

ritual, and the like, if only in conjunction with all these things: there may be an ingenuous loyalty to the life and authority of the written Word—the preaching of the fulness, freeness, and sufficiency of the grace of Christ, and the indispensable-ness of the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit of God. We are one in Christ; but it is only in Christ that we can be one, and Christ is the same living and Divine man that He always was, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—not an idea or a sentiment, or an aggregate of propositions and doctrines; but a living and ruling man, who has the characteristics of a man in being able to exercise and bring to bear upon the heart His personal influence. When Christ is thus apprehended He is sure to be the one thing needful, the pearl of great price, the hidden treasure for which all is gladly given. And when He is thus believed in and accepted, all other matters fall into their legitimate and relative positions. The supremacy of first principles dominates and holds sway, and the indifference of minor points is found to assume naturally its rightful place in the category of the non-essential. But as long as the non-essential is looked at through a microscope and intensely magnified, we cannot be surprised if it is confounded with the one great essential and substituted for it. In that case there is an end to all hope of unity or of reunion, for it is a false centre that is proposed instead of the true one for the unknown and as yet indefinite circle.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. II.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

SECOND NOTICE.

HAVING turned aside from questions of grammar, in order to present our readers with extracts from the new translation, of which we quoted twenty specimens, giving both the text and the marginal rendering, we revert to the consideration of changes which are the result of a more accurate acquaintance with the grammatical structure of the original. And from the consideration of the Article we naturally turn to that of the Aorist. Whereas the Latin language has no article, and in the Version of 1611, as we have remarked, the presence or the absence of the article is almost wholly disregarded, so again, the Latin language has but one past tense where the Greek has two, and the Revisers of 1611 failed, for the most part, to distinguish between the aorist and the perfect. The Revisers, in fact, were accustomed to write and to speak in Latin, and, as Bishop Lightfoot has

remarked, they unconsciously limited the range and capacity of the Greek by the measure of the classical language with which they were familiarly acquainted. Their knowledge of the grammar of the Greek language was, of necessity, imperfect. The present period, however, is remarkable for its Greek scholarship, and in the volume before us the grammatical errors of the Version of 1611 have been corrected. It was well remarked by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, ten years ago:—"The Word of God, just because it is God's Word, ought to be presented to every reader in a state as pure and perfect as human learning, skill, and taste can make it. The higher our veneration for it the more anxious ought we to be to free it from every blemish, however small and unimportant. But nothing in truth can be unimportant which dims the light of Divine Revelation."

II. As to the Aorist. In St. Luke i. 19 the angel Gabriel is represented as saying, "I am sent," instead of "I *was* sent," the obvious reference being, not to the time at which he was speaking, but to his original commission. "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee." Again, in 2 Peter i. 14, the Apostle is represented in the Authorized Version as saying, "knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *hath showed me*." It is obvious that the special historical allusion to St. John xxi. 18, 19 is thus obscured, and were it not for the marginal reference to that passage (which is not contained in a large number of the Bibles in common use), might be wholly lost sight of; whereas in the rendering of the Revisers of 1881, "even as our Lord Jesus Christ *signified unto me*," the true import of this passage becomes much more clear; and when reference is made to the passage above named in St. John's Gospel, all doubt will be removed from the mind of the reader respecting the time of the intimation to which the Apostle alludes. Again, in 2 Cor. v. 14 the Authorized Version reads thus, "If one died for all, then *were all dead*." In this rendering, the state of death is substituted for the fact of dying. When we turn to the Revision of 1881, however, we find the rendering of the passage correctly, if not very idiomatically, given, in this wise: "Because we thus judge, that¹ one died for all, therefore *all died*." Verses 14 and 15 in the Version before us run as follows:—

For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died (*ἀπέθανεν, ἀπέθανον*); and he died for all (*ἀπέθανεν*), that they which live should no longer live unto themselves; but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again.

In this passage, the words "*all died*" have been explained by

¹ The *εἰ* is omitted in the Revised Text.

Bishop Lightfoot in the statement, "that all men have participated potentially in Christ's death, have died with Him to their former selves and to sin." Again, "St. Paul regards this change—from sin to righteousness, from bondage to freedom, from death to life—as summed up in one definite act of the past; potentially to all men in our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, actually to each individual man when he accepts Christ, is baptized into Christ." "It is the definiteness, the absoluteness of this change considered as a historical crisis, which forms the central idea of St. Paul's teaching, and which the aorist marks."²

In further illustration of St. Paul's argument that the true Christian "died with Christ," we may quote from the Version of 1611 and the Version of 1881, placing the renderings side by side. First, Rom. vi. 2, 8 :—

Version 1611.

How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein ?

Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death ?

Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him.

Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

Again, in Colossians iii. 1 :—

If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.

Version 1881.

We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein ? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death ? We were buried therefore with him through baptism unto death. . . .

Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him. . . .

But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God.

The ἀπεθάνετε of ii. 20, and of iii. 3, ought obviously, to be rendered in the same manner. The meaning of the passage is marred by the substitution of "ye are dead," for "ye died."³

¹ "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," p. 85.

² In Rom. vi. 10, the word recording an act which happened at a definite point is correctly rendered in the Authorized Version, "he died unto sin once," ἀπέθανε. The expression is altogether different from that (νεκροῖς εἶναι) of verse 11. In the volume before us these verses run thus :—"For the death that he died (marg. *in that*) he died unto sin once (marg. *once for all*); but the life that (marg. *in that*) he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God. . . ."

³ The new rendering of Coloss. ii. 12, ff., is worthy of quotation—" . . . having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised

Again, in Ephes. ii. 5, 6:—

Hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace we are saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. . . .

Quickened us together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus. . . .

the new version is better than the old. "Quickened," and not "*hath* quickened," "raised us up," and not "*hath* raised us up," is the faithful translation. In all these passages, without question, St. Paul's argument is this: "Ye (true believers) died, ye were buried, ye were raised up, ye were quickened."

The rendering of the aorist, no doubt, has its own difficulties, and the idiom of the English language cannot be slighted.¹ But it is not likely to be seriously maintained in any quarter that the proper force of the tenses in the sacred original is adequately brought out in the translations of the time of Henry VIII. and King James.

The aorist participle in combination with the finite verb is sometimes rendered in the Authorized Version in such a manner as to give rise to serious error. Thus, *e.g.*, in Acts xix. 2, the Authorized Version has "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" whereas the true rendering, as we find in the volume before us, is, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?"² The aorist of this verb, we may here remark, is precisely translated in other passages, *e.g.*,—

(συνηγέρθητε) with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead (νεκροὺς ὄντας) through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, *I say*, did he quicken together with him (συνεζωοποίησε)." "Ye were raised," not "ye are risen": "who raised him," not "who *hath* raised": and "he quickened," he did quicken, not "he *hath* quickened." Compare Galat. ii. —*e.g.*, v. 19, "I died," not "*am* dead." Also 2 Tim. ii. 11, "If we died with him," not "if be we *dead* with him." Two considerations in regard to what is termed the baptismal aorist must be always kept in view: first, the Apostle's language was addressed to those who had been baptized as *adults*, and second, it is *hypothetical*.

¹ In the Preface we read;—"There are numerous cases, especially in connection with particles ordinarily expressive of present time, in which the use of the indefinite past tense in Greek and English is altogether different; and in such instances we have not attempted to violate the idiom of our language by forms of expression which it could not bear. But we have often ventured to represent the Greek aorist by the English preterite, even where the reader may find some passing difficulty in such a rendering, because we have felt convinced that the true meaning of the original was obscured by the presence of the familiar auxiliary."

² One verse in the 2nd chapter of the Acts is probably not understood by the majority of English readers. Verse 23 in the Authorized Version runs thus:—"Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." In the Revised Version, however, we read:—"Ye by the hand

ACTS xi. 17.—If, then, God gave unto them the like gift as *he did* also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ.

ROM. xiii. 11.—Now is salvation nearer to us than when we *first* believed.

III. From the aorist tense we turn to the perfect.

In 1 Cor. xv. 4, St. Paul lays the stress of his argument, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, on the fact that Christ *is risen*. The perfect is repeated six times within a few verses (vv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20), ἐγήγερται, he hath been raised, while the aorist ἠγέρθη is not once used, because the point is, not that Christ *once rose from the grave*, but that having risen *He lives for ever*. The contrast between the two tenses in the fourth verse (ἐτάφη and ἐγήγερται, he was buried . . . he hath been raised) brings out this idea clearly. Nevertheless, in the fourth and twelfth verses the Revisers of 1611 treated the perfect as an aorist; “he *rose*.” Again, in Matthew i. 22 (xxi. 4, xxvi. 56), “Now all this is come to pass,” is much better than . . . “was done,” and in xxiv. 21, “such as hath not been from the beginning,” than “such as *was* not. . . .” In John iii. 26, “to whom thou hast borne witness” (Authorized Version, “*bearest* witness”), iv. 38, “others have laboured” (A. V., “laboured,”) vi. 38. “I am come down from heaven” (A. V., “I came”), are improvements.

Again, in 2 Cor. i. 9, the volume before us shows the perfect tense, and the translation of verses 8–11, which we may quote, is, throughout, precise and pointed:—

For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell *us* in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life: yea (marg. *but we ourselves*), have had the answer (marg. *sentence*) of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us out of so great a death and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope¹ that he will also still

of lawless men did crucify (προσπήξαντες ἀνόμους) and slay,” and in the margin, *lawless, ἀνόμων*, is explained men *without the law*—i.e., the pagan Romans. In Dean Alford’s “New Testament Revised” (Strahan, 1869) the verse is rendered, “Ye by the hand of heathen men nailed to a cross and slew,” a footnote having:—“*literally*, men without law”; see 1 Cor. ix. 21. The true text, διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων, *by the hand of men without law*, makes the meaning still more evident. In the volume before us, 1 Cor. ix. 21 runs thus: “To them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law.”

¹ 2 Tim. vi. 17, “nor have their hope set on.” Matt. xi. 21, “in his name shall the Gentiles *hope*,” (John v. 45) and elsewhere. In Hebrews x. 23, the *faith* of the A. V., instead of *hope*, is unfortunate: v. 22, *faith*, v. 23, *hope*, v. 24, *love*. (THE CHURCHMAN, p. 228.)

deliver us; ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication. (τη δεήσεται.)

IV. In rendering the Greek imperfect it is, as a rule, perhaps, practically impossible to give in English the precise equivalent, and in the Preface to the volume before us the revisers state¹ that they have been frequently compelled to leave the force of the tense to be inferred from the context. Nevertheless, where the English idiom permitted it, they have made the change. For example, instead of "they called," Luke i. 59, we read, "they *would have* called him Zecharias;" iv. 42, instead of "and stayed him," we read "they *would have* stayed him;" instead of "John forbade him," Matt. iii. 14, we read "John *would have* hindered him," thus bringing out the tentative force of the imperfect—he *was for* doing. . . . Again. The graphic description of events in the original is faithfully represented in such renderings as that of Luke viii. 23, "they were filling with water," where the Authorized Version translates as though the boat was really filled with water. To turn with this thought to renderings of the present² tense: in Matt. xxv. 8, what the foolish virgins really say in the original is "Our lamps *are going out* (not *gone out*, as in the Authorized Version); compare 1 John ii. 8, "the darkness *is passing away*" (not "is *past*"). In Luke xviii. 3, the A. V. simply says that the woman *came* unto him, a bald and feeble rendering of the Greek imperfect: "the woman *kept on coming* to the judge," "came oft unto." . . . The force of the imperfect in Acts ii. 47, is understood, of course, from the context: "the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."³ In Acts xvi. 25, the Victorian Version has "Paul and Silas *were* praying and singing hymns."

¹ The meaning of the Greek is clear, *e.g.*, in such passages as Mark xv. 19; (they *went on* doing. . . .); iii. 2, viii. 6, ἐδίδου, xii. 41.

² The vividness of the narrative is obscured when the Greek present is rendered by an English past tense. Many instances, in addition to the above, might be given. One consideration of no small importance, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, occurs in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The present tense is habitually used concerning the temple services, yet the Revisers of 1611 substituted a past tense. For example, in ix. 6, 7, the A. V. has "the priests went in always." The R. V. has:—"the priests *go in* continually." The high priest alone *goes in* "once a year, not without blood, which he *offereth*. . . ."

³ It may be admitted that "such *as should be saved*" is not an exact reproduction of the original; and yet it is undoubtedly difficult to translate, οἱ σωζόμενοι. In 1 Cor. i. 18, the volume before us has "For the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God."

V. Many passages occur in the Authorized Version in which the meaning of the original is commonly misunderstood, either by reason of an improper rendering of the Greek prepositions, or of a change in the meaning of their English equivalents since the year 1611. A few instances will serve to illustrate this statement.

The Greek preposition *διὰ* when followed by the accusative case is not unfrequently rendered in the Authorized Version as if it had been followed by the genitive. Thus, in Matt. xv. 3 and 6 we find "*by* your tradition," instead of *because* or *for the sake of* your tradition,¹ the preposition being followed by the accusative, not the genitive case. In Heb. vi. 7 we read that the earth "*bringeth forth* herbs meet for them *by* whom it is dressed," where the rendering should undoubtedly be, "*for* whom it is dressed," or, as in the volume before us, "*for whose sake* it is also tilled."²

Once more. In St. John xv. 3 we read: "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;" but the Revisers of 1881, by a more precise rendering, have brought out the meaning still more clearly: "Already ye are clean *because of* the word . . ."³ The "word" is not merely the instrument of the cleansing. (Compare Luke i. 78: "Because of the tender mercy of our God," R. V.: "*by reason of*;" not, as in A. V., "*through*.")

In many places, however, the error is owing, no doubt, to the change in meaning which the prepositions *of* and *by* have undergone; the former having been commonly used at the time when the Authorized Version was made in the sense in which we use the preposition *by*, and the latter in the sense in which we now use the preposition *through*. Thus, *e.g.*, in Matt. i. 22 and ii. 15, and other similar passages, where the Revisers of 1881 rightly read, "spoken *by* the Lord *through* the prophet," the Revisers of 1611, intending to convey the same

¹ Compare St. Mark vii. 9: "Full well do ye reject the commandment of God *that ye may keep* your tradition."

² It is worthy of observation that the Revisers of 1611 give the alternative rendering in the margin "*for whom*." So also in Rom. viii. 11, although it is doubtful whether they were aware of the existence of a different reading, they give *because of* as an alternative to *by*. In the volume before us, Rom. viii. 11, has in the margin, "Many ancient authorities read *because of*."

³ The revised Chapter has several improvements. Thus, verse 2, instead of "he *purgeth* it," "he *cleanseth* it;" v. 5, instead of "*without* Me," "*apart from* Me." The verb in v. 2 "*cleanseth*," is translated in Heb. x. 2 (the only other place in which it occurs in the New Testament) "*cleanseth*," and not "*purgeth*" (Vulgate, *purgabit*).

meaning, rendered the words "of the Lord *by* the prophet."¹ A still more remarkable instance of the change of usage in regard to the preposition *by* occurs in 1 Cor. iv. 4 where, according to the Authorized Version, we read thus, "For I know nothing *by* myself," which would naturally convey to the mind of the ordinary English reader the idea of knowing nothing without Divine illumination. The true meaning, however, of the original Greek is correctly represented in the Revised Version by the change of the preposition *by* into *against*, one of the meanings which, in the seventeenth century, the preposition *by* was used to convey, but which it has now lost.

And here, before passing from the prepositions,² we may quote from the Version of 1881, as herein distinguished from that of 1661, a few translations:—

MATT. iv. 6.—On their hands they shall bear thee up, xxiv. 30. The Son of man coming on the clouds (*see* Rev. xiv. 15.)

¹ The distinction between *διὰ* and *ὑπὸ* is of no small importance touching the doctrine of Inspiration. As Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, wherever the sacred writers quote from the Old Testament, they apply the preposition *διὰ*, as denoting *instrumentality*, to the lawgiver, prophet or psalmist, and reserve *ὑπὸ* as signifying the primary motive agency, to God Himself. A few exceptions to this rule occur in the received text; but these disappear when the readings of the ancient authorities are adopted. In the Victorian Version the word *through* is placed in the margin of Matt. xxi. 4, "spoken *by* the prophet," *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*. So in xxiv. 15, Luke xviii. 31, and elsewhere.

Secondly, in regard to the Office of the Divine Word, the peculiar preposition is *διὰ*. Thus, St. John, i. 3, "All things were made *by* (marg. *through*) him;" 10, "the world was made *by* (marg. *through*) him." The expression in the Nicene Creed, "By whom (*δι' οὗ*) all things were made," we may here remark, is perhaps, as a rule, scarcely understood. In Heb. i. 2 the volume before us has, "through whom also he made the worlds," and ii. 10 "for (*δι' οὗ*) whom are all things, and through (*δι' οὗ*) whom are all things;" and, once more, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, also without any alternative rendering in the margin, ". . . as there are gods many and lords many; yet to us there is one God, the Father, of (*ἐξ*) whom all things, and we unto (*εἰς*) him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through (*διὰ*) whom are all things and we through him." The new rendering of this verse can hardly fail, we think, to be generally regarded as a great improvement.

² Here and there the full force of the Greek preposition cannot be brought out in an English version. For instance, the *εἰς τὸν κόλπον*, "Which is in the bosom of the Father," an expression of the deepest import (John i. 18). 1 Pet. ii. 24, motion towards; "who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree," in the margin, *carried up . . . to the tree*. Rev. xxii. 14, "that they may have the right to come to the tree of life;" in the margin, "the authority over;" their "right" leads even as far as. . . . While noticing Rev. xxii. 14, we may quote the new text of the first portion of the verse:—"Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life." For this precious promise-statement we may well be thankful.

MARK xii. 26.—Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush, how. . . .

ACTS xix.—They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. (In verse 3 the Version of 1611 accurately renders the preposition.) See Matt. xxviii. 19, baptizing them into the name.

1 COR. xii. 13.—For in (*ἐν*, not *by*) one Spirit were we all baptized into one body (*were* we all, not *are*).

2 THESS. ii. 1.—Now we beseech you, brethren, touching (marg. *in behalf of*)¹ the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς*).

1 COR. viii. 11.—The brother for whose sake (*δι' ὅν*) Christ died.

LUKE viii. 12.—Taketh away the word from (not *out of*) their heart.

LUKE xxiii. 42.—Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

JOHN iii. 13.—And no man hath ascended into (*εἰς*) heaven; but he that descended out of heaven.

JOHN vi. 57.—As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me. (Compare 2 Cor. iv. 11, “for Jesus’ sake.”)

ROM. xv.—I have, therefore, my glorying in (not *through*) Christ Jesus.

VI. We now proceed to notice some other instances, in which, as in the case of the prepositions *of* and *by*, words have acquired a different signification since the Revision of 1611, or in which, by reason of disuse, words and phrases which were common in the seventeenth century are no longer intelligible to the ordinary class of readers.

In Matthew x. 19, we find “be not anxious” in the place of “take no thought.” (“When they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak.”) The passages in the Sermon on the Mount, with Philipians iv. 4, which are parallel, were quoted in the last CHURCHMAN. Now, the word *thought* was commonly used when the Version of 1611 appeared, to denote *solicitude*, as we find not only in the Old and New Testament (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. ix. 5), but also in the writings of Bacon and Milton. In his “History of Henry the Seventh,” the former of these writers speaks of Harris, an alderman of London, as “dying of *thought* and anxiety;” whilst the latter represents Adam as “taking no thought,” but “eating his fill.” A prudent forethought, a carefulness which is not out of harmony with trust and dependence,

¹ The version of 1611, “*by* the coming of our Lord” (Vulgate, Beza, Calvin) cannot be defended. The use of this preposition for adjuration is not found in the New Testament: and it would be strange were a writer to adjure his readers by the very matter he was about to unfold to them. Bishops Ellicott and Wordsworth explain the preposition here “in behalf of” “in the interest of.”

is nowhere condemned in the Word of God; and the Revisers have done well to introduce a new word—*anxiety*, in the place of *thought*.¹ In 1 Pet. v. 7, they have marked the distinction between *μέριμνα* and *μέλειν*, thus: “casting all your *anxiety* upon him, because he *careth for you*.”

Again, the word *allow*, which is derived, through the French *allower*, from the Latin *allaudare*, originally denoted praise or approval,² and is thus used in Luke xi. 48: “Truly ye bear witness that ye *allow* (συνευδοκεῖτε) the deeds of your fathers.” It appears to be used in the same signification in Rom. vii. 15: “For that which I do, I *allow* not,” where it is the representative of the Greek *γινώσκω*. In the former of these places the volume before us has *consent unto* in the place of *allow*, and in the latter the primary meaning of the Greek verb is retained, “I *know* not.”

Again, the words *admire* and *admiration*, which, in accordance with their derivation from the Latin *miror*, originally denoted *wonder*, whether with or without approval, are used in the Bible of 1611 in their wide and general signification, but have subsequently become restricted in use to the sense of wonder with approval, and are often employed to denote *approval* in which *wonder* has little or no place. We have an instance in Rev. xvii. 6, in which the ordinary English reader of the present day is likely to be misled by the rendering of 1611, which represents the beloved Evangelist and Seer as “wondering with great *admiration*” at “the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” The Revisers of 1881 have very properly adopted the rendering, “I wondered with a great wonder.” There are two other places in which the Revisers of 1881 have substituted the original for the acquired sense of these words, in which, however, we doubt whether the meaning of the original Greek is more accurately represented. We refer to 2 Thess. i. 10, “When He shall come to be glorified in His saints and to be *admired* in all them that believe;” and to Jude v. 16, “*having* men’s persons in *admiration* because of advantage.” In the former of these places the Revisers of 1881 have adopted the rendering, “to be *marvelled at* in all them that believed;” and in the latter, “*shewing respect* of persons for the sake of advantage.”

The word *by-and-by* (Greek *εὐθὺς*, or *εὐθέως*, or *ἔξαρῆς*) occurs four times in the Authorized Version of the New Testament in the sense of straightway or *immediately*, viz., St. Matt.

¹ On this archaism, which Bishop Lightfoot terms a *guilty* archaism, as distinguished from such *innocent* ones as “bewray,” “travail,” and “list,” see Archbishop Trench’s “Authorized Version.”

² The Prayer Book version of Psalm xi. 6, is, “The Lord *alloweth* the righteous.”

xiii. 21; St. Mark vi. 25; St. Luke xvii. 7 and xxi. 9. In these cases the Revisers of 1881 render the word *straightway*, *forthwith*, or *immediately*. At the time when the Authorized Version was published, the word *by-and-by* denoted the immediate future, but has now ceased to convey that meaning.¹

Another word which has changed its meaning since the time of King James's Revisers is *carriage*. We find this word used both in the Old and in the New Testament to denote *baggage*. Thus in 1 Sam. xvii. 22, we read that "David left his *carriage* in the hand of the keeper of the *carriage*;" and in Acts xxi. 15, we read that St. Paul and those who were with him "took up their *carriages*, and went up unto Jerusalem." In the latter of these places the Greek word employed is the verb cognate to the noun which occurs in the LXX. in 1 Sam. xvii. The Revisers of 1881 have done wisely in substituting for this word its modern equivalent *baggage*.

Another word which has changed its meaning since 1611 is *grudge*, which was formerly employed to denote open expressions of dissatisfaction, rather than inward feelings of envy. Thus—*e.g.*, in 1 St. Peter iv. 9, Christians are exhorted to "use hospitality one to another without *grudging*," where the Greek is *ἀνευ γογγυσμοῦ*, which the Revisers of 1881 have rendered "without *murmuring*." In St. James v. 9, an expressive English word would be "*Grumble* not . . ."

The word *usury*, again, was used in the seventeenth century, not only to denote the lending of money on inordinate interest, but the lending of it with any interest whatever. An illustration of this use occurs in St. Luke xix. 23, in which place the Revisers of 1881 have substituted the word *interest* for *usury*; "and I, at my coming, should have required it with interest."

The word *sincere*, again, whatever may be its etymology, is now used only in an ethical signification. It appears, however, to have been used at one time to denote freedom from the admixture of extraneous elements, as, *e.g.*, in 1 St. Peter ii. 2, where we read "As new-born babes desire the *sincere* milk of the word," the word *sincere* being used in the sense of *pure*, *unadulterated*. This does not appear, however, to be the correct rendering of the passage. The Greek is *τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα*; and the Revisers of 1881 have translated these words "the spiritual (Greek, reasonable) milk which is without guile." The Authorized Version is rather a paraphrase than a translation of the original; and it altogether misses the obvious allusion of the word *ἄδολον*

¹ Here may be quoted, Luke vii. 4, "they besought him *instantly*," A. V.; the Greek being, *they went on beseeching him with earnestness*,—with urgent importunity. "Instantly," in the A. V. means *urgently*, but English readers, as a rule, perhaps, do not see the force of the original.

to the *δόλον* of the preceding verse. "Putting away, therefore, . . . all guile . . . long for the spiritual milk which is without guile."

The word *room* was used in the seventeenth century to denote *place* in a different sense from that in which it would be commonly understood at the present time. Thus in Luke xiv. 8, our Lord cautions His hearers, according to the Authorized Version, when bidden to a marriage feast, not to "sit down in the highest *room*," *μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν*, a rendering which naturally conveys to the mind of the English reader of the nineteenth century the idea of a variety of *apartments*, of which some were more honourable than others. The obvious meaning of the passage, when reference is made to the Greek, is correctly conveyed in the Revised rendering, "sit not down in the chief seat."

A few other examples may be given with brevity. The word "*let*" now means allow, permit, but in Rom. i. 13 (Authorized Version, "was let hitherto") St. Paul's statement is "I was *hindered*." Similarly, 2 Thess. ii. 7, ". . . he who now letteth," is better rendered, "there is one that *restraineth* now." Again, in Matt. xvii. 25, instead of ". . . *prevented* him, saying," ". . . spake first to him, saying" is an improvement, although for members of the Church of England the archaistic sense of the word "prevent" has, comparatively, little difficulty.¹ Again, for "conversation" the rendering "conduct" is undoubtedly better; and in all cases, save in Philipp. iii. 20, where we find "citizenship," the Revised Version has "behaviour" (in Pet. iii. 1, *marg*, "manner of life"). In Luke xix. 13, instead of "*Occupy* . . ." we find, "*Trade* ye till I come;" in v. 15, the same word, ". . . what they had gained *by trading*." In 1 Tim. iii. 13, the R. V. ". . . deacons gain to themselves a good standing" is a decided improvement on "*purchase* to themselves. . . ." *Shamefastness* is, without doubt, better than "*shamefacedness*," 1 Tim. ii. 9, as Archbishop Trench has pointed out. In Luke xviii. 9, instead of *possess* we find, of course, *get*: "I give tithes of all that I get." The word "*observe*" in Mark vi. 20, a mistake rather than an archaism, could not fail to be removed; and we find the correct rendering in the R. V. as follows:—"Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man, and a holy, and *kept him safe*" (Geneva, "did him reverence;" Wycliffe, "kept him"). Similarly, instead of ". . . as I suppose," 1 Pet. v. 12, the R. V. gives, ". . . "Silvanus, our faithful brother, as *I account* him;" and for "*business*," in Rom. xii. 11, *diligence*, the refer-

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 15, ". . . we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep."

ence being to spiritual duties, although not, of course, exclusively; as regards Christian earnestness be not slothful.

VII. We may now notice a few passages in which the Revisers of 1611 assigned to Greek words a signification which they cannot bear, or where, although a Greek word may admit the meaning which the Revisers assigned to it, the context leads to a different thought. We may also notice a few vague and doubtful translations.

In Matt. xiv. 28, the Revised Version has—"She being put forward by her mother;" for the verb in the original does not refer to time, but means to urge on. The Authorized Version "being *before instructed* of her mother" (derived from the Vulgate) is undoubtedly an error. To quote the remark of Archbishop Trench: "We may conceive the unhappy girl, with all her vanity and levity, yet shrinking from the petition of blood which her mother would put into her lips, and needing to be urged on or pushed forward before she could be induced to make it; and this is implied in the word."

In Mark iv. 29, the Revised Version gives the proper translation, "when the fruit is *ripe*."

In Luke iii. 23, the statement of the Authorized Version that Jesus ". . . began to be about thirty years of age," must have puzzled many English readers; but the Revised Version has the correct translation, which needs no explanatory comment. "When he began to *teach*, was about thirty years of age."¹

In 2 Pet. iii. 12, the Authorized Version "*hastening unto*" is an error. The verse, correctly rendered, brings out the great truth that the real Christian is one who is *waiting for* Christ's advent and *working for* it. The Revised Version has, "looking for and earnestly desiring (*marg.* hastening) the coming (*marg.* the presence) of the day of God." For ourselves, we should not have placed *hastening* in the margin, as it seems to us the most appropriate, as well as really accurate rendering of the original.²

In 1 Tim. vi. 5 the Authorized Version, "supposing that gain is godliness," is a most unfortunate mistranslation: the Revised Version has "supposing that godliness is a way of gain."

In Heb. xi. 13, the Authorized Version *embraced* is incorrect. The Revised Version has, "not having received the promises, but having seen them and *greeted them from afar*." As one

¹ For the word *began*, compare (Acts i. 1) the first verse of St. Luke's latter "treatise;" also Matt. iv. 17.

² Dr. Eadie ("English Bible," vol. ii. p. 222) advocates *hastening*, and refers to the expression in the Burial Service of the Church of England, "that it may please Thee . . . to hasten Thy kingdom."

of the Revisers, Professor Roberts, remarks:¹ St. Chrysostom pointed out the beauty of the image; it is that of sailors who, catching a glimpse of the wished-for shores, salute them from a distance. So Cowper ("Task," Book I.) speaking of a promontory by the sea, says:

his hoary head
Conspicuous many a league, the mariner,
Bound homeward, and in hope already there,
Greeted with three cheers exulting.

In 1 Pet. iii. 21, instead of "the answer . . ." must clearly be read "the *appeal* of a good conscience towards God." The Revised Version has the "interrogation" or "inquiry."

The Revised Version has a precise and a graphic rendering of the statement by St. Luke (xxii. 56) as to the maid-servant recognizing the Apostle at the fire: "A certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light of *the fire*, and looking stedfastly upon him, said. . . ."

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—SEVEN YEARS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Seven Years in South Africa. Travels, Researches, and Hunting Adventures, between the Diamond-fields and the Zambesi (1872-79). By Dr. EMIL HOLUB. Translated by ELLEN E. FREWER. Two vols. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1881.

FROM the days of his boyhood Emil Holub, a Bohemian by birth, had been stirred with the desire to devote himself in some way to the exploration of Africa. The narratives of those travellers who had done something towards the opening up of the Dark Continent gave a definite shape to his longings; and in the year 1872, when an opportunity was afforded him of gratifying his desire, he decided that South Africa should be the field of his researches. For seven years he applied himself to his undertaking with energy and with success; and the narrative of his three journeys, written in a pleasing style, gives a good deal of information, and has an interest of its own. As a discoverer, Dr. Holub cannot rank with Major Pinto; but as a naturalist he is entitled to first-class honours. The distinguishing feature of his work, indeed, is the description of the regions through which he passed, their *flora* and *fauna*. The

¹ "Companion to the Revised Version." By Alex. Roberts, D.D.