thou that savest by thy right hand them which put their trust in thee from those that rise up against them.”

*Revised Version.*

“Shew thy marvellous lovingkindness, O thou that savest them which put their trust in thee. From those that rise up against them, by thy right hand.”

The Revisers' version of the passage makes God's right hand the means by which the wicked rise against the righteous. But the Bible distinctly says that God will not help evil-doers, or, as the margin reads,

“Will not take the ungodly by the hand.”  
Job. viii. 20.

There is, in the Authorised Version of the Book of Proverbs (xxx. 26), a beautiful description of the language of a virtuous woman; and one of the charms of the passage is the delicate balancing of its different parts. Compare the two versions, the Authorised and the

Revised, and you will see how the harmony of the whole has been destroyed by the Revisers' alteration of it.

*Authorised Version.*

“She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness.”

*Revised Version.*

“She openeth her mouth with wisdom; And the law of kindness is on her tongue.”

The Revisers have altered “*in* her tongue” to “*on* her tongue”; but here likewise, they are wrong; for, “*tongue*” in this passage does not mean the organ of taste; it means that which is spoken by the “*tongue*”, L. *lingua*, the tongue, whence our word “*language*”. Therefore the Authorised Version is correct in saying,

“And *in* her tongue [i.e., *in* her language, not *on* it] is the law of kindness.”

This is a very absurd error. Besides, if it should be “*on* her tongue” here, why should it be “*in* my tongue” in Psa. cxxxix. 4?

Moreover, in the Authorised Version, each clause of the passage is divided into two parts,

beautifully balanced in expression and meaning :

“She openeth her mouth—with wisdom ;  
And in her tongue is—the law of kindness.”

In the Revised Version, the transposing of the last clause destroys the balance of the parts, mars the melody of the whole, and removes from the place of emphasis the word “*kindness*”, which should have been left at the end of the sentence, that it might linger in the ear, and dwell undisturbed in the memory.

## CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS.—The letter H, ‘hairy and ‘airy’; ‘a’ and ‘an’; ‘a eunuch’; ‘an hiatus’; ‘such a one,’ and ‘such an one’; ‘no end’ and ‘none end’; ‘my’ and ‘mine’; ‘thy’ and ‘thine’; ‘thy honour.’

What were the Revisers’ opinions of the use of the letter “H”? In the Authorised Version, we read, in Num. xxx. 6, of “*an* husband”; this, in the Revised Version, has been altered to “*a* husband”. So also, in Ex. xxviii. 32, “*an* hole” has been altered to “*a* hole”; and, in Lev. xxiii. 12, “*an* he-lamb” has been altered to “*a* he-lamb”. But, as if to neutralize this teaching, “*a* harlot” has been altered to “*an* harlot”, in Joel iii. 3.

Again, in Neh. vii. 5, “*mine* heart” has been altered to “*my* heart”; and, in 1 Chron. xvii. 16, “*mine* house” has been altered to “*my* house”. Did the Revisers make this latter

alteration because they knew that the "h" being asperated in "*house*", the pronoun should be "*my*" and not "*mine*"? or was it because they thought it probable that "*mine house*" might be so pronounced as to be mistaken for "*my vous*", and each Reviser's modesty forbade his even seeming to speak of *that*?

In Dan. iv. 10, "*mine head*" has been altered to "*my head*"; and, in 2 Sam. i. 25, "*thine high places*" has been altered to "*thy high places*"; while in Ex. xviii. 4, "*mine help*" has been altered to "*my help*". But, as if to neutralize this correction also, "*my helper*" has been altered to "*mine helper*" in Psa. liv. 4.

In 2 Chron. xxv. 19, "*thine hurt*" has been altered to "*thy hurt*"; but, as if this also had to be neutralized, and, for some mysterious purpose, students of English had to be bewildered, the Revisers have altered "*my hurt*" to "*mine hurt*", in Psa. xxxv. 26.

However, I will do my best to neutralize the Revisers' teaching, by showing that, in the

matter of English scholarship, they are but blind leaders of the blind. Let none follow them.

With regard to the letter "*H*", why have certain of the foregoing errors been corrected, and a hundred others similar been left? What excuse have the Revisers for giving us the following archaisms, some of which are not found in the corresponding passages in the Authorised Version?

- "*An* help". Gen. ii. 18, 20.
- "*An* hundred". Gen. viii. 3.
- "*An* husbandman". Gen. ix. 20.
- "*An* heifer". Gen. xv. 9.
- "*An* handmaid". Gen. xvi. 1.
- "*An* heap". Gen. xxxi. 46.
- "*An* house". Gen. xxxiii. 17.
- "*An* harlot". Gen. xxxiv. 31.
- "*An* haven". Gen. xlix. 13.
- "*An* hoof". Ex. x. 26.
- "*An* hired servant". Ex. xii. 45.
- "*An* high hand". Ex. xiv. 8.
- "*An* holy nation". Ex. xix. 6.
- "*An* handbreadth". Ex. xxv. 25.

- “*An* heave offering”. Ex. xxix. 28.  
“*An* hin of wine”. Ex. xxix. 40.  
“*An* handful”. Num. v. 26.  
“*An* heart”. Deut. v. 29.  
“*An* hammer”. Judges iv. 21.  
“*An* hair-breadth”. Judges xx. 16.  
“*An* helmet”. 1 Sam. xvii. 5, 38.  
“*An* half”. 1 Kings vii. 31.  
“*An* horse”. 1 Kings xx. 20.  
“*An* host”. 2 Kings vi. 15.  
“*An* hissing”. 2 Chron. xxix. 8.  
“*An* hedge”. Job i. 10.  
“*An* hidden birth”. Job iii. 16.  
“*An* heinous crime”. Job xxxi. 11.  
“*An* heavy burden”. Psa. xxxviii. 4.  
“*An* haughty spirit”. Prov. xvi. 18.  
“*An* honeycomb”. Prov. xvi. 24.  
“*An* healer”. Isa. iii. 7.  
“*An* harp”. Isa. xvi. 11.  
“*An* habitation”. Isa. xxii. 16.  
“*An* hungry man”. Isa. xxix. 8.  
“*An* hill”. Isa. xxx. 17.  
“*An* hiding place”. Isa. xxxii. 2.  
“*An* hart”. Isa. xxxv. 6.  
“*An* horrible thing”. Jer. xxiii. 14.  
“*An* hard language”. Ezk. iii. 5, 6.



- “*An* horn”. Ezk. xxix. 21.  
 “*An* harvest”. Hosea vi. 11.  
 “*An* herdman”. Amos vii. 14.  
 “*An* howling”. Zeph. i. 10.

That the practice of the Revisers is, in this matter, as in many others, inconsistent, will be seen from the following quotations :—

- “*An* hundred”. Num. ii. 24.  
 “*A* hundred”. 1 Chron. xxix. 7.  
 “*An* holy one”. Dan. iv. 23.  
 “*A* holy one”. Dan. viii. 13.  
 “*An* he-goat”. Dan. viii. 5.  
 “*A* he-lamb”. Lev. xxiii. 12.  
 “*An* hammer”. Judges iv. 21.  
 “*A* hammer”. Jer. xxiii. 29.  
 “*An* homer”. Ezk. xlv. 11.  
 “*A* homer”. Lev. xxvii. 16.  
 “*An* husband”. Deut. xxii. 22.  
 “*A* husband”. Num. xxx. 6.  
 “*An* harp”. Isa. xxiii. 16.  
 “*A* harp”. 1 Sam. x. 5.  
 “*An* high wall”. Prov. xviii. 11.  
 “*A* high wall”. Isa. xxx. 13.

“*An* hard language”. Ezk. iii. 5, 6.

“*A* hard thing”. 2 Kings ii. 10.

“*An* hairy garment”. Gen. xxv. 25.

“*A* hairy mantle”. Zech. xiii. 4.

“*An* hairy man”. 2 Kings i. 8.

“*A* hairy man”. Gen. xxvii. 11.

Can any one tell me why the Revisers have described Esau as “*a* hairy man”, and Elijah as “*an* hairy man”? Was it because it was considered that, in Elijah’s case, the “*h*” should be dropped, “’airy” being a more appropriate description of him who “went up by a whirlwind into heaven”? 2 Kings ii. 11. For my own part, I consider such jokes as quite out of place in the Bible. Let us, then, leave this specimen of lack-wisdom clerical *levity* (no pun intended), and resume our criticisms.

Another matter, intimately connected with the use of “*a*” and of “*an*” before “*h*”, is the proper use of “*an*” before words beginning with a vowel.

It is apparent that the Old Testament Revisers believed it to be correct to put “*an*”

before all words beginning with a vowel, and that the New Testament Revisers held a contrary opinion; for, in the Revised Version of Jer. xxxviii. 7, we read of “*an* eunuch”; but in Acts viii. 27, the expression “*an* eunuch” has been altered to “*a* eunuch”, in the Revised Version. Here the Old Testament Revisers are wrong, and the New are right, because the rule is, not that “*a*” becomes “*an*” before a vowel, as erroneously taught by Lindley Murray, but that “*a*” becomes “*an*” before a vowel sound in order to avoid an hiatus; the change being purely for the sake of euphony.

The phrase which I have just now employed, “*an hiatus*”, is a good example of this; for, the emphasis being on the second syllable, the aspiration of the “*h*” is suppressed, and the result is the production of a vowel sound, at the beginning of the word, necessitating the employment of “*an*”, instead of “*a*”, which latter would have been needed had the “*h*” been fully aspirated.

Now, in the word “*eunuch*”, the “*e*” has the

sound of “*y*”, and that being a consonant, when used at the beginning of a word, should be preceded by “*a*”, and not by “*an*”; we should say “*a eunuch*”, not “*an eunuch*”.

For the same reason we ought not to say, as the Revisers have said,

“Such *an* one”. Job xiv. 3; Psa. l. 21;  
and lxviii. 21;

but “such *a* one”, as they, with their usual inconsistency, have said in Ruth iv. 1.

It is as incorrect to say “such *an* one”, as it would be to say, “such *an* wonder”.

In Ezk. xvi. 5, we read,

“*None eye* pitied thee”;

but in Job x. 18; and xxiv. 15, it is

“*No eye*”.

Why this difference?

In Nahum ii. 9, and iii. 3, we read,

“There is *none end*”;

but in Isa. ix. 7; Psa. cii. 27; Eccl. iv. 8, 16; and xii. 12, it is “*no end*”.

Why this difference?

In Zeph. ii. 5, we read,

“*No* inhabitant”;

but in the very next chapter, Zeph. iii. 6, it is,

“*None* inhabitant”.

Why this difference?

“*None*” is an abbreviation of “*no one*”, and occurs in both forms in Isa. xxxiv. 16:—

“Seek ye out the book of the Lord, and read :  
*no one* of these shall be missing, *none* shall  
want *her* mate.”

It is singular, and is so used a hundred times in the Bible. What reason, then, had the Revisers for using it as a plural in 1 Kings x. 21, saying,

“All the vessels were of pure gold : *none*  
*were* of silver”;

and, in 2 Chron. ix. 11, also,

“There *were none* such seen before”?

In Jer. xxxiv. 9, 10, the Revisers make it both singular and plural,

“None should serve *himself*”, and “None should serve *themselves*.”

Certainly the Revisers’ consistency is worthy of honourable mention.

Let us continue our criticisms, and we shall see additional reasons for this.

- |                           |                               |                 |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| “ <i>Thine</i> hand”.     | Deut. ii. 24                  | } same chapter. |
| “ <i>Thy</i> hand”.       | Deut. ii. 7                   |                 |
| “ <i>Thine</i> head”.     | Gen. xl. 13                   | } same chapter. |
| “ <i>Thy</i> head”.       | Gen. xl. 19                   |                 |
| “ <i>Thine</i> handmaid”. | 2Sam. xiv. 7, 17              | } same chapter. |
| “ <i>Thy</i> handmaid”.   | 2Sam. xiv. 6, 15              |                 |
| “ <i>Thine</i> house”.    | Ruth iv. 11; 2 Sam. xi. 10.   |                 |
| “ <i>Thy</i> house”.      | Ruth iv. 12; 2 Sam. xi. 8.    | same chapters.  |
| “ <i>Thine</i> heart”.    | 2 Kings x. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 7. |                 |
| “ <i>Thy</i> heart”.      | 2 Kings x. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 7. | same verses.    |
| “ <i>Thine</i> heart”.    | Lam. ii. 19                   | } same verse.   |
| “ <i>Thy</i> hands”.      | Lam. ii. 19                   |                 |
| “ <i>Thine</i> husband”.  | Num. v. 20                    | } same verse.   |
| “ <i>Thy</i> husband”.    | Num. v. 20                    |                 |
| “ <i>Thine</i> horn”.     | Micah iv. 13                  | } same verse.   |
| “ <i>Thy</i> hoofs”.      | Micah iv. 13                  |                 |

- “*Thine* estimation”. Lev. xxvii. 27 } same  
 “*Thy* estimation”. Lev. xxvii. 27 } verse.  
 “*Thine* enemies”. Deut. xxxiii. 29 } same  
 “*Thy* excellency”. Deut. xxxiii. 29 } verse.  
 “*Thine* exactors”. Isa. lx. 17 } same verse.  
 “*Thy* officers”. Isa. lx. 17 }  
 “*Thine* ox”. Ex. xxiii. 12 } next verse.  
 “*Thy* oliveyard”. Ex. xxiii. 11 }  
 “*Mine* holy things”. Ezk. xliv. 8 } same  
 “*My* holy things”. Ezk. xliv. 13 } chapter.  
 “*Mine* heart”. Psa. cxix. 112 } same psalm.  
 “*My* heart”. Psa. cxix. 161 }  
 “*Mine* affliction”. Psa. cxix. 92 } same  
 “*My* affliction”. Psa. cxix. 50 } psalm.  
 “*Mine* house”. Isa. lvi. 7 } same verse.  
 “*My* house”. Isa. lvi. 7 }  
 “*Mine* hand”. 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 } same verse.  
 “*My* hand”. 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 }  
 “*Mine* head”. Psa. xl. 12 } same verse.  
 “*My* heart”. Psa. xl. 12 }  
 “*Mine* hand”. Isa. xlix. 22 } same verse.  
 “*My* ensign”. Isa. xlix. 22 }  
 “*Mine* husband is dead”. 2 Sam. xiv. 5.  
 “*My* husband is dead”. 2 Kings iv. 1.

In Prov. xx. 3, the Revisers say “*an* honour”; but in Psa. lxxi. 8, they say “*thy* honour”! But let me “render honour to whom honour is due”, Rom. xiii. 7; and candidly express my opinion that, notwithstanding these vagaries, it is evident that the Revisers had some sense of propriety in dealing with the personal pronouns; for, in an address to an *ass*, (Num. xxii. 29) we find the asinine expression “*mine* hand”; but, in the previous chapter, in an address to the *Deity*, the expression is “*my* hand”. (Num. xxi. 2).

Doubtless the Revisers had equally good reasons for all their varieties of expression; and some day they will, for the enlightenment of mankind, publish those reasons; but, in the mean time, the Revisers’ light being, as it were, hid under a measure, is in a measure hid.



## CHAPTER VI.

CONTENTS. — Redundancy, ‘vomit them up again’; ‘doubled twice’; ‘budded buds and bloomed blossoms’; ‘plaister it with plaister’; ‘pitch it with pitch’; ‘praying a prayer’; ‘kneeling on his knees’; ‘stood on his feet’; ‘heard with our ears’; ‘see it with thine eyes’; ‘devised devices’; ‘assembled together’; ‘a widow woman whose husband is dead’; ‘stone him with stones’; ‘rise up’; ‘vanish away’; ‘depart away’; ‘no doubt but’; ‘all of them’; ‘each of them’; ‘both of them’; ‘both of those, both of four, both of five, both of eight, and of things innumerable; ‘else’; ‘it”.

One of the commonest faults in the language of young writers and inexperienced public speakers is redundancy. Having no confidence in the power of simple expressions, they trust to iteration and reiteration, rather than to one incisive utterance that would instantly pierce the understanding. Their speech is more like the repeated dull blows of a hammer on the head of a blunt nail, than the lightning flash

of intellect which cleaves the surrounding darkness; and, by its dazzling brilliancy, at once and for ever photographs itself upon the mind.

And as with youthful writers, so it is with languages which, in the world's history, may be said to be youthful. This is true of the Hebrew language especially; it is extremely elliptical; but, at the same time, it abounds with tautologies and other redundancies; and this fact, having unfortunately been allowed by the Revisers to have undue weight in their choice of words, has given rise to some of the following redundant expressions.

“*Of* the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat *of it*”. Gen. ii. 17.

“Is there room *in* thy father's house for us to lodge *in*?” Gen. xxiv. 23.

“He *restored* the chief butler unto his butlership *again*.” Gen. xl. 21.

As the butler had not previously been restored, he could not be said to have been restored *again*. Why, then, did the Revisers leave in this passage the word “*again*”, seeing that they struck

it out of Lev. xxiv. 20, where, in the Authorised Version, a similar redundancy occurs.

See also 1 Kings xiii. 6,

“And the man of God intreated the Lord,  
and the king’s hand was restored him  
*again.*”

Had the king’s hand been restored previously? If not, how could it be said to have been restored *again*?

In Ex. xiv. 26, we read,

“Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that  
the waters may come *again upon the  
Egyptians*”.

A comma after the word “*again*” might improve this sentence, but it would be still more improved by the omission of that word. As the sentence stands now, one is tempted to ask, “Had the sea on some former occasion overwhelmed the Egyptians?”

In Gen. xli. 32, we read,

“The dream was doubled unto Pharaoh  
twice.”

A perusal of the chapter will show that the dream of Pharaoh was *doubled*, but not doubled *twice*; he did not dream the same circumstances four times.

I have said that "*some*" of the redundancies are found in the Hebrew. They are not all there; e.g., the redundancy of the word "*again*", in Num. xii. 14 and 15, has no equivalent in the Hebrew.

In Job xx. 15, we read,

"He hath swallowed down riches, and he shall vomit them up *again*".

This is a very unpleasant metaphor; for, before anything can be vomited *again*—I will say no more; only that the original does not mean what the Revisers' language implies.

In Ex. xiv. 13, we read,

"The Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see *them* again no more *for ever*."

Omit the words in Italics: "*them*" is redundant, "*Egyptian*" being the accusative to the verb; and the phrase "*for ever*" is worse

than redundant, for it implies that the Israelites had previously seen the Egyptians “*for ever*”! but should do so “*again no more*”.

In Ex. iii. 5, and Josh. v. 15, we read,

“Put *off* thy shoes from *off* thy feet”.

“The rod of Aaron was *budded*, and put forth *buds*, and *bloomed blossoms*”. Num. xvii. 8.

“Whosoever toucheth the *dead body* of any man that is *dead*”. Num. xix. 13.

“Thou shalt set thee up great stones, and *plaster* them with *plaster*.” Deut. xxvii. 2, 4.

“Rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt *pitch* it within and without with *pitch*.” Gen. vi. 14.

“*Then Solomon assembled* the elders of Israel . . . . *unto king Solomon*”.  
1 Kings viii. 1.

“When Solomon had made an end of *praying* all this *prayer*, he arose from *kneeling* on his *knees*.” 1 Kings viii. 54. See also, Dan. vi. 10.

“Then David the king stood up *upon his feet*.” 1 Chron. xxviii. 2.

Did the Revisers imagine that we should think he stood upon his head?

In Job xxviii. 22, we read,

“We have heard a rumour thereof *with our ears.*”

“Behold, thou shalt see it *with thine eyes.*”  
2 Kings vii. 2; Deut. xxxiv. 4.

“Hear, O Lord, when I cry *with my voice.*”  
Psa. xxvii. 7.

“I knew not that they had *devised devices* against me”. Jer. xi. 19; See also, xviii. 18; Dan. xi. 25.

In the Authorised Version of this last passage, it is “they shall *forecast devices*”, but the Revisers preferred to be literally tautological, and therefore altered the passage.

In Dan. vi. 11, we read,

“Then these men *assembled together*, and found Daniel making petition.”

How could they assemble otherwise than “*together*”? But, evidently the Revisers imagined it possible, or they would not have inserted the word “*together*”; they would

have given us the passage as it stands in the Authorised Version, viz.,

“Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying”.

The error is repeated in verse 15.

Here is a fine specimen of tautology :

“Of a truth I am a widow *woman*, and mine husband is dead.” 2 Sam. xiv. 5.

Why do the Revisers speak of a “widow *woman*”? Do they think it likely that any one would imagine that the “*widow*” was a man? And then, as if they had not been sufficiently explicit in telling us that the widow was a woman, they must needs add “*and my husband is dead*”. Surely, the death of the husband is implied in the word “*widow*”. But, if they wished to be emphatic, they might with propriety have said,

“Of a truth I am a widow,—my husband is dead!”

The error occurs also in 1 Kings xi. 26, and xvii. 9.

In Ex. xii. 33, we read,

“The Egyptians were urgent upon the people, to send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead *men*.”

The equivalent to the word “*men*” is not in the original; why, then, have the Revisers inserted it in the English of the passage? There can be no question that the Egyptians’ remark referred, not to the “*men*” only, but to the whole nation. It was called forth by the death of “all the firstborn in the land of Egypt”, and therefore certainly had reference to children as well as to men.

In Lev. xx. 2, we read,

“The people of the land shall *stone* him with *stones*.”

Why this tautology? Could he be *stoned* with any thing else? In verse 16, of chapter xxiv., it says simply,

“All the congregation shall certainly stone him.”

So also, in 1 Sam. xxx. 6, the expression is simply,

“The people spake of stoning him.”



But in the following passages it is “*stoning with stones*”: Lev. xxiv. 23; Num. xiv. 10; xv. 35, 36; Deut. xiii. 10; xxi. 21; xxii. 21, 24; Josh. vii. 25; 1 Kings xii. 18; xxi. 13; 2 Chron. x. 18; xxiv. 21; and Ezk. xvi. 40.

In Deut. xix. 2, we read,

“Thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of thy land, *which* the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess *it*.”

If the Revisers thought the word “*it*” to be necessary in the foregoing passage, why did they omit it in the following verse, Deut. xix. 3? There we read,

“Thou shalt prepare thee the way, and divide the borders of thy land, *which* the Lord thy God causeth thee to inherit.”

Why not “inherit *it*”? There is just as much, or as little, need of the word “*it*” in the one case as in the other. The same error occurs in Deut. xxi. 1 and Josh. i. 11.

In 1 Sam. i. 13, we read,

“Now Hannah, *she* spake in her heart; only

her lips moved, *but* her voice was not heard”.

Here the word “*she*” is redundant, as “*Hannah*” is the nominative to the verb “*spake*”. The word “*but*” likewise is redundant; the word “*only*” rendering it needless. The passage should have been,

“Now Hannah spake in her heart; only her lips moved, her voice was not heard.”

In Psa. xlv. 26, we have,

“Rise *up* for our help”.

Why “rise *up*”; is it possible to rise *down*? In the Authorised Version it is,

“*Arise* for our help.”

This is called “*revising*”!

In Isa li. 6, we read,

“The heavens shall vanish *away* like smoke”.

See also Job vii. 9,

“As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth *away*”.

And Zech. x. 11, we read,

“The sceptre of Egypt shall depart *away*.”

Again, 2 Kings ii. 11, we read,

“There appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, which parted them *both* asunder”.

How much more forcible these passages would be if the redundant words which I have italicized, were omitted.

In Job xii. 1, 2, we read,

“Then Job answered and said,  
No doubt *but* ye are the people”.

The insertion of the redundant word “*but*” in this sentence, really makes Job say exactly the reverse of what it is evident that he intended; namely,

“There is no doubt *that* ye are the people”.

The Revisers’ words mean that there is no doubt *except* that they are the people; there *is* doubt about that.

“*But*” is from the Saxon “*be-utan*”; originally the imperative of “*beon-utan*,” to be out.

It is literally "*be out*", and means "*exclude*" or "*except*".

The same error occurs in Gen. xxiii. 6, where we read,

"None of us shall withhold from thee his sepulchre, *but* that thou mayest bury thy dead."

Substitute "*except*" for "*but*", and you will at once see that its presence in the passage reverses the meaning of the speaker.

"None of us shall withhold from thee his sepulchre, *except* that thou mayest bury thy dead."

i.e., we will withhold it for that; but the speaker's intention was, we will give it for that.

The word "*but*" should be omitted; the meaning then will be obvious,

"None of us shall withhold from thee his sepulchre, that thou mayest bury thy dead."

In Deut. xxix. 10, we read,

“Ye stand this day *all of you* before the Lord your God”.

In Lev. x. 1, we read,

“Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took *each of them* his censer”.

In Jer. xlvi. 12, we read,

“They are fallen *both of them* together.”

And in Prov. xvii. 15, we read,

“*Both of them* alike are an abomination to the Lord.”

Why have the Revisers inserted the words “*of them*” in each of the last two passages? In the Authorised Version of the passages the words are not found, nor are they needed. These are additional instances in which the Revisers have made faulty that which was correct.

“*Both*” is *all* of two; but “*of them*” is partitive, and therefore implies that something is left. Hence the incongruity; for, when all is gone, how can anything be left?

The expression “*both of them*” occurs in

Gen. xxii. 6, 8; Ex. xxxvi. 29; Lev. xx. 11, 12, 13, 18; 1 Sam. ii. 34; Prov. xx. 10, 12; and twelve times in the seventh chapter of Numbers; but it is as incorrect as is "*all of them*", and that for the same reason. Yet the Revisers have used that expression in Deut. xxxiii. 17; 1 Chron. vii. 3; 2 Chron. v. 12; Ezra viii. 20; Isa. vii. 19; Ezk. vii. 16; xx. 40; and Amos ix. 1.

In speaking of *all*, the words "*of them*", "*of these*", "*of you*", "*of us*", are worse than redundant. It is sufficient to say "*all*", "*both*", or "*each*". The more sententious we make our language, the more forcible will it be.

In Deut. xxiii. 18, the Revisers use the correct form, and say, not "*both of these*", but,

"*Both these* are an abomination unto the Lord thy God."

"*Both*" means "*the two*"; yet the Revisers have used it in reference to *three*, in Judges xx. 48,

"And smote them with the edge of the

sword, *both* the entire city, and the cattle, and all that they found”.

In the Authorised Version it is,

“And smote them with the edge of the sword, *as well* the men of every city, as the beast, and all that came to hand”.

Therefore this error, in using “*both*” in reference to *three*, rests solely with the Revisers.

In Gen. vi. 7, the Revisers have used the word “*both*” in reference to *four*; so have they in Num. xxxi. 28, where we read,

“Levy a tribute unto the Lord [,] of the men of war that went out to battle: one soul of five hundred, *both* of the persons, and of the beeves, and of the asses, and of the flocks”.

In the Hebrew of this passage, there is no equivalent to the word “*both*”. Why, then, have the Revisers inserted it? and if they deemed it to be needful in this verse, why was it not needful in the verse next but one also, Num. xxxi. 30, where it is not found, though

the expressions are almost identical? It reads thus,

“Take one drawn out of every fifty, of the persons, of the beeves, of the asses, and of the flocks”.

In Joshua vi. 21, and Neh. xii. 27, the Revisers use the word “*both*” when speaking of *five* things. And in 1 Sam. xv. 3 they use the word when speaking of *eight* things!

“Slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.”

I suppose the Revisers mean, “*both* man and woman, *both* infant and suckling, *both* ox and sheep, *both* camel and ass.” But why use the word “*both*”? It adds nothing to the meaning, and is therefore redundant.

I have shown that the Revisers use the word “*both*” when speaking of *three*, of *four*, of *five*, and of *eight* different things. Now turn to Gen. vii. 21, and you will see that the Revisers there use it in reference to things *innumerable*.

“All flesh died that moved upon the earth, *both* fowl, and cattle, and beast, and *every*



creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man”.

And yet in Ex. xxxv. 25, and xxxvii. 26 they have corrected the error! Truly they are persistently consistently inconsistent.

In Neh. ii. 2, we read,

“Why is thy countenance sad, seeing thou art not sick? this is nothing *else* but sorrow of heart”.

“*Else*” is equivalent to the Latin “*alius*”, and means “*other*”; therefore, in such sentences as that which I have quoted, it should be followed by “*than*”, not by “*but*”. The Revisers should have said,

“This is nothing *else than* sorrow of heart”; or they might have omitted the word (and there is nothing in the Hebrew justifying its presence in the sentence) and have said,

“This is nothing *but* sorrow of heart”.

A similar error occurs in Judges vii. 14,

“This is nothing *else* save the sword of Gideon.”

In Prov. xxvi. 4, we read,

“ Answer not a fool according to his folly,  
Lest thou *also* be like unto him ”.

If this sentence had had reference to other persons who had answered a fool according to his folly and had become like him; and the person addressed were cautioned against doing as they had done, then the word “ *also* ” would have been permissible. But there is no evidence in the context that any such reference was intended; therefore the “ *also* ” is redundant, and the passage should have read thus,

“ Answer not a fool according to his folly,  
Lest thou become like him.”

In Isa. xxxiv. 16, we read,

“ Seek ye out the book of the Lord, and read :  
no one of these shall be missing, none  
shall want her mate : for my mouth *it*  
hath commanded, and his spirit *it* hath  
gathered them.”

Compare this with the following passage,  
from Isa. xlvi. 5, and conceive, if you can,

why the Revisers have sanctioned the pronominal tautology in the former, and have avoided it in the latter :

“ Mine idol hath done them, and my graven image, and my molten image, hath [have] commanded them.”

If the former passage is correct, the latter should have been,

“ Mine idol *it* hath done them, and my graven image and my molten image *they* have commanded them.”

This might have been in accordance with Hebrew idiom ; but it would certainly not have been good English.

The same error occurs in Prov. x. 22,

“ The blessing of the Lord, *it* maketh rich ” ;  
and in Prov. x. 24,

“ The fear of the wicked, *it* shall come upon him.”

But I need not multiply instances of this kind of error ; numerous examples of it can be

found by any superficial reader of the Revised Version ; and even to those who have become accustomed to this construction, a moment's reflection will show it to be a fault.

In one instance the Revisers have struck out the word "*it*" from a verse of this description in the Authorised Version ; I refer to Prov. xix. 2,

"That the soul be without knowledge, *it* is not good."

Their selection of this verse, as the one to be altered, was not judicious ; almost any other would have done better ; for the presence of the word "*it*" might by some persons be justified on the ground that if the last clause of the sentence be transposed and put first, the word "*it*" must be retained, thus :

"*It* is not good that the soul be without knowledge".

therefore,

"That the soul be without knowledge, *it* is not good."

I should not write it so; but the reasoning is plausible.

Why do the Revisers speak of a woman's "*latter end*"? e.g.:

"Her filthiness was in her skirts; she remembered not her *latter end*". Lam. i. 9.

"Oh that they would consider their *latter end!*". Deut. xxxii. 29.

"Thy *latter end* should greatly increase." Job. viii. 7.

"The Lord blessed the *latter end* of Job". Job xlii. 12.

"He shall not see our *latter end*." Jer. xii. 4.

"Let my *last end* be like his." Num. xxiii. 10.

The Revisers' language implies that the end to a man's existence may be elsewhere than at the close; otherwise, why speak of the "*latter end*" and "*last end*"?

## CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS.—The articles, ‘a’, ‘an’, and ‘the’; ‘another’; ‘the other’; ‘the son of man’, or ‘a son of man’; the verb ‘to be’; the subjunctive mood.

The Revisers’ errors are not such as are occasionally found in the writings of advanced students of the language—errors in the structure of complex sentences—there we might reasonably expect the Revisers to fail; for, very few Englishmen write their own language with accuracy. The marvel is, that the Revisers, besides failing in other things, fail in the simple A B C of the grammar, the proper use of “*a*”, “*an*”, and “*the*”!

I have, on pages 63–70, given some examples of this; here are some more.

Every one knows that “*an*” is indefinite, and refers indiscriminately to one of several; and that “*the*” is definite, and refers specially to one by itself, which may be a single unit, or

which may be an aggregate of units; yet the Revisers say, in Dan. v. 6,

“Then the king’s countenance was changed in him, and his thoughts troubled him; and the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another.”

This statement might be correct if Belshazzar had three or more knees, and it was uncertain which of the knees “smote one against another.” But as history does not say that he had more than two legs (though his father did eat grass like an ox) the Revisers are not justified in writing as if he had more than two knees; and therefore ought to say that

“his knees smote one against *the* other.”

The difference between “*an*” and “*the*” cannot have a better illustration than the one found in Ezk. vii. 2,

“*An* end, *the* end is come.”

That the Revisers were aware of the propriety of employing the definite article “*the*”, when speaking of only two things, is evident

from their having altered "*another*", as it is in the Authorised Version, to "*the other*", in the Revised Version. See Gen. xv. 10,

"He took all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each half over against *the other*."

Why, then, after thus acknowledging the necessity for the alteration, have the Revisers left the error in Gen. xxxi. 49, and elsewhere?

"The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from *another*."

It should be,

"When we are absent, one from *the other*."

In Ex. xxv. 18, 20; and xxxvii. 9, we read,

"And thou shalt make two cherubim of gold ; . . . . And the cherubim shall spread out their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, with their faces one to *another*."

In 1 Kings vi. 23, 27, we read,

"In the oracle he made two cherubim of olive wood, . . . . and their wings touched one *another*." See also Ezk. i. 11.



In Ezk. xxxvii. 16, 17, we read,

“Take thee [thou] one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, . . . then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, . . . and join them for thee one to *another*”.

In Ex. xxvi. 17, we read,

“Two tenons shall there be in each board, joined one to *another*.” See also Ex. xxxvi. 22.

In Ezk. iv. 4-8, we read,

“Thy left side . . . thy right side . . . Thou shalt not turn thee from one side to *another*”.

In each of the foregoing passages, the Revisers should have said, not “*another*”, but “*the other*”. And in the following passages, they should have said, “*each other*”, instead of “one *another*”.

“Then Amaziah sent messengers to Jehoash . . . saying, Come, let us look one *another* in the face”. 2 Kings xiv. 8, 11, and 2 Chron. xxv. 17, 21.

In the Authorised Version there occurs the following reading:—

“Thy righteousness may profit *the* son of man”.  
Job. xxxv. 8.

This the Revisers have with great prudence altered to,

“Thy righteousness may profit *a* son of man”.

The expression “*son of man*” occurs nearly a hundred times in Ezekiel; but “*the*” Son of Man is one of the titles of Christ (see Psa. lxxx. 17; Matt. xvi. 13, &c.), and therefore it was that the Revisers recognized the necessity for making the above correction.

But, recognizing this necessity, why did they leave unaltered the same expression in Job xxv. 6, where we read that “the son of man” is a worm? and still more, why did they leave unaltered Psa. cxlvi. 3? There it says,

“Put not your trust in princes,  
Nor in *the* son of man, in whom there is no  
help.”

The Revisers should have said,

“Nor in any son of man”.

The same error occurs in Num. xxiii. 19; Psa. viii. 4; cxliv. 3; Isa. li. 12; and lvi. 2.

The following passages are correct, Job xxxv. 8; Jer. xlix. 18, 33; l. 40; and li. 43.

In Lev. xvii. 3, we read of

“an ox, or lamb, or goat”.

But in a sentence like this, where one of the nouns begins with a vowel, and each of the others begins with a consonant, it is especially necessary that the appropriate article precede each. The Revisers should have said,

“*an* ox, or *a* lamb, or *a* goat”.

The sentence, as it stands in the Revised Version, means

“*an* ox, or [*an*] lamb, or [*an*] goat”.

The Revisers have recognized this in Psa. lxix. 31. There, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“This also shall please the Lord better than an ox or bullock”.

which is equivalent to saying

“*an ox or [an] bullock*”.

In the Revised Version it is,

“*an ox, or a bullock*”,

which is correct.

But how is it that we so frequently find that an error corrected in one part of the Revisers' work, is left uncorrected in another? There must have been something extremely faulty in their mode of revision.

I believe the explanation to be, that the Revisers were not all equally good masters of English; and as they were not always all present, and as everything was carried by votes of the majority, the less-informed were frequently the more numerous and therefore, of course, outvoted those who knew better.

In any further revision, this evil must be guarded against. The marvel is, that *any* educated men could have sanctioned the errors which I have exposed; or, at least, that they have considered them so unimportant that it

was not deemed necessary to record a protest against them. Therefore even the best of the Revisers must be held to have been "partakers of other men's sins".

Even the simple verb "*to be*" meets with strange treatment at the hands of the Revisers. It cannot be that its various forms were not understood; and yet they seem to have puzzled the Revisers almost as much as they puzzled the Oriental lecturer, who ridiculing our English language, and especially the changeable verb "*to be*", said, "In my country, if *I am*, *I am* always". "Oh, well", said a reviewer, "if you *am* always in your own country, how *am* it that you *am* here? And if a man always *am*, what *am* he when he *am* not? And how *am* he to simplify or unify, as it *am*, our verb '*to am*', so that we shall always *am* here, as they *am* in Burmah? Somehow we *am* at a loss to see how this verb '*am*' *am*, with any success, to be reformed on a Burmese basis. How *am* this? Any way, '*to am*, or not to *am*, that *am* the question'".

Let us look at the Revisers' treatment of the verb "*to be*". Their examples of its uses are certainly strange. Here are some of them,

"There *be* three things which *are* too wonderful for me". Prov. xxx. 18. See also verses 24 and 29.

"There *be* six things which the Lord hateth ; Yea, seven which *are* an abomination unto him." Prov. vi. 16.

Could anything be more capricious?—"There *be* six, and there *are* seven". What has number to do with it? The inconsistency is not found in the corresponding passage in the Authorised Version. There we read,

"These six things doth the Lord hate ; yea, seven are an abomination unto him".

In Amos vi. 2 of the Revised Version we read,

"*Be* they better than these kingdoms ? or *is* their border greater than your border ?"

Neither is this inconsistency found in the Authorised Version.

In Psa. xxxiv. 18, and cxxv. 4, we read,

“The Lord is nigh unto *them that are* of a broken heart,

And saveth *such as be* of a contrite spirit.”

“Do good, O Lord, unto *those that be* good,  
And to *them that are* upright in their hearts.”

In these two verses we have the expressions “*them that are*”; but in Ezk. xxxi. 17, 18, the expression is “*them that be*”; and in the next chapter we have both forms,

“Them that *be* slain”. v. 25.

“Them that *are* slain”. v. 30.

Nor is this inconsistency found in the corresponding verses in the Authorised Version; (though it does exist elsewhere in that Version) neither is there in the Hebrew, in either verse, any equivalent to the expression “*them that be*” or “*them that are*”. Why, then, have the Revisers altered the translation of the latter verse and not that of the former?

The same inconsistency exists in the following passages. See Ezk. xlii. 13,

“The north chambers and the south chambers,  
*which are* before the separate place, *they be*  
the holy chambers”.

Likewise, Ezk. xliii. 19,

“Thou shalt give to the priests the Levites  
*that be* of the seed of Zadok, *which are*  
near unto me”.

Also Zech. iv. 4, 5,

“What *are* these my Lord? . . . . Knowest  
thou not what these *be*?”

See also Zech. i. 19,

“What *be* these? And he answered me,  
These *are* the horns”.

And Zech. iv. 11, 12,

“What *are* these two olive trees? . . . .  
What *be* these two olive branches?”

And so on, *usque ad nauseam*. See Gen.  
xxxiv. 15 (compare with verse 22); xxxvi. 43  
(compare with verse 15); xxix. 4; Num. xiii. 31;  
Deut. i. 1 (compare with Num. xxx. 16); x. 5;  
Judges viii. 5; 2 Sam. i. 5 (compare with



verse iv.); xxiii. 1; Job iii. 17 (compare with verse 18); v. 11; &c.

For some reason the Revisers have corrected the following passages, Gen. xlvi. 15; Ex. vi. 14; Lev. x. 14; xi. 31; Num. iv. 45; xiii. 28; Deut. xxvii. 4; Judges xi. 26; 2 Sam. vii. 28; &c.

The Revisers' alteration of some passages, and of some only, shows the incompleteness of their work.

In '*The Revisers' English*' I discussed so fully the commission of errors in connection with verbs in the subjunctive mood, that it is not necessary to say much more than that the Revisers of the Old Testament are as faulty in that respect, as were those of the New. True, here and there the former seem to be groping after the correct form of expression; and occasionally they are right; but more frequently they are wrong. In Prov. xxix. 12, they say,

“If a ruler hearkeneth to falsehood,  
All his servants *are* wicked.”

As the circumstance here spoken of relates to the present time, the Revisers very properly have taken the verb from the subjunctive, in which it stands in the Authorised Version, and have put it into the indicative.

But so likewise does 1 Kings ii. 23 refer to the present time; why, then, have the Revisers not put that also into the indicative? The verse reads thus,

“God do so to me, and more also, if Adonijah *have* not spoken this word against his own life.”

It should be,

“if Adonijah *has* not spoken”.

With a perverseness, at which one cannot but smile, the Revisers have, in the last quotation, put the verb into the subjunctive when it ought to be in the indicative, and in 1 Kings xvii. 14, have put the verb into the indicative when it ought to be in the subjunctive, the time being future. The words are,

“The barrel of meal shall not waste, neither

shall the cruse of oil fail, until the day that the Lord sendeth rain upon the earth."

It should be,

"until the day that the Lord *send* rain",

i.e., "until the day when the Lord [*shall*] send rain".

The general rule governing this form of speech is very simple; it is this:—"Where there is in the circumstance a combination of contingency and futurity, the verb must be in the subjunctive mood; but where there is either contingency without futurity, or futurity without contingency, the verb must be in the indicative mood."

In the following passages the time spoken of is certainly present, and therefore the verb should be in the indicative; yet the Revisers have put it into the subjunctive,

"If it *be* not so *now*". Job xxiv. 25.

This should be,

"If it *is* not so *now*".

Again, in Judges vii. 10, we read,

“ Arise, get thee down into the camp . . .  
But if thou *fear* to go down”.

It should be,

“ But if thou *fearest* to go down”.

Another example of this error will be found in Ex. xl. 37,

“ If the cloud *were* not taken up, then they journeyed not.”

Here there is contingency, but not futurity ; it is the relation of a past event, and therefore the Revisers should have said,

“ If the cloud *was* not taken up, then they journeyed not.”

For other examples of the error, see Judges vi. 13, 31 ; 1 Kings xviii. 21 ; Neh. ii. 5 ; Esther vi. 13 ; viii. 5 ; Prov. xxiv. 10.

An example of the correct use of the indicative in a contingent sentence is found in Esther iv. 14,

“ If thou altogether *holdest* thy peace” ;

and an example of the correct use of the subjunctive in a contingent sentence is found in Num. xxx. 14,

“If her husband altogether *hold* his peace”.

The former quotation relates to the present; the latter relates to the future; hence the necessity for the change of mood in the verb.

So simple; yet, apparently, so little understood!

## CHAPTER VIII.

CONTENTS.—Consistently inconsistent; adjectives and adverbs; ‘speak plain’, or ‘speak plainly’; ‘look sad’, or ‘look sadly’; ‘wonderful great’, and ‘exceeding magnificent’; ‘for to’; ‘in’, and ‘into’, ‘on’, and ‘onto’, ‘on’, and ‘in’; prepositions; ‘of’, for ‘by’; ‘of’, for ‘on’; ‘despite’.

I have spoken of the Revisers’ inconsistency; but I wish to be strictly accurate, and therefore bear testimony to their consistency in one matter which I must admit never varies, and that is the maintenance of their *in*consistency.

Having disburdened my mind by the rendering of this act of justice to the Revisers, I proceed to show that their claims to this concession on my part are very great.

Compare the following passages with each other.

“Write upon the stones all the words of this law very *plainly*.” Deut. xxvii. 8;

“The tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak *plainly*.” Isa. xxxii. 4.

“His tongue was loosed, and he spake *plain*”.  
Mark vii. 35.

“Say now Shibboleth; and he said Sibboleth; for he could not frame to pronounce it *right*.” Judges xii. 6.

Surely the rule respecting the right use of adjectives and adverbs must have been forgotten by the Revisers; and if so, I do not wonder at their being puzzled which to employ; but then why did they not ask, rather than blunder, and bring disgrace on the language of Scripture?

The rule is, that if the verb is intended to denote the manner of doing a thing, an adverb should be used; but if the verb is intended to denote the nature or the quality of a thing, then an adjective should be used. Further, the appropriateness of using an adjective may be tested by our being able to substitute for the adjective so used, some part of the verb “*to be*”; for, the verb “*to be*” in all its moods

and tenses, generally requires the word immediately connected with it, to be an adjective, not an adverb; consequently, when this verb can be substituted for any other without varying the sense or the construction, that other verb also must be connected with an adjective. Of course there are exceptions to this rule, but we should not reject a useful general rule because it is attended with exceptions.

In Gen. xl. 7, the Revisers make Joseph say to Pharaoh's officers,

“ Wherefore look ye so *sadly* to day ?”

As Joseph's enquiry did not refer to the *manner* in which they looked, but to the *nature* of their looks, the verb should have been followed by an adjective, not by an adverb. The inquiry should have been,

“ Wherefore look ye so *sad* to day ?”

Test the correctness of this expression by substituting, for the verb “*look*”, part of the verb “*to be*”, and you will find the value of the rule.



“Wherefore *are* ye so *sad* to day?”

In Num. xxxvi. 5, we have,

“The tribe of the sons of Joseph speaketh  
*right.*”

This is correct; because what was intended was not that they spoke in a proper *manner*, but that the *nature* of their request was *right.*” Test the correctness of this sentence also by the substitution of part of the verb “*to be*” for the verb “*speaketh*”.

“The tribe of the sons of Joseph *is* right.

The adjective “*exceeding*” is erroneously employed for the adverb “*exceedingly*” in numerous passages in the Revised Old Testament; e.g.,

“Exceeding great”. Gen. xv. 1.

“Exceeding fruitful”. Gen. xvii. 6.

“Exceeding mighty”. Ex. i. 7.

“Exceeding strong”. Ex. x. 19.

“Exceeding loud”. Ex. xix. 16.

“Exceeding good”. Num. xiv. 7.

- "Exceeding many". 2 Sam. xii. 2.  
 "Exceeding much". 2 Sam. xii. 30.  
 "Exceeding guilty". Ezra. ix. 7.  
 "Exceeding broad". Psa. cxix. 96.  
 "Exceeding crooked". Prov. xxi. 8.  
 "Exceeding wise". Prov. xxx. 24.  
 "Exceeding deep". Eccl. vii. 24.  
 "Exceeding beautiful". Ezk. xvi. 13.  
 "Exceeding hot". Dan. iii. 22.  
 "Exceeding glad". Dan. vi. 23.  
 "Exceeding terrible". Dan. vii. 19.  
 "Exceeding magnificent". 1 Chron. xxii. 5.  
 "Wonderful great". 2 Chron. ii. 9.

Contrast the foregoing with the following,

- "Then were the men exceedingly afraid."  
     Jonah i. 10.  
 "The queen was exceedingly grieved." Es-  
     ther iv. 4.

In this matter the Revisers are ten times as often wrong as they are right. May we not, in their own words, describe their errors as "*wonderful great*", and their language as "*exceeding magnificent*"?

The American company of Revisers suggested many very judicious emendations which unfortunately were not duly appreciated by the English Revisers. A list of those emendations is printed at the end of each division of the Scriptures; and I do not doubt that, when a future revision is undertaken, most of them will be adopted.

One of them was the omission of "*for*" before infinitives. The English Revisers declined to adopt this emendation; consequently we are favoured with such inconsistencies as the following:—

"*For to go*". Gen. xxxi. 18.

See Ruth i. 18; "*to go*".

"*For to come*". Isa. xli. 22.

See Jer. xl. 4; "*to come*".

"*For to buy*". Gen. xli. 57.

See Gen. xlii. 7; "*to buy*".

"*For to shew*". Ex. ix. 16.

See Neh. ix. 19; "*to shew*".

"*For to gather*". Ex. xvi. 27.

See 2 Kings iv. 39; "*to gather*".

“*For to deliver*”. Deut. xxv. 11.

See Psa. xxxiii. 19; “*to deliver*”.

“*For to give*”. Deut. xxvi. 3.

See Ex. xiii. 21; “*to give*”.

“*For to keep*”. Josh. x. 18.

See Gen. ii. 15; “*to keep*”.

“*For to confirm*”. Ruth iv. 7.

See 2 Kings xv. 19; “*to confirm*”.

“*For to make*”. 1 Sam. i. 6.

See Gen. iii. 6; “*to make*”.

“*For to build*”. 1 Kings ix. 15.

See Jer. xviii. 9; “*to build*”.

“*For to search*”. 1 Chron. xix. 3.

See Josh. ii. 2; “*to search*”.

“*For to shed*”. Jer. xxii. 17.

See Prov. i. 16; “*to shed*”.

“*For to draw*”. Hag. ii. 16.

See Gen. xxiv. 11; “*to draw*”.

“*For to do*”. Deut. iv. 1.

See 2 Chron. ix. 8; “*to do*”.

In the Authorised Version of Gen. xlvii. 4,  
we read,

“*For to sojourn in the land are we come.*”

From this verse the Revisers have eliminated the word "*for*"; and, as far as I have observed, it is the only instance of their having made the correction, and why they made it, and only it, I cannot tell.

By-the-bye, did they, upon reconsidering the matter, regret the loss of their favourite little word, and resolve to make amends for it by finding it a place elsewhere? I see that they have inserted the word in Neh. ii. 10; where, in the Authorised Version, it is not found. We now read,

“And when Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly, *for* that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel.”

In the Authorised Version, which the Revisers thought to improve, it reads thus,

“it grieved them exceedingly that”, &c.

I need not say which is correct.

Another preposition which the Revisers very frequently misuse is "*in*". They do not dis-

criminate between it and its cognate "*into*"; yet these two words are not interchangeable, they are not synonyms. "*Into*" has an active meaning, "*in*" has a passive meaning. You put a thing *into* its place, and then it is *in* its place. The Revisers say, Gen. 1. 26, that Joseph's body was

"put *in* a coffin in Egypt";

they should have said that it was

"put *into* a coffin in Egypt."

The Revisers evidently knew that this is the correct word to use in such sentences, for in Neh. ii. 12, they have corrected this very error, and say,

"Neither told I any man what my God put  
*into* my heart".

In the Authorised Version, it is

"what my God had put *in* my heart".

In 2 Chron. ix. 23, we read,

"All the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon, to hear his wisdom, which God had put *in* his heart."

It should be,

“ which God had put *into* his heart ” :

as it is in Neh. ii. 12, and vii. 5, thus,

“ And my God put *into* my heart to gather together the nobles ”.

Why have the Revisers made this distinction between God’s act in respect to the wisdom of Solomon, and His act in respect to the resolve of Nehemiah? They cannot answer.

For other instances of “*in*” for “*into*”, see Gen. xliii. 22; Num. xxiii. 5, 12, 16; Deut. xxiv. 1, 3; 1 Kings x. 24; Ezra vii. 27; Psa. xl. 3; Isa. lix. 21 (see li. 23); Jer. xxxvii. 15, 18 (see verse 4).

What is the meaning of the following differences?

“ The Lord spake *unto* Moses and *to* Aaron.”

Lev. xi. 1; and xv. 1 (See xiii. 1).

“ Behold, I give *unto* him my covenant of peace: and it shall be *unto* him, and *to* his seed.” Num. xxv. 13.

“ I will neither turn *unto* the right hand nor *to* the left.” Deut. ii. 27.

“The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great *in* the earth. . . . And it repented the Lord that he had made man *on* the earth. . . . And God said . . . Every thing that is *in* the earth shall die.” Gen. vi. 5, 6, 13, 17.

Here is an awkward sentence; more than one fourth of the words composing it are prepositions. It is from 1 Kings viii. 6;

“And the priests brought *in* the ark *of* the covenant *of* the Lord *unto* its place, *into* the oracle *of* the house, *to* the most holy place, even *under* the wings *of* the cherubim.”

The proper choice of prepositions is confessedly difficult to a foreigner; but Englishmen ought not to find any difficulty in making the proper selection. Poor little “*of*” seems to be the “*fag*”; it is made to do the work of “*with*”, and “*by*”, and “*on*”, as well as its own work.

In Ex. xii. 16, we read,

“No manner of work shall be done in them,



save that which every man must eat, that only may be done *of* you."

Of course, it should be,

"that only may be done *by* you".

In 2 Sam. iv. 8 we read,

"Behold the head of Ish-bosheth the son of Saul thine enemy, which sought thy life; and the Lord hath avenged my lord the king this day *of* Saul, and *of* his seed."

It should be,

"*avenged* . . . . *on* Saul, and *on* his seed."

See Jer. v. 9, 29; ix. 9; there we read,

"Shall not my soul be *avenged on* such a nation as this?"

Sometimes "*of*" is made to do needless work; as, for instance, in Isa. xlvii. 9;

"despite *of* the multitude of thy sorceries";

this should be either,

"*in spite of* the multitude",

or else,

"*despite* the multitude".

In Ezk. xxxix. 12 we read,

“Seven months shall the house of Israel be burying *of* them”;

it should be,

“burying them”, not “burying *of* them”.

Again, in Psa. xix. 11, we have,

“In keeping *of* them there is great reward”.

The error has been corrected by the Revisers in Lev. ix. 22, where, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“And Aaron . . . . came down from offering *of* the sin-offering.”

In the Revised Version it is,

“And Aaron . . . . came down from offering the sin-offering.”

Why did the Revisers correct the latter passage, and leave the former passages uncorrected?

Sometimes “*of*” is wrongly omitted, as in Gen. iv. 22, where we read,

“Tubal-Cain, the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron.”

It should be,

“every cutting instrument of brass and of iron”;

otherwise, the statement means that the instruments were of a compound of brass and iron, and not separately of brass and of iron.

These are little matters, but they all tend to show the limited extent of the Revisers' knowledge of English.

## CHAPTER IX.

CONTENTS.—Wiser than the wisest; Queen Esther not a woman; Moses not a man; Israel not a nation; omission of 'other'; 'none but'; 'other' redundant; 'none other', and 'no other'; 'beside', and besides'.

Is it not grotesquely absurd to state of one man that he was wiser than he was wise; and of another, that he was more brutish than he was brutish; and of one woman, that she was blessed more than she was blessed; and of another, that she was loved more than she was loved; and so on, of beasts, and nations, and peoples? Yet that is only what the Revisers have done. Turn to 1 Kings iv. 30, 31, and you will read,

“Solomon’s wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men.”

As the phrase "*all men*" must include Solomon, the statement is that he was wiser than himself, which is absurdly untrue.

The Revisers should have said,

"He was wiser than all *other men*";

not "wiser than *all men*"; unless they meant to imply that he was either angelic or divine; and his life was not such as would lead us to draw *that* inference from it.

In Esther ii. 17, we read,

"And the king loved Esther above all the women, and she obtained grace and favour in his sight more than all the virgins."

Was Esther, then, not a woman? And if not, what was she? Her name means "*secret*"; perhaps her nature also was secret.

What did the Revisers intend to assert about Moses when in Num. xii. 3 they said,

"Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth."

Was Moses not a man? Was he not upon

the face of the earth? In what sense, then, could he be said to be meeker than himself?

In Deut. xxviii. 1, we read,

“It shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, . . . . that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all the nations of the earth.’

The Jews were one of the nations of the earth; were they, then, to be set on high above themselves? If so, how?

The same error occurs in Psa. cxlvii. 20. See also Deut. x. 15; xiv. 2; and Esther iii. 8.

In 2 Chron. xi. 21, we read,

“And Rehoboam loved Maacah the daughter of Absolom above all his wives and his concubines.”

If, then, Maacah was neither Rehoboam’s wife, nor one of his concubines, what was she?

In verses 18 and 20, it says,

“And Rehoboam took him a wife, Mahalath, the daughter of Jerimoth the son of

David . . . . And after her he took him  
Maacah the daughter of Absalom”.

Clearly she also was his wife; yet it is said that he loved her above all his wives. So he loved her more than he loved her! At least, that is what the Revisers say; but how he did it, they do *not* say.

In Jer. xvii. 9, we read,

“The heart is deceitful above all things”.

But surely the expression “*all things*” must include the heart. Will the Revisers condescend to explain what they mean?

What meaning did the Revisers put, or expect us to put, on the words of Agur the son of Jakeh, which, in Prov. xxx. 2, are quoted thus,

“Surely, I am more brutish than any man”?

Who was Agur? It is evident that, though he was the son of Jakeh, he was not a man; for, the Revisers say that he was more brutish than any man. Perhaps he was a brute; but if so, why speak of his brutish nature? *cela va*

*sans dire.* And how came he to possess the faculty of speech? The Revisers have made a pretty puzzle of it.

Of course, the fault in each of these quotations is the omission of the word "*other*",—

“more brutish than any *other* man”, &c.

In considering the word "*other*", the omission of it is not the only fault which has to be noticed: there is its very opposite,—its needless insertion.

In Gen. viii. 10, we read,

“Noah stayed yet *other* seven days; and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark.”

Why "*other* seven days"? There had been no mention of a previous "*seven days*".

The word "*other*" is redundant in Gen. xxviii. 17, also. There we read,

“How dreadful is this place! this is none *other* but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.”

It should be either,

“this is *none but* the house of God”,



or else,

“ this is *none other than* the house of God ”.

The word “*other*” is redundant in Dan. ii. 11, likewise. There we read,

“ It is a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none *other* that can shew it before the king, *except* the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh.”

It should be “*none...but*”, or “*none...other than*”, or “*none...except*”,

“ there is *none* that can shew it before the king, *except* the gods ”.

Let me ask also, why have we, in 1 Chron. xxiii. 17,

“ none other ”;

and in 1 Sam. xxi. 9,

“ no other ”?

Can the Revisers give any reasons for this change? I trow not.

The latter passage is as follows,

“ And the priest said, The sword of Goliath

the Philistine, whom thou slewest in the vale of Elah, behold, it is here wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod: if thou wilt take that, take it; for there is *no other save that* here."

It should be, "there is no other", or "*none other than that*", or "there is *none save that*", or "there is *none besides that*".

This word "*besides*" reminds me of an oft-repeated error in the Revised Version. The words "*besides*" and "*beside*" are frequently misused there, one for the other.

They are of common origin, but have different and distinct meanings: "*beside*" means "by the side of", and therefore "in addition to"; but "*besides*" means "in addition to", but not necessarily "by the side of".

If this distinction be not observed, very awkward mistakes of meaning may be made; and the Revisers were quite aware of this, as is evident by their having corrected Num. v. 20.

In the Authorised Version the passage reads thus

“But if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee *beside* thine husband”.

The Revisers saw that this wording could but refer to three in a bed; and, conceiving that that is not the meaning of the original, they altered “*beside*” to “*besides*”.

Additional evidence that they knew the proper meaning of “*beside*” is found in Neh. iii. 23. There in the Authorised Version we read,

“After him repaired Benjamin and Hashub, over against their house. After him repaired Azariah, the son of Maaseiah, the son of Ananiah, *by* his house.”

This the Revisers have altered to

“*beside* his own house”;

i.e., Azariah repaired that part of the wall of Jerusalem which was *by the side* of his own house. Had the Revisers said that he repaired the wall “*besides*” his own house, the meaning would have been that he repaired the wall *in*

*addition* to repairing his own house. It is evident, then, that the Revisers clearly understood the distinctive meaning of each of the two words.

Is further evidence of this wanted? Then turn to Lev. ix. 17, where, in the Authorised Version we read,

“He burnt it upon the altar, *beside* the burnt sacrifice of the morning.”

Knowing that these words mean that the two offerings were burnt *side by side*, the Revisers substituted “*besides*” for “*beside*”, to show that the statement intended to be made was that the one offering was supplementary to the other, and not necessarily cöexistent with it. A similar correction is made in Num. xvi. 49. The word “*beside*” is used correctly in Lev. x. 12; xxv. 47; Num. vi. 9; Deut. xi. 30; xvi. 21; Josh. xii. 9; Ruth ii. 14; and the word “*besides*” is used correctly in Gen. xix. 12,

“Hast thou here any *besides*?”

and in 2 Chron. xviii. 6,

“Is there not here *besides* a prophet of the Lord?”

Now, why do I adduce these passages in proof of the Revisers' knowledge of the meaning of these two words? Simply to show how strangely the Revisers have utterly repudiated the teaching of their own lessons; as will be seen in the passages which I have to bring forward.

Turn now to 1 Sam ii. 2; 2 Sam. vii. 22; Isa. xliii. 11; xliv. 6, 8; and xlv. 6. All these passages refer to the oneness of the Deity; and, in every instance, the prepositional, instead of the adverbial, form of the word has been used.

So also is it in Gen. xxvi. 1; xxxi. 50; Lev. xxiii. 38, four times (compare ix. 17); and in Num. xxviii. 10, 15, 24, and 31; xxix. eleven times; also in Deut. xviii. 8; 2 Chron. xvii. 19, and elsewhere.

In my school days, if any boy had done this, and it could be proved that he knew better, he

would have been called up *beside* the master ; and, *besides* receiving a reproof, would have received something that would have made him almost *beside* himself with pain. I am speaking of more than fifty years ago. School discipline has much changed since then ; and, apparently, so has the appreciation of pure English ; for, the senior scholars (decidedly senior) who wilfully committed the errors which I have pointed out have received not even a gentle reproof for their errors, but have received instead, the thanks of Convocation. Poor Lindley Murray ; *requiescat in pace !*

## CHAPTER X.

CONTENTS.—The Revisers' vacillation; 'alway', and 'always'; 'afterward', and 'afterwards'; 'toward', and 'towards'; 'forward', and 'forwards'; 'backward', and 'backwards'; 'upward', and 'upwards'; 'downward', and 'downwards'; 'inward', and 'inwards'; 'outward', and 'outwards'; 'time past', and 'times past'; 'while', and 'whiles'; 'this twenty years', and 'these twenty years'; 'every'; 'every one'; 'either' for 'each'; 'each of them'; 'each one'; 'one half'; 'eat', and 'eat up'; 'swallowed up', and 'swallowed down'.

I cannot but pity the Revisers, they seem to have been so bewildered by the intricacies of their mother tongue. No man among them appears to have possessed a perfect knowledge of the language combined with so commanding an influence over his fellows as to ensure the accurate expression of their thoughts in forcible and graceful English.

This is evidenced by their vacillation respecting numerous words and phrases; various

instances of which have been given, and many more remain to be recorded.

For example, in Deut. xi. 1, we have "*always*"; and, in verse 12 of the same chapter, "*always*". What did the Revisers wish us to understand by this difference; and, if they had no wish respecting it, why did they make the difference? This is not the only passage where it is found.

"*Always*" occurs in Ex. xxv. 30; Num. ix. 16; Deut. xi. 1; xxviii. 29; 2 Sam. ix. 10; Job vii. 16; and Prov. xxviii. 14.

"*Always*" is found in Deut. v. 29; vi. 24, xi. 12; xiv. 23; Psa. xvi. 8; ciii. 9; Prov. v. 19; viii. 30; Eccl. ix. 8; and Isa. lvii. 16.

Then we have "*afterward*" and "*afterwards*"; and one altered to the other without any assignable reason; as in Jer. xxxiv. 11, where "*afterward*" has been altered by the Revisers to "*afterwards*"; yet in Jer. xvi. 16, the Revisers have inserted the very word which they have struck out of chapter xxxiv. 11!

"*Afterward*" occurs in Deut. xvii. 7; Jer. xvi. 16; xlix. 6; and Ezk. xliii. 1.



"*Afterwards*" is found in Deut. xiii. 9; Job xviii. 2; Prov. xx. 17; and Jer. xxxiv. 11.

The difference is the more strange, because the Revisers invariably say, "*toward*", not "*towards*"; "*forward*" and "*backward*", not "*forwards*" or "*backwards*"; they always say "*upward*" and "*downward*", never "*upwards*" or "*downwards*"; always "*inward*" and "*outward*", never "*inwards*" or "*outwards*", except where "*inwards*" is used as a noun.

Would that this uniformity were judiciously extended throughout the Revisers' work. They have made "*afterwards*" an exception in this class of words, without any reasonable ground upon which to base the exception.

Look at Ex. xxi. 29, 36; Deut. xix. 4, 6; and 1 Chron. ix. 20; in these passages we have the expression,

"in *time* past";

but in 2 Sam. iii. 17, the expression is,

"in *times* past";

while in Deut. iv. 42 the latter expression has

been altered to the former; and as the Revisers must, of course, be consistently inconsistent through their work, they have, in 2 Sam. v. 2, and 1 Chron. xi. 2, done the very reverse—they have altered the former expression into the latter.

The Revisers first alter “in *times* past” into “in *time* past”; and then alter “in *time* past”, into “in *times* past”. Was ever such childishness seen in the work of “most potent, grave, and reverend seigniors”? The passage in 2 Sam. v. 2 (and in 1 Chron. xi. 2), is, in the Authorised Version,

“In *time* past, when Saul was king”;

this the Revisers have altered to,

“In *times* past, when Saul was king”.

Was Saul king more than once, that the Revisers must needs make this alteration? The Scriptures are silent respecting it; whence, then, have the Revisers their information on this matter? or have they presumed to be wise “above that which is written,” 1 Cor. iv. 6,

with the usual result spoken of in Rom. i. 22?

There is another word, of similar meaning, which the Revisers have treated in a similarly capricious manner: viz., the word "while."

In Dan. iv. 31, we read,

"*While* the word was in the king's mouth,  
there fell a voice from heaven".

But in the same book, Dan. ix. 20, 21, it is

"*Whiles* I was speaking . . . . yea, *whiles* I  
was speaking".

"*Whiles*" occurs also in Ezk. xxi. 29; xlv. 17; and Hosea vii. 6.

Elsewhere, throughout the Old Testament, it is "*while*", not "*whiles*". See Deut. xxxi. 27; 1 Sam. xx. 14; 2 Sam. xii. 18, 21, 22; 1 Kings i. 14; 2 Chron. xv. 2; xxxiv. 3; Job xx. 23; Psa. vii. 2; xlix. 18; lxiii. 4; civ. 33; Isa. lv. 6; Jer. xv. 9; and xl. 5.

The Revisers' notions of singular and plural, though plural, are truly singular.

Turn to Gen. xxxi. 38; there you will read,

"*This* twenty years have I been with thee".

Now look three verses lower down, and you will read,

“*These* twenty years have I been in thy house”.

Really, were the book not the Holy Bible, such English as this, would render it unworthy of criticism. And it is because it is the Holy Bible, that one feels so indignant with the Revisers for having put its truths into language so atrociously and absurdly inaccurate.

Surely we ought to give to God our very best, and not think any labour too great to bestow upon our offering. “What saith the Scripture?” Rom. iv. 3. “I will show thee that which is noted in the Scripture of Truth.” Dan. x. 21. It is this:—“Ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this of your hand? saith the Lord. *But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing.*” Mal. i. 13, 14. “Out of all your gifts ye shall offer every heave-offering of

the Lord, *of all the best thereof*, even the hal-  
lowed part thereof out of it." Num. xviii. 29.

Did not the Revisers know that "*every*" is  
singular? Certainly it seems as if they did,  
when they altered Gen. xxxii. 16, from

"*every* drove by *themselves*"

to

"*every* drove by *itself*".

In Ezk. xxxiii. 20 also, they say,

"O house of Israel, I will judge you *every*  
*one* after *his* ways".

But in Jonah iii. 8, they waver; and evi-  
dently being uncertain, yet desirous to be  
correct at least once, they give both forms in  
one verse, and say,

"Let them turn *every one* from *his* evil way,  
and from the violence that is in *their* hands."

In Ezk. xxii. 6, there is a strange confusion  
of singular and plural. The Revisers have en-  
deavoured to correct the Authorised Version,  
but have only partially succeeded. They say,

"*Every one* according to *his* power, *have* been".

The following passages are altogether wrong.

“They did not *every man* cast away the abomination of *their eyes*”. Ezk. xx. 8.

“*Every man* to your tents, O Israel.” 2 Chron. x. 16.

“And so they set forward, *every man* by *their families*”. Num. ii. 34.

“These cities were *every one* with *their suburbs* round about *them*.” Josh. xxi. 42.

“They were *every one* of them head of *their fathers’ houses*”. Josh. xxii. 14.

Contrast the next two quotations.

“They walked *every one* in the stubbornness of *their evil heart*.” Jer. xi. 8.

“Behold, ye walk *every one* after the stubbornness of *his evil heart*.” Jer. xvi. 12.

What is to be said of the perpetrators of such inconsistencies as these in the Sacred Oracles? I can say only that I am sorry they are Englishmen.

Turn now to 2 Chron. xviii. 9. In the Authorised Version the passage reads thus,

“The king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat king of Judah, sat *either of them* on his throne”.

This, very properly, the Revisers have altered to,

“The king of Israel and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah sat *each* on his throne”.

The reason for this change is that “*either*” means one of two, but not both; and the passage, as it stood, meant that only one of them “*either*” the king of Israel *or* the king of Judah, “sat on *his* throne”; and this is not the meaning of the Hebrew.

Now, but for indisputable evidence, would it be believed that, within five pages of this correction, the Revisers have committed the very error which their own alteration of 2 Chron. xviii. 9 has condemned? Refer to 2 Chron. ix. 18, and to the corresponding passage in 1 Kings x. 19; the Authorised Version of the passage reads correctly thus,

“There were six steps to the throne, with a footstool of gold, which were fastened to the throne, and stays on *each* side”.

This the Revisers have “*revised*” thus,

“There were six steps to the throne, with a footstool of gold, which were fastened to the throne, and stays on *either* side”.

In the former passage the Revisers made right what was wrong; and in the latter they make wrong what was right; and they leave both passages as altered, to bear witness to their inexplicable inconsistency. It everywhere characterizes their work.

The Revisers have attempted to correct Lev. x. 1.

The passage, in the Authorised Version, reads thus,

“And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took *either of them* his censer, and put fire therein.”

This the Revisers have altered to “*each of them*”.

I have spoken, on page 87, of the error of saying “*of them*” when all are meant; and the Revisers, in correcting 2 Chron. xviii. 9, very properly struck out those words; and, instead of saying



“sat *either of them* on his throne”;  
said

“sat *each* on his throne”.

Yet, with the Revisers' peculiar consistency, they left the words “*of them*” when correcting Lev. x. 1, so that

“took *either of them* his censer”,

is altered to,

“took *each of them* his censer”.

As there were but two, it should be

“took *each* his censer”.

It will be seen, then, that no dependence whatever can be placed on the finality of any correction made by the Revisers. Their vacillation is ceaseless, so that it is impossible to be heartily thankful for any wise correction made by them in any one place, without having ever present in our minds the feeling that in all probability we shall have to retract our thankful words before many more pages are read.

The following instances of redundancy must not pass without remark.

“So Hanun took David’s servants, and shaved off the *one* half of their beards.” 2 Sam. x. 4.

Why did the Revisers say “*one* half”? Could there have been more halves than one, without there being the whole? It is sufficient to say “*half*”. The expression, “*one* half”, is pleonastic. So also is the word “*one*” in the following passages.

“Each *one* had six wings.” Isa. vi. 2.

“Each *one* for his fathers’ house.” Num. i. 44.

“Each *one* resembled the children of a king.” Judges viii. 18.

“Each *one* that walketh in his uprightness.” Isa. lvii. 2.

In all these instances the word “*one*” is redundant; as the word “*each*” implies “*oneness*.”

Can any person tell me what there is distinctively different in a moth’s and a worm’s manner of feeding, so that one must be said to “eat *up*” a thing, and the other simply to “eat” it? Look at Isa. li. 8;

“The moth shall *eat them up* like a garment,  
and the worm shall *eat them* like wool.”

• What also is the difference which the Revisers intended us to understand between the expressions “swallowing *up*” and “swallowing *down*”? In Prov. xxi. 20, we read,

“There is [are] precious treasure and oil in  
the dwelling of the wise ;  
But a foolish man *swalloweth it up*.”

But in Job xx. 15, we are told,

“He hath *swallowed down* riches”.

See also verse 18,

“That which he laboured for shall he restore,  
and shall not *swallow it down*”.

The only other instance of the occurrence of the expression “swallow down” that I can recall to mind is in Job. vii. 19 ;

“How long wilt thou not look away from me,  
“Nor let me alone till I *swallow down* my  
spittle?”

In other instances it is “*swallow up*”; though

what the Revisers intended by the difference, I must ask them to explain.

In Num. xvi. 32, 33 it says that,

“The earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them *up*, . . . . and they went *down* alive into the pit.”

Why did the Revisers say “swallowed them *up*”? There is some sense in speaking of a thing as being swallowed *down*; but “swallowed *up*” is not in accordance with the action of swallowing. Besides, it is sufficient to say, “*swallowed*”,

“The earth opened her mouth and swallowed them alive.”

## CHAPTER XI.

CONTENTS.—‘So—as’, for ‘as—as’; ‘whether or no’, for ‘whether or not’; ‘or’, and ‘nor’; ‘not—or’, and ‘not—nor’; ‘after’ = ‘according to’; ‘never’, and ‘ever’; ambiguity of pronouns.

There are many other errors in the Revised Version of the Old Testament; some are the same as those which were committed by the Revisers of the New Testament, and have been commented on in ‘*The Revisers’ English*’, and therefore need but a passing remark here; others are new, and might be enlarged on, but I shall epitomize them all, for I am sure that my readers must be heartily tired of the subject.

“So—as”, for “as—as”, is a very common error. The rule respecting this matter will be found in ‘*The Revisers’ English*’, p. 141 of the 2nd edition. Evidently the Revisers of the Old Testament knew as little about it

as did the Revisers of the New ; for, where it was correct in the Authorised Version of the Old Testament, it has been "*revised*" [!] and made incorrect; e.g., in the Authorised Version of Psa. lxxii. 5, we read,

"They shall fear thee *as long as* the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations."

This, in the Revised Version, has been altered to,

"They shall fear thee while the sun endureth, And *so long as* the moon, throughout all generations."

Besides noticing the error of "*so long as*", for "*as long as*", look at the structure of the sentence, as *revised*. "They shall fear thee while the sun endureth, and *so long as* the moon, throughout all generations." "So long as the moon", what? The sentence is incomplete, and the meaning unintelligible; but, in the Authorised Version, all is clear.

Look at Gen. xliii. 34, and following verse. In the former we have the expression "*so much*

as”; and, in the latter, “*as much as*”. Yet both expressions are affirmative, and therefore both should have been “*as much as*”.

In Lev. xxvi. 34, 35; Num. ix. 18, and Eccl. ii. 13, we have “*as—as*” used correctly. In all these passages the Revisers had the Authorised Version to guide them; the last passage reads thus,

“Wisdom excelleth folly, *as far as* light excelleth darkness.”

But in the very next chapter, viz. Eccl. iii. 12, where they were left to their own wisdom, they erred, saying,

“There is nothing better for them, than to rejoyce, and to do good *so long as* they live.”

It should be,

“*as long as* they live.”

The same error occurs in Ex. xxx. 23; Deut. i. 11; 1 Sam. xxv. 22; xxix. 8; 1 Chron. xxi. 3; Esther v. 13; Job. xxvii. 6; and Prov. xxv. 16.

In Deut. ii. 5, *so—as* is correct, the statement being negative :

“I will not give you of their land, no, *not so much as* for the sole of your foot to tread on.”

The mention of a negative statement reminds me of another error into which the Revisers have fallen, and consciously fallen ; for it is an error which they have corrected elsewhere.

In Gen. xxxvii. 32, we read, in the Authorised Version,

“ Know now whether it be thy son’s coat or *no*”.

i.e.,

“ Know now whether it *is* thy son’s coat, or *no his coat*”.

The Revisers have corrected the “*no*” into “*not*”; but have left the “*be*”, which ought to have been “*is*”.

Again I have to ask, the oft-repeated question, Why have the Revisers corrected an error in one place, and left the very same error



uncorrected in other places? Were the Revisers really in doubt as to which is the correct form? It seems so, for in Ex. xvi. 4, they write,

“That I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or *no*.”

i.e., “or *no* walk in it”.

Compare the foregoing with Gen. xxvii. 21, where we have the correct form;

“That I may feel thee, my son, whether thou be my very son Esau or *not*.”

i.e., “or *not* my very son Esau.”

Then in Deut. viii. 2, we have,

“Whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or *no*.”

i.e., “or *no* keep them”.

The Revisers, then, by way of maintaining their character for their peculiar consistency, once more give us the correct form. See Ex. xvii. 7,

“Is the Lord among us, or *not*?”

See also Judges ii. 22.

Can an affirmative mean the same as a negative? The Revisers seem to think so; for, in Deut. xvii. 11, they say,

“Thou shalt *not* turn aside . . . : to the right hand, *nor* to the left”.

and in verse 20 of the same chapter, they say,

“That he turn *not* aside . . . . to the right hand, *or* to the left.”

In Num. xx. 17; Deut. xvii. 11; 2 Sam. ii. 19; and Prov. iv. 27, it is

“*not* to the right hand, *nor* to the left”;

but in Deut. v. 32; xvii. 20; xxviii. 14; Josh. i. 7; xxiii. 6; 1 Sam. vi. 12, and 2 Kings xxii. 2, it is

“*not* to the right hand, *or* to the left”.

What did the Revisers mean us to understand by this difference?

In the following passages also, we have “*not*” followed by “*nor*”; Ex. xii. 9; Deut. xxxi. 6; Josh. i. 6; Judges xiv. 16; Isa. xi. 9; xxxiv. 10; lx. 11; and lxv. 25.

But in these passages we have “*not*” followed by “*or*”. 2 Chron. xvi. 1; Psa. cxxxii. 4; and Dan. iv. 19.

In Josh. i. 6 it is,

“I will *not* fail thee, *nor* forsake thee”;

and, in the very next verse,

“Turn *not* to the right hand *or* to the left”.

While speaking of “*not*”, I must call attention to a passage in Psa. ciii.; there, in verse 10 in the Authorised Version, we read,

“He hath not dealt with us after our sins,  
nor rewarded us according to our iniquities.”

In the Church Litany this passage is turned into a prayer, thus,

“O Lord, deal *not* with us *after* our sins,  
Neither reward us *after* our iniquities”.

I well remember when a boy, refusing to say that prayer, and mentally saying, what I thought was the very reverse of it,

“O Lord *do* deal with us *after* our sins”.

I thought it so awful to ask God not to have

anything to do with us *after* we had sinned; and it was not until I found the words in the ciii. Psalm, that I discovered, by the latter part of the passage, that "*after*" meant there, "*according to*". Thenceforth my trouble was at an end, and I always said,

"O Lord, deal not with us *according to* our sins.

Neither reward us *according to* our iniquities."

Judge then of my disappointment when, in the Revised Version, I found that the explanatory phrase "*according to*" had been struck out, and the ambiguous word, "*after*", had been repeated in the latter clause of the passage. It now reads thus,

"He hath not dealt with us *after* our sins,  
Nor rewarded us *after* our iniquities."

Thanks be to God, that this passage as I used to understand it, and as, doubtless, many others have understood it, is not true. He does deal with us *after*, though in mercy not *according to*, our sins.

In 2 Chron. vi. 14, in the Authorised Version, we read,

“There is no god like thee in the heaven, *nor* in the earth”.

This, the Revisers wisely have altered to,

“There is no God like thee, in the heaven, *or* in the earth”.

So far, so good; but why leave other similar passages unaltered? In view of the foregoing alteration, we may reasonably ask, Why have we to read, in Deut. xiv. 27, 29; xviii. 1;

“He hath no portion *nor* inheritance”?

In Judges xiii. 4, 7, we have,

“Drink no wine *nor* strong drink”;

and in Isa. liii. 2,

“He hath no form *nor* comeliness”;

and in Dan. ii. 10,

“No king, lord, *nor* ruler, hath asked such a thing”.

Again, in Dan. vi. 15,

“No interdiction *nor* statute which the king establisheth may be changed.”

In all these passages it should be either  
 “no—*or*”, or else “no—*nor any*”. e.g.,

“No interdict *or* statute”;

or else,

“No interdict, *nor any* statute”.

In Ex. xxiii. 26, we read,

“There shall none cast her young, *nor* be  
 barren”,

and in Psa. xlix. 7,

“None *of them* can by any means redeem his  
 brother,

*Nor* give to God a ransom for him.”

These passages should be,

“There shall none cast her young, *or* be  
 barren”;

and,

“None can by any means redeem his brother,

*Or* give to God a ransom for him.”

Why have the Revisers inserted the words  
 “*of them*” in the last passage? There is  
 nothing in the Hebrew to justify it; and the  
 words do harm, for they make the passage

imply that the impossibility of redeeming a soul, or of giving to God a ransom for him, is affirmed only “*of them*” of whom the Psalmist had just been speaking; whereas, if the words be not inserted, the statement is that “*none*” can do it.

Another question which I have to ask is, Why do the Revisers say “*never*”, when they mean “*ever*”? In Gen. xxxiv. 12, we read,

“Ask me *never* so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me”.

In Job ix. 30, we read,

“If I wash myself in snow water,  
And make my hands *never* so clean”.

And in Psa. lviii. 5, we read,

“They are like the deaf adder that stoppeth  
her ear;  
Which hearkeneth not to the voice of  
charmners,  
Charming *never* so wisely.”

In each of these instances, “*never*” should be “*ever*”; the meaning being, “*to the extreme*”

*limit*”—as far as *ever* it is possible to go. “*Never*” is, of course, the exact opposite.

It is very odd that the Revisers should, against their will, state what they so plainly do not mean, and should obscurely state what they so plainly mean. For instance, Gen. iv. 17, says,

“And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bore Enoch: and he [who?] builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.”

It is not until we have read to the end of the verse that we find out that “*he*” does not refer to Enoch, as it seems to do, but to Cain.

Again, in Gen. ii. 21, we read,

“The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he [who, the man?] took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof.”

But for our well-knowing the circumstance, we might have imagined, from the wording of this verse, the absurdity that the man took out one of his own ribs.



I would suggest that in a re-revision of the Scriptures, the personal pronoun, when referring to the Deity, be printed in capitals. Then this passage will be,

“The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and HE took one of his ribs”.

Turn now to 2 Kings xxiii. 29, and without reading the next verse, decide, if you can, who was the slayer, and who was the slain.

“In his days, Pharaoh-necoh king of Egypt went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates: and king Josiah went against him; and *he* slew *him* at Megiddo, when *he* had seen *him*.”

This is nearly as lucid as was the evidence given by a witness in a case of manslaughter in Somersetshire,

“*He'd* a stick, and *he'd* a stick; and *he* licked *he*, and *he* licked *he*; and if *he'd* a-licked *he*, as hard as *he* licked *he*, *he'd* a-killed *he*, and not *he*, *he*.”

## CHAPTER XII.

CONTENTS.—Pronouns; ‘who’, and ‘which’; ‘ye’, and ‘you’; ‘his’, and ‘your’; ‘they’, and ‘your’; ‘your’, and ‘thy’; ‘turn ye’, and ‘turn you’; ‘thou’, and ‘thee’; ‘in them’, and ‘in those’; ‘his’, and ‘it’; ‘the man’s rod whom’; ‘John Smith, his book’; ‘beside’, and ‘besides’; ‘again’.

The Revisers’ errors in the use of pronouns are very numerous. By “*The Revisers*”, I mean always the English Revision Company; for, many of the errors were protested against by the American Revision Company, but protested against in vain. One of those errors was the use of “*which*”, applied to persons. It will be seen in the Appendix to the Revised Version of the Scriptures that the Americans wished to substitute “*who*”, or “*that*”, for “*which*”, when applied to persons. Had that been done we should have been spared such inconsistencies as the following;

- “The man of God, *who*”. 1 Kings xiii. 26.  
 “Obadiah, *which*”. 1 Kings xviii. 3.  
 “The son of Shaphat, *who*”. 1 Kings xix.  
 19.  
 “The son of Hilkiash, *which*”. 2 Kings xviii.  
 18, 37.  
 “O Lord, the God of Israel, . . . . *who*”.  
 2 Chron. vi. 14. 15.  
 “The Lord, the God of their fathers, *which*”.  
 2 Chron. vii. 22.  
 “The Lord thy God, *which* brought thee  
 forth”. Deut. viii. 14.  
 “The Lord thy God, *who* brought thee forth”.  
 Deut. viii. 15.

As the English Revisers refused to comply with the wish of their American friends for uniformity in this matter, they have a right to know why “*which*” was altered to “*who*” in 2 Chron. vi. 15; 1 Sam. xii. 8; and Psa. cxxxv. 21; and why, *remembering these alterations*, it was not altered in Job v. 9; Psa. vii. 10; Isa. xxviii. 29; and other passages.

Let me also ask why we have, in Psa. cxxiv. 8,

“ Our help is in the name of the Lord *who*  
made heaven and earth ” ;

and in Psa. cxlvi. 5, 6, 7,

“ Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob  
for his help,

*Which* made heaven and earth ;

*Which* keepeth truth for ever ;

*Which* executeth judgement for the oppressed ;

*Which* giveth food to the hungry.”

and then, in the very next Psalm, verses 7 and 8,

“ Sing praises upon the harp unto our God ;

*Who* covereth the heaven with clouds,

*Who* prepareth rain for the earth,

*Who* maketh grass to grow upon the moun-  
tains.”

Here are other instances of the Revisers’  
inconsistency. Josh. xxiv. 13, is as follows,

“ I gave *you* a land whereon *thou* hadst not  
laboured, and cities which *ye* built not ”.

Here “*you*” and “*ye*” are right; but why  
has the singular pronoun “*thou*” been inserted  
in the middle of the sentence? Why change

from plural to singular, and then from singular to plural, all in one verse ?

In Zech. vii. 10, we have,

“Let none of you imagine evil against *his* brother in *your* heart.”

Probably the Revisers thought that if they had said “*his* heart” the pronoun would have referred to “*brother*”. But why did they not transpose the latter part of the sentence and say,

“Let none of you imagine evil in *his* heart against *his* brother” ?

See also Zech. viii. 17. In Ex. xxx. 15, we have,

“The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than the half shekel, when *they* give the offering of the Lord, to make atonement for *your* souls.”

It should be,

“when *they* give the offering of the Lord, to make atonement for *their* souls.”

In Lev. xxiii. 22, a similiar confusion of pronouns occurs.

“When *ye* reap the harvest of *your* land, *thou* shalt not wholly reap the corners of *thy* field, neither shalt *thou* gather the gleaning of *thy* harvest: *thou* shalt leave them for the poor”.

See also Deut. vii. 4,

“So will the anger of the Lord be kindled against *you*, and he will destroy *thee* quickly.”

In Deut. xxix. 5, we have,

“*Your* clothes are not waxen old upon *you*, and *thy* shoe is not waxen old upon *thy* foot.”

Then in verse 11 of the same chapter, we have,

“*Your* little ones, *your* wives, and *thy* stranger that is in the midst of *thy* camps, from the hewer of *thy* wood unto the drawer of *thy* water.”

But why multiply examples of this error? They abound in the Revisers' work.

However, I must give one more; it is really too good to be omitted. See 2 Sam. vii. 23. I will quote part of the previous verse in order to make the reference of the pronouns plain—if possible.

“There is none like *thee*, neither is there any God beside [besides] *thee*, according to all that we have heard with our ears. And what one nation in the earth is like *thy* people, even like Israel, whom *God* went to redeem unto *himself* for a people, and to make *him* a name, and to do great things for *you*, and terrible things, for *thy* land, before *thy* people, which *thou* redeemedst to *thee* out of Egypt”?

Here we have first, God addressed in the second person, “*thee*” and “*thy*”; then He is spoken of in the third person as “*God*”, and “*himself*”, and “*him*”; then, without any indication that the speaker is addressing any one else, we have “*you*”, which appears to refer to the Israelites; then another change, again without any indication of change of person addressed,

and we have “*thy*”, “*thy*”, “*thou*”, and “*thee*”, in the second person, though the reference is to God, who just before has been spoken of in the third person, as “*himself*”, and “*him*”!

Do the Revisers think that “*ye*” is singular? It appears so, for in Micah i. 11, they say,

“Pass *ye* away, O inhabitant of Shaphir”.

In Isa. xxxi. 6, we read,

“Turn *ye* unto him from whom *ye* have deeply revolted”;

and in Ezk. xxxiii. 11, we read,

“Turn *ye*, turn *ye* from your evil ways”;

but in Prov. i. 23, it is,

“Turn *you*, at my reproof”;

and in Zech. ix. 12, it is,

“Turn *you* to the strong hold, *ye* prisoners of hope”.

In Psa. xxv. 16, we read,

“Turn *thee* unto me, and have mercy upon me”,

but in Psa. lxix. 16, it is,



“According to the multitude of thy tender mercies turn *thou* unto me.”

“*Thou*” is nominative, “*thee*” is accusative; therefore they are no more interchangeable than are “*I*” and “*me*”. We may say,

“Turn *thyself* unto me”;

or we may say,

“Turn *thou* unto me”;

but we may not say,

“Turn *thee* unto me”.

Members of the Society of Friends, for whom I have the greatest respect, frequently err in this matter.

The Revisers are evidently among those who are given to change, Prov. xxiv. 21; hence, in Ex. xxxv. 35, we have to read,

“*Of them* that do any workmanship, and of *those* that devise cunning works.”

In Psa. cxlvii. 11, we read,

“The Lord taketh pleasure *in them* that fear him.

*In those* that hope in his mercy,”

and in Psa. lxix. 6, we read,

“*Let not them* that wait on thee be ashamed :

. . . . .

*Let not those* that seek thee be brought to dishonour.”

See also Ex. xxxv. 35.

The Revisers' errors in the use of pronouns are, as I have said, innumerable. I can give only examples of them. See how the singular and plural are mixed in the following passage. Deut. xxii. 1, 2,

“Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox *or* his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from *them*: thou shalt surely bring *them* again unto thy brother. And if thy brother be not nigh unto thee, or if thou know him not, then thou shalt bring *it* home to thine house, and *it* shall be with thee until thy brother seek after *it*, and thou shalt restore *it* to him again.”

Of course, the word “*again*” is redundant,

unless the reference is to an animal that had previously been restored to the loser; and that, the passage does not imply.

One more example. See Dan. iv. 14, 15,

“He cried aloud, and said thus, Hew down the tree, and cut off *his* branches, shake off *his* leaves, and scatter *his* fruit: let the beasts get away from under *it*, and the fowls from *his* branches. Nevertheless leave the stump of *his* roots in the earth . . . and let *it* be wet with the dew of heaven, and let *his* portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth.”

While speaking of pronouns, I would call attention to the Revisers' alteration of Num. xvii. 5. In the Authorised Version it is,

“It shall come to pass, that *the man's rod*, *whom* I shall choose, shall blossom”.

As I pointed out in a paper which I read before the Royal Society of Literature (upon common errors in speaking and writing), the expression, “*the man's rod, whom*”, is very objectionable.

The Revisers saw the error, and tried to correct it, but how have they done it? Thus,

“It shall come to pass, that the man whom I shall choose, his rod shall bud”;

which is as graceful a form of expression as is, “*John Smith, his book*”.

Why did not the Revisers say,

“It shall come to pass that the rod, of the man whom I shall choose, shall bud”?

## CHAPTER XIII.

CONTENTS:—Positive assertions weakening; ‘ever and ever’; ‘from everlasting to everlasting’; ‘shall’, and ‘will’; ‘compass us round’; ‘shall’, for ‘should’; ‘lift’, and ‘lifted’; ‘we be’; ‘be surely’, and ‘surely be’; ‘none was’, and ‘none were’; ‘the distance were’; ‘dwelt unto this day’; ‘get thee to Anathoth’.

There are some forms of expression which we weaken by our very endeavours to strengthen them. For instance, if I say, “There were two thousand persons present”; I make a statement which those who hear me, believe to be founded on trustworthy information. But if I say, “*I am sure* there were two thousand persons present”; it is at once understood that the number is doubtful; and, by my saying “*I am sure*,” they know that I am *not* sure, but am only estimating the number of persons that were present.

These remarks apply to the expression, “*for*

*ever and ever*", which is repeatedly found in the Revisers' work, e.g., in Ex. xv. 18; 1 Chron. xxix. 10; Psa. ix. 5; x. 16; xxi. 4; xlv. 6, 17; xlvi. 14; lii. 8; cxix. 44; cxlv. 1, 2; cxlviii. 6; Isa. xxx. 8; xxxiv. 10; Dan. ii. 20; vii. 18; xii. 3; Micah iv. 5.

The mischief of the expression "for ever *and ever*", is that it most unmistakably implies that "*for ever*" does not mean "*eternally*"; for if it does, why add "*and ever*"? Besides, how can there be any extension of existence to that which is eternal? And if one "*for ever*" does not mean "*eternally*", how can two, or even two thousand, "*for evers*" mean it? No number of finites can make an infinite. Therefore, by endeavouring to strengthen the expression "*for ever*", by adding "*and ever*" to it, you utterly destroy its meaning.

In 1 Chron. xvi. 36; Neh. ix. 5; Jer. vii. 7, and xxv. 5, the Revisers have struck out the expression "*for ever and ever*", and have substituted for it, "from everlasting even to everlasting", "from everlasting to everlasting",

“from of old even for evermore”, and “from of old and even for evermore.”

Of these four forms of expression, the two latter are the most to be preferred; because we can with propriety speak of some thing as existing *from* some *definite* past time onward for ever; but we cannot with propriety speak of anything as existing “*from* everlasting to everlasting”; because *from* one thing to another, implies that there is an interval between them, and that idea is inconsistent with the term “*everlasting*”.

The Revisers’ errors in the use of the auxiliaries “*shall*” and “*will*” are very strange. We are accustomed to find foreigners perplexed by them; but Englishmen should know their own language. However, it is clear that there are some who do not. The Revisers, of course, think that they do; hence, in Gen. xxxiv. 30, they have altered “*shall*” to “*will*”, and, in so doing, were right. The verse reads thus in the Revised Version,—

“And Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, ye have

troubled me, to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanites and the Perizzites: and, I being few in number, they *will* gather themselves together against me and smite me; and I shall be destroyed, I and my house."

The alteration was necessary because "*shall*", in the third person, implies compulsion on the part of the speaker, whereas "*will*" implies futurity only; and that was what was intended by Jacob.

But why, seeing that the Revisers have made this judicious alteration, have they left unaltered numerous other similar passages? For instance, that in Joshua vii. 9, which is an almost parallel passage; why was it left? It is as follows:

"Oh [O] Lord, what shall I say, after that Israel hath [*have*] turned *their* backs before their enemies! For the Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land *shall* hear of it, and *shall* compass us round, and cut off our name from the earth".



This should be,

“the inhabitants of the land *will* hear of it,  
and *will* compass us, and cut off our name  
from the earth”.

There is no occasion to say “compass us  
*round*”. The word “*round*” is comprehended  
in the word “*compass*”.

In Gen. iv. 13, 14, we read,

“And Cain said . . . . I shall be a fugitive  
and a wanderer in [*on*] the earth; and it  
*shall* come to pass that whosoever findeth  
me *shall* slay me.”

Of course, the Revisers should have said,

“it *will* come to pass, that whosoever findeth  
me *will* slay me.” See also Gen. xii. 12.

In Num. xiv. 13, we read,

“And Moses said unto the Lord, Then the  
Egyptians *shall* hear it”.

This would have been all very well if Moses  
had been threatening to tell the Egyptians;  
but he was not; he was simply saying what  
*would* happen, not what *should* happen. The

Revisers therefore should have rendered his words thus,

“Then the Egyptians *will* hear it”.

In 1. Sam. xix. 11, Michal, David’s wife, warns him of her father’s intention to kill him, and says, according to the Revisers’ interpretation of her words,

“If thou save not thy life to-night, tomorrow thou *shalt* be slain.”

It ought to be,

“tomorrow thou *wilt* be slain.”

In Ezk. xiv. 16, 18, 20 we read of dire judgments being threatened by God against a land; and the certainty of the execution of those judgments is enforced by the utterance of these thrice repeated words,

“Though these three men [Noah, Daniel, and Job] were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they *shall* deliver neither sons nor daughters; they only *shall* be delivered”.

As this is the *future* subjunctive, as shown by the verb "*were*", the sentence should be,

"Though these three men *were* in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they *should* deliver neither sons nor daughters; they only *should* be delivered".

Errors of this kind abound throughout the work. See Deut. i. 39; 1 Sam. xix. 11; 1 Kings viii. 42; xii. 27; xviii. 12, 14; Neh. iv. 3; Esther i. 17, 20; ii. 11; Psa. lxxxv. 12, 13; cxxxix. 10; Isa. lvii. 16; Jer. xxvi. 15; and elsewhere.

In Psalm xxiii. 6, we have "*shall*" for "*will*", and "*will*" for "*shall*":

"Surely goodness and mercy *shall* follow me  
all the days of my life:

And I *will* dwell in the house of the Lord  
for ever."

It should be,

Surely goodness and mercy *will* follow me all  
the days of my life:

And I *shall* dwell in the house of the Lord  
for ever."

The reason of this is that "*shall*", in the third person, implies compulsion on the part of the speaker, whereas "*will*" implies futurity only, as I have previously explained; and "*will*", in the first person implies volition, whereas "*shall*" in the first person is simply indicative of futurity, without any reference to volition.

David did not say, "Goodness and mercy *shall* follow me"; that would have been equivalent to saying that he had the ordering of the providence of God; but he did say, "Goodness and mercy *will* follow me", which is an expression of trust in God's loving-kindness. Neither did he say, "*I will* dwell in the house of the Lord for ever". He knew very well that

" 'Tis of grace from first to last,  
That sinners enter Heaven ";

and, trusting in God's grace, he said,

" I *shall* dwell in the house of the Lord for  
ever."

The Revisers' language is the utterance of

proud presumption; David's language was the expression of child-like faith.

I have previously cited some instances of the Revisers' inconsistencies in the use of verbs, but "the half was not told". Here are some more.

- "Hagar *lift* up her voice". Gen. xxi. 16.
- "Abraham *lifted* up his eyes". Gen. xxii. 4.
- "Abraham *lift* up his eyes". Gen. xviii. 2.
- "Aaron *lifted* up his hands". Lev. ix. 22.
- "We *are* twelve brethren". Gen. xlii. 13.
- "We *be* twelve brethren". Gen. xlii. 32.
- "If I *be* bereaved of my children,  
I *am* bereaved". Gen. xliii. 14.
- "I am the Lord *that* healeth thee". Ex. xv. 26.
- "I am the Lord *which* sanctify you". Lev.  
xx. 8.
- "He shall *be* *surely* put to death". Ex. xxi. 15.
- "He shall *surely be* put to death". Ex. xxi. 16.
- "None *were* of silver". 1 Kings x. 21.
- "None *was* exempted". 1 Kings xv. 22.
- "*Though it is* a forest". Josh. xvii. 18.
- "*Though they be* strong". Josh. xvii. 18.
- "Thou *has* been a strong hold to the poor, a

strong hold to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones *is* as a storm against the wall." Isa. xxv. 4.

The Revisers cannot justify this change in the verb, from the past to the present; for, the verb in the Hebrew is not written; it is understood; and *is*, of course, understood, in the latter clause, to agree with the time of the previous verb, i.e.,

"Thou *hast been* a refuge . . . . when the blast *was* as a storm".

Again,

"From the uttermost part of the one wing unto the uttermost part of the other *were* ten cubits." 1 Kings vi. 24.

What *were*? The distance *were*! *Were* it? The verb is not expressed in the Hebrew; therefore, to the Revisers be all the glory of the grammar.

"Art thou the man of God that *camest* from Judah?" 1 Kings xiii. 14.

In this verse the nominative to the verb

“*came*” is not the pronoun “*thou*”, but “*the man of God*”; and we cannot say, “the man of God *camest*.” The meaning is,

“Art thou — the man of God that came from Judah?”

Again, in the Revised Version, we read,

“The children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem: but the Jebusites *dwelt* with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, *unto this day*.”  
Judges i. 21.

This should have been,

“the Jebusites *have dwelt* with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, *unto this day*.”

In the Authorised Version it is “*dwelt*”. Even that is preferable to “*dwelt*”.

“*Dwelt*” refers wholly to the past, and therefore cannot be used in connection with “*unto this day*”. But “*have dwelt*” can be used in that connection; and, being so used, means,

“have continued to dwell unto this day.”

As has frequently been said, any error made in one direction in 'the Revisers' work, is almost certain to be accompanied by a corresponding error in the opposite direction. Hence, we are not surprised at the following :

Solomon said unto Abiathar the priest (1 Kings ii. 26),

“Get thee [*thou*] to Anathoth, unto thine own fields ; for thou art worthy of death : but I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou *barest* the ark of the Lord God before David my father”.

How could Abiathar make bare the ark before one who was dead and buried ? The verb should be in the past, to agree with the event ; and the last clause of the verse should be transposed, so that the sense would not be dependent on a comma. But probably the Revisers meant “*bear*”, to carry ; if so, they should have said,

“Get *thou* to Anathoth, unto thine own fields, for thou art worthy of death ; but, because thou *bearedst* the ark of the Lord God before David my father, I will not at this time put thee to death”.



## CHAPTER XIV.

CONTENTS.—The Rule respecting verbs that are not expressed. ‘I had rather be’; ‘thence’, and ‘from thence’; ‘whence’, and ‘from whence’; the natural place of emphasis.

. The Revisers have corrected a very common error, which occurs in the Authorised Version of Prov. iii. 16. The nominative in the first part of the verse being in the singular, of course the verb also is in the singular to agree with it; and the nominative in the last part of the verse being in the plural, the verb also should be in the plural; but, being omitted, the verb in the first part of the verse is understood as applying to the last, but being in the singular, does not agree with it. The verse is as follows :

“Length of days *is* in her right hand; and  
in her left hand [*is*] riches and honour.”

This has been corrected thus,

“Length of days *is* in her right hand ;  
In her left hand *are* riches and honour.”

Prov. xviii. 4, also has been corrected. In the Authorised Version it reads thus,

“The words of a man’s mouth *are* as deep waters, and the well-spring of wisdom [*are*] as a flowing brook.”

This has been corrected thus,

“The words of a man’s mouth *are* as deep waters ;  
The wellspring of wisdom *is* as a flowing brook.”

Now, is it not strange that the Revisers, who by making the foregoing alterations showed that they understood the rule respecting such sentences, should have given us such sentences as the following ?

“Lord, my heart *is* not haughty nor [*is*] mine eyes lofty”. Psa. cxxxix. 1.

“God *is* in heaven, and thou [*is*] upon earth”. Eccl. v. 2.

“The vineyard of the Lord of hosts *is* the

house of Israel, and the men of Judah  
[*is*] his pleasant plant". Isa. v. 7.

"The sword *is* without, and the pestilence  
and the famine [*is*] within". Ezk. vii. 15.

"Whose leaves *were* fair, and the fruit thereof  
[*were*] much". Dan. iv. 21.

"Behold a man clothed in linen, whose loins  
were girded with pure gold of Uphaz:  
his body also *was* like the beryl, and his  
face as the appearance of lightning, and  
his eyes [*was*] as lamps of fire, and his  
arms and his feet [*was*] like in colour  
to burnished brass, and the voice of his  
words [*was*] like the voice of a multitude."  
Dan. x. 5, 6.

It should be,

"Behold a man clothed in linen, whose loins  
*were* girded with pure gold of Uphaz: his  
body also *was* like the beryl, and his face  
as the appearance of lightning; his eyes  
*were* as lamps of fire, and his arms and  
his feet like in colour to burnished brass;  
and the voice of his words *was* like the  
voice of a multitude."

Where the number of the nominative changes,

the verb must be repeated and be made to agree with its nominative.

How is it that the Revisers fall into that common error of using "*had*" for "*would*"? They would never think of saying,

"I *had* be";

yet, in Psa. lxxxiv. 10, they say,

"I *had* rather be a doorkeeper".

Of course, it should be,

"I *would* rather be a doorkeeper".

The presence of the adverb "*rather*" cannot affect the verb; therefore, as it is wrong to say "I *had* be", it must be wrong to say "I *had* rather be".

In Obadiah 4, we read, in the Authorised Version,

"Though thou exalt *thyself* as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, *thence* will I bring thee down, saith the Lord."

This is altered, in the Revised Version, thus,

"Though thou mount on high as the eagle,

and though thy nest be set among the stars, I will bring thee down *from thence*, saith the Lord."

The simile is drawn from the rock-dwellings of the Edomites ; but the beauty and force of the old Version has been sadly marred by the Revisers.

'*The Vision of Obadiah*' had for its object the denouncing of the arrogance of Edom ; (see v. 3) and, bearing that in mind, the expression "*exalt thyself*" is certainly to be preferred to "*mount on high*", notwithstanding that the latter expression may be more suitable in speaking of an eagle ; for we ought not, in using symbolic language, to lose sight of the purport of the simile, but should judiciously blend the words suitable to each state, the real and the symbolic, as has been carefully done in this passage in the Authorised Version.

Further, the expression,

"though thy nest *be set* among the stars",

does not so graphically describe the arrogance

of Edom, as does the expression in the Authorised Version,

“though *thou set thy nest among the stars*”.

The passive form of the verb has less force than has the active. Also, the transposition of the last clause is bad, because it weakens the declaration ;

“I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord.”

Far stronger is it as it stands in the Authorised Version,

“Thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord.”

The verse is divided into two parts ; the former part, consisting of two clauses, relates to the proud bearing of the Edomites,

“Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars” :

and the latter part relates to God’s threatened debasement of the Edomites,

“Thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord.”

Now, as I have previously said, the natural places of emphasis in a sentence, or in a clause of a sentence, are those occupied by the first and the last words; the intermediate words occupy places of inferior emphasis.

The writers of the Authorised Version admirably illustrate this in the verse which is under consideration, especially in the last clause, the first and last words of which are "*thence*" and "*Lord*". Emphasize these words, and likewise the first and last words of the two previous clauses, and mark the power of the expression.

"*Though* thou exalt thyself as the *eagle*,  
and

*Though* thou set thy nest among the *stars*,  
*Thence* will I bring thee down, saith the *Lord*."

How feeble is the Revised Version of this!

"I will bring thee down from thence, saith  
the Lord."

However, I have not, in these criticisms, asked my readers to consider graces of style,

and such like higher matters ; that were a hopeless task with such writings as the Revisers' before us. It will be time enough to consider the higher branches of the study of the language of the Sacred Scriptures when the Revisers have learnt to express themselves grammatically.

The primary object which I had in calling attention to Obadiah 4 was to criticize the Revisers' alteration of "*thence*" to "*from thence*"; an alteration which is certainly not for the better.

"*Thence*", "*hence*", and "*whence*" mean, respectively, "*from there*", "*from here*", and "*from where*"; they carry in themselves the meaning of "*from*"; consequently, to say "*from thence*", is equivalent to saying "*from from there*".

The absurdity of the Revisers' alteration is therefore apparent, though their motive in making it is certainly not so. I must concede that they had a motive ; but what it was, it is impossible to even imagine, for, on the very same page where they have substi-



tuted "*from thence*" for "*thence*", they have five times employed the word "*thence*", in sentences strictly parallel with Obadiah 4. Here are the words; judge for yourselves. The passage containing them is Amos ix. 2—4.

"Though they dig into hell, *thence* shall mine hand take them; and though they climb up to heaven, *thence* will I bring them down. And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out *thence*; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, *thence* will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them. And though they go into captivity before their enemies, *thence* will I command the sword, and it shall slay them."

The passage in Obadiah is not the only one in which the Revisers have altered "*thence*" to "*from thence*"; they have made the same ridiculous alteration in 1 Chron. xiii. 6, and 2 Chron. viii. 18. But, with their usual inconsistency, they have left the word unaltered elsewhere. So we have,

“Abraham journeyed *from thence*”. Gen. xx. 1.

“Isaac departed *thence*”. Gen. xxvi. 17.

“Isaac removed *from thence*”. Gen. xxvi. 22.

“The Lord thy God brought thee out *thence*”.  
Deut. v. 15.

“He brought us out *from thence*”. Deut. vi. 23.

Quite as faulty are the Revisers in their use of the adverbs “*hence*” and “*whence*”. e.g.,

“Carry up my bones *from hence*.” Gen. i. 25.

“Carry up my bones away *hence*.” Ex. xiii. 19.

“Carry us not up *hence*.” Ex. xxxiii. 15.

“Get thee down quickly *from hence*.” Deut. ix. 12.

“*Whence* comest thou?” Job i. 7.

“*From whence* comest thou?” Job ii. 2.

“*Whence* come ye?” Gen. xlii. 7.

“*From whence* come ye?” Josh. ix. 8.

And so on, to the end of the Bible.

## CHAPTER XV.

CONTENTS.—‘This’, and ‘that’; change of proper names; ‘O’, and ‘oh’; ‘wilt’, and ‘willest’; ‘if’ for ‘whether’; ‘though’ for ‘if’; ‘except’ for ‘unless’; the first use of ‘its’; ‘nitre’ for ‘natron’; ‘brass’ for ‘copper’; ‘bits’ for ‘bridles’; ‘Aha’ for ‘Ha, Ha’; roaring like a lion; youth like an eagle; ‘people of his pasture’; ‘sheep of his hand’; ‘who was Sarai Abram?’; again the second time; ‘sick of’ and ‘sick with’; heavier than them is!

Lord Iddesleigh, in his address to the students of the University of Edinburgh, said, “Some persons are so intent upon details that they lose all idea of the whole, and for want of grasp of the whole, they lose the benefit of the very details with which they so energetically busy themselves.”

This remark is singularly applicable to the Revisers. Intent upon the jots and tittles of their work, they have failed to take a comprehensive view of the whole, with the object of bringing, as it were into the unity of brother-

hood, the various forms of expression which, in their heterogeneous characters, must be considered as aliens to the commonwealth of our language.

However, let us hope that some day the work will be taken up again; and that then it will be in the hands of those who will have crowned their other qualifications by superadding a perfect knowledge of their own mother tongue.

There still remain certain errors to be criticized, but I will be very brief with them all, for I fear to tire my readers by dwelling on a subject which is universally held to be devoid of interest.

I grant that the study of English is uninteresting to most persons, but had it been so to all, where would have been that powerful command of words which has so often held captive the minds of multitudes who have listened with entrancement to the overflowing eloquence of our orators; or where would have been the thrilling music of language heard in the rhythm of poetry?

Do my readers think that the orator and the poet have not to study their utterances? No man ever arrived at eminence in any art without much study. True, "*poeta nascitur, non fit*", but that refers to the constitution of the mind, not to poetic diction. The feelings and thoughts, which are the soul of poetry and eloquence, are given; but the command of language, adequate to express those feelings and thoughts, is the result of diligent study by a highly sensitive mind and keenly appreciative intellect.

But I must not linger over this engaging subject; I must descend from the sublime to the ridiculous; for my present duty is to call attention to errors, not to descant on the raptures of eloquence and poetry.

And truly my subject is ridiculous, for one cannot but laugh at the Revisers' absurd mistakes.

Are the words "*this*" and "*that*" interchangeable? Are nearness and distance one and the same thing? The Revisers say, in

2 Kings iii. 16, 17,

“ Make *this* valley full of trenches. For thus saith the Lord, Ye shall not see wind, neither shall ye see rain, yet *that* valley shall be filled with water.”

What confusion the change of names makes in the Second Book of Kings ! We read there, in chapter xi. verse 2, of *Joash*, the son of Ahaziah, king of Judah. But, in verse 21 of the same chapter, and in xii. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 18, and xiv. 13, he is called “*Jehoash*” ; then, in xii. 19, 20, and xiii. 1, he is again called “*Joash*”. This is the more confusing because the name of the king of *Israel*, who was cotemporary with Jehoash, the king of *Judah*'s successor, was *Jehoahaz*'s son *Joash*, so called in 2 Kings xiii. 9 ; but in the following verse called “*Jehoash*” ; then, in verses 12, 13 and 14, “*Joash*”, and, in verse 25, called both “*Jehoash*” and “*Joash*”, while, in xiv. 1, his father, who in the last verse of the previous chapter is called “*Jehoahaz*”, is called “*Joahaz*”. Why all this bewildering confusion ? Is this making matters so plain

that "wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein"? Isa. xxxv. 8.

We have, in English, two words which are very similar to each other, and therefore are often misused, "*O*" and "*Oh*". The former is simply vocative, and the latter is an exclamation of surprise, pain, sorrow, or desire.

As in other matters, so in this, the Revisers, being uncertain as to the right use of each, have erred in the use of both.

I give the Revisers credit for having endeavoured to write correctly; but it was beyond them, they could not do it. Simple as is the rule respecting "*O*" and "*Oh*", the Revisers being as frequently wrong as they are right when they had to employ either of the words, it is evident that their correct use was unknown to them.

Both "*O*" and "*Oh*" are correctly employed in Psa. xcv.; the former in verse 6, the latter in verse 7.

"O come, let us worship and bow down;  
Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker."

There is “*O*” vocative.

“Oh that ye would hear his voice.”

There is “*Oh*” expressive of desire, but not vocative.

The Revisers seem occasionally to have had glimpses of what is right respecting these words, and give us a flash of the truth ; but it is only a flash ; it goes out immediately, and all is again darkness.

Thrice they have corrected “*O*” to “*Oh*”, but more than five times as frequently have they left “*O*” unaltered, though in every instance the sentence is expressive of some sentiment, feeling, passion, or desire.

Compare Prov. xxx. 13 ; Psa. ci. 2 ; and cxix. 97, which the Revisers have altered, with the following which they have not altered :

Psa. xxv. 17, 20 ; xxxvi. 10 ; xliii. 1, 3 ; lxi. 7 ; lxvii. 4 ; lxxiv. 19, 21 ; lxxxvi. 16 ; lxxxix. 47 ; xc. 14 ; cvi. 4 ; cix. 26 ; cxix. 8, 10.

Look also at Judges vi. 13, 15 ; there they have employed “*Oh*”, although the expressions are only vocative.



“*Oh* my Lord”, and “*Oh* Lord”.

The inconsistency of the Revisers will be better seen if we compare passages in which the expressions are similar; e.g., Psa. vii. 9, with Psa. lxxvii. 4; lxxiv. 21; and cxix. 10.

“*O* let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end.

That is correct; the expression being one of desire; so also are the following passages expressions of desire, but the interjections, being vocative, are wrong.

“*O* let the nations be glad and sing for joy.”

“*O* let not the oppressed return ashamed.”

“*O* let me not wander from thy commandments.”

In my criticisms on the New Testament Revisers' errors, I have so fully discussed the error of using “*wilt*” for “*willest*”, that I must refer my readers to that work for the reasons which justify my condemnation of the error.

In Esther v. 3, we have,

“What *wilt* thou, queen Esther?”

This should be,

“What *willest* thou, queen Esther?”

In Job xxxiv. 33, we have,

“Shall his recompense be as thou *wilt*?”

“As thou *wilt*” what? The sentence is not complete; “*wilt*” is only an auxiliary to another verb. The sentence should be,

“Shall his recompense be as thou *willest*?”

The Revisers' error of using “*if*” for “*whether*”, “*though*” for “*if*”; and “*except*” for “*unless*” need not be criticized here; enough having been said on those matters also in ‘*The Revisers' English*’. I will merely quote some of the passages in the Old Testament where the errors will be found.

“*If*”, used incorrectly for “*whether*”, will be found in Gen. viii. 8; Psa. xiv. 2; cxxxix. 24; Jer. ii. 10; v. 1; Lam. i. 12; and Mal. iii. 10; and yet in Cant. vii. 12; Joel ii. 14; and

Jonah iii. 9, the Revisers have corrected the error. But why there, and not elsewhere? Will they condescend to tell us?

“*Whether*” is used correctly in Gen. xviii. 21; xxxvii. 14; Ex. iv. 18; xxii. 8; Num. xiii. 18, 19, 20, and elsewhere.

“*Though*,” used incorrectly for “*if*,” will be found in Gen. xl. 10; Num. xviii. 27; 1 Sam. xx. 20; 2 Sam. iv. 6; Job. x. 19; Psa. xxxv. 14; lviii. 7; Obad. 16; and Zech. x. 6: and yet in Job. xxxix. 16, the Revisers have corrected the error. But why they selected that particular passage for correction and left the rest, is probably known only to themselves; if, indeed, it is known to them. The error in Psa. lviii. 7, does not exist in the Authorised Version.

“*Except*,” used incorrectly for “*unless*,” will be found in Gen. xxxi. 42; xxxii. 26; xlii. 15; xliii. 3, 5, 10; xliv. 23, 26; Deut. xxxii. 30; Josh. vii. 12; 1 Sam. xxv. 34; 2 Sam. iii. 13; v. 6; 2 Kings iv. 24; Esther ii. 14; Psa. cxxvii. 1; Isa. i. 9; Dan. vi. 5; and Amos iii. 3. In

Prov. iv. 16, both words occur, the one wrong, the other right :

“They sleep not, *except* [*unless*] they have done mischief;

And their sleep is taken away, *unless* they cause some to fall.”

The rule respecting these two words will be found in ‘*The Revisers’ English*’, p. 95, of the 2nd Edition. Briefly, it is this: “*except*” should be used in referring to persons or to things; and “*unless*”, in referring to actions.

The word “*unless*” is used correctly in Psa. xxvii. 13; xciv. 17; cxix. 92, and elsewhere.

“I had fainted, *unless* I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord  
In the land of the living.”

“*Unless* the Lord had been my help,  
My soul had soon dwelt in silence.”

“*Unless* thy law had been my delight,  
I should then have perished in mine affliction.”

“*Except*” is used correctly in Dan. ii. 11; and iii. 28.

“There is none other that can show it before the king, *except* the gods whose dwelling is not with flesh.”

“That they might not serve nor worship any god, *except* their own God.”

Sometimes the Revisers are wrong as to facts. In their preface they say that the word “*its*” does not appear to have been introduced into any edition of the Bible before 1660.

More than twenty years ago I had a discussion with the late Dean Alford upon this matter; and if the Revisers will refer to my work, ‘*The Dean’s English*’, p. 70, 11th edition, they will read of the word “*its*” found in a Bible published in 1653.

In Prov. xxv. 20, the Revisers say,

“As vinegar upon *nitre*,  
So is he that singeth songs to an heavy heart.”

The entire force of the illustration is lost by the use of the word “*nitre*”—i.e., saltpetre—for, this salt produces no visible result of any kind on intermixture with vinegar.

The word "*nitre*" should probably have been "*natron*", i.e., crude carbonate of soda. Vinegar upon being poured over *natron* develops a copious froth, the hollowness and rapid subsidence of which are in keeping with the effect of the singing of songs to a heavy heart.

In Deut. viii. 9, we are told that Palestine is  
 "A land whose stones are iron, and out of  
 whose hills thou mayest dig "*brass*."

But neither out of the hills of Palestine, nor out of any other hills can brass be dug. Brass is an alloy of copper and zinc, or of copper and tin, and does not exist as a natural product. This fact ought to have taught the Revisers that the word "*brass*" must be a mistranslation.

The Revisers are not at all "*horsey*", or they would not have made any mistake about bits and bridles. But thrice they speak of "*bridles*" where what are meant are "*bits*", e.g.;

"I will put my *bridle* in thy *lips*". 2 Kings  
 xix. 28; and Isa. xxxvii. 29.

“A *bridle* that causeth to err shall be in the *jaws* of the peoples”. Isa. xxx. 28.

In 2 Sam. viii. 1, the *bridle* is spoken of as being taken out of the *hand*, which is correct; but who ever heard of a “*bridle*” being in the “*lips*” or the “*jaws*” of any animal?

The ‘*Edinburgh Review*’ remarked on Job xxxix. 25, “Even the horse is no longer allowed by the Revisers to snort ‘Ha, Ha’; but is made, like human beings, to say ‘Aha’”.

In Isa. v. 29, we read,

“Their roaring shall be like a lion.”

A roaring may be like *that of* a lion, but the roaring cannot be like a lion.

In Psa. ciii. 5, we read,

“Thy youth is renewed like the eagle.”

A man’s youth may be said to be renewed like the fabled renewal of the eagle’s youth; and thus the passage stands in the Authorised Version; but how a portion of a man’s existence can be like an eagle, let the Revisers explain.

What do the Revisers mean us to understand when they say, in Psa. xciv. 7,

“We are the *people* of his *pasture*, and the *sheep* of his *hand*.”?

“*People*” do not “*pasture*”, nor are “*sheep*” led by the “*hand*”. Doubtless what the Psalmist meant, was,

“We are the *sheep* of his *pasture*”;

(which agrees with Psa. c. 3, “We are . . . . the sheep of his pasture”); and

“We are the *people* of his *hand*”;

(which agrees with Jer. xxxi. 32, “I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt”).

The Revisers’ punctuation is, to say the least of it, peculiar. Who was Sarai Abram? and who was “*Sarai Abram’s wife*”? In Gen. xii. 17, we read that

“The Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of *Sarai Abram’s wife* :”

and, in Gen. xvi. 1, we read that



“*Sarai Abram’s* wife bare him no children.”

In Gen. iv. 2, we are told that Eve bore Cain’s brother Abel twice!

“And *again* she bare his brother Abel.”

Very strange! And here is something else very strange. The Revisers tell us that there can be two second times of doing the same thing. To me it seems to be an impossibility, even though God Himself is said to be the doer. See Isa. xi. 11;

“It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand *again the second time* to recover the remnant of his people.”

Fortunately they have put a comma after the word “*old*” in Isa. lxiii. 11, or the reading would have been rather irreverent.

“Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people.”

A comma in each of the previously quoted passages, viz. Gen. xii. 17; xvi. 1; iv. 2; and Isa. xi. 11; would have saved the Revisers from justly merited reproach.

In 2 Kings xix. 35, and Isa. xxxvii. 36, we read of "*dead* corpses". Are there, then, *live* corpses? The Revisers seem to have some horrible ideas.

Finally, why do the Revisers represent Solomon's beloved one as saying in Cant. ii. 5, and v. 8,

"I am sick of love",

when love is so absorbing her whole soul that she is sick of everything but love? It should be,

"I am sick *with* love";

as in Jer. xiv. 18, "sick with famine."

To be sick *of* a thing, is to be heartily tired of it, as I am of the Revisers' errors; and probably the Revisers will feel that they are sick of the *vexation* of my criticisms, and, in their own elegant language, will say,

"A stone heavy, and the sand weighty;

But a fool's *vexation* is heavier than *them* both." Prov. xxvii. 3.

"Heavier than *them*" are! Enough.

My task is done, and I lay down my pen. Is it with a sense of relief? Nay, rather with a sad and heavy heart; for I know but too well how golden an opportunity has been lost; the like of which may not occur again for generations.

Our English Bible, which to millions of the human race will for ever remain the standard of moral and religious truth, ought to have been made also the standard of all that is pure, and graceful, and noble, in our language. It is the Temple of Truth in whose solemn archives are kept the records of past ages, and the memorials of the infancy of our race. Therein are enshrined also all human experiences, the utterances of holy desire, the breathings of fervent hope, the expressions of unwavering faith, and the exulting songs of a nation's triumphs. Therein, too, are heard the sighs of the broken-hearted, the groans of the soul's agonies in its wrestlings with sin; and, coming up from the dungeon-depths of despair, the smothered cry of remorse from the self-

condemned. But these are not the only voices : therein are heard also the prayers of the mighty minds that have moved heaven by their supplications ; and therein are heard the lisplings of the little ones that have taught us life's lessons of child-like trust. Moreover, therein above all is heard the voice of God !—heard in its mighty thunderings, heard in its awful holiness, heard in its yearning pity, and heard in its undying love. All these voices live and reverberate in this Temple of Truth, and thence are ever echoed along the long corridors of time for the world's instruction and admonition. Why then, when this sanctuary of all that the heart holds to be most sacred needed repair, did the Revisers “daub it with untempered mortar ?”—Ezk. xiii. 11-15.

THE END.

*The author of this work and of various other critical works on the English language (see accompanying List, with Extracts from Reviews), will be happy to give private lessons in English; correcting the style, grammar, punctuation, and composition generally, of important private letters, essays, poems, sermons, or other addresses, or MSS. intended for publication.*

### *Terms.*

*Revision of MSS.—prose,*

*A minimum charge of 10/- for any number of words under 1000; over 1000 will be charged at the rate of 10/- per 1000 words.*

*Revision of MSS.—poetry,*

*A minimum charge of 20/- for any number of lines under 100; over 100 will be charged at the rate of 20/- per 100 lines.*

*Private Lessons at 16, New Burlington Street, W., or by post.*

*A course of 12 lessons of one hour each, Five Guineas. All fees to be paid in advance.*

*16, New Burlington Street,  
London, W.*

## *Instruction by Post.*

---

*If instruction in composition be required to be given by post, it will be necessary that the pupil send, for the purpose of each lesson, a MS. of not more than 1000 words. This should be written on foolscap paper, and in lines sufficiently wide apart to admit of interlineation; and a two-inch margin at the side should be left for the instructor's remarks. The MS. would be returned corrected; and, as the corrections would be intended for a course of instruction, the reasons for the corrections, where necessary, would be given in the margin.*

# A LIST

OF

## Philological, Poetical, and Sacred Works,

BY

G. WASHINGTON MOON,

*Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature*

OF

*Great Britain and Ireland.*

---

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY

Extracts from Reviews.

---

London:

HATCHARDS, PUBLISHERS, 187, PICCADILLY.

—  
1886.

“ All that concerns the culture of language is of infinite importance.”

“ The language is common property ; and one of the most laudable objects an educated man can pursue is to defend it from contamination.”

“ The care bestowed upon language is bestowed on the most perfect instrument of the mind, without which all other gifts are valueless.”—

*The Edinburgh Review.*

“ He who cannot express his thoughts correctly in his own language, is not likely to obtain credit for much knowledge of any other ; nor will an ill-spelt, ungrammatical letter impress anyone with the idea that the writer of it is an ‘ *educated* ’ man ; while, on the other hand, the Englishman whose linguistic acquirements do not extend beyond the language of Shakspeare, but who knows that thoroughly and can wield it well, possesses an instrument with which he may fight his way to almost any position to which he may choose to aspire, whether he turn his thoughts to poetry or to politics, to literature or to commerce.”—*The Reader.*



## THE DEAN'S ENGLISH.

*A Criticism on the late Dean Alford's Essays on the Queen's English.*

Eleventh Edition. Price 1s. 6d.

---

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"It is as smart and trenchant a criticism as ever appeared."  
—*The Literary World*.

"It is one of the most trenchant and complete controversial works of modern times."—*The Court Circular*.

"It is an alarming treatise. It will make the most accurate of us anxious, self-distrustful, and modest."—*The Echo*.

"It contains some of the best specimens of verbal criticism that we have ever seen."—*The New York Round Table*.

"It is worthy of the attention of every University man in Oxford."—*The Oxford Messenger*.

"It is one of the smartest pieces of prose-criticism we have chanced to meet with for many a day."—*The Morning Advertiser*.

"Demonstrating that while the Dean undertook to instruct others, he was, himself, but a castaway in matters of grammar."—*The Edinburgh Review*.

"Even practised writers may here learn a lesson or two in the art of expressing themselves in their mother tongue clearly and correctly."—*The Dublin Review*.

"Mr. Washington Moon's critiques are full of useful hints, and may be advantageously studied by all who desire to use pure English either in speaking or in writing."—*The Educational Guide*.

"Mr. Washington Moon has rendered a real service to literature by his exposure of Dean Alford, and we are glad to express our recognition of the value of his labours."—*The Sunday Times*.

"A critical study of the English language is always a pleasant task; it is here rendered doubly agreeable by the happy style of the author of '*The Dean's English*.'"—*Public Opinion*.

"The tendency to a faulty style of speech is so wide-spread that there is undoubtedly an important mission to be fulfilled

by this little volume, if thoughtfully studied by all those into whose hands it falls."—*The English Independent*.

"It is written with a power of sarcasm and criticism rarely excelled. Mr. Washington Moon is a brilliant writer; his work is full of point, sound in English, and deserves to be generally read."—*The Cambridge Independent Press*.

"All who are interested in such critical discussions as are so clearly and accurately carried on in this little book will be grateful to Mr. Washington Moon, not only for much solid instruction, but for much entertainment also."—*The Court Circular*.

"It is calculated to render considerable service to loose thinkers, speakers, and writers. Mr. Washington Moon's volume points out some serious errors of style, and has the relish and zest of a sharp passage of arms."—*The London Review*.

"This is a work which treats of a subject well worthy of attention. On the part of even educated persons, errors in speaking and writing are by no means uncommon, and we can recommend the perusal of this work to all who desire to be accurate in the use of our language."—*The Linguist*.

"There is so much in this neatly printed volume to command our approval, that we cannot withhold our meed of praise. There is a great deal of sound and trenchant criticism, and the style is vigorous, versatile, and epigrammatic."—*The Church Standard*.

"This is the eleventh edition of a work which has done much to promote the study of pure and undefiled English, from which even good English scholars may learn much that is valuable in the department of English philology."—*The English Churchman*.

"This is the eleventh edition of a work which, for thoroughness of grammatical criticisms and penetrating insight into the real genius of the English language, ranks as one of the most valuable contributions to English philology published during the present century."—*Public Opinion*.

"Mr. Washington Moon shows not only that Dr. Alford is wrong in the *ex cathedrâ* judgments he pronounces as to certain popular forms of speech, but demonstrates that the

Dean's whole papers are specimens of slipshod writing, and abound with inelegancies, if not inaccuracies, of composition."—*The Weekly Review*.

"The Dean has laid himself open to criticism as much for bad taste as for questionable syntax. His style of writing is awkward and slovenly, that of his antagonist remarkably terse and clear, and bearing witness to a sensitiveness of ear and taste which are glaringly deficient in his opponent."—*The Westminster Review*.

"The Dean is clearly in error in his contempt for the grammarians. He might very properly enlighten them if he could show that they have framed some of their rules on too narrow grounds, but he is himself a warning example against the neglect of regular English teaching in our great schools. It may be hoped that he will improve—he certainly ought under Mr. Washington Moon's instructions."—*The Daily News*.

"For ourselves, we have carefully scanned the present paragraph, but we confess to sending it to the printers, with some misgivings. If it should meet the eye of Mr. Washington Moon, we can only trust that no latent vice of style nor any faulty piece of syntax may be found to destroy the force of our hearty acknowledgments of his talents as a writer, and of his skill in literary controversy."—*The Publishers' Circular*.

"Mr. Washington Moon's letters are models of English composition, and are so full of animation, so sharp, lively, and trenchant, that it is quite a treat to read them. He has, with a precision and an elegance which are unsurpassed in any writings, rendered a dry and forbidding subject both pleasing and profitable. His formidable indictment of the Dean is supported with an ability and an acuteness which we have seldom seen excelled."—*The Christian News*.

"We thank Mr. Washington Moon very cordially for what he has done, and have no hesitation in saying, that he has so far succeeded in his vindication of pure and correct English, as opposed to that which is lax and slipshod, as to deserve the gratitude of all those who, like ourselves, deem our mother tongue, in all its restraints as well as in all its liberties, to be one of the most precious inheritances of Englishmen."—*The Nonconformist*.

“ Mr. Washington Moon has performed a public service by his exposure of the errors into which men of the position of even Dean Alford fall when they attempt to write English. The amusing specimens of ungrammatical and slovenly sentences which are here collected will serve, we hope, to warn authors against similar offences, and we think Mr. Washington Moon entitled to the gratitude of all lovers of our language in its purity for this exposure of the Dean’s English.”—*The Churchman*.

“ Greatly as we fear that the Dean of Canterbury has failed to establish his claim to be regarded as an authority on the Queen’s English, we, by no means, regret the appearance of his present work; and for this reason—had there never been ‘*The Queen’s English*,’ there would probably never have been ‘*The Dean’s English* ;’ and had there never been ‘*The Dean’s English*,’ the world would have lost a very valuable contribution to English philology, and one of the most masterly pieces of literary criticism in the language.”—*The Newsmen*.

“ The continued sale of the book evinces that a more careful study of the English language has, mainly through its means, come to be regarded as of greater importance than it used to be, not only in our public schools, but even among literary men in general; especially when it shows, by the controversy to which the book has given birth, that it is quite possible that even those who take upon themselves the office of public teachers of our mother tongue may themselves be profoundly ignorant of that which they profess to teach.”—*The Printing Times*.

“ We welcome as a benefactor every man who sets himself conscientiously to prune out of our language those unsightly excrescences of style, violation of syntax, and inaccuracies of expression which disfigure so much of the literature of the day. This is the task which Mr. Washington Moon has imposed upon himself, and we wish him well accordingly. It would be unjust to him not to acknowledge that his two little books, ‘*The Dean’s English*’ and ‘*Bad English Exposed*,’ are a useful contribution to the art of writing the English language with accuracy.”—*The Times*.

“ We do not wonder to see the collection of Mr. Washington

Moon's criticisms in their third edition. The vigour with which he has attacked unlucky Dean Alford, and the awkward way in which the latter struggles and kicks under the infliction, are very entertaining. It is curious to see mistakes and inelegancies perpetrated in English composition for one tithe of which in the classical languages the offenders would meet with severe castigation, and for which, indeed, they themselves would blush with shame. The book is one which we should wish to put into the hands of our young learner of English, that he may be upon his guard against certain current modes of speech, and the adoption of custom as a standard."—*The Church Review*.

"We have read '*The Dean's English*' with pleasure, and we can recommend this carefully prepared work to all who are interested in the study of language, or desire to sharpen their wits by the perusal of a little Cobbett-like criticism. Mr. Washington Moon well performs his self-imposed task: he evinces a fine sense of discernment of the niceties of language; and, while severely criticising the sentences of his opponent, shows that he, himself, knows how to write in a remarkably clear, terse, and vigorous style. With the air of a combatant who is confident of success, Mr. Washington Moon plays with his antagonist before seriously commencing the fray; he then points out the Dean's errors one by one; strips him of his grammatical delusions; and leaves him at last in a forlorn state of literary nudity."—*The Social Science Review*.

"The name of Mr. Washington Moon is well known in this country and in America as that of an able writer and critic on the English language; and we are constrained to look upon his contributions to a more correct criticism and a fuller knowledge of the English language as the most valuable additions to this part of our literature which we have seen for very many years. Mr. Washington Moon has brought to his difficult task rare powers of analysis and discrimination, and a highly cultivated appreciation of all that is most beautiful, vigorous, and correct in our language; and it is almost impossible for any sound English scholar to read Mr. Washington Moon's '*Dean's English*,' and '*Bad English Exposed*' without learning very much from their pages. Why does not Mr. Washington Moon write a grammar of the English language—a task for which he

clearly is eminently qualified?"—*The School Board Chronicle*.

"The critic's calling is exceedingly difficult, and requires for its successful prosecution an aggregate of moral and intellectual excellencies which few men possess. Again, it is a very difficult thing to speak and to write good English; yet everybody thinks he can both speak and write it, and most men fancy that they can criticize it too. But the difficulty of producing unexceptionable English, lays open to censure almost all writers and speakers. Mr. Washington Moon's '*Dean's English*' is one of the smartest pieces of criticism that we ever read. It is not only admirable as a specimen of critical style, but it abounds with suggestions which no man in his senses can undervalue; more than this, it is a delightful example of good writing. The vigour of the critic is sometimes almost like severity, but we doubt whether it is ever malicious, and so we enjoy the book and learn from it at one and the same time."—*The Journal of Sacred Literature*.

"Most readers will, we believe, think with us that Mr. Washington Moon comes cleanest out of the controversy, and has in every way the best of the argument. The Dean entered the arena with a light jaunty step, and spoke with the air, and in the tone, of a man whose decision was to be final; all he said at first was quite *ex cathedrâ*, and bore the look of being said by one whose *ipse dixit* was to settle all strife about words: a very Daniel in the person of a Dean had come to judgment. But he speedily had to lower his pretensions. Mr. Washington Moon cried, 'Physician, heal thyself. Before you attempt to teach us how to use the Queen's English, see that you know how to write it yourself.' Coming out for wool, in fact, the Dean went back shorn; rushing forth to teach, he went home taught. We can cordially recommend Mr. Washington Moon's volume. It is really an able critique. The argument is conducted with admirable temper, and no reader can finish the volume without learning many valuable lessons in English composition, and some other things well worth knowing."—*The Record*.

"To fathers of families this book will be worth more than all the money which they are now paying for their children's grammar. In many of the criticisms, the acumen displayed

by Mr. Washington Moon is of no common kind. His letters are models of English composition, and are so full of animation, so sharp, lively, and trenchant, that it is quite a treat to read them. He has demonstrated beyond dispute that the Dean of Canterbury, who sets himself up as a defender of the English language, commits the most culpable blunders in writing it. The formidable indictment is supported with an ability and acuteness we have seldom seen excelled. Mr. Washington Moon writes with greater elegance, with greater ease, with greater perspicuity, with greater vigour, and with incomparably greater accuracy, than his opponent. He has rendered a dry and forbidding subject both pleasing and profitable. Though there is a remorseless exactness about his criticisms which makes one feel as if the writing of proper English were a hopeless attempt, there is really nothing of the true pedant about him any more than there is about the sturdy Dean himself. Both volumes are equally free from pedantry, and both, though in different senses, we can recommend to all who take any interest in the subject."—*The Christian News*.

"We are greatly obliged to Mr. Washington Moon for taking up the matter. It would have been a pity to allow the Dean to escape a castigation he deserved; the exposure of his incapacity is a public good. In light, lively writing, strict correctness of diction and arrangement is not requisite. For our recreation reading, the stately periods of Robertson would be intolerable; but Dickens's brilliant page, utterly ignoring stops and violating all rules of composition, is delightfully fresh and grateful. Dashing leaders in the papers we do not expect to find reducible to strict principles like those laid down by Kames or Campbell. But when a man seriously pretends to be writing to amend faults, his own style should be faultless, especially when he speaks in the tone of calm, self-assured superiority to vulgar error which the Dean of Canterbury assumes. It would occupy too much space were we to give a *resumé* of the contents of Mr. Washington Moon's clever work. We coincide with all his strictures on the Dean's article, and do not doubt that, like ourselves, he could have pointed to many more egregious blunders on the part of this new would-be critic. We advise all our readers to see Mr.

Washington Moon's reply. Written in pure, forcible, elegant, and classic, English—perfect in composition and punctuation, and in its gentlemanly dignity so opposed to the slipshod, half-vulgar easiness of the Dean's '*Plea*'—it merits the attention of all students of our tongue, and shows that though in familiar talk and writing we may be as men at home—free and at our ease—there are not wanting amongst us that covert stateliness and rigid propriety which a weighty subject demands."—*The English Journal of Education*.

“There are but few of our readers, we presume, who have not already heard of this work; but we are nevertheless glad of an opportunity of expressing the opinion we entertain of its merits, and of urging the perusal of it upon all our friends, especially upon those who have read '*The Queen's English*.' The raciness and smartness of these criticisms invest a dry subject with interest. The frequent discomfiture of the warlike Dean will amuse all persons, and we have no doubt that the contents of this book will enliven many a fireside during these long, dark, winter evenings. We shall be mistaken if the perusal of it does not lead, amongst the members of many domestic circles to a good-humoured criticism, for a time, of each other's words and sentences. The result will be increasing correctness in the phraseology employed; and that the end of both the Dean and his critic will be in some degree realised. We have spoken of 'the *discomfiture* of the warlike Dean,' and we cannot doubt that, on the whole, this word fitly describes the result of this smart passage of arms. The Dean advanced with the bearing of one who deemed that he had no superior, if indeed, any equal. He did not imagine that any one would be found daring enough to confront him, and to dispute the positions he had assumed. Mr. Washington Moon, with little delay or ceremony, attacked and repulsed him; caring nothing for offended dignity, or anything else, save the vindication of the truth. It is impossible not to see that he is fond of a brush. He goes about his work and prosecutes it *con amore*. Scarcely a page occurs in this small volume in which the Dean is not proved to have fallen into errors, either of grammar, construction, orthography, or pronunciation. Whenever he shall write again in defence of the Queen's English,



he will, no doubt, write with greater care. He has done the public good service by introducing the subject; but the advantage gained will be owing, in a very great degree, to the criticisms of his accomplished and keen-eyed antagonist."—*The London Christian News*.

“ If, as some good people hold, everybody and everything is created, not merely for a general, but moreover for some specific, purpose, then we might infer that the particular use to which Nature destined the Dean of Canterbury was to set himself up to lecture upon the Queen’s English, and so to offer himself as a conspicuous mark, and a defenceless victim, to the scathing criticism and merciless exposure of Mr. George Washington Moon. Not for many years, have we seen so brilliant and effective a passage of arms, as is contained in the little book under notice, which consists principally of five letters addressed to Dr. Alford. To say that the poor Dean is worsted in the encounter, is to say very little. His defeat is almost too complete, were that possible. Like an untrained youth, in the grasp of an athlete, he never has even a chance. At every round, he is quickly thrown; and the blows, given with a will, and planted with a precision and vigour, which no feint can elude, fall fast and heavily on his defenceless head. At every point, the Dean is confronted by his pertinacious and inexorable assailant, who leaves him no possibility of escape; or, if he does occasionally attempt a feeble defence, it only serves to bring down upon himself still severer punishment, until, exhausted by the encounter, he does that, which, for his own sake, he had better have done at first—makes peace with his adversary while yet he is in the way with him. To set one’s self up for a teacher of English, pure and undefiled; jauntily to ascend the rostrum, as one gifted with authority to lay down the whole law; and then to meet with so withering an exposure of incompetence, with such inevitable inferences of imbecility, as constitute the staple of Mr. Washington Moon’s book; for the physician, who gratuitously obtrudes his advice upon us, and vaunts his ability to cure our disorder,—for him to be convicted of labouring under a virulent form of the same disease, certainly this is *not* a pleasant position for a man to occupy, and we heartily com-

miserate the unfortunate Dean. Even in the fair field of criticism he is quite unable to cope with his skilful and alert adversary. Never was there a more conspicuous instance of going out to shear, and coming home shorn. For our own part, we would rather have submitted to a month's stone-breaking than have called down upon ourselves such withering sarcasms and incisive irony as Dr. Alford's language has so justly provoked. To those who are interested in speaking and writing good English,—and what educated person is not?—this book is full of instruction; and to those who enjoy a controversy, conducted with consummate skill, and in excellent taste by a strong man, well armed, it is such a treat as does not fall in one's way often during a lifetime. Regarded in itself, and without any immediate reference to its object, this book affords a model of correct and elegant English, such as it is a perfect treat to meet with, in these days of slipshod writing. Perspicuous, compact, and nervous in its construction, it is by no means deficient in some of the higher and more brilliant qualities of style; while, for refined sarcasm and covert irony, it has rarely been equalled. We can assure our readers that a pleasanter or more profitable employment than the perusal of this book, it would be difficult to recommend to them. Many of our public writers, highly educated, and perhaps *because* they have been so educated, undertake English composition as if it were the one exceptional art which required no rule but the 'rule of thumb.' To such, the lamentable *fiasco* of the Dean, owing to his disregard of rules, *should* be a lesson, but, too probably, will not. We cannot help wishing that a writer who is so eminently qualified as Mr. Washington Moon to teach a subject which, just now, so greatly needs to be taught, and who illustrates so admirably by his example the precepts that he so clearly enforces, would devote himself to the task of drawing up a code of rules for composition, such as our journalists and periodical writers might appeal to, as a standard for correct English. We are of opinion that there is a crying want of such a work, that it would be one of the most useful and most popular works of the day, and that Mr. Washington Moon, with his thorough mastery of the subject, with his keen perception, nice judgment, and pellucid and

elegant style, is just the person to write it. When a man displays peculiar aptitudes, and of a high order, for a given subject, we grieve, we almost resent it, if our natural expectations should remain unfulfilled. We feel that to be defeated of our hopes is, in some sense, to be defrauded of our rights. We think we have a right to call upon Mr. Washington Moon, now that he has once exhibited this shining talent, not to wrap it up again in a napkin, but to put it out to interest, and we have no doubt of its bringing him back most abundant returns. We entertain this opinion notwithstanding Mr. Washington Moon's disclaimer that 'very little can be added to the canons of criticism already laid down; though very much may be done for the permanent enriching of our language, by popular writers using more care as to the examples they set in composition, than as to the lessons they teach concerning it.' It is precisely because Mr. Washington Moon teaches so well by example, that we would fain have him make this example the vehicle for the inculcation of precepts, and the execution of the work the best comment upon, and illustration of, its rules."—*The Phonetic Journal*.

---

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

## BAD ENGLISH EXPOSED.

Companion Volume to "The Dean's English."

*A Series of Criticisms showing the Errors and Inconsistencies of Lindley Murray and other Grammarians.*

Eighth Edition. Price 2s.

---

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"Mr. Washington Moon points out many real inaccuracies of language."—*The Saturday Review*.

"We commend the work to the attention of all those who are interested in preserving the purity of the English tongue."—*The Friend*.

"This work is well worthy of the careful study of all who

aspire to write English elegantly and accurately.”—*The London Quarterly Review*.

“Like the author’s now celebrated ‘*Dean’s English*,’ it is characterised by vivacity of style and a complete mastery of the niceties of our mother tongue.”—*The Educational Record*.

“Mr. Washington Moon probably attains the extreme point of invulnerability. The elegance and accuracy of his style are so extraordinary as to be almost unique.”—*The New York Round Table*.

“We heartily recommend the work to students, as containing many valuable instructions for those who desire to attain a thorough knowledge of the art of English composition.”—*The Morning Post*.

“Mr. Washington Moon is well known as a champion for the utmost purity and precision in the use and arrangement of words, and as a severe critic of some well-known authors. We commend his work to the attention of students.”—*The Queen*.

“This is a work by Mr. Washington Moon, a gentleman well known for his criticisms on grammar, which he invariably makes extremely interesting. The present is particularly so: Mr. Moon, with much genial humour, pointing out several very common errors frequently met with in English.”—*Public Opinion*.

“The book is a splendid specimen of what a controversial work should be—keen, incisive, vigorous, yet discriminating and perfectly courteous. It will be a valuable work for purposes of reference and guidance long after the memory of the controversy which excited it has faded away.”—*The Court Circular*.

“Mr. Washington Moon is extremely punctilious and rigorous in his requirements; but his severity is a wholesome antidote to the extreme slovenliness into which most of us are in danger of sinking in these days. The work is written with all Mr. Moon’s characteristic incisiveness and vigour.”—*The Congregationalist*.

“The English language is a noble inheritance, and we may well be thankful to those who, like Mr. Washington Moon, jealously guard its purity. There are, indeed, but few, either readers or writers of the English language, who do not need to

profit by his very instructive criticisms."—*The Quarterly Journal of Education*.

"Mr. Washington Moon writes with considerable elegance and remarkable perspicuity. His book is both amusing and instructive, and may be read with advantage by all who wish to acquire a correct mode of writing and speaking, and to avoid the popular errors which are in some danger of being permanently incorporated into our language."—*The Inquirer*.

"Mr. Washington Moon has produced another series of witticisms at the expense of sundry distinguished men who have made the grammar and history of the English language their study. The volume is very instructive and highly amusing; and if the author betrays some ostentatious triumph, he does this with admirable temper."—*The British Quarterly Review*.

"The volume abounds with the clear and keen criticisms of one who has every right to speak with very high authority. It redounds to the credit, not only of Mr. Washington Moon, but to the credit of our English literature. It is a work that ought by all means to find its way into the hands of our best schoolmasters and their pupils, and all scholars and students of our language."—*The Rock*.

"In Mr. Washington Moon's hands, a subject universally dry and dull becomes most amusing. His style is clear and trenchant; he deals firmly and at the same time good-humouredly with his opponents. In exposing some of the common grammatical errors of our language to-day—errors which custom has now familiarised—he has rendered a great service to Englishmen, and deserves our warmest commendation."—*Lloyd's Weekly News*.

"Very cleverly written, and does great credit to the author. Mr. Washington Moon, as those who have read his '*Dean's English*' know, is a perfect master of the English language in its most minute details. He can see errors where most others would not have the slightest suspicion of their existence; and those who have much speaking and writing to do, as well as the public generally, ought to be very grateful to him for pointing them out."—*Glasgow Christian News*.

"Mr. Washington Moon is a chivalrous opponent, ready

with hearty goodwill to espouse the cause of a former adversary when unjustly attacked, as may be seen in his defence of Dean Alford against the strictures of Mr. Gould. Those who desire to express their ideas clearly and grammatically can hardly fail to benefit by a perusal of Mr. Washington Moon's essays, although they may not acquire his power of acute criticism, nor his mastery over the English language."—*The Record*.

"There is something very inviting in the work of a man who, having fairly unhorsed the Dean of Canterbury in his own chosen lists, has now the audacity to attack the great arbiter of such contests, Lindley Murray himself. We confess our obligation to Mr. Washington Moon, not only for an instructive but for an entertaining book; and we believe that there are few who do not often fall into errors which he condemns, or who cannot learn from him, in a very pleasant way, to write and to speak English more elegantly."—*The New York Church Record*.

"The English language has not often been thoroughly mastered, and there have been few at any time who have been able to use it with correctness and taste. A distinguished scholar of the eighteenth century said that in his lifetime he had known only three men who spoke their native language with uniform grammatical accuracy. Mr. Washington Moon has obviously studied with great diligence the rules of English construction, by no means easy to master. The book is very valuable and very important. We unhesitatingly commend it."—*The Sunday Times*.

"The name of Mr. Washington Moon is already well known to the intelligent reading public, and the work now before us will be welcomed by all who desire to 'speak and write the English language with propriety.' The author does not object to measure his sword with Archbishop Trench, and many other distinguished grammarians, and even ventures to question the judgment in some cases of the great Lindley Murray himself. Mr. Moon's standard is very high, and few writers could be tried by it and not found wanting, but every sensible person will gladly make use of his hints, and endeavour to profit by them."—*Oxford Times*.

"Mr. Washington Moon is now no stranger to the public.

He has laid before it two series of literary productions, so diverse from each other in character, that future generations will be tempted to believe there must have been, in the nineteenth century, two authors of the name of Washington Moon, whose works somehow became confounded together. Gaining the reputation of a severe critic by a determined onslaught which he made on a composition of Dean Alford's, he next launched an epic poem, '*Elijah*,' containing many a glorious stanza. The work now under review will fully sustain Mr. Washington Moon's high reputation. As a critic able and accurate, we have an unbounded respect for our author."—*The Weekly Review*.

---

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

## THE REVISERS' ENGLISH.

*A Series of Criticisms, showing the Revisers' Violations of the Laws of the Language.*

Second Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

---

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"Mr. Washington Moon's criticisms upon the Revisers' English seems to us very searching and very just."—*The Homilist*.

"Mr. Washington Moon's book betrays considerable acuteness of criticism, and will afford much profitable diversion."—*The Church Review*.

"There can be no question that Mr. Washington Moon has dealt the heaviest of all blows yet given to the English of the Revisers."—*The Revisionist*.

"More about the language is to be learnt from reading and considering such critical books as Mr. Washington Moon's than from the dry study of many a scholastic grammar."—*The Oracle*.

"Mr. Washington Moon has a keen eye for detecting blunders, and uses a keen pen in replying to opponents who, stung

by his sarcasms, have attempted to retaliate.”—*The Liverpool Weekly Albion*.

“If we are not able in all cases quite to follow Mr. Washington Moon, none can deny him the palm of ingenuity and skill, as well as a copious facility of illustration of difficult passages in English standard authors.”—*Public Opinion*.

“No student of the English language can read one of Mr. Washington Moon’s works without learning something—generally something that he would not find elsewhere. He is invariably accurate in his remarks as to the rules of grammar.”—*The World of Science*.

“Mr. Washington Moon, who is well known as a critic of English, assails the Revised New Testament on the score of its bad and unidiomatic English: and in almost every case in which he challenges the corrections of the Revisers he gives sound and substantial reasons for his opinion.”—*The Literary Churchman*.

“The author is so well known to fame as a scholar of English literature, that his criticisms have a permanent value. His judgment on the Revisers’ English is extremely severe, but it is quite justified by the specimens which he gives.”—*The Dublin Review*.

“There is no keener grammatical critic of English composition than Mr. Washington Moon. Years ago he turned the tables against Dean Alford, who had written a work on the common violations of the Queen’s English, and now he has returned to the fray to expose the errors, inconsistencies, and inelegancies of the learned men who have revised the New Testament.”—*The Printers’ Register*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s ‘*Revisers’ English*’ is, we need not say, a lively and entertaining volume. That he is thoroughly well versed in the history and laws of the English language, the master of a clear, terse, and trenchant style, all readers of his previous books will at once admit. He is a keen, discriminating critic, and a sworn foe of all loose and slipshod expressions. His letters in *Public Opinion*—here collected into a volume—are the most racy, amusing, and instructive criticisms on the English of the Revised Version with which we are acquainted.”—*The Freeman*.



“Mr. Washington Moon is undoubtedly a master of his subject. Nothing escapes him. The student of English will find him a safe guide in matters of grammatical accuracy and precision. He not only points out errors, but discusses their nature, and thus teaches a valuable lesson with every correction which he suggests. It would be a public benefit to embody his corrections in the next edition.”—*The Educational Review*.

“Of course criticism so trenchant has not passed unchallenged; Mr. Washington Moon, however, is no carpet knight, and has manfully held his own against all competitors, if he has not done more, and involved them in discomfiture and defeat. Any one desirous of a lesson in the niceties and elegancies of his mother tongue will find ample instruction in this volume. It is replete at once with good-natured irony and sound learning, and is the most amusing volume we have met with for a long time. The reader will rise from the perusal of this able exposition impressed with the conviction that Mr. Washington Moon is justified in his criticisms on the Revisers' English, and that he has fully substantiated his charge against them of violations of the laws of the English language.”—*The English Churchman*.

“Mr. Washington Moon, in these interesting letters, lays down two principles which he says must necessarily be observed in a good translation: ‘The one, that it be a faithful expression of the ideas intended to be conveyed in the original; and the other, that it be a grammatical expression of those ideas according to the idiom of the language into which the translation is to be made.’ Taking as a basis these two axioms, which it would be rash to deny, Mr. Washington Moon boldly declares that the English of the Revisers is very faulty. The letters in which he maintains this assertion are very instructive and amusing, and are written in the author's imperturbable good humour and with his happy power of illustration. We have only to add that we have read Mr. Washington Moon's volume with great pleasure, and that we heartily recommend it.”—*The Schoolmaster*.

“Fifteen years ago Mr. Washington Moon proved that a learned Dean was not necessarily a master of the Queen's English. He now demonstrates, with his wonted clearness

and precision, that the Revisers of the New Testament are more competent to unravel the mysteries of the Greek tongue than to write English accurately. Time has neither abated the force of his attack nor dimmed the keenness of his vision. ‘*The Revisers’ English*,’ as a model of verbal criticism, is a worthy rival to ‘*The Dean’s English* ;’ and Mr. Washington Moon displays in both works a delicate appreciation of the niceties of our language, a polished and accurate style, and an unusual power of making his points with fatal precision. The controversial character of the book gives animation to a dull subject, and, though Mr. Washington Moon’s method of overthrowing his antagonists is probably irritating to his victims, his tone is uniformly courteous. The champions who maintain the Revisers’ cause against Mr. Washington Moon’s attacks are compelled to commit a kind of literary suicide, and to fall, as it were, on their own swords. The book cannot fail to interest all who are lovers of the purity of the English language, or who desire to secure for the New Testament an accurate translation into our own tongue.”—*Notes and Queries*.

“It is with much pleasure we review the latest work of Mr. Washington Moon, the famous author of the ‘Dean’s English.’ The Revisers appear to fare, in Mr. Washington Moon’s hands, little better than the late Dean Alford, when the latter took up the cudgels in defence of the ‘Queen’s English.’ The fact is, Mr. Washington Moon is so skilful a master in the use of idiomatic and perspicuous English that he must be a bold man, indeed, who ventures to enter the lists and risk a combat with him, upon his own special ground. It appears that a Rev. John C. Hyatt, M.A., vicar of Queensbury, has ventured to stand up for several of these glaring mistakes, and to criticise the critic, with but poor results on his part, for he is so tossed and tumbled by Mr. Washington Moon that he appears as helpless as a child in the powerful hands of a giant, comes out of the fray cutting a very sorry figure indeed, and is rightly recommended by his antagonist to study his mother tongue to more profit. The fact is, as our Revisers’ critic says, not one educated man in a thousand knows his own language thoroughly. There are many glaring mistakes which Mr. Washington Moon takes up

and exposes to the full blaze of his luminous English in a most amusing and pitiless manner; but the few we have quoted must suffice to show how needful it is that the Revision be revised. We cannot but regret that Mr. Washington Moon had not been added to the learned company of Revisers, as guardian of the English language.”—*The Watchman*.

“The bold champion of pure English who, fifteen years ago, so successfully laid bare the grammatical errors of Dean Alford, Lindley Murray, and other past and living authorities on the English tongue, has recently found his *protégée* seriously menaced, and has come forth from his retirement to do battle for her once more. Mr. Washington Moon, in common with the great mass of his brothers and cousins who speak the English language, evidently looked forward with intense interest to the completion of the labours of the New Testament Revisers, not only because he possesses that deep religious feeling which is exhibited in many of his works, but because he felt that here was an opportunity of clothing the teachings of the New Testament in yet finer and purer English than that of the present Authorised Version. ‘If perfection of language ought to be looked for anywhere,’ he writes, ‘it ought to be looked for, and found, in the Bible.’ Unfortunately he has to add, ‘I have looked for it in our translation and have not found it, hence these letters.’ The publication of the letters in *Public Opinion* gave rise to much correspondence, in the course of which some formidable opponents rose up against our grammarian and were in turn demolished by him. No unbiassed student of English will read these letters without admitting that in extremely few instances, if, indeed, in any, Mr. Washington Moon has failed to get the better of his letter-writing adversaries, or to prove his charges against the Revisers. To even those who have read ‘*The Dean’s English*’ and ‘*Bad English Exposed*,’ it is startling to find, in a work which has occupied for ten years a large portion of the time of twenty-five of our most illustrious scholars, so many gross violations of the most elementary laws of grammar. It shows still more conclusively than was already apparent that the study of English has been—and there is no doubt it still is—very much neglected in our higher

schools and at the Universities. 'I honour the Revisers,' Mr. Washington Moon says, 'for their conscientious fidelity to the original text; and we must all confess that as a *literal* translation, their work is of inestimable value, especially as a basis for a future free translation into pure idiomatic English.' When this free translation is made—and without doubt it will have to be made—we believe that full weight will be given to Mr. Washington Moon's most valuable criticisms."—*The School Board Chronicle*.

---

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

## ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH.

Companion Volume to "The Revisers' English."

*A Series of Criticisms showing the Old Testament Revisers' Violations of the Laws of the Language.*

Illustrated by more than 1000 Quotations.

Just Published. Price 3s. 6d.

---

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

## THE KING'S ENGLISH.

I.—*Its Sources and History.*

II.—*The Origin and Progress of Written Language.*

III.—*Puzzling Peculiarities of English.*

IV.—*Spelling Reform.*

Recently Published. Price 3s. 6d.

---

"A very interesting book, containing a collection of rare information."—*The Publishers' Circular*.

"This is a really interesting book. Many of our readers will remember that clever criticism, '*The Dean's English*,' a reply to

Dean Alford's essays on '*The Queen's English.*' Mr. Moon is an accomplished writer, and his present work is suggestive as well as readable."—*The Churchman.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## ELIJAH THE PROPHET.

*An Epic Poem in Twelve Cantos.*

Third Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"It is really a sacred epic of the highest order."—*The Orb.*

"This is a remarkable poem, and is from first to last worthy of its subject."—*Our Own Fireside.*

"It is a poem worthy of the subject and of the author."—*The Christian Examiner.*

"It is full of quiet beauty, and is specially remarkable for elegance of diction and purity of language."—*The Freeman.*

"A work that may stand in a high place among the specimens of modern English classical literature."—*The Court Circular.*

"It is an epic poem of great beauty and power. An epic poem containing many a glorious stanza."—*The Weekly Review.*

"The grandeur of the subject is well-nigh unsurpassed, and the poem is not unworthy of the subject."—*The North British Daily Mail.*

"'*Elijah the Prophet*' is the most noticeable poem of the season. It is poetical in the true sense of the term."—*The Bookseller.*

"We are bound to remark that, taken as a whole, it is by far the best poem on a sacred subject that has appeared for a considerable time."—*The Imperial Review.*

"In this work the library has one of the most valuable additions that has for many years emanated from the press."—*The Oxford University Herald.*

"This poem is one of unusual interest and beauty. It will find favour chiefly with persons of refined and cultivated taste,

who can appreciate the nicer elegancies of composition.”—*Evangelical Christendom*.

“ Her Majesty has graciously been pleased to accept a copy of Mr. Washington Moon’s ‘*Elijah the Prophet*,’ an epic poem of great merit, exhibiting powers rarely equalled for sublimity and strength, and breathing a noble and an elevated spirit which deserves all praise.”—*The Court Journal*.

“ In this work the library has one of the most valuable additions that have for many years emanated from the press. Gifted with a master-mind—imaginative, penetrative, refined, and modest withal—the author of this poem has thrown the full force of his powers of expression into the accomplishment of a great end, namely, the effective rendering, with the aid of poetry, of one of the most sublime records in the Old Testament.”—*The Oxford University Herald*.

“ The magnificent epic poem before us is one of those rare issues which, like wandering comets, appear only at long intervals. Every page teems with high poetic beauty, often soaring to the sublime. The author has approached his subject with studied care, and has mastered it in a style so grand, that little is left to be desired further than that the poet may attain the position which his brilliant epic entitles him to hold.”—*The Illustrated Weekly News*.

“ The author has not only the attributes and qualifications of a poet in the true and highest sense, but a rare amount of varied knowledge, which he brings in the happiest manner to bear on the grand heads of his subject. We have not for many a day perused a volume of poetry that possesses so many attractive features. The book is one series of beautiful and brilliant gems and profound thoughts, set in pure and ornate language.”—*The St. James’s Chronicle*.

“ We are bound to say that Mr. Moon’s poem is a great work. There is a grandeur and sublimity that reminds one of Milton and of Young, even at their best, in the poet’s description of the Day of Doom, and also of the Translation of Elijah. It is awarding no slight merit to the author to say that his whole poem breathes the purest morality and the loftiest devotion. Going through it is like going through a cathedral, where, as the grand music rolls on the ear, the eye

is almost everywhere enchanted with visions of unearthly interest and scriptural beauty, breaking in richest colours from its storied windows, while the soul is touched and stirred with the deepest emotions of religion."—*The Church and School Gazette*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## EDEN THE GARDEN OF GOD,

*And other Poems.*

One Volume, uniform with "Elijah the Prophet."

Third Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"Far above mediocrity."—*The Morning Advertiser*.

"The poetry is really chaste and beautiful."—*Evangelical Christendom*.

"The volume only needs to be known to become a favourite."—*The Freeman*.

"'A Christmas Reverie,' is a charming poem."—*The Ladies' Treasury*.

"The hymns written by Mr. Washington Moon are of a high order of merit."—*The Church of England Pulpit*.

"We have here the happy union of sweet poetry and sound religious teaching."—*The English Churchman*.

"They breathe, in well-chosen diction, the true spirit of Christianity."—*The Musical Standard*.

"The poems manifest considerable power and poetical genius."—*The Preachers' Analyst*.

"We recommend this volume of genuine poetry as one of the best gift-books of the season."—*Our Own Fireside*.

"Some of Mr. Washington Moon's poems certainly possess great merit."—*The Educational Chronicle*.

"In these poems his well-known skill is turned to good account. He has long been known as a poet of a high order."—*The Rock*.

“Mr. Washington Moon knows the secrets of both the strength and the grace of his own tongue.”—*The London Quarterly Review*.

“These poems are replete with graceful thought and tender feeling, and they prove that Mr. Washington Moon has the true poetic gift.”—*The Court Journal*.

Mr. Washington Moon’s poems are, for the most part, fresh in thought and feeling; some are exquisitely tender and beautiful.”—*The Literary World*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s poems, catching their inspiration from the Word of Truth, are rich in the heart’s best utterances, and deserve our strongest commendation.”—*Hand and Heart*.

“Written with a fine poetic feeling, and with an evident desire to do God’s work by bringing home God’s Word to the heart of the reader.”—*Public Opinion*.

“They are replete with amiable sentiments, and if a decidedly religious feeling pervades them, it is the emanation from a religion of love and charity in its widest acceptance.”—*The Kent Herald*.

“Mr. Washington Moon, mighty in prose, is still mightier in poetry, and these beautiful poems must touch the chords of the roughest heart with their plaintive notes.”—*The Cambridge Independent Press*.

“The author modestly disclaims poetry as his ‘forte,’ but he is no mean poet notwithstanding. All the pieces exhibit not only a beauty of sentiment, but in our opinion a high order of poetic talent.”—*Colburn’s United Service Magazine*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s minor poems have deservedly reached a second edition; some of them being of great beauty. They show a cultivated mind, and considerable command of language, and inculcate good and kindly lessons.”—*The John Bull*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s minor poems have a polished beauty and earnestness of feeling which will secure for some among them a lasting place in English sacred poetry. They are of elevated morality, of fervent devotion, and of fascinating eloquence in song.”—*The St. James’s Chronicle*.

“We sincerely admire the spirit which must have dictated these pretty little poems, and we can scarcely forbear to express



surprise that the same mind from which emanated the clever and trenchant '*Dean's English*' should, when brought into the region of sentiment, be so tender and so good. Love to God and man pervades every verse."—*The Weekly Review*.

"Mr. Washington Moon will, of course, expect the composition of any volume of his to be closely and severely scrutinised. A man who ventures to correct the '*Queen's English*' of a Dean, should at least be immaculate in his own. This test, as far as we have been able to discover, this volume will bear. It is the production of a scholar and an accomplished writer."—*The Patriot*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## WHAT IS POETRY?

*A Paper read before the Royal Society of Literature.*

8vo, sewed, 1s.

"The adroit and lively author of the '*Dean's English*' has a pleasant way of bringing some good compositions of his own to the front, and of setting them in very charming prose, having of itself a poetical rhythm. There is no doubt that he possesses the real poetic fire; and the variable examples here given of different kinds of verse will enable readers to entertain the highest respect for the versatility of his mind. Some of the original poetry here published for the first time is excellent, especially *The Land of Freedom* ['God is our Defence!'], which only requires a tune to it to become one of the most popular of national and patriotic songs. We knew that Mr. Moon had a fine taste, but did not know that he was capable of producing so many styles of elegant poetry. The present essay goes far to prove its author one of the most elegant writers in the English language."—*Public Opinion*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

*Preparing for Publication.*

## THE POET'S RHYMING DICTIONARY.

*A New Work, with a Treatise on the Laws of Poetry, &c.*

---

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

## THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES

ANSWERED IN THE WORDS OF SCRIPTURE:

“As if a man had inquired at the Oracle of God.”—2 SAM., xvi. 23.

“Call Thou and I will answer; or let me speak, and answer Thou me.”—  
JOB xiii. 22.

A Year-Book of Scripture Texts.

*Thirtieth Thousand.*

Price 2s. 6d. cloth antique; 3s. roan, gilt edges. (Cheaper Editions, 8d. and 1s. 6d.)

---

### EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

“We cordially recommend this book.”—*The Christian Ambassador.*

“It is calculated to do immense good.”—*The Home Journal (Philadelphia, U.S.A.).*

“It is a Scripture text-book of unequalled excellence.”—*The General Baptist Magazine.*

“It is the most attractive and useful work of the kind we have yet seen.”—*The Sunday School Teacher.*

“We have no hesitation in recommending it to favourable notice.”—*The British Friend.*

“We trust that to many a pilgrim-heart it will be a blessed companion.”—*The Advent Herald (Boston, U.S.A.).*

“It is an exceedingly valuable little book which many devout persons will, we think, be glad to possess.”—*The Christian Observer.*

“It is on the whole one of the best of its class. We are glad

to see that it is having so wide a circulation."—*Messiah's Herald (Boston, U.S.A.)*.

"It is a compilation of rare excellence, very far superior to any other book of the kind we have seen."—*The Presbyterian Witness (Halifax, N.S.)*.

"It is the best birthday text-book we have seen. Most instructive, suggestive, striking, valuable. Far better than anything of the kind before in print."—*The Sword and Trowel*.

"The striking way in which the grand doctrines of Christianity are set forth one after another must make this pretty little work much valued."—*The Daily Witness (Montreal)*.

"This is the twentieth edition of a very popular and useful every-day manual of practical devotion, which we cannot too cordially or amply commend to our readers."—*The English Churchman*.

"This is the twentieth thousand of this unique text book. It is printed for distribution, and costs only 8d. We have used it for two years, and regard it as by far the best book of the kind we have yet seen."—*The General Baptist Magazine*.

"A happy idea happily carried out. All the great questions which man can ask about God and Christ and himself, the life that now is, and the life to come, are here asked and answered in Scripture language."—*The Freeman*.

"What could be happier than the thought to arrange a diary in such a manner that, open it where we may, we light upon some divine words of counsel or of comfort, borrowed from the Sacred Oracles? This year-book of Scripture texts ought to win the widest popularity."—*The St. James's Chronicle*.

"It would not be a difficult task for any person of ordinary mental power to commit to memory, day by day, all the questions and answers in this book; by doing which he would, in a year, have possessed himself of a rich treasury of Scripture truth that would afford unfailing light, strength, and consolation in all the varied circumstances of life."—*The Christian Guardian (Toronto)*.

"Among selections of texts for daily reading and meditation we have seen few equal to this. Every word of God is good and helpful to the soul, but this book contains the result of much profound Scripture study, and is at once a mine of rich

theology and a manual of practical piety. It is most valuable, and should be heartily welcomed in Christian homes."—*The Scottish Sabbath School Teachers' Magazine*.

"This we consider quite a remarkable book in its way. The questions are all Scripture, and so are the answers. This might have been the case, and yet confusion or misapplication might have prevailed. It is not so, however. The answers have been selected with wonderful tact, so as, in combination with the questions, to bring out truth in new and striking aspects. For one's own use, as a foundation for addresses, or as a gift book, it is truly valuable."—*The Scottish Sabbath School Teachers' Magazine*.

"This book consists of a series of Scripture questions for every day in the year answered in the words of Scripture. The selection of texts brings out clearly the value of comparing Scripture with Scripture and the inherent unity of the word of God. The fact that this book has reached a circulation of 20,000 copies is a proof of its general acceptance and appreciation. As a Scripture *vade mecum* we know of nothing to compare to it. The price of this edition is only eightpence."—*The Young Men's Christian Magazine*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

## THE SOUL'S DESIRES BREATHED TO GOD IN THE WORDS OF SCRIPTURE.

"Teach us what we shall say unto HIM; for we cannot order our speech by reason of darkness."—JOB xxxvii. 19.

**A Book of Prayers for Private and Family Devotion.**

Being Prayers for One Week based on the Seven Petitions in the Lord's Prayer, a Treatise on Prayer in the Words of Scripture, and a Selection from the Devotional Portions of the Psalms, arranged for Daily Reading at Family Worship.

Third Edition. One volume, Demy 24mo. price 2s. 6d. cloth antique;  
3s. roan, gilt edges.

## THE MONOGRAPH GOSPEL.

*Being the Four Gospels arranged in one continuous narrative without omission of fact or repetition of statement.*

Second Edition, with Map and Marginal References.

24mo. cloth 2s. 6d.; roan, 3s.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

“For devotional purposes very admirable.”—*The Evangelical Magazine.*

“Essentially valuable and beautifully effective.”—*The Study and Homiletical Monthly.*

“This is one of the handiest of handy books for the Biblical student.”—*The Church of England Pulpit.*

“A very excellent little volume, which will be heartily welcomed in many Christian homes.”—*The English Independent.*

“Every lover of the Gospels will find a copy a pleasant possession.”—*The Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

“We can offer to no work of the season a more cordial welcome than to this book.”—*Public Opinion.*

“An admirable work. Will be highly appreciated by the devotional student of Scripture. We know of nothing superior in kind.”—*The Christian Globe.*

“A valuable desideratum in the study of the life and work of Christ as scattered throughout the Gospel narratives.”—*The British Friend.*

“Mr. Washington Moon has succeeded admirably in the work he has undertaken, and has produced a volume which, as a companion to the New Testament, should be dear to every Christian heart.”—*The Glasgow Christian News.*

“It simplifies the history of our Lord’s life and deeds and teachings to have them thus brought into consecutive order and completeness of detail. The task has been executed with discernment, fidelity, and skill.”—*Dickenson’s Theological Quarterly.*

“This is a handsome little book with a beautifully executed map of Palestine. The author has arranged the whole of the four Gospels as a continuous narrative, in the very words of Scripture, without the omission of a single fact or any repetition of statement. This would be a capital book for Sunday School

classes. We recommend it to all our teachers."—*The Christian Life*.

"There has been no excision of fact, and not the most bigoted need fear that there has been dangerous tampering with Holy Writ. By running on from the Gospel according to St. Matthew to the Acts of the Apostles as one continuous account, in wide lines, without division into verses, and with chaptered sections given as the complete narrative seems to require, it is astonishing how much more of an actual personal history the old, old story seems to be. We think those who are inwardly conscious they have not regarded the New Testament in this way will find the '*Monograph Gospel*' aid them to realise it thoroughly."—*The Bazaar*.

---

### MUSIC.

## GOD IS OUR DEFENCE!

*National Anthem, sung by Mr. THURLEY BEALE.*

Written and Composed by

G. WASHINGTON MOON,

Hon. F.R.S.L.

Price 3s.

---

## WHO SHALL ROLL AWAY THE STONE?

*A Sacred Song.*

Written and Composed by

G. WASHINGTON MOON,

Hon. F.R.S.L.

Price 3s.

"The poetry and music of this song are alike honourable to their author's good taste and feeling. Compass, G below to G above."—*The Queen*.

"Truly a song of consolation."—*Public Opinion*.

"A musicianly and expressive sacred song."—*The Music Trades' Review*.

107



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.  
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

17 Dec '51 LR

3 Dec '51 LU

4 May '65 GP

REC'D LD  
JUN 11 1965



YB 71107

885987

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

