

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE ARTICLE IN THE REVISED VERSION.

BY REV. WILLIAM S. TYLER, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR, ETC., AT AMHERST COLLEGE.

THE Canterbury Revision of the King James Version of the New Testament is doubtless a better translation of a better Greek text than the version which was revised,—probably better than any version of the entire New Testament for popular use that has been made into any language in modern times. In other words, it is a more exact representation than has before been given to English readers of the original and true “New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” And so it is more truly an “authorized version” than the one which we are accustomed to call by that imposing name, whether we consider the authority of him whom alone Christians call Master and Lord, or the right and title and personal and representative influence of the revisers, or, indeed, any other authority which the English-speaking nations of our day are bound to respect. It is therefore entitled to be received and read in private and in public by the free choice and suffrage of individuals, families, and churches, equally with “the received version,” so far forth as they may deem it equally or more adapted to their instruction and edification. Indeed, the reception which the new revision has already met wherever the English language is spoken—awaited and watched for “more than they that watch for the morning,” and circulated by thousands and millions in books and primers and newspapers, at prices varying from sixteen dollars to ten cents, as no other book, sacred or profane, was ever expected and circulated in ancient or modern times,—this reception is one of the grandest and gladdest events of all the ages. And let it be welcomed, so

we say, — by all means let it meet a cordial welcome from ministers and Christians of every name, even as some of the best scholars and representatives of almost every denomination of Christians in England and America have united in making it and giving it their sanction. Let the two versions lie side by side in our pulpits, let them be studied together in our Sunday-schools, let them stand together in loving fellowship in every Christian home, at least until, after fair trial, the one or the other, or if possible a better than either, shall at length be approved, authorized, and received by that general consensus of Christian minds and hearts from which there is no appeal, before which kings and scholars must alike bow, and committees and convocations must ultimately stand or fall.

But the new revision is not inspired any more than the old version was. The original Greek, as it came from the pens of the sacred writers (we too often forget this, and therefore we cannot be too often reminded of it), — that, and that only is the inspired word of God; and all versions are authorized and authoritative and entitled to be received just in proportion as they truly represent the meaning and reproduce the impression of that original “New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” Nothing can be more preposterous than for any man or set of men to set themselves up, or set themselves down, upon any version, new or old, and defend it, as if that were the word of God and the very rock of ages.

The new revision is not perfect. No version has ever been perfect, and no revision ever will be. There is no such thing as a perfect translation. And the new revision does not profess or aspire to be a new translation. It claims to be only a revision, and is in fact a compromise between a revision and a translation. It is also a compromise between a revision by the Anglican committee and a revision by the American committee. And, like other compromises, it wants the freedom, it wants the consistency, it wants inevitably some of the merits of both the things between which the compromise was made.

We confess to some disappointment in the results of this compromise. We think the feeling is wide in Great Britain, and it is almost universal in this country, that the greater part of the changes which were proposed by the American committee and rejected by the Anglican committee should have been accepted, and that consistency, not less than the intrinsic merits of the proposed emendations, required their adoption.

On the other hand, we are disappointed, and the same disappointment is widely felt, at the great number of alterations which are needless, which make no difference whatever in the meaning of the Scripture, and whose only effect, with constant readers and lovers of our old English Bible, is to offend the ear and taste of scholars, and to disturb the sacred associations of the common people. Why, for example, should "the fowls of the air" be changed to "the birds of the heaven"? Is the latter any more intelligible? Is there any difference in the meaning of the two phrases? Is the latter any more in conformity with the idiom and usage of the English language? Above all, how can this alteration be reconciled with the first and second rules of the Anglican committee? 1. To introduce as few alterations as possible in the text of the Authorized Version, consistently with faithfulness. 2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the authorized and earlier versions. Very good rules; but readers of the revision very generally complain—and justly, we think—that the revisers have not better obeyed them.

Is it maintained that faithfulness required the alteration in question, and others of which this is a specimen? Faithfulness to what? Not to the meaning of the original; for there is no difference in the meaning of the two versions. Not to the words of the Greek text; for it is the business of the translator to translate the Greek into English; and when the meaning is the same the only question is, Which is the better, the more idiomatic, the more perspicuous and proper English? And to that question, in this case, there can be but one answer.

It may, perhaps, be said, in defence of the revisers, that they intended to avoid the error of the translators, who avowed their purpose to vary the rendering of the same Greek words and phrases in different connections, for the sake of the variety; and so they — the revisers — have taken pains to render the same Greek word by the same English word, so far as possible, wherever it occurs. Another good rule, if well, that is wisely, followed. But, in the first place, we cannot but feel, and we hear the same complaint from many others, that they have gone to the opposite extreme, and thus not only introduced unnecessary alterations, but made the revision sometimes obscure or affected or inelegant, and sometimes erroneous. And yet, in the second place, they have found it impossible to carry their principle through, and always render the same Greek words by the same English words. Thus, they have rendered *ὁ οὐρανός* *the heaven* (as in Matt. vi. 26, “Behold the birds of the heaven,” so also) in Matt. xvi. 2, 3, and thus given us the unidiomatic, unauthorized, Greek-English expression, “The heaven is red and lowering”; and yet they have rendered *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* *heaven* (without the article) in the verse which immediately precedes these, and *ἐν οὐρανῷ* (Matt. vi. 10), *ἐν οὐρανοῖς* (Matt. vi. 9), and *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (Matt. vi. 1) all by the same English, viz. *in heaven*; thus illustrating the impossibility of rendering the same Greek always by the same English, or having the same English stand always for the same Greek, and the unwisdom of attempting to do so at the expense of our good mother tongue. Doubtless the revisers have improved on the translators in their effort to secure consistent renderings. Thus they have enabled the readers of their version, with a Concordance, to follow the same English word with a strong probability that the word will be found to be the same also in the different passages of the Greek. But they could not achieve impossibilities. To err is human; and they have doubtless erred, sometimes in the very direction which they have censured in the Authorized Version, but more frequently by going to the opposite extreme.

We have been disappointed most of all to find that the revisers have given us so much English that is *not* English, that is not authorized by good usage, and is therefore bad. Some of this may perhaps at length be hallowed by age; but too much of it will be Greek still, requiring a further translation, — a translation of the idiom, — and very likely a transposition of the words, to make it English. If English at all, it is such as no good writer or speaker would ever think of using in original discourse; such as is found only in translations and in the lessons of school-boys, and found there by good teachers only to be scourged and held up as a warning to others. It is the result, no doubt, of their strong desire to be true to the original and sacred Greek; but it is not for that reason any the less false to English idioms, and unfortunate in a version which is intended to be read by the masses in Great Britain and America, and to become, as the Authorized Version has been, the educator of all English-speaking peoples and nations. We gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the revisers for emendations in great numbers which are as felicitous in their English as they are faithful to the Greek, and so luminous that they seem to be like the word which brought light out of the primeval darkness. But “*aliquando dormitat bonus Homerus*”; and, although it would be easy and far more pleasant to descant on the excellences of the revision, while to point out its defects is a thankless and perhaps offensive task; yet the former is needless and useless, while the latter may lead to some good result, since the only way to arrive at an approximately perfect version is by the frank criticism and patient elimination of remaining imperfections.

In the present paper we shall confine ourselves to an examination of the manner in which the revisers have rendered into English the Greek article. And here we must begin with acknowledging again our obligations for numerous alterations which shed light and life on the sacred page. Such, for instance, as the more frequent rendering of  $\delta$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  by *the Christ*, e.g. Matt. ii. 4, “Where *the Christ*

should be born"; and John iv. 29, "Can this be *the* Christ?" the rendering of τοῦ ἐνός and οἱ πολλοί, throughout that passage in Rom. v. 12-19, on which so much good and so much bad theology has been hung, by *the one* and *the many*, e.g. verse 19, "For as through *the* one man's disobedience *the* many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of *the* one shall *the* many be made righteous"; the rendering of 2 Thess. ii. 3, where, instead of "*a* falling away" and "*that* man of sin," we have in the revision the more consistent and more exact "except *the* falling away come first, and *the* man of sin be revealed"; and in Heb. xi. 10, instead of "he looked for *a* city which hath foundations," the revisers have given us "he looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations," viz. "the new Jerusalem," to which the primitive Christians, and especially the Christian Hebrews; looked forward with such delightful anticipations, and "*the* foundations," so firm and yet so precious, which are more fully described in the Apocalypse (Rev. xxi.), together with "*the* crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10), and "*the* white robes" (vii. 14), as well as "*the* lake that burneth with brimstone," which were familiar to ancient as they are to modern readers of the same book.

But it is impossible to carry out the principle of always rendering the Greek article by the definite article in English, and using no article in English where there is none in Greek. Of course, scholars are well aware of this. And yet we doubt if even scholars are fully conscious of the ludicrous results which would follow the attempt in any chapter — we had almost said any verse — of the New Testament. Take, for illustration, a few verses at and near the beginning of the first Gospel: "Book of generation of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham. Abraham begat the Isaac, and Isaac begat the Jacob, and Jacob begat the Judah and the brothers of him. And Judah begat the Perez and the Zerah of the Tamar," etc. "Now, the birth of the Jesus Christ was on this wise." "Now when the Jesus was born in Bethlehem of the Judaea in days of Herod the king, h'

wise men from easts [sun-risings] came to Jerusalem." "Now when they were departed, behold, angel of Lord appeareth to the Joseph in dream." "Then came the Jesus from the Galilee to the Jordan to the John for the being baptized by him." "If thou art Son of the God, cast thyself down." "The Son of the man hath power on the earth to forgive sins." "The Son of the man is Lord of the Sabbath." "If I by Spirit of God cast out the demons, then is the kingdom of the God come upon you." "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto the men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven." "If the Satan cast out the Satan, how then shall the kingdom of him stand?" "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after the righteousness. . . . . Blessed are they that are pure in the heart, for they shall see the God. Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens." "Depart from me ye that work the iniquity." We beg pardon for such a travesty of Holy Scripture. But, if we mistake not, the revisers have sometimes given us renderings that come within the same category. And there was no way in which we could so effectually expose the absurdity of any blind and indiscriminate following of the Greek article in an English version as by this practical *reductio ad absurdum*.

From some of the first verses above cited, it will be seen at once that in regard to the use of the article with proper names the Greek idiom differs entirely from the English. We never use the article with proper names; a Greek writer could prefix the article or omit it, according as he did or did not wish to point out the person named as the well-known, the distinguished, or the before-mentioned person of that name. And Matthew in his genealogy not only contravenes entirely English usage, but reverses the prevailing law of Greek usage, in that he prefixes the article to the name when it is first mentioned, and omits it when the name is repeated, while classic Greek usually omits the article when a name is first mentioned, and prefixes it when the name is

repeated, to suggest to the reader that the before-mentioned person of that name is intended; the article, as the word *article* imports, thus serving as a *little joint* to connect the following with the foregoing context.

The writers of the New Testament use the Greek words for God, Lord, Jesus, and Christ very much like proper names, and sometimes prefix the article to them, and sometimes omit it, as they wish to be more or less definite or emphatic. We never prefix the article to the name Jesus. In the Greek of the New Testament, the article is usually prefixed to that name in the Gospels and the Acts,—that is, the historical books,—and generally omitted in the other books. Yet it is sometimes omitted in the historical books, and sometimes prefixed in the other books, and all this without any obvious reason or apparent difference of meaning. For example, in John xi. 30–39 we have this singular alternation and succession of “Jesus” and “*the* Jesus” (we put it in English partly that it may be intelligible, or at least legible, by others besides Greek scholars, and partly that it may be seen in its bearings on an indiscriminate translation of the Greek article in an English version): vs. 30, “*the* Jesus had not yet come”; vs. 32, “where Jesus was”; vs. 33, “when Jesus saw”; 35, “*the* Jesus wept”; 38, “Jesus . . . . cometh”; vs. 39, “*the* Jesus saith.” And in 2 Cor. iv. we have vs. 10, “the dying of *the* Jesus” (the *Lord* Jesus in the Authorized Version, but not in the revised version and the best authorities), and “the life of *the* Jesus”; vs. 11, “for Jesus’ sake,” and “the life of *the* Jesus”; vs. 14, “who raised up *the* Jesus,” and “with Jesus”; the variation, so far as can be seen, depending not on any difference of meaning to be conveyed, but sometimes on the rhythmical ear and taste of the writer, sometimes on the case and construction of the Greek,—e.g. the connection of the name with a preposition, or the insertion or omission of the article with a noun which the name limits as a genitive,—and sometimes, it must be confessed, on the copyist; for there is scarcely anything in which the MSS. differ more than in the insertion or the omission of the s

We naturally prefix the article to the name Christ only when it is not a personal name, but an official title, equivalent to *the Anointed* of the Lord, *the Messiah* of the Old Testament. The New Testament Greek prefixes the article in all these cases; and the Canterbury revision does well, far better than the King James translation, in consistently rendering  $\delta$  Χριστός in such passages by *the Christ*. But the Greek also prefixes the article in many passages, particularly in the Epistles, where Χριστός is a personal name, where of course we cannot use the article in English, and where it is difficult, if not impossible, for us to see the reason for its use, or any difference it makes in the meaning. For example, in 1 Cor. i. we have vs. 12, "I am Christ's"; vs. 13, "is *the* Christ divided?" vs. 17, "Christ sent me," and "the cross of *the* Christ."

We can scarcely use the word Lord as applied to God or Christ without the article, except it be in address (Greek vocative), or as a predicate, e.g. Acts ii. 36, "Lord and Christ." The Greek of the New Testament has usually  $\delta$  Κύριος, but sometimes Κύριος, e.g. Mark xiii. 20; frequently τοῦ Κυρίου, but almost as frequently Κυρίου without the article; compare Luke i. 9, "*the* temple of *the* Lord," with vs. 11, "angel of Lord"; while in some set forms of speech, such as "name of Lord," "hand of Lord," "law of Lord," "in Lord," etc., the article is regularly omitted. Of course, no translator or reviser will attempt to follow the Greek in these variations.

We never prefix the article to the name of God when used simply as his proper name. All the writers of the New Testament prefix the article to that name as a rule; yet they not unfrequently omit it. And when they omit it we can sometimes see, or think we see, a reason for the omission or a difference in the meaning; as, for instance, in some of the profound utterances of the apostle John, e.g. John i. 1, "the Word was with *the* God," that is, the person or being whom we are accustomed to call by that name; "and the Word was *God*," that is, God in nature, essence,

and attributes; not *a* god, but emphatically *God*, as the position of the word shows; not the same person as "*the* God," but *with* him, and of the same divine nature and attributes;<sup>1</sup> and again, vs. 18, "*God* (emphatic by position and without the article) — *God* (in the infinite depths of his mysterious being and nature) no one has seen at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*" — brought him out (*ἐξήγγισατο*); and yet again, 1 John iv. 11, 12, "If *the* God [God as a person, our loving Father] so loved us, we ought to love one another: *God* (as God in his nature and essence, and by reason of that nature and essence — *deity* as such, and emphatically such) no one has ever beheld (*τεθέαται*); if we love one another, *the* God [as revealed in Christ and manifested in the flesh] dwelleth (*abideth*) in us, and his love is perfected in us." The only other passage in the Epistles of John in which the word God occurs without the article is the similar one in 2 John 9, of which may this perhaps be the profound significance: "Whosoever abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not *God* [God in the fullest and most comprehensive sense, Godhead or Godhood]; he that abideth in the teaching hath both the Father and the Son," who unite to constitute Godhead, to communicate Godhood, to *realize* the *idea* of God, to reveal *God* in the fullest, most emphatic, and most comprehensive sense?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The omission of the article here comes under the rule of Greek Grammar, that the predicate usually omits the article. But the reason why it omits the article is, that the predicate is usually general. When the predicate is required to be particular, it *takes* the article, e.g. John iv. 29, "is not this the Christ" *ὁ χριστός*. Hence the omission of the article in the proposition, "the Word was God," suggests that God is to be taken in a general and comprehensive sense, of divine nature and attributes.

<sup>2</sup> So Matt. x. 37, "he that loveth *father* or *mother*," and xix. 29, "every one that hath forsaken *father* or *mother*" — not *his* father or mother, not *the* father or mother, which the Greek sometimes uses for *his* father or mother, but *father* or *mother* in the fullest, most emphatic, and most comprehensive sense, all that is involved in that sacred idea, all that is expressed by that endearing name. So also Plato in his *Crito*, 51 B, "The fatherland is a thing more precious and venerable and sacred than *mother* and *father*, and all other progenitors," where not only is the article omitted, but mother and father are emphasized by reversing the

It would seem as if there must be some peculiar significance in the omission of the article, together with the emphatic position of the word "God" in these unique, emphatic, striking utterances thus repeated in the Gospel and the Epistles of John. And yet some doubt is perhaps thrown on this distinction even in the writings of John, when we compare John i. 18, "*God* no one has seen at any time," with 1 John iv. 20, "*the* God whom he hath not seen." And any one who will look through any chapter of the Epistles of Paul, e.g. the eighth chapter of Romans,<sup>1</sup> and observe how the article is inserted or omitted before the name of God, while, on the one hand, he will see that the insertion or omission seems to be guided to some extent by some rules of Greek syntax and rhythm, yet, on the other, he will be at a loss to discover the reason for those rules (though of course there must be some reason); still less will he be able to divine any difference of meaning, however slight or subtile, which is expressed by the insertion or omission of the article.

The omission of the article before the word "son" in the Greek of such expressions as "son of David," "son of Abraham" (Matt. i. 1), "Son of God" (Matt. xiv. 33; xxvii. 54), and "Son of the God" (Matt. iv. 6; xxvii. 40), in which we are obliged to use the article, is in obedience to the general rule of Greek grammar, that with substantives which will be readily recognized as definite without the article, it is often omitted (Crosby, Gr. Gram. 485); and the particular rule of Hebrew and Greek grammar, that the

order of subject and predicate as in John i. 1. "The omission of the article may have *emphatic* force, attention being given wholly to the proper meaning of the word instead of its particular relations."—Hadley, Gr. Gram. 530 c.

<sup>1</sup> *The* God, vs. 3; *against* God, vs. 7; the law of *the* God, same verse; please God, vs. 8; Spirit of God, sons of God, vs. 14; children of God, vs. 16; heirs of God, vs. 17; the sons of *the* God, vs. 19; the children of *the* God, vs. 21; according to (the will of) God, *κατὰ θεόν*, vs. 27; those that love *the* God, vs. 28; if *the* God be for us, vs. 31; elect of God, God who justifieth, vs. 33; right hand of *the* God, vs. 34. There seems to be a general tendency when God is in the genitive to insert the article with both nouns, or omit it with both. But *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*, at right hand of *the* God, is an exception. And the exceptions are not unrequent.

article is regularly omitted before a substantive whose application is limited by a genitive which renders the use of the article unnecessary (Gesenius, Heb. Gram. 108, 2; Winer, New Test. Gram, 19, 2, b, p. 125 Am. ed.), e.g. gospel of God, or God's gospel; angels of God, or God's angels; hand of the Lord, or the Lord's hand, and others without number, in all of which in English the article is indispensable. The revisers have rendered *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* (Matt. xxvii. 43, 54; Luke i. 35), *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Matt. iv. 8, 6; Mark i. 1), and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Mark iii. 11; Luke xxii. 70; John i. 34, et al.), indiscriminately "the Son of God" (though in the margin they have put "a son of God" for *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* in Matt. xxvii. 54); thus showing that they have not felt bound to follow the Greek article exactly in their renderings, but have taken the liberty, or submitted to the necessity, to express it or not, and to omit it or not, according to circumstances—following their own judgment in each instance. In our opinion they have done right in their rendering of the various forms of the Greek expression for "the Son of God." Yet they have taken pains to omit the article, where the Authorized Version inserts it, before the first substantive in such passages as Matt. v. 9, "They shall be called sons of God," and Matt. v. 45, "That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven." Perhaps the new revision here is more exact than the old version; but the old is more vivid, and is justified by the rule of Hebrew and Greek grammar just cited, and according to the first rule of the revisers should have been retained in the revision. What important difference is there in the meaning of the two versions? What difference would it make whether the two sons of President Garfield who are becoming known to the public should be introduced as "sons" or "the sons" of the president? What difference is there in meaning between the rendering in the old version of Matt. xxii. 30, "they are as *the* angels of God in heaven," and the rendering in the new version, "they are as angels"? But there is this great difference, that the latter will strike the ordinary reader of the Bible as affected and strange; while

the former is not only familiar, but natural and sacred. And the old version is as faithful to the Greek in its rendering of these passages as the revision is in its rendering of *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* in the other class of passages. "God's Son," on the one hand, and "God's sons" and "God's angels," on the other, is in form, perhaps, the most exact rendering into English of which the phrases are susceptible.

So in Rom. i. 17, "God's righteousness" would be a more exact and more faithful rendering of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* than either "the righteousness of God," as in the Authorized Version, or "a righteousness of God," as in the revision. And "God's wrath" would be a more exact and faithful rendering of the antithetic *ὀργὴ Θεοῦ* in the next verse, than either "the wrath of God," which the revisers inconsistently retain in their text, or "a wrath of God," which they have strangely placed in the margin. The rendering of the Authorized Version, "the righteousness of God," is justified by the rule of grammar above cited, and is also in accordance with the teaching and usage of the apostle Paul. Compare the more definite teaching of the apostle in Phil. iii. 9, "not having my own righteousness which is from the law (*ἐκ νόμου*), but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God (*ἐκ Θεοῦ*) by faith." It is God's righteousness, in contradistinction from man's, which Paul teaches—the righteousness of which God is the source, and faith in Christ the medium or means, in contradistinction from the righteousness which men were continually seeking from the law as its source, and by the deeds of the law as its means. The revisers have rendered *ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου*, "a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law" in the text, while they have placed in the margin as an alternative rendering, "not having as my righteousness that which is of the law." We cannot think that either of these renderings is justified by faithfulness to the Greek text, by the rules of Greek Grammar, or by the analogy of Paul's teaching.

The manner in which the article is here used by the apostle

in connection with the word *πίστις* is worthy of note. The first time that word is used it is made sufficiently definite by the genitive *Χριστοῦ*, literally *faith of Christ*, that is, the faith of which Christ is not only the object (objective genitive, *of = in respect of, or in*), but also the source or medium (that is, partly also subjective genitive, *of = from or by*). But when the word is repeated the article is prefixed in order to define and emphasize it as the faith before mentioned; *ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει = by or on the ground of that same faith*. So in the strikingly similar passage, Acts iii. 16, "and by faith in his name [literally *on the ground of the faith of his name, ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*] hath his name made this man strong whom ye behold and know; yea, the faith which is through him, of which he is not only the object, but the medium or means (*ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ*) hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." A comparison of the rendering of these two passages in the revised version will show that the revisers have taken the same liberty with the Greek article here which they censure elsewhere in the translators, viz. omitting the article with the first *πίστις* in the Acts and with the second *πίστις* in the Philippians, although it is prefixed to both in the Greek, and indeed is particularly emphatic in both. In Rom. iii. 30, where in like manner *πίστεως* occurs twice, first without the article and then with it, the revisers have expressed the article in the margin, and might well have placed it in the text: "he will justify the circumcision *ἐκ πίστεως* [as the result of faith], and the uncircumcision *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*" [by means of the same faith], where the apostle wishes to emphasize the idea, that the Gentiles are justified by means of the same faith which results in the justification of the Jews, viz. *faith in*, literally *of*, Jesus Christ; cf. vs. 22, *διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

The instances in which the revisers themselves have very properly, though not very consistently, inserted the article before a noun which omits the article in the Greek because it is already made sufficiently definite by a limiting genitive are numerous, e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 6, "(the) condemnation of the

devil"; vs. 7, "(the) snare of the devil"; vs. 15, "(the) house of God" (οἶκον Θεοῦ), "(the) church of (the) living God," "(the) pillar and ground of the truth"; iv. 5, "(the) word of God," etc. In view of such renderings, which are almost without number, it seems hardly necessary that they should have placed in the margin "*a* judgment of this world" for κρίσις τοῦ κόσμου (John xii. 31), "works of law" as an alternative to "the works of the law" (Rom. iii. 20), or that they should have taken pains to give us in their text "sons of God," instead of "the sons of God" (Rom. viii. 14); "sons of light," instead of "the children of light" (John xii. 36); "*a* temple of God," instead of "the temple of God" (2 Cor. vi. 16), etc. The exact import of all this class of passages may be expressed most nearly in the Greek form by placing the limiting genitive before the noun limited; thus, "the devil's condemnation," "God's house," "God's word," "God's children," "God's temple," etc. Thus the genitive of itself makes the thing sufficiently definite. But if we place the noun limited first, we must prefix the article to make it as definite as it is seen and felt to be in Greek.

In such phrases as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, literally *the Son of the man*, the second article is called the generic article, that is, it defines not the individual, but the genus, the species, or the class. In other words, ὁ ἄνθρωπος may mean not some particular man, but mankind in general, and then must be rendered not *the man*, but *man*. We use the article in the same way to distinguish the species of the lower animals, as "the ox," "the horse," etc. But when we wish to speak of the human species we omit the article. The Greek language extends the use of the generic article to the plural also both of men and the lower animals. Οἱ ἄνθρωποι can mean either the particular men denoted by the connection, or it may mean men in general, mankind. So also οἱ κύνες may mean the particular dogs denoted by the connection, or it may mean dogs in general, the canine species; οἱ χοῖροι may mean some particular swine, or swine in general; and οἱ ἀλώπεκες may mean either the particular foxes under con-

sideration, or foxes as a species. But in English the men, the dogs, the swine, the foxes, etc., mean *the* men, dogs, swine, foxes, etc., before mentioned, and sufficiently understood in the connection; while we omit the article, and say men, dogs, swine, foxes, etc., if we wish to speak of the genus or species in the plural number.

Now the revisers have recognized this distinction usually in their rendering of *ἄνθρωπος* and also *ἄνθρωποι* with the article. For example, in Mark ii. 27, 28, they have rendered *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* "man," and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* "the Son of man." And in Matt. vi. 14, 15, 18 et al. they have rendered *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* "men," without hesitation, as they could not help doing. And yet in John ii. 25 they have placed "a man" in the margin as an alternate rendering for *τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and "the man" for *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*, although no particular man has been mentioned or can be intended in the connection, and the *πάντας* which immediately precedes shows that a knowledge of "all" men must be what is here predicated of Jesus. And in Matt. vii. 6 they have taken pains to give us such English as this: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine." What swine? is the spontaneous question of the common English reader. Compare Luke viii. 33, where "*the* swine" is the proper rendering, because the reference is to the herd of swine spoken of in the preceding verse. But here swine as a species and dogs as a species are manifestly intended, and the rendering of the Authorized Version is English, while that of the revision is Greek — not to say, affectation and pedantry.

In Matt. viii. 20 and Luke ix. 58, there is good reason to wonder and ask why the translators have rendered the very same Greek words in Matthew with the article, and in Luke without it, though they are not chargeable with heresy, or even unfaithfulness, in so doing. But the revisers have made the matter worse by adopting the rendering with the article in both. For all the influence of the Authorized Version during almost three centuries has not sufficed to make "the foxes"

good English for foxes in general ; and rarely, if ever, do we hear this scripture quoted in modern discourse except in the form without the article.

The same difference between the Greek and the English idiom extends to inanimate things ; that is, the generic article is often prefixed not only to persons, but also to things, in Greek, where in English we generalize by omitting the article, or using the indefinite article instead. Thus in Matt. v. 15 the rendering of the Authorized Version, "Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel," etc. is, to say the least, better English than that of the revised version, "Neither do men light a lamp, and place it under *the* bushel," etc. The bushel may have been a common article of household furniture in a Jewish house, but it is not in an English or American house ; and it is for English-speaking moderns, not ancient Greek-speaking Jews, we suppose, that the revision was made. An English author would not be likely to write "*the* rock," instead of "*a* rock," as the revisers have altered Matt. vii. 24 ; scarcely more likely than he would be to write "*the* iniquity" instead of "iniquity" in the previous verse, or "*the* false prophets" instead of "false prophets" in the fifteenth verse, — renderings upon which even the revisers have not ventured.

The revisers seem to have a passion for the importation of this Greek idiom of the article into the English Bible. Thus in a single chapter — the thirteenth of Matthew — they have given us "*the* sower," "*the* rocky places," "*the* thorns," "*the* good ground," "*the* herbs," "*the* furnace of fire," "*the* weeping and gnashing of teeth" ;<sup>1</sup> all of which are unnecessary, make no difference in the real meaning of the passage, and in the connection must strike the English reader as strained, affected, and pedantic. See also "*the* breaking of bread and *the* prayers" (Acts ii. 42), "beware of *the* dogs, beware of *the* evil workers" (Phil. iii. 2), "without are *the* dogs and *the* sorcerers and *the* fornicators and *the* murderers and *the* idolaters" (Rev. xxii. 15). Indeed, this use of the

<sup>1</sup> Why not "*the* weeping and *the* gnashing of *the* teeth," as in the Greek ?

article is so characteristic a feature that it would not be strange if the revised version should yet be known as the "The Bible," or, from its marginal renderings, the "A or An Bible."<sup>1</sup> Professor Hadley begins his treatment of the generic article in his grammar by saying that it "must often be left untranslated." A proper observance of this rule would have saved us many needless alterations and much unidiomatic English in the revised version.

Perhaps no alterations of the revisers have excited more feeling and evoked more unfavorable comment than those which they have made in the Lord's prayer. Certainly no unnecessary alterations should be made in the contents or the language of a prayer every word of which is so familiar to the ear of childhood itself, so dear to the heart of every Christian, and so constantly used in the closet, in the family, and in the house of God. No intelligent and unprejudiced critic will censure the omission of the doxology. Being found in no first-class manuscript, it is unquestionably a later addition to the text, and so not a part of the Lord's prayer; and hence it should not have a place in the Gospel which purports to give a faithful and true record of that prayer. But the change in the order of the clauses, "as in heaven, so on earth," has no such justification. It is unnecessary; it is a needless offence to the ear and disturbance of sacred associations; and the new order is open to the charge of being not English, but Greek. Why did they not follow the Greek order throughout, and give us: Come thy kingdom; be done thy will, as in heaven, also on earth.

The alteration in the last petition, "deliver us from the evil one," is so radical and so significant in its theological bearings that it should not have been made without the

<sup>1</sup> See the marginal rendering of John i. 14, instead of "the glory of the only begotten of the Father," "the glory of an only begotten from a father"! We are at a loss to understand what this means. It seems too much like a burlesque of a sacred mystery. See also a man, John ii. 25; a son of man, v. 27; a shepherd, x. 2; a judgment, xii. 31; a wrath, Rom. i. 18; a law, ii. 17; an act of righteousness, v. 16, — all marginal renderings, but the rendering "a word of promise," Rom. ix. 9, bad at the best, is made worse by being placed in the text.

clearest evidence and an almost imperative necessity. What is the evidence?

The Greek *τοῦ πονηροῦ* is confessedly ambiguous. It may be either masculine or neuter, and may mean either the evil one, or that which is evil — evil in general. Now the use of the article with an adjective or a participle for an abstract noun is in its frequency a marked characteristic even of the classical Greek of the first century of the Christian era. We take up at random, for instance, Plutarch's *De Sera Numinis Vindicta*, and we find on a single page *τοῦ θείου*, for *the deity*; *τὸ κακόν*, *the evil*; *τὸ λυποῦν*, *the pain*; *τὸ κολάζεσθαι*, *the punishment*; and finally we find him saying of the delay of the deity in punishing the wicked, that "it has in it the error and delay and disorder which resembles chance rather than providence, which he expresses thus: τῷ αὐτομάτῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατὰ πρόνοιαν ὁμοιον ἔχει τὸ πεπλανημένον καὶ ὑπερήμερον καὶ ἄτακτον, where five times in two lines he expresses an abstract idea or quality by the article with an adjective word or phrase. And throughout the treatise he is constantly using such phrases as *τὸ κακόν*, *τὸ χρηστόν*, *τὸ καλόν*, *τὸ δίκαιον*, κ.τ.λ. He does not use *ὁ πονηρός* for the evil one, or for the wicked man; but the plural *οἱ πονηροί* is his most common designation for the wicked, of whom his subject leads him so often to speak.

In the Septuagint we do not find *ὁ πονηρός* in the sense of the evil one (of course, since the idea is not found in the Old Testament), nor in the sense of the wicked man.<sup>1</sup> But *τὸ πονηρόν*, in the sense of evil in general, moral evil, is found with great frequency. For example, it is found in all that class of passages in the historical books, in which it is said that the Israelites or their kings "did evil in the sight of the Lord." *ἐποίησαν τὸ πονηρόν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου* is the regular form for this indictment in the Septuagint, e.g. Judg. ii. 11; iii. 12 et passim; 1 Kings xi. 6; 2 Kings viii. 18; 2 Chron. xxii. 4, etc.

<sup>1</sup> It may be there. Having no Concordance of the Septuagint I have not made an exhaustive investigation. But in my examination of very many passages in which it would be most likely to occur I have not found it.

In the Greek of the New Testament there are unquestionable instances both of τὸ πονηρὸν for evil in general, and of ὁ πονηρὸς for the wicked man, and for the evil one κατ' ἐξοχήν. Thus in 1 Cor. v. 13 τὸν πονηρὸν means the evil doer, viz. the incestuous person whom the apostle exhorts the Corinthians to put away from the church. In Matt. xiii. 19, "When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the evil one (ὁ πονηρὸς), and snatcheth away that which is sown in his heart," we can scarcely doubt that ὁ πονηρὸς is the evil one. In our Lord's interpretation of the parable of the tares, in the same chapter at vs. 39, "The tares are the children of the evil one (τοῦ πονηροῦ), and the enemy that sowed them is the devil," we seem to have the Master's exegesis of τοῦ πονηροῦ. In the First Epistle of John we have several examples of the use of ὁ πονηρὸς for the evil one, e.g. ii. 13, 14, "Ye have overcome the evil one," τὸν πονηρὸν; iii. 12, "Cain was of the evil one, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ (cf. vs. 10, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου); v. 18, "the evil one toucheth him not," ὁ πονηρὸς. But in the very next verse we have τῷ πονηρῷ, where, to say the least, it is much more natural to understand it of evil in general, or wickedness: "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and the evil one (ὁ πονηρὸς) toucheth him not. And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness," ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ. Led by the connection, the revisers have rendered this, "lieth in the evil one"; but that is too bold a figure even for John. The connection only shows how intimately the two ideas temptation and sin were associated in the mind of the writer, and how easy it was for him to pass from the evil one, ὁ πονηρὸς, to evil in general, or the evil of which he is the source.

Unquestionable instances of the neuter, τὸ πονηρὸν used for evil in general are Luke vi. 45, "The evil man (ὁ πονηρὸς) out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil," τὸ πονηρὸν; and Rom. xii. 9, "Abhor that which is evil," τὸ πονηρὸν. In both these passages τὸ πονηρὸν is contrasted

with τὸ ἀγαθόν, evil with good. In like manner τὸ κακόν is often contrasted with τὸ καλόν, as in Rom. vii. 21; or with τὸ ἀγαθόν, as in Rom. xii. 21, "overcome evil with good"; cf. xiii. 3, 4. In Matt. v. 39, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil," τῷ πονηρῷ cannot mean the evil one, but must mean either the evil man or the evil that he would do you. And in Matt. v. 37, "Whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil," ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν, the Authorized Version is more simple and obvious than the revised, "is of the evil one."<sup>1</sup> The same is true of 1 John v. 19, "the whole world lieth in wickedness" (as we have already shown), and of John xvii. 15, "I ask not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from (literally, *out of*) the evil," sc. that is in the world, or in which the whole world lieth, according to the conception in 1 John v. 19, which is strikingly analogous.

We conclude, then: 1. That the classical usage of that age, the usage of the Septuagint, and the general usage of the New Testament — viz. of the article with the neuter adjective for abstract nouns — creates a presumption in favor of the rendering in the Authorized Version. 2. That the usage of the New Testament in regard to this particular word πονηρόν is divided. There are undisputed instances both of ὁ πονηρός for the evil one and of τὸ πονηρόν for evil in general. And the disputed cases in which the genitive and dative are used seem to us on the whole to favor the Authorized Version. 3. The prepositions and verbs that are used in connection with τοῦ πονηροῦ and τῷ πονηρῷ in the disputed passages create a probability that they are neuter, and mean evil in general, "the whole world lieth in wickedness"; "keep them from [literally *out of*] the evil," sc. that is in the world"; "deliver us from [literally *draw us away from*] evil." 4. The temptation spoken of in the previous clause of the Lord's prayer is no argument for the

<sup>1</sup> The mention of the evil one here is far-fetched. It is scarcely credible that our Lord would have said that anything more than yea and nay in affirming and denying is from the devil. It were exaggerated, not to say profane, according to his own dictum.

revised version. The antithesis is just as good according to the common version, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil," that is, the sin, to which the temptation might otherwise lead us.<sup>1</sup> And just so with the antithesis to the other passages. 5. Under these circumstances their own rules should have debarred the revisers from altering this petition. The alteration is more than unnecessary; it is probably erroneous, and in any view it is unfortunate.

It should be remembered, however, by those who offer the Lord's prayer in the language of the old version, as Christians generally will doubtless continue to do, that evil here does not mean natural, but moral and spiritual evil; it is not misery or calamity, but sin, from which they pray to be delivered.

The right rendering and true meaning of that very interesting and important class of passages which are grouped together under Number XIII. in the emendations that were recommended by the American committee, and not accepted by the Anglican, turns on the article. The American committee state their proposed emendations as follows: "XIII. Against the expression 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' add the marginal rendering '*Or, God and the Father,*' etc., viz. in Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 81; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. And against the expression 'our God and Father' add the marg. '*Or, God and our Father,*' viz. in Gal. i. 4; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 3; iii. 11, 13; James i. 27. And against the expression 'his God and Father' add the marg. '*Or, God and his Father,*' viz. in Rev. i. 6."

It will be observed that the revised version follows the Authorized Version in the first division of the class, and departs from it in the second and third; and suggests no alternative rendering in the margin. The American committee propose in each division an alternative rendering in the margin, which in the first division departs from the

<sup>1</sup> And the connection is better. The specifications which precede and follow are un-personal — daily bread, debts, temptation, trespasses; to give τοῦ ποτηροῦ the personal rendering disturbs the harmony, mars the concinnity of the prayer and of the commentary on it.

Authorized Version, and follows in the second and third. The revised version is consistent throughout in its rendering; so also are the American committee in their proposed rendering. The Authorized Version is inconsistent with itself, rendering the Greek, which has the same construction throughout, in various ways in different passages, without any fixed principles or attempt at uniformity.

In all the divisions the Greek has two substantives connected by the conjunction *καί* and followed by a genitive, and the article is prefixed only to the first of the two substantives. Now the Greek idiom in such a construction is just like the English; that is, the one article links the two substantives so closely to each other that the genitive limits them both. For example: "*the* head and front of our offending"; "*the* commandments and ordinances of the Lord"; "*the* commandments and doctrines of men." In such expressions, the Greek may omit the article before both substantives, where we should express it before the first, the genitive making the first substantive as well as the second sufficiently definite without the article (cf. p. 169 sqq.); e.g. "*the* pillar and ground of the truth," *στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας* (1 Tim. iii. 15). But when the article is prefixed to the first substantive and omitted with the second, as in the passages above cited, Luke i. 6. *ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασίαι τοῦ Κυρίου*; Col. ii. 22, *τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, in Greek as in English, as a matter of course, the genitive limits both substantives.

Such being the rule, the only question is, whether there is anything in the passages under consideration to make them exceptions. It may be and is argued that in the expression *τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. xv. 6 et al.), *Θεόν* takes the article simply as the proper name of God as it most frequently does, and so should be rendered simply "God," while *πατέρα* omits the article because it is made sufficiently definite by the genitive, and so should be rendered "the father of our Lord Jesus Christ." But it so happens that, as a general fact, *πατήρ*, when fol-

lowed by the genitive, takes the article; cf. Matt. iv. 21, *τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν*; vs. 22, *τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν*; vi. 1, *τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν*; vs. 4, *ὁ πατήρ σου*; vs. 8, *ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν*; John ii. 16, *τοῦ πατρὸς μου*; iv. 12, *τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*, et passim. And *Θεός*, when followed by *πατήρ* so as to make it sufficiently definite, omits the article, as in the apostolic benediction at the beginning of the Epistles, *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν* (Rom. i. 7, et passim). And in the passages under consideration, if the apostle had intended to say, "God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," we can scarcely doubt that he would either have omitted the article with both the substantives or have prefixed it to both. But having prefixed the article only to the first the presumption is very strong, almost as strong as it would be in English, that they are linked inseparably together, and are both limited by the same genitive; in other words, that the revised version was right in following the Authorized Version and rendering this expression wherever it occurs, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The same reasons authorized, not to say required, the revisers to render the second division of the class as they did; viz. "our God and Father," and "his God and Father."

The interpretation of this class of passages carries with it the rendering of another class still more interesting and still more disputed, in which the revisers have admitted an alternative rendering into the margin; viz. 2 Pet. i. 1, "the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ"; and Titus ii. 13, "the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." For the same arguments apply to both classes, and those arguments need not be repeated. Besides, it so happens that this last verse furnishes a striking example of our doctrine of the article, "waiting for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory," *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης*, where the article and adjective prefixed to the first substantives extend also to the second, and link them both to the genitive which follows, just as in the latter part of the verse

the article and adjective prefixed to Θεοῦ extend also to σωτήρος and link them both to ἡμῶν, and make the rendering of the last part of the verse grammatically as certain and necessary as that of the first part. If τὴν μακρὴν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης means "the blessed hope and appearing of the glory," then τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ means "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." And if 2 Pet. i. 11 confessedly is rightly rendered "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," then 2 Pet. i. 1 must, on the same principle, be rendered "the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ"; for the only difference between the two expressions is that the one has Κυρίου and the other has Θεοῦ.

The only objection that can be brought against this rendering is of a doctrinal kind. And it is expressly and solely on this ground that Winer rejects it (p. 130, Am. ed.): "For reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul I do not regard σωτήρος as a second predicate by the side of Θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας Θεός and then σωτήρ." So he says in his text, and then in a note to a later edition, he says, "In the above remarks I did not mean to deny that σωτήρος ἡμῶν can *grammatically* (the italics are Winer's) be regarded as a second predicate, dependent on the article τοῦ; only doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ *the great God*, induced me to show that there is also no *grammatical obstacle* (these italics are *not* Winer's) to taking καὶ σωτ. . . χριστοῦ by itself as a second subject." Thus his argument is wholly doctrinal and negative. Doctrinally it *cannot* be that Christ is called "our great God and Saviour"; grammatically it *can* be that he is not so called. That is the whole of his argument. The grammatical part of the argument has already been set aside in the discussion of Class XIII. of the emendations proposed by the American committee. And while it is freely admitted that there is some weight in the doctrinal argument that Christ *is usually* represented in quite

another relation to God in the teachings of Paul and in the other Scriptures, yet (1) scholars and revisers tread on dangerous ground when they decide questions of interpretation or translation "only" on doctrinal grounds; (2) It is not contrary to the analogy of Scripture or of Paul's teachings for Christ to be called God. Thomas called him "my Lord and my God" (John xx. 28); Paul says of him, "who is over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 5); and in Heb. i. 8, 9 the Son is addressed as "God" in one verse, while in the other the Father is called "thy God." And to conclude this whole topic and justify by the analogy of Scripture the rendering in the revised version of the first division also of the American committee's Class XIII., our Lord himself says to his disciples, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God"; where, by the way, in the Greek the article occurs only with the first *πατέρα*, thus linking the repeated *πατέρα* and the repeated *Θεόν* together as predicates of the same person = him who is at once my Father and your Father, my God and your God; just as in Titus iii. 13, "the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ" = the glory of him, the great Being, who is our God and Saviour, viz. Jesus Christ.

We must add a few words about the article in certain phrases, such as "the law" and "the dead." The word *νόμος* seems to be used in the Greek Testament very much as *Κύριος* and *Θεός* are, that is, like proper names; and it takes the article or omits it at the pleasure of the writer without any apparent reason or difference of meaning. So in English there is no real difference between "according to Scripture" and "according to the Scriptures," and we should never think of discovering or looking for any subtile distinction between "holy Scripture" or "holy writ" and "the holy Scriptures."<sup>1</sup> But the article is omitted in the Greek in many cases where we cannot omit it in English. To the writers of the New Testament there was properly but one

<sup>1</sup> Compare *ἱερὰ γράμματα* and *πᾶσα γραφή*, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, both without the article.

law, the law of Moses; or, in a broader use, the Hebrew Scriptures; just as to the classic Greeks there was but one king, the king of Persia; hence the former could use νόμος without the article for the law of Moses with no more danger of being misunderstood than the latter were when they used βασιλεύς without the article for the king of Persia. They were in no danger of being understood to mean a law any more than they were of being understood to mean a lord or a god when they wrote Κύριος or Θεός without the article. Thus in the Septuagint "the law of the Lord" is expressed by νόμος Κυρίου and ὁ νόμος Κυρίου, and in like manner, "the law of Moses" is expressed with or without the article in the same book, in the same chapter, and in successive verses of the same chapter, indiscriminately and without any possible difference of meaning. And in the Epistle to the Romans, as Winer has well illustrated in his Grammar (p. 123, Am. ed.), νόμος is used without the article even more frequently than with it where there is no room for doubt that the writer means the Mosaic law; e.g. Rom. ii. 17, "Behold thou art called a Jew and retest in the law," ἐν νόμῳ; vs. 23, "thou that makest thy boast of the law (ἐν νόμῳ), through breaking the law (τοῦ νόμου, the law in which thou makest thy boast), dishonourest thou God?" vs. 25, "For circumcision indeed profiteth if thou be a doer of the law" νόμον; vs. 27, "and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law (τὸν νόμον), judge thee who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law," νόμον; v. 18, For "until the law" (νόμου), that is, "until Moses," as it is defined in the next verse, "sin was in the world."

In that familiar passage, the last thirteen verses of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where the apostle describes the Jew in contrast with the Gentile as boasting and trusting in the law and in circumcision, and where of course the reference must be to the Jewish law or the Hebrew Scriptures, the word νόμος is used ten times, five times with the article and five times without it; and the Authorized Version translates it each time "the law":

but the revised version sets out with placing "a law" in the margin in vs. 17 and repeats the same in vs. 23, but gives it up in the remainder of the verses, and renders it "the law," without regard to the insertion or omission of the article in the Greek. In the six verses which immediately precede, viz. Rom. ii. 11-16, where the apostle lays down the proposition that there is no respect of persons with God, and illustrates it by stating the principle on which he will judge the Jews and the Gentiles, viz. that the Jews who have the law, that is, the Scriptures, will be judged by that law, where of course the reference must be to the Jewish law or the Hebrew Scriptures, while the Gentiles who have not the Scriptures will be judged by the law that is written in their hearts, the word *νόμος* is used nine times, seven times without the article and twice with it; and the Authorized Version renders it "the law" in every instance, except where it refers expressly to the law of nature written in the reason and conscience of the Gentiles, while the revised version has rendered it "law" four times, "a law" three times, and "the law" twice; in other words, they have rendered *ὁ νόμος* "the law" wherever it occurs, but have rendered *νόμος* "a law" three times, and "law" four times; twice, however, taking the liberty to render "no law" when it occurs with a negative, although in the connection and in the nature of the case, as it is stated by the apostle himself, the meaning must be not "having no law," but "not having the law," that is, the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> In this whole paragraph, Rom. ii. 11-29, the rendering of the Authorized Version is not only the more consistent, but the more correct. The connection and the argument of the apostle limit *νόμος* here to the Jewish law, i.e. the Hebrew Scriptures, the written law, the revelation contained in the Old Testament. The difference between the Jews and the Gentiles is that the former have this law, this revelation, and the latter do not

<sup>1</sup> For this use of *νόμος* for *γραφή*, in the general sense of Scripture, i.e. the Jewish Scripture, see John x. 34; xii. 34, and other similar passages in any good Lexicon of the New Testament.

have it. But, the apostle argues, the Gentiles will not be condemned merely for not having the Scriptures. They will be judged, not according to the law written in the Jewish Scriptures, which they have not, but by the law which they have, viz. the law of nature written in their hearts. They cannot be said to have *no law*. The apostle expressly says they have a law written in their reason and conscience, and by that they will be judged. But they have not the Jewish law, the Hebrew Scriptures, or, as we might say even in English, Scripture, holy writ, and by that they will not be judged. Even the *ἀνόμως* of the twelfth verse means without the written law, without revelation; and both the translators and the revisers would have done better to have rendered it either "without *the law*," or, if they must avoid the article, without revelation.<sup>1</sup> As many as have sinned without *the written law* shall perish without the law; and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law. This is manifestly Paul's doctrine. But put *law* or *a law* in place of *the law* wherever *νόμος* occurs without the article, and the doctrine is both false and inconsistent with the very language and argument of the apostle.<sup>2</sup>

"From the dead," in connection with some word denoting resurrection, is the uniform rendering both in the old and the new versions of two different Greek phrases, one of which takes the article with the preposition *ἀπό* (*ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*), and the other takes the preposition *ἐκ* without the article (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*). The latter literally means *out from among dead*

<sup>1</sup> Compare *ἀνόμων*, Acts ii. 23, which the translators have rendered "*wicked hands*," and the revisers rendered "by the hand of *lawless men*," and in the margin have well explained "*lawless men*" by "*men without the law*," i.e. heathen, viz. Romans. So Hackett and the best Commentators interpret this passage. And this is just the meaning of *ἀνόμως* in Rom. ii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> After writing the above I looked into Meyer's Commentary on the passage, and was pleased to find my interpretation of *νόμος* to be in entire agreement with his. He renders *τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα*, vs. 14, "*who have not the law*." And he says: "On *νόμος* without the article, used of the Mosaic law, see Winer, p. 123. So frequently in the Apocrypha, and of particular laws also in classical writers. To question this use of it in the New Testament opens the way for artificial, and sometimes intolerable, explanations of the several passages."—Meyer on Rom. ii. 12, p. 114 (English ed.), 1881.

*persons*, and the former seems to conceive of the dead as a totality, and so is nearly equivalent to "from the place of the dead." But they are only two different modes of conceiving and expressing the same thing, and that thing translators, revisers, and commentators agree to express in English by resurrection "from the dead." It is a good illustration of the impossibility of carrying the Greek article bodily, with hoofs and horns, into an English version. In the language of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar, "The Hebrew article [and the same is true of the Greek, especially the Hebraistic Greek] certainly never stands for the indefinite article; but the Hebrew conceives and expresses many ideas definitely which we are accustomed to conceive and express indefinitely," and vice versa. A noun without the article is never in all respects the exact equivalent of the same noun with it. But the difference is often in the form of conception or shade of expression rather than in the substance of the thought. It is a question, not of meaning, but of emphasis or coloring; perhaps of mere grammatical usage or agreeableness to the ear. And how to express it, or whether it can be expressed at all in English, must be left to the discretion of the translator, and often requires the exercise of the nicest discrimination.

Our whole discussion shows the folly of a servile imitation of the original in any translation. Three things belong to a good translation: (1) A faithful representation of the exact thought of the original writer; (2) A reproduction of his language, word for word, so far as the genius of the English language will permit; (3) The expression of all this, so far as it can be expressed, in good idiomatic English—the English of the *people* by whom it is to be read in our own day. The greatest of these is the first. The second is the least important of the three. It is the chief infelicity of the revised version that in a scholastic and somewhat servile effort to attain the second they sometimes permit both the others to fail of accomplishment.

In conclusion, we cannot but reiterate our sense of obliga-

tion to the committees who have given us the new revision. We repeat our hope that it will meet a cordial welcome to the hearts and homes and churches of English and American Christians. The very changes which now offend the taste, and sensibilities of some will, doubtless, in the course of time, disturb them less, and will actually increase its power over others. They have rendered an invaluable service towards the right understanding and the clear expression of the New Testament. But their work is not perfect. We dare say that, knowing as they do by experience the difficulties of the work, they are themselves the most conscious of its imperfections. We are not likely soon to have another committee of revision whose work will be so well done, still less be invested with so much authority. But for that very reason it is a pity it should not be made as perfect as possible. Of course they cannot be expected to heed or care for every censure or criticism that is passed upon it. But it is a great pity that they should not come together at some future time, and either in committee of the whole, or by a sub-committee, review their own work, and remove such errors and imperfections as the best scholars always discover in their published works, and are eager to correct in subsequent editions. Then they might also take note of the general drift of the public taste and sentiment in regard to the revision, and make such alterations and improvements as seem to be generally demanded and are, at the same time, approved by their own more deliberate judgment. Thus might we have a version, not that will please everybody, but one that will deserve to live for a hundred years to come alongside of the old version, if not come gradually to supersede it in the public estimation and service. And such an exhibition of Christian magnanimity, deference to the common sentiment and consent of Christian people, and self-forgetful devotedness to the finishing and perfecting of a sacred work — such a victory over themselves and triumph of the principle and spirit of Christianity in the revisers would be of scarcely less value to the church, and not less acceptable to the Master,

than the wisdom and learning which are generally so conspicuous in the revision.

At some time after the Old Testament company shall have completed their revision a joint committee of both and, if possible, of the American companies also, should be appointed to review the work and give harmony and consistency to the whole. Let this committee, composed, of course, of the most honored and trusted men of all the companies, be authorized to make a final revision of the entire Bible. Such a committee would be a better working body than the companies, and, at the same time, as their representative would carry with it the weight, in some respects more than the weight, of the companies themselves. The Authorized Version was thus revised by a committee; why not the revision?

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

#### NO. IX. — PHYSICAL SCIENCE IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

SOME one has defined a cultivated man to be "a person who knows a little of a good many things and a good deal of one thing." The couplet of Pope warning us that a little knowledge is dangerous, and exhorting us to drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring is a half truth, and adapted to give much needless alarm. A little knowledge, provided it be real knowledge, and provided its relative amount be not over-estimated, is by no means an evil thing.

Modern science has indeed wrought great changes in the general methods of both work and study. Society is far more complex in its organization than it was before the invention of the steam-engine and the telegraph. The facilities for manufacture and commerce are now such that minute division of labor is necessary for success in business of almost every kind. A single city, or indeed a single firm, may now supply the demands of the world for some of the products of skilled labor. More frequently than in former times the merchant is compelled to limit himself to the purchase and sale of some one commodity, and the workman to the construction of a very small portion of the manufactured article upon which he labors. The narrowing tendency of modern industries was long ago made familiar by Sydney Smith's reference to the lot of those who spend their lives in