

ART. V.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

CONCLUDING NOTICE.

IN accordance with the principles laid down at the commencement of the present Review, we continue our classification of the changes which the Revisers of 1881 have made.

VIII. Alterations of the Authorized Version in cases where it was inconsistent with itself in the rendering of two or more passages confessedly alike or parallel. Further, alterations rendered necessary by *consequence*, that is, arising out of changes already made, though not in themselves required by the general rule of faithfulness.

The “studied variety of rendering,” which was adopted by the Revisers of 1611, say the Revisers of 1881, in their Preface, produced, in numerous passages, a degree of inconsistency that cannot be reconciled with the principle of faithfulness. And here, upon this matter, we may quote from the Preface to the Version of 1611, an exceedingly interesting document, which is, we fancy, but little read, or even known. The Revisers wrote thus:—

Reasons inducing us not to stand curiously upon an identity of phrasing.

πολύσημα.

Abed.
Niceph. Ca-
list. lib. 8.
cap. 42.
St. Hieron.
in 4 Jonæ.
See St. Aug.
Epist. 10.

Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; if one where *journeying*, never *travelling*; if one where *think*, never *suppose*; if one where *pain*, never *ache*; if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? A godly Father in the primitive time showed himself greatly moved, that one of newfangledness called *κραββάρον*, *σκίμπος*, though the difference be little or none; and another reporteth, that he was much abused for turning *cucurbita* (to which reading the people had been used) into *hedera*. Now if this happen in better times, and upon so small occasions, we might justly fear hard censure, if generally we should make verbal and unnecessary changings. We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good *English* words. For as it is written of a certain great philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with St. James's words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.*

These, then, were the reasons which led King James's Revisers to reject *consistency* in rendering: they were not willing "to stand curiously upon an identity of phrasing;" they reckoned "niceness in words" the "next step to trifling;" they ignored a saying previously made in their Preface as to being "*holpen by conference of places.*" Yet the Revisers desired that "Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar."¹ Now, the question before the Revisers of 1881, having in view the "vulgar," as well as others, was this:—Ought the studied variety of rendering, even in the same chapter and context, a principle with their predecessors, to be preserved? Their decision was in favour of consistency, or uniformity, in rendering, so far as may be; and we believe that this decision was wise. When the translation of the same word is capriciously varied in the same sentence and in the same paragraph, a false effect is inevitably produced, and the reader is more or less seriously misled.² In some passages the variation—an "insufficient adherence to identity," to quote Professor Blunt—obscures the connexion; and in other passages utter confusion is produced: the English, indeed, is musical and vigorous; but it is a free translation approaching a paraphrase, rather than a faithful reproduction of the inspired original.

Every Bible-Class Teacher who has made good use of Commentaries remembers the surprise and pleasure evidenced in the class when, in comparing passage with passage, the remark was made, "In the original, it's *the same word!*"³

We give some illustrations.

¹ "Without translation into the vulgar tongue," say the Revisers of 1611, "the unlearned . . . cannot come by the water" of the Well of Life. Fuller, quoting another sentence from the Preface, says that "now Rachel's weak women may freely come, both to drink themselves, and to water the flocks of their families at the same." The passage above quoted, we may add, was probably directed against the Rhemish (Roman Catholic) Version, which contained many Latinisms. An allusion may have been made to the letter of the redoubtable Broughton, laying down the rule, "The same terms must be translated in the same way."

² Bishop Lightfoot: "A Fresh Revision," 1871, p. 35.

³ In every translation, of course, some subtle distinctions of the original must be lost. Rigid uniformity, again, is not advisable. But why perplex plain people by concealing concords? (e.g., "simple as doves," Wiclif; A. V. harmless: Rom. xvi. 19, *simple*). Why introduce artificial distinctions? In 2 Thess. ii. verse 9, St. Paul wrote, "the working of Satan," verse 11, "a working of delusion." The A. V., improving, so to speak, on St. Paul, rendered, in verse 11, "strong delusion." In 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, St. Paul uses the word *sanctification*; in v. 7, the same word. Yet in v. 7 A. V. gives *holiness*. (The preposition in v. 7 is *in*, not *unto* sanctification.) Many of the variations in the A. V. are altogether unaccountable. A long list of the "bewildering" variations is given in "The English Bible." By John Eadie, D.D. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 1876.

In Matt. xviii. 33, the R. V. has—"Shouldst not thou also have had *mercy* on thy fellow servant, even as I had *mercy* (A. V. *pity*) on thee?" the word in the original being the same. Again, in Matt. xxv. 32, we read, "He shall *separate* them one from another, as the shepherd *separateth*" where the A. V., as though the verbs were different, gives "separate" and "divideth." In Rom. xv. the "patience and comfort" of verse 4 recurs in verse 5, R. V.; whereas in the A. V. instead of *comfort* appears *consolation*. The present rendering is as follows:—

For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through [new text, δὲ] comfort of the scriptures we might have hope. Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you. . . .

In Philipp. ii. 13, the R. V. gives consistently, "*work out* your own salvation . . . for it is God which *worketh* in you both to will and to *work*." In Acts xxvi. R. V., the same Greek word has the same English word, "thou art mad, . . . to madness; . . . I am not mad." Similarly, in 1 Cor. iii. 17, the Revisers of 1881 render, "If any man *destroyeth*,¹ (A. V. defile) the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*:" and in xii. 4 ff. diversities, diversities (A. V. *differences*) diversities, the word ἐνεργήματα, both in verse 6 and in verse 10 being rendered *workings*, thus:—

Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of *workings* [energ. . . .] but the same God who *worketh* [energ. . . .] all things . . . to another *workings* of miracles.

In 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, one Greek word appears six times in the same sense; the A. V. gives "put under," "be subdued," "be subject:" the R. V. keeps the same note, *subject*, throughout.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, is remarkable for the recurrence of key-note words, a fact which was systematically disregarded by the Revisers of 1611. They aimed at producing agreeable variety: they failed to perceive that in such cases monotony is force. Thus, for instance, in the first chapter of the Epistle, vv. 2-10, St. Paul's stress lies upon the word *comfort*. He uses this noun and the verb again and again; yet in verse 5 and verse 7, the Revisers of 1611 changed the word for *consolation*; and in verse 6 they gave both "consolation" and "comforted." Again, in the opening verses of the second chapter, instead of adhering to the same word *sorrow*, they gave "heaviness," "sorrow," "grief." Again, in the fifth chapter, one word was rendered in v. 6, *to be at home*, in verses 8 and 9, *to be present*. This passage in the R. V. runs thus:—

¹ Matt. xxi. 41, R. V., "He will miserably destroy those miserable men." *κακῶς κακῶς*.

Being therefore always of good courage [confident, A. V.], and knowing that, whilst we are *at home* in the body, we are absent from the Lord . . . are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be *at home* with the Lord. Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether *at home* or absent, to be well-pleasing with him. For we must all be made manifest [appear A. V.] before the judgment seat. . . .

The words *made manifest*, in the R. V., connect v. 10 with v. 11.

In John xvi. 30, the R. V. has:—"Now *know* we [A. V., "we are sure"] that thou *knowest* all things;" so in 2 Cor. xii., "I *know* such a man (whether in the body or apart from the body, I *know* not [A. V. "I cannot tell"], God *knoweth*);" the same word in the Greek.¹

In 2 Pet. ii. 1, 3, the R. V. has ". . . *destructive* heresies . . . swift *destruction* . . . *destruction* slumbereth not," where, for the same Greek word the A. V. gives, damnable, destruction, damnation. The same Greek word is rendered in the 3rd chapter, v. 7, *perdition*; but in the 16th v., *destruction*. In both verses the R. V., of course, gives "destruction."

In John i. 12, "the right [A. V. "power"] to become," is a gain.² The R. V. preserves, to a great extent, the meaning of δύναμις (Mark v. 30), ἐξουσία (John i. 12), ἰσχύς (2 Pet. ii. 11), κράτος (Eph. i. 19.), and ἀρχή (Jude 6; A. V., "first estate," R. V., "principality.")³

A Greek verb, in the Fourth Gospel, chapters xiii. and xxi., is precisely rendered, and consistently, in the R. V., *leaning back*. Several graphic touches are obscured in the A. V. The Evangelist records that he was "at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom" (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ) when Peter beckoned to him; "he, leaning back as he was,⁴ on Jesus' breast (ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος) saith. . . ." Thus, a link between chapter xiii. and the closing sentences of the Fourth Gospel is, in the R. V., preserved.

In Eph. iii. 14, the R. V. gives, "every family" (marg. *father-*

¹ (οἶδα). In Jude 10 the R. V. distinguishes between οἶδα and ἐπίσταμαι, thus:—" . . . rail at whatsoever things they *know* not; and what they *understand* naturally, like the creatures without reason . . ."; and in Acts xix. 15, between γινώσκω and ἐπίσταμαι, thus:—"Jesus I *know* (marg. *recognize*) and Paul I *know*." The knowledge and the *full* knowledge, in 1 Cor. xii. 12, is expressed in the R. V. margin. Compare 2 Cor. vi. 9, "*well* known."

² Cf. CHURCHMAN, p. 257.

³ The student of N. T. synonyms will, as a rule, thoroughly appreciate the careful discrimination of the R. V. Here and there, however, one sees reason for doubt. In Rom. vii., e.g., the attempt was made to distinguish between I *do*, and I *practise*. But, as Dean Alford pointed out, the verbs are interchanged in verses 19, 20. In St. John, no doubt, the habit, continuous action, is referred to.

⁴ "As he was," new text, οὕτως. Compare the fourth chapter of this gospel, verse 6:—"sat *thus* (as he was) by the well."

hood, as Wiclif, following the Vulgate; *Pater, paternitas*); in Luke ii. 4, and Acts iii. 25, "family" (A. V. "lineage" and "kindreds").

In the margin of Acts xvii. 21, we find, "had leisure for nothing else"; *vacabant*; as Fuller says, "*vacation* was their whole *vocation*." (Mark vi. 31: "they had no leisure so much as to eat.")

The true force of St. Paul's word, in Eph. iv. 3, is brought out in the R. V. "giving diligence" (A. V. *endeavouring*: archaistic); 2 Pet. i. 15, "I will give diligence;" 2 Tim. iv. 9, and in other passages.

It is a gain in 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5, that the same word in the original has one and the same word in the translation: ". . . . as unto a *living* stone ye also as *living* stones. . . ." The A. V. word "lively," as Archbishop Trench has pointed out, was formerly almost, if not altogether, equipollent to "living."¹ Nevertheless, we are glad to have here, as elsewhere, the very same word applied to Christians and to Christ.

The Greek word in verses 1 and 2 of 1 Cor. xvi., now appears for the English reader as *collection* (not "collection" and "gathering," A. V.). The Greek word in Jas. ii. verses 2 and 3, is consistently rendered "clothing;" in 1 John v. 9-11, "witness;" in Matt. xxv. 46, "eternal." One English word, "throne" (the Greek word *thronos*), now appears in the place of "seat" and "throne":—"round about the throne were four-and-twenty thrones" (Rev. iv. 4).²

In the First and the Second Gospel, now, the English reader sees the same words: "All these things have I observed" (Matt. xix. 20, Mark x. 20): "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi. 11, Mark xiv. 38): "A leathern girdle" (Matt. iii. 4, Mark i. 6). It has been remarked that by purely gratuitous variations the English version hitherto has closed, to a considerable extent, for the mere English reader, the deeply interesting fields of inquiry concerning the relation of the Four Gospels one to another. With respect to quotations from the Old Testament, the parallelisms of the Evangelists, and the coincidences of language which occur in allied Epistles,³ and in the Revelation,

¹ In *Titus Andronicus*, act iii. sc. 1, "Now I behold thy *lively* body so." And in Massinger's *The Fatal Dowry*:—

"That his dear father might interment have,
See, the young man entered a lively grave."

² See Archbishop Trench's suggestive remarks, "Authorized Version," p. 91. (Parker, 1859.) Compare Rev. ii. 13, iii. 21, iv. 4, xi. 16, xvi. 10, Matt. xix. 28.

³ See the second lecture, Professor Blunt's "Parish Priest." Murray, 1857. Also Paley's "*Horæ Paulinæ*."

together with the Gospel and Epistles written by St. John, the A. V. is defective in the extreme. No attempt was made to preserve similarity of diction: agreements obvious in the original are concealed in the translation. In regard to quotations, a single illustration may here be given, the renderings in the volume before us being set by the side of those in the A. V. :—

1611.	1881.
It was <i>counted</i> unto him for righteousness (Rom. iv. 3).	It was <i>reckoned</i> unto him.
It was <i>imputed</i> to him (Rom. iv. 22).	It was <i>reckoned</i> unto him.
It was <i>accounted</i> (Gal. iii. 6)	It was <i>reckoned</i> unto him.
[<i>margin, imputed</i>].	

These are the renderings of the same inspired statement, *ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (Sept.), Genesis xv. 6 (A. V. *counted*) (Rom. iv. 11). The uniformity of the R. V. here, and in other such passages, is an indisputable gain.

The building termed by three Evangelists *πραιῶριον*, (Matt xxvii. 27, "common hall," or "governor's house;" Mark xv. 16, "prætorium;" John xviii. 28, "hall of judgment"), is rendered in the R. V. "palace." (Acts xxiii. 35.) In Philipp. i. 13, we find "prætorian guard."

The variation of the A. V., "a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2), "an odour of a sweet smell" (Phil. iv. 18), has disappeared.

A marginal note in Matt. xxii. points out that the "bond-servants" (*douloi*) of v. 3, and the "servants" or "ministers" (*diakonoi*) of v. 13 are not the same. (The Douay Version has "servants" and "waiters.") Men invite their fellow-men; angels "stand by" (Luke xix. 24) to take away or to expel. So, too, in the parable of the Tares; bond-servants¹ and *reapers*.

In John xiii. 12, the R. V. distinguishes between the *guarding* and the *keeping*, thus bringing forth a beautiful truth. Jesus guards and protects so that His own are kept and preserved. The same two Greek verbs, we may remark, occur in Prov. xix. 6; he that *φυλάσσει* the commandment, *τηρεῖ* his own soul.

In rendering the word *Παράκλητος* in four places "Comforter," but in the fifth place "Advocate," the Revisers of 1881 have laid themselves open, no doubt, to a charge of inconsistency. Nevertheless, in adhering to the A. V. translation of the First Epistle of St. John ii. 1, they have, we think, done well. It seems, as Archdeacon Hare remarked, almost "an act of sacrilege" to change the word in the A. V. of the Gospel according to St. John².

¹ The R. V., in the margin, has "Paul, a *bond-servant* of God." So too, in John xv. 15. "Slave," no doubt, would convey an inexact impression, while "servant" goes hardly far enough.

² In the Douay Version, after Jerome, *Paraclete* in the Gospel, *Advocate* in the Epistle. We are sorry to see *consolation* removed to the

Concerning the translation of τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, the American Committee have recorded their preference for "the Holy Spirit." In the list¹ of renderings preferred by the American Revisers we read:—"For Holy Ghost adopt uniformly the rendering Holy Spirit." The English Revisers, however, have chosen to retain the word *Ghost*. In 1 Cor. xii. 3, the words in the first clause ". . . in the Spirit of God," led them to render in the second clause ". . . in the Holy Spirit" (A. V., "by the Holy Ghost"). In John xiv. 26, Luke ii. 25, and other passages they have given "Spirit" instead of Ghost;² but, so far as we can see, they have not followed any rule in this matter; and certainly, with the sweet sounds of Prayer-Book phrases in our ears, we can pardon the inconsistency.

The rendering of Eph. iv. 30—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed," has been objected to by the Unitarian Reviser, Mr. Vance Smith. He has written, we observe, that the words "'Ghost' and 'Spirit' are by no means of identical force and meaning;" the former "has far more of the personal force in it than the latter; 'Ghost' should everywhere have been rejected." As to Eph. iv. 30, he argues that if *in* rather than *by* is to appear here, as in other passages, the translation should be—"in *which* ye were sealed" (not in *whom*;³ the neuter, not the masculine). But the Revisers had herein an Apostle for their pattern. St. John wrote:—"When he (ἐκεῖνος), the Spirit of Truth (τὸ πνεῦμα . . .), is come, he will guide you," xvi. 13 ("whom, ὅν, I will send to you," xv. 26). The new rendering, therefore, of Rom. viii. 16—"The Spirit himself (A. V. itself) beareth witness," to which also Mr. Vance Smith objects, is consistently correct.

In Jas. i. 3, and 1 Pet. i. 7, appears the word δοκίμων, A. V. "the trying" and "the trial." R. V., in both places, "the proof" (1 Pet. i. 7, ". . . though it is proved . . ."). It is better, we think, to keep the same English word; but is "the proof" better than "the trying?"⁴ Dr. Davidson, in his Translation,

margin in Acts iv. 36. Inasmuch as this two-sided word is not uniformly rendered *exhortation*, "Barnabas, son of consolation," should have been, we think, left in the text. In John xiv. 18, we were sure to find "orphans," or "desolate" in the place of *comfortless*.

¹ Given at the end of the volume, a list worthy of careful study.

² A marginal note on Matt. i. 18, runs thus:—"Or, *Holy Spirit*: and so throughout this book."

³ *In whom*. So even Dr. Davidson renders. "The New Testament Translated." By Samuel Davidson, D.D. King & Co. 1875.

Mr. Vance Smith complains of "theological bias" in the new rendering of Matt. i. 21, "It is he that shall save his people;" the complaint has no more warrant in this case than in the other. Here may be noticed the change in Jas. i. 13:—"he himself (αὐτός) tempteth no man."

⁴ In 1 Pet. iv. 12, the R. V. renders "to *prove* you." But the verse, a literal translation, is awkward and unmusical.

gives "the *proving* of your faith;" but test, proof, trial, is undoubtedly more exact. The objection to "trial," of course, is obvious; with the marginal rendering *trials* before him, the mere English reader might suppose that the Greek word in verse 2 (Jas. i.) is the same as in verse 3 [v. 6 and v. 7, 1 Pet. i.]. The R. V. runs thus:—

Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations [marg. *trials*]; knowing that the proof of your faith worketh patience.

The suggestion made by the Revisers on the other side the Atlantic with regard to this word *temptation* seems to us of weight. "Whenever enticement to what is wrong is not evidently spoken of," they suggest that *trials* should be substituted for temptations. It is true, of course, that every "trial" from the Father of mercies may become a "temptation" from the believer's adversary, the devil; but an exhortation to "count it all joy" when one falls "into manifold *temptations*" presents, for a great number of readers, a serious difficulty, especially if Jas. i. 3 be contrasted with 1 Pet. i. 6, A. V., "ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations," and with the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Lead us not into temptation." We are glad, therefore, to have *trials*, though only in the margin.

"Easter," as the rendering of *πάσχα*, *passover*, has disappeared. The word was retained in Acts xii. 4, probably, by an oversight; in the earlier versions it frequently occurred.

Its, instead of *his*, appears in the R. V. "If the salt have lost its savour;" "the gate opened . . . of its own accord." (Geneva: "*it* own accord.") In the A. V. "*its*"—found two or three times in Milton's poetry—nowhere occurs.

On the subjunctive we have not space to touch. We may remark, however, that such passages as Heb. v. 8, "though he was a Son" (A. V. *were*), 1 John v. 15, "if we know that he heareth us" (A. V. *hear*), are improvements. In the last-quoted passage the original words "request" and "make request," are not reproduced with exactness: "If we know that he heareth us whatsoever we ask (*request*, *αἰτώμεθα*), we know that we have the petitions (*requests*, *αἰτήματα*) which we have asked (*requested*) of him."² Consistency, full-orbed, would exhibit the "requests" of Philipp. iv. 6, also *αἰτήματα*, in a parallel passage on prayer such as this.

The A. V. "This man calleth for Elias" is changed into "this man calleth Elijah." In Matt. xvii. 10, also, we now read, "that

¹ Turnbull's rendering is:—"Keep yourselves perfectly cheerful when you are exposed to a variety of trials!"

² "The Help of Prayer." By W. O. Purton. Nisbet & Co.

Elijah must first come." For many in a country congregation, as Dr. Trench has pointed out, *Elias* is but a name; yet it is of high importance to keep "vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testaments in the minds of the great body of English readers and hearers of Scripture." We may remark in passing that as regards names of places and of persons, technical words, and other such questions—on which we are not able to dwell—the Revisers of 1881 have, on the whole, as we think, shown sound judgment. To give two or three instances. "Proconsul," Acts xiii. 7 (following Wiclif), is an improvement on "deputy," and "Zarephath," Luke iv. 26, on "Sarepta" [1 Kings xvii. 9], while "Joshua," instead of "Jesus," Heb. iv. 8 (Acts vii. 45) is a great gain. The question remains, of course, how far on such points the Old Testament Revisers will be found to agree with the alterations in the volume before us.

The word *οικονομία* is rendered in 1 Tim. i. 4, a *dispensation* or "stewardship" of God (A. V. "godly edifying," *οικοδομία*): in Luke xvi. 2, and 1 Cor. ix. 17, stewardship,¹ Eph. i. 10 and iii. 2, and Col i. 25, "dispensation."

In only one passage of the A. V. occurs the word "atonement,"—viz., Rom. v. 11; and the general reader probably is not aware that in passages where he meets "reconciliation," or "reconciling," the Greek is the very same word. Rom. v. verse 11, compared with 2 Cor. v. verses 18–20. R. V., puts the reader of the translation, as nearly as may be, on the same vantage-ground as the reader of the original; and much as we regret the loss of the word "atonement," so far as regards the New Testament, we nevertheless welcome the consistency of rendering in so important a word as St. Paul's "reconciliation." And here we may remark concerning another of the Apostle's leading words—words which must be termed, indeed, *sedes doctrinæ*—that the Victorian Revisers have done well in rendering τὸν ἁγιασμὸν, "the sanctification"—CHURCHMAN, p. 228. (This word occurs in Rom. vi. 19, 22, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, 2 Thess. ii. 13, 1 Tim. ii. 15, 1 Pet. i. 2.) It is the foundation principle of growth in grace, that Christ is made to the believer ἁγιασμός, "sanctification," 1 Cor. i. 30; but much of the erroneous teaching as to sanctification by faith which has spread during the last few years, first in the United States, and then in the British Islands, would have stood self-condemned, as more than once was pointed out in this Magazine, if, together with 1 Cor. i. 30, had been read and carefully considered, the inspired

¹ In Luke xvi. 8, for "unjust steward" the R. V. gives "the unrighteous steward," thus preserving the key-note word of these verses, *righteous*. The rendering "for their own generation" is an improvement.

teaching of Heb. xii. 14—*διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν*, follow after, earnestly follow, sanctification.¹

In Acts xx. 9 and 12, the A. V. gives one English word for two Greek words; the R. V. keeps “young man” in v. 9, but renders “lad” in v. 12. Comparing Luke ii. 43, and other passages, not forgetting that up to ii. 43 St. Luke uses *παιδίον*, we regard the new renderings of *παῖς* as inexpedient.

In 1 Cor. xiii. the Revisers of 1881 have done well, in that, after considering the claims of the Latin “charity” and the Saxon “love,” they have gone back to the older rendering. Ignoring the positive protest of Tyndale,² the Revisers of 1611 adopted “charity.” The Rhemish Version, indeed, has—“God is charity,” and Lord Bacon admired the “discretion” of the Rhemish translation upon this point. But no three words in our English Testament are more sacred than these—“God is love.” And upon every ground, in 1 Cor. xiii., as in eighty other passages, *love* is far better than *charity*. It would have been a most serious mistake, as we think, if the Revisers of 1881 had, in this important passage, neglected their principle of consistency.³

In 2 Cor. ix. 10, as in 2 Cor. i. 5 and Galat. iii. 5, the Greek verb is rendered “supplieih.” With “. . . in your faith supply [Tyndale: “minister?”] virtue, . . .” 2 Pet. i. 5, we cannot say that we are satisfied.⁴

The change in Col. i. 16, “in him [A. V. *by*] were all things created,” will probably excite discussion. On this use of the preposition *ἐν*, here, and in other passages, we have not, at present, space to touch. But as to the particular passage now cited (13-22), it may be remarked that the authorities are in favour of *in*. The R. V. gives, at the end of verse 16, “through him and unto him.”⁵

¹ On the article here, “the sanctification,” no great stress need be laid. St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, “follow after charity,” *διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην*.

² Yet Tyndale, oddly enough, introduced “charitably” in Rom. xiv. 15; R. V., “in love” (in Rom. xiii. 10—“Love is the fulfilling of the law”). Against Tyndale’s great work Sir Thomas More wrote with bitterness, and “love” was one of the six words specially complained of.

³ One change in the English which follows inevitably from a change in the Greek, will be regretted on all sides. 1 Cor. xv. 57, 58, new text, runs thus:—*Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος. Πῶδ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; πῶδ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον; τὸ δὲ κέντρον. . . .* R. V., “Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death. . . .”

⁴ “In your love of the brethren love” is not felicitous. Surely “in brotherly affection love” is better. (We do not forget that the Greek word, with the heathen, meant only the love between “brethren” in blood.) Bengel’s remarks are excellent.

⁵ The A. V. rendering of v. 15, “the first-born of every creature” is by no means satisfactory, as that great champion of the English Church against Arianism, Waterland, complained. Yet, is the R. V. “the first-born of all creation,” much better?

The Revisers of 1881 have attempted, and not in vain, to distinguish between the verb *to be*, and *to become*, or *be made*. For example, "Before Abraham was [*mary*. was born] I am" (following Cranmer: Vulgate; Antequam Ab. fieret, ego sum. Douay; Ab. was made). Heb. v. 11, "Seeing ye are become (A. V. *are*) dull of hearing." The A. V. in John viii. 33, preserves the contrast: the Jews said, we *are*; the Saviour said, "Ye shall *be made* (become) free."

One change of an important character results from the R. V. consistency of rendering. The proper force of ἰδιος (*his own*, as in Matt. xxv. 14) appears in John v. 18 ". . . called God his own Father, making himself equal with God." The charge of blasphemy clearly was that Christ claimed to be God's own Son in a peculiar and unparalleled sense.

Our analysis of the alterations of the R. V. must here terminate. Under the heading of (1) the article, (2) the aorist, (3) the perfect and present, (4) the imperfect, (5) the prepositions, (6) archaisms, (7) incorrect and vague translations, (8) consistency, we have arranged the alterations, giving—with more or less of comment—typical illustrations. Hitherto, we have expressed no opinion concerning the R. V. regarded as a rival, or successor, of the "Authorized" Version. Our aim has been to prove, in accordance with our statement at the outset, that the Revised New Testament is a "more faithful and accurate representation of the original than its predecessor of A.D. 1611."

We will now, with brevity, remark, first, that the changes made by the Victorian Revisers are too numerous; and, in the second place, that the English in the passages which have been altered is, too often, either weak or stiff and unmusical.

(1.) The changes are too numerous. This is, perhaps, the general verdict; and their own rule is quoted, not without justice, against the Revisers. It is easy to understand, however, that as the work progressed, and grew upon them, they were led to consider "alterations by *consequence*" of real necessity. Still, the great number of changes, many of them trivial, and others of only secondary importance, has excited prejudice. Here and there, too, an alteration appears pedantic: an excellent rule, as regards, *e.g.*, the proper force of the tenses, is pressed to no purpose. Sometimes the alterations irritate.¹ One important change—perhaps, the most important—has been already criticized in this Magazine—viz., the substitution of "the evil one" for *evil*. While we honour the courage which brings into prominence a Scriptural doctrine especially disliked at the present day, we cannot—as at present advised—consider so great a variation in

¹ *E.g.*, instead of the A. V. "Lord, is it I?" the R. V. has "Is it I, Lord?"

such a passage either expedient or sound. And, again, "Bring us," instead of "lead us," is, no doubt, consistent and correct; but the value of the alteration seems of the smallest. To meddle with the Lord's Prayer is a dangerous matter.¹

To dwell upon the changes which appear to us needless would be an ungrateful labour. Criticism has been copious; and not a few of the critics have seemed more anxious to point out blemishes than to give that credit which is undeniably due. Fault-finding is easy. For ourselves, a single sample seems sufficient. Some of the alterations in the first chapter of St. John, quoted below, we think unnecessary:—

A. V.	R. V.
there was a man.	there came a man.
that all men through him might believe.	that all might believe through him.
his own.	they that were his own.
John bare witness.	John beareth witness.
is preferred before me.	is become before me.
the prophet Esaias.	Isaiah the prophet.
whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.	the latchet of whose shoe. . . .
I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove.	I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven.
He first findeth.	He findeth first.
brought him to Jesus.	brought him unto Jesus.
abode. ²	they abode.

(2.) In the altered passages the language is occasionally poor. With the Revisers of 1611 the strong point was English; with our Revisers it is Greek. Here and there, it is true, appears a terse and felicitous rendering; but in certain passages, where more than one word has been changed, the English is thin, not sonorous; it is that of a scholastic, too literal, and savouring of the class-room. That the translation of every clause and of every paragraph throughout the volume is, as a rule, clear, and remarkably accurate, is admitted on all hands, but it is said, and with reason, that a Version which has to be read aloud must be more than lucid and faithful.

Whether the Revised New Testament will win its way³ as did

¹ In the Angels' Hymn, again, "Peace among men in whom he is well pleased," is a paraphrase.

² "Come and ye shall see" is the new text in verse 30.

³ The Preface to the A. V. thus opens:—"Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising any thing ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find an hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story, or have any experience. For was there ever any thing projected that savoured any way of newness or renewing, but the same endured

the "Authorized" Version, depends, to some extent, of course, on the character of the revision of the Old Testament. When the whole work is completed, another effort may be called for, and the revision be revised. Time will show. It is easy to speculate, and it is useless. For ourselves, we can only say that our study of the present Revision has deepened our admiration for the conscientious care with which the labour has been done. The work was carried on, we believe, in a true spirit of prayer, and dependence upon God. Of the learning, the candour, the ability, and the unwearied assiduity of the Revisers there can be but one opinion among unprejudiced readers. And the number of readers will increase, we have no doubt, who entertain a very high sense of the value of the boon which the Revisers have conferred upon the English-reading population of the Christian world.

ART. VI.—SUNDAY CLOSING.

IN the article in last October's CHURCHMAN on "Local Option and Local Control," it was truly remarked that, to anyone unacquainted with the temperance question these terms convey of themselves no definite ideas. It may, however, be doubted whether to many of those who are acquainted with the temperance question, and of those who voted in the recent divisions in Parliament in favour of Local Option, they convey any very definite idea, or are associated with any tangible proposal for carrying them into effect. The demand for Sunday Closing, on the other hand, is a definite, tangible, and practical proposal. It postulates the introduction of no new principle into our legislation.¹ It asks for no exceptional dealing in the case of the liquor traffic. It simply proposes the extension of restrictions already in operation, and the application to this traffic of the prohibition which already exists in the case of other trades. It is directly based rather on the distinctive character of *the day*, than of *the trade*, affected; although, as a matter of course, the latter largely enters indirectly into the consideration. Hence it stands on a platform

many a storm of gainsaying or opposition?" The Translators of 1611 foresaw the enmity and opposition which their work would meet with. They knew what St. Jerome had to undergo. The first critic, bitter enough, was the erudite but arrogant Hugh Broughton, who had been passed over. Broughton was so vain that when he went to the Continent it was said he was gone to teach the Jews Hebrew.

¹ Even the application of the principle to the whole day has been conceded by the Legislature in the creation of six days' licences.