

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. VII.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

*The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Translated out of the Greek; being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Oxford, 1881.*¹

SOME reasons were assigned in an Article which appeared in the April issue of this Periodical why it was reasonable to anticipate that the Revised New Testament of A.D. 1881 would prove to be a more faithful and accurate representation of the original text than its predecessor of A.D. 1611. We propose, in the present Paper, to inquire how far the anticipation thus expressed has been realized in the long and anxiously-expected volume which is now before us.

It would be an interesting subject of inquiry were we to endeavour to trace out in detail the various circumstances by which the minds of the English-speaking population have been gradually prepared for a further revision of that admirable version of the Greek New Testament, for which they are, and will ever continue to be, deeply indebted to the unwearied labours and the sound learning of the Commissioners who were appointed by King James in the year 1604. Such an inquiry, however, would occupy far too much of the space which is now at our disposal; and we must content ourselves, before we enter upon any critical examination of the volume which now lies before us, with directing the attention of our readers to a short historical account of the origin of that Revision of the Old and New Testaments, of which the first instalment is already in our hands.

The necessity which existed for a thorough and accurate Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments had long forced itself upon the minds of scholars, both in England and in America, and was beginning to be felt² and

¹ The work is printed at the University Press. The Cambridge copies are precisely the same as the Oxford. Opposite the title-page appears the statement: Published by Henry Frowde, Oxford Warehouse, 7, Paternoster Row; C. J. Clay, M.A., Cambridge Warehouse, 27, Paternoster Row.

² In the year 1856 the subject was brought before Convocation by Canon Selwyn, who moved in favour of a petition for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The time, however, was not yet come. In the House of Commons Sir George Grey declined to entertain the proposal. A private undertaking in the year 1857, the preparation of a revised version of St.

acknowledged in the outside world, when, on the 10th February, in the year 1870, the late Bishop Wilberforce brought forward the question in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. He moved for the appointment of a Committee of both Houses of that Province, with power to confer with any Committee that might be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, "to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translation made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist."¹ This motion, which had reference only to the New Testament, was formally extended, in the course of the discussion which ensued, so as to comprehend the whole of the Inspired Volume, and was agreed to in the Upper House on the same day, and accepted in the Lower House of Convocation on the day following.

A similar motion was proposed on the 23rd day of the same month in the Convocation of York. This motion was opposed by the Bishop of Carlisle and others, on the grounds that the present Authorized Version is accepted, not only by the Established Church of this land, but also by the Dissenters of various denominations, and by the whole of the English-speaking people of the world, as their standard of faith; that the attempts which had been made in the way of Revision of late years were not such as to encourage the Convocations in their expectations of the beneficial results of Revision; that the power of writing that clear and dialectic English which distinguishes the Authorized Version had been lost by scholars of the present generation; and further, that a work such as was contemplated by the Convocation of Canterbury could be effectually carried out only under a Commission from the Crown. The Northern Convocation appears to have been influenced by considerations such as these; and without, as it appears to us, duly weighing both the preponderating arguments which had been adduced in the Southern Convocation on the other side, or the proposals which had been made, or which yet might be made, with a view to overcome the objections and difficulties which stood in the way, the members of that Convocation came to a conclusion adverse to the original motion which had been submitted to them. This conclusion was

John's Gospel "by five clergymen," served to keep the question before the public; and in the year 1869 two of these "five clergymen," Bishop Ellicott and Dean Alford, obtained the support of Bishop Wilberforce. It was thought, at first, that an address should be moved for in the House of Lords, but after consultation with those in authority the idea of a Royal Commission was abandoned.

¹ Chronicles of Convocation, vol. ii. p. 74, 1870.

expressed in the following Resolution, which was passed with general approval, the original motion being previously withdrawn :—

That this Convocation desires to express its thankfulness for the possession of an Authorized Version of Holy Scriptures which has been accepted and valued, not only within the English Church, but by English Nonconformists, and by the English-speaking people throughout the world; that, whilst admitting that certain blemishes exist in that version, such as have been pointed out from time to time by means of marginal notes and corrections, this Convocation deprecates any revision which might lead to a complete recasting of the text of the Authorized Version; that this Convocation earnestly desires to co-operate with the sister Convocation of Canterbury, but, in the present state of the question, it does not think it wise to ask his Grace the President to grant a Committee on the subject of a revision of the Authorized Version.¹

A formal communication to this effect was made to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was read to the Upper House of Convocation of the Southern Province on May 3, in the same year.²

The Southern Convocation being thus left to carry on the work alone, proceeded to the appointment of a Committee consisting of members of both Houses, who reported that it was desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members who should be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they might belong. In accordance with this resolution two Companies were appointed, consisting, not only of scholars belonging to both Houses of Convocation, but also, as had been originally proposed by the Bishop of St. David's, of men eminent for Biblical scholarship amongst the different Nonconformist bodies.

The Company appointed for the Revision of the Old Testament was to consist, as originally proposed, of the following members of both Houses of Convocation :—

Bishop of St. David's (Thirlwall).
 Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant).
 Bishop of Ely (Harold Browne).
 Bishop of Lincoln (Wordsworth).
 Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord A. C. Hervey).
 Archdeacon Rose.
 Canon Selwyn.
 Dr. Jebb.
 Dr. Kay.

The following persons were invited to join in the Old Testament Company :—

¹ See the *Guardian* of March 2, 1870.

² Chronicles of Convocation, vol. ii. p. 210.

Dr. W. L. Alexander, Pastor of St. Augustine's Church, Edinburgh, Professor in the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches of Scotland; T. Chenery, Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford; the Rev. Canon Cook, of Exeter; Dr. Davidson, Professor of Theology in the Free Church Hall, Edinburgh; Dr. B. Davies, Professor in the Baptist College, Regent's Park, London; Dr. Fairbairn, Professor in the United Presbyterian College, Glasgow; the Rev. I. Field, Rector of Higham, Norwich; Dr. Ginsburg; Dr. Gotch, Principal of the Baptist College, Bristol; Archdeacon Harrison, Canon of Canterbury; Professor Leathes, of King's College, London; Professor McGill; Dr. Payne Smith, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Professor Perowne, of Cambridge; Canon Plumptre, Professor in King's College, London; Canon Pusey, of Oxford; Dr. Wright, of the British Museum; and W. Aldis Wright, of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The New Testament Company was to consist of the following members of the two Houses of Convocation:—

Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce).
 Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Ellicott).
 Bishop of Salisbury (Moberly).
 Dean of Lichfield (Bickersteth).
 Dean of Canterbury (Alford).
 Dean of Westminster (Stanley).
 Canon Blakesley.

The following scholars and divines were invited to join the New Testament Company:—

Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench; Dr. Angus, Principal of Baptist College, Regent's Park; Dr. Eadie, Professor in United Presbyterian College, Glasgow; the Rev. F. G. Hort, Vicar of Great Wymondley, Herts; Canon Humphry; Canon Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge; Archdeacon Lee; Canon Lightfoot, Professor at Cambridge; Dr. Milligan, Professor of Biblical Criticism, Aberdeen; Professor Moulton, Wesleyan College, Richmond; Dr. T. H. Newman, Oscott, Birmingham; Professor Newth, New College, St. John's Wood; Dr. Roberts, Professor, St. Andrew's University; Rev. G. Vance Smith, English Presbyterian College, York; Dr. Scott, Balliol College, Oxford; Rev. F. Scrivener, Rector of Gerrans, Cornwall; Dr. Vaughan, Master of the Temple; and Professor Westcott, Cambridge.

A few of the members of Convocation who were originally nominated refused to serve, or soon retired from the work, and a few of the invited members were unable or unwilling to accept the invitation. Several of those who were original members of one or other of the two Companies have subsequently died, or,

¹ Of the New Testament Company, Dean Alford, Dr. Tregelles, Bishop Wilberforce, and Dr. Eadie. Dr. Tregelles was never able to attend, and Bishop Wilberforce only attended once. The place of Dean Alford was supplied by Dean Merivale, who, after a short time, resigned; he was succeeded by Professor Palmer, now Archdeacon of Oxford. The place of Dr. Eadie was not filled up, as his death took place at a time when much of the work was done. The number of the members of the New Testament Company was thus for the greater portion of the time only 24.

from various causes, have been compelled to resign their posts. At the present time the lists of members of the two Companies are as follows:—

OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

- The Right Rev. the Bishop of Winchester (*Chairman*), Farnham Castle, Surrey.
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Palace, Wells, Somerset.
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of Llandaff, (*Corresponding Member*), Bishop's Court, Llandaff.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury, Deanery, Canterbury.
 The Ven. the Archdeacon of Maidstone, Canterbury.
-
- The Rev. Dr. Alexander, Pinkieburn, Musselburgh, Edinburgh.
 R. L. Bensly, Esq., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
 The Rev. Professor Birrell, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, N.B.
 Frank Chance, Esq., M.D., Burleigh House, Sydenham Hill, London.
 T. Chenery, Esq., Reform Club, London, S.W.
 The Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Balliol College, Oxford.
 The Rev. Professor Davidson, New College, Edinburgh.
 The Rev. Principal Douglas, 10, Fitzroy Place, Glasgow.
 S. R. Driver, Esq., New College, Oxford.
 The Rev. C. J. Elliott, Winkfield Vicarage, Windsor.
 The Rev. Dr. Field, 2, Carlton Terrace, Heigham, Norwich.
 The Rev. J. D. Geden, Wesleyan College, Didsbury, Manchester.
 The Rev. Dr. Ginsburg, Holmea, Virginia Water.
 The Rev. Dr. Gotch, Baptist College, Bristol.
 The Rev. Dr. Kay, Great Leghs Rectory, Chelmsford.
 The Rev. Professor Leathes, Cliffe Rectory, Rochester.
 The Rev. Professor Lumby, St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough, Deanery, Peterborough.
 The Rev. A. H. Sayce, Queen's College, Oxford.
 The Rev. Professor W. Robertson Smith, 83, Crown Street, Aberdeen.
 Professor Wright, St. Andrews, Station Road, Cambridge.
 W. Aldis Wright, Esq. (*Secretary*), Trinity College, Cambridge.

NEW TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

- The Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (*Chairman*), Palace, Gloucester.
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of Salisbury, Palace, Salisbury.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster, Deanery, Westminster, S.W.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Rochester, Deanery, Rochester.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Lincoln, Deanery, Lincoln.
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield, Deanery, Lichfield.
-
- The Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin, Palace, Dublin.
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of Durham, Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland.
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of St. Andrews, Bishopshall, St. Andrews, N.B.
 The Rev. Dr. Angus, Baptist College, Regent's Park, London, N.W.
 The Rev. Principal Brown, Free Church College, Aberdeen.
 The Rev. Professor Hort, 6, St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
 The Rev. W. G. Humphry, Vicarage, St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, W.C.
 The Rev. Canon Kennedy, The Elms, Cambridge.
 The Ven. the Archdeacon of Dublin, 24, Merrion Square, Dublin.
 The Rev. Professor Milligan, University, Aberdeen.
 The Rev. Dr. Moulton, The Leys, Cambridge.
 The Rev. Principal Newth, New College, Hampstead, London, N.W.
 The Ven. the Archdeacon of Oxford, Ch. Ch., Oxford.
 The Rev. Professor Roberts, St. Andrews, N.B.
 The Rev. Prebendary Scrivener, Hendon Vicarage, London, N.W.
 The Rev. Dr. G. Vance Smith, 5, Parade, Carmarthen.
 The Very Rev. the Master of the Temple, The Temple, London, E.C.
 The Rev. Canon Westcott, Trinity College, Cambridge.
-
- The Rev. J. Troutbeck (*Secretary*), 4, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

It will be obvious to every one who considers the ultimate design of the proposed revision that it could not be other than an object of the highest importance to secure at the outset of the undertaking the sympathy and, if practicable, the active co-operation of Biblical scholars in America, where the Authorized Version of the Bible is as generally adopted and as highly esteemed as in the Mother country. It was with this view that Dr. Angus, one of the members of the New Testament Company, was authorized, under a resolution passed by both Houses of Convocation, to open negotiations for the formation of an American Committee of Revision. At his request Dr. Schaff prepared a draft of rules for co-operation with the English Revisers, and also a list of names of Biblical scholars who, it was thought, would fairly represent the different denominations of Christians in the United States. Communications were opened with the Protestant Episcopal Church. An American Committee, consisting, as the English, of two Companies, was accordingly organized in the course of the year 1871, and began the work of Revision in October, 1872.

The general principles of the Revision adopted by the English and American Committees are the same.

The mode of proceeding which has been adopted in regard to the co-operation of the English and American Companies has been as follows. The English Companies have transmitted their work, from time to time, to the American Companies for their consideration and suggestions. The American Companies have transmitted their remarks, and suggested alterations, from time to time, which have been privately communicated to the members of the English Companies, and jointly considered in their subsequent meetings, and many of their suggestions have been adopted in the final Revision. There will be found at the end of the volume a list of those readings and renderings which are preferred by the American Committee, and which are recorded at their desire, but which have not been accepted by the English Committee.

The first meeting of the English New Testament Company were held on the 22nd of June, 1870. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who has presided during ten years and a half, and who out of the 407 meetings, was present at 405, has made an admirable Chairman. For such a post, of course, much more than scholarship was needed; and it is admitted that Bishop Ellicott's guidance proved, under God, in many ways for good; but as an accurate, acute, and accomplished scholar, the Bishop was peculiarly well qualified to take the lead in so difficult and delicate a labour.

Having thus briefly related the circumstances which led to the formation of the Revision Committees, it remains only that

we should first place before our readers a copy of the general rules, which were adopted at the outset by both Committees, as embodying the principles upon which the Revision should be conducted, before we proceed to examine some of the changes which have been introduced into the volume before us as the results of textual criticism, of a more accurate acquaintance with the grammatical structure of the original Greek, and of the changes which the meaning of English words and phrases have undergone, during the lapse of the last two hundred and fifty years.

The rules adopted for the guidance of the two Revision Companies are as follows:—

I. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.¹

II. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and Earlier English Versions.

III. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereafter is provided.

IV. That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

V. To make or retain no change in the Text, on the second final revision by each Company, except *two-thirds* of those present approve of the same; but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

VI. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whenever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

VII. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.²

VIII. To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to Divines, Scholars, and Literary Men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

It was further decided:—

¹ In the Preface (which is the work of the Right Rev. the President, but has been carefully considered by the whole Company) we read, of our "time-honoured" and greatly beloved Authorized Version:—"We have had to study this great Version carefully and minutely, line by line; and the longer we have been engaged upon it the more we have learned to admire its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, its general accuracy, and we must not fail to add, the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm. To render a work that had reached this high standard of excellence still more excellent, to increase its fidelity without destroying its charm, was the task committed to us."

² "The revision of headings of chapters and pages would have involved so much of indirect, and indeed frequently of direct interpretation, that we judged it best to omit them altogether."—*Preface*.

That the work of each Company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

That the Special or Bye-rules for each Company be as follows:—

- (1) To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.
- (2) To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin.
- (3) To transmit to the Chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration."

The first Revision occupied about six years; the second, about two years and a half. Suggestions from America on the second Revision had then to be considered, and reserved questions had to be discussed. It may be said that the work has gone through seven revisions.

We now proceed, as it was proposed, to notice, in the first place, some of the alterations dependent upon textual criticism which have been made in the present Revision.

We will refer in the first instance to St. John v. 7. The spurious character of the words respecting the three heavenly witnesses which were probably inserted into the text out of a marginal gloss, is a fact which is now commonly accepted by all competent critics. The absence of the words from the three great uncial MSS.—the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrian,—coupled with the facts that the words are nowhere quoted by the great controversial writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and that the insertion occurs in some manuscripts before and in some after the mention of the three genuine witnesses, may be regarded as conclusive evidence of the spuriousness of these words. When once the fact is admitted that the words are spurious, no doubt can exist in the minds of those who dread alike additions to or detractions from the words of Scripture, respecting the duty which is absolutely incumbent upon the faithful translator or reviser of the New Testament. We observe, therefore, with satisfaction, that instead of inserting the spurious words in italics, after the example of Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the great Bible, the Revisers of 1881 have omitted them altogether, and have not even deemed it necessary to notice the fact that they are found in some MSS. of a later date and of inferior authority.

Few, we venture to assert, who are either personally acquainted with the members of the New Testament Company, or who know the reputation in which they are held by those who have been associated with them, will entertain the slightest suspicion that in the alterations which have been made, whether it be on textual or on philological grounds, the Revisers have been swayed by

doctrinal prepossessions. Should, however, any lurking suspicion exist in the minds of any in regard to this point, we think that a careful examination of the alterations which have been made in those passages which bear upon the doctrine of the Trinity will supply evidence of the strict impartiality with which the Revisers have acted in this respect. We have already stated the manner in which they have dealt with the most remarkable instance of unauthorized insertion. We will now refer to one or two further instances in illustration of our remark. In St. John i. 18, notwithstanding the great amount of authority which has been adduced in support of the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., "God, only begotten," instead of "the only begotten Son," the Revisers have allowed the reading of the received text to stand, and have contented themselves with the remark that "many very ancient authorities read 'God only begotten.'"

Again, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, in place of the reading, "God was manifest in the flesh," the Revisers, guided by the weight of ancient authority, read, "He who was manifested in the flesh;" and observe in the margin, which is reserved for such alterations as are connected with textual considerations, that the word *God*, in place of *He who*, "rests on no sufficient ancient evidence."

But whilst some, having regard to the fact that the New Testament Revision Company is composed almost exclusively of members of the Established English Church and of orthodox Nonconformist bodies, might suspect the majority of that body to be influenced by doctrinal prepossessions in favour of the genuineness of those passages which support the doctrine of the Trinity, there are others who may suppose that the fear of being unduly influenced by their prepossessions may have led them to make concessions in regard to passages bearing upon this doctrine which are not sustained by a sufficient amount of evidence. Now, we think that a careful and candid examination of the volume before us will dispose of this accusation as effectually as of the former. We turn, *e.g.*, to Acts xx. 28; and we find there that, notwithstanding the weight of those ancient authorities, including the Alexandrian MS., which read "the Church of the Lord," our Revisers retain the reading of the received text, and thus justify the conclusion at which one of the most learned of their number, Dr. Scrivener, had previously arrived, and which he has stated in the words which follow:— "The reading of the received text, though different from that of the majority of copies, is pretty sure to be correct. It is upheld by the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., by *all* the known MSS. and editions of the Vulgate (except the Complutensian). Patristic testimony also slightly inclines to the same reading, *the Church of God.*"

We may observe, in connection with the present subject, that the last clause of 1 John ii. 23, which is printed in our present English Bibles in italics, as if of doubtful genuineness, is retained without any marks of doubtfulness by the Revisers of 1881, the real cause of the doubt respecting the words having arisen, in all probability, from the fact that some scribe, looking at the close of the verse, of which the three last words are the same as the three last of the preceding clause, supposed that he had written the second clause, when, in point of fact, he had only written the former. We may also notice here, although the correction strictly speaking falls under another class of incorrect or doubtful renderings, to which we shall have occasion to advert, that in Titus ii. 13, whilst allowing a place in the margin to the present rendering of the Authorized Version "of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," the Revisers of 1881 insert in the text that which, it can scarcely admit of doubt, is the true rendering of the original Greek, "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"

We must deal very concisely with other alterations or marginal insertions which are dependent upon the results of textual criticism.¹

The concluding verses of the Gospel of St. Mark, chap. xvi. 9-20, remain in the text—a break being made in the page, and a marginal note being inserted to the effect that the verses are wanting in the "two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities," whilst "some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel."

A similar course is adopted in regard to St. John vii. 53; viii. 11. There is a break before and after these verses, and the reader is informed that they are omitted by most of the ancient authorities, whilst those which retain them vary much from each other. The doxology in St. Matthew vi. 13, which may have been inserted at a later period, under the influence of liturgical usage, is omitted; and a note informs the reader that some ancient authorities admit the words with variations. A similar note, as regards the omission, is inserted in the margin of St. Matthew in regard to the words, xvi. 2, 3: "When it is evening . . . red and louring." In St. Luke ix. 54, the words "even as Elijah did" are omitted from the text, and a marginal note is inserted on verse 55, stating that some ancient authorities add the words "and said, Ye know not!" &c.; whilst others, but fewer, add also the words, "For the Son of Man," &c.; whilst at

¹ We are glad to observe in the Preface that from the University Presses will appear, with complete Greek Texts of the New Testament, the changes which have been made.

St. John v. 3, we meet with a note to the effect that many ancient authorities insert in whole, or in part, the words which follow—"blind, halt, withered," viz., the last clause of verse 3, and the whole of verse 4, which relate to the descent to the angel into the pool and the tumbling of the water.

We think that the verdict of those who are competent to pronounce an opinion on such a subject will be in favour of the manner in which these and other textual difficulties have, on the whole, been met, and that the sound judgment displayed in Bishop Lightfoot's prognostication in 1872 will be generally admitted, viz., that "the course which is most truthful" will, in the end, prove to be also the "most politic."¹

We must now pass on from the notice of textual emendations to the wider question of faults, real or alleged, in the actual translation of the words.

We will refer, in the first instance, to a few of those cases in which ignorance of the doctrine of the Greek Article—an ignorance not peculiar to the Revisers of 1611, but common to the age in which they lived—has obscured or perverted the meaning of many passages of the New Testament. It has been well observed by Archbishop Trench, that, "in regard of the Greek Article our translators err both in excess and defect, but oftener in the latter."² We will first notice one or two passages in which the Translators erred by way of excess.

In Rom. ii. 14, the insertion of the Article before the word Gentiles, as in the Authorized Version, might lead to the inference that the Gentiles did commonly obey the dictates of a moral law which was engraven upon their hearts, although such an inference could with difficulty be reconciled with the description of the heathen world which the same Apostle gives in the first chapter of that Epistle. The Revisers of 1881 having properly rendered the passage thus, "For when Gentiles which have no law, do by nature the things of the law, these have no law, are a law unto themselves."³ Again, in 1 Tim. vi. 10,

¹ "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," 2nd ed. p. 32.

² "On the Authorized Version of the New Testament," 2nd edition, 1859, p. 132.

³ The error involved in the insertion of the article where it does not occur in the Greek is not confined in this place to the verse which we have quoted. It affects the rendering of the Authorized Version in the twelfth as well as in the following verses of this chapter, and is found again, in the opinion of some able critics, in other parts of the same Epistle (as iii. 19 and following verses) and also in the Epistle to the Galatians. So also in regard to the rendering of ὁ χριστός, the Revisers of 1611 have sometimes overdone the translation by the rendering "that Christ" (St. John i. 25) or "the very Christ" (St. John vii. 26), whilst elsewhere, as, e.g., in St. Matt. xvi. 16; xxiv. 5, &c. &c., under the same conditions, they have not noticed the existence of the Article at all.

the Revisers of 1611 have represented St. Paul as affirming that "the love of money is *the* root of all evil," as if all evil of every kind sprang from one and the same source. The Revisers of 1881, observing that the definite article is wanting before the word *ρίζα*, *root*, have rendered the passage thus, "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil (or of all evils, *marg.*)."

But the more common error into which the Revisers of 1611 fell in regard to the Greek Article was not by its insertion in the English when it does not occur in the Greek, but by its omission in the English when it appears in the Greek.

Thus, *e.g.*, in Rom. v. 15-19, as it has been frequently remarked from the time of Bentley, the Revisers of 1611 altogether ignored the contrast which is sustained throughout between "*the* one" and "*the* many;" and thus, as that great critic observed, they afforded opportunity for "some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation." The passage is too long to be quoted in full. We content ourselves with directing the attention of our readers to this passage as it appears in the Authorized Version, and as it is found in the Revised Version of 1881.

Again, in the rendering of St. Matt. xxiv. 12, there is a very important distinction between "the love of many shall wax cold," as we read in the Authorized Version, and that of the Revisers of 1881, who have properly rendered the passage, "The love of the many shall wax cold," *i.e.*; of the vast majority of Christians. So also in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians i. 14, the same distinction between *many* and *the greater part* (or *most*) is overlooked by the Revisers of 1661, whereas the Revisers of 1881 represent the Apostle as affirming not that *many* but "*most* of the brethren," waxing confident by his words, were bold to speak the word of God without fear.¹

Again, the force of Heb. xi. 10 is greatly obscured in the Authorized Version by the rendering "*a* city which hath foundations," instead of "*the* city which hath *the* foundations." Here, as in so many other cases, the Revisers of 1881 have rendered essential service to the reader, by referring him not only, as in our present English Bibles, to chap. xii. 22, and to chap. xiii. 14, of the same Epistle, but also by referring him, in connection with the word *city*, to verse 16 of the same chapter, and in regard to the words "which hath the foundations," to Apoc.

Other instances of the insertion of the Article, or of the possessive pronoun by which it is sometimes represented, when it does not occur in the Greek, will be found in the renderings adopted in the Authorized Version of St. John iv. 27, "*the* woman" instead of "*a* woman," and in 1 Tim. iii. 11, "*their* wives," instead of "women."

¹ Similar instances occur in St. Luke xxiv. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 4; 2 Cor. x. 13. Our readers will do well to compare the Revised Version of 1881, with that of 1611 in other places.

xxi. 14, "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

Once more, the omission of the Article in the Authorized Version of Rev. vii. 14, "These are they that came (rather than *come*) out of great tribulation," is corrected in the Revision of 1881.

We may here quote from the Victorian Version, without comment, a few renderings in the new text, of which probably all critical readers will approve:—

ST. MATT. v.—Neither do *men* light a lamp,¹ and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house. Even so let your light shine. . . .

vi.—Be not anxious for your life. . . .

Be not therefore anxious for the morrow. . . .²

I Cor. i. 30.—Who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption [marg. "both righteousness and sanctification and redemption].

xi.—For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death. . . .

ACTS xxvi. 28, 29.—And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian. And Paul said I would to God, that whether with little or with much, not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds.

iii. 13.—"his Servant Jesus." (The References here are valuable).

PHIL. iii. 20, 21.—For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself.

ST. JOHN x.—I am the good shepherd; I know mine own, and mine own know me . . . and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.

ROM. viii. 29, 30.—For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

HEB. x. 23.—. . . "let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not. [Faith, hope, love.]

xii. 14.—Follow . . . the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord.

¹ So in chapter vi.: "The lamp of the body is the eye."

² So also in Philip. iv. 4, "In nothing be *anxious*." Here we may notice the rendering—"Let your *forbearance* (marg. *gentleness*) be known unto all men."—In Philip. ii. 6, instead of "thought it not robbery," we find, as a matter of course, "*counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God*" [marg. "a thing to be grasped at"]. And in ii. 10, we read—"in the name of Jesus."

2 PET. iii. 18.—But grow in the grace and knowledge. . . .

COLOSS. ii. 6.—As therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him, rooted and builded up in him, and stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding in thanksgiving. Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you. . . .

15.—Having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

23.—Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.

ST. JOHN vi. 10.—Jesus said, make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

25.—And when they found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither? Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him the Father, *even* God, hath sealed. They said therefore unto him, What must we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent [marg. *he sent*].

1 COR. i. 22.—It was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching [marg. *thing preached*].

In 2 Tim. iii. 16, we read:

Every Scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable for teaching,¹ for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness.

"Instruction" is explained in the margin "discipline." Also in the margin occurs the rendering "Every Scripture *is* inspired of God and profitable." But no explanation of the important word "correction" (which occurs only here) is given in the margin.

The text which is mainly appealed to in regard to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, Titus iii., the Revisers of 1881 have not changed; but the word *laver* appears in the margin, and the words "*and through renewing . . .*" are given in the margin. In Eph. v. 27, the margin has the word *laver*.

"Instead of "be converted," Acts iii. 19, the version before us has "turn again." So also in other passages.

(To be continued.)

¹ St. John vii. 27, "If any man is willing to do his will, he shall know of the teaching . . ."