

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VI.

THE NEW TESTAMENT REVISION.¹

BY REV. FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D., PROFESSOR IN BERKELEY DIVINITY
SCHOOL, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

THE book which most nearly touches the deepest interests of the whole human race is now, after years of expectation, placed before the English-speaking world in a carefully revised translation. It is issued in great variety of size and binding to suit all tastes and purses, and in all of them with the greatest perfection of the typographical art. It has the charm, novel to the larger number of its readers, of being arranged in a form convenient to be read, not broken up into the modern abomination of separate verses, and the *paragraphing* has been admirably done. In these days of reputed "decline of faith," it is cheering to find that 2,000,000 copies were immediately called for in England, and that American publishers also have judged it to their profit to put forth with all speed a great number of editions. The New Testament has never in the history of the ages found such an innumerable body of readers as in the days immediately following the 20th of May.

In speaking of the work, it must first of all be assumed that some revision of the "Authorized Version" was called for. The question of its necessity was discussed for many years by many able writers, and became so much a *res adjudicata* that even a body as conservative as the Convocation of Canterbury was ready to take the initiative; while a large number of distinguished scholars, both in England and America, were willing to devote for ten years a large amount of their time and thought and labor to the task. It is unnecc-

¹ 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.

sary now to repeat the arguments which have justified so much toil; the question is not, whether a revision is needed, but, whether the present work has been well done.

The object of any revision is to present the writings of the New Testament to the English reader more nearly in the exact language of the writer, and success in accomplishing this must be the main test of its value. Other considerations, however, cannot be neglected, and in view of the present position of the Authorized Version, the rules laid down by the Convocation of Canterbury through its Committee were obviously wise, that no alteration should be made in its language except when it should be judged necessary, and "that in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed."

The first question before the revisers when they entered upon their task must have been, What Greek text shall be followed? That they could not honestly confine themselves to the *Textus Receptus* was self-evident. Had they attempted to do so, a further question must have arisen at once, What is the *Textus Receptus*? The edition of Stephens of 1550 is generally so-called in England, that of the Elzevirs of 1624 bears the same name on the continent, and generally in this country; that of Beza of 1565 and of the Elzevirs of 1633, also make some claims to the title, which is derived from the preface to the last, "*Textum habes nunc ab omnibus receptum.*" These editions, according to Scrivener, contain two hundred and eighty-six variations from one another, although most of them are comparatively minute, and it can hardly be supposed, as already said, that the revisers could have so far entertained the idea of adopting the *Textus Receptus* at all as to consider them; or should they follow the same text as the translators of the Authorized Version? Unfortunately it cannot be ascertained what this was. It could not have been that of any of the Elzevir editions, the earliest of which was published in 1624, while the Authorized Version was printed in 1611; but neither does it agree exactly with any earlier printed edition. The best editions the translators

had before them were those of Stephens of 1550, and of Beza of 1589, and the Authorized Version, according to an examination made by Dr. Abbot many years ago, agrees with Beza against Stephens in about ninety places, and with Stephens against Beza in about forty ; but there are also between thirty and forty other places in which it differs from them both. Substantially the same result is obtained by a comparison with any of the other printed editions. Most of these variations are of a trivial character, but by no means all. Such changes as that of the *εἶπον* of Matt. ii. 11 into *εἶδον*, and of the singular into the plural in the pronoun referring to the legion of demons in Luke viii. 38, are evidences of a desire to be strictly faithful to the exact words of the original, notwithstanding the fact that these had been vitiated in all the printed texts before them. Some of these alterations are of importance, as the insertion (although in italics) in 1 John ii. 23 of the clause "he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." In all the changes thus far mentioned they have been sustained by modern criticism, and are followed in the new revision. In other changes, although acting according to the best light they had, they were less fortunate, as in altering the *ῥάβδον* of Matt. x. 10 into *ῥάβδους*, to avoid the seeming opposition to the *εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον* of Mark vi. 8, and the insertion of the clause "as though he heard them not" in John viii. 6. In view of these facts it is plain that the translators of King James's time used the best texts to which they had access, and exercised their own judgment in departing from any or all of them. Their example would seem to have commended a similar course to the revisers of our own time.

Since the time of King James a very large number of the most important manuscripts have been brought to light, together with a vast mass of other critical material obtained by the examination of the ancient versions and the abundant patristic quotations. Textual criticism has risen to the dignity of a science, and has formed the life-work of many able investigators. Very many readings which were conscientiously followed in 1611, are now *known* to be wrong, and are

changed or rejected by all competent scholars. Conscientious revisers certainly could not now set them forth as a part of the true word of God. What could be said of the morality of a reviser who would now insert 1 John v. 7 as a part of Scripture, or would retain Acts viii. 37 as belonging to the original record of St. Luke, or would commit inspiration to the periodic angelic miracle of John v. 4?

The *Textus Receptus*, as a whole, being thus necessarily given up, what text were our revisers to take in its place? There is no single text yet published which can claim to be either authorized or perfect. There is none, it is believed, which the world of Christian scholars would have sanctioned if adopted to the exclusion of all others. Yet the preparation of a new text would have been the work of a lifetime, and except in so far as it was a necessary incident of their work, was not the business of the revisers. The path was largely cleared for them by the fact that there is now a general *consensus* in the text of all the best critical editors which, although not so close, may be compared to the various forms of the *Textus Receptus*. The constant application of minute learning has indeed multiplied the number of various readings; but the points of importance in which the best modern texts differ are very few. Still there remain some variations, and the reading of one of them must necessarily be placed in the text, even if an alternative be given in the margin. How shall it be decided which to adopt? Shall they write "the only begotten Son" in John i. 18 with Lachmann, Alford, and Tischendorf (ed. 8); or "only begotten God" with Tregelles? In Acts xx. 28 shall they read $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ with Alford, or $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ with Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles? Other instances are unnecessary as these sufficiently present the difficulty before them. Their course was in one respect clearer than it had been to the translators of the Authorized Version; for so much critical labor and sagacity has since been expended upon the text that they could very seldom, if at all, have felt obliged to vary, as the former had often done, from the readings adopted by common consent in

all the best texts before them. Especially they could have confidence in these texts when agreeing together, because they had been prepared by eminent scholars of different lands and under widely varying circumstances and prepossessions. So far, then, their course was clear. But when these various editors differ, we can conceive of but one path left open to conscientious revisers, however laborious and responsible the task may have been ; and that was to follow the example of their predecessors of the Authorized Version and exercise their own judgment. In this course they must have been greatly assisted (as it is generally understood), by the use of advanced sheets of the text of Westcott and Hort, which has now been many years in press, and which is expected to prove the most satisfactory text yet prepared. They also had the advantage of numbering among their own company, both in England and in America, the most eminent textual critics now living in any land.

The course thus theoretically marked out for the revisers is the one which they have actually pursued, and seems to be the only course which they could rightly have pursued. It is very easy to criticise such a course. It is very easy to say that they were appointed to revise the *translation*, not to determine the text ; but who can fix the translation before he has first fixed the text from which it is to be translated ? It is very easy to say that they should have adhered throughout to the *Textus Receptus* in some one or other of its forms ; but why should they have done so when the Authorized Version does not ? How could they do so in passages where they *knew* it was wrong ? Or should they have adopted the text of some one critical editor ? Certainly this would have saved them a vast amount of time and trouble ; but what editor has a claim thus to be made an infallible standard ? We think that any scholar, abandoning for the moment the position of a critic, and supposing himself sitting at the table with the revisers, with an earnest and conscientious purpose to present the writings of the New Testament as nearly as possible in the actual words of the originals, would have

found himself, perhaps after a little hesitation, constrained to adopt precisely the course which the revisers have actually followed. This course was definitely prescribed to them in the fourth of the rules provided for their guidance by the Committee of Convocation: "That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating"; and this rule was further guarded by the next, "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."

In one respect they found themselves compelled to deviate from the letter of the latter part of the fourth rule, the better to fulfil its spirit. The rule required them to note all changes of the text in the margin. It was found better to indicate them in a separate Greek text which the universities of Oxford and Cambridge undertook to issue; and this text, prepared with great care, and with a thorough examination of the original authorities on doubtful points, is likely to become the new *Textus Receptus* of Christendom. Its general and speedy acceptance is far more sure than that of the revision itself; for it rests simply upon questions of scholarship and authorities, little encumbered by prejudices and associations with familiar words. It will doubtless be true even of this text that, in minor points, it may hereafter be improved; for the true reading can by no means be considered as in every case finally settled. There are cases in which the evidence simply preponderates in a slight degree, as in the instance of *κυρίου* for *Θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, and we suppose it was the restriction of making alterations only on "*decidedly* preponderating evidence" which have restrained the English revisers from adopting the change which the American recommended. It is possible also that additional evidence may yet be discovered; fresh manuscripts may yet be found; some of the versions may be more thoroughly studied, and their text more accurately determined, and certainly the original form of many of the patristic quotations may be more fully settled. But with the evidence as it stands, and is likely to stand for

many years to come, this text must be considered as the best existing representative of the original documents. Besides being the latest, and prepared with careful examination of all that has been done before, it has the immense advantage of being the work of a company, or rather of two companies of scholars, constantly conferring together, and thus protected from the danger of being led astray by individual idiosyncrasies.

The actual readings adopted by the revisers appear sufficiently in the translation. In this part of their work they had a more delicate task before them, and one which is both of more general interest, and sure to call out much more general criticism, as well on account of life-long associations with the exact language of the existing version, as by reason of prejudice, and of honest difference of opinion. The secrecy with which their work has been conducted, although a necessary condition of its success, yet at the same time has deprived them of criticisms that might perhaps have been suggestive. Their conferences, confined almost exclusively to their own company, allowed them to contract a *habit* of freedom in alteration for which the public are insufficiently prepared. A far more serious disadvantage of this "closet work" was in the saturation of the minds of the revisers with the forms and idioms of the language with which they had to deal, so that their English is not infrequently put into forms which could hardly have maintained their ground in the freer air of public criticism.

There are various methods in which the revision may be taken up for examination, so that by a certain number of examples one may form a fair judgment of the character of the innumerable alterations. The one which seems generally to have been preferred by the revisers themselves in the numerous articles and pamphlets put forth by individuals among them, is that of classifying the alterations under certain general heads, and citing certain examples under each. To this way it may be well to recur presently. Meantime it is more satisfactory in the first place to take several more or

less famous passages to which every one turns on opening the volume, and see how these have been dealt with, and then to examine in the same way one or two paragraphs of some length presenting in their connection alterations of various kinds.

Perhaps the first passages to which a scholar will turn are those in which modern criticism has led to omissions from the text, or at least to serious doubts of its genuineness. Here we find, as we should expect, the doxology omitted at the close of the Lord's prayer in Matt. vi. 13, with the remark in the margin that it is added in "many authorities, some ancient, but with variations." The last twelve verses of St. Mark are given with a space interposed between them and the foregoing text, with a note in the margin. The story of the woman taken in adultery, John vii. 53-viii. 11, is treated in the same way with the addition of being placed in brackets. John v. 3 (latter part), 4, and Acts viii. 37, are omitted, with notes in the margin, and 1 John v. 7 (the testimony of the heavenly witnesses) is omitted without remark, as destitute of any respectable authority. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 $\delta\varsigma$ has been of course preferred to $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, although the revisers are by no means happy in their English "He who was manifested." The last verse of the Gospel of St. John is retained according to the great preponderance of authorities, Tischendorf to the contrary notwithstanding. Matt. xvi. 2 (latter part), 3 are retained with a marginal note; xvii. 21, with a corresponding note, is omitted, as also xviii. 11; the latter part of xx. 16 is no doubt rightly omitted, but it seems strange that it should have no note, in view of the great mass of MSS. and the large preponderance of versions in which it is contained. The revisers have rightly retained xxi. 44, notwithstanding the marks of suspicion by Griesbach and Lachmann, and the omission by Tischendorf; but in the alteration of the translation to "scatter him as dust" they have been less successful, restoring a primitive sense of $\lambda\iota\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\omega$ to the confusion of the figure, while the smaller change of "crush him to powder" would have escaped this difficulty and been quite literal, while avoiding the incongruity of the Authorized Version in

making a falling stone to "grind." Chap. xxiii. 14 (13?) is omitted, with a marginal note, and the latter part of xxvii. 35 without one. The omission of the latter part of Mark vi. 11 has sufficient reason; but the fact that it is contained in A, and ten other uncials, as well as in nearly all cursives, in important mss. of the Latin, in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic, would seem to have justified a marginal note which it does not receive. Mark vii. 16; ix. 44, 46, are all omitted, and this is done in each case on very nearly the same (sufficient) authority; it is not apparent therefore why the form of the marginal notes should differ from "many ancient authorities insert," in the first case, to "are omitted by the best ancient authorities" in the last. Chap. xi. 26 and xv. 28 are both omitted with similar marginal notes.

These examples, which cover all the considerable changes of text in the first two Gospels, may serve as a sufficient illustration of this part of the work of the revisers. It is the work of careful, conscientious, critical scholars, based on the best accessible evidence, and is plainly the result of the exercise of their own independent judgment. In this connection the remark must not be omitted because it has been so often made, that all the alterations of the revisers do not modify one Christian doctrine or one Christian duty; the result of the most searching criticism, guided by the highest scholarship, is to leave the Bible, for all practical purposes, unchanged.

Passing now to changes of translation where the text remains the same or at most but slightly altered, it is fitting to acknowledge in strong terms the frequent gain in accuracy, and thereby in force and beauty, in the revision. If we cannot speak in these terms of all the alterations, or even find ourselves able to commend generally the language in which these changes have been expressed, it is yet to be remembered that there is a great advantage to the English reader in being able to compare two different translations of the same original. He can gather from them both a more exact idea of the true sense than either one alone could give. And

this advantage is likely to be a permanent one: whether or not the new revision shall ever be accepted for the ordinary reading of the New Testament, it will unquestionably be long and largely used as an exceedingly careful commentary.

A singularly beautiful and instructive change has been made by translating the word *ἀνομία* in 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 John iii. 4, *lawlessness*, a word precisely expressing the sense of the original and thoroughly English in its etymology, but one which the translators of 1611 could not use, because it had not then been introduced into the language. If this had been consistently used throughout by our revisers it would really have helped the English reader to a knowledge of that important aspect of sin in which it appears as a development of self-will without respect to the will of God; and in every place in which the word occurs it might have been so used most appropriately. But it has been left *iniquity* (a Latin word of quite a different shade of meaning) in Matt. vii. 23; xiii. 41; xxiii. 28; xxiv. 12; Rom. iv. 7; vi. 19 *bis*; Tit. ii. 14; Heb. i. 9; viii. 12; x. 17; and in 2 Cor. vi. 14 it has actually been changed from the English *unrighteousness* to the Latin *iniquity*. In the case of the corresponding adjective *ἀνομος* they have done better, but yet not quite as well as they ought to have done. This occurs ten times (once, Mark xv. 28, in a rejected verse), with five different translations, in the Authorized Version, of which our revisers have retained but three: in 1 Cor. ix. 21 they were quite justified in retaining the equivalent form *without law* four times, because the change would have been inconvenient; but there is no good reason for keeping the Latin *transgressors* in Luke xxii. 37, when in all other cases they have rightly used *lawless*.

The Greek New Testament recognizes but one *διάβολος*, though many *δαίμονες* and *δαιμόνια*. It is greatly to be regretted that the accuracy and faithfulness of the American company could not prevail upon the English to recognize this distinction, for its neglect in the Authorized Version may have no little bearing upon quite common views in regard to the personality of the devil. The Americans were fortunately

more successful in insisting on the change from *hell* to *Hades* in every instance in which the latter word occurs in the Greek.

The change in the Lord's prayer (Matt. vi. 13) from "evil" to "the evil *one*" is particularly unfortunate, especially in view of the command in the same discourse (v. 39), "Resist not evil," now become "Resist not him that is evil." In both cases the abstract has been made into the personal, probably from an over-nice regard to the Greek article; but surely τῷ πονηρῷ and τοῦ πονηροῦ should at least have received similar forms of translation, and the revisers should either have read in the prayer "deliver us from him that is evil" or else in the command "Resist not the evil *one*." The objections to either course show the superiority here of the old version. The same change has been unfortunately made in John xvii. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 3.

Among the many unnecessary and unfortunate changes must be placed Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34, where *killeth* and *stoneth* (in the third person) have been substituted for *killest* and *stonest*. The verbs of the English are participles in the Greek, and will in themselves bear either translation equally well; but the whole address is in the second person, and this uncalled-for change not only takes away from the force of the language, but makes it positively ungrammatical. We do not know why the vulgarism, "but they only heard say," was introduced into Gal. i. 23 as the translation of μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν. In Heb. i. 3 the exact correspondence of the Latin *effulgence* to the ἀπαύγασμα is but a poor consolation for the loss of the far more expressive English *brightness*. The ἐπερώτημα of 1 Pet. iii. 21 may have required some better translation than *answer*, but only the evil genius of the revisers could have suggested to them such an expression as "the *interrogation* of a good conscience toward God." In Acts xxvi. 28 they have, in a different way, missed the sense, although not so badly as the Authorized Version. No doubt the text of so many sermons, "Almost thou persuadedest me to be a Christian," conveys a wrong idea of what Agrippa intended to say; but neither did he mean (as in the

revision) "With but little persuasion." He had just heard from Paul's own lips the story of his sudden conversion, and it is doubtless with reference to this suddenness that he uses ἐν ὀλίγῳ — in little *time* his prisoner would persuade him to embrace his faith. In John i. 11 we have τὰ ἴδια and οἱ ἴδιοι, and the revisers have undertaken the praiseworthy task of distinguishing the genders, but with a lamentable failure in their purpose (since the gender of τὰ ἴδια is still as undefined as before), and with a loss both of literalness and force. Such awkward insertions of the relative and verb where they are no more necessary in English than in Greek are far too common. An instance may be found in Col. iii. 1, 2. In verse 1 the Authorized Version reads "seek those things which are above," and the revisers have changed this into "seek the things that are above," — an improvement as far as it goes; but it would have been better to have followed the example of the Authorized Version in the next verse, and have simply translated literally "seek the things above." Instead of this they have actually inserted "that are" twice in verse 2. In Eph. iii. 8 and 16 two infinitives occur which are differently rendered in their form in the Authorized Version, the former, "that I should preach," the latter, "to be strengthened"; the revisers have changed both of them, but in opposite ways, making the former "to preach," and the latter "that ye may be strengthened." What principle was here followed? In James i. 21 περισσεῖαν κακίας might certainly have a better translation than *superfluity of naughtiness*, but there seems to be no gain in the *overflowing of wickedness* of the revision. *Planted together* may be an insufficient rendering of σύμφυτοι in Rom. vi. 5, since the word also conveys the idea of a common birth or origin; but if the revised expression *become united* is nearer to the original on one side, it is farther from it on another, and also misses entirely the beautiful figure in which Paul expressed his thought. Just before (Rom. vi. 3), it is hard to see how the Latin *are ye ignorant* of the revision is an improvement upon the English *know ye not* of the Authorized Version; such

changes (which are very frequent) might have been tolerated if made in the interest of uniformity in translation. The fact is, however, that while the revisers have everywhere retained *ignorant* as the translation of ἀγνοέω when it is so used in the Authorized Version (thirteen times), they have also left unchanged *know not*, *unknown*, and *understand not* wherever they occur (nine times), except here and in Rom. vii. 1. The word *evidently* in Gal. iii. 1 can hardly be considered as included in the meaning of προεγράφη, and has nothing else answering to it in the original, but is retained by the revisers under the changed form of *openly*; while in Gal. ii. 9 the order of the words is unnecessarily changed to the confusion of the sense. In Gal. iv. 15 the abominable word *gratulation* of the revision involves the more than doubtful rendering of ἑμῶν by *yourselves*, albeit the *ye spake of* in the Authorized Version was a hardly admissible periphrasis; in the only other places in which μακαρισμός occurs (Rom. iv. 6, 9) the revisers have changed it from *blessedness* into *blessing*. But these are surely enough random instances of minute changes that violate the rule of necessity, and are hardly likely to be accepted as improvements; their number, however, might easily be multiplied.

Let us select one or two instances of more importance. The word θρησκεία occurs but three times; in Col. ii. 18 it is translated *worshipping*, and the same word is retained in the revision, as it ought to be, since this is the true general sense of the word = *cultus*. In Acts xxvi. 5, however, in both versions it stands *religion*, and this, except for consistency's sake, can do no great harm since the connection makes it abundantly plain in what sense *religion* is used. But the same translation in Jas. i. 27 (so also of the adjective θρησκευτικός in vs. 26), which is also allowed to remain in the revision, is misleading, and has been the fruitful source of misapprehension. For the sake alike of accuracy and of consistency it should have been rendered "Pure *worship* and undefiled."

One great fault of the Authorized Version is the use of the

same English word to translate different Greek terms, and, on the other hand, the employment of different English words to represent the same Greek. Our revisers have felt and keenly regretted the impossibility of always avoiding this, especially in view of the fact that words often have more than one sense in their own language, and that the English vocabulary is sometimes quite insufficient (as in the case of *φιλέω* and *ἀγαπάω*) to represent the richness of the Greek. They have, however, the object constantly before them, and if the success they have attained is but incomplete, this is a proof of its extreme difficulty. One important instance may be mentioned in which they have shown both courage and consistency in carrying out their purpose. The exclusively scriptural word *ἀγάπη* appears occasionally in the Septuagint, and was adopted from it by the New Testament writers to express that peculiar Christian grace for which the classical language furnishes no adequate word. It occurs very frequently, and is generally translated *love* in the Authorized Version, but in thirty-four instances *charity*, with a few other cases of special rendering. The revisers have uniformly translated *ἀγάπη*, *love*, even in the very familiar chapter 1 Cor. xiii., where they were sure to encounter much criticism, but where the change is of especial value in showing the true nature of Christian love. Unfortunately they have not been equally consistent with *χάρις*, a common classical word, and also frequent in the New Testament in a somewhat elevated sense, which has a great variety of translations in the Authorized Version, although *grace* is far more common than all the others put together. On account of the mingling of the classic with the Christian sense of this word, and in view of its use in the accusative for *because*, *for the sake of*, it would have been impossible to give it a uniform rendering; but a nearer approach to this would have been a gain. The revisers have indeed changed *gift* (2 Cor. viii. 4) and *benefit* (2 Cor. i. 15) to *grace*, and have used *grace* when the word is brought in by a change of text in Acts vi. 8; but they have allowed *favour* to stand in Luke i. 30; ii. 52, and other places, and

have changed *pleasure* to *favour* in Acts xxiv. 27; xxv. 9, and *liberality* to *bounty* in 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

It would be an easy and a far more gracious task to cite some of the needed and happily accomplished changes in the translation; but these were expected, and had been largely pointed out beforehand. It is the unfortunate position of the revisers that their good work will be accepted as of course, while judgment will be passed upon their errors and shortcomings. In this there is no ground for complaint; it was the very same treatment of the Authorized Version which led to the revision. Certainly excellent changes may be found everywhere, of which the following may serve as examples in comparatively minor points: Matt. xiv. 8 *put forward*, instead of *before instructed*, spoken of Herodias; Luke ix. 32, *yet having remained awake*, for *and when they were awake*, of the disciples at the transfiguration; Luke xvii. 12, *get* for *possess* in the words of Zacchaeus, although *gain* might have been preferred to either; in Luke xxii. 56 real light is thrown upon the circumstances of Peter's first denial by the slight changes introduced into the revision; Luke xxiv. 25, the *fools* of the Authorized Version is wisely changed to *foolish*, but with *men* unwisely added. (If this was to mark the gender it was quite as unnecessary as in the addition of *man*, Gal. iii. 28); in 1 Thess. v. 22 *every form* has happily replaced *appearance* of evil; in John ix. 17 the Authorized Version is hardly intelligible, *What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?* the revision, *in that he hath*, is an improvement, but would have been still better if *ὅτι* had simply been translated in its frequent sense, *because*; a happy change is introduced into John xi. 20 by merely altering the order of the words, *Mary still sat* instead of *Mary sat still*; the confusion introduced into the Authorized Version by making *fold* stand for both *αὐλή* and *ποιμνη* is removed by translating the latter correctly, *flock*; Acts ii. 3, *parting asunder* is a decided gain over *cloven*; the literal translations in Acts iii. 19, 20, *that so seasons of refreshing may come*, and *that he may send*

the Christ, are a manifest improvement on the old version; in Rom. xi. 7, 25, *blinded* and *blindness* has given way, as the Greek required, to *hardened* and *hardness*; the Authorized Version missed both the sense and a figure of great beauty in 2 Cor. ii. 14, *causeth us to triumph in Christ*, while both are restored in the revision by the translation, *leadeth us in triumph in Christ*; so also in Heb. xi. 13, ἀσπασάμενοι is changed with excellent result from *embraced* to *greeted them from afar* (although "from afar" should have been printed in italics as having nothing answering to it in the Greek); the most unfortunate translation of ζῶον by *beast* is changed throughout the Apocalypse into *living creature*, *creature* (without *living*) being allowed to stand in 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10; but why *beast* should not have been changed to *creature* in Heb. xiii. 11 the revisers have not explained.

Many pages might easily be filled with such citations; but it is quite time to take a consecutive passage and observe all its changes in order. The text of the revision is copied, with the different readings of the Authorized Version in the right hand column, and numbers attached referring to the remarks below. The passage selected is Rom. iv. 1-9.

REVISION.

What then¹ shall we say that Abraham our forefather² according³ to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham was⁴ justified by works he hath whereof⁵ to glory; but not toward⁶ God. For what saith the Scripture? And⁷ Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned⁸ unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, the reward is⁹ not reckoned as¹⁰ of grace, but as¹⁰ of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned⁹ for righteousness. Even as David also pronounceth¹¹ blessing upon¹² the man, unto whom God reckoneth¹³ righteousness apart from¹⁴ works, saying,

Blessed are¹⁵ they whose iniquities are forgiven
And whose sins are covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not
reckon¹⁶ sin.

AUTHORIZED VERSION.

¹ shall we then
² father³ as pertaining
⁴ were
⁵ whereof⁶ before
⁷ Omit and
⁸ counted

⁹ is the reward ¹⁰ Omit
as twice

¹¹ describeth¹² the blessedness of ¹³ imputeth
¹⁴ without
¹⁵ are

¹⁶ impute.

Is this blessing then pronounced¹⁷ upon the circumcision¹⁸ or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say, To Abraham his faith was reckoned¹⁹ for righteousness. ¹⁷ Cometh this blessedness then ¹⁸ Add only ¹⁹ that faith was reckoned to Abraham.

Here are twenty-one corrections in nine verses; less than the average proportion for the Epistles, but rather more than the average for the Gospels. ¹A mere change in the order of words, conforming to the Greek order. ²*Forefather* is more exact for προπάτορα. ³*According to* is a simpler translation of κατά than *as pertaining to*. ⁴In a conditional sentence the old *were* is better English than the new *was*. There is a slight difference in sense between the two, but we conceive the true sense better represented by *were*; this is an unnecessary change for the worse. ⁵The *whereof* is certainly implied in καύχημα, and the italics are therefore fairly removed. ⁶*Toward* is better both in sense and as the translation of πρὸς than *before*. ^{8 bis. 12, 16}The verb λογίζομαι occurs eleven times in this chapter with three different translations, and altogether is found forty-three times with fourteen translations. It is certainly an advantage to have, as here, a uniform rendering throughout one important passage; but whether *reckon* was the best word that could have been chosen, or whether some other, as *count*, might not only have been better in itself, but also have enabled the revisers still further to reduce the variety of translation, must be left to the judgment of the reader. The revisers have generally left the renderings *count* or *account* (Rom. viii. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 1; Heb. xi. 19), or changed other words into these (Acts xix. 27; Phil. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 5), but have left *think* in 1 Cor. xiii. 11, and *think on* in Phil. iv. 8. This is perhaps a fair example of the way in which the revisers have generally dealt with the translation of common words; they have made great improvement, but neither as great as was possible, nor as uniformly carried out as was fairly within their power. ⁹A better order of words. ¹⁰The revisers have twice inserted *as before of* to convey better the sense of κατά; they would have done still better to have followed their own example in vs. 1,

⁸and have translated *according to*. ^{11, 12}*Pronounceth blessing upon the man*, is not a fair translation of λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀθρώπου, and conveys a wrong idea. The Authorized Version may not be exactly literal (it is hard to hit upon a phrase that would be so), but is nearer than the revision; such a genitive cannot be translated with the preposition *upon*, and with this must fall the translation of λέγει = pronounceth. Moreover, the slight gain in accuracy of *blessing* over *blessedness* was insufficient to warrant the change; if it must be made, it should have been something on this wise: "Even as David declares the blessing of the man"; but it would have been better to leave it as it was. ¹³See ⁸. ¹⁴*Apart from* is a better translation of χωρὶς than *without*, and tends to remove a serious misapprehension. The quotation, as in all similar cases, is arranged in lines corresponding to the Hebrew parallelism; it is to be hoped that all the poetical parts of the Old Testament will be printed in the same way, but if this is to have any value double columns must be abandoned as not allowing space for the lines. ¹⁵*Are* is not expressed in the Greek, and was therefore rightly printed in italics in the old version. ¹⁷Here are several changes. *Blessing* for *blessedness* has already occurred above; *pronounced* has no warrant in the Greek, and ought at least to have been printed in italics, but is really a mere continuation of the fault of ¹¹. *Is*, if put in italics, might perhaps be better than the Authorized *cometh*. ¹⁸*Only* is rightly omitted as merely exegetical. ¹⁹The revision is slightly less faithful to the original than the old version; the change is minute, but bad as far as it goes. Both omit the definite article before "faith."

The passage thus examined in detail is a fair average example, and what must be said of this is likely to be the general verdict on the whole. It has important points of marked improvement; it shows conscientious and painstaking care; it has also decided faults; on the whole, it has so much that is good that every one must wish it were a great deal better.

The passage above considered fails to show the work of the revisers in their way of dealing with the article, and with the Greek tenses. But before coming to these it may be well to look at a point in which they claim to have exercised especial care,—“alterations of obscure or ambiguous renderings.” Of this a great wealth of examples might be cited; but the following may serve as a specimen. *Food* always instead of *meat* where the original word is τροφή, but when the word is βρώμα, *meat* is changed to *food* only in Luke iii. 11; ix. 13, and left unchanged in fourteen other places; where it is βρώσις it is changed once (to eating, Rom. xiv. 17), and left unchanged six times; where it is βρώσιμος (Luke xxiv. 41 only), it becomes *anything to eat*, προσφάγιον (John xxi. 5 only), *ought to eat*; τράπεζα is left *meat* in Acts xvi. 34, with margin *table*. There is one instance in which βρώμα is contrasted with milk (1 Cor. iii. 2), but there is the same contrast with τροφή in Heb. v. 12, and why the revisers should not have uniformly substituted the general word *food* for that which has ceased to be general since 1611 we do not know. *Worthy of death* takes the place of *guilty of death* in Matt. xxvi. 66; a tumult *was arising* for *was made* Matt. xxvii. 24. All these and many more were adopted at the instance of the American revisers. *Hinder* (ἐκωλύθην, Rom. i. 13), and *restrain* (κατέχων, 2 Thess. ii. 7) for *let*; *glory* for *worship*, Luke xiv. 10; *place* (Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xx. 46) and *seat* (Luke xiv. 7, 8) for *room* (why not the same word for πρωτοκλισία throughout?) In the translation of τόπος *room* is changed to *place* three times, and left unchanged twice (Luke ii. 7; xiv. 22); *welfare* instead of *wealth* to supply the ellipses in 1 Cor. x. 24; *virtue* has lost the double sense it bore in the Authorized Version, and while it is retained as the translation of ἀρετή, is changed to *power* where it was used for δύναμις (Mark v. 30; Luke vi. 19, 46); *honest*, as the translation of καλός, is liable to misapprehension in several places, and has therefore sometimes been changed, but why should it have been left in Luke viii. 15; Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 18, changed to

honorable in Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21; xiii. 7; Phil. iv. 8, and to *seemly* in 1 Pet. ii. 12? *ζηλώω* is happily changed from *affect* to *seek* in Gal. iv. 17 *bis*, 18, but its nine other translations are left undiminished, although *covet* and *desire* have sometimes changed places, and *moved with envy* (Acts vii. 9; xvii. 5) has become *moved with jealousy*; *usury* is changed to *interest* with great advantage; "Take no thought for the morrow" (Matt. vi. 34) becomes *be not anxious*; and the misunderstood *carriages* of Acts xxi. 15 becomes *baggage*. There are a great host of such changes in words either actually conveying a wrong sense, or in danger of being so misunderstood. Sometimes, however, the change when really needed has been unfortunately made, of which a single instance (and there are many) must suffice. Paul, in his effort to conciliate his hearers in the opening of his speech on Mar's hill, did not tell the Athenians *ye are too superstitious* (A. V.), far less *ye are somewhat superstitious* (Rev.); *δεισιδαιμονεστέρως* is a comparative used absolutely, and is a word capable of either a bad or a good sense. What the Apostle meant to say was, that the Athenians were very reverential, — very fond of worshipping their deities.

An important service has been done in assimilating the translation of parallel passages in the Gospels which are identical in the original, and also in giving a uniform rendering of the same quotations in different places, whereby an unnecessary hinderance to the English reader's study of the New Testament has been removed. The same may be said of particular words characteristic of some one of the writers, and yet also common with others; it is certainly desirable that such words should have a uniform rendering as far as may be. The Authorized Version had regarded this principle generally in the case of the *τότε* of the first Gospel; but had given a variety of rendering to the *εὐθύς* (*εὐθέως*) of Mark. In the revision it is uniformly translated *straightway* in that Gospel, and for the most part elsewhere also, but has been left *immediately* in Matt. xiv. 31; xxiv. 39 (a passage where the change certainly ought to have been made); Acts

xvii. 10, 14; Gal. i. 16, *shortly* in 3 John 14, while *by and by* is changed, not to *straightway*, but to *immediately* in Luke xxi. 9.

The revisers acknowledge in their preface the difficulty of dealing properly in a translation with the article, and with the distinctions of tense. It must remain a question of individual judgment, and in some cases of individual taste, how far they have succeeded in reaching the best attainable result. There is room for but few examples, and first, of the article omitted in the Authorized Version and restored in the revision. The most striking instance is in the case of the official title of our Lord in the Gospels, ὁ χριστός = the Messiah; this restoration is in itself a commentary of no mean value, and its omission later, in conformity to the Greek, when the word had become a personal name is very suggestive. For other cases, "*the* falling away" of 2 Thess. ii. 3, and "*the* city which hath *the* foundations" of Heb. xi. 10, may serve as sufficient examples. On the other hand, the revision has been able sometimes to remove with advantage the article when it had been inserted in the old version without authority. Thus *the* becomes *a* veil in 2 Cor. iii. 15; *the* is dropped before *soldiers* in Luke iii. 14; for *the* we have *a* woman in John iv. 27; in Jas. v. 20 and 1 Pet. iv. 8 πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν is without the article, and is so given in the revision, while it was inserted in one case in the Authorized Version, and omitted in the other. An instance of scrupulous care in both ways may be seen in Col. ii. 11; here *circumcision* occurs twice, once with and once without the article, and this has been exactly followed to the manifest gain in the sense. Unfortunately they have been less accurate than the Authorized Version in omitting the article before "*faith*" in the next verse. It is omitted with great advantage before "*living and true God*" in 1 Thess. i. 9; so also before "*righteousness*" in Rom. iii. 21 (here also *χωρίς* is happily translated *apart from*). In Luke xv. 12 they have twice omitted the article where it properly belongs (in the first case it is retained in the Authorized Version), substituting *thy* (italics)

and *his* (Roman) without authority. But space forbids further dwelling upon this point. Here, as elsewhere, the final conclusion is likely to be: Much has been excellently done which will help materially to a right understanding of the sacred word; but something has been left undone that ought to have been done, and done that ought not to have been.

The last remark applies with greater force to the tenses. In nothing do the revisers appear to have taken more pains, and in nothing do they appear to have made both more excellent and more objectionable changes. No better instance of happy care in this matter need be given (in narrative) than in Luke viii. 23, *were filling with water* instead of *were filled* and (in argument) Rom. vi. 2, 8; 2 Cor. v. 14 *died* for *were dead*; so also (though of less consequence) the omission of *had*, Rom. i. 2, and of *have* in vs. 5; and a multitude of other cases. The change in the Lord's prayer, *have forgiven*, is a result of a change of text. On the other hand, while the old translation of τοὺς σωζομένους, *such as should be saved*, is objectionable, that of the revision, *those that were being saved*, is intolerable English; why not have put simply *the saved*? In Luke xvii. 6 the Greek reads ἐλέγετε αὐν καὶ ὑπήκουσεν αὐν, and the revisers in attempting the impossible task of representing the Greek tenses have constructed a sentence which is simply ungrammatical: *Ye would say to this sycamine tree and it would have obeyed you*. Space forbids further illustrations; but in general it may be said that the errors in this respect have doubtless arisen from an earnest desire to express the Greek forms more precisely than the English idiom will allow. In nothing is the misfortune of the necessary secrecy of their work more apparent; for, closeted together with their thoughts absorbed in the force and beauty of the nice distinctions of the Greek tenses, the revisers forgot that in English men express their ideas differently. We wonder how so many members of the revision committee can say in published articles that the ordinary English reader will scarcely observe the changes, and that the "flavor" of the

old version remains the same; the more general cry as it reaches the ears of the writer is, "How changed!" and "Did the Greek really require such destruction of the English?"

In regard to prepositions there is not room to speak. The alterations are generally carefully made, and often, by bringing out more exactly the sense of the original, add fresh force and beauty to the version. The revisers here seem to have been quite too much alive to the loose use of some of the prepositions, as e.g. *εἰς* and *ἐν*, by the New Testament writers to have attempted to represent their normal meaning. At the same time there is a tendency, especially on the part of the Americans, to be over-nice here also, and we cannot see the gain in many cases, particularly in regard to the utterances of the prophets, in translating *διά* *through* rather than *by*, when *by* is retained in a multitude of other cases. The English reader sufficiently understands the meaning of *by*, and in fact would be likely to understand *through* in a stronger sense than was meant.

In this connection two instances (among many) may be given, the mere reading of which is enough to show the loss in the rhythm and power of the old version, while in the second there is no gain in accuracy: John xvii. 24, "Father, that which thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me;" 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, "For, He put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him. And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." No one can say that all these repetitions convey a better idea of the Greek than the old version, and the English is simply inadmissible.

The revision was required to be extended to the italics. This work has been much overdone. When words are supplied that are necessary to the sense and plainly implied in the Greek the italics of the Authorized Version were unnecessary, and the revisers have rightly used Roman type; but

instances have already been given in which they have supplied in the same way words not only unnecessary, but actually erroneous. At all events, whenever there was the slightest doubt, faithfulness required the use of italics.

The titles of the several books, although not especially mentioned, were clearly within the scope of the revisers' duty. The suggestions of the American company show what difficulties would have attended any attempt to revise these titles. At the same time, we conceive that they were bound to undertake the task, although it may be hard to call its omission the shirking of a disagreeable duty. It is too bad to find that while the Gospels and the Apocalypse were written by "saints," the writers of the rest of the New Testament (in one case the same person) do not bear this title. The book of Acts should have its author's name, while the revisers had no right to decide a point contested from all antiquity by leaving unchanged "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews." But the American committee vainly urged these considerations upon their English colleagues.

The careful assimilation of proper names to a uniform reading in each case is a matter of no little consequence to the merely English reader, as well as of comfort to all; in the case of the change of *Jesus* to *Joshua* in Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8 the alteration is really important, and in less flagrant instances there was often room in the old version for misapprehension on the part of the English reader. We are not quite sure, however, how far they were right in giving the same English forms to names which have different forms (as *Mapla*, *Mapiaμ*) in the Greek.

The revisers have made very free use of the margin, generally indicating clearly where there is any real doubt about either the text or the translation. In a few cases it seems to the writer that they have gone too far, as in putting *soul* in the margin as an alternative translation of *ψυχή* in Matt. x. 39; xvi. 25, and other places in which the American company object to its insertion; so also with *testament* as an alternative for *covenant*, to which the Americans also ob-

jected. But on the whole the fulness of the marginal readings will be gratefully accepted by the English student of the New Testament.

Of the appendix containing a "list of readings and renderings preferred by the American committee," but which failed to secure the concurrence of the English, much has already been said. It contains also many other valuable suggestions; but these would have had more weight if they had been unencumbered with others that are of hardly sufficient importance to be thus emphasized. Among their "classes of passages" the last is in regard to the names of coins. This is a subject of peculiar difficulty, but it will scarcely be considered that the revision has done its full duty in the matter. Leaving the good Samaritan offering *two pence* (*δηνάρια*, Luke x. 35) to the host for the care of the wounded stranger is likely to give rise to much more misunderstanding than many passages which have been painfully corrected.

But space fails. We are quite conscious of having given a very imperfect presentation of the great merits of the revision. That it is the work of most able and faithful scholars, all know; that it will be a most valuable aid to the understanding of the true sense of the original there can be no manner of doubt; but, as already said, it must necessarily be judged, like that which it proposes to supersede, not by its merits but by its defects. If the old version failed sometimes in accuracy, the new not infrequently fails by that excess of accuracy which so precisely *transfers* instead of translates the Greek as to make almost unintelligible English. One who knows the Greek can detect, e.g., in 2 Thess. ii. 11, what the revisers meant by *God sendeth them a working of error* (*ἐνεργειαν πλάνης*); but to the ordinary English reader it conveys no idea at all. The English is also often faulty in elegance and in force as well as in clearness, and occasionally, as already said, it is ungrammatical. What will be the final result of this work it is hard to foresee. On simply literary grounds we do not believe it will ever be allowed to replace the great classic of the English language, while nearly the

same verdict is likely to be rendered also on devotional grounds. It continually reminds one of the French version. At the same time it rests upon a most admirable and well-considered Greek text, and in the nice, almost pedantic, accuracy of many of its renderings cannot but serve a most important purpose as a commentary. For this we most heartily thank the revisers, even if we are scarcely prepared to surrender the noble English of the translators of 1611.

ARTICLE VII.

POLYGLOT BIBLES IN THE "JOHN CARTER BROWN LIBRARY."

BY REV. J. C. STOCKBRIDGE, D.D.

In an Article published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April 1876, the writer gave a somewhat extended account of the library of the late Hon. John Carter Brown of Providence, R.I. There was a brief paragraph in the Article, on the Polyglot Bibles in the library. A more detailed description of these huge folios may not be without interest to many of the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

I. We naturally allude, in the first place, to what is known as the "Complutensian Bible." It was published under the auspices of the celebrated Cardinal Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo, Spain, and founder of a college at Alcala, a place which once bore the Latin name Complutum, whence, the title "Complutensian Bible." The ablest Spanish scholars were employed in the editing of this great work, which was commenced in 1502, and for fifteen years was continued without interruption. "It is equally astonishing," says Timperley, "that neither the long and tedious application wearied the constancy of the learned editors nor the oppressive cares which devolved on Ximenes relaxed either his zeal or affection for the undertaking. The whole charge of the work, including the pensions of the editors, the wages of transcribers, the price of books, the expense of journeys, and the cost of the impression amounted, according to the calculations that were made, to more than fifty thousand crowns." No pains were spared to procure the best manuscripts of the Bible; and so interested was Pope Leo X. in the prosecution of the work that he loaned several most valuable ones from the Vatican Library to the Cardinal, to be used by the biblical scholars who were in his employ. The work was published in 1522. A small number of copies, said, by the