did that and then you open it up and you read a little further on that Chatham did this and Chatham did that, and they called the particular name that was the designation he was most commonly referred to by in those days. And the same thing applies to some extent in this country though most less (than?) in most others.

Now many feel that the term Jethro which is used so many times here is a sort of title rather than a name. I don't know if they have real evidence for that, but that is a theory that has been advanced. I don't know whether it's true whether they both were regular names of his or whether one was a sort of a title or an official designation. We don't know. But that is the suggestion some make. And so the name Jethro and the name Reuel -- there is no reason why they may not both be used for the same individual. But now we find in Ex. 2:18 he's called Reuel, and here in Num. 10:19 it says "Moses said to Hobab the son of Raguel, the Midianite." And if you look in most, in many Eng. concordances and dictionaries you will find under "Reuel" it says"also called Raguel" And under "Raguel" you will find it says "also called Reuel". Now which of these is correct. Well if you look in the Heb. you find that in both places its רְעוּאֵל - - reuel -- it's exactly the same in both places. But if you look in the LXX, in the Greek trans., you'll find it is Reguel, in both places. And so it would seem that the translators of the KJV, men who were thoroughly famaliar with the LXX, with the Greek and the Latin as well as with the Hebrew, that they felt that they couldn't decide between the Heb. form "Reuel" and the Gk. form"Reguel" so they put the one in one case and the other in the other. And in the Heb. it's identicalin both. In the LXX it's identical in both. Well the King James translators couldn't decide so they put them both in and the result is the average English reader thinks they are two different names. And of course that's just another instance of the confusion we often get into when we use merely a translation. It's like in Isa. 24 where we have the word "erets" about a dozen times "land" and about a dozen times "earth" in the KJV. And you would think they were two diff. words but they are actually the same word in the Heb. and it means one or the other. And it would have been far better there if they had put one, and put the other in the margin as an alternative in my opinion. The RSV, you might say, has done better there than the KJ. They have translated it one way all the way through, but they have given no margin to show that the